

Compact Answers to Temporal Regular Path Queries (Supplementary Material)

ACM Reference Format:

. 2023. Compact Answers to Temporal Regular Path Queries (Supplementary Material). In *Proceedings of 32nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM'23)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 16 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnnn.nnnnnnnn>

1 INTRODUCTION

This document provides detailed definitions and proofs for the article *Compact answers to Temporal Regular Path Queries*, submitted at CIKM 2023.

As opposed to the structure adopted in the article, the result here are grouped by topic (inductive representation, finiteness, complexity, etc) rather than representation ($\mathcal{U}^{[t]}$, $\mathcal{U}^{[d]}$, etc.). This allows us to emphasize which proofs differ from one representation to the other.

2 NOTATION

Let $\langle o_1, o_2, \tau, \delta, b, e \rangle \in \mathcal{U}^{[t,d],b,e}$, and let $t \in \tau$.

In the article, we defined the interval δ_t for each t as

$$\delta_t [b_\delta + \max(0, b - t), e_{\delta_t} - \max(0, t - e)]_\delta$$

In this supplementary material, we will use $\delta(t)$ instead of δ_t . This notation will allow us to write $\delta_1(t)$ when several tuples are involved. Note that the time points b and e in this notation are still omitted, for conciseness, because they should be clear from the context.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

CIKM'23, October 21–25, 2023, Birmingham, U.K.

© 2023 Association for Computing Machinery.

ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM...\$15.00

<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnnn.nnnnnnnn>

3 INDUCTIVE REPRESENTATION

Let q be a TRPQ and G a TG.

Then $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$ is the set of answers to q over G (represented as tuples in \mathcal{U}).

In this section, we provide the full definition of the four inductive representations of $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$ discussed in the article, in $\mathcal{U}^{[t]}$, $\mathcal{U}^{[d]}$, $\mathcal{U}^{[t,d]}$ and $\mathcal{U}^{[t,d],b,e}$ respectively, and prove that they are correct.

These representations are denoted as $\langle\langle q \rangle\rangle_G^{[t]}$, $\langle\langle q \rangle\rangle_G^{[d]}$, $\langle\langle q \rangle\rangle_G^{[t,d]}$ and $\langle\langle q \rangle\rangle_G^{[t,d],b,e}$ respectively.

3.1 Grammar

For convenience, we reproduce here the syntax of TRPQs (already provided in the article).

Definition 3.1 (TRPQ). A TRPQ is an expression for the symbol path in the following grammar:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{path} &::= \text{test} \mid \text{axis} \mid (\text{path}/\text{path}) \mid (\text{path} + \text{path}) \mid \text{path}[m, n] \mid \text{path}[m, _] \\ \text{test} &::= \text{pred} \mid (? \text{path}) \mid \text{test} \vee \text{test} \mid \text{test} \wedge \text{test} \mid \neg \text{test} \\ \text{axis} &::= F \mid B \mid T_\delta \end{aligned}$$

with $\delta \in \text{intv}(\mathcal{T})$, $m, n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $m \leq n$.

3.2 In \mathcal{U}

For convenience still, we reproduce the full semantics of TRPQs, i.e. the inductive definition of the evaluation $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$ of a query q over a graph G in \mathcal{U} (already provided in the article).

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \text{pred} \rrbracket_G &= \{ \langle o, o, t, 0 \rangle \mid t \in \tau \text{ for some } \tau \in \text{val}(o, \text{pred}) \} \\ \llbracket T_\delta \rrbracket_G &= \{ \langle o, o, t, d \rangle \mid o \in (N \cup E), t \in \mathcal{T}_G, d \in \delta, t + d \in \mathcal{T}_G \} \\ \llbracket F \rrbracket_G &= \{ \langle v, e, t, 0 \rangle \mid \text{src}(e) = v, t \in \mathcal{T}_G \} \cup \{ \langle e, v, t, 0 \rangle \mid \text{tgt}(e) = v, t \in \mathcal{T}_G \} \\ \llbracket B \rrbracket_G &= \{ \langle v, e, t, 0 \rangle \mid \text{tgt}(e) = v, t \in \mathcal{T}_G \} \cup \{ \langle e, v, t, 0 \rangle \mid \text{src}(e) = v, t \in \mathcal{T}_G \} \\ \llbracket ? \text{path} \rrbracket_G &= \{ \langle o, o, t, 0 \rangle \mid \langle o, o', t, t + d \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path} \rrbracket_G \text{ for some } o' \in N \cup E, d \in \mathcal{T} \} \\ \llbracket \text{test}_1 \vee \text{test}_2 \rrbracket_G &= \llbracket \text{test}_1 \rrbracket_G \cup \llbracket \text{test}_2 \rrbracket_G \\ \llbracket \text{test}_1 \wedge \text{test}_2 \rrbracket_G &= \llbracket \text{test}_1 \rrbracket_G \cap \llbracket \text{test}_2 \rrbracket_G \\ \llbracket \neg \text{test} \rrbracket_G &= (\{ \langle o, o \rangle \mid o \in N \cup E \} \times \mathcal{T}_G \times \{0\}) \setminus \llbracket \text{test} \rrbracket_G \\ \llbracket \text{path}_1 / \text{path}_2 \rrbracket_G &= \{ \langle o_1, o_3, t, d_1 + d_2 \rangle \mid \exists o_2: \langle o_1, o_2, t, d_1 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path}_1 \rrbracket_G \wedge \langle o_2, o_3, t + d_1, d_2 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path}_2 \rrbracket_G \} \\ \llbracket \text{path}_1 + \text{path}_2 \rrbracket_G &= \llbracket \text{path}_1 \rrbracket_G \cup \llbracket \text{path}_2 \rrbracket_G \\ \llbracket \text{path}[m, n] \rrbracket_G &= \bigcup_{k=m}^n \llbracket \text{path}^k \rrbracket_G \\ \llbracket \text{path}[m, _] \rrbracket_G &= \bigcup_{k \geq m} \llbracket \text{path}^k \rrbracket_G \end{aligned}$$

3.3 In $\mathcal{U}^{[t]}$

3.3.1 Definition.

The full definition of $\langle\langle q \rangle\rangle_G^{[t]}$ is already provided in the article. We only reproduce it here for convenience.

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle \text{pred} \rangle\rangle_G^{[t]} &= \{ \langle o, o, \tau, 0 \rangle \mid o \in (N \cup E), \tau \in \text{val}(o, \text{pred}) \} \\ \langle\langle T_\delta \rangle\rangle_G^{[t]} &= \{ \langle o, o, [t_1, t_1], t_2 - t_1 \rangle \mid o \in (N \cup E), t_1 \in \mathcal{T}_G, t_2 \in (\delta + t_1) \cap \mathcal{T}_G \} \\ \langle\langle F \rangle\rangle_G^{[t]} &= \{ \langle v, e, \mathcal{T}_G, 0 \rangle \mid \text{src}(e) = v \} \cup \{ \langle e, v, \mathcal{T}_G, 0 \rangle \mid \text{tgt}(e) = v \} \\ \langle\langle B \rangle\rangle_G^{[t]} &= \{ \langle v, e, \mathcal{T}_G, 0 \rangle \mid \text{tgt}(e) = v \} \cup \{ \langle e, v, \mathcal{T}_G, 0 \rangle \mid \text{src}(e) = v \} \\ \langle\langle ? \text{path} \rangle\rangle_G^{[t]} &= \{ \langle o, o, \tau, 0 \rangle \mid \langle o, o', \tau, d \rangle \in \langle\langle \text{path} \rangle\rangle_G^{[t]} \text{ for some } o' \in N \cup E, d \in \mathcal{T} \} \\ \langle\langle \text{test}_1 \vee \text{test}_2 \rangle\rangle_G^{[t]} &= \langle\langle \text{test}_1 \rangle\rangle_G^{[t]} \cup \langle\langle \text{test}_2 \rangle\rangle_G^{[t]} \\ \langle\langle \text{test}_1 \wedge \text{test}_2 \rangle\rangle_G^{[t]} &= \{ \langle o, o, \tau_1 \cap \tau_2, 0 \rangle \mid \langle o, o, \tau_1, 0 \rangle \in \langle\langle \text{test}_1 \rangle\rangle_G^{[t]}, \langle o, o, \tau_2, 0 \rangle \in \langle\langle \text{test}_2 \rangle\rangle_G^{[t]}, \tau_1 \cap \tau_2 \neq \emptyset \} \\ \langle\langle \neg \text{test} \rangle\rangle_G^{[t]} &= \bigcup_{o \in N \cup E} \left\{ \langle o, o, \tau, 0 \rangle \mid \tau \in \text{compl} \left(\{ \tau' \mid \langle o, o, \tau', 0 \rangle \in \langle\langle \text{test} \rangle\rangle_G^{[t]}, \mathcal{T}_G \} \right) \right\} \\ \langle\langle \text{path}_1 / \text{path}_2 \rangle\rangle_G^{[t]} &= \left\{ \langle o_1, o_3, ((\tau_1 + d_1) \cap \tau_2) - d_1, d_1 + d_2 \rangle \mid \exists o_2: \langle o_1, o_2, \tau_1, d_1 \rangle \in \langle\langle \text{path}_1 \rangle\rangle_G^{[t]} \wedge \langle o_2, o_3, \tau_2, d_2 \rangle \in \langle\langle \text{path}_2 \rangle\rangle_G^{[t]} \wedge (\tau_1 + d_1) \cap \tau_2 \neq \emptyset \right\} \\ \langle\langle \text{path}_1 + \text{path}_2 \rangle\rangle_G^{[t]} &= \langle\langle \text{path}_1 \rangle\rangle_G^{[t]} \cup \langle\langle \text{path}_2 \rangle\rangle_G^{[t]} \\ \langle\langle \text{path}[m, n] \rangle\rangle_G^{[t]} &= \bigcup_{k=m}^n \langle\langle \text{path}^k \rangle\rangle_G^{[t]} \\ \langle\langle \text{path}[m, _] \rangle\rangle_G^{[t]} &= \bigcup_{k \geq m} \langle\langle \text{path}^k \rangle\rangle_G^{[t]} \end{aligned}$$

We observe that when q is of the form $(\text{path}_1 + \text{path}_2)$, $(\text{path}[m, _])$ and $(\text{path}[m, n])$, the definition of $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[t]}$ is nearly identical to the one of $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$. This will also be the case for the three representations below.

3.3.2 Correctness.

We start with a lemma:

LEMMA 3.2. *Let $G = \langle N, E, \text{conn}, \mathcal{T}_G, \text{val} \rangle$ be a TPG and let q an expression for the symbol test in the grammar of Definition 3.1. Then:*

- *each tuples in $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$ is of the form $\langle o_1, o_2, t, 0 \rangle$ for some o_1, o_2 and t ,*
- *each tuples in $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[t]}$ is of the form $\langle o_1, o_2, \tau, 0 \rangle$ for some o_1, o_2 and τ .*

PROOF. Immediate from the definitions of $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$ and $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[t]}$. □

The following result states that the representation $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[t]}$ is correct:

PROPOSITION 3.3. *Let $G = \langle N, E, \text{conn}, \mathcal{T}_G, \text{val} \rangle$ be a TPG and q a TRPQ. Then the unfolding of $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[t]}$ is $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$.*

PROOF.

Let $G = \langle N, E, \text{conn}, \mathcal{T}_G, \text{val} \rangle$ be a TG, and let q be a TRPQ.

We show below that:

- (I) for any $\langle o_1, o_2, t, d \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G$, there is a $\tau \in \text{intv}(\mathcal{T})$ such that
 - (a) $\langle o_1, o_2, \tau, d \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[t]}$, and
 - (b) $t \in \tau$,
- (II) for any $\langle o_1, o_2, \tau, d \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[t]}$ for any $t \in \tau$,
 - $\langle o_1, o_2, t, d \rangle$ is in $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$.

We proceed by induction on the structure of q .

If q is of the form pred , F , B , $(\text{test} \vee \text{test})$, $(\text{path} + \text{path})$, $\text{path}[m, n]$ or $\text{path}[m, _]$, then (I) and (II) immediately follow from the definitions of $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$ and $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[t]}$.

So we focus below on the five remaining cases:

- $q = T_\delta$.

From the above definitions, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket q \rrbracket_G &= \{ \langle o, o, t, d \rangle \mid o \in (N \cup E), t \in \mathcal{T}_G, d \in \delta, t + d \in \mathcal{T}_G \} \\ \llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[t]} &= \{ \langle o, o, [t_1, t_1], t_2 - t_1 \rangle \mid o \in (N \cup E), t_1 \in \mathcal{T}_G, t_2 \in (\delta + t_1) \cap \mathcal{T}_G \} \end{aligned}$$

- For (I), let $\mathbf{v} = \langle o, o, t, t + d \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G$.

And let $\mathbf{u} = \langle o, o, [t, t], d \rangle$ in $\mathcal{U}^{[t]}$.

For (Ia) we show that $\mathbf{u} \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[t]}$.

From $\mathbf{v} \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G$, we get $o \in N \cup E$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}_G$.

Besides, because $\mathbf{v} \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G$ still,

$$t + d \in \mathcal{T}_G \tag{1}$$

and

$$d \in \delta \tag{2}$$

$$t + d \in t + \delta \tag{3}$$

So from (1) and (3)

$$t + d \in (\delta + t) \cap \mathcal{T}_G \tag{4}$$

So there is a t_2 (namely $t + d$) such that $d = t_2 - t$ and $t_2 \in t + \delta \cap \mathcal{T}_G$.

Together with the definition of $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[t]}$, this implies $\mathbf{u} \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[t]}$, which concludes the proof for (Ia).

And trivially, $t \in [t, t]$, so (Ib) is verified as well.

- For (II), let $\mathbf{u} = \langle o, o, [t, t], d \rangle \in \langle q \rangle_G^{[t]}$.

From $\mathbf{u} \in \langle q \rangle_G^{[t]}$, we get $o \in N \cup E$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}_G$.

So to conclude the proof, it is sufficient to show that (i) $d \in \delta$ and (ii) $t + d \in \mathcal{T}_G$.

Because $\mathbf{u} \in \langle q \rangle_G^{[t]}$ still, we have

$$d = t_2 - t \text{ for some } t_2 \in (\delta + t) \cap \mathcal{T}_G \quad (5)$$

From (5), we get $t_2 = t + d$.

Therefore from (5) still,

$$t + d \in (\delta + t) \cap \mathcal{T}_G \quad (6)$$

which proves (ii).

And from (6), we also get

$$\begin{aligned} t + d &\in \delta + t \\ t + d - t &\in (\delta + t) - t \\ d &\in \delta \end{aligned}$$

which proves (i).

- $q = \text{test}_1 \wedge \text{test}_2$.

From the above definitions, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket q \rrbracket_G &= \llbracket \text{test}_1 \rrbracket_G \cap \llbracket \text{test}_2 \rrbracket_G \\ \langle q \rangle_G^{[t]} &= \{ \langle o, o, \tau_1 \cap \tau_2, 0 \rangle \mid \langle o, o, \tau_1, 0 \rangle \in \langle \text{test}_1 \rangle_G^{[t]}, \langle o, o, \tau_2, 0 \rangle \in \langle \text{test}_2 \rangle_G^{[t]}, \tau_1 \cap \tau_2 \neq \emptyset \} \end{aligned}$$

- For (I), let $\mathbf{v} = \langle o, o, t, d \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G$.

From Lemma 3.2, $d = 0$.

And from the definition of $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$, $\mathbf{v} \in \llbracket \text{test}_1 \rrbracket_G \cap \llbracket \text{test}_2 \rrbracket_G$.

So by IH, there are intervals τ_1 and τ_2 s.t. $\langle o, o, \tau_i, 0 \rangle \in \langle \text{test}_i \rangle_G^{[t]}$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $t \in \tau_1 \cap \tau_2$.

Together with the definition of $\langle q \rangle_G^{[t]}$, this proves (I).

- For (II), let $\langle o, o, \tau, d \rangle \in \langle q \rangle_G^{[t]}$.

Then from Lemma 3.2, $d = 0$.

And from the definition of $\langle q \rangle_G^{[t]}$, there are two intervals τ_1 and τ_2 s.t. $\tau = \tau_1 \cap \tau_2$ and $\langle o, o, \tau_i, 0 \rangle \in \langle \text{test}_i \rangle_G^{[t]}$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

Now take any $t \in \tau$.

Then $t \in \tau_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

So by IH, $\langle o, o, t, 0 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{test}_i \rrbracket_G$ for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

Together with the definition of $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$, this proves (II).

- $q = (?path)$.

From the above definitions, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket q \rrbracket_G &= \{ \langle o, o, t, 0 \rangle \mid \langle o, o', t, t + d \rangle \in \llbracket path \rrbracket_G \text{ for some } o' \in N \cup E, d \in \mathcal{T} \} \\ \langle q \rangle_G^{[t]} &= \{ \langle o, o, \tau, 0 \rangle \mid \langle o, o', \tau, d \rangle \in \langle path \rangle_G^{[t]} \text{ for some } o' \in N \cup E, d \in \mathcal{T} \} \end{aligned}$$

- For (I), let $\langle o, o, t, 0 \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G$.

From the definition of $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$, there are o' and d such that $\langle o, o', t, t + d \rangle \in \llbracket path \rrbracket_G$.

So by IH, there is a τ s.t. $t \in \tau$ and $\langle o, o', \tau, d \rangle \in \langle path \rangle_G^{[t]}$.

Therefore $\langle o, o, \tau, 0 \rangle \in \langle q \rangle_G^{[t]}$, from the definition of $\langle q \rangle_G^{[t]}$.

- For (II), let $\langle o, o, \tau, 0 \rangle \in \langle q \rangle_G^{[t]}$.

From the definition of $\langle q \rangle_G^{[t]}$, there are o' and d s.t. $\langle o, o', \tau, d \rangle \in \langle path \rangle_G^{[t]}$.

Now take any $t \in \tau$.

By IH, $\langle o, o', t, t + d \rangle \in \llbracket path \rrbracket_G$.

Therefore $\langle o, o, t, 0 \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G$, from the definition of $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$.

- $q = \neg\text{test}$.

From the above definitions, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket q \rrbracket_G &= (\{\langle o, o \rangle \mid o \in N \cup E\} \times \mathcal{T}_G \times \{0\}) \setminus \llbracket \text{test} \rrbracket_G \\ \langle q \rangle_G^{[t]} &= \bigcup_{o \in N \cup E} \left\{ \langle o, o, \tau, 0 \rangle \mid \tau \in \text{compl} \left(\{\tau' \mid \langle o, o, \tau', 0 \rangle \in \langle \text{test} \rangle_G^{[t]} \}, \mathcal{T}_G \right) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

- For (I), let $\mathbf{v} = \langle o, o, t, 0 \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G$.
From the definition of $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$, $\mathbf{v} \notin \llbracket \text{test} \rrbracket_G$.
So

$$t \notin \{\tau' \mid \langle o, o, \tau', 0 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{test} \rrbracket_G\} \quad (7)$$

Now by IH, together with Lemma 3.2, we get:

$$\langle o, o, t, 0 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{test} \rrbracket_G \text{ iff } t' \in \tau' \text{ for some } \tau' \text{ s.t. } \langle o, o, \tau', 0 \rangle \in \langle \text{test} \rangle_G^{[t]} \quad (8)$$

So from (7) and (8):

$$t \notin \bigcup \{\tau' \mid \langle o, o, \tau', 0 \rangle \in \langle \text{test} \rangle_G^{[t]}\}$$

Therefore

$$t \in \mathcal{T}_G \setminus \bigcup \{\tau' \mid \langle o, o, \tau', 0 \rangle \in \langle \text{test} \rangle_G^{[t]}\} \quad (9)$$

So $t \in \tau$ for some $\tau \in \text{compl} \left(\bigcup \{\tau' \mid \langle o, o, \tau', 0 \rangle \in \langle \text{test} \rangle_G^{[t]} \}, \mathcal{T}_G \right)$.

And $\langle o, o, \tau, 0 \rangle \in \langle q \rangle_G^{[t]}$, from the definition of $\langle q \rangle_G^{[t]}$.

- For (II), let $\langle o, o, \tau, 0 \rangle \in \langle q \rangle_G^{[t]}$.
And take any $t \in \tau$.

From the definition of $\langle q \rangle_G^{[t]}$:

$$t \in \mathcal{T}_G \setminus \bigcup \{\tau' \mid \langle o, o, \tau', 0 \rangle \in \langle \text{test} \rangle_G^{[t]}\}$$

Together with (8), this implies

$$\langle o, o, t, 0 \rangle \notin \llbracket \text{test} \rrbracket_G$$

Therefore $\langle o, o, t, 0 \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G$, from the definition of $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$.

- $q = \text{path}_1 / \text{path}_2$.

From the above definitions, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket q \rrbracket_G &= \{ \langle o_1, o_3, t, d_1 + d_2 \rangle \mid \exists o_2: \langle o_1, o_2, t, d_1 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path}_1 \rrbracket_G \wedge \langle o_2, o_3, t + d_1, d_2 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path}_2 \rrbracket_G \} \\ \langle q \rangle_G^{[t]} &= \left\{ \langle o_1, o_3, ((\tau_1 + d_1) \cap \tau_2) - d_1, d_1 + d_2 \rangle \mid \exists o_2: \langle o_1, o_2, \tau_1, d_1 \rangle \in \langle \text{path}_1 \rangle_G^{[t]} \wedge \langle o_2, o_3, \tau_2, d_2 \rangle \in \langle \text{path}_2 \rangle_G^{[t]} \wedge \right. \\ &\quad \left. (\tau_1 + d_1) \cap \tau_2 \neq \emptyset \right\} \end{aligned}$$

- For (I), let $\mathbf{v} = \langle o_1, o_3, t, d \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G$.
From the definition of $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$, there are o_2, d_1 and d_2 such that $\langle o_1, o_2, t, d_1 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path}_1 \rrbracket_G$, $\langle o_2, o_3, t + d_1, d_2 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path}_2 \rrbracket_G$ and $d = d_1 + d_2$.
By IH, because $\langle o_1, o_2, t, d_1 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path}_1 \rrbracket_G$, there is a τ_1 such that $t \in \tau_1$ and

$$\langle o_1, o_2, \tau_1, d_1 \rangle \in \langle \text{path}_1 \rangle_G^{[t]} \quad (10)$$

And similarly, because $\langle o_2, o_3, t + d_1, d_2 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path}_2 \rrbracket_G$, there is a τ_2 such that $t + d_1 \in \tau_2$ and

$$\langle o_2, o_3, \tau_2, d_2 \rangle \in \langle \text{path}_2 \rangle_G^{[t]} \quad (11)$$

From $t \in \tau_1$, we get

$$t + d_1 \in \tau_1 + d_1 \quad (12)$$

Together with the fact that $t + d_1 \in \tau_2$, this implies

$$\tau_1 + d_1 \cap \tau_2 \neq \emptyset \quad (13)$$

So from (10), (11), (13) and the definition of $\langle q \rangle_G^{[t]}$,

$$\langle o_1, o_2, ((\tau_1 + d_1) \cap \tau_2) - d_1, d_1 + d_2 \rangle \in \langle q \rangle_G^{[t]}$$

which proves (Ia).

And in order to prove (Ib), we only need to show that

$$t \in ((\tau_1 + d_1) \cap \tau_2) - d_1$$

We know that $t \in \tau_1$, therefore

$$t + d_1 \in \tau_1 + d_1$$

Together with the fact that $t + d_1 \in \tau_2$, this yields

$$\begin{aligned} t + d_1 &\in (\tau_1 + d_1) \cap \tau_2 \\ t &\in ((\tau_1 + d_1) \cap \tau_2) - d_1 \end{aligned}$$

– For (II), let $\mathbf{u} = \langle o_1, o_3, \tau, d \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[t]}$, and let $t \in \tau$.

We show that $\langle o_1, o_3, t, t + d \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G$.

Because $\mathbf{u} \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[t]}$, from the definition of $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[t]}$, there are τ_1, τ_2, d_1, d_2 and o_2 s.t.:

- (i) $d = d_1 + d_2$
- (ii) $\tau = ((\tau_1 + d_1) \cap \tau_2) - d_1$
- (iii) $\langle o_1, o_2, \tau_1, d_1 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path}_1 \rrbracket_G^{[t]}$
- (iv) $\langle o_2, o_3, \tau_2, d_2 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path}_2 \rrbracket_G^{[t]}$

Since $t \in \tau$, from (ii), we have

$$t \in ((\tau_1 + d_1) \cap \tau_2) - d_1 \quad (14)$$

$$t + d_1 \in (((\tau_1 + d_1) \cap \tau_2) - d_1) + d_1 \quad (15)$$

$$t + d_1 \in (\tau_1 + d_1) \cap \tau_2 \quad (16)$$

$$t + d_1 \in \tau_1 + d_1 \quad (17)$$

$$t \in \tau_1 \quad (18)$$

From (iii), by IH, for any $t' \in \tau_1$

$$\langle o_1, o_2, t' + d_1 \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G$$

In particular, from (18)

$$\langle o_1, o_2, t, t + d_1 \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G \quad (19)$$

And from (iv), by IH, for any $t'' \in \tau_2$

$$\langle o_2, o_3, t'', t'' + d_2 \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G$$

In particular, from (16)

$$\langle o_2, o_3, t + d_1, (t + d_1) + d_2 \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G \quad (20)$$

So from (19), (20) and the definition of $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$

$$\langle o_1, o_3, t, t + d_1 + d_2 \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G$$

□

3.4 In $\mathcal{U}^{[d]}$

3.4.1 Definition.

We start with the case where q is an expression for the symbol test in the grammar of Definition 3.1.

The definitions of $\llbracket \text{pred} \rrbracket_G^{[t]}$ and $\llbracket \neg \text{test} \rrbracket_G^{[t]}$ are already provided in the article, we reproduce them here for completeness:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \text{pred} \rrbracket_G^{[d]} &= \{ \langle o, o, t, [0, 0] \rangle \mid t \in \tau \text{ for some } \tau \in \text{val}(o, \text{pred}) \} \\ \llbracket \text{F} \rrbracket_G^{[d]} &= \{ \langle v, e, t, [0, 0] \rangle \mid \text{src}(e) = v, t \in \mathcal{T}_G \} \cup \{ \langle e, v, t, [0, 0] \rangle \mid \text{tgt}(e) = v, t \in \mathcal{T}_G \} \\ \llbracket \text{B} \rrbracket_G^{[d]} &= \{ \langle v, e, t, [0, 0] \rangle \mid \text{tgt}(e) = v, t \in \mathcal{T}_G \} \cup \{ \langle e, v, t, [0, 0] \rangle \mid \text{src}(e) = v, t \in \mathcal{T}_G \} \\ \llbracket (? \text{path}) \rrbracket_G^{[d]} &= \{ \langle o, o, t, [0, 0] \rangle \mid \exists o', \delta: \langle o, o', t, \delta \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path} \rrbracket_G^{[d]} \} \\ \llbracket \text{test}_1 \vee \text{test}_2 \rrbracket_G^{[d]} &= \llbracket \text{test}_1 \rrbracket_G^{[d]} \cup \llbracket \text{test}_2 \rrbracket_G^{[d]} \\ \llbracket \text{test}_1 \wedge \text{test}_2 \rrbracket_G^{[d]} &= \llbracket \text{test}_1 \rrbracket_G^{[d]} \cap \llbracket \text{test}_2 \rrbracket_G^{[d]} \\ \llbracket \neg \text{test} \rrbracket_G^{[d]} &= \left\{ \langle o, o, t, [0, 0] \rangle \mid o \in N \cup E, t \in \mathcal{T}_G \setminus \{ t' \mid \langle o, o, t', [0, 0] \rangle \in \llbracket \text{test} \rrbracket_G^{[d]} \} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Next, we consider the operators $(\text{path}_1 + \text{path}_2)$, $(\text{path}[m, _])$ and $(\text{path}[m, n])$.

For these cases, $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[t, d]}$ is once again defined analogously to $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$, in terms of temporal join (a.k.a. $\text{path}_1/\text{path}_2$) and set union.

We only write the definitions here for the sake of completeness:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \text{path}_1 + \text{path}_2 \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]} &= \llbracket \text{path}_1 \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]} \cup \llbracket \text{path}_2 \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]} \\ \llbracket \text{path}[m, n] \rrbracket_G &= \bigcup_{k=m}^n \llbracket \text{path}^k \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]} \\ \llbracket \text{path}[m, _] \rrbracket_G &= \bigcup_{k \geq m} \llbracket \text{path}^k \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]} \end{aligned}$$

The only remaining operators are temporal join ($\text{path}_1/\text{path}_2$) and temporal navigation (T_δ), already defined in the article. We reproduce here these two definition for convenience:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \text{path}_1/\text{path}_2 \rrbracket_G^{[d]} &= \left\{ \langle o_1, o_3, t_1, \delta_2 + t_2 - t_1 \rangle \mid \exists o_2: \langle o_1, o_2, t_1, \delta_1 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path}_1 \rrbracket_G^{[d]} \wedge \langle o_2, o_3, t_2, \delta_2 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path}_2 \rrbracket_G^{[d]} \wedge t_2 \in t_1 + \delta_1 \right\} \\ \llbracket T_\delta \rrbracket_G^{[d]} &= \left\{ \langle o, o, t, ((\delta + t) \cap \mathcal{T}_G) - t \rangle \mid o \in N \cup E, t \in \mathcal{T}_G, (\delta + t) \cap \mathcal{T}_G \neq \emptyset \right\} \end{aligned}$$

We also reproduce the alternative characterization of $\llbracket T_\delta \rrbracket_G^{[d]}$ provided in the article, as a unary operator:

$$\llbracket q/T_\delta \rrbracket_G^{[d]} = \{ \langle o_1, o_2, t, (\delta' + \delta) \cap \mathcal{T}_G \rangle \mid \langle o_1, o_2, t, \delta' \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[d]}, (t + (\delta' + \delta)) \cap \mathcal{T}_G \neq \emptyset \}$$

3.4.2 Correctness.

The following result states that the representation $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[d]}$ is correct:

PROPOSITION 3.4. *Let $G = \langle N, E, \text{conn}, \mathcal{T}_G, \text{val} \rangle$ be a TPG and q a TRPQ. Then the unfolding of $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[d]}$ is $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$.*

PROOF.

Let $G = \langle N, E, \text{conn}, \mathcal{T}_G, \text{val} \rangle$ be a TG, and let q be a TRPQ.

We show below that:

- (I) for any $\langle o_1, o_2, t, d \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G$, there is a $\delta \in \text{intv}(\mathcal{T})$ such that
 - (a) $\langle o_1, o_2, t, \delta \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[d]}$, and
 - (b) $d \in \delta$,
- (II) for any $\langle o_1, o_2, t, \delta \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[d]}$ for any $d \in \delta$, $\langle o_1, o_2, t, d \rangle$ is in $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$.

We proceed once again by induction on the structure of q .

If q is of the form pred , F, B, $(\text{test} \vee \text{test})$, $(\text{test} \wedge \text{test})$, $\neg \text{test}$, $(\text{path} + \text{path})$, $\text{path}[m, n]$ or $\text{path}[m, _]$, then (I) and (II) immediately follow from the definitions of $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$ and $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[d]}$.

If q is of the form $(? \text{path})$, then the proof is nearly identical to one already provided for $\llbracket (? \text{path}) \rrbracket_G^{[t]}$.

So we focus below on the two remaining cases:

- $q = T_\delta$.

From the above definitions, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket q \rrbracket_G &= \{ \langle o, o, t, d \rangle \mid o \in (N \cup E), t \in \mathcal{T}_G, d \in \delta, t + d \in \mathcal{T}_G \} \\ \llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[d]} &= \{ \langle o, o, t, ((\delta + t) \cap \mathcal{T}_G) - t \rangle \mid o \in N \cup E, t \in \mathcal{T}_G, (\delta + t) \cap \mathcal{T}_G \neq \emptyset \} \end{aligned}$$

- For (I), let $\mathbf{v} = \langle o, o, t, d \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G$.
And let $\mathbf{u} = \langle o, o, t, ((\delta + t) \cap \mathcal{T}_G) - t \rangle$ in $\mathcal{U}^{[d]}$.
For (Ia) we show that $\mathbf{u} \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[d]}$.
From $\mathbf{v} \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G$, we get $o \in N \cup E$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}_G$.
Besides, because $\mathbf{v} \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G$ still,

$$t + d \in \mathcal{T}_G \tag{21}$$

and

$$d \in \delta \tag{22}$$

$$t + d \in t + \delta \tag{23}$$

So from (21) and (23)

$$t + d \in (\delta + t) \cap \mathcal{T}_G \tag{24}$$

$$(\delta + t) \cap \mathcal{T}_G \neq \emptyset \tag{25}$$

Together with the definition of $\langle q \rangle_G^{[d]}$, this implies $\mathbf{u} \in \langle q \rangle_G^{[d]}$, which concludes the proof for (Ia).
Finally, from (24), we get

$$t + d - t \in ((\delta + t) \cap \mathcal{T}_G) - t \quad (26)$$

$$d \in ((\delta + t) \cap \mathcal{T}_G) - t \quad (27)$$

which proves (Ib).

- For (II), let $\mathbf{u} = \langle o, o, t, ((\delta + t) \cap \mathcal{T}_G) - t \rangle \in \langle q \rangle_G^{[d]}$, and let $d \in ((\delta + t) \cap \mathcal{T}_G) - t$.

From $\mathbf{u} \in \langle q \rangle_G^{[d]}$, we get $o \in N \cup E$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}_G$.

So to conclude the proof, it is sufficient to show that (i) $d \in \delta$ and (ii) $t + d \in \mathcal{T}_G$.

By assumption, we have

$$d \in ((\delta + t) \cap \mathcal{T}_G) - t \quad (28)$$

$$d + t \in (\delta + t) \cap \mathcal{T}_G \quad (29)$$

$$d + t \in \mathcal{T}_G \quad (30)$$

which proves (ii).

And from (29), we also get

$$d + t \in \delta + t$$

$$d + t - t \in (\delta + t) - t$$

$$d \in \delta$$

which proves (i).

- $q = \text{path}_1/\text{path}_2$.

From the above definitions, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket q \rrbracket_G &= \{ \langle o_1, o_3, t, d_1 + d_2 \rangle \mid \exists o_2: \langle o_1, o_2, t, d_1 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path}_1 \rrbracket_G \wedge \langle o_2, o_3, t + d_1, d_2 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path}_2 \rrbracket_G \} \\ \langle q \rangle_G^{[d]} &= \left\{ \langle o_1, o_3, t_1, \delta_2 + t_2 - t_1 \rangle \mid \exists o_2: \langle o_1, o_2, t_1, \delta_1 \rangle \in \langle \text{path}_1 \rangle_G^{[d]} \wedge \langle o_2, o_3, t_2, \delta_2 \rangle \in \langle \text{path}_2 \rangle_G^{[d]} \wedge t_2 \in t_1 + \delta_1 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

- For (I), let $\mathbf{v} = \langle o_1, o_3, t, d \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G$.

From the definition of $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$, there are o_2, d_1 and d_2 such that $\langle o_1, o_2, t, d_1 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path}_1 \rrbracket_G$, $\langle o_2, o_3, t + d_1, d_2 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path}_2 \rrbracket_G$ and $d = d_1 + d_2$.

By IH, because $\langle o_1, o_2, t, d_1 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path}_1 \rrbracket_G$, there is a δ_1 such that $d_1 \in \delta_1$ and

$$\langle o_1, o_2, t, \delta_1 \rangle \in \langle \text{path}_1 \rangle_G^{[d]} \quad (31)$$

And similarly, because $\langle o_2, o_3, t + d_1, d_2 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path}_2 \rrbracket_G$, there is a δ_2 such that $d_2 \in \delta_2$ and

$$\langle o_2, o_3, t + d_1, \delta_2 \rangle \in \langle \text{path}_2 \rangle_G^{[d]} \quad (32)$$

Next, since $d \in \delta_1$

$$t + d_1 \in t + \delta_1 \quad (33)$$

So from (31), (32), (33) and the definition of $\langle q \rangle_G^{[d]}$ (replacing t_1 with t and t_2 with $t + d_1$), we get

$$\langle o_1, o_2, t, \delta_2 + (t + d_1) - t \rangle \in \langle q \rangle_G^{[d]}$$

which proves (Ia).

And in order to prove (Ib), we only need to show that $d \in \delta_2 + (t + d_1) - t$, or in other words that

$$d \in \delta_2 + d_1$$

We know that

$$d_2 \in \delta_2 \quad (34)$$

$$d_2 + d_1 \in \delta_2 + d_1 \quad (35)$$

Together with the fact that $d = d_1 + d_2$, this concludes the proof for (Ib).

- For (II), let $\mathbf{u} = \langle o_1, o_3, t_1, \delta \rangle \in \langle q \rangle_G^{[d]}$, and let $d \in \delta$.

Because $\mathbf{u} \in \langle q \rangle_G^{[d]}$, from the definition of $\langle q \rangle_G^{[d]}$, there are δ_1, δ_2, t_2 and o_2 s.t.:

$$(i) \quad \delta = \delta_2 + t_2 - t_1$$

$$(ii) \quad t_2 \in t_1 + \delta_1$$

$$(iii) \quad \langle o_1, o_2, t_1, \delta_1 \rangle \in \langle \text{path}_1 \rangle_G^{[d]}$$

(iv) $\langle o_2, o_3, t_2, \delta_2 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path}_2 \rrbracket_G^{[d]}$
 From (i) and (ii), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\delta &= \delta_2 + (t_1 + \delta_1) - t_1 \\ &= \delta_2 + \delta_1\end{aligned}$$

Together with $d \in \delta$, this implies that there are $d_1 \in \delta_1$ and $d_2 \in \delta_2$ such that $d = d_1 + d_2$.
 Next, because $d_1 \in \delta_1$, from (iii), by IH

$$\langle o_1, o_2, t_1, t_1 + d_1 \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G \quad (36)$$

And similarly, because $d_2 \in \delta_2$, from (iv)

$$\langle o_2, o_3, t_2, t_2 + d_2 \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G \quad (37)$$

So from (36), (37) and the definition of $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$

$$\langle o_1, o_3, t_1, d_1 + d_2 \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G \quad (38)$$

Together with the fact that $d = d_1 + d_2$, this concludes the proof for (II). \square

3.5 In $\mathcal{U}^{[t,d]}$

3.5.1 Definition.

We start with the case where q is an expression for the symbol test in the grammar of Definition 3.1.

As a consequence of Lemma 3.2, $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]}$ can be trivially defined out of $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[t]}$ by replacing the distance 0 with the interval $[0, 0]$, i.e.

$$\llbracket \text{test} \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]} = \{ \langle o, o, \tau, [0, 0] \rangle \mid \langle o, o, \tau, 0 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{test} \rrbracket_G^{[t]} \}$$

Next, if q is of the form $(\text{path}_1 + \text{path}_2)$, $(\text{path}[m, _])$ or $(\text{path}[m, n])$, then the definition of $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]}$ is once again nearly identical to the one of $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$:

$$\begin{aligned}\llbracket \text{path}_1 + \text{path}_2 \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]} &= \llbracket \text{path}_1 \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]} \cup \llbracket \text{path}_2 \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]} \\ \llbracket \text{path}[m, n] \rrbracket_G &= \bigcup_{k=m}^n \llbracket \text{path}^k \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]} \\ \llbracket \text{path}[m, _] \rrbracket_G &= \bigcup_{k \geq m} \llbracket \text{path}^k \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]}\end{aligned}$$

The only remaining operators are temporal join $(\text{path}_1 / \text{path}_2)$ and temporal navigation (T_δ) , already defined in the article, and reproduced here for convenience:

$$\begin{aligned}\llbracket \text{path}_1 / \text{path}_2 \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]} &= \bigcup \{ \mathbf{u}_1 \bowtie \mathbf{u}_2 \mid \mathbf{u}_1 \in \llbracket \text{path}_1 \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]}, \mathbf{u}_2 \in \llbracket \text{path}_2 \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]} \} \\ \llbracket T_\delta \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]} &= \bigcup_{o \in N \cup E} \{ \langle o, o, \mathcal{T}_G, \delta \rangle \bowtie \langle o, o, \mathcal{T}_G, [0, 0] \rangle \}\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{u}_1 \bowtie \mathbf{u}_2$ is defined as follows.

Let $\mathbf{u}_1 = \langle o_1, o_2, \tau_1, \delta_1 \rangle$ and $\mathbf{u}_2 = \langle o_3, o_4, \tau_2, \delta_2 \rangle$.

If $o_2 \neq o_3$, then $\mathbf{u}_1 \bowtie \mathbf{u}_2 = \emptyset$.

Otherwise, let:

$$\tau = ((\tau_1 + \delta_1) \cap \tau_2) \ominus \delta_1 \cap \tau_1$$

And for every $t \in \tau$, let

$$\delta(t) = \delta_1 \downharpoonright b_{\delta_1} + \max(0, b - t), \quad e_{\delta_1} - \max(0, t - e) \downharpoonright_{\delta_1}$$

Then

$$\mathbf{u}_1 \bowtie \mathbf{u}_2 = \{ \langle o_1, o_4, [t, t], \delta(t) + \delta_2 \rangle \mid t \in \tau \}$$

3.5.2 Correctness.

If $\mathbf{u} = \langle o_1, o_2, \tau, \delta \rangle \in \mathcal{U}^{[t,d]}$, we call *temporal relation induced by \mathbf{u}* the set $\{ \langle t, t + d \rangle \mid t \in \tau, d \in \delta \}$.

We also define the binary operator \bowtie : $(\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T}) \times (\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T})$ as in the article, i.e.

$$R_1 \bowtie R_2 = \{ t_1, t_3 \mid (t_1, t_2) \in R_1 \text{ and } (t_2, t_3) \in R_2 \text{ for some } t_2 \}$$

We can now formulate the following lemma:

LEMMA 3.5. Let $\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2 \in \mathcal{U}^{[t,d]}$, and for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let R_i denote the temporal relation induced by \mathbf{u}_i . If $\mathbf{u}_1 \bowtie \mathbf{u}_2 \neq \emptyset$, then

$$R_1 \bowtie R_2 = \bigcup_{\langle o_1, o_2, \tau, \delta \rangle \in \mathbf{u}_1 \bowtie \mathbf{u}_2} \{ \langle t, t + d \rangle \mid t \in \tau, d \in \delta \}$$

The following result states that the representation $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]}$ is correct:

PROPOSITION 3.6. *Let $G = \langle N, E, \text{conn}, \mathcal{T}_G, \text{val} \rangle$ be a TPG and q a TRPQ. Then the unfolding of $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]}$ is $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$.*

PROOF.

Let $G = \langle N, E, \text{conn}, \mathcal{T}_G, \text{val} \rangle$ be a TG, and let q be a TRPQ.

We show below that:

- (I) for any $\langle o_1, o_2, t, d \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G$, there are $\tau, \delta \in \text{intv}(\mathcal{T})$ such that
 - (a) $\langle o_1, o_2, \tau, \delta \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]}$,
 - (b) $t \in \tau$, and
 - (c) $d \in \delta$.
- (II) for any $\langle o_1, o_2, \tau, \delta \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]}$ for any $(t, d) \in \tau \times \delta$, $\langle o_1, o_2, t, d \rangle$ is in $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$.

We proceed once again by induction on the structure of q .

If q is of the form *pred*, *F*, *B*, (*test* \vee *test*), (*path* + *path*), *path*[m, n] or *path*[$m, _$], then (I) and (II) immediately follow from the definitions of $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$ and $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]}$.

If q is of the form *test* \wedge *test*, \neg *test* or (*?path*), then the proof is nearly identical to one already provided for $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[t]}$.

So we focus below on the two remaining cases:

- $q = \text{path}_1 / \text{path}_2$.

From the above definitions, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket q \rrbracket_G &= \{ \langle o_1, o_3, t, d_1 + d_2 \rangle \mid \exists o_2: \langle o_1, o_2, t, d_1 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path}_1 \rrbracket_G \wedge \langle o_2, o_3, t + d_1, d_2 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path}_2 \rrbracket_G \} \\ \llbracket \text{path}_1 / \text{path}_2 \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]} &= \bigcup \{ \mathbf{u}_1 \bowtie \mathbf{u}_2 \mid \mathbf{u}_1 \in \llbracket \text{path}_1 \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]}, \mathbf{u}_2 \in \llbracket \text{path}_2 \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]} \} \end{aligned}$$

- For (I), let $\mathbf{v} = \langle o_1, o_3, t, d \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G$.

From the definition of $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$, there are o_2, d_1 and d_2 such that $\langle o_1, o_2, t, d_1 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path}_1 \rrbracket_G$, $\langle o_2, o_3, t + d_1, d_2 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path}_2 \rrbracket_G$ and $d = d_1 + d_2$.

By IH, because $\langle o_1, o_2, t, d_1 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path}_1 \rrbracket_G$, there are τ_1 and δ_1 such that $t \in \tau_1$, $d_1 \in \delta_1$ and

$$\langle o_1, o_2, \tau_1, \delta_1 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path}_1 \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]} \quad (39)$$

Let R_1 be the temporal relation induced by this tuple $\langle o_1, o_2, \tau_1, \delta_1 \rangle$.

Since $t \in \tau_1$ and $d_1 \in \delta_1$, we have

$$(t, t + d_1) \in R_1 \quad (40)$$

Similarly, because $\langle o_2, o_3, t + d_1, d_2 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path}_2 \rrbracket_G$, there are τ_2 and δ_2 such that $t + d_1 \in \tau_2$, $d_2 \in \delta_2$ and

$$\langle o_2, o_3, \tau_2, \delta_2 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path}_2 \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]} \quad (41)$$

Let R_2 be the temporal relation induced by this tuple $\langle o_2, o_3, \tau_2, \delta_2 \rangle$.

Since $t + d_1 \in \tau_2$ and $d_2 \in \delta_2$, we have

$$(t + d_1, t + d_1 + d_2) \in R_2 \quad (42)$$

So from (40), (42) and Lemma 3.5, there are τ and δ such that $\langle o_1, o_3, \tau, \delta \rangle \in \mathbf{u}_1 \bowtie \mathbf{u}_2$, $t \in \tau$ and $d_1 + d_2 = d \in \delta$, which concludes the proof for (I).

- For (II), let $\mathbf{u} = \langle o_1, o_3, t_1, \delta \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]}$, and let $(t, d) \in \tau \times \delta$.

Because $\mathbf{u} \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]}$, from the definition of $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]}$, there are \mathbf{u}_1 and \mathbf{u}_2 s.t.:

- (i) $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{u}_1 \bowtie \mathbf{u}_2$
- (ii) $\mathbf{u}_1 \in \llbracket \text{path}_1 \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]}$
- (iii) $\mathbf{u}_2 \in \llbracket \text{path}_2 \rrbracket_G^{[t,d]}$

Let R_i be the temporal relation induced by \mathbf{u}_i for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

From (i), and Lemma 3.5,

$$(t, t + d) \in R_1 \bowtie R_2 \quad (43)$$

Now let $\mathbf{u}_1 = \langle o_1, o_2, \tau_1, \delta_1 \rangle$ and $\mathbf{u}_2 = \langle o_2, o_3, \tau_2, \delta_2 \rangle$ for some $o_2, \tau_1, \tau_2, \delta_1$ and δ_2 .

From (43) and the definition of \bowtie , there must be d_1 and d_2 s.t. $d = d_1 + d_2$, $t \in \tau_1$, $d_1 \in \delta_1$, $t + d_1 \in \tau_2$ and $d_2 \in \delta_2$.

So from ii, and iii, by IH

$$\langle o_1, o_2, t, d_1 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path}_1 \rrbracket_G \quad (44)$$

$$\langle o_2, o_3, t + d_1, d_2 \rangle \in \llbracket \text{path}_2 \rrbracket_G \quad (45)$$

So from (44), (45) and the definition of $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$

$$\langle o_1, o_3, t, d_1 + d_2 \rangle \in \llbracket q \rrbracket_G,$$

which concludes the proof for (II). \square

3.6 In $\mathcal{U}^{[t,d],b,e}$

3.6.1 Definition.

If q is an expression for the symbol test in the grammar of Definition ??, then the definition of $\langle q \rangle_G^{[t,d],b,e}$ is nearly identical to the one of $\langle q \rangle_G^{[t,d]}$, extending each tuple $\{\langle o, o, \tau, [0, 0] \rangle$ with b_τ and e_τ , i.e.

$$\langle \text{test} \rangle_G^{[t,d],b,e} = \{ \langle o, o, \tau, [0, 0], b_\tau, e_\tau \rangle \mid \langle o, o, \tau, [0, 0] \rangle \in \langle \text{test} \rangle_G^{[t,d]} \}$$

Next, if q is of the form $(\text{path}_1 + \text{path}_2)$, $(\text{path}[m, _])$ or $(\text{path}[m, n])$, then the definition of $\langle q \rangle_G^{[t,d]}$ is once again nearly identical to the one of $\llbracket q \rrbracket_G$:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \text{path}_1 + \text{path}_2 \rangle_G^{[t,d],b,e} &= \langle \text{path}_1 \rangle_G^{[t,d],b,e} \cup \langle \text{path}_2 \rangle_G^{[t,d],b,e} \\ \llbracket \text{path}[m, n] \rrbracket_G &= \bigcup_{k=m}^n \langle \text{path}^k \rangle_G^{[t,d],b,e} \\ \llbracket \text{path}[m, _] \rrbracket_G &= \bigcup_{k \geq m} \langle \text{path}^k \rangle_G^{[t,d],b,e} \end{aligned}$$

So the only remaining operator are temporal join $(\text{path}_1/\text{path}_2)$ and temporal navigation (T_δ) , already defined in the article. We reproduce here these two definition for convenience:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \text{path}_1/\text{path}_2 \rangle_G^{[t,d],b,e} &= \{ \mathbf{u}_1 \bowtie \mathbf{u}_2 \mid \mathbf{u}_1 \in \langle \text{path}_1 \rangle_G^{[t,d],b,e}, \mathbf{u}_2 \in \langle \text{path}_2 \rangle_G^{[t,d],b,e}, \mathbf{u}_1 \sim \mathbf{u}_2 \} \\ \langle T_\delta \rangle_G^{[t,d],b,e} &= \{ \langle o, o, \mathcal{T}_G, \delta, b_{\mathcal{T}_G}, e_{\mathcal{T}_G} \rangle \bowtie \langle o, o, \mathcal{T}_G, [0, 0], b_{\mathcal{T}_G}, e_{\mathcal{T}_G} \rangle \mid o \in N \cup E \} \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{u}_1 \sim \mathbf{u}_2$ and $\mathbf{u}_1 \bowtie \mathbf{u}_2$ are defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle o_1, o_2, \tau_1, \delta_1, b_1, e_1 \rangle &\sim \langle o_3, o_4, \tau_2, \delta_2, e_2, b_2 \rangle \text{ iff } o_2 = o_3 \\ \langle o_1, o_3, \tau_1, \delta_1, b_1, e_1 \rangle &\bowtie \langle o_3, o_4, \tau_2, \delta_2, e_2, b_2 \rangle = \langle o_1, o_4, \tau, \delta_1 + \delta_2, b, e \rangle \\ &\text{with} \\ \tau &= (((\tau_1 + \delta_1) \cap \tau_2) \ominus \delta_1) \cap \tau_1 \\ b &= \max(b_1, b_2 - b_{\delta_1}) \\ e &= \min(e_1, e_2 - e_{\delta_1}) \end{aligned}$$

3.6.2 Correctness.

Operator $\text{path}_1/\text{path}_2$.

Let $\mathbf{u}_1 = \langle o_1, o_2, \tau_1, \delta_1 \rangle$ and $\mathbf{u}_2 = \langle o_3, o_4, \tau_2, \delta_2 \rangle$, with $o_2 = o_3$.

Let also $\mathbf{u}_1 \bowtie \mathbf{u}_2 = \langle o_1, o_4, \tau'_1, \delta_1 + \delta_2, b, e \rangle$, with

$$\begin{aligned} \tau &= (((\tau_1 + \delta_1) \cap \tau_2) \ominus \delta_1) \cap \tau_1 \\ b &= \max(b_1, b_2 - b_{\delta_1}) \\ e &= \min(e_1, e_2 - e_{\delta_1}) \end{aligned}$$

As explained in Section 2, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $t \in \tau_i$, we use $\delta_i(t)$ for the interval

$$\delta_i \downarrow b_{\delta_i} + \max(0, b_i - t), e_{\delta_i} - \max(0, t - e_i) \downarrow \delta_i$$

And similarly to what we did for $\mathcal{U}^{[t,d]}$, we use R_i for be the binary relation over \mathcal{T} specified by the time points and distances in \mathbf{u}_i , i.e. $R_i = \{ (t, t + d) \mid t \in \tau_i, d \in \delta_i(t) \}$.

Then the intervals in the set $\mathbf{u}_1 \bowtie \mathbf{u}_2$ should intuitively represent this relation $R_1 \bowtie R_2$, i.e. we need to prove that (i) $\tau = \text{dom}(R_1 \bowtie R_2)$ and that (ii) for each $t \in \tau$,

$$t + \delta(t) = \{ t' \mid (t, t') \in R_1 \bowtie R_2 \}$$

For (ii), let $t \in \tau$. We use

- a for the least value s.t. $(t, a) \in \text{range}(R_1) \cap \text{dom}(R_2)$, and
- a' for the least value s.t. $(a, a') \in R_2$

Then a' is also the least value s.t. $(t, a') \in R_1 \bowtie R_2$.

Analogously, we use z for the greatest value s.t. $(t, z) \in \text{range}(R_1) \cap \text{dom}(R_2)$, and z' for the greatest value s.t. $(z, z') \in R_2$. Then z' is also the greatest value s.t. $(t, z') \in R_1 \bowtie R_2$.

From Lemma ??:

- $\{t\} \times (t + [a, z]) \subseteq R_1$, and
- $[a, b] \times [a', z'] \subseteq R_2$

Therefore $[a', z'] = \{c \mid (t, c) \in R_1 \bowtie R_2\}$.

To conclude the proof, we show that $t + \delta_t = [a, z]$.

We only prove that $t + b_{\delta_t} = a$ (the proof that $t + e_{\delta_t} = z$ is symmetric).

Following the definition of b , we consider 2 cases:

- (1) $b_1 < b_2 - b_{\delta_1}$
- (2) $b_1 \geq b_2 - b_{\delta_1}$

For Case (1), we get

$$b_1 < b_2 - b_{\delta_1} \quad (46)$$

$$\max(b_1, b_2 - b_{\delta_1}) = b_2 - b_{\delta_1} \quad (47)$$

$$b = b_2 - b_{\delta_1} \quad \text{from the definition of } b \quad (48)$$

And in Case (1) still, we get:

$$b_1 < b_2 - b_{\delta_1} \quad (49)$$

$$0 < b_2 - b_{\delta_1} - b_1 \quad (50)$$

$$\max(0, b_2 - b_{\delta_1} - b_1) = b_2 - b_{\delta_1} - b_1 \quad (51)$$

Next, we consider two subcases:

- (i) $t < b_2 - b_{\delta_1}$
- (ii) $t \geq b_2 - b_{\delta_1}$

In Case (i), we get

$$t < b_2 - b_{\delta_1} \quad (52)$$

$$0 < b_2 - b_{\delta_1} - t \quad (53)$$

$$\max(0, b_2 - b_{\delta_1} - t) = b_2 - b_{\delta_1} - t \quad (54)$$

Now from the definition of δ_t ,

$$b_{\delta_t} = b_{\delta_1} + b_{\delta_2} + \max(0, b - t) \quad (55)$$

$$= b_{\delta_1} + b_{\delta_2} + \max(0, b_2 - b_{\delta_1} - t) \quad \text{from (48)} \quad (56)$$

$$= b_{\delta_1} + b_{\delta_2} + b_2 - b_{\delta_1} - t \quad \text{from (54)} \quad (57)$$

$$= b_{\delta_2} + b_2 - t \quad (58)$$

$$b_{\delta_t} + t = b_{\delta_2} + b_2 - t + t \quad (59)$$

$$= b_{\delta_2} + b_2 \quad (60)$$

Next, from the definition of a'

$$a' = b_{\delta_2(a)} + a \quad (61)$$

$$= b_{\delta_2} + \max(0, b_2 - a) + a \quad (62)$$

And, from the definition of a

$$a = b_{\delta_1(t)} + t \quad (63)$$

$$= b_{\delta_1} + \max(0, b_1 - t) + t \quad (64)$$

Then we have two further subcases:

- (I) $t \geq b_1$, or
- (II) $t < b_1$

In case (I):

$$t \geq b_1 \quad (65)$$

$$0 \geq b_1 - t \quad (66)$$

$$\max(0, b_1 - t) = 0 \quad (67)$$

$$a = b_{\delta_1} + t \quad \text{from (64)} \quad (68)$$

$$\max(0, b_2 - a) = \max(0, b_2 - b_{\delta_1} - t) \quad (69)$$

$$= b_2 - b_{\delta_1} - t \quad \text{from (54)} \quad (70)$$

$$= b_2 - a \quad \text{from (68)} \quad (71)$$

In case (II):

$$t < b_1 \quad (72)$$

$$0 < b_1 - t \quad (73)$$

$$\max(0, b_1 - t) = b_1 - t \quad (74)$$

$$a = b_{\delta_1} + b_1 - t + t \quad \text{from (64)} \quad (75)$$

$$= b_{\delta_1} + b_1 \quad (76)$$

$$\max(0, b_2 - a) = \max(0, b_2 - b_{\delta_1} - b_1) \quad (77)$$

$$= b_2 - b_{\delta_1} - b_1 \quad \text{from (51)} \quad (78)$$

$$= b_2 - a \quad \text{from (76)} \quad (79)$$

$$(80)$$

So in both cases (I) and (II), we get

$$\max(0, b_2 - a) = b_2 - a$$

Therefore from (62)

$$a' = b_{\delta_2} + b_2 - a + a \quad (81)$$

$$= b_{\delta_2} + b_2 \quad (82)$$

$$= t + b_{\delta_t} \quad \text{from (60)} \quad (83)$$

which concludes the proof for Case (1)- (i).

We continue with Case (1)- (ii).

From Case (ii):

$$t \geq b_2 - b_{\delta_1} \quad (84)$$

$$0 \geq b_2 - b_{\delta_1} - t \quad (85)$$

$$\max(0, b_2 - b_{\delta_1} - t) = 0 \quad (86)$$

Now from the definition of δ_t :

$$b_{\delta_t} = b_{\delta_1} + b_{\delta_2} + \max(0, b - t) \quad (87)$$

$$= b_{\delta_1} + b_{\delta_2} + \max(0, b_2 - b_1 - t) \quad \text{from (48)} \quad (88)$$

$$= b_{\delta_1} + b_{\delta_2} \quad \text{from (86)} \quad (89)$$

$$b_{\delta_t} + t = b_{\delta_1} + b_{\delta_2} + t \quad (90)$$

Next, from Case (1) and Case (ii), by transitivity, we get

$$b_1 \leq t \quad (91)$$

$$\max(0, b_1 - t) = 0 \quad (92)$$

And from the definition of a

$$a = b_{\delta_1(t)} + t \quad (93)$$

$$= b_{\delta_1} + \max(0, b_1 - t) + t \quad (94)$$

$$= b_{\delta_1} + t \quad \text{from (92)} \quad (95)$$

$$\geq b_{\delta_1} + b_2 - b_{\delta_1} \quad \text{from Case (ii)} \quad (96)$$

$$\geq b_2 \quad (97)$$

$$0 \geq b_2 - a \quad (98)$$

$$\max(0, b_2 - a) = 0 \quad (99)$$

Therefore from (62) and (99)

$$a' = b_{\delta_2} + a \quad (100)$$

$$= b_{\delta_2} + b_{\delta_1} + t \quad \text{from (95)} \quad (101)$$

$$= b_{\delta_t} + t \quad \text{from (60)} \quad (102)$$

which concludes the proof for Case (1)- (ii).

We continue with Case (2).

In this case, we get

$$b_1 \geq b_2 - b_{\delta_1} \quad (103)$$

$$\max(b_1, b_2 - b_{\delta_1}) = b_1 \quad (104)$$

$$b = b_1 \quad \text{from the definition of } b \quad (105)$$

And from Case (2) still, we derive

$$b_1 \geq b_2 - b_{\delta_1} \quad (106)$$

$$0 \geq b_2 - b_{\delta_1} - b_1 \quad (107)$$

$$\max(0, -b_{\delta_1} - b_1) = 0 \quad (108)$$

As well as

$$b_1 \geq b_2 - b_{\delta_1} \quad (109)$$

$$b_1 + b_{\delta_1} \geq b_2 \quad (110)$$

Next, we distinguish two subcases, namely

(a) $t < b_1$ and

(b) $t \geq b_1$

We start with Case (a).

In this case,

$$t < b_1 \quad (111)$$

$$0 < b_1 - t \quad (112)$$

$$\max(0, b_1 - t) = b_1 - t \quad (113)$$

And from the definition of δ_t :

$$b_{\delta_t} = b_{\delta_1} + b_{\delta_2} + \max(0, b - t) \quad (114)$$

$$= b_{\delta_1} + b_{\delta_2} + \max(0, b_1 - t) \quad \text{from (105)} \quad (115)$$

$$= b_{\delta_1} + b_{\delta_2} + b_1 - t \quad \text{from (113)} \quad (116)$$

$$b_{\delta_t} + t = b_{\delta_1} + b_{\delta_2} + b_1 - t + t \quad (117)$$

$$= b_{\delta_1} + b_{\delta_2} + b_1 \quad (118)$$

Next, from the definition of a

$$a = b_{\delta_1(t)} + t \quad (119)$$

$$= \max(0, b_1 - t) + b_{\delta_1} + t \quad (120)$$

$$= b_1 - t + b_{\delta_1} + t \quad \text{from (113)} \quad (121)$$

$$= b_1 + b_{\delta_1} \quad (122)$$

$$\text{So from (110)} \quad (123)$$

$$a \geq b_2 \quad (124)$$

$$0 \geq b_2 - a \quad (125)$$

$$\max(0, b_2 - a) = 0 \quad (126)$$

$$b_{\delta_2} + \max(0, b_2 - a) = b_{\delta_2} \quad (127)$$

$$b_{\delta_2(a)} = b_{\delta_2} \quad (128)$$

$$b_{\delta_2(a)} + a = b_{\delta_2} + a \quad (129)$$

$$a' = b_{\delta_2} + a \quad \text{from the defintiiion of } a' \quad (130)$$

$$a' = b_{\delta_2} + b_1 + b_{\delta_1} \quad \text{from (122)} \quad (131)$$

$$a' = b_{\delta_t} + t \quad \text{from (118)} \quad (132)$$

which concludes the proof for Case (2)- (a).

We end with Case (2)- (b). In this case,

$$t \geq b_1 \quad (133)$$

$$0 \geq b_1 - t \quad (134)$$

$$\max(0, b_1 - t) = 0 \quad (135)$$

And from the definition of δ_t :

$$b_{\delta_t} = b_{\delta_1} + b_{\delta_2} + \max(0, b - t) \quad (136)$$

$$= b_{\delta_1} + b_{\delta_2} + \max(0, b_1 - t) \quad \text{from (105)} \quad (137)$$

$$= b_{\delta_1} + b_{\delta_2} \quad \text{from (135)} \quad (138)$$

$$b_{\delta_t} + t = b_{\delta_1} + b_{\delta_2} + t \quad (139)$$

Next, from the definition of a

$$a = b_{\delta_1(t)} + t \quad (140)$$

$$= \max(0, b_1 - t) + b_{\delta_1} + t \quad (141)$$

$$= b_{\delta_1} + t \quad \text{from (135)} \quad (142)$$

Now from Case (b)

$$b_1 + \leq t \quad (143)$$

$$b_1 + b_{\delta_1} \leq t + b_{\delta_1} \quad (144)$$

$$b_1 + b_{\delta_1} \leq a \quad \text{from (142)} \quad (145)$$

$$b_2 \leq a \quad \text{from (110), by transitivity} \quad (146)$$

$$b_2 - a \leq 0 \quad (147)$$

$$\max(0, b_2 - a) = 0 \quad (148)$$

$$b_{\delta_2} + \max(0, b_2 - a) = b_{\delta_2} \quad (149)$$

$$b_{\delta_2(a)} = b_{\delta_2} \quad (150)$$

$$b_{\delta_2(a)} + a = b_{\delta_2} + a \quad (151)$$

$$a' = b_{\delta_2} + a \quad \text{from the defintiiion of } a' \quad (152)$$

$$= b_{\delta_2} + b_{\delta_1} + t \quad \text{from (142)} \quad (153)$$

$$= b_{\delta_t} + t \quad \text{from (139)} \quad (154)$$

which concludes the proof for Case (2)- (b). \square

4 FINITENESS

5 COMPLEXITY OF QUERY ANSWERING

5.1 Problem

We define in this section a decision problem for each representation, similar to the problem $\text{COMPACT ANSWER}^{[t]}$ defined in the article. First, we define a (possibly partial) order over tuples of each representation, in the expected way, i.e.:

- over $\mathcal{U}^{[t]}$: $\langle o_1, o_2, \tau_1, d_1 \rangle \sqsubseteq_{[t]} \langle o_3, o_4, \tau_2, d_2 \rangle$ iff $\langle o_1, o_2, d_1 \rangle = \langle o_3, o_4, d_2 \rangle$ and $\tau_1 \subseteq \tau_2$,
- over $\mathcal{U}^{[d]}$: $\langle o_1, o_2, t_1, \delta_1 \rangle \sqsubseteq_{[d]} \langle o_3, o_4, t_2, \delta_2 \rangle$ iff $\langle o_1, o_2, t_1 \rangle = \langle o_3, o_4, t_2 \rangle$ and $\delta_1 \subseteq \delta_2$,
- over $\mathcal{U}^{[t,d]}$: $\langle o_1, o_2, \tau_1, \delta_1 \rangle \sqsubseteq_{[t,d]} \langle o_3, o_4, \tau_2, \delta_2 \rangle$ iff $\langle o_1, o_2 \rangle = \langle o_3, o_4 \rangle$, $\tau_1 \subseteq \tau_2$ and $\delta_1 \subseteq \delta_2$,
- over $\mathcal{U}^{[t,d],b,e}$: $\langle o_1, o_2, \tau_1, \delta_1, b_1, b_2 \rangle \sqsubseteq_{[t,d],b,e} \langle o_3, o_4, \tau_2, \delta_2, b_2, e_2 \rangle$ iff $\langle o_1, o_2 \rangle = \langle o_3, o_4 \rangle$, $\tau_1 \subseteq \tau_2$ and $\delta_1(t) \subseteq \delta_2(t)$ for all $t \in \tau_1 \cap \tau_2$ (the notation of $\delta_i(t)$ is explained above, in Section 2).

Now let x be one of $[t]$, $[d]$, $[t, d]$ or $[t, d], b, e$.

We decline the notion of compact answer defined in Section XXX in four flavors, as follows:

Definition 5.1. Let G be a TG, let q be a TRPQ and let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}^x$.

We say that \mathbf{u} is a *compact answer* to q over G (in \mathcal{U}^x) if $\mathbf{u} \in \max_{\sqsubseteq_x} \{\mathbf{u}' \in \mathcal{U}^x \mid \text{unfold}(\mathbf{u}') = \llbracket q \rrbracket_G\}$

And similary, we get four decision problems:

COMPACT ANSWER^x
Input: TG G , TRPQ q , tuple $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}^x$
Decide: \mathbf{u} is a compact answer to q over G (in \mathcal{U}^x)

5.2 Hardness

5.3 Membership

6 MINIMIZATION

7 SIZE OF COMPACT ANSWERS