

The Complexity of Reverse Engineering Problems for Conjunctive Queries

Pablo Barceló and Miguel Romero

Center for Semantic Web Research &
Department of Computer Science, University of Chile
pbarcelo@dcc.uchile.cl, mromero@dcc.uchile.cl

Abstract

Reverse engineering problems for conjunctive queries (CQs), such as query by example (QBE) or definability, take a set of user examples and convert them into an explanatory CQ. Despite their importance, the complexity of these problems is prohibitively high (coNEXPTIME-complete). We isolate their two main sources of complexity and propose relaxations of them that reduce the complexity while having meaningful theoretical interpretations. The first relaxation is based on the idea of using existential pebble games for approximating homomorphism tests. We show that this characterizes QBE/definability for CQs up to treewidth k , while reducing the complexity to EXPTIME. As a side result, we obtain that the complexity of the QBE/definability problems for CQs of treewidth k is EXPTIME-complete for each $k \geq 1$. The second relaxation is based on the idea of “desynchronizing” direct products, which characterizes QBE/definability for unions of CQs and reduces the complexity to coNP. The combination of these two relaxations yields tractability for QBE and characterizes it in terms of unions of CQs of treewidth at most k . We also study the complexity of these problems for conjunctive regular path queries over graph databases, showing them to be no more difficult than for CQs.

1998 ACM Subject Classification H.2.3 Database Management - Query Languages

Keywords and phrases reverse engineering, conjunctive queries, query by example, definability, treewidth, complexity of pebble games

Digital Object Identifier 10.4230/LIPIcs...

1 Introduction

Reverse engineering is the general problem of abstracting user examples into an explanatory query. An important instance of this problem corresponds to *query-by-example* (QBE) for a query language $\mathcal{L}$. In QBE, the system is presented with a database $\mathcal{D}$ and n -ary relations S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$ of *positive* and *negative* examples, respectively. The question is whether there exists a query q in $\mathcal{L}$ such that its evaluation $q(\mathcal{D})$ over $\mathcal{D}$ contains all the positive examples (i.e., $S^+ \subseteq q(\mathcal{D})$) but none of the negative ones (i.e., $q(\mathcal{D}) \cap S^- = \emptyset$). In case such q exists, it is also desirable to return its result $q(\mathcal{D})$. Another version of this problem assumes that the system is given the set S^+ of positive examples only, and the question is whether there is a query q in $\mathcal{L}$ that precisely defines S^+ , i.e., $q(\mathcal{D}) = S^+$. This is often known as the *definability problem* for $\mathcal{L}$. As of late, QBE and definability have received quite some attention in different contexts; e.g., for first-order logic and the class of conjunctive queries over relational databases [26, 23, 19, 7, 2, 24, 22]; for regular path queries over graph databases [1, 6]; for SPARQL queries over RDF [3]; and for tree patterns over XML [10, 20].

In data management, a particularly important instance of QBE and definability corresponds to the case when $\mathcal{L}$ is the class of conjunctive queries (CQs). Nevertheless, the relevance of such instance is counterbalanced by its inherent complexity: Both QBE and definability



© Pablo Barceló and Miguel Romero;
licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY
Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics
LIPICS Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany

for CQs are coNEXPTIME-complete [24, 22]. Moreover, in case that a CQ-explanation q for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$ exists (i.e., a CQ q such that $S^+ \subseteq q(\mathcal{D})$ and $q(\mathcal{D}) \cap S^- = \emptyset$ for QBE), it might take double exponential time to compute its result $q(\mathcal{D})$. While several heuristics have been proposed that alleviate this complexity in practice [26, 23, 19, 7], up to date there has been (essentially) no theoretical investigation identifying the sources of complexity of these problems and proposing principled solutions for them. The general objective of this article is to make a first step in such direction.

A semantic characterization of QBE for CQs has been known for a long time in the community. Formally, there exists a CQ q such that $S^+ \subseteq q(\mathcal{D})$ and $q(\mathcal{D}) \cap S^- = \emptyset$ (i.e., a CQ-explanation) if and only if the following *QBE test for CQs* fails:

- QBE test for CQs: There is a tuple $\bar{b}$ in S^- such that $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$, i.e., $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ homomorphically maps to $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$. (Here, $\prod$ denotes the usual direct product of databases with distinguished tuples of constants).

(A similar test characterizes CQ-definability, save that now $\bar{b}$ is an arbitrary tuple over $\mathcal{D}$ outside S^+). Moreover, in case there is a CQ-explanation q for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$, then there is a *canonical* such explanation given by the CQ whose *frozen body* is $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$. As shown by Willard [24], the QBE test for CQs yields optimal bounds for determining (a) the existence of a CQ-explanation q for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$ (namely, coNEXPTIME), and (b) the size of such q (i.e., exponential). More important, it allows to identify the two main sources of complexity of the problem, each one of which increases its complexity by one exponential:

1. The construction of the canonical explanation $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$, which takes exponential time in the combined size of $\mathcal{D}$ and S^+ .
2. The homomorphism test $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$ for each tuple $\bar{b} \in S^-$. Since, in general, checking for the existence of a homomorphism is an NP-complete problem, this step involves an extra exponential blow up.

Our contributions: We propose relaxations of the QBE test for CQs that alleviate one or both sources of complexity and have meaningful theoretical interpretations in terms of the QBE problem (our results also apply to definability). They are based on standard approximation notions for the homomorphism test and the construction of the direct product $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$, as found in the context of constraint satisfaction and definability, respectively.

1. We start by relaxing the second source of complexity, i.e., the one given by the homomorphism tests of the form $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$, for $\bar{b} \in S^-$. In order to approximate the notion of homomorphism, we use the *strong consistency tests* often applied in the area of constraint satisfaction [13]. As observed by Kolaitis and Vardi [18], such consistency tests can be recast in terms of the *existential pebble game* [17], first defined in the context of database theory as a tool for studying the expressive power of Datalog, and also used to show that CQs of bounded treewidth can be evaluated efficiently [12].

As opposed to the homomorphism test, checking for the existence of a *winning duplicator strategy* in the existential k -pebble game on $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ and $(\mathcal{D}', \bar{b})$, denoted $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow_k (\mathcal{D}', \bar{b})$, can be solved in polynomial time for each fixed $k > 1$ [17]. Therefore, replacing the homomorphism test $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$ with its “approximation” $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow_k (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$ reduces the complexity of the QBE test for CQs to EXPTIME. Furthermore, this approximation has a neat theoretical interpretation: The relaxed version of the QBE test does not accept the input given by $(\mathcal{D}, S^+, S^-)$ if and only if there is a CQ-explanation q for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$ such that q is of *treewidth at most* $(k - 1)$. While the latter is not particularly surprising in light of the strong existing connections between the existential

k -pebble game and the evaluation of CQs of treewidth at most $(k - 1)$ [12], we believe our characterization to be of conceptual importance.

Interestingly, when this relaxed version of the QBE test yields a CQ-explanation q of treewidth at most $(k - 1)$, its result $q(\mathcal{D})$ can be evaluated in exponential time (recall that for general CQs this might require double exponential time).

2. We then prove that the previous bound is optimal, i.e., checking whether the relaxed version of the QBE test does not accept the input given by $(\mathcal{D}, S^+, S^-)$, or, equivalently, if there is a CQ-explanation q for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$ of treewidth at most k , for each $k \geq 1$, is EXPTIME-complete. (This also holds for the definability problem for CQs of treewidth at most k). Intuitively, this states that relaxing the second source of complexity of the test by using existential pebble games does not eliminate the first one.

Establishing this lower bound is the technically most challenging result in the paper. It is obtained by a nontrivial adaptation of techniques that have been used to study the complexity of pebble games [15, 16].

3. Finally, we look at the second source of complexity, i.e., the construction of the exponential size canonical explanation $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$. While it is not clear which techniques are better suited for approximating this construction, we look at a particular one that appears in the context of definability: Instead of constructing the synchronized product $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ with respect to all tuples in S , we look at them one by one. That is, we check whether there exists a tuple $\bar{a} \in S^+$ and a tuple $\bar{b} \in S^-$ such that $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$. By using a characterization developed in the context of definability [1], we observe that this relaxed version of the QBE test is NP-complete and has a meaningful interpretation: It corresponds to finding explanations based on *unions* of CQs. Moreover, when combined with the previous relaxation (i.e., replacing the homomorphism test $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$ with $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow_k (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$) we obtain tractability. This further relaxed test corresponds to finding explanations over the set of unions of CQs of treewidth at most $(k - 1)$.

We then switch to study QBE in the context of graph databases, where CQs are often extended with the ability to check whether two nodes are linked by a path whose label satisfies a given regular expression. This gives rise to the class of *conjunctive regular path queries*, or CRPQs (see, e.g., [11, 8, 25, 5]). CRPQ-definability was first studied by Antonopoulos et al. [1]. In particular, it is shown that CRPQ-definability is in EXPSPACE by exploiting automata-based techniques, in special, pumping arguments.

1. We first provide a QBE test for CRPQs in the spirit of the one for CQs given above. With such characterization we prove that QBE and definability for CRPQs are in coNEXPTIME, improving the EXPSPACE upper bound of Antonopoulos et al. This tells us that these problems are at least not more difficult than for CQs.
2. We also develop relaxations of the QBE test for CRPQs based on the existential pebble game and the “desynchronization” of the direct product $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$. As before, we show that they reduce the complexity of the test and have meaningful interpretations in terms of the class of queries we use to construct explanations.

Organization: Preliminaries are in Section 2. A review of QBE/definability for CQs is provided in Section 3. Relaxations of the homomorphism tests are studied in Section 4 and the desynchronization of the direct product in Section 5. In Section 6 we consider QBE/definability for CRPQs. Future work is presented in Section 7. Due to space limitations, we relegate some proofs to the appendix.

2 Preliminaries

Databases, homomorphisms, and direct products. A *schema* is a finite set of relation symbols, each one of which has an associated arity $n > 0$. A *database* over schema σ is a finite set of atoms of the form $R(\bar{a})$, where R is a relation symbol in σ of arity $n > 0$ and $\bar{a}$ is an n -ary tuple of constants. We slightly abuse notation, and sometimes write $\mathcal{D}$ also for the set of elements mentioned in $\mathcal{D}$.

Let $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D}'$ be databases over the same schema σ . A *homomorphism* from $\mathcal{D}$ to $\mathcal{D}'$ is a mapping h from the elements of $\mathcal{D}$ to the elements of $\mathcal{D}'$ such that for every atom $R(\bar{a})$ in $\mathcal{D}$ it is the case that $R(h(\bar{a})) \in \mathcal{D}'$. We often need to talk about distinguished tuples of elements in databases. We then write $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ to define the pair that corresponds to the database $\mathcal{D}$ and the tuple $\bar{a}$ of elements in $\mathcal{D}$. Let $\bar{a}$ and $\bar{b}$ be n -ary ($n \geq 0$) tuples of elements in $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D}'$, respectively. A homomorphism from $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ to $(\mathcal{D}', \bar{b})$ is a homomorphism from $\mathcal{D}$ to $\mathcal{D}'$ such that $h(\bar{a}) = \bar{b}$. We write $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}', \bar{b})$ if there is a homomorphism from $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ to $(\mathcal{D}', \bar{b})$. Checking if $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}', \bar{b})$ is a well-known NP-complete problem.

In this work, the notion of *direct product* of databases is particularly important. Let $\bar{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and $\bar{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$ be n -ary tuples of elements over A and B , respectively. Their direct product $\bar{a} \otimes \bar{b}$ is the n -ary tuple $((a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_n, b_n))$ over $A \times B$. If $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D}'$ are databases over the same schema σ , we define $\mathcal{D} \otimes \mathcal{D}'$ to be the following database over σ :

$$\{R(\bar{a} \otimes \bar{b}) \mid R \in \sigma, R(\bar{a}) \in \mathcal{D}, \text{ and } R(\bar{b}) \in \mathcal{D}'\}.$$

Further, we use $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \otimes (\mathcal{D}', \bar{b})$ to denote the pair $(\mathcal{D} \otimes \mathcal{D}', \bar{a} \otimes \bar{b})$. Finally, we write $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} (\mathcal{D}_i, \bar{a}_i)$ as a shorthand for $(\mathcal{D}_1, \bar{a}_1) \otimes \dots \otimes (\mathcal{D}_m, \bar{a}_m)$. Note that this is allowed since $\otimes$ is an associative operation.

The direct product $\otimes$ defines the least upper bound in the lattice of databases defined by the notion of homomorphism. In particular, (a) $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} (\mathcal{D}_i, \bar{a}_i) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}_i, \bar{a}_i)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq m$, and (b) if $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}_i, \bar{a}_i)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq m$, then $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow \prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} (\mathcal{D}_i, \bar{a}_i)$.

Conjunctive queries. A *conjunctive query* (CQ) q over relational schema σ is an FO formula of the form:

$$\exists \bar{y} (R_1(\bar{x}_1) \wedge \dots \wedge R_m(\bar{x}_m)), \quad (1)$$

such that (a) each $R_i(\bar{x}_i)$ is an atom over σ , for $1 \leq i \leq m$, and (b) $\bar{y}$ is a sequence of variables taken from the $\bar{x}_i$'s. In order to ensure domain-independence for queries, we only consider CQs without constants. We often write $q(\bar{x})$ to denote that $\bar{x}$ is the sequence of *free* variables of q , i.e., the ones that do not appear existentially quantified in $\bar{y}$.

Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a database over σ . We define the evaluation of a CQ $q(\bar{x})$ of the form (1) over $\mathcal{D}$ in terms of the homomorphisms from $\mathcal{D}_q$ to $\mathcal{D}$, where $\mathcal{D}_q$ is the database $\{R_1(\bar{x}_1), \dots, R_m(\bar{x}_m)\}$ that contains all atoms in q . The *evaluation* of $q(\bar{x})$ over $\mathcal{D}$, denoted $q(\mathcal{D})$, contains exactly those tuples $h(\bar{x})$ such that h is a homomorphism from $\mathcal{D}_q$ to $\mathcal{D}$.

CQs of bounded treewidth. The evaluation problem for CQs (i.e., determining whether $q(\mathcal{D}) \neq \emptyset$, given a database $\mathcal{D}$ and a CQ q) is NP-complete, but becomes tractable for several syntactically defined classes. One of the most prominent such classes corresponds to the CQs of *bounded treewidth* [9]. Recall that treewidth is a graph-theoretical concept that measures how much a graph resembles a tree (see, e.g., [14]). For instance, trees have treewidth one, cycles treewidth two, and K_k , the clique on k elements, treewidth $k - 1$.

Formally, let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph. A *tree decomposition* of G is a pair (T, λ) , where T is a tree and λ is a mapping that assigns a nonempty set of nodes in V to each node t in T , for which the following holds:

1. For each $v \in V$ it is the case that the set of nodes $t \in T$ such that $v \in \lambda(t)$ is connected.
2. For each edge $\{u, v\} \in E$ there exists a node $t \in T$ such that $\{u, v\} \subseteq \lambda(t)$.

The *width* of (T, λ) corresponds to $(\max \{|\lambda(t)| \mid t \in T\}) - 1$. The treewidth of G is then defined as the minimum width of its tree decompositions.

We define the treewidth of a CQ $q = \exists \bar{y} \bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq m} R_i(\bar{x}_i)$ as the treewidth of the *Gaifman graph* of its existentially quantified variables. Recall that this is the undirected graph whose vertices are the existentially quantified variables of q (i.e., those in $\bar{y}$) and there is an edge between distinct existentially quantified variables y and y' if and only they appear together in some atom of q , that is, they both appear in a tuple $\bar{x}_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$. For $k \geq 1$, we denote by $\text{TW}(k)$ the class of CQs of treewidth at most k . It is known that the evaluation problem for the class $\text{TW}(k)$ (for each fixed $k \geq 1$) can be solved in polynomial time [9, 12].

The QBE and definability problems. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a class of queries (e.g., the class CQ of all conjunctive queries, or $\text{TW}(k)$ of CQs of treewidth at most k). Suppose that $\mathcal{D}$ is a database and S^+ and S^- are n -ary relations over $\mathcal{D}$ of positive and negative examples, respectively. A $\mathcal{C}$ -*explanation* for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$ is a query q in $\mathcal{C}$ such that $S^+ \subseteq q(\mathcal{D})$ and $q(\mathcal{D}) \cap S^- = \emptyset$. Analogously, a $\mathcal{C}$ -*definition* of S^+ over $\mathcal{D}$ is a query q in $\mathcal{C}$ such that $q(\mathcal{D}) = S^+$. The *query by example* and *definability* problems for $\mathcal{C}$ are as follows:

PROBLEM :	$\mathcal{C}$ -QUERY-BY-EXAMPLE (resp., $\mathcal{C}$ -DEFINABILITY)
INPUT :	A database $\mathcal{D}$ and n -ary relations S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$ (resp., a database $\mathcal{D}$ and an n -ary relation S^+ over $\mathcal{D}$)
QUESTION :	Is there a $\mathcal{C}$ -explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$? (resp., is there a $\mathcal{C}$ -definition of S^+ over $\mathcal{D}$?)

3 Query by example and definability for CQs

Let us start by recalling what is known about these problems for CQs. We first establish characterizations of the notions of CQ-explanations/definitions based on the following tests:

- **QBE test for CQs:** Takes as input a database $\mathcal{D}$ and n -ary relations S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$. It accepts if and only if $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$ for some n -ary tuple $\bar{b} \in S^-$.
- **Definability test for CQs:** Takes as input a database $\mathcal{D}$ and an n -ary relation S^+ over $\mathcal{D}$. It accepts iff $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$ for some n -ary tuple $\bar{b}$ over $\mathcal{D}$ that is not in S^+ .

The following characterizations are considered to be folklore in the literature:

► **Proposition 1.** *The following hold:*

1. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a database and S^+, S^- relations over $\mathcal{D}$. There is a CQ-explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$ if and only if the QBE test for CQs fails over $\mathcal{D}$, S^+ , and S^- .
2. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a database and S^+ a relation over $\mathcal{D}$. There is a CQ-definition for S^+ over $\mathcal{D}$ if and only if the definability test for CQs fails over $\mathcal{D}$ and S^+ .

This provides us with a simple method for obtaining a coNEXPTIME upper bound for CQ-QUERY-BY-EXAMPLE and CQ-DEFINABILITY. Let us concentrate on the first problem (a similar argument works for the second one). Assume that S^+ and S^- are relations of positive and negative examples over a database $\mathcal{D}$. It follows from Proposition 1 that to check that there is *not* CQ-explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$, we need to guess a tuple $\bar{b} \in S^-$ and a homomorphism h from $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ to $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$. Since $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ is of exponential size, the guess of h is also of exponential size. Checking that h is indeed a homomorphism from $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ to $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$ can be performed in exponential time. The whole procedure can then be carried out in NEXPTIME. As it turns out, this bound is also optimal:

► **Theorem 1.** [24, 22] *The problems CQ-QUERY-BY-EXAMPLE and CQ-DEFINABILITY are coNEXPTIME-complete.*

The lower bound for CQ-DEFINABILITY was established by Willard using a complicated reduction from the complement of a tiling problem. A simpler proof was then obtained by ten Cate and Dalmau [22]. Their techniques also establish a lower bound for CQ-QUERY-BY-EXAMPLE. Notably, these lower bounds hold even when S^+ and S^- are unary relations.

The cost of evaluating CQ-explanations. Recall that in query by example not only we want to find a CQ-explanation q for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$, but also compute its result $q(\mathcal{D})$ if possible. It follows from the proof of Proposition 1 that in case there is a CQ-explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$, then we can assume such CQ to be $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$, i.e., the CQ whose set of atoms is $\mathcal{D}^{|S^+|}$ and whose tuple of free variables is $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} \bar{a}$. This is known as the *canonical* CQ-explanation. We could then simply evaluate this canonical CQ-explanation over $\mathcal{D}$ in order to meet the requirements of query by example. Notice, however, that this takes double exponential time since $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ itself is of exponential size. It is not known whether there are better algorithms for computing the result of *some* CQ-explanation, but the results in this section suggest that this is unlikely.

Size of CQ explanations and definitions. It follows from the previous observations that CQ-explanations are of at most exponential size (by taking the canonical CQ-explanation as witness). The same holds for CQ-definitions. Interestingly, these bounds are optimal:

► **Proposition 2.** [24, 22] *The following holds:*

1. *If there is a CQ-explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$, then there is a CQ-explanation of at most exponential size; namely, $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$. Similarly, for CQ-definitions.*
2. *There is a family $(\mathcal{D}_n, S_n^+, S_n^-)_{n \geq 0}$ of tuples of databases $\mathcal{D}_n$ and relations S_n^+ and S_n^- over $\mathcal{D}_n$, such that (a) the combined size of $\mathcal{D}_n$, S_n^+ , and S_n^- is polynomial in n , (b) there is a CQ-explanation for S_n^+ and S_n^- over $\mathcal{D}_n$, and (c) the size of the smallest such CQ-explanation is at least 2^n . Similarly, for CQ-definitions.*

Sources of complexity. The QBE test performs the following steps on input $(\mathcal{D}, S^+, S^-)$: (1) It computes $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$, and (2) it checks whether $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$ for some $\bar{b} \in S^-$. The definability test is equivalent, but the homomorphism test is then extended to each tuple over $\mathcal{D}$ but outside S^+ . Two sources of complexity are involved in these tests, each one of which incurs in one exponential blow up: (a) The construction of $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$, and (b) the homomorphism tests $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$. In order to alleviate the high complexity of the tests we thus propose relaxations of these two sources of complexity. The proposed relaxations are based on well-studied approximation notions with strong theoretical support. As such, they give rise to clean reformulations of the notions of CQ-explanations/definitions. We start with the homomorphism test in the following section.

4 A relaxation of the homomorphism test

We use an approximation technique for the homomorphism test based on the existential pebble game. This technique finds several applications in database theory [17, 12] and can be shown to be equivalent to the strong consistency tests for homomorphism approximation used in the area of constraint satisfaction [18]. The complexity of the (existential) pebble game is by now well-understood [15, 16]. We borrow several techniques used in such analysis to understand the complexity of our problems. We also prove some results on the complexity of such games that are of independent interest. We define the existential pebble game below.

The existential pebble game. Let $k > 1$. The existential k -pebble game is played by the spoiler and the duplicator on pairs $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ and $(\mathcal{D}', \bar{b})$, where $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D}'$ are databases over the same schema and $\bar{a}$ and $\bar{b}$ are n -ary ($n \geq 0$) tuples over $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D}'$, respectively. The spoiler plays on $\mathcal{D}$ only, and the duplicator responds on $\mathcal{D}'$. In the first round the spoiler places his pebbles $p_1, \dots, p_k$ on (not necessarily distinct) elements $c_1, \dots, c_k$ in $\mathcal{D}$, and the duplicator responds by placing his pebbles $q_1, \dots, q_k$ on elements $d_1, \dots, d_k$ in $\mathcal{D}'$. In every further round, the spoiler removes one of his pebbles, say p_i , for $1 \leq i \leq k$, and places it on an element of $\mathcal{D}$, and the duplicator responds by placing his corresponding pebble q_i on some element of $\mathcal{D}'$. The duplicator wins if he has a *winning strategy*, i.e., it can indefinitely continue playing the game in such way that at each round, if $c_1, \dots, c_k$ and $d_1, \dots, d_k$ are the elements covered by pebbles $p_1, \dots, p_k$ and $q_1, \dots, q_k$ on $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D}'$, respectively, then

$$((c_1, \dots, c_k, \bar{a}), (d_1, \dots, d_k, \bar{b}))$$

is a *partial homomorphism* from $\mathcal{D}$ to $\mathcal{D}'$. Recall that this means that for every atom of the form $R(\bar{c}) \in \mathcal{D}$, where each element c of $\bar{c}$ appears in $(c_1, \dots, c_k, \bar{a})$, it is the case that $R(\bar{d}) \in \mathcal{D}'$, where $\bar{d}$ is the tuple that is obtained from $\bar{c}$ by replacing each element c of $\bar{c}$ by its corresponding element d in $(d_1, \dots, d_k, \bar{b})$. If such winning strategy for the duplicator exists, we write $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow_k (\mathcal{D}', \bar{b})$.

It is easy to see that the relations $\rightarrow_k$, for $k > 1$, provide an approximation of the notion of homomorphism in the following sense:

$$\rightarrow \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \rightarrow_{k+1} \subsetneq \rightarrow_k \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \rightarrow_2.$$

Furthermore, these approximations are convenient from a complexity point of view: While checking for the existence of a homomorphism from $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ to $(\mathcal{D}', \bar{b})$ is NP-complete, checking for the existence of a winning strategy for the duplicator in the existential k -pebble game can be solved efficiently:

► **Proposition 3.** [17] *Fix $k > 1$. Checking if $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow_k (\mathcal{D}', \bar{b})$, given databases $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D}'$ and n -ary tuples $\bar{a}$ and $\bar{b}$ over $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D}'$, respectively, can be solved in polynomial time.*

Furthermore, there is an interesting connection between the existential pebble game and the evaluation of CQs of bounded treewidth as established in the following proposition:

► **Proposition 4.** [4] *Fix $k \geq 1$. Consider databases $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D}'$ over the same schema and n -ary tuples $\bar{a}$ and $\bar{b}$ over $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D}'$, respectively. Then $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow_{k+1} (\mathcal{D}', \bar{b})$ if and only if for each CQ $q(\bar{x})$ in $\text{TW}(k)$ such that $|\bar{x}| = n$ the following holds:*

$$\bar{a} \in q(\mathcal{D}) \implies \bar{b} \in q(\mathcal{D}'),$$

or, equivalently, $(\mathcal{D}_q, \bar{x}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ implies $(\mathcal{D}_q, \bar{x}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}', \bar{b})$, where as before $\mathcal{D}_q$ is the database that contains all the atoms of q .

Moreover, in case that $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \not\rightarrow_{k+1} (\mathcal{D}', \bar{b})$ there exists an exponential size CQ $q(\bar{x})$ in $\text{TW}(k)$ such that $\bar{a} \in q(\mathcal{D})$ but $\bar{b} \notin q(\mathcal{D}')$.

The relaxed test. We study the following relaxed version of the QBE test for CQs that replaces the notion of homomorphism $\rightarrow$ with its approximation $\rightarrow_k$, for a fixed $k > 1$:

- **k -pebble QBE test for CQs:** Takes as input a database $\mathcal{D}$ and n -ary relations S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$. It accepts if and only if $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow_k (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$ for some n -ary tuple $\bar{b} \in S^-$.

Analogously, we define the k -pebble definability test for CQs. It immediately follows from the fact that the relation $\rightarrow_k$ can be decided in polynomial time (Proposition 3) that the k -pebble tests for CQs reduce the complexity of the general test from NEXPTIME to EXPTIME. Later, in Section 4.2, we show that this is optimal.

4.1 A characterization of the k -pebble tests for CQs

Using Proposition 4 we can now establish the theoretical meaningfulness of the relaxed tests: They admit a clean characterization in terms of the CQs of bounded treewidth. In fact, recall that the QBE (resp., definability) test for CQs precisely characterizes the non-existence of CQ-explanations (resp., CQ-definitions). As we show next, their relaxed versions based on the existential $(k + 1)$ -pebble game preserve these characterizations up to treewidth k :

- **Theorem 2.** *Fix $k \geq 1$. Consider a database $\mathcal{D}$ and n -ary relations S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$.*
1. *There is a $\text{TW}(k)$ -explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$ if and only if the $(k + 1)$ -pebble QBE test for CQs fails over $\mathcal{D}$, S^+ , and S^- .*
 2. *There is a $\text{TW}(k)$ -definition for S^+ over $\mathcal{D}$ if and only if the $(k + 1)$ -pebble definability test for CQs fails over $\mathcal{D}$ and S^+ .*

Proof. We concentrate on explanations (the proof for definitions is analogous). From left to right, assume for the sake of contradiction that q is a $\text{TW}(k)$ -explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$, yet the $(k + 1)$ -pebble QBE test for CQs accepts $\mathcal{D}$, S^+ , and S^- , i.e., $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow_{k+1} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$ for some $\bar{b} \in S^-$. Since $S^+ \subseteq q(\mathcal{D})$, it is the case that $\bar{a} \in q(\mathcal{D})$ for each $\bar{a} \in S^+$. That is, $(\mathcal{D}_q, \bar{x}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ for each $\bar{a} \in S^+$. Due to basic properties of direct products, this implies that $(\mathcal{D}_q, \bar{x}) \rightarrow \prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$. From Proposition 4 we conclude that $(\mathcal{D}_q, \bar{x}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$, i.e., $\bar{b} \in q(\mathcal{D})$. This is a contradiction since $\bar{b} \in S^-$ and $q(\mathcal{D}) \cap S^- = \emptyset$.

From right to left, assume that the $(k + 1)$ -pebble QBE test for CQs fails over $\mathcal{D}$, S^+ , and S^- , i.e., for every tuple $\bar{b} \in S^-$ it is the case that $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \not\rightarrow_{k+1} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$. From Proposition 4, this implies that for each $\bar{b} \in S^-$ there is a CQ $q_{\bar{b}}(\bar{x})$ such that $(\mathcal{D}_{q_{\bar{b}}}, \bar{x}) \rightarrow \prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ but $(\mathcal{D}_{q_{\bar{b}}}, \bar{x}) \not\rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$. Suppose first that $S^- \neq \emptyset$ and let:

$$q(\bar{x}) := \bigwedge_{\bar{b} \in S^-} q_{\bar{b}}(\bar{x}).$$

It is easy to see that $q(\bar{x})$ is well-defined (since S^- is nonempty) and can be expressed as a CQ in $\text{TW}(k)$. For the latter we simply use fresh existentially quantified variables for each CQ $q_{\bar{b}}$ such that $\bar{b} \in S^-$ and then move all existentially quantified variables in $\bigwedge_{\bar{b} \in S^-} q_{\bar{b}}(\bar{x})$ to the front. We now prove that $q(\bar{x})$ is a $\text{TW}(k)$ -explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$. It easily follows that $(\mathcal{D}_q, \bar{x}) \rightarrow \prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ from the fact that $(\mathcal{D}_{q_{\bar{b}}}, \bar{x}) \rightarrow \prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ for each $\bar{b} \in S^-$. But then $(\mathcal{D}_q, \bar{x}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ for each $\bar{a} \in S^+$. This means that $\bar{a} \in q(\mathcal{D})$ for each $\bar{a} \in S^+$, i.e., $S^+ \subseteq q(\mathcal{D})$. Assume now for the sake of contradiction that $q(\mathcal{D}) \cap S^- \neq \emptyset$, that is, there is a tuple $\bar{b} \in q(\mathcal{D}) \cap S^-$. Then $(\mathcal{D}_q, \bar{x}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$, which implies that $(\mathcal{D}_{q_{\bar{b}}}, \bar{x}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$. This is a contradiction. The case when $S^- = \emptyset$ can be proved using similar techniques. ◀

4.2 The complexity of the k -pebble tests for CQs

As mentioned before, the k -pebble tests for CQs can be evaluated in exponential time. We show here that such bounds are also optimal:

- **Theorem 3.** *Deciding whether the k -pebble QBE test for CQs accepts $(\mathcal{D}, S^+, S^-)$ is EXPTIME-complete for each $k > 1$. Similarly, for the k -pebble definability test for CQs. This holds even if restricted to the case when S^+ and S^- are unary relations.*

As a corollary to Theorems 2 and 3, we obtain the following interesting result:

- **Corollary 4.** *The problems $\text{TW}(k)$ -QUERY-BY-EXAMPLE and $\text{TW}(k)$ -DEFINABILITY are EXPTIME-complete for each fixed $k \geq 1$. This holds even if restricted to the case when the relations to be explained/defined are unary.*

We now provide a brief outline of the main ideas used for proving the lower bounds in Theorem 3. Let us first notice that in the case of the general QBE/definability tests for CQs, an NEXPTIME lower bound is obtained in [22] as follows:

1. It is first shown that the following *product homomorphism problem* (PHP) is NEXPTIME-hard: Given databases $\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_m$ and $\mathcal{D}$, is it the case that $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathcal{D}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$?
2. It is then shown that there is an easy polynomial-time reduction from PHP to the problem of checking whether the QBE/definability test accepts its input.

The ideas used for proving (2) can be easily adapted to show that there is a polynomial-time reduction from the following *relaxed* version of PHP to the problem of checking whether the k -pebble QBE/definability test accepts its input:

PROBLEM :	k -PEBBLE PHP (for $k > 1$)
INPUT :	Databases $\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_m$ and $\mathcal{D}$ over the same schema
QUESTION :	Is it the case that $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathcal{D}_i \rightarrow_k \mathcal{D}$?

Our main result thus establishes that this relaxed version of PHP is EXPTIME-complete for each fixed $k > 1$:

► **Theorem 5.** *The problem k -PEBBLE PHP is EXPTIME-complete for each fixed $k > 1$.*

To prove this result, we exploit techniques from [16, 15] that study the complexity of pebble games. In particular, it is shown in [16] that for each fixed $k > 1$, checking whether $\mathcal{D} \rightarrow_k \mathcal{D}'$ is P-complete. The proof uses an involved reduction from the *monotone circuit value problem*, that is, given a monotone circuit C , it constructs two databases $\mathcal{D}_C$ and $\mathcal{D}'_C$ such that the value of C is 1 if and only if $\mathcal{D}_C \rightarrow_k \mathcal{D}'_C$.

In our case, to show that k -PEBBLE PHP is EXPTIME-hard for each fixed $k > 1$, we reduce from the following well-known EXPTIME-complete problem: Given an alternating Turing machine M and a positive integer n , decide whether M accepts the empty tape using n space. The latter problem can be easily recast as a circuit value problem: We can construct a circuit $C_{M,n}$ such that the value of $C_{M,n}$ is 1 if and only if M accepts the empty tape using n space. The main idea of our reduction is to construct databases $\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_m$ and $\mathcal{D}$, given M and n , such that:

$$\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathcal{D}_i \rightarrow_k \mathcal{D} \iff \mathcal{D}_{C_{M,n}} \rightarrow_k \mathcal{D}'_{C_{M,n}},$$

where $\mathcal{D}_{C_{M,n}}$ and $\mathcal{D}'_{C_{M,n}}$ are defined as in [16].

A natural approach then is to construct $\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_m, \mathcal{D}$ such that $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathcal{D}_i$ and $\mathcal{D}$ roughly coincide with $\mathcal{D}_{C_{M,n}}$ and $\mathcal{D}'_{C_{M,n}}$. However, there is a problem with this: the databases $\mathcal{D}_{C_{M,n}}$ and $\mathcal{D}'_{C_{M,n}}$ closely resemble the circuit $C_{M,n}$, but the size of $C_{M,n}$ is exponential in $|M|$ and n , and so are the sizes of $\mathcal{D}_{C_{M,n}}$ and $\mathcal{D}'_{C_{M,n}}$. Although it is possible to codify the exponential size database $\mathcal{D}_{C_{M,n}}$ using a product of polynomial size databases $\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_m$, we cannot do the same with the exponential size $\mathcal{D}'_{C_{M,n}}$ using $\mathcal{D}$ only. To overcome this, we need to extend the techniques in [16] and show that the complexity of the existential k -pebble game is P-complete even over a *fixed template*:

► **Lemma 6.** *For each fixed $k > 1$, there is a database $\mathcal{D}_k$ that only depends on k , such that the following problem is P-complete: Given a database $\mathcal{D}$, decide whether $\mathcal{D} \rightarrow_k \mathcal{D}_k$.*

To prove this, we again use a reduction from the circuit value problem that given a circuit C constructs a database $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_C$ such that C takes value 1 if and only if $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_C \rightarrow_k \mathcal{D}_k$. We then

use the following idea to prove that k -PEBBLE PHP is EXPTIME-complete: Given M and n , we construct in polynomial time databases $\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_m$ and $\mathcal{D}$ such that $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathcal{D}_i$ and $\mathcal{D}$ roughly coincide with $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{C_{M,n}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_k$, respectively. It then follows that:

$$\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathcal{D}_i \rightarrow_k \mathcal{D} \iff \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{C_{M,n}} \rightarrow_k \mathcal{D}_k \iff M \text{ accepts the empty tape using } n \text{ space.}$$

4.3 Evaluating the result of TW(k)-explanations

Recall that computing the result of CQ-explanations might require double exponential time. For TW(k)-explanations, instead, we can do this in single exponential time.

► **Theorem 7.** *Fix $k \geq 1$. There is a single exponential time algorithm that, given a database $\mathcal{D}$ and n -ary relations S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$, does the following:*

1. *It checks whether there is a TW(k)-explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$, and*
2. *if the latter holds, it computes the evaluation $q(\mathcal{D})$ of one such TW(k)-explanation q .*

Proof. We first check in exponential time the existence of one such TW(k)-explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$ using the $(k+1)$ -pebble QBE test for CQs. If such TW(k)-explanation exists, we compute in exponential time the set S^e of all n -ary tuples $\bar{b}$ over $\mathcal{D}$ such that $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow_{k+1} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$. Notice, in particular, that $S^+ \subseteq S^e$ and $S^e \cap S^- = \emptyset$. Moreover, it can be shown that $S^e = q(\mathcal{D})$ for some TW(k)-explanation q for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$. ◀

Notably, the previous result computes the result of a TW(k)-explanation q for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$ without explicitly computing q . One might wonder whether it is possible to also include q in the output of the algorithm. The answer is negative, and the reason is that TW(k)-explanations/definitions can be double exponentially large in the worst case:

► **Proposition 5.** *Fix $k \geq 1$. The following holds:*

1. *Assume that there is a TW(k)-explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$. Then there is one such TW(k)-explanation of at most double exponential size.*
2. *There is a family $(\mathcal{D}_n, S_n^+, S_n^-)_{n \geq 0}$ of tuples of databases $\mathcal{D}_n$ and relations S_n^+ and S_n^- over $\mathcal{D}_n$, such that (a) the combined size of $\mathcal{D}_n$, S_n^+ , and S_n^- is polynomial in n , (b) there is a TW(k)-explanation for S_n^+ and S_n^- over $\mathcal{D}_n$, and (c) the size of the smallest such TW(k)-explanation is at least 2^{2^n} .*

The same holds for TW(k)-definitions.

Proof. From the proof of Theorem 2, whenever there is a TW(k)-explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$ this can be assumed to be the CQ $q = \bigwedge_{\bar{b} \in S^-} q_{\bar{b}}(\bar{x})$. From Proposition 4, each such $q_{\bar{b}}$ is of exponential size in the combined size of $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ and $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$, i.e., double exponential in the size of $\mathcal{D}$, S^+ and S^- . Thus, the size of q is at most double exponential in that of $\mathcal{D}$, S^+ and S^- . The lower bound follows by inspection of the proof of Theorem 3. ◀

Notice that this establishes a difference with CQ-explanations/definitions, which are at most of exponential size (Proposition 2).

5 Desynchronizing the direct product

We now look at the other source of complexity for the QBE and definability tests for CQs: The construction of the direct product $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$. It is a priori not obvious how to define reasonable approximations of this construction with a meaningful theoretical interpretation. As a first step in this direction, we look at a simple idea that has been applied in the study

of CQ-definability: We “desynchronize” this direct product and consider each tuple $\bar{a} \in S^+$ in isolation. This leads to the following relaxed test:

- **Desynchronized QBE test for CQs:** Takes as input a database $\mathcal{D}$ and n -ary relations S^+, S^- over $\mathcal{D}$. It accepts iff there is $\bar{a} \in S^+$ and $\bar{b} \in S^-$ such that $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$.

Similarly, we define the desynchronized definability test for CQs. It follows from [1] that these tests capture the notion of explanations/definitions for the class of *unions* of CQs (UCQs). Recall that a UCQ is a formula Q of the form $\bigvee_{1 \leq i \leq m} q_i(\bar{x})$, where the $q_i(\bar{x})$'s are CQs over the same schema. The evaluation $Q(\mathcal{D})$ of Q over database $\mathcal{D}$ corresponds to $\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq m} q_i(\mathcal{D})$. We denote by UCQ the class of UCQs. We then obtain the following:

► **Theorem 8** (implicit in [1]). *Consider a database $\mathcal{D}$ and n -ary relations S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$. There is a UCQ-explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$ if and only if the desynchronized QBE test for CQs fails over $\mathcal{D}$, S^+ , and S^- . Similarly, for the UCQ-definitions of S^+ and the desynchronized definability test for CQs.*

In this case, the *canonical* UCQ-explanation/definition corresponds to $Q = \bigcup_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$. Notice that Q consists of polynomially many CQs of polynomial size. Its evaluation $Q(\mathcal{D})$ over a database $\mathcal{D}$ can thus be computed in single exponential time (as opposed to the double exponential time needed to evaluate the canonical CQ-explanation $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$).

It is easy to see that the desynchronization of the direct product reduces the complexity of the general tests from NEXPTIME to NP. It follows from [1] that this bound is optimal. As a corollary to Theorem 8 we thus obtain that QBE/definability for UCQs are coNP-complete:

► **Proposition 6.** [1] *The following holds:*

1. *Deciding whether the desynchronized QBE test for CQs accepts $(\mathcal{D}, S^+, S^-)$ is NP-complete. Similarly, for the desynchronized definability test for CQs.*
2. *UCQ-QUERY-BY-EXAMPLE and UCQ-DEFINABILITY are coNP-complete.*

5.1 Combining both relaxations

By combining both relaxations (replacing homomorphism tests with relations $\rightarrow_k$, for $k > 1$, and desynchronizing direct products) we obtain the *desynchronized k -pebble QBE (resp., definability) test for CQs*. Its definition coincides with that of the desynchronized QBE (resp., definability) test for CQs given above, save that now the homomorphism test $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$ is replaced by $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow_k (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$. As is to be expected from the previous characterizations, this test captures definability by the class of UCQs of bounded treewidth. Formally, let $\text{UTW}(k)$ be the class of unions of CQs in $\text{TW}(k)$ (for $k \geq 1$). Then:

► **Theorem 9.** *Fix $k \geq 1$. Consider a database $\mathcal{D}$ and n -ary relations S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$. There is a $\text{UTW}(k)$ -explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$ if and only if the desynchronized $(k+1)$ -pebble QBE test for CQs fails over $\mathcal{D}$, S^+ , and S^- . Similarly, for the $\text{UTW}(k)$ -definitions of S^+ and the desynchronized $(k+1)$ -pebble definability test for CQs.*

Furthermore, in case there is a $\text{UTW}(k)$ -explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$ (resp., a $\text{UTW}(k)$ -definition of S^+ over $\mathcal{D}$), then there is one such explanation/definition given by a union of polynomially many CQs in $\text{TW}(k)$, each one of which is of at most exponential size.

Interestingly, the combination of both relaxations yields tractability for the QBE test. In contrast, the definability test remains NP-complete. The difference lies on the fact that the QBE test only needs to perform a polynomial number of tests of the form $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow_k (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$ for each $\bar{a} \in S^+$ (one for each tuple $\bar{b} \in S^-$), while the definability test needs to perform exponentially many such tests (one for each tuple $\bar{b}$ outside S^+). Then:

► Proposition 7. *The following holds:*

1. *Deciding whether the desynchronized k -pebble QBE test for CQs accepts $(\mathcal{D}, S^+, S^-)$ can be solved in polynomial time for each fixed $k > 1$. As a consequence, $\text{UTW}(k)\text{-QUERY-BY-EXAMPLE}$ is in polynomial time for each fixed $k \geq 1$.*
2. *If a $\text{UTW}(k)$ -explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$ exists, we can compute the evaluation $Q(\mathcal{D})$ of one such explanation Q in polynomial time.*
3. *Deciding whether the desynchronized k -pebble definability test for CQs accepts $(\mathcal{D}, S^+, S^-)$ is NP-complete for each fixed $k > 1$. As a consequence, $\text{UTW}(k)\text{-DEFINABILITY}$ is coNP-complete for each $k \geq 1$.*

6 Conjunctive regular path queries

We now switch to study the QBE and definability problems in the context of graph databases. Let Σ be a finite alphabet. Recall that a *graph database* $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ over Σ consists of a finite set V of nodes and a set $E \subseteq V \times \Sigma \times V$ of directed edges labeled in Σ (i.e., $(v, a, v') \in E$ represents the fact that there is an a -labeled edge from node v to node v' in $\mathcal{G}$). A *path* in $\mathcal{G}$ is a sequence $\eta = v_0 a_1 v_1 a_2 v_2 \dots v_{k-1} a_k v_k$, for $k \geq 0$, such that $(v_{i-1}, a_i, v_i) \in E$ for each $1 \leq i \leq k$. The *label* of η , denoted $\text{label}(\eta)$, is the word $a_1 a_2 \dots a_k$ in Σ^* . Notice that v is a path for each node $v \in V$. The label of such path is the empty word ε .

The basic navigational mechanism for querying graph databases is the class of *regular path queries*, or RPQs (see, e.g., [25, 5]). An RPQ L over alphabet Σ is a regular expression over Σ . The *evaluation* $L(\mathcal{G})$ of L over graph database $\mathcal{G}$ consists of those pairs (v, v') of nodes in $\mathcal{G}$ such that there is a path η in $\mathcal{G}$ from v to v' whose label $\text{label}(\eta)$ satisfies L . The analogue of CQs in the context of graph databases is the class of *conjunctive* RPQs, or CRPQs [8]. Formally, a CRPQ γ over Σ is an expression of the form:

$$\exists \bar{z} (L_1(x_1, y_1) \wedge \dots \wedge L_m(x_m, y_m)),$$

where each L_i is a RPQ over Σ , for $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $\bar{z}$ is a tuple of variables among $\{x_1, y_1, \dots, x_m, y_m\}$. We write $\gamma(\bar{x})$ to denote that $\bar{x}$ is the tuple of free variables of γ . A homomorphism from γ to the graph database $\mathcal{G}$ is a mapping h from $\{x_1, y_1, \dots, x_m, y_m\}$ to the nodes of $\mathcal{G}$, such that $(h(x_i), h(y_i)) \in L_i(\mathcal{G})$ for each $1 \leq i \leq m$. The evaluation $\gamma(\mathcal{G})$ of $\gamma(\bar{x})$ over $\mathcal{G}$ is the set of tuples $h(\bar{x})$ such that h a homomorphism from γ to $\mathcal{G}$. We denote the class of CRPQs by CRPQ.

6.1 The QBE and definability tests for CRPQs

We present QBE/definability tests for CRPQs in the same spirit than the tests for CQs, save that we now use a notion of *strong homomorphism* from a product $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathcal{G}_i$ of directed graphs to a single directed graph $\mathcal{G}$. This notion preserves, in a precise sense defined below, the languages defined by pairs of nodes in $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathcal{G}_i$. Interestingly, these tests yield a coNEXPTIME upper bound for the QBE/definability problems for CRPQs, which improves the EXPSPACE upper bound from [1]. In conclusion, QBE/definability for CRPQs is no more difficult than for CQs.

We start with some notation. Let v and v' be nodes in a graph database $\mathcal{G}$. We define the following language in Σ^* :

$$L_{v, v'}^{\mathcal{G}} := \{\text{label}(\eta) \mid \eta \text{ is a path in } \mathcal{G} \text{ from } v \text{ to } v'\}.$$


Moreover, if $\mathcal{G}_1 = (V_1, E_1)$ and $\mathcal{G}_2 = (V_2, E_2)$ are graph databases over Σ , their direct product $\mathcal{G}_1 \otimes \mathcal{G}_2$ is the graph database (V, E) such that $V = V_1 \times V_2$ and there is an a -labeled edge in E from node (v_1, v_2) to node (v'_1, v'_2) if and only if $(v_1, a, v_2) \in E_1$ and $(v'_1, a, v'_2) \in E_2$.

Let then $\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_n$ and $\mathcal{G}$ be graph databases over Σ . A *strong homomorphism* from $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathcal{G}_i$ to $\mathcal{G}$ is a mapping h from the nodes of $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathcal{G}_i$ to the nodes of $\mathcal{G}$ such that for each pair $\bar{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$ and $\bar{v}' = (v'_1, \dots, v'_n)$ of nodes in $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathcal{G}_i$, it is the case that:

$$L_{v_i, v'_i}^{\mathcal{G}_i} \subseteq L_{h(\bar{v}), h(\bar{v}')}^{\mathcal{G}}, \text{ for some coordinate } i \text{ with } 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

We write $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathcal{G}_i \Rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ when there is a strong homomorphism h from $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathcal{G}_i$ to $\mathcal{G}$. Note that in this case, h must also be a (usual) homomorphism from $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathcal{G}_i$ to $\mathcal{G}$, i.e., $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathcal{G}_i \Rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ implies $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathcal{G}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$. The next example shows that the converse does not hold in general:

► **Example 10.** Let $\vec{C}_n$ be the directed cycle of length n over $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. We assume $\vec{C}_n$ to be represented as a graph database over the unary alphabet $\Sigma = \{a\}$. We then have that $\vec{C}_2 \otimes \vec{C}_3 \rightarrow \vec{C}_6$, since $\vec{C}_2 \otimes \vec{C}_3$ is isomorphic to $\vec{C}_6$ as shown below (we omit the labels):



On the other hand, $\vec{C}_2 \otimes \vec{C}_3 \not\Rightarrow \vec{C}_6$. To see this, take e.g. the homomorphism h defined as $\{(1,1) \mapsto 1, (2,2) \mapsto 2, (1,3) \mapsto 3, (2,1) \mapsto 4, (1,2) \mapsto 5, (2,3) \mapsto 6\}$. This is not a strong homomorphism as witnessed by the pair $(1,1)$ and $(2,2)$. Indeed, we have that $h(1,1) = 1$, $h(2,2) = 2$, but $L_{1,2}^{\vec{C}_2} \not\subseteq L_{1,2}^{\vec{C}_6}$ and $L_{1,2}^{\vec{C}_3} \not\subseteq L_{1,2}^{\vec{C}_6}$. The reason is that $aaa \in L_{1,2}^{\vec{C}_2}$, $aaaa \in L_{1,2}^{\vec{C}_3}$, but none of these words is in $L_{1,2}^{\vec{C}_6}$. The same holds for any homomorphism $h : \vec{C}_2 \otimes \vec{C}_3 \rightarrow \vec{C}_6$. ◀

If $(\mathcal{G}_1, \bar{a}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{G}_n, \bar{a}_n)$ and $(\mathcal{G}, \bar{b})$ are graph databases with distinguished tuple of elements, then we write $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} (\mathcal{G}_i, \bar{a}_i) \Rightarrow (\mathcal{G}, \bar{b})$ if there is a strong homomorphism h from $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathcal{G}_i$ to $\mathcal{G}$ such that $h(\bar{a}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \bar{a}_n) = \bar{b}$. Next we present our tests for CRPQs:

- QBE test for CRPQs: Takes as input a graph database $\mathcal{G}$ and n -ary relations S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{G}$. It accepts if and only if $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{G}, \bar{a}) \Rightarrow (\mathcal{G}, \bar{b})$ for some n -ary tuple $\bar{b} \in S^-$.
- Definability test for CRPQs: Takes as input a graph database $\mathcal{G}$ and an n -ary relation S^+ over $\mathcal{G}$. It accepts if and only if $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{G}, \bar{a}) \Rightarrow (\mathcal{G}, \bar{b})$ for some n -ary tuple $\bar{b} \notin S^+$.


As it turns out, our tests characterize the non-existence of CRPQ-explanations/definitions.

► **Theorem 11.** *The following hold:*

1. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a database and S^+, S^- relations over $\mathcal{G}$. There is a CRPQ-explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{G}$ if and only if the QBE test for CRPQs fails over $\mathcal{G}, S^+$, and S^- .
2. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a database and S^+ a relation over $\mathcal{G}$. There is a CRPQ-definition for S^+ over $\mathcal{G}$ if and only if the definability test for CRPQs fails over $\mathcal{G}$ and S^+ .

Since containment of regular languages can be checked in polynomial space [21], it is straightforward to check that both tests can be carried out in NEXPTIME. We then obtain:

► **Theorem 12.** CRPQ-QUERY-BY-EXAMPLE and CRPQ-DEFINIBILITY are in coNEXPTIME.



■ **Figure 1** The graph database $\mathcal{G}$ from Example 13.

Whether these problems are complete for coNEXPTIME is left as an open question.

CRPQ vs UCQ explanations. It is easy to see that if there is a CRPQ-explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{G}$, then there is also a UCQ-explanation [1]. One may wonder then if QBE for CRPQs and UCQs coincide. If this was the case, we would directly obtain a coNP upper bound for CRPQ-QUERY-BY-EXAMPLE from Proposition 6 (which establishes that UCQ-QUERY-BY-EXAMPLE is in coNP). The next example shows that this is not the case:

► **Example 13.** Consider the graph database $\mathcal{G}$ over $\Sigma = \{a\}$ given by the three connected components depicted in Figure 1 (we omit the labels). Let $S^+ = \{1, 1'\}$ and $S^- = \{1''\}$. Clearly, $(\mathcal{G}, 1) \not\rightarrow (\mathcal{G}, 1'')$ and $(\mathcal{G}, 1') \not\rightarrow (\mathcal{G}, 1'')$, since the underlying graph of each component on the left-hand side is a clique of size 4, while the one on the right-hand side is a clique of size 3. It follows that there is a UCQ-explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{G}$. On the other hand, a straightforward construction shows that $(\mathcal{G}, 1) \otimes (\mathcal{G}, 1') \Rightarrow (\mathcal{G}, 1'')$. The intuition is that, since $(4', 1')$ and $(1, 4)$ have opposite direction, they do not synchronize in the product and, thus, the product does not contain a clique of size 4. We conclude that there is no CRPQ-explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{G}$. ◀

6.2 Relaxing the QBE and definability tests for CRPQs

In this section, we develop relaxations of the tests for CRPQs based on the ones we studied for CQs in the previous sections. Let us start by observing that desynchronizing the direct product trivializes the problem in this case: In fact, as expected the *desynchronized QBE/definability tests for CRPQs* characterize QBE/definability for the *unions* of CRPQs (UCRPQ). It is known, on the other hand, that QBE/definability for UCRPQ and UCQ coincide [1]. The results then follow directly from the ones obtained in Section 5 for UCQs. In particular, UCRPQ-QUERY-BY-EXAMPLE and UCRPQ-DEFINABILITY are coNP-complete.

We thus concentrate on the most interesting case, which is the relaxation of the homomorphism tests. In order to approximate the strong homomorphism test, we consider a variant of the existential pebble game. Fix $k > 1$. Let $(\mathcal{G}_1, \bar{a}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{G}_n, \bar{a}_n)$ and $(\mathcal{G}, \bar{b})$ be graph databases over Σ with distinguished tuples of elements. We define $\bar{a} := \bar{a}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \bar{a}_n$. The *strong existential k -pebble game* on $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} (\mathcal{G}_i, \bar{a}_i)$ and $(\mathcal{G}, \bar{b})$ is played as the existential k -pebble game on $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} (\mathcal{G}_i, \bar{a}_i)$ and $(\mathcal{G}, \bar{b})$, but now, at each round, if $c_1, \dots, c_k$ and $d_1, \dots, d_k$ are the elements covered by pebbles on $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathcal{G}_i$ and $\mathcal{G}$, respectively, then the duplicator needs to ensure that $((c_1, \dots, c_k, \bar{a}), (d_1, \dots, d_k, \bar{b}))$ is a *strong partial homomorphism* from $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathcal{G}_i$ and $\mathcal{G}$. This means that for every pair $\bar{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$ and $\bar{v}' = (v'_1, \dots, v'_n)$ of nodes in $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathcal{G}_i$ that appear in $(c_1, \dots, c_k, \bar{a})$, if u and u' are the elements in $(d_1, \dots, d_k, \bar{b})$ that correspond to $\bar{v}$ and $\bar{v}'$, respectively, then:

$$L_{v_i, v'_i}^{\mathcal{G}_i} \subseteq L_{u, u'}^{\mathcal{G}}, \text{ for some coordinate } i \text{ with } 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

We write $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} (\mathcal{G}_i, \bar{a}_i) \Rightarrow_k (\mathcal{G}, \bar{b})$ if the duplicator has a winning strategy in the strong existential k -pebble game on $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} (\mathcal{G}_i, \bar{a}_i)$ and $(\mathcal{G}, \bar{b})$.

By replacing the notion of strong homomorphism $\Rightarrow$ with its approximation $\Rightarrow_k$, for a fixed $k > 1$, we can then define the following relaxed test:

- k -pebble QBE test for CRPQs: Takes as input a graph database $\mathcal{G}$ and n -ary relations S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{G}$. It accepts iff if $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{G}, \bar{a}) \Rightarrow_k (\mathcal{G}, \bar{b})$ for some n -ary tuple $\bar{b} \in S^-$.

The k -pebble definability test for CRPQs is defined analogously. As in the case of CQs, these tests characterize the non-existence of CRPQs-explanations/definitions of treewidth at most k . Formally, the treewidth of a CRPQ $\gamma = \exists \bar{y} \bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq m} L_i(x_i, y_i)$ is the treewidth of the undirected graph that contains as nodes the existentially quantified variables of γ , i.e., those in $\bar{y}$, and whose set of edges is $\{\{x_i, y_i\} \mid 1 \leq i \leq m, x_i \neq y_i\}$. We denote by $\text{TW}_{\text{crpq}}(k)$ the class CRPQs of treewidth at most k (for $k \geq 1$). Then:

- **Theorem 14.** *Fix $k \geq 1$. Consider a database $\mathcal{G}$ and n -ary relations S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{G}$.*
1. *There is a $\text{TW}_{\text{crpq}}(k)$ -explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{G}$ if and only if the $(k+1)$ -pebble QBE test for CRPQs fails over $\mathcal{G}$, S^+ and S^- .*
 2. *There is a $\text{TW}_{\text{crpq}}(k)$ -definition for S^+ over $\mathcal{G}$ if and only if the $(k+1)$ -pebble definability test for CRPQs fails over $\mathcal{G}$ and S^+ .*

Using similar ideas as for the existential k -pebble game, it is possible to prove that the problem of checking whether $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} (\mathcal{G}_i, \bar{a}_i) \Rightarrow_k (\mathcal{G}, \bar{b})$, given $(\mathcal{G}_1, \bar{a}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{G}_n, \bar{a}_n)$ and $(\mathcal{G}, \bar{b})$, can be solved in exponential time for each fixed $k > 1$. We then obtain that the k -pebble QBE/definability tests for CRPQs take exponential time, and from Theorem 14 that $\text{TW}_{\text{crpq}}(k)$ -QUERY-BY-EXAMPLE and $\text{TW}_{\text{crpq}}(k)$ -DEFINABILITY are in EXPTIME (same than for $\text{TW}(k)$ as stated in Corollary 4). We also obtain an exponential upper bound on the cost of evaluating a $\text{TW}_{\text{crpq}}(k)$ -explanation (in case it exists):

- **Proposition 8.** *Fix $k \geq 1$. The following holds:*
1. $\text{TW}_{\text{crpq}}(k)$ -QUERY-BY-EXAMPLE and $\text{TW}_{\text{crpq}}(k)$ -DEFINABILITY are in EXPTIME.
 2. *Moreover, in case that there is a $\text{TW}_{\text{crpq}}(k)$ -explanation of S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{G}$, the evaluation $\gamma(\mathcal{G})$ of one such explanation γ over $\mathcal{G}$ can be computed in exponential time.*

7 Future work

We have left some problems open. The most notable one is determining the precise complexity of QBE/definability for CRPQs (resp., CRPQs of bounded treewidth). We have only obtained upper bounds for these problems that show that they are no more difficult than for CQs, but proving matching lower bounds seems challenging.

An interesting line for future research is studying what to do when no explanation/definition exists for a set of examples. In such cases one might want to compute a query that minimizes the “error”, e.g., the number of misclassified examples. We plan to study whether the techniques presented in this paper can be extended to deal with such problems.

Acknowledgements: We are grateful to Leonid Libkin for their helpful comments in earlier versions of the paper and to Timos Antonopoulos for enlightening discussions about the notion of definability. Barceló and Romero are funded by the Millennium Nucleus Center for Semantic Web Research under Grant NC120004. Romero is also funded by a Conicyt PhD scholarship.

References

- 1 Timos Antonopoulos, Frank Neven, and Frédéric Servais. Definability problems for graph query languages. In *ICDT*, pages 141–152, 2013.
- 2 Marcelo Arenas and Gonzalo I. Díaz. The exact complexity of the first-order logic definability problem. *ACM TODS*, to appear.
- 3 Marcelo Arenas, Gonzalo I. Díaz, and Egor V. Kostylev. Reverse engineering sparql queries. In *WWW*, 2016.
- 4 Albert Atserias, Phokion G. Kolaitis, and Moshe Y. Vardi. Constraint propagation as a proof system. In *CP*, pages 77–91, 2004.
- 5 Pablo Barceló. Querying graph databases. In *PODS*, pages 175–188, 2013.
- 6 Angela Bonifati, Radu Ciucanu, and Aurélien Lemay. Learning path queries on graph databases. In *EDBT*, pages 109–120, 2015.
- 7 Angela Bonifati, Radu Ciucanu, and Slawek Staworko. Learning join queries from user examples. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.*, 40(4):24, 2016.
- 8 Diego Calvanese, Giuseppe De Giacomo, Maurizio Lenzerini, and Moshe Y. Vardi. Containment of conjunctive regular path queries with inverse. In *KR*, pages 176–185, 2000.
- 9 Chandra Chekuri and Anand Rajaraman. Conjunctive query containment revisited. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 239(2):211–229, 2000.
- 10 Sara Cohen and Yaacov Y. Weiss. Learning tree patterns from example graphs. In *ICDT*, pages 127–143, 2015.
- 11 Mariano P. Consens and Alberto O. Mendelzon. Graphlog: a visual formalism for real life recursion. In *PODS*, pages 404–416, 1990.
- 12 Víctor Dalmau, Phokion G. Kolaitis, and Moshe Y. Vardi. Constraint satisfaction, bounded treewidth, and finite-variable logics. In *CP*, pages 310–326, 2002.
- 13 Rina Dechter. From local to global consistency. *Artif. Intell.*, 55(1):87–108, 1992.
- 14 Reinhard Diestel. *Graph Theory, 4th Edition*, volume 173 of *Graduate texts in mathematics*. Springer, 2012.
- 15 Martin Grohe. Equivalence in finite-variable logics is complete for polynomial time. *Combinatorica*, 19(4):507–532, 1999.
- 16 Phokion G. Kolaitis and Jonathan Panttaja. On the complexity of existential pebble games. In *CSL*, pages 314–329, 2003.
- 17 Phokion G. Kolaitis and Moshe Y. Vardi. On the expressive power of datalog: Tools and a case study. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 51(1):110–134, 1995.
- 18 Phokion G. Kolaitis and Moshe Y. Vardi. A game-theoretic approach to constraint satisfaction. In *AAAI*, pages 175–181, 2000.
- 19 Hao Li, Chee-Yong Chan, and David Maier. Query from examples: An iterative, data-driven approach to query construction. *PVLDB*, 8(13):2158–2169, 2015.
- 20 Slawek Staworko and Piotr Wiecezorek. Characterizing XML twig queries with examples. In *ICDT*, pages 144–160, 2015.
- 21 Larry J. Stockmeyer and Albert R. Meyer. Word problems requiring exponential time: Preliminary report. In *Proceedings of the 5th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, April 30 - May 2, 1973, Austin, Texas, USA*, pages 1–9, 1973.
- 22 Balder ten Cate and Víctor Dalmau. The product homomorphism problem and applications. In *ICDT*, pages 161–176, 2015.
- 23 Quoc Trung Tran, Chee Yong Chan, and Srinivasan Parthasarathy. Query reverse engineering. *VLDB J.*, 23(5):721–746, 2014.
- 24 Ross Willard. Testing expressibility is hard. In *CP*, pages 9–23, 2010.
- 25 Peter T. Wood. Query languages for graph databases. *SIGMOD Record*, 41(1):50–60, 2012.
- 26 Meihui Zhang, Hazem Elmeleegy, Cecilia M. Procopiuc, and Divesh Srivastava. Reverse engineering complex join queries. In *SIGMOD*, pages 809–820, 2013.

8 Appendix

Proof of Theorem 2

We concentrate on explanations (the proof for definitions is analogous). From left to right, assume for the sake of contradiction that q is a $\text{TW}(k)$ -explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$, yet the $(k+1)$ -pebble QBE test for CQs accepts $\mathcal{D}$, S^+ , and S^- , i.e., $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow_{k+1} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$ for some $\bar{b} \in S^-$. Since $S^+ \subseteq q(\mathcal{D})$, it is the case that $\bar{a} \in q(\mathcal{D})$ for each $\bar{a} \in S^+$. That is, $(\mathcal{D}_q, \bar{x}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ for each $\bar{a} \in S^+$. Due to basic properties of direct products, this implies that $(\mathcal{D}_q, \bar{x}) \rightarrow \prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$. From Proposition 4 we conclude that $(\mathcal{D}_q, \bar{x}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$, i.e., $\bar{b} \in q(\mathcal{D})$. This is a contradiction since $\bar{b} \in S^-$ and $q(\mathcal{D}) \cap S^- = \emptyset$.

From right to left, assume that the $(k+1)$ -pebble QBE test for CQs does not accept $\mathcal{D}$, S^+ , and S^- , i.e., for every tuple $\bar{b} \in S^-$ it is the case that $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \not\rightarrow_{k+1} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$. From Proposition 4, this implies that for each $\bar{b} \in S^-$ there is a CQ $q_{\bar{b}}(\bar{x})$ such that $(\mathcal{D}_{q_{\bar{b}}}, \bar{x}) \rightarrow \prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ but $(\mathcal{D}_{q_{\bar{b}}}, \bar{x}) \not\rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$. Suppose first that $S^- \neq \emptyset$ and let:

$$q(\bar{x}) := \bigwedge_{\bar{b} \in S^-} q_{\bar{b}}(\bar{x}).$$

It is easy to see that $q(\bar{x})$ is well-defined (since S^- is nonempty) and can be expressed as a CQ in $\text{TW}(k)$. For the latter we simply use fresh existentially quantified variables for each CQ $q_{\bar{b}}$ such that $\bar{b} \in S^-$ and then move all existentially quantified variables in $\bigwedge_{\bar{b} \in S^-} q_{\bar{b}}(\bar{x})$ to the front. We now prove that $q(\bar{x})$ is a $\text{TW}(k)$ -explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$. It easily follows that $(\mathcal{D}_q, \bar{x}) \rightarrow \prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ from the fact that $(\mathcal{D}_{q_{\bar{b}}}, \bar{x}) \rightarrow \prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ for each $\bar{b} \in S^-$. But then $(\mathcal{D}_q, \bar{x}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ for each $\bar{a} \in S^+$. This means that $\bar{a} \in q(\mathcal{D})$ for each $\bar{a} \in S^+$, i.e., $S^+ \subseteq q(\mathcal{D})$. Assume now for the sake of contradiction that $q(\mathcal{D}) \cap S^- \neq \emptyset$, that is, there is a tuple $\bar{b} \in q(\mathcal{D}) \cap S^-$. Then $(\mathcal{D}_q, \bar{x}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$, which implies that $(\mathcal{D}_{q_{\bar{b}}}, \bar{x}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$. This is a contradiction.

If $S^- = \emptyset$, we use the following fact: For each database $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ with a distinguished tuple, there is a CQ $q(\bar{x}) \in \text{TW}(k)$ such that $(\mathcal{D}_q, \bar{x}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$. Thus, for $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$, there is a CQ $q(\bar{x}) \in \text{TW}(k)$, such that $(\mathcal{D}_q, \bar{x}) \rightarrow \prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$. It follows that $(\mathcal{D}_q, \bar{x}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$, for each $\bar{a} \in S^+$, and then $S^+ \subseteq q(\mathcal{D})$. We conclude that q is a CQ-explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$.

Proof of Theorem 3

First, we show that, for each fixed $k > 1$, the k -PEBBLE PHP problem reduces to checking whether the k -pebble QBE test accepts. Similarly, for the k -pebble definability test. Let focus first on the k -pebble QBE test. Let $\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_m, \mathcal{D}$ be an instance of k -PEBBLE PHP. Suppose that the schema of all these databases is σ . We define a database $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ over schema $\sigma \cup \{\$, \}$, where $\$$ is a fresh binary relation not in σ , as follows. For each $1 \leq i \leq m$, let $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_i$ be the database obtained from $\mathcal{D}_i$ by adding a new element a_i and atoms $\$(a_i, u)$ for each u in $\mathcal{D}_i$. Similarly, let $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ be the database obtained from $\mathcal{D}$ by adding a fresh element b and atoms $\$(b, u)$ for each u in $\mathcal{D}$. We define $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ to be the disjoint union of $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_m$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$. Let S^+ and S^- be the unary relations $\{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$ and $\{b\}$, respectively.

We claim that $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathcal{D}_i \rightarrow_k \mathcal{D}$ if and only if the k -pebble QBE test accepts $(\hat{\mathcal{D}}, S^+, S^-)$. Suppose first that $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathcal{D}_i \rightarrow_k \mathcal{D}$. We need to show that $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} (\hat{\mathcal{D}}, a_i) \rightarrow_k (\hat{\mathcal{D}}, b)$. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the connected component (defined w.r.t the underlying graph) of the tuple $(a_1, \dots, a_m)$ in $\hat{\mathcal{D}}^m$. Observe that each connected component different from $\mathcal{P}$ in $\hat{\mathcal{D}}^m$ can be homomorphically mapped to $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ (via the projections). Thus $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} (\hat{\mathcal{D}}, a_i) \rightarrow_k (\hat{\mathcal{D}}, b)$ iff $(\mathcal{P}, (a_1, \dots, a_m)) \rightarrow_k$

$(\mathcal{D}, b)$. Also, observe that $\mathcal{P}$ is exactly the database obtained from $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathcal{D}_i$ by adding the tuple $(a_1, \dots, a_m)$ and one atom $\$((a_1, \dots, a_m), \bar{t})$, for each tuple in $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathcal{D}_i$. Since there is also one atom $\$(b, u)$ for each u in $\mathcal{D}$, duplicator has a winning strategy on $(\mathcal{P}, (a_1, \dots, a_m))$ and $(\mathcal{D}, b)$: He plays exactly as in the winning strategy on $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathcal{D}_i$ and $\mathcal{D}$, but additionally, if spoiler places a pebble in $(a_1, \dots, a_m)$, then duplicator places the corresponding pebble on b . We have then that $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} (\hat{\mathcal{D}}, a_i) \rightarrow_k (\hat{\mathcal{D}}, b)$ and thus the k -pebble QBE test accepts $(\hat{\mathcal{D}}, S^+, S^-)$.

On the other hand, assume that the k -pebble QBE test accepts $(\hat{\mathcal{D}}, S^+, S^-)$. Then $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} (\hat{\mathcal{D}}, a_i) \rightarrow_k (\hat{\mathcal{D}}, b)$. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the connected component of the tuple $(a_1, \dots, a_m)$ in $\hat{\mathcal{D}}^m$. In particular, $(\mathcal{P}, (a_1, \dots, a_m)) \rightarrow_k (\hat{\mathcal{D}}, b)$. As observed before, $\mathcal{P}$ is exactly the database obtained from $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathcal{D}_i$ by adding the tuple $(a_1, \dots, a_m)$ and one atom $\$((a_1, \dots, a_m), \bar{t})$, for each tuple in $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathcal{D}_i$. Thus in the winning strategy of duplicator witnessing that $(\mathcal{P}, (a_1, \dots, a_m)) \rightarrow_k (\hat{\mathcal{D}}, b)$, every time the spoiler plays on an element of $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathcal{D}_i$, duplicator must respond with an element of $\mathcal{D}$. We have then that $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathcal{D}_i \rightarrow_k \mathcal{D}$.

Finally, observe that the k -pebble QBE test accepts $(\hat{\mathcal{D}}, S^+, S^-)$ iff the k -pebble definability test accepts $(\hat{\mathcal{D}}, S^+)$. Indeed, if the k -pebble definability test accepts $(\hat{\mathcal{D}}, S^+)$, then $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} (\hat{\mathcal{D}}, a_i) \rightarrow_k (\hat{\mathcal{D}}, b')$, for some $b' \notin S^+$. Since in $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} (\hat{\mathcal{D}}, a_i)$, there are atoms of the form $\$((a_1, \dots, a_m), u)$, for some u , and the only element $b' \notin S^+$ that appears in some atom $\$(b', u')$, is b , we conclude that $b' = b$. It follows that the k -pebble QBE test accepts $(\hat{\mathcal{D}}, S^+, S^-)$. Thus the previous reduction also works for definability.

It remains to prove the following:

► **Theorem 5.** *The problem k -PEBBLE PHP is EXPTIME-complete for each fixed $k \geq 1$.*

Before proving this theorem, we need to show that the complexity of the existential k -pebble game is P-complete even over a *fixed template*:

► **Lemma 6 .** *For each fixed $k > 1$, there is a database $\mathcal{D}_k$ that only depends on k , such that the following problem is P-complete: Given a database $\mathcal{D}$, decide whether $\mathcal{D} \rightarrow_k \mathcal{D}_k$.*

Proof. It was already known that this problem is P-complete when $\mathcal{D}_k$ is part of the input [16]. We modify this proof in order to obtain our result. Next we give a self-contained proof that also simplifies the one given in [16]. Recall that a *monotone circuit* is an acyclic directed graph in which each node has in-degree 0 or 2. The nodes of in-degree 0 are called *input nodes*, and the nodes of in-degree 2 *internal nodes*. Each internal node is labeled either with AND or OR. Given a 0/1-assignment α to the input nodes, the value $\text{val}_\alpha^C(v)$ of a node v of the circuit C is defined inductively: if v is an input node then $\text{val}_\alpha^C(v) = \alpha(v)$. If v is an internal node with children u, w then $\text{val}_\alpha^C(v) = \text{val}_\alpha^C(u) \wedge \text{val}_\alpha^C(w)$, if v is an AND-node, or $\text{val}_\alpha^C(v) = \text{val}_\alpha^C(u) \vee \text{val}_\alpha^C(w)$, otherwise.


The *monotone circuit value problem* (MCV) asks, given a monotone circuit C , a 0/1-assignment α to the input nodes, and an output node v , whether $\text{val}_\alpha^C(v) = 1$. It is known that this problem is P-complete. First, we note that this problem is also P-complete when (C, v) is *normalized*, that is, the following hold:

1. v is an OR-node.
2. If v is an AND-node, its two children are OR-nodes.
3. If v is an OR-node, its children are either inputs or AND-nodes. In particular, inputs nodes are only connected with OR-nodes.

► **Lemma 15.** *The following problem is P-complete: Given a monotone circuit C , a 0/1-assignment α to the input nodes and an output node v such that (C, v) is normalized, decide whether $\text{val}_\alpha^C(v) = 1$.*


Proof. We reduce from the MCV problem. Let C be a monotone circuit, α an assignment and v an output node. An *incorrect* edge in C is an edge between two AND-nodes, two OR-nodes or between an input and an AND-node. Note that C, v is normalized iff v is an OR-node and there is no incorrect edges in C . We replace each incorrect edge in C by a particular gadget. Suppose the edge is of the form (a, b) where a is either an input or an AND-node, and b is an AND-node. Then we add a new OR-node c , a new input node d and edges $(a, c), (c, b), (d, c)$. The value of d is 0. If a, b are OR-nodes, c is now an AND-node and d becomes an OR-node with two fresh input nodes as children with value 1. Finally, if the output node v is labeled with AND, we add a new output OR-node v' with children v and d' , where d' is a fresh input node with value 0. Let C', α' and v' be the resulting circuit, assignment and output node respectively. By construction, (C', v') is normalized and $\text{val}_{\alpha'}^{C'}(v') = \text{val}_{\alpha}^C(v)$. Moreover, the reduction can be carried out in logspace. ◀

We reduce from this normalized version of the MCV. Before doing so, we need to introduce some terminology and gadgets from [16, 15]. A *position* of the existential k -pebble game on $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D}'$ is a subset $P \subseteq D \times D'$, where D and D' are the domains of $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D}'$ respectively, and $|P| \leq k$. For convenience, we write $ab \in P$, instead of $(a, b) \in P$. We say that the spoiler can *reach* a position P' from position P in the existential k -pebble game on $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D}'$, if he has a strategy for the game with initial position P such that he either wins the game or position P' eventually occurs. We say that spoiler can reach P' or P'' from P if he has a strategy with initial position P such that he either wins the game or eventually one of the positions P' or P'' occurs.



■ **Figure 2** The gadgets H_S and H_D .

We define gadgets H_S, H_D, I_S and I_D as in [16, 15]. These are *colored* graphs, that is, databases with a symmetric binary relation and some unary relations. H_S , as shown in Figure 2, consists of three nodes h, i, j , each of a different color. H_D consists of six nodes h, h', i, i', j, j' , where $\{h, h'\}$, $\{i, i'\}$ and $\{j, j'\}$ have the same color as h, i, j in H_D , respectively. I_S and I_D , as depicted in Figure 3, have some additional nodes.



■ **Figure 3** The gadgets I_S and I_D .

The intuition is that H_S, H_D codify an AND-gate while I_S, I_D an OR-gate. It is straightforward to verify the following lemma.

► **Lemma 16.** H_S, H_D, I_S and I_D satisfies the following:

1. Spoiler can reach ii' and jj' from hh' in the existential k -pebble game on H_S and H_D .
2. Spoiler can reach ii' or jj' from hh' in the existential k -pebble game on I_S and I_D .


Now we introduce a simplification of the so-called *single-input one-way switch* from [16]. These are two colored graph O_S^k and O_D^k defined as follows (recall $k > 1$ is fixed in the theorem). The node set of O_S^k is $\{x, y\} \cup \{1\} \times \{1, 2, \dots, k-1\} \cup \{(2, 0)\}$ (see Figure 4) and its edge set is

$$\begin{aligned} & \{(x, (1, a)) \mid 1 \leq a \leq k-1\} \cup \{((1, a), (1, b)) \mid a \neq b, 1 \leq a, b \leq k-1\} \\ & \cup \{((1, a), (2, 0)) \mid 1 \leq a \leq k-1\} \cup \{((2, 0), y)\} \end{aligned}$$

The node set of O_D^k is $\{x, x', y, y'\} \cup \{1\} \times \{0, 1, 2, \dots, k-1\} \cup \{(2, 0), (2, 1)\}$ and its edge set is

$$\begin{aligned} & \{(x, (1, a)) \mid 0 \leq a \leq k-2\} \cup \{(x', (1, a)) \mid 1 \leq a \leq k-1\} \\ & \cup \{((1, a), (1, b)) \mid a \neq b, 0 \leq a, b \leq k-1\} \cup \{((2, 0), (1, a)) \mid 1 \leq a \leq k-1\} \\ & \cup \{((2, 1), (1, a)) \mid 0 \leq a \leq k-2\} \cup \{((2, 0), y'), ((2, 1), y), ((2, 1), y')\} \end{aligned}$$

In both graphs, each row is colored by a unique color, and corresponding rows have the same color in O_S^k and O_D^k . If h is a mapping, then we write $x \mapsto y \in h$ to indicate that $h(x) = y$.



■ **Figure 4** The gadgets O_S^k and O_D^k . Nodes within dashed dot boxes form a clique.

► **Lemma 17.** O_S^k and O_D^k satisfies the following:

1. Spoiler can reach yy' from xx' in the existential k -pebble game on O_S^k and O_D^k .
2. There are three homomorphisms from O_S^k to O_D^k , denoted by h_{yy}^{xx} , $h_{yy'}^{xx}$ and $h_{yy'}^{xx'}$, such that $\{x \mapsto x, y \mapsto y\} \subseteq h_{yy}^{xx}$, $\{x \mapsto x, y \mapsto y'\} \subseteq h_{yy'}^{xx}$ and $\{x \mapsto x', y \mapsto y'\} \subseteq h_{yy'}^{xx'}$, respectively.

Proof. For part (1), from position xx' , spoiler plays the remaining $k-1$ pebbles over $L_1 = \{(1, 1), \dots, (1, k-1)\}$. Since L_1 is a clique and there is no edge between x' and $(1, 0)$ in O_D^k , duplicator must place his pebbles also on $\{(1, 1), \dots, (1, k-1)\}$. Then spoiler moves the pebble on x to $(2, 0)$, to which duplicator must respond with $(2, 0)$. Finally, spoiler


picks one pebble from L_1 and places it on y . Since there is no edge between $(2,0)$ and y in O_D^k , duplicator must respond with y' , and thus position yy' is reached. For part (2), define $h_{yy}^{xx} = \{x \mapsto x\} \cup \{(1,i) \mapsto (1,i-1) \mid 1 \leq i \leq k-1\} \cup \{(2,0) \mapsto (2,1), y \mapsto y\}$, $h_{yy'}^{xx} = \{x \mapsto x\} \cup \{(1,i) \mapsto (1,i-1) \mid 1 \leq i \leq k-1\} \cup \{(2,0) \mapsto (2,1), y \mapsto y'\}$, and $h_{yy'}^{xx'} = \{x \mapsto x'\} \cup \{(1,i) \mapsto (1,i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq k-1\} \cup \{(2,0) \mapsto (2,0), y \mapsto y'\}$. ◀

Now we present the main reduction. Given a monotone circuit C , and assignment α and an output node v , where (C, v) is normalized, we construct a colored graph $\mathcal{D}_{C,\alpha,v}$ such that $\text{val}_\alpha^C(v) = 1$ if and only if $\mathcal{D}_{C,\alpha,v} \rightarrow_k \mathcal{D}_k$. For readability, we write $\mathcal{D}_C$ instead of $\mathcal{D}_{C,\alpha,v}$. The graph $\mathcal{D}_k$ only depends on k , thus it is fixed in the reduction. In [16], two colored graphs C_S and C_D are constructed from C, α, v , such that $\text{val}_\alpha^C(v) = 1$ iff $C_S \rightarrow_k C_D$. These two graphs closely resemble the structure of the circuit C . The key idea of our reduction is that, since (C, v) is normalized, by slightly modifying C_S (resulting in the graph $\mathcal{D}_C$), we can compress C_D in a fixed colored graph $\mathcal{D}_k$.

The graph $\mathcal{D}_C$ is obtained bottom-up from C, v, α by replacing each node and edge in C by some gadgets as follows:

1. If a is an input node in C , then $\mathcal{D}_C$ contains a node a and a fresh copy of O_S^k , called O_a , where the node x is connected to a . If the value $\alpha(a) = 1$, we color O_a with the color one, otherwise we color it with the color zero. Thus each node in O_a has two colors: one according to the value of v and the other according to the row in O_a to which the node belongs.
2. If a is an AND-node with children b and c , then $\mathcal{D}_C$ contains a node a ; a copy of H_S , called H_a with h identified with a ; and two copies of O_S^k . In one copy, called O_{ab} , x is connected with the node i of H_a and y is connected with the node b in $\mathcal{D}_C$. In the other copy, called O_{ac} , x is connected with j , and y with c .
3. If a is an OR-node with children b and c , then $\mathcal{D}_C$ contains a node a ; a copy of I_S , called I_a with h identified with a ; and two copies of O_S^k . In one copy, called O_{ab} , x is connected with the node i of I_a and y is connected with the node b in $\mathcal{D}_C$. In the other copy, called O_{ac} , x is connected with j , and y with c .

Additionally, there is a copy of O_S^k , called Init_S , where y is connected to the output node v , and x is colored with an a fresh color init. The graph $\mathcal{D}_C$ is similar to the graph C_S from [16], except that we use the single-input one-way switch Init_S to initialize the game, instead of the so-called *twisted switch* [16], and for each input node a , we need to append O_a to a .



■ **Figure 5** The graph $\mathcal{D}_k$.

The graph $\mathcal{D}_k$ is depicted in Figure 5. There are two pairs of nodes $\{z, z'\}$ and $\{w, w'\}$. The pair $\{z, z'\}$ codifies an OR-node and $\{w, w'\}$ an AND-node. There is a copy of I_D , called I_{or} , and a copy of O_D^k , called O_{or} , where h and h' are identified with z and z' respectively; x of O_{or} is connected with i and j of I_{or} , and x' with i' and j' ; y and y' of O_{or} are connected with w and w' respectively. Analogously, there is a copy of H_D , called H_{and} , and a copy of O_D^k , called O_{and} , where h and h' are identified with w and w' respectively; x of O_{and} is connected with i and j of H_{and} , and x' with i' and j' ; y and y' of O_{and} are connected with z and z' respectively. Additionally, there is a copy of O_D^k , called $Init_D$, where y and y' is connected to z and z' respectively, and the node x' is colored with the color *init*. Also, there are two copies of O_D^k , called O_0 and O_1 , where x and x' in both O_0 and O_1 are connected to w and w' , respectively. The node y' in O_0 is colored with a fresh color *fail*. All the nodes in O_0 and O_1 are additionally colored with *zero* and *one*, respectively.

Note that $\mathcal{D}_C$ can be constructed from C, α, v using logarithmic space. Below we show the correctness of the construction.

Suppose first that $\text{val}_\alpha^C(v) = 0$. In this case, the intuition is that the spoiler can traverse $\mathcal{D}_C$ in a top-down fashion from the gadgets representing the output node v to a gadget representing an input node a with value 0. At this point spoiler can reach the position $\{yy'\}$ between O_a and O_0 . Since the colors of y and y' are distinct (y' is colored with the special color *fail*), this is a winning position for the spoiler. Formally, the strategy of the spoiler is as follows. He starts playing one pebble on the node x of $Init_S$. Since this node is colored with *init*, duplicator must respond with the only *init*-colored node, that is, with x' in $Init_D$. By Lemma 17, spoiler can reach position $\{yy'\}$ on $Init_S$ and $Init_D$ and then position $\{vz'\}$.

The invariant is that spoiler can always reach a position of the form $\{au'\}$, where a corresponds to a node in C with value 0, and $u' = z'$ if a corresponds to an OR-node, or $u' = w'$ otherwise. To maintain the invariant spoiler proceed as follows. Suppose a corresponds to an OR-node in C with children b and c . Since the value of a is 0, so are the values of b and c . By Lemma 16, when playing over I_a and I_{or} , spoiler can reach either ii' or jj' . Assume he reaches ii' (the case jj' is analogous). Then he can reach xx' on O_{ab} and O_{or} , and by Lemma 17, he can reach position $\{bw'\}$ and then satisfies the invariant. Similarly, suppose a corresponds to an AND-node in C with children b and c . Since the value of a is 0, one of the values of b and c is 0. Assume the value of b is 0 (the other case is analogous). By Lemma 16, when playing over H_a and H_{and} , spoiler can reach ii' and then xx' on O_{ab} and O_{and} . By Lemma 17, he can reach position $\{bz'\}$ and then satisfies the invariant. With this strategy the spoiler eventually reach a position $\{aw'\}$ where a corresponds to an input node with value 0. Then spoiler places a pebble on x in O_a . Since O_a is colored with *zero*, and the only *zero*-colored nodes in $\mathcal{D}_k$ are those in O_0 , duplicator must respond with x' in O_0 . By Lemma 17, he can reach position $\{yy'\}$ on O_a and O_0 . This is a winning position for the spoiler as the colors of y and y' are distinct.

Suppose now that $\text{val}_\alpha^C(v) = 1$. Let T be a tree witnessing the fact that $\text{val}_\alpha^C(v) = 1$, that is, T is a subgraph of C such that (i) its underlying graph is a tree rooted at v , (ii) if a is an OR-node in T , then there is only one child of a in C that is also in T (together with the edge from this child to a), (iii) if a is an AND-node in T , then the two children of a in C are in T (together with the edges from the children to a), (iv) the value of each node in T is 1. Note that in particular, all the leaves of T are input nodes with value 1 (not necessarily all the input nodes with value 1 from C). Using T we can show that there is an homomorphism h_T from $\mathcal{D}_C$ to $\mathcal{D}_k$. In particular, $\mathcal{D}_C \rightarrow_k \mathcal{D}_k$ as required. The mapping h_T is composed by domain-disjoint partial homomorphisms that we define below.

A *block* of $\mathcal{D}_C$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{D}_C$ corresponding either to a copy of O_S^k , I_S or H_S , or a

singleton $\{a\}$ such that a corresponds to an input node of C . For each block B of $\mathcal{D}_C$, we define a subgraph R_B of $\mathcal{D}_k$ as follows:

1. If $B = I_a$ for some OR-node a , then $R_B = I_{or}$; if $B = H_a$ for some AND-node a , then $R_B = H_{and}$; if $B = \{a\}$ for an input node a , then $R_B = \{w, w'\}$.
2. If $B = O_{ab}$ for some OR-node a , then $R_B = O_{or}$; if $B = O_{ab}$ for some AND-node a , then $R_B = O_{and}$.
3. If $B = Init_S$, then $R_B = Init_D$; if $B = O_a$ for an input node of value 0, then $R_B = O_0$; if $B = O_a$ for an input node of value 1, then $R_B = O_1$.

Recall the definition of H_S , H_D , I_S and I_D . It is straightforward to verify that $id_H = \{h \mapsto h, i \mapsto i, j \mapsto j\}$ and $switch_{i,j} = \{h \mapsto h', i \mapsto i', j \mapsto j'\}$ are homomorphism from H_S to H_D . Also, we can define three homomorphism id_I , $switch_i$ and $switch_j$ from I_S and I_D , such that $\{h \mapsto h, i \mapsto i, j \mapsto j\} \subseteq id_I$, $\{h \mapsto h', i \mapsto i', j \mapsto j\} \subseteq switch_i$ and $\{h \mapsto h', i \mapsto i, j \mapsto j'\} \subseteq switch_j$. Now using T , we define for each block B of $\mathcal{D}_C$, an homomorphism h_B from B to R_B as follows:

1. Suppose $B = I_a$ for some OR-node a . If a is not in T , then $h_B = id_I$. If a is in T , then let b be the only child of a in T . If b is the right child of a in C , that is, O_{ab} is connected with i , then $h_B = switch_i$; otherwise, $h_B = switch_j$.
2. Suppose $B = H_a$ for some AND-node a . If a is not in T , then $h_B = id_H$; otherwise, $h_B = switch_{i,j}$.
3. Suppose $B = \{a\}$ for an input node a . If a is not in T , then $h_B = \{a \mapsto w\}$; otherwise, $h_B = \{a \mapsto w'\}$.
4. Assume $B = O_{ab}$. If the edge (b, a) is in T , then $h_B = h_{yy'}^{xx'}$ from Lemma 17. If this not the case, then $h_B = h_{yy'}^{xx}$ when b is in T , or $h_B = h_{yy}^{xx}$ otherwise.
5. If $B = O_a$ for an input node a , then $h_B = h_{yy'}^{xx'}$ from Lemma 17 when a is in T , or $h_B = h_{yy}^{xx}$ otherwise. Note that h_B is an homomorphism since whenever a has value 0 then a is not in T and then $h_B = h_{yy}^{xx}$ (thus we avoid the fail position yy').
6. If $B = Init_S$, then $h_B = h_{yy'}^{xx'}$ from Lemma 17. Note that h_B is an homomorphism since x and x' are both colored with *init*.

By construction h_B and h'_B are compatible when B and B' are *adjacent* blocks, that is, when there is an edge from B to B' in $\mathcal{D}_C$. Indeed, h_{Init_S} is compatible with h_{I_v} , and h_{O_a} is compatible with $h_{\{a\}}$, for each input node a . Also, an easy case-by-case analysis shows that $h_{O_{ab}}$ is compatible with h_{B_a} and h_{B_b} , where B_a is the block associated with a (either I_a or H_a), and B_b is the block associated with b (either I_b , H_b or $\{b\}$). Thus by gluing all the h_B s, we can define an homomorphism h_T from $\mathcal{D}_C$ to $\mathcal{D}_k$. ◀

Proof of Theorem 5. We reduce from the following EXPTIME-complete problem: Given an alternating Turing machine M and an integer n , decide whether M accepts the empty tape using n space. Some of the states of M are *halting* states, which are partitioned into *accepting* and *rejecting* states. As usual, the non-halting states of M are either *existential* or *universal*. A *configuration* γ of M is a string of length n over the alphabet $\Gamma \cup S \times \Gamma$, where Γ is the alphabet of M and S its state set, such that exactly one symbol in γ belongs to $S \times \Gamma$. Intuitively, if the i -th symbol of γ is $(s, e) \in S \times \Gamma$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, then M is in state s and its head is on the i -th cell of the tape reading e . We say that a configuration is of a particular type when its state is of that type (for instance, existential, universal, accepting, etc...). The *initial* configuration is the string $(s_0, \perp) \perp^{n-1}$, where s_0 is the initial state of the machine and $\perp$ the blank symbol. It is straightforward to verify that this problem is still

EXPTIME-complete, even when M and n are *normalized*, that is, the following conditions hold:

1. The initial configuration of M is existential.
2. If γ is a successor of γ' , for two non-halting configurations γ and γ' , then either γ is existential and γ' universal, or vice versa.
3. If a halting configuration is a successor of a configuration γ , then γ is an existential configuration.
4. Every non-halting configuration γ of M has two possible successors, a *left* successor γ^ℓ and a *right* successor γ^r , defined by two deterministic transition functions δ^ℓ and δ^r . Moreover, the configurations γ^ℓ and γ^r are distinct.
5. Starting from the initial configuration, M always reaches a halting state, independently of the chosen transitions.

From such a normalized machine M and n , we can define a monotone circuit $C_{M,n}$, a 0/1-assignment $\alpha_{M,n}$ to the input nodes and an output node $v_{M,n}$ such that $(C_{M,n}, v_{M,n})$ is normalized. The nodes of circuit $C_{M,n}$ are all the configurations of M that can be reached from the initial configuration. A node is an OR-node if it corresponds to an existential configuration. Similarly, a node is an AND-node if it corresponds to an universal configuration. The inputs nodes of $C_{M,n}$ are those that correspond to halting configurations. $\alpha_{M,n}$ assigns 1 exactly to the accepting configurations. The output node $v_{M,n}$ is the initial configuration of M . There is an edge (γ, γ') in the circuit $C_{M,n}$ if the configuration γ is a successor of γ' . Note that conditions (4) and (5) ensure that $C_{M,n}$ is actually a circuit, and conditions (1)–(3) ensure that $(C_{M,n}, v_{M,n})$ is normalized. It is straightforward to verify that the value of $v_{M,n}$ is 1 if and only if M accepts the empty tape using n space.

The intuition of the reduction is as follows. Let M be an alternating Turing machine and n a positive integer, such that M and n are normalized. Recall $k > 1$ is fixed. From Lemma 6, we can construct a colored graph $\mathcal{D}_{C_{M,n}}$ such that $\mathcal{D}_{C_{M,n}} \rightarrow_k \mathcal{D}_k$ iff the value of $v_{M,n}$ is 1. In particular, $\mathcal{D}_{C_{M,n}} \rightarrow_k \mathcal{D}_k$ iff M accepts the empty tape using n space. The problem is that the size of $C_{M,n}$ is exponential in the size of M and n , and so is the size of $\mathcal{D}_{C_{M,n}}$. The idea then is to construct polynomially sized databases $\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_m$, for some $m \geq 1$, over an enriched schema σ such that $\Pi_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathcal{D}_i$ roughly coincide with $\mathcal{D}_{C_{M,n}}$. We also construct a database $\mathcal{D}$ that represents $\mathcal{D}_k$ in terms of the schema σ . Now $\mathcal{D}$ is not fixed in the reduction as the schema σ depends on M and n . The output of the reduction are the databases $\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_m, \mathcal{D}$.

Let M be an alternating Turing machine and n a positive integer such that M and n are normalized. Let S be the set of states of M , and Γ the alphabet of M , which includes the blank symbol $\perp$. Let τ be the schema of the colored graphs from Lemma 6. Let σ_τ be the schema $\{\tau_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq 6\}$, where each τ_i is a disjoint copy of τ . Let σ' contains the following binary relation symbols:

- $O^\exists, O^\forall, P_0, P_1$ and P_{init} .
- $L_j^q(e, f, g)$ and $R_j^q(e, f, g)$, for each $q \in \{\exists, \forall\}$, $1 < j < n$, $e, g \in \Gamma$ and $f \in S \times \Gamma$ such that $f = (s, p)$ for an existential state s if $q = \exists$, otherwise $f = (s, p)$ for a universal state s .
- $L_1^q(e, f)$, $L_n^q(g, h)$, $R_1^q(e, f)$ and $R_n^q(g, h)$, for each $q \in \{\exists, \forall\}$, $f, e \in \Gamma$ and $e, h \in S \times \Gamma$ such that $e = (s, p)$ for an existential state s if $q = \exists$, otherwise $e = (s, p)$ for a universal state s , and similarly for h .

We define the schema $\sigma = \sigma_\tau \cup \sigma'$. From M and n , we construct databases $\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_{n+7}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ over σ such that $\Pi_{1 \leq i \leq n+7} \mathcal{D}_i \rightarrow_k \mathcal{D}$ iff M accepts the empty tape using n space.

The domain of the first $\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_n$ databases is $\Gamma \cup (S \times \Gamma)$. Recall I_S, H_S and O_S^k from the proof of Lemma 6. Let P_S^k be the colored graph O_S^k with the addition of a new node g and an edge from g to x . The node g is colored with the same color as h in I_S (or H_S). For each $1 \leq i \leq 6$, the domain of $\mathcal{D}_{n+i}$ is $D \cup \{\text{off}\}$, where off is a fresh element not in D , and D is either the domain of I_S if $i = 1$, the domain of H_S if $i = 2$, the domain of O_S^k if $i \in \{3, 6\}$, and the domain of P_S^k if $i \in \{4, 5\}$. For $\mathcal{D}_{n+7}$, the domain is $E \cup \{\text{off}\}$, where $E = \{u_P \mid P \in \sigma' \setminus \{O^\exists, O^\forall, P_0, P_1, P_{init}\}\}$. Recall that we want the product $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq n+7} \mathcal{D}_i$ to codify $\mathcal{D}_{C_{M,n}}$, which is the colored graph associated with the circuit $C_{M,n}$. The intuition is that the first n coordinates of this product indicates the configuration of the machine, while the next six coordinates indicates the actual element in the “current” gadget of $\mathcal{D}_{C_{M,n}}$ (the seventh coordinate is present for technical reasons we explain later). Thus all the coordinates, except for one, between $n+1$ and $n+6$ are “turned off”, that is, they are off . For instance, if a is an OR-node in the circuit $C_{M,n}$, then the gadget I_a in $\mathcal{D}_{C_{M,n}}$ associated with a , is represented by $(n+7)$ -ary tuples, where the first n coordinates correspond to the configuration a , the $(n+1)$ -th coordinate corresponds to the elements of I_a , and the rest of the coordinates are off .

Similarly, we use the $(n+2)$ -th and $(n+3)$ -th coordinate for gadgets of the form H_a and O_{ab} respectively, where a and b are nodes in $C_{M,n}$ (see the proof of Lemma 6). The coordinates at positions $n+4$ and $n+5$ correspond to gadgets $O_a \cup \{a, x\}$, for input nodes a with value 0 and value 1, respectively. Here, $O_a \cup \{a, x\}$ denotes the gadget obtained from O_a by adding the edge $\{a, x\}$. The $(n+6)$ -th coordinate corresponds to the gadget $Init_S$. The intuition of $\mathcal{D}_{n+7}$ is as follows. In $\mathcal{D}_{C_{M,n}}$, we could have two gadgets of the form O_{ab} and $O_{a'b}$, for nodes a, a' and b in $C_{M,n}$. It is crucial in the construction of $\mathcal{D}_{C_{M,n}}$ that they are distinct gadgets, that is, that they are disjoint blocks of $\mathcal{D}_{C_{M,n}}$ (see proof of Lemma 6). In $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq n+7} \mathcal{D}_i$, the gadgets O_{ab} and $O_{a'b}$ are represented by tuples $\bar{u}$, where $\bar{u}_1 \dots \bar{u}_n$ is the configuration that corresponds to b , and $\bar{u}_{n+3}$ indicates the element in the gadget. We use $\mathcal{D}_{n+7}$ to force the tuples representing O_{ab} to be disjoint from those representing $O_{a'b}$. The idea is that the $(n+7)$ -th coordinate in $\bar{u}$ indicate the provenance of the transition, which in this case is a or a' . In order to indicate the provenance, elements in $E = \{u_P \mid P \in \sigma' \setminus \{O^\exists, O^\forall, P_0, P_1, P_{init}\}\}$ are sufficient.

Now we define the relations of the databases $\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_{n+7}$. For a p -ary tuple $\bar{u}$ and $1 \leq j \leq p$, we denote by $\bar{u}_j$, the j -th coordinate of $\bar{u}$. Consider the relations in τ_1 . In $\mathcal{D}_{n+1}$ these are interpreted as in I_S . For each $2 \leq i \leq 7$, $\mathcal{D}_{n+i}$ interprets the relations in τ_1 , as all the possible atoms that only mention off . For $1 \leq i \leq n$, $\mathcal{D}_i$ interprets τ_1 as follows: $\mathcal{D}_i$ contains all the atoms that only mention u , for all $u \in \Gamma$ and $u \in S \times \Gamma$ of the form $u = (s, e)$, for some existential state s and some $e \in \Gamma$. Thus if E_1 is the (only) binary relation in τ_1 , and $\bar{s}$ and $\bar{t}$ are tuples in $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq n+7} \mathcal{D}_i$, then there is an atom $E_1(\bar{s}, \bar{t})$ exactly when there is an atom $E_1(\bar{s}_{n+1}, \bar{t}_{n+1})$ in $\mathcal{D}_{n+1}$, $\bar{s}_i = \bar{t}_i = \text{off}$, for each $n+2 \leq i \leq n+7$, $\bar{s}_i = \bar{t}_i$, for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ and all the states mentioned in symbols $\bar{s}_i$, with $1 \leq i \leq n$, are existential.

The case τ_2 is analogous. In $\mathcal{D}_{n+2}$, τ_2 is interpreted as in H_S . For each $1 \leq i \leq 7$, with $i \neq 2$, $\mathcal{D}_{n+i}$ interprets τ_2 as all possible atoms that only mention off . For $1 \leq i \leq n$, $\mathcal{D}_i$ interprets τ_2 as follows: $\mathcal{D}_i$ contains all the atoms that only mention u , for all $u \in \Gamma$ and $u \in S \times \Gamma$ of the form $u = (s, e)$, for some universal state s and some $e \in \Gamma$. For τ_3 , $\mathcal{D}_{n+3}$ interprets it as in O_S^k , and for each $1 \leq i \leq 6$, with $i \neq 3$, $\mathcal{D}_{n+i}$ interprets τ_3 as all possible atoms that only mention off . $\mathcal{D}_{n+7}$ contains all the atoms that only mention u , for all $u \neq \text{off}$. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, $\mathcal{D}_i$ interprets τ_3 as follows: for all u in $\mathcal{D}_i$, we have all possible atoms that only mention u . In this case, we do not restrict to the existential or universal configurations as the $(n+3)$ -th corresponds to the gadget O_{ab} , where a and b alternates between existential

and universal nodes.

$\mathcal{D}_{n+4}$ interprets the relations of τ_4 as in P_S^k . Let $zero_4$ be the copy in τ_4 of the unary symbol $zero \in \tau$. We additionally add to $\mathcal{D}_{n+4}$ all the atoms $zero_4(u)$, for all u in $\mathcal{D}_{n+4} \setminus \{g\}$. The intuition is that $\mathcal{D}_{n+4}$ is a copy the gadget $O_a \cup \{a, x\}$ in $\mathcal{D}_{C_{M,n}}$, for an input node a in $C_{M,n}$ with value 0. For each $1 \leq i \leq 7$, with $i \neq 4$, $\mathcal{D}_{n+i}$ interprets τ_4 as all possible atoms that only mention *off*. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, $\mathcal{D}_i$ interprets τ_4 as follows: $\mathcal{D}_i$ contains all possible atoms that only mention u , for all $u \in \Gamma$ and $u \in S \times \Gamma$ of the form $u = (s, e)$, for some rejecting state s and some symbol $e \in \Gamma$. Similarly, $\mathcal{D}_{n+5}$ interprets the relations of τ_5 as in P_S^k . We also add to $\mathcal{D}_{n+5}$ all the atoms $one_5(u)$, for all u in $\mathcal{D}_{n+5} \setminus \{g\}$, where one_5 is the copy of $one \in \tau$. For each $1 \leq i \leq 7$, with $i \neq 5$, $\mathcal{D}_{n+i}$ interprets τ_5 as all possible atoms that only mention *off*. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, $\mathcal{D}_i$ interprets τ_5 as follows: $\mathcal{D}_i$ contains all possible atoms that only mention u , for all $u \in \Gamma$ and $u \in S \times \Gamma$ of the form $u = (s, e)$, for some accepting state s and some symbol $e \in \Gamma$. Finally, $\mathcal{D}_{n+6}$ interprets τ_6 as in O_S^k . We add to $\mathcal{D}_{n+6}$ the atom $init_6(x)$, where $init_6$ is the copy in τ_6 of $init \in \tau$. Note then that $\mathcal{D}_{n+6}$ is a copy of the gadget $Init_S$. For each $1 \leq i \leq 7$, with $i \neq 6$, $\mathcal{D}_{n+i}$ interprets τ_6 as all possible atoms that only mention *off*. Since in the product we only want this gadget to be associated with the initial configuration, for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, we interpret τ_6 over $\mathcal{D}_i$ as follows: if $i = 1$, $\mathcal{D}_i$ has all the atoms that only mention $(s_0, \perp)$, where s_0 is the initial state of M and $\perp$ is the blank node; otherwise, if $i > 1$, $\mathcal{D}_i$ has all the atoms that only mention $\perp$.

Now we interpret the binary relations of σ' . Let $1 < j < n$; $q \in \{\exists, \forall\}$; $e, g \in \Gamma$, and $f \in S \times \Gamma$. The intuition is that $L_j^q(e, f, g)$ relates configurations γ and γ' such that γ' is the successor of γ according to the left transition δ^ℓ of M , the head of M is over the position j in γ , and the positions $j-1, j, j+1$ in γ are e, f, g , respectively. Note that in such a transition all the symbols in γ in positions not in $\{j-1, j, j+1\}$ remain the same and e, f, g become new symbols $e', f', g' \in \Gamma \cup (S \times \Gamma)$, which are completely determined by δ^ℓ (note also that exactly one symbol from $\{e', f', g'\}$ belongs to $S \times \Gamma$). Then, for each $j' \in \{1, j-2\} \cup \{j+2, n\}$, $\mathcal{D}_{j'}$ interprets $L_j^q(e, f, g)$ as all the atoms that only mention u , for all u in $\mathcal{D}_{j'}$ with $u \in \Gamma$. Additionally, $\mathcal{D}_{j-1}$, $\mathcal{D}_j$ and $\mathcal{D}_{j+1}$ interpret $L_j^q(e, f, g)$ as the atoms $L_j^q(e, f, g)(e, e')$, $L_j^q(e, f, g)(f, f')$ and $L_j^q(e, f, g)(g, g')$, respectively. Observe that if $\bar{u}$ and $\bar{v}$ belongs to $\Pi_{1 \leq j' \leq n} \mathcal{D}_{j'}$, then $L_j^q(e, f, g)(\bar{u}, \bar{v})$ iff $\bar{u}$ and $\bar{v}$ are actually configurations (that is, they contain exactly one symbol from $S \times \Gamma$), $\bar{u}_{j-1} = e$, $\bar{u}_j = f$, $\bar{u}_{j+1} = g$, and $\bar{v}$ is the successor of $\bar{u}$ according to δ^ℓ . Note also that by construction, if $q = \exists$ (resp. $q = \forall$), then $\bar{u}$ is an existential (resp. universal) configuration.

Let $q \in \{\exists, \forall\}$, $e \in S \times \Gamma$ and $f \in \Gamma$. Then for each $3 \leq j' \leq n$, $\mathcal{D}_{j'}$ interprets $L_1^q(e, f)$ as all the atoms $L_1^q(e, f)(u, u)$, for all u in $\mathcal{D}_{j'}$ with $u \in \Gamma$. Suppose e, f become e', f' when we apply the transition δ^ℓ . Then, $\mathcal{D}_1$ and $\mathcal{D}_2$ interprets $L_1^q(a, b)$ as the atoms $L_1^q(a, b)(a, a')$ and $L_1^q(a, b)(b, b')$, respectively. The case of $L_n^q(g, h)$ is similar. Analogously, we interpret $R_j^q(e, f, g)$, $R_1^q(e, f)$ and $R_n^q(g, h)$ as before, but now we consider the right transition δ^r instead of δ^ℓ .

Let $L^\exists$ be a symbol of the form $L_j^\exists(e, f, g)$, $L_1^\exists(e, f)$ or $L_n^\exists(g, h)$ and $R^\exists$ a symbol of the form $R_j^\exists(e, f, g)$, $R_1^\exists(e, f)$ or $R_n^\exists(g, h)$. Now we interpret $L^\exists$ and $R^\exists$ over $\mathcal{D}_{n+1}, \dots, \mathcal{D}_{n+7}$. The idea is to produce connections in the product between gadgets of form I_a with the gadgets O_{ab} and O_{ac} , where b, c are the children of a in the circuit $C_{M,n}$. Specifically, we want to produce a connection between i from I_a and x from O_{ab} , an similarly from j to x from O_{ac} . Thus $\mathcal{D}_{n+1}$ contains the atoms $L^\exists(i, \text{off})$ and $R^\exists(j, \text{off})$, and $\mathcal{D}_{n+3}$ contains atoms $L^\exists(\text{off}, x)$ and $R^\exists(\text{off}, x)$. For each $p \in \{2, 4, 5, 6\}$, $\mathcal{D}_{n+p}$ contains atoms $L^\exists(\text{off}, \text{off})$ and $R^\exists(\text{off}, \text{off})$. $\mathcal{D}_{n+7}$ contains $L^\exists(\text{off}, u_{L^\exists})$ and $R^\exists(\text{off}, u_{R^\exists})$. For instance, if $\bar{u}$ and $\bar{v}$ belongs to $\Pi_{1 \leq p \leq n+7} \mathcal{A}_p$ then we have an atom $L^\exists(\bar{u}, \bar{v})$ iff $\bar{u}_1 \dots \bar{u}_n$ is an existential configuration,

$\bar{v}_1 \cdots \bar{v}_n$ is the left successor of $\bar{u}_1 \cdots \bar{u}_n$; $\bar{u}_{n+1} = i$ and $\bar{u}_{n+p} = \text{off}$ for each $2 \leq p \leq 7$; $\bar{v}_{n+3} = x$, $\bar{v}_{n+7} = u_{L^\exists}$ and $\bar{v}_{n+p} = \text{off}$ for each $p \in \{1, 2, 4, 5, 6\}$. Intuitively, from $\bar{u}$ to $\bar{v}$ we apply the left transition and change the current gadget from I_a to O_{ab} where a is the node in $C_{M,n}$ that corresponds to the configuration in $\bar{u}$, and b is the left child of a in $C_{M,n}$, that is, b corresponds to the configuration in $\bar{v}$. Similarly, suppose $L^\forall$ is a symbol of the form $L_j^\forall(e, f, g)$, $L_1^\forall(e, f)$ or $L_n^\forall(g, h)$ and $R^\forall$ a symbol of the form $R_j^\forall(e, f, g)$, $R_1^\forall(e, f)$ or $R_n^\forall(g, h)$. Thus $\mathcal{D}_{n+2}$ contains the atoms $L^\forall(i, \text{off})$ and $R^\forall(j, \text{off})$, and $\mathcal{D}_{n+3}$ contains atoms $L^\forall(\text{off}, x)$ and $R^\forall(\text{off}, x)$. For each $p \in \{1, 4, 5, 6\}$, $\mathcal{D}_{n+p}$ contains atoms $L^\forall(\text{off}, \text{off})$ and $R^\forall(\text{off}, \text{off})$. $\mathcal{D}_{n+7}$ contains $L^\forall(\text{off}, u_{L^\forall})$ and $R^\forall(\text{off}, u_{R^\forall})$.

It remains to interpret the symbols $O^\exists, O^\forall, P_0, P_1$ and P_{init} . The intuition is that $O^\exists$ (resp. $O^\forall$) connects in the product, gadgets O_{ab} and I_b (resp. H_b), for nodes a and b in $C_{M,n}$, specifically, it connects y in O_{ab} with h in I_b (resp. H_b). For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, $\mathcal{D}_i$ has all the atoms $O^\exists(u, u)$ (resp. $O^\forall(u, u)$), for all $u \in \Gamma$ and $u \in S \times \Gamma$ of the form $u = (s, q)$, for some existential (resp. universal) state s and some symbol $q \in \Gamma$. $\mathcal{D}_{n+3}$ contains $O^\exists(y, \text{off})$, $\mathcal{D}_{n+7}$ contains $O^\exists(u_P, \text{off})$, for all $P \in \sigma' \setminus \{O^\exists, O^\forall, P_0, P_1, P_{init}\}$, and $\mathcal{D}_{n+1}$ has an atom $O^\exists(\text{off}, h)$. Also, for each $p \in \{2, 4, 5, 6\}$, $\mathcal{D}_{n+p}$ contains $O^\exists(\text{off}, \text{off})$. Similarly, $\mathcal{D}_{n+3}$ contains an atom $O^\forall(y, \text{off})$, $\mathcal{D}_{n+7}$ contains $O^\forall(u_P, \text{off})$, for all $P \in \sigma' \setminus \{O^\exists, O^\forall, P_0, P_1, P_{init}\}$, and $\mathcal{D}_{n+2}$ contains the atom $O^\forall(\text{off}, h)$. For each $p \in \{1, 4, 5, 6\}$, $\mathcal{D}_{n+p}$ contains the atom $O^\forall(\text{off}, \text{off})$.

For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, $\mathcal{D}_i$ has all the atoms $P_0(u, u)$, for all $u \in \Gamma$ and $u \in S \times \Gamma$ of the form $u = (s, q)$, for some rejecting state s and symbol $q \in \Gamma$. $\mathcal{D}_{n+3}$ has the atom $P_0(y, \text{off})$, $\mathcal{D}_{n+7}$ contains $P_0(u_P, \text{off})$, for all $P \in \sigma' \setminus \{O^\exists, O^\forall, P_0, P_1, P_{init}\}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{n+4}$ has atom $P_0(\text{off}, g)$. For each $p \in \{1, 2, 5, 6\}$, $\mathcal{D}_{n+p}$ has the atom $P_0(\text{off}, \text{off})$. Similarly, for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, $\mathcal{D}_i$ has all the atoms $P_1(u, u)$, for all $u \in \Gamma$ and $u \in S \times \Gamma$ of the form $u = (s, q)$, for some accepting state s and symbol $q \in \Gamma$. $\mathcal{D}_{n+3}$ has atom $P_1(y, \text{off})$, $\mathcal{D}_{n+7}$ contains $P_1(u_P, \text{off})$, for all $P \in \sigma' \setminus \{O^\exists, O^\forall, P_0, P_1, P_{init}\}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{n+5}$ contains $P_1(\text{off}, g)$. For each $p \in \{1, 2, 4, 6\}$, $\mathcal{D}_{n+p}$ contains $P_1(\text{off}, \text{off})$. Finally, $\mathcal{D}_1$ contains $P_{init}((s_0, \perp), (s_0, \perp))$, where s_0 is the initial state of M and $\perp$ the blank symbol, and $\mathcal{D}_i$ contains $P_{init}(\perp, \perp)$, for each $2 \leq i \leq n$. $\mathcal{D}_{n+6}$ contains $P_{init}(y, \text{off})$ and $\mathcal{D}_{n+1}$ contains $P_{init}(\text{off}, h)$. Finally, for each $p \in \{2, 3, 4, 5, 7\}$, $\mathcal{D}_{n+p}$ contains $P_{init}(\text{off}, \text{off})$. The intuition is the same as before: P_0 and P_1 connect the gadgets O_{ab} with $O_b \cup \{b, x\}$, where a is the parent of b in $C_{M,n}$, and b is an input node with value 0 or 1, respectively. P_{init} connects the gadget $Init_S$ with I_v , where v is the output node of $C_{M,n}$.

The database $\mathcal{D}$ over σ is obtained from $\mathcal{D}_k$ as follows. We replace each edge $\{u, v\}$ in $\mathcal{D}_k$ by all the atoms $P(u, v)$ and $P(v, u)$, for all binary symbols $P \in \sigma$. Also, we replace each atom $C(u)$ in $\mathcal{D}_k$ where C is a unary relation in τ by the atoms $C_1(u), \dots, C_6(u)$, where $C_1, \dots, C_6$ are the copies of C contained in $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_6$, respectively.

It is easy to see that $\mathcal{D}_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}_{n+7}, \mathcal{D}$ can be constructed in polynomial time from M and n . For the correctness of the reduction, let say that a tuple $\bar{u}$ in $\Pi_{1 \leq i \leq n+7} \mathcal{D}_i$ is *invalid* if one of the following hold:

1. It is not the case that there is exactly one position $1 \leq p \leq 6$ such that $\bar{u}_{n+p} = \text{off}$.
2. It is not the case that $\bar{u}_{n+7} \neq \text{off}$ if and only if $\bar{u}_{n+3} \neq \text{off}$.
3. $\bar{u}_i \in \Gamma$ for each $1 \leq i \leq n$.
4. All positions in $\bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_n$ that belongs to $S \times \Gamma$ are associated with same type of states (either existential, universal, accepting or rejecting), and there is at least two of these positions.
5. There is at least two positions in $\bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_n$ that belongs to $S \times \Gamma$, and they are associated with states of distinct type.

By construction, invalid tuples $\bar{u}$ satisfying (1) are isolated in $\Pi_{1 \leq i \leq n+7} \mathcal{D}_i$, that is, they

do not appear in any atom. The same is true for invalid tuples satisfying (2). Invalid tuples satisfying (3) but not (1)-(2) are not isolated in $\Pi_{1 \leq i \leq n+7} \mathcal{D}_i$ but they induce disjoint copies of either (i) a gadget O_{ab} connected with a gadget I_b , (ii) a gadget O_{ab} connected with a gadget H_b , or (iii) a gadget O_{ab} connected with a gadget $O_b \cup \{b, x\}$, where a is the parent of b in $C_{M,n}$. This is because these invalid tuples do not appear in any relation of the form $L_j^q(e, f, g)$, $R_j^q(e, f, g)$, $L_1^q(e, f)$, $R_1^q(e, f)$, $L_n^q(g, h)$ or $R_n^q(g, h)$. As a consequence, all these invalid tuples can be homomorphically mapped to $\mathcal{D}$. For invalid tuples satisfying (4) but not (1)-(2), the situation is similar but now the type of the states determines which of the three cases applies. In any case, we can homomorphically map these invalid tuples to $\mathcal{D}$. Invalid tuples satisfying (5) but not (1)-(2) form disjoint copies of gadgets of the form O_{ab} , where a is the parent of b in $C_{M,n}$. Thus again these can be mapped homomorphically to $\mathcal{D}$.

We have then that the database induced by invalid tuples in $\Pi_{1 \leq i \leq n+7} \mathcal{D}_i$ is homomorphic to $\mathcal{D}$. Note also that there is no atom in $\Pi_{1 \leq i \leq n+7} \mathcal{D}_i$ that mentions an invalid and a valid tuple at the same time. We conclude that $\Pi_{1 \leq i \leq n+7} \mathcal{D}_i \rightarrow_k \mathcal{D}$ iff $\mathcal{D}_{valid} \rightarrow_k \mathcal{D}$, where $\mathcal{D}_{valid}$ is the database induced by valid tuples in $\Pi_{1 \leq i \leq n+7} \mathcal{D}_i$. Now suppose that M does not accept the empty tape using n space. Then spoiler has a winning strategy in the existential k -pebble game on $\mathcal{D}_{C_{M,n}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_k$, as explained in the proof of Lemma 6. By construction, we can easily emulate this strategy on $\mathcal{D}_{valid}$ and $\mathcal{D}$, and thus we have that $\mathcal{D}_{valid} \rightarrow_k \mathcal{D}$. On the other hand, if M accepts the empty tape using n space, by the proof of Lemma 6, there is an homomorphism h from $\mathcal{D}_{C_{M,n}}$ to $\mathcal{D}_k$. From h , we can define an homomorphism g from $\mathcal{D}_{valid}$ to $\mathcal{D}$, and thus $\mathcal{D}_{valid} \rightarrow_k \mathcal{D}$. Note that $\mathcal{D}_{valid}$ roughly coincide with $\mathcal{D}_{C_{M,n}}$, save that in $\mathcal{D}_{valid}$ there are gadgets associated with configurations that are not reached from the initial configuration of M (and thus these do not appear in $C_{M,n}$). It is straightforward to check that g can be defined over these gadgets (as they do not mention the color init). We have then that $\Pi_{1 \leq i \leq n+7} \mathcal{D}_i \rightarrow_k \mathcal{D}$ iff M accepts the empty tape using n space. ◀

Proof of Theorem 7

We first check in exponential time the existence of one such $\text{TW}(k)$ -explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$ using the $(k+1)$ -pebble QBE test for CQs. If such $\text{TW}(k)$ -explanation exists, we compute in exponential time the set S^e of all n -ary tuples $\bar{b}$ over $\mathcal{D}$ such that $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow_{k+1} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$. Notice, in particular, that $S^+ \subseteq S^e$ and $S^e \cap S^- = \emptyset$. Now we show that $S^e = q(\mathcal{D})$ for some $\text{TW}(k)$ -explanation q for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$. For each $\bar{b} \notin S^e$, from Proposition 4, we have a $q_{\bar{b}}(x) \in \text{TW}(k)$ such that $(\mathcal{D}_{q_{\bar{b}}}, \bar{x}) \rightarrow \prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ but $(\mathcal{D}_{q_{\bar{b}}}, \bar{x}) \not\rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$. Let $q(\bar{x}) = \bigwedge_{\bar{b} \notin S^e} q_{\bar{b}}(\bar{x})$. Clearly, $(\mathcal{D}_q, \bar{x}) \rightarrow \prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ and $(\mathcal{D}_q, \bar{x}) \not\rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$, for each $\bar{b} \notin S^e$. Note also that $q \in \text{TW}(k)$ since we can assume that the existentially quantified variables of each $q_{\bar{b}}$ are disjoint from those of $q_{\bar{b}'}$, for a different $\bar{b}' \notin S^e$. We claim that $S^e = q(\mathcal{D})$. Indeed, suppose $\bar{b} \in S^e$. Then $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow_{k+1} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$. By Proposition 4, and since $(\mathcal{D}_q, \bar{x}) \rightarrow \prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$, we have that $(\mathcal{D}_q, \bar{x}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$ and thus $\bar{b} \in q(\mathcal{D})$. Suppose now that $\bar{b} \notin S^e$. As we mentioned above, we have that $(\mathcal{D}_q, \bar{x}) \not\rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$, and thus $\bar{b} \notin q(\mathcal{D})$.

Proof of Proposition 5

From the proof of Theorem 2, whenever there is a $\text{TW}(k)$ -explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$ this can be assumed to be the CQ $q = \bigwedge_{\bar{b} \in S^-} q_{\bar{b}}(\bar{x})$. From Proposition 4, each such $q_{\bar{b}}$ is of exponential size in the combined size of $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ and $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$, i.e., double exponential in

the size of $\mathcal{D}$, S^+ and S^- . Thus, the size of q is at most double exponential in that of $\mathcal{D}$, S^+ and S^- .

In order to prove the size lower bound, we exploit the proof of Theorem 3. Let $k > 1$ and $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}'$ be two databases. We define the *size* of a winning strategy $\mathcal{S}$ of the spoiler, denoted by $|\mathcal{S}|$, in the existential k -pebble game on $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D}'$, as the total number of elements of $\mathcal{D}$ that receive a pebble during the game, when spoiler plays according to $\mathcal{S}$ and independently of duplicator's choices.

Let C be a monotone circuit, α be a 0/1-assignment to the input nodes and v an output node, such that (C, v) is normalized (recall the definitions from Lemma 6). A *rejecting tree* T for C, α and v , witnesses the fact that $\text{val}_\alpha^C(v) = 0$. Formally, a rejecting tree T is a subgraph of C such that (i) its underlying graph is a tree rooted at v , (ii) if a is an OR-node in T , then the two children of a in C are in T (together with the edges from the children to a), (iii) if a is an AND-node in T , then there is only one child of a in C that is also in T (together with the edge from this child to a), and (iv) the value of each node in T is 0. We define the *size* $|T|$ of the rejecting tree T to be its number of nodes. For $k > 1$, the reduction from Lemma 6, constructs from such a C, α and v , a database $\mathcal{D}_C$ such that $\text{val}_\alpha^C(v) = 1$ iff $\mathcal{D}_C \rightarrow_k \mathcal{D}_k$. Observe that the only way spoiler can make progress in the existential k -pebble game is actually following a rejecting tree of C in $\mathcal{D}_C$, otherwise duplicator can always respond with a partial homomorphism. Thus we have the following:

► **Claim 1.** If spoiler has a winning strategy $\mathcal{S}$ for the existential k -pebble game on $\mathcal{D}_C$ and $\mathcal{D}_k$, then there is a rejecting tree T for C, α and v such that $|T| \leq |\mathcal{S}|$.

Let $k \geq 1$ and $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}'$ be databases. From Proposition 4, we have that whenever there is a boolean CQ q in $\text{TW}(k)$, such that $\mathcal{D}_q \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D}_q \not\rightarrow \mathcal{D}'$, then spoiler has a winning strategy $\mathcal{S}$ from the existential $(k+1)$ -pebble game on $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D}'$. The strategy $\mathcal{S}$ can be easily derived from the tree decomposition of q and the homomorphism $h : \mathcal{D}_q \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$, and we can obtain an upper bound for the size of $\mathcal{S}$ in terms of the size q .

► **Claim 2.** Let $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D}'$ be arbitrary databases and $k \geq 1$ a positive integer. If there is a boolean CQ q in $\text{TW}(k)$ with m variables such that $\mathcal{D}_q \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D}_q \not\rightarrow \mathcal{D}'$, then the spoiler has a winning strategy $\mathcal{S}$ in the existential $(k+1)$ -pebble game on $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{D}'$, where $|\mathcal{S}| \leq m$.

Let M be a normalized alternating Turing machine that uses at most n space, for a positive integer n . A *rejecting computation* of M is a pair $\mathcal{R} = (F, \rho)$, where F is a rooted tree and ρ labels the nodes of T with configurations of M such that (i) $\rho(r)$ is the initial configuration, where r is the root of T , (ii) if $\rho(u)$ is an existential configuration, for some node of u , then u has a left and a right child v and w , respectively, where $\rho(v)$ and $\rho(w)$ are the left and right successor of $\rho(u)$, respectively, (iii) if $\rho(u)$ is an universal configuration, for some node of u , then u has exactly one child v , where $\rho(v)$ is either the left or the right successor of $\rho(u)$, and (iv) $\rho(u)$ is a rejecting configuration for each leaf u of F . The size $|\mathcal{R}|$ of $\mathcal{R}$ is the number of nodes of F . Clearly, M rejects the empty tape using n space iff it has a rejecting computation.

► **Claim 3.** For each $n \geq 1$, there is a normalized alternating Turing machine M_n that uses n space, such that (i) the size of M_n is polynomial in n , (ii) M_n rejects the empty tape, and (iii) every rejecting computation of M_n has size at least 2^{2^n} .

Proof. Let M_n^d be a deterministic Turing machine that on the empty tape, it writes n 0's, counts from 0 to $2^n - 1$ in binary, and then rejects. This machine can be implemented with $O(n)$ states. Let M_n^{nd} be the nondeterministic Turing machine obtained from M_n^d by setting the left and right transition functions of M_n^{nd} exactly as the transition function of M_n^d . Clearly, every rejecting computation of M_n^{nd} has size at least 2^{2^n} . Then, we can let M_n

to be a normalized alternating Turing machine associated with M_n^{nd} . The size of M_n is at most polynomial in n , and from any rejecting computation $\mathcal{R}$ of M_n , we can easily define a rejecting computation $\mathcal{R}'$ of M_n^{nd} , with $|\mathcal{R}'| \leq |\mathcal{R}|$. Thus any rejecting computation of M_n has size at least 2^{2^n} . We conclude that M_n satisfies conditions (i),(ii) and (iii). ◀

Let M be an alternating Turing machine and n a positive integer such that M and n are normalized. Recall the definition of the circuit $C_{M,n}$ from the proof of Theorem 5. The next claim follows directly from the definitions:

► **Claim 4.** If $C_{M,n}$ has a rejecting tree of size m , then M has a rejecting computation of size at most m .

Now we can show the size lower bound. We focus on $\text{TW}(k)$ -explanations (the case of $\text{TW}(k)$ -definitions is analogous). Let $n \geq 1$. Let M_n be the normalized machine from claim 3. Let $\mathcal{D}_1^n, \dots, \mathcal{D}_m^n, \mathcal{D}^n$ be the result of applying the reduction from the proof of Theorem 5 with $k+1$, to M_n and n . Let $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_n, S_n^+, S_n^-$ be the result of applying to $\mathcal{D}_1^n, \dots, \mathcal{D}_m^n, \mathcal{D}^n$, the reduction from $(k+1)$ -PEBBLE PHP to the $(k+1)$ -pebble QBE test, explained in the beginning of the proof of Theorem 3.

We claim that $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_n, S_n^+, S_n^-$ satisfy the required conditions. First, the combined size of $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_n, S_n^+, S_n^-$ is polynomial in n . Second, since M_n rejects the empty tape using n space, it follows that $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathcal{D}_i^n \not\rightarrow_{k+1} \mathcal{D}^n$. Then, the $(k+1)$ -pebble QBE test fails over $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_n, S_n^+, S_n^-$. We conclude that there is a $\text{TW}(k)$ -explanation for S_n^+, S_n^- over $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_n$. Finally, for the sake of contradiction, suppose there is a $\text{TW}(k)$ -explanation $q(x)$ for S_n^+, S_n^- over $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_n$, with $|q| < 2^{2^n}$. Recall that $S_n^+ = \{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$ and $S_n^- = \{b\}$ are unary relations. Also, $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_n$ is the disjoint union of the databases $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_1^n, \dots, \hat{\mathcal{D}}_m^n, \hat{\mathcal{D}}^n$, where $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_i^n$ is obtained from $\mathcal{D}_i^n$ by adding the fresh element a_i and atoms $\$(a_i, u)$ for each u in $\mathcal{D}_i^n$. Similarly for $\hat{\mathcal{D}}^n, \mathcal{D}^n$ and b . Let $q'(x)$ be the CQ obtained from q by keeping only the atoms that mention variables in the same connected component (defined w.r.t the Gaifman graph) than x . Clearly $q'(x)$ is still a $\text{TW}(k)$ -explanation for S_n^+, S_n^- over $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_n$ and $|q'| \leq |q|$. Let q'' be the boolean CQ obtained from $q'(x)$ by removing all those atoms that mention the relation $\$$. It follows that $q'' \in \text{TW}(k)$, $\mathcal{D}_{q''} \rightarrow \prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathcal{D}_i^n$ and $\mathcal{D}_{q''} \not\rightarrow \mathcal{D}^n$. Also, $|q''| \leq |q'| < 2^{2^n}$. In particular, the number of variables in q'' is less than 2^{2^n} . By claim 2, we obtain that spoiler has a winning strategy $\mathcal{S}$ on the existential $(k+1)$ -pebble game on $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathcal{D}_i^n$ and $\mathcal{D}^n$, with $|\mathcal{S}| < 2^{2^n}$. This implies that spoiler has a winning strategy $\mathcal{S}'$ on the existential $(k+1)$ -pebble game on $\mathcal{D}_{C_{M,n}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{k+1}$, with $|\mathcal{S}'| < 2^{2^n}$. By claim 1, $C_{M,n}$ has a rejecting tree of size less than 2^{2^n} , and by claim 4, M_n has a rejecting computation of size less than 2^{2^n} . This is a contradiction with claim 3.

Proof of Theorem 9

We only focus on $\text{UTW}(k)$ -explanations (the same arguments apply to $\text{UTW}(k)$ -definitions). Suppose there is a $\text{UTW}(k)$ -explanation $Q(\bar{x}) = \bigvee_{1 \leq i \leq m} q_i(\bar{x})$ for S^+, S^- over $\mathcal{D}$. For the sake of contradiction, suppose the desynchronized $(k+1)$ -pebble QBE test for CQs accepts over $\mathcal{D}, S^+$, and S^- . Then there is $\bar{a} \in S^+$ and $\bar{b} \in S^-$ such that $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow_{k+1} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$. Since Q is an explanation, we have that $(\mathcal{D}_{q_i}, \bar{x}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$, for some $1 \leq i \leq m$. By Proposition 4, we have that $(\mathcal{D}_{q_i}, \bar{x}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$. This implies that $\bar{b} \in Q(\mathcal{D})$, which is a contradiction, since $\bar{b} \in S^-$.

Now suppose that the desynchronized $(k+1)$ -pebble QBE test for CQs fails over $\mathcal{D}, S^+$, and S^- . If this is because $S^- = \emptyset$, we use the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 2. Suppose $S^- \neq \emptyset$. Then for each $\bar{a} \in S^+$ and $\bar{b} \in S^-$, we have that $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \not\rightarrow_{k+1} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$.

From Proposition 4, there is a CQ $q_{\bar{a},\bar{b}}(\bar{x})$ in $\text{TW}(k)$, such that $(\mathcal{D}_{q_{\bar{a},\bar{b}}}, \bar{x}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ and $(\mathcal{D}_{q_{\bar{a},\bar{b}}}, \bar{x}) \not\rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$. Let $q_{\bar{a}}(\bar{x}) = \bigwedge_{\bar{b} \in S^-} q_{\bar{a},\bar{b}}(\bar{x})$. Clearly, $q_{\bar{a}}(\bar{x}) \in \text{TW}(k)$, $(\mathcal{D}_{q_{\bar{a}}}, \bar{x}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{a})$ and $(\mathcal{D}_{q_{\bar{a}}}, \bar{x}) \not\rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$, for each $\bar{b} \in S^-$. Then $Q(\bar{x}) = \bigvee_{\bar{a} \in S^+} q_{\bar{a}}(\bar{x})$ is a $\text{UTW}(k)$ -explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$.

Proof of Proposition 7

Item (1) follows directly from Proposition 3 and Theorem 9.

For item (2), if a $\text{UTW}(k)$ -explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$ exists, we can compute in polynomial time the set S^e of all the tuples $\bar{b}$ such that $(\mathcal{D}, \bar{a}) \rightarrow_{k+1} (\mathcal{D}, \bar{b})$, for some $\bar{a} \in S^+$. By similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem 7, it follows that $S^e = Q(\mathcal{D})$ for some $\text{UTW}(k)$ -explanation Q for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{D}$.

For item (3), we reduce from satisfiability of 3CNF formulas. Given a 3CNF formula φ , we define a database $\mathcal{D}$ as the disjoint union of two databases $\mathcal{D}_\varphi$ and $\mathcal{T}_\varphi$ over the schema $\sigma = \{T_1, \dots, T_4, E\}$, where $T_1, \dots, T_4$ are ternary relations and E is binary. The domain of $\mathcal{D}_\varphi$ are the variables $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ of φ . We assume w.l.o.g. that all clauses of φ are either of the form $(x \vee y \vee z)$, $(\bar{x} \vee y \vee z)$, $(\bar{x} \vee \bar{y} \vee z)$ or $(\bar{x} \vee \bar{y} \vee \bar{z})$, for $x, y, z \in \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$. Each symbol in $T_1, \dots, T_4$ corresponds to one of these cases. If x, y, z appears in a clause of φ (in that order), then $\mathcal{D}_\varphi$ has an atom $T_\ell(x, y, z)$, where ℓ indicates the form of the clause. Additionally, $\mathcal{D}_\varphi$ has the atoms $E(x_1, x_2), E(x_2, x_3), \dots, E(x_{n-1}, x_n)$.

The domain of $\mathcal{T}_\varphi$ is $\{0_1, 1_1, 0_2, 1_2, \dots, 0_n, 1_n\}$. If $x_p, x_q, x_r \in \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ appears in a clause C of φ (in that order), Then $\mathcal{T}_\varphi$ contains seven atoms of the form $T_\ell(b_p, b_q, b_r)$, where ℓ indicates the form of the clause, $b_p \in \{0_p, 1_p\}$, $b_q \in \{0_q, 0_q\}$, $b_r \in \{0_r, 1_r\}$ and b_p, b_q, b_r defines an 0/1-assignment to x_p, x_q, x_r (by dropping the subscripts) that makes the clause C true. Additionally, there are atoms $E(b, b')$, where $b \in \{0_i, 1_i\}$ and $b' \in \{0_{i+1}, 1_{i+1}\}$, for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$.

We claim that φ is satisfiable iff the desynchronized $(k+1)$ -pebble QBE test for CQs accepts $\mathcal{D}$ and S^+ , where $S^+ = \{(x_1, \dots, x_n)\}$. Suppose that φ is satisfiable and let h be a 0/1-assignment to $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ that satisfies φ . Let $(b_1, \dots, b_n)$ be the tuple such that $b_i = 1_i$ if $h(x_i) = 1$, or $b_i = 0_i$, if $h(x_i) = 0$, for each $1 \leq i \leq n$. By construction, the mapping $\{x_1 \mapsto b_1, \dots, x_n \mapsto b_n\}$ is an homomorphism from $\mathcal{D}_\varphi$ to $\mathcal{T}_\varphi$. In particular, $(\mathcal{D}, (x_1, \dots, x_n)) \rightarrow_{k+1} (\mathcal{D}, (b_1, \dots, b_n))$. Since $(b_1, \dots, b_n) \notin S^+$, the desynchronized $(k+1)$ -pebble QBE test for CQs accepts $\mathcal{D}$ and S^+ . Suppose now that the desynchronized $(k+1)$ -pebble QBE test for CQs accepts $\mathcal{D}$ and S^+ . Then $(\mathcal{D}, (x_1, \dots, x_n)) \rightarrow_{k+1} (\mathcal{D}, (a_1, \dots, a_n))$, where $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \notin S^+$. Since $x_1, \dots, x_n$ form a directed path of n E -labeled edges, $a_1, \dots, a_n$ must also form such a directed path. It follows that $a_i \in \{0_i, 1_i\}$, for each $1 \leq i \leq n$. Define the assignment h that maps each x_i to 1 iff $a_i = 1_i$, for each $1 \leq i \leq n$. This is a satisfiable assignment for φ .

Proof of Theorem 11

We need the following claims:

► **Claim 5.** Let $(\mathcal{G}_1, \bar{a}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{G}_m, \bar{a}_m), (\mathcal{G}, \bar{b})$ be graph databases with distinguished tuple of elements. Let $\gamma(\bar{x})$ be a CRPQ such that $\bar{a}_i \in \gamma(\mathcal{G}_i)$, for each $1 \leq i \leq m$. If $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} (\mathcal{G}_i, \bar{a}_i) \Rightarrow (\mathcal{G}, \bar{b})$, then $\bar{b} \in \gamma(\mathcal{G})$.

Proof. For each $1 \leq i \leq m$, let h_i be an homomorphism from $\gamma(\bar{x})$ to $\mathcal{G}_i$ such that $h_i(\bar{x}) = \bar{a}_i$. Let h be the mapping from the variables of γ to $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathcal{G}_i$, that maps each variable x to $h(x) = (h_1(x), \dots, h_m(x))$. Let g be the strong homomorphism from witnessing the fact that

$\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} (\mathcal{G}_i, \bar{a}_i) \Rightarrow (\mathcal{G}, \bar{b})$. Define $h' = g \circ h$. We claim that h' is an homomorphism from $\gamma(\bar{x})$ to $\mathcal{G}$ such that $h'(\bar{x}) = \bar{b}$. Note first that $h'(\bar{x}) = g(h(\bar{x})) = g(\bar{a}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \bar{a}_m) = \bar{b}$. Now let $L(x, y)$ be an atom in γ . We need to show that $(h'(x), h'(y)) \in L(\mathcal{G})$. Since each h_i , with $1 \leq i \leq m$, is an homomorphism we have that there is a string w_i that satisfies L and $w_i \in L_{h_i(x), h_i(y)}^{\mathcal{G}_i}$. On the other hand, since g is a strong homomorphism, there is a coordinate $1 \leq i^* \leq m$, such that $L_{h_{i^*}(x), h_{i^*}(y)}^{\mathcal{G}_{i^*}} \subseteq L_{h'(x), h'(y)}^{\mathcal{G}}$. It follows that $w_{i^*} \in L_{h'(x), h'(y)}^{\mathcal{G}}$, and hence $(h'(x), h'(y)) \in L(\mathcal{G})$. ◀

► **Claim 6.** Let $(\mathcal{G}_1, \bar{a}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{G}_m, \bar{a}_m), (\mathcal{G}, \bar{b})$ be graph databases with distinguished tuple of elements. Suppose $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} (\mathcal{G}_i, \bar{a}_i) \not\Rightarrow (\mathcal{G}, \bar{b})$. Then there is a CRPQ $\gamma(\bar{x})$ such that $\bar{a}_i \in \gamma(\mathcal{G}_i)$, for each $1 \leq i \leq m$, and $\bar{b} \notin \gamma(\mathcal{G})$.

Proof. The CRPQ $\gamma(\bar{x})$ has one variable $x_{\bar{t}}$, for each tuple $\bar{t}$ in $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathcal{G}_i$. The tuple of free variables of γ is $\bar{x} = (x_{\bar{a}^1}, \dots, x_{\bar{a}^n})$, where $\bar{a}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \bar{a}_m = (\bar{a}^1, \dots, \bar{a}^n)$. Let $\bar{t}$ and $\bar{t}'$ be tuples in $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathcal{G}_i$. Let $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{t}, \bar{t}'}$ be the set of RPQs defined by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\bar{t}, \bar{t}'} = \{w_1 + \cdots + w_m \mid w_i \in L_{\bar{t}_i, \bar{t}'_i}^{\mathcal{G}_i}, \text{ for each } 1 \leq i \leq m\}$$

Note that $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{t}, \bar{t}'}$ could be infinite. For a string w , we define its *type* to be the tuple $L_w(\mathcal{G})$, where L_w is the RPQ that accepts $\{w\}$. Note that there are at most $2^{|\mathcal{G}|^2}$ types. Let $L \in \mathcal{L}_{\bar{t}, \bar{t}'}$ and suppose L is of the form $L = w_1 + \cdots + w_m$. The *type* of L is the tuple $(T_1, \dots, T_m)$, where T_i is the type of w_i as defined above, for each $1 \leq i \leq m$. Let $\text{types}(\mathcal{L}_{\bar{t}, \bar{t}'})$ be a subset of $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{t}, \bar{t}'}$ that contains one RPQ for each possible type that appears in $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{t}, \bar{t}'}$. Note that $\text{types}(\mathcal{L}_{\bar{t}, \bar{t}'})$ is finite. The CRPQ γ contains one atom $L(x_{\bar{t}}, x_{\bar{t}'}),$ for each $L \in \text{types}(\mathcal{L}_{\bar{t}, \bar{t}'})$.

Now we show that γ satisfies the required conditions. Let $1 \leq i \leq m$. Let π_i be the mapping that maps each variables $x_{\bar{t}}$ of γ to the i -th coordinate $\bar{t}_i$ of $\bar{t}$. We claim that π_i is an homomorphism from γ to $\mathcal{G}_i$. Indeed, let $L(x_{\bar{t}}, x_{\bar{t}'})$ be an atom in γ , where L is of the form $L = w_1 + \cdots + w_m$, for some $w_j \in L_{\bar{t}_j, \bar{t}'_j}^{\mathcal{G}_j}$, with $1 \leq j \leq m$. In particular, w_i satisfies L and $w_i \in L_{\bar{t}_i, \bar{t}'_i}^{\mathcal{G}_i}$, thus $(\pi_i(x_{\bar{t}}), \pi_i(x_{\bar{t}'})) \in L(\mathcal{G}_i)$. Moreover, $\pi_i(\bar{x}) = \bar{a}_i$. Thus we have that $\bar{a}_i \in \gamma(\mathcal{G}_i)$, for each $1 \leq i \leq m$. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that $\bar{b} \in \gamma(\mathcal{G})$ via an homomorphism g . Let g' be the mapping from $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathcal{G}_i$ to $\mathcal{G}$ that maps each tuple $\bar{t}$ to $g(\bar{t})$. Note that $g'(\bar{a}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \bar{a}_m) = \bar{b}$. We show that g' is actually a strong homomorphism from $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathcal{G}_i$ to $\mathcal{G}$, which is a contradiction. Let $\bar{t}$ and $\bar{t}'$ be tuples in $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathcal{G}_i$. By contradiction, assume that there is no $1 \leq k \leq m$ such that $L_{\bar{t}_k, \bar{t}'_k}^{\mathcal{G}_k} \subseteq L_{g'(\bar{t}), g'(\bar{t}')}^{\mathcal{G}}$. Then, we can choose for each $1 \leq i \leq m$, a string $w_i \in L_{\bar{t}_i, \bar{t}'_i}^{\mathcal{G}_i} \setminus L_{g'(\bar{t}), g'(\bar{t}')}^{\mathcal{G}}$. We have that $w_1 + \cdots + w_m$ is in $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{t}, \bar{t}'}$. By construction, there is an atom in γ of the form $L(x_{\bar{t}}, x_{\bar{t}'}),$ where $L = w'_1 + \cdots + w'_m$ and the types of w'_i and w_i are the same. Since g is an homomorphism, there must be an index $1 \leq i^* \leq m$ such that $w'_{i^*} \in L_{g'(\bar{t}), g'(\bar{t}')}^{\mathcal{G}}$. We conclude that $w_{i^*} \in L_{g'(\bar{t}), g'(\bar{t}')}^{\mathcal{G}}$, which is a contradiction. ◀

Now we can prove Theorem 11. We only focus on item (1), as the proof of item (2) is analogous. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a database and S^+, S^- relations over $\mathcal{G}$. Assume first that there is a CRPQ-explanation $\gamma(\bar{x})$ for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{G}$. For the sake of contradiction, suppose the QBE test for CRPQs accepts over $\mathcal{G}$, S^+ and S^- . Then there is $\bar{b} \in S^-$ such that $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{G}, \bar{a}) \Rightarrow (\mathcal{G}, \bar{b})$. As γ is an explanation, we have that $\bar{a} \in \gamma(\mathcal{G})$, for each $\bar{a} \in S^+$. By Claim 5, we have that $\bar{b} \in \gamma(\mathcal{G})$, which is a contradiction since $\bar{b} \in S^-$.

Suppose now that the QBE test for CRPQs fails over $\mathcal{G}$, S^+ , and S^- . If $S^- = \emptyset$, then we simply choose the CQ $\gamma(\bar{x})$, whose body $(\mathcal{D}_\gamma, \bar{x})$ is isomorphic to the product $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{G}, \bar{a})$.

We have that $\bar{a} \in \gamma(\mathcal{G})$, for each $\bar{a} \in S^+$, and thus γ is a CRPQ-explanation for S^+, S^- over $\mathcal{G}$. Assume now that $S^- \neq \emptyset$. We have that $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{G}, \bar{a}) \not\Rightarrow_{k+1} (\mathcal{G}, \bar{b})$, for each $\bar{b} \in S^-$. By Claim 6, for each $\bar{b} \in S^-$, there is a CRPQ $\gamma_{\bar{b}}(\bar{x})$ such that $\bar{a} \in \gamma(\mathcal{G})$, for each $\bar{a} \in S^+$, and $\bar{b} \notin \gamma(\mathcal{G})$. Then $\gamma(\bar{x}) = \bigwedge_{\bar{b} \in S^-} \gamma_{\bar{b}}(\bar{x})$ is a CRPQ-explanation for S^+, S^- over $\mathcal{G}$.

Proof of Theorem 14

Using the same arguments as in Proposition 4 and Claims 5 and 6, it is straightforward to show the following:

► **Claim 7.** Fix $k \geq 1$. Let $(\mathcal{G}_1, \bar{a}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{G}_m, \bar{a}_m), (\mathcal{G}, \bar{b})$ be graph databases with distinguished tuple of elements. Let $\gamma(\bar{x})$ be a CRPQ in $\text{TW}_{\text{crpq}}(k)$ such that $\bar{a}_i \in \gamma(\mathcal{G}_i)$, for each $1 \leq i \leq m$. If $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} (\mathcal{G}_i, \bar{a}_i) \Rightarrow_{k+1} (\mathcal{G}, \bar{b})$, then $\bar{b} \in \gamma(\mathcal{G})$.

► **Claim 8.** Fix $k \geq 1$. Let $(\mathcal{G}_1, \bar{a}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{G}_m, \bar{a}_m), (\mathcal{G}, \bar{b})$ be graph databases with distinguished tuple of elements. Suppose $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} (\mathcal{G}_i, \bar{a}_i) \not\Rightarrow_{k+1} (\mathcal{G}, \bar{b})$. Then there is a CRPQ $\gamma(\bar{x})$ in $\text{TW}_{\text{crpq}}(k)$ such that $\bar{a}_i \in \gamma(\mathcal{G}_i)$, for each $1 \leq i \leq m$, and $\bar{b} \notin \gamma(\mathcal{G})$.

Now we can show Theorem 14. We only focus on $\text{TW}_{\text{crpq}}(k)$ -explanations, as for definitions we can apply the same arguments. Suppose there is a $\text{TW}_{\text{crpq}}(k)$ -explanation γ for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{G}$. For the sake of contradiction, assume that the $(k+1)$ -pebble QBE test for CRPQs accepts $\mathcal{G}$, S^+ , and S^- . Then, $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{G}, \bar{a}) \Rightarrow_{k+1} (\mathcal{G}, \bar{b})$ for some $\bar{b} \in S^-$. Since $\bar{a} \in \gamma(\mathcal{G})$ for each $\bar{a} \in S^+$, by Claim 7, it follows that $\bar{b} \in \gamma(\mathcal{G})$. This is a contradiction since $\bar{b} \in S^-$ and $\gamma(\mathcal{G}) \cap S^- = \emptyset$.

Now suppose that the $(k+1)$ -pebble QBE test for CRPQs fails over $\mathcal{G}$, S^+ , and S^- . If this is because $S^- = \emptyset$, we know that there is a CQ in $\text{TW}(k)$ that explains S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{G}$ (see proof of Theorem 2). This is also a $\text{TW}_{\text{crpq}}(k)$ -explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{G}$. Assume then that $S^- \neq \emptyset$. Then, for each tuple $\bar{b} \in S^-$, it is the case that $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{G}, \bar{a}) \not\Rightarrow_{k+1} (\mathcal{G}, \bar{b})$. Claim 8 implies that for each $\bar{b} \in S^-$ there is a CRPQ $\gamma_{\bar{b}}(\bar{x})$ in $\text{TW}_{\text{crpq}}(k)$ such that $\bar{a} \in \gamma_{\bar{b}}(\mathcal{G})$, for each $\bar{a} \in S^+$, and $\bar{b} \notin \gamma_{\bar{b}}(\mathcal{G})$. Then, $\gamma(\bar{x}) = \bigwedge_{\bar{b} \in S^-} \gamma_{\bar{b}}(\bar{x})$ is a $\text{TW}_{\text{crpq}}(k)$ -explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{G}$.

Proof of the Proposition 8

Item (1) follows directly from Theorem 14.

For item (2), if there is a $\text{TW}_{\text{crpq}}(k)$ -explanation for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{G}$, we can compute in exponential time the set S^e of all tuples $\bar{b}$ over $\mathcal{G}$ such that $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{G}, \bar{a}) \Rightarrow_{k+1} (\mathcal{G}, \bar{b})$. Notice, in particular, that $S^+ \subseteq S^e$ and $S^e \cap S^- = \emptyset$. Now we show that $S^e = \gamma(\mathcal{G})$ for some $\text{TW}_{\text{crpq}}(k)$ -explanation γ for S^+ and S^- over $\mathcal{G}$. For each $\bar{b} \notin S^e$, from Claim 8, we have a CRPQ $\gamma_{\bar{b}}(\bar{x}) \in \text{TW}_{\text{crpq}}(k)$ such that $\bar{a} \in \gamma_{\bar{b}}(\mathcal{G})$, for each $\bar{a} \in S^+$, but $\bar{b} \notin \gamma_{\bar{b}}(\mathcal{G})$. Let $\gamma(\bar{x}) = \bigwedge_{\bar{b} \notin S^e} \gamma_{\bar{b}}(\bar{x})$. Note that $\gamma \in \text{TW}_{\text{crpq}}(k)$. Also, $\bar{a} \in \gamma(\mathcal{G})$, for each $\bar{a} \in S^+$, and $\bar{b} \notin \gamma(\mathcal{G})$, for each $\bar{b} \notin S^e$. In particular, $\gamma(\mathcal{G}) \subseteq S^e$. Suppose $\bar{b} \in S^e$. Then $\prod_{\bar{a} \in S^+} (\mathcal{G}, \bar{a}) \Rightarrow_{k+1} (\mathcal{G}, \bar{b})$. By Claim 7, since $\bar{a} \in \gamma(\mathcal{G})$, for each $\bar{a} \in S^+$, we have that $\bar{b} \in \gamma(\mathcal{G})$. We conclude that $S^e = \gamma(\mathcal{G})$.