arXiv:1504.04044v7 [cs.DB] 23 Dec 2023

FAQ: Questions Asked Frequently

MAHMOUD ABO KHAMIS, RelationalAI, USA
HUNG Q. NGO, RelationalAI, USA
ATRI RUDRA, University at Buffalo (SUNY), USA

We define and study the **F**unctional **A**ggregate **Q**uery (FAQ) problem, which encompasses many frequently asked questions in constraint satisfaction, databases, matrix operations, probabilistic graphical models and logic. This is our main conceptual contribution.

We then present a simple algorithm called InsideOut to solve this general problem. InsideOut is a variation of the traditional dynamic programming approach for constraint programming based on variable elimination. Our variation adds a couple of simple twists to basic variable elimination in order to deal with the generality of FAQ, to take full advantage of Grohe and Marx's fractional edge cover framework, and of the analysis of recent worst-case optimal relational join algorithms.

As is the case with constraint programming and graphical model inference, to make InsideOut run efficiently we need to solve an optimization problem to compute an appropriate *variable ordering*. The main technical contribution of this work is a precise characterization of when a variable ordering is 'semantically equivalent' to the variable ordering given by the input FAQ expression. Then, we design an approximation algorithm to find an equivalent variable ordering that has the best 'fractional FAQ-width'. Our results imply a host of known and a few new results in graphical model inference, matrix operations, relational joins, and logic.

We also briefly explain how recent algorithms on beyond worst-case analysis for joins and those for solving SAT and #SAT can be viewed as variable elimination to solve FAQ over compactly represented input functions.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Motivating examples

The following fundamental problems from three diverse domains share a common algebraic structure.

Example 1.1. (Matrix Chain Multiplication (MCM)) Given a series of matrices $\mathbf{A}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{A}_n$ over some field $\mathbb{F}$, where the dimension of $\mathbf{A}_i$ is $p_i \times p_{i+1}$, $i \in [n]$ (where $[n]$ denotes $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $[0]$ denotes $\emptyset$), we wish to compute the product $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}_1 \cdots \mathbf{A}_n$. The problem can be reformulated as follows. There are $n+1$ variables $X_1, \ldots, X_{n+1}$ with domains $\mathsf{Dom}(X_i) = [p_i]$, for $i \in [n+1]$. For $i \in [n]$, matrix $\mathbf{A}_i$ can be viewed as a function of two variables

$$\psi_{i,i+1} : \mathsf{Dom}(X_i) \times \mathsf{Dom}(X_{i+1}) \to \mathbb{F},$$

where $\psi_{i,i+1}(x, y) = (\mathbf{A}_i)_{xy}$. The MCM problem is to compute the output function

$$\varphi(x_1, x_{n+1}) = \sum_{x_2 \in \mathsf{Dom}(X_2)} \cdots \sum_{x_n \in \mathsf{Dom}(X_n)} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \psi_{i,i+1}(x_i, x_{i+1}).$$

Example 1.2. (Maximum A Posteriori (MAP) queries in probabilistic graphical models (PGM)) Consider a discrete graphical model represented by a hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$. There are n discrete random variables $\mathcal{V} = \{X_1, \ldots, X_n\}$ on finite domains $\mathsf{Dom}(X_i)$, $i \in [n]$, and $m = |\mathcal{E}|$ *factors*

$$\psi_S : \prod_{i \in S} \mathsf{Dom}(X_i) \to \mathbb{R}_+, \ S \in \mathcal{E}.$$

An extended abstract of this manuscript appeared in the Proceedings of the 35th ACM Symposium on Principles of Database Systems *(PODS '16)* [3].
Authors' addresses: Mahmoud Abo Khamis, RelationalAI, Berkeley, CA, USA; Hung Q. Ngo, RelationalAI, Berkeley, CA, USA; Atri Rudra, University at Buffalo (SUNY), Buffalo, NY, USA.

A typical inference task is to compute the marginal MAP estimates, written in the form

$$\varphi(x_1,\ldots,x_f) = \max_{x_{f+1}\in \mathrm{Dom}(X_{f+1})} \cdots \max_{x_n\in \mathrm{Dom}(X_n)} \prod_{S\in\mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S).$$

Example 1.3. (# Quantified Conjunctive Query (#QCQ)) Let Φ be a first-order formula of the form

$$\Phi(X_1,\ldots,X_f) = Q_{f+1}X_{f+1}\cdots Q_n X_n \left(\bigwedge_{R\in \mathrm{atoms}(\Phi)} R \right),$$

where $Q_i \in \{\exists,\forall\}$, for $i > f$. The #QCQ problem is to *count* the number of tuples in relation Φ on the free variables $X_1,\ldots,X_f$. To reformulate #QCQ, construct a hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V},\mathcal{E})$ as follows: $\mathcal{V}$ is the set of all variables $X_1,\ldots,X_n$, and for each $R \in \mathrm{atoms}(\Phi)$ there is a hyperedge $S = \mathrm{vars}(R)$ consisting of all variables in R. The atom R can be viewed as a function indicating whether an assignment $\mathbf{x}_S$ to its variables is satisfied by the atom; namely $\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) = 1$ if $R(\mathbf{x}_S)$ is true and 0 otherwise.

Now, for each $i \in \{f+1,\ldots,n\}$ we define an aggregate operator

$$\bigoplus^{(i)} = \begin{cases} \max & \text{if } Q_i = \exists, \\ \times & \text{if } Q_i = \forall. \end{cases}$$

Then, the #QCQ problem above is to compute the *constant* function

$$\varphi = \sum_{x_1\in\mathrm{Dom}(X_1)} \cdots \sum_{x_f\in\mathrm{Dom}(X_f)} \bigoplus_{x_{f+1}\in\{0,1\}}^{(f+1)} \cdots \bigoplus_{x_n\in\{0,1\}}^{(n)} \prod_{S\in\mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S).$$

It turns out that these and dozens of other fundamental problems from constraint satisfaction (CSP), databases, matrix operations, PGM inference, logic, coding theory, and complexity theory can be viewed as special instances of a generic problem we call the **F**unctional **A**ggregate **Q**uery, or the FAQ problem, which we define next. The first two columns in Table 1 present eight of these problems. See [9, 31, 58] and Appendix A for many more examples.

1.2 The FAQ problem

Throughout the paper, we use the following convention. Uppercase X_i denotes a variable, and lowercase x_i denotes a value in the domain $\mathrm{Dom}(X_i)$ of the variable. Furthermore, for any subset $S \subseteq [n]$, define

$$\mathbf{X}_S = (X_i)_{i\in S}, \qquad \mathbf{x}_S = (x_i)_{i\in S} \in \prod_{i\in S} \mathrm{Dom}(X_i).$$

In particular, $\mathbf{X}_S$ is a tuple of variables and $\mathbf{x}_S$ is a tuple of specific values with support S. The input to FAQ is a set of functions and the output is a function computed using a series of aggregates over the variables and input functions. More specifically, for each $i \in [n]$, let X_i be a variable on some discrete domain $\mathrm{Dom}(X_i)$, where $|\mathrm{Dom}(X_i)| \geq 2$. The FAQ problem is to compute the following function

$$\varphi(\mathbf{x}_{[f]}) = \bigoplus_{x_{f+1}\in\mathrm{Dom}(X_{f+1})}^{(f+1)} \cdots \bigoplus_{x_n\in\mathrm{Dom}(X_n)}^{(n)} \bigotimes_{S\in\mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S), \tag{1}$$

where

- $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V},\mathcal{E})$ is a multi-hypergraph. $\mathcal{V} = [n]$ is the index set of the variables X_i, $i \in [n]$. Overloading notation, $\mathcal{V}$ is also referred to as the set of variables.

- The set $F = [f]$ is the set of *free variables* for some integer $0 \le f \le n$. Variables in $\mathcal{V} - F$ are called *bound variables*.
- $\mathbf{D}$ is a fixed domain, such as $\{\text{true}, \text{false}\}$, $\{0, 1\}$ or $\mathbb{R}^+$.
- For every hyperedge $S \in \mathcal{E}$, $\psi_S : \prod_{i \in S} \text{Dom}(X_i) \to \mathbf{D}$ is an *input* function (also called a *factor*). There are $m = |\mathcal{E}|$ hyperedges.
- For every bound variable $i > f$, $\oplus^{(i)}$ is a binary (aggregate) operator on the domain $\mathbf{D}$. Different bound variables may have different aggregate operators.
- Finally, for each bound variable $i > f$ either $\oplus^{(i)} = \otimes$ or $(\mathbf{D}, \oplus^{(i)}, \otimes)$ forms a commutative semiring [1] (with the same additive identity $\mathbf{0}$ and multiplicative identity $\mathbf{1}$). If $\oplus^{(i)} = \otimes$, then $\oplus^{(i)}$ is called a *product aggregate*; otherwise, it is a *semiring aggregate*.

To avoid triviality, we assume that there is at least one semiring aggregate. (The semiring requirement is not as much of a restriction as one might think at first glance. In Appendix B, we describe several methods for 'turning' non-semiring aggregates into semiring aggregates.) Because for $i > f$ every variable X_i has its own aggregate $\oplus^{(i)}$ over all values $x_i \in \text{Dom}(X_i)$, in the rest of the paper we will write $\bigoplus_{x_i}^{(i)}$ to mean $\bigoplus_{x_i \in \text{Dom}(X_i)}^{(i)}$. Also for brevity, we use "semiring" to refer to a "commutative semiring" unless otherwise stated. In particular, we don't use non-commutative semirings in this paper.

We will often refer to φ as an FAQ-*query*. We use FAQ-SS[2] to denote the special case of FAQ when there is only *one* variable aggregate, i.e. $\oplus^{(i)} = \oplus, \forall i > f$, and $(\mathbf{D}, \oplus, \otimes)$ is a commutative semiring. The special case of FAQ-SS when there is no free variable is called the SumProd problem. As shall be further discussed in Section 3, SumProd and FAQ-SS are well-studied problems.

1.3 Input and output representation

To make the problem definition complete, we will also have to specify how the input and output functions of an FAQ instance are represented. As we shall see in Section 8, this is a subtle issue that vastly affects the landscape of tractability of the problem.

To streamline the presentation, in the first part of this paper we will assume that both the input and output factors are represented using the *listing representation*: each factor is a table of all tuples of the form $\langle \mathbf{x}_S, \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) \rangle$, such that $\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) \neq \mathbf{0}$. (In particular, entries not in the table are $\mathbf{0}$-entries.) This representation is commonly used in the CSP, databases, and sparse matrix computation domains.

Our algorithms are in fact more generic, they work for a general class of input and output representations, as discussed in Section 8.

1.4 Paper organization

Section 2 summarizes the contributions of the paper and sketches the line of attack. Related works are discussed in Section 3. Section 4 defines notations, terminologies, and establishes a few facts used throughout the paper. Section 5 discusses the main ideas behind InsideOut and analyzes its runtime *given* a variable ordering. Section 6 explains how to characterize variable orderings that are "semantically-equivalent" to the original ordering in the given FAQ-query.

[1] A triple $(\mathbf{D}, \oplus, \otimes)$ is a *commutative semiring* if $\oplus$ and $\otimes$ are commutative binary operators over $\mathbf{D}$ satisfying the following: (1) $(\mathbf{D}, \oplus)$ is a commutative monoid with an additive identity, denoted by $\mathbf{0}$. (2) $(\mathbf{D}, \otimes)$ is a commutative monoid with a multiplicative identity, denoted by $\mathbf{1}$. (In the usual semiring definition, we do not need the multiplicative monoid to be commutative.) (3) $\otimes$ distributes over $\oplus$. (4) For any element $e \in \mathbf{D}$, we have $e \otimes \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0} \otimes e = \mathbf{0}$.
[2] FAQ with a Single Semiring.

Section 7 explains how to *efficiently* search through all those equivalent variable orderings to find the "best" one (i.e. the one that allows InsideOut to run the fastest). Finally, Section 8 presents the effect of input and output representations; in particular, it shows how InsideOut is still useful for problems such as SAT and #SAT.

2 SUMMARY OF CONTRIBUTIONS

2.1 Conceptual contribution

The formulation of FAQ has its roots in the SumProd and more generally FAQ-SS problems, which have been studied by by Dechter [31], Aji and McEliece [9] and Kohlas and Wilson [58]. The SumProd problem is *exactly* the special case of FAQ when all variable aggregates are semiring aggregates over *the same* semiring, and there is no free variable. We will discuss more of the history of this problem in Section 3.

FAQ substantially generalizes SumProd, as FAQ can now capture problems in logic such as QCQ (quantified conjunctive query) or #QCQ (sharp quantified conjunctive query). We argue that FAQ is a very powerful way of thinking about these problems and related issues. FAQ can be thought of as a declarative query language over functions. For example, we show in Section 8 how different input representations can vastly affect the landscape of tractability of the problem, and how the output representation is related to the notion of factorized databases [73].

2.2 Algorithmic contribution

We present a single algorithm, called InsideOut, to solve FAQ. InsideOut is a variation of the variable elimination algorithm [31, 93, 94]. In PGM, variable elimination was first proposed by Zhang and Poole [93]. Then Dechter [31] observed that this strategy can be applied to problems on other semirings such as constraint satisfaction and SAT solving. In the database literature, Yannakakis' algorithm [90] can also be cast as variable elimination under the set semiring or Boolean semiring.[3]

InsideOut adds three minor twists to the basic variable elimination strategy. First, we use a backtracking-search strategy called OutsideIn to compute the intermediate results. This strategy allows us to use recent worst-case optimal join algorithms [2, 67, 69, 89] to compute intermediate results within the fractional edge cover bound [12, 47]. Second, we introduce the idea of an *indicator projection* of a function onto a given set of variables to obtain the fractional hypertree width style of runtime guarantee [48]. Third, in addition to making use of the distributive law to 'fold' common factors [9] when we face a semiring aggregate, we apply a swap between an aggregate and the inside product when that aggregate is also a product.

We show that InsideOut runs in time $\tilde{O}(N^{\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma)} + \|\varphi\|)$, where σ is a variable ordering that we choose to run the algorithm on, N is the input size, and $\|\varphi\|$ is the output size (under the 'listing representation' of input and output factors), and $\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma)$ is a parameter called the (fractional) FAQ-*width* of σ. FAQ-width is the FAQ-analog of the induced fractional hypertree width of a variable ordering. (See Definition 5.10.) In this paper, we use $\tilde{O}$ to hide a logarithmic factor in data complexity and a polynomial factor in query complexity.

In fact, Section 8 shows that the variable elimination framework is still powerful in cases when the fractional hypertree width bounds are no longer applicable. These are special cases of FAQ where the input functions are compactly represented. In particular, we explain how – with a suitable modification – InsideOut can be used to recover recently known beyond worst-case results in join algorithms (Minesweeper [65], and Tetris [2]), and results on the tractability of SAT and #SAT for β-acyclic formulas [19, 74].

[3] It is well-known [9, 59] that variable elimination and message passing are equivalent in the special case of FAQ-SS.

2.3 Main technical contributions

2.3.1 "Width" of an FAQ. In light of InsideOut running in time $\tilde{O}(N^{\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma)} + \|\varphi\|)$ for a given variable order σ, the key technical problem is choosing a σ that minimizes $\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma)$. This is where the generality of FAQ requires new techniques and results. Traditional variable elimination for CSPs or PGM inference also requires computing a good variable ordering to minimize the (induced) *treewidth* [59] or *fractional hypertree width* [48] of the variable ordering. However, in those cases all variable orderings are valid; hence, all we have to do in this traditional setting is to compute a tree decomposition whose maximum bag size (or maximum fractional edge cover number over the bags) is minimized; then, the GYO-elimination procedure will produce a good variable ordering (see Section 4). In the general setting of FAQ, just like in logic where there are alternating quantifiers, the set of semantically equivalent variable orderings depends on both the scoping structure specified by the input query expression *and* the connectivity structure of the query's hypergraph.

To see how the query's hypergraph affects the set of equivalent variable orderings, consider the following simple example. A natural class of valid permutations to consider are those that only permute aggregates in a maximal block of identical aggregates in the query expression. However, taking the query hypergraph into account, one can do much better. Consider, for example, the FAQ-query

$$\varphi = \max_{x_1} \sum_{x_2} \max_{x_3} \cdots \sum_{x_{2k}} \psi_{\{1,3,\ldots,2k-1\}} \psi_{\{2,4,\ldots,2k\}}$$

where both factors have range $\mathbb{R}_+$. In this case, even though max and $\sum$ do not commute with one another, we can rewrite φ using any of the $(2k)!$ variable orderings and still obtain the same result. (The aggregates have to be permuted along with the variables to which they are attached.)

Even for the special case of FAQ-SS, where there is only one type of semiring aggregates hence all permutations are valid, computing the optimal variable ordering is already **NP**-hard in query complexity, because computing the (fractional hyper) treewidth of the query hypergraph is **NP**-hard [38, 61]. (See also Gottlob et al [43] for a survey.) Hence, the extra complication of only considering 'valid' orderings for FAQ seems to make our task much harder. Somewhat surprisingly, we are able to show that the complexity of computing the optimal ordering for general FAQ is essentially the same as the complexity of computing the optimal ordering for FAQ-SS instances. Figure 1 presents a schematic summary of our main technical contributions, described in more details below.

- Given an FAQ-query φ, we define the set $\mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)$ of all variable orderings *semantically equivalent* to φ. Roughly, for any $\sigma \in \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)$, if we rewrite the expression for φ using the ordering σ (with all aggregates permuted along), then we obtain a function identical to φ, **no matter** what the input factors are. The FAQ-width of φ is $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi) = \min_{\sigma \in \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)} \mathsf{faqw}(\sigma)$. (If the FAQ instance was a SumProd instance, then $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi)$ is exactly the fractional hypertree width of the query.)
  In Figure 1, suppose we are looking at the top/orange path: from the input expression φ with variable order σ, if we somehow were able to compute the optimal variable ordering $\sigma^* = \arg\min_{\tau \in \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)} \mathsf{faqw}(\tau)$, then we would have an algorithm running in time $\tilde{O}(N^{\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi)} + \|\varphi\|)$. Here, $\|\varphi\|$ denotes the output size. However, even if we were willing to spend an exponential time in query complexity, in order to take the orange path and find σ^* we need to be able to characterize the set $\mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)$. In particular, given a variable ordering τ, how do we know whether $\tau \in \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)$ or not? Our answer to this question comes next.
- We describe how to (in poly-time, query complexity) construct an *expression tree* for the input FAQ-query. The expression tree induces a partially ordered set on the variables called the *precedence poset*. By defining a notion




Fig. 1. Summary of our technical contributions

called *component-wise equivalence* (CWE), we completely characterize $\mathrm{EVO}(\varphi)$: $\sigma \in \mathrm{EVO}(\varphi)$ if and only if it is component-wise equivalent to some linear extension of the precedence poset. In fact, we also show that checking whether $\sigma \in \mathrm{EVO}(\varphi)$ can be done in polynomial time in query complexity.

- While membership in $\mathrm{EVO}(\varphi)$ is verifiable in polynomial time, as aforementioned the optimization problem $\sigma^* = \arg\min_{\tau \in \mathrm{EVO}(\varphi)} \mathrm{faqw}(\tau)$ is **NP**-hard. In some applications such as PGM-inference, we cannot sweep query complexity under the rug as we do in database applications. It is thus natural to design approximation algorithms for $\mathrm{faqw}(\varphi)$. To this end, we prove another technical result, that going through all orderings in $\mathrm{EVO}(\varphi)$ is *not* necessary. The set of linear extensions of the precedence poset is sufficient: every linear extension of the precedence poset is semantically equivalent to φ, and every $\sigma \in \mathrm{EVO}(\varphi)$ has the same FAQ-width as some linear extension of this poset.[4]
- Finally, using an approximation algorithm for the fractional hypertree width (fhtw) with approximation ratio $g(\mathrm{fhtw})$ as a blackbox,[5] and using the expression tree as a guide, we give an approximation algorithm computing an ordering σ such that $\mathrm{faqw}(\sigma) \le \mathrm{OPT} + g(\mathrm{OPT})$, where $\mathrm{OPT} = \mathrm{faqw}(\varphi)$. (In the FAQ-SS case, our approximation guarantee is slightly better: $\mathrm{faqw}(\sigma) \le g(\mathrm{OPT})$.)

2.3.2 The effect of input and output representation. The input to FAQ is a collection of functions. We observe that the representation of the input functions has a huge effect on the computational complexity of the problem.

We begin with the representation of the input factors. One option is the truth table representation for each factor involved in the FAQ instance φ (e.g. the *conditional probability table* in PGM [59] or the usual 2D-array representation of matrices). This representation is wasteful when the input factors have many **0**-entries. Another option, which is

[4] If the instance is an FAQ-SS instance, then the poset imposes no order on the non-free variables, i.e. the set of linear extensions is the set of all possible variable orderings of non-free variables.
[5] The best known such algorithm due to Marx [61] has $g(\mathrm{fhtw}) = O(\mathrm{fhtw}^3)$ and runs in polynomial time, given fhtw is bounded by a constant.

commonly used in the CSP, databases, and sparse matrix computation domains is to list pairs $\langle \mathbf{x}_S, \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)\rangle$ for a given factor ψ_S such that $\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) \neq \mathbf{0}$. The results listed in Table 1 implicitly assumed the listing representation.

However, our results can handle even more succinct representations such as GDNFs and decision diagrams [26] in CSP literature and algebraic decision diagrams in the PGM literature [13]. We present a common view of these representations: an input factor $\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)$ might itself be the output of some other FAQ instance φ'_S on the (free) variables $\mathbf{x}_S$. The succinctness in the representation comes from representing factors of φ'_S in the listing format (instead of listing ψ_S). Technically, we analyze what happens when one *composes* an FAQ instance with another. More interestingly, this framework is general enough to present a class of structured matrices (including the DFT matrices) for which we can quantify how much better our algorithm runs than the naïve quadratic time algorithm.

Furthermore, we observe that when the input factors are too "compact", then the class of tractable FAQ-queries is much smaller, and the fractional hypertree width framework no longer applies. Nevertheless, the variable elimination strategy is still a powerful approach. We will, however, have to change the algorithm used to solve sub-problems: it can no longer be backtracking-search-style of algorithm. We give four examples where we explain how recent beyond worst-case results in join algorithms (Minesweeper [65], and Tetris [2]), and the tractability of SAT and #SAT for β-acyclic formulas [19, 74], all of which are special cases of FAQ, can be explained using this idea.

Last but not least, we make several observations regarding the representations of the *output* function φ. For the case when the FAQ instance φ has no free variables, the algorithm needs to output a single element from $\mathbf{D}$. However, when φ has free variables, then we have to also represent the output somehow. The default option is to also use the listing representation for the output. However, InsideOut is general enough to be able to output an FAQ instance as the output. This issue is slightly subtle as φ is *already* an FAQ instance that represents the output but it is not an "interesting" representation. However, the generality of our algorithm allows the input factors and output both to be represented as FAQ instances. Our observations here are very close in spirit to the recent results on database factorization of Olteanu and Závodný [73].

2.4 Highlights of our corollaries

In light of the fact that many problems can be reduced to FAQ, Table 1 presents a selected subset of corollaries that our results imply.[6] We list the results assuming the optimal variable ordering is already given. (This holds true for both known results and our results.) When the optimal variable ordering is not given, the exponents of N in all cases have to be changed to the best known approximating factors for the corresponding width. In the FAQ case, that would be $O(\mathsf{faqw}^3(\varphi))$.

For each problem, the table lists the corresponding FAQ instance, the runtime of the previously best known algorithm, and the runtime of InsideOut. These are the problems that we would like to highlight, as they yield either new results or an alternative interpretation of known results in the FAQ framework.

The results in Table 1 roughly span three areas: (1) CSPs and Logic; (2) PGMs and (3) Matrix operations. Except for joins, problems in area (1) need the full generality of our FAQ formulation, where InsideOut either improves upon existing results or yields new results. Problems in area (2) can already be reduced to FAQ-SS. Here, InsideOut improves upon known results since it takes advantage of Grohe and Marx's more recent fractional hypertree width bounds. Finally, problems in area (3) of Table 1 are classic. InsideOut does not yield anything new here, but it is intriguing to be able to explain the textbook dynamic programming algorithm for Matrix-Chain Multiplication [29] as an algorithm to

[6] The results listed in the table implicitly assumed the listing representation of input factors.

Problem	FAQ formulation	Previous Algo.	**Our Algo.**
#QCQ	$\sum_{(x_1,\ldots,x_f)} \oplus^{(f+1)}_{x_{f+1}} \cdots \oplus^{(n)}_{x_n} \prod_{S\in\mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)$ where $\bigoplus^{(i)} \in \{\max, \times\}$	No non-trivial algo	$\tilde{O}(N^{\text{faqw}(\varphi)} + \|\varphi\|)$
QCQ	$\oplus^{(f+1)}_{x_{f+1}} \cdots \oplus^{(n)}_{x_n} \prod_{S\in\mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)$ where $\bigoplus^{(i)} \in \{\max, \times\}$	$\tilde{O}(N^{\text{PW}(\mathcal{H})} + \|\varphi\|)$ [25]	$\tilde{O}(N^{\text{faqw}(\varphi)} + \|\varphi\|)$
#CQ	$\sum_{(x_1,\ldots,x_f)} \max_{x_{f+1}} \cdots \max_{x_n} \prod_{S\in\mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)$	$\tilde{O}(N^{\text{DM}(\mathcal{H})} + \|\varphi\|)$ [35]	$\tilde{O}(N^{\text{faqw}(\varphi)} + \|\varphi\|)$
Joins	$\bigcup_{\mathbf{x}} \bigcap_{S\in\mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)$	$\tilde{O}\left(N^{\text{fhtw}(\mathcal{H})} + \|\varphi\|\right)$ [47]	$\tilde{O}\left(N^{\text{fhtw}(\mathcal{H})} + \|\varphi\|\right)$
Marginal	$\sum_{(x_{f+1},\ldots,x_n)} \prod_{S\in\mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)$	$\tilde{O}(N^{\text{htw}(\varphi)} + \|\varphi\|)$ [55]	$\tilde{O}(N^{\text{faqw}(\varphi)} + \|\varphi\|)$
MAP	$\max_{(x_{f+1},\ldots,x_n)} \prod_{S\in\mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)$	$\tilde{O}(N^{\text{htw}(\varphi)} + \|\varphi\|)$ [55]	$\tilde{O}(N^{\text{faqw}(\varphi)} + \|\varphi\|)$
MCM	$\sum_{x_2,\ldots,x_n} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \psi_{i,i+1}(x_i, x_{i+1})$	DP bound [29]	DP bound
DFT	$\sum_{(y_0,\ldots,y_{m-1})\in\mathbb{Z}_p^m} b_y \cdot \prod_{0\le j+k<m} e^{i2\pi \frac{x_j\cdot y_k}{p^{m-j-k}}}$	$O(N \log_p N)$ [28]	$O(N \log_p N)$

Table 1. Runtimes of algorithms assuming optimal variable ordering is given. Problems shaded red are in CSPs and logic ($\mathbf{D} = \{0,1\}$ for CSP and $\mathbf{D} = \mathbb{N}$ for #CSP), problems shaded green fall under PGMs ($\mathbf{D} = \mathbb{R}_+$), and problems shaded blue fall under matrix operations ($\mathbf{D} = \mathbb{C}$). N denotes the size of the largest factor (assuming they are represented with the listing format; see Definition 4.1). $\text{htw}(\varphi)$ is the notion of integral cover width defined in [55] for PGM. $\text{PW}(\mathcal{H})$ is the *optimal width of a prefix graph* of $\mathcal{H}$ from [25] and $\text{DM}(\mathcal{H}) = \text{poly}(F\text{-ss}(\mathcal{H}), \text{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}))$, where $F\text{-ss}(\mathcal{H})$ is the $[f]$-quantified star size [35]. $\|\varphi\|$ is the output size in listing representation. Our width $\text{faqw}(\varphi)$ is never worse than any of the three and there are classes of queries where ours is unboundedly better than all three. In DFT, $N = p^m$ is the length of the input vector. $\tilde{O}$ hides a logarithmic factor in data complexity and polynomial factor in query complexity.

find a good variable ordering for the corresponding FAQ-instance. The DFT result is a re-writing of Aji and McEliece's observation [9].[7]

It should be noted that the prior results on #CQ [35] and QCQ [25] focused on dichotomy theorems for bounded-arity classes of input hypergraphs, not just on the best possible runtime one can get. Our faqw notion is a generalization of fractional hypertree width, which steps into the unbounded arity world. See Marx [63] for a more detailed discussion of known results on CSP in the unbounded-arity case.

3 RELATED WORK

Since FAQ encompasses so many areas, our related work discussion is necessarily incomplete. Appendix G discusses more related works on the factor/function representation issue.

3.1 Problems on one semiring

As was mentioned earlier, SumProd is the special case of FAQ when all variable aggregates are semiring aggregate over *the same* semiring, and there is no free variable. This special case is powerful enough to capture a bunch of problems (e.g. it captures all CSPs). This problem was implicitly defined by Dechter [31], who solved it using variable elimination.

[7] Note that we have further results on matrix vector multiplication for structured matrices (see Appendix G.3).

To the best of our knowledge, the FAQ-SS problem was explicitly defined by Aji and McEliece [9] who called it the MPF problem (for Marginalize the product function).[8] They presented a message passing algorithm for FAQ-SS and essentially showed that their algorithm meets the treewidth bound. Their paper also lists a number of problems that are FAQ-SS instances, including Matrix Chain Multiplication (less specific than our result, they just argue that essentially different variable orderings give rise to different ways of parenthesizing the matrix chain multiplication) and Matrix Vector Multiplication. They showed that their general algorithm contains FFT as a special case. We re-phrase their interpretation of the FFT using InsideOut. They also showed that many basic decoding problems in coding theory can be cast as FAQ-SS instances.

Kohlas and Wilson [58] presented even more applications of the FAQ-SS problem. The paper categorized various existing message passing algorithms depending on what extra properties they need beyond $(\mathbf{D}, \oplus, \otimes)$ being a commutative semiring. Their paper also explored algorithms for approximate computations (while in this work we solely deal with exact computation). Approximate computations in PGMs have been explored under the semiring framework [80].

Most of the results in the PGM literature present algorithms that are shown to obtain the treewidth bound. To the best of our knowledge, the finest hypergraph width parameter used to bound the performance of PGM inference algorithms is the integral hypertree width bound of [44], which appeared in [32, 55]. See Sections 3.3 and 4.3 for a more detailed discussion on the various width parameters.

In the database literature, recently Koch [57] described an algebraic query language called AGCA over 'rings of databases' which is somewhat similar in spirit to FAQ. This framework makes use of additive inverses to allow for efficient view maintenance.

3.2 Factorized databases

Bakibayev et al. [14] and Olteanu and Závodný [73] introduced the notion of *factorized databases*, and showed how one can efficiently compute join and aggregates over factorized databases. In hindsight there is much in common between their approach and InsideOut applied to the single semiring case of FAQ-SS. Both approaches have the same runtime complexity, because both are dynamic programming algorithms, InsideOut is bottom-up, and factorized database computation is top-down (memoized).

The FAQ framework is more general in that it can handle multiple aggregate types. Our contribution also involves the characterization of EVO and an approximation algorithm for faqw. On the other hand, aspects of factorized database that FAQ does not handle include the evaluation of SQL queries and output size bounds on the factorized representations.

3.3 Width parameters

Various notions of hypergraph 'widths' have been developed over the years in PGM, CSP, and database theory. In particular, two often-used properties of the input query are *acyclicity* and *bounded width.*

When the query is acyclic, the classic algorithm of Yannakakis [90] for relational joins (and CSPs) runs in time linear in the input plus output size, modulo a log factor. Similarly, Pearl's belief propagation algorithm [77] works well for acyclic graphical models. As we briefly touch upon in Appendix F.1, Yannakakis' algorithm is essentially belief propagation on the Boolean semiring or set semiring. The algorithm can also be reinterpreted using InsideOut.

[8] Though related problems had been defined before: see e.g. [15].

Subsequent works on databases and CSPs further expand the classes of queries that can be evaluated in polynomial time. These works define progressively more general width parameters for a query, which intuitively measure how far a query is from being acyclic. Roughly, these results state that if the corresponding width parameter is bounded by a constant, then the query is 'tractable,' i.e. there is a polynomial-time algorithm to evaluate it. For example, Gyssens et al. [51, 52] showed that queries with bounded *degree of acyclicity* are tractable. Then came *query width* (qw) from Chekuri and Rajaraman [23], *hypertree width* and *generalized hypertree width* (ghw) from Gottlob et al. [44, 82], and *fractional hypertree width* from Grohe and Marx [48]. See [43] for a survey and [38] for the latest in this line of work. Marx developed stronger width parameters called *adaptive width* and *submodular width* [62, 63], which were recently extended to functional dependencies and degree bounds [4, 5].

In the PGM literature, the most common parameter is *treewidth* as the textbook variable elimination and message passing algorithms are often stated to run in time $O(N^{w+1})$ where w is the tree width of the model [59]. Freuder [39] and Dechter and Pearl [33] showed in late 1980s that CSP instances with bounded treewidth are tractable.

In the logic/finite model theory literature, several width parameters were also developed [7, 25, 35]. We will describe them later in the relevant sections of the paper.

3.4 Finite model theory

In [79], Pichler and Skritek studied the #CQ problem in the special case where the query is acyclic. We refer to this special case as #ACQ. In particular, they showed that #ACQ is tractable in data complexity (i.e. when the number of variables that we are counting over is a constant) and in query complexity (i.e. when all relations have constant sizes) but not in combined complexity where the problem turns out to be #**P**-complete.

In [35], Durand and Mengel introduced a new parameter for #CQ called the *quantified star size*. It is basically a measure of how free variables are connected in the query's hypergraph. Along with bounded generalized hypertree width (or fractional hypertree width), bounded quantified star size characterizes the classes of #CQ instances that are tractable in the bounded arity (or bounded generalized hypertree width) case.

The quantified star size idea has been expanded later by applying it to the *core* of the query instead of the original query [46]. The core is a minimal subquery that is homomorphically equivalent to the original query. Because homomorphism does not preserve counts (i.e. it is not a one-to-one mapping), free variables have to be explicitly preserved by taking the core of the *color query* of the original query. Further development along with new lower bounds appeared in [27].

QCQ (second row of Table 1) has its own long line of research. An early and interesting result was the tractability of QCQ when the domain size, treewidth, and number of quantifier alternations are all constants [24]. More recently, Chen and Dalmau introduced a width parameter for QCQ based on elimination orderings [25]. In particular, they take the minimum width over some variable orderings that are equivalent to the original query. They showed the tractability of QCQ when their width is bounded.

The runtime of InsideOut for CQ, #CQ, and QCQ are unboundedly better than the above results as shown in Table 1. Our result on #QCQ is new: to the best of our knowledge no non-trivial efficient algorithms for #QCQ were known prior to our work. Essentially, InsideOut is able to unify the above results under the same umbrella.

4 PRELIMINARIES

4.1 Factors, their representations, and sizes

In relational database systems [1, 60, 88], constraint satisfaction, and sparse matrix operations [92], the following representation of input and output factors is the most common:

Definition 4.1 (Listing representation)**.** In the *listing representation*, each factor is a table of all tuples of the form $\langle \mathbf{x}_S, \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)\rangle$, such that $\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) \neq \mathbf{0}$. In particular, entries not in the table are $\mathbf{0}$-entries.

We will assume in most of this paper that all input and output factors are represented using the listing representation. Section 8 discusses how our results still hold under other representations and the effect they have on the computational landscape.

Recall that $\mathbf{0}$ is the additive identity of the semiring(s) which also annihilates any element of $\mathbf{D}$ under multiplication.

Let $W \subseteq [n]$ be some subset of variables, and $\mathbf{y}_W \in \prod_{i\in W} \mathrm{Dom}(X_i)$ be some given value tuple. The *conditional factor* $\psi_S(\cdot \mid \mathbf{y}_W)$ is a function from $\prod_{i\in S} \mathrm{Dom}(X_i)$ to $\mathbf{D}$ defined by

$$\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S \mid \mathbf{y}_W) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{0} & \text{if } S \cap W \neq \emptyset \text{ and } \mathbf{x}_{S\cap W} \neq \mathbf{y}_{S\cap W} \\ \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For each factor ψ_S, define its *size* to be the number of non-zero points under its domain:

$$\|\psi_S\| := \left|\left\{\mathbf{x}_S \mid \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) \neq \mathbf{0}\right\}\right|.$$

(This is also the number of rows in the table representing ψ_S in the list representation.) Let $T \subseteq S$ be arbitrary, then obviously we can write a factor size as a sum of conditional factor sizes:

$$\|\psi_S\| = \sum_{\mathbf{y}_T \in \prod_{i\in T} \mathrm{Dom}(X_i)} \|\psi_S(\cdot \mid \mathbf{y}_T)\|. \tag{2}$$

Throughout this paper, we use N to denote the maximum over all input factor sizes.

Definition 4.2 (Indicator projection)**.** For any two sets $S, T \subseteq [n]$ such that $S \cap T \neq \emptyset$, and a given factor ψ_S, the function $\psi_{S/T} : \prod_{i\in S\cap T} \mathrm{Dom}(X_i) \to \mathbf{D}$ defined by

$$\psi_{S/T}(\mathbf{x}_{S\cap T}) := \begin{cases} \mathbf{1} & \exists \mathbf{x}_{S-T} \text{ s.t. } \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_{S\cap T}, \mathbf{x}_{S-T}) \neq \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

is called the *indicator projection* of ψ_S onto T.

4.2 AGM-bound and fractional cover numbers

Let $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ be a hypergraph. Let $B \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ be any subset of vertices. An *integral edge cover* of B using edges in $\mathcal{H}$ is a feasible solution $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_S)_{S\in\mathcal{E}}$ to the following integer program:

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{S\in\mathcal{E}} \lambda_S \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{S: v\in S} \lambda_S \geq 1, \quad \forall v \in B \\ & \lambda_S \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \forall S \in \mathcal{E}, \end{aligned}$$

whose optimal objective value is denoted by $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(B)$. The number $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(B)$ is called the *integral edge cover number* of B. Similarly, $\rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(B)$ is the optimal objective value of the relaxation

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{S\in\mathcal{E}} \lambda_S \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{S: v\in S} \lambda_S \geq 1, \ \ \forall v \in B \\ & \lambda_S \geq 0, \ \ \forall S \in \mathcal{E}. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Any feasible solution to the above linear program is called a *fractional edge cover* of B using edges in $\mathcal{H}$. Note that ρ and ρ^* are functions from $2^{\mathcal{V}} \to \mathbb{R}_+$.

Fix some input $(\psi_S)_{S\in\mathcal{E}}$ for our FAQ problem. Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^* = (\lambda^*_S)_{S\in\mathcal{E}}$ denote an optimal solution to the linear program

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{S\in\mathcal{E}} \lambda_S \log_2 \|\psi_S\| \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{S: v\in S} \lambda_S \geq 1, \ \ \forall v \in B \\ & \lambda_S \geq 0, \ \ \forall S \in \mathcal{E}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the quantity

$$\mathsf{AGM}_{\mathcal{H}}(B) := \prod_{S\in\mathcal{E}} \|\psi_S\|^{\lambda^*_S} \tag{4}$$

is called the AGM-*bound* for B using edges of $\mathcal{H}$. It is obvious that

$$\mathsf{AGM}_{\mathcal{H}}(B) \leq N^{\rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(B)}. \tag{5}$$

We call the quantities $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathcal{V})$, $\rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathcal{V})$, and $\mathsf{AGM}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathcal{V})$ the integral cover number, fractional cover number, and AGM-bound corresponding to $\mathcal{H}$. When $\mathcal{H}$ is implicit from context, we shall drop the subscript $\mathcal{H}$ and write $\rho(B)$, $\rho^*(B)$, and $\mathsf{AGM}(B)$ for the sake of brevity. Note that the AGM-bound is "data-dependent" in the sense that it is a function of the input factors, while the cover numbers are only dependent on the hypergraph. Thus, our notation $\mathsf{AGM}(B)$ is under the implicit assumption that the input factors are fixed.

4.3 Tree decomposition, acyclicity, and width-parameters

Definition 4.3 (Tree decomposition)**.** Let $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ be a hypergraph. A *tree-decomposition* of $\mathcal{H}$ is a pair (T, χ) where $T = (V(T), E(T))$ is a tree and $\chi : V(T) \to 2^{\mathcal{V}}$ assigns to each node of the tree T a subset of vertices of $\mathcal{H}$. The sets $\chi(t)$, $t \in V(T)$, are called the *bags* of the tree-decomposition. There are two properties the bags must satisfy

(a) For any hyperedge $S \in \mathcal{E}$, there is a bag $\chi(t)$, $t \in V(T)$, such that $S \subseteq \chi(t)$.
(b) For any vertex $v \in \mathcal{V}$, the set $\{t \mid t \in V(T), v \in \chi(t)\}$ is not empty and forms a connected subtree of T.

Definition 4.4 (α-acyclic)**.** A hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ is *α-acyclic* iff there exists a tree decomposition (T, χ) in which every bag $\chi(t)$ is a hyperedge of $\mathcal{H}$.

When $\mathcal{H}$ represents a join query, the tree T in the above definition is also called the *join tree* of the query. A query is α-acyclic if and only if its hypergraph is α-acyclic. While possessing many nice properties [37], the notion of α-acyclicity is unsatisfying in some settings because we can turn any hypergraph into an α-acyclic hypergraph by adding a hyperedge covering all its vertices. This observation motivates a second notion of acyclicity [37].

Definition 4.5 (β-acyclicity)**.** A hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ is *β-acyclic* iff the hypergraph formed by any subset of edges of $\mathcal{H}$ is α-acyclic.

To define commonly used width parameters of hypergraphs, we follow the width function framework introduced by Adler [6]. Let $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ be a hypergraph. Let $g : 2^{\mathcal{V}} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be a function that assigns a non-negative real number to each subset of $\mathcal{V}$. Then, the *g-width* of a tree decomposition (T, χ) is $\max_{t \in V(T)} g(\chi(t))$. The *$g$-width of $\mathcal{H}$* is the *minimum* g-width over all tree decompositions of $\mathcal{H}$. Note that the g-width of a hypergraph is a *Minimax* function.

Definition 4.6 (Common width parameters)**.** Let s be the following function: $s(B) = |B| - 1, \forall B \subseteq \mathcal{V}$. Then the *tree-width* of a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$, denoted by $\mathrm{tw}(\mathcal{H})$, is exactly its s-width. The *generalized hypertree width* of a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$, denoted by $\mathrm{htw}(\mathcal{H})$, is the ρ-width of $\mathcal{H}$, and the *fractional hypertree width* of a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$, denoted by $\mathrm{fhtw}(\mathcal{H})$, is the ρ^*-width of $\mathcal{H}$.

4.4 Vertex/variable ordering and its equivalence to tree decomposition

Besides tree decompositions, there is another equivalent way to characterize and define (α/β-) acyclicity and width parameters of hypergraphs using a listing of vertices of a hypergraph [16, 17]. The results in this section are probably well-known to researchers in this area, but we were not able to track down a precise reference for some of our propositions below. Their proofs are presented in Appendix C for completeness.

Definition 4.7 (Vertex/variable ordering)**.** A *vertex ordering* of a hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ is simply a listing $\sigma = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ of all vertices in $\mathcal{V}$. Because we use vertices (of $\mathcal{H}$) and variables more or less interchangeably in this paper, the term *variable ordering* will also be used with the same semantic.

In the literature "elimination order", "elimination ordering", or "global attribute order" are also used in place of "vertex ordering" [2, 16, 17, 65]. However, we chose not to use "elimination order" here because a vertex ordering is meant to be the *reverse* of a (GYO) elimination ordering, as we explain below.

Elimination hypergraph sequence. Fix a vertex ordering $\sigma = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ of $\mathcal{H}$, for $j = n, n-1, \ldots, 1$ we recursively define a sequence of n hypergraphs $\mathcal{H}_n^\sigma, \mathcal{H}_{n-1}^\sigma, \ldots, \mathcal{H}_1^\sigma$ as follows. To avoid cumbersome super-scripting, we will denote the sequence as $\mathcal{H}_n, \mathcal{H}_{n-1}, \ldots, \mathcal{H}_1$ when the vertex ordering σ is clear from context. Define $\mathcal{H}_n = (\mathcal{V}_n, \mathcal{E}_n) = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}) = \mathcal{H}$. Let $\partial(v_n)$ be the set of hyperedges of $\mathcal{H}_n$ incident to v_n, and U_n be the union of edges in $\partial(v_n)$:

$$\partial(v_n) = \big\{S \in \mathcal{E}_n \mid v_n \in S\big\}, \tag{6}$$

$$U_n = \bigcup_{S \in \partial(v_n)} S. \tag{7}$$

For each $j = n-1, n-2, \ldots, 1$, define the hypergraph $\mathcal{H}_j = (\mathcal{V}_j, \mathcal{E}_j)$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_j &= \big\{v_1, \ldots, v_j\big\} \\ \mathcal{E}_j &= \big(\mathcal{E}_{j+1} - \partial(v_{j+1})\big) \cup \big\{U_{j+1} - \{v_{j+1}\}\big\} \\ \partial(v_j) &= \big\{S \in \mathcal{E}_j \mid v_j \in S\big\} \\ U_j &= \bigcup_{S \in \partial(v_j)} S. \end{aligned}$$

Again, strictly speaking the sets $\mathcal{V}_j, \mathcal{E}_j, \partial(v_j)$, and U_j should have been denoted by $\mathcal{V}_j^\sigma, \mathcal{E}_j^\sigma, \partial^\sigma(v_j)$, and U_j^σ. But we drop the superscript as σ is implicitly understood.

Definition 4.8. The above sequence of hypergraphs is called the *elimination hypergraph sequence* associated with the vertex ordering σ. There is an intimate relationship between tree decompositions and vertex orderings, which can be proved by making use of the above elimination hypergraph sequence.

Proposition 4.9 (α-Acyclicity)**.** *A hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ is α-acyclic if and only if there is a vertex ordering $\sigma = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ such that $U_k^\sigma \in \partial(v_k)$ for all $k \in [n]$.*

Proposition 4.10 (β-Acyclicity)**.** *A hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ is β-acyclic if and only if there is a vertex ordering $\sigma = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ such that the collection of hyperedges in $\partial(v_k)$ form a nested inclusion chain, for all $k \in [n]$. Furthermore, β-acyclicity can be verified in polynomial-time.*

Definition 4.11 (Induced g-width)**.** Let $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ be a hypergraph. Let $g : 2^{\mathcal{V}} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be a function and $\sigma = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ be a vertex ordering of $\mathcal{H}$. Then, the *induced g-width* of σ is the quantity $\max_{k \in [n]} g(U_k^\sigma)$. When $g(B) = |B| - 1$, this is called the *induced width* of σ. When $g(B) = \rho_{\mathcal{H}}(B)$, this is called the *induced integral edge cover width* of σ. When $g(B) = \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(B)$, this is called the *induced fractional edge cover width* of σ.

We next characterize three width parameters of a hypergraph using vertex ordering. A function $g : 2^{\mathcal{V}} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is said to be *monotone* if $g(A) \leq g(B)$ whenever $A \subseteq B$. We prove a generic lemma.

Lemma 4.12 (g-width)**.** *Let $g : 2^{\mathcal{V}} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be a monotone function. A hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ has g-width at most w if and only if there exists a vertex ordering σ of all vertices of $\mathcal{H}$ such that the induced g-width of σ is at most w.*

Because the functions $s(U_k) = |U_k| - 1$, $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(U_k)$ and $\rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U_k)$ are all monotone, the following results follow immediately.

Corollary 4.13. *A hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ has treewidth (respectively, generalized hypertree width, fractional hypertree width) at most w if and only if there exists a vertex ordering $\sigma = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ of $\mathcal{H}$ such that for every $k \in [n]$ we have $|U_k^\sigma| \leq w + 1$ (respectively, $\rho_{\mathcal{H}}(U_k) \leq w$, $\rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U_k) \leq w$).*

Note that the above corollary is actually three corollaries. The one regarding tree-width alone is well-known in the probabilistic graphical model literature [11, 33]. The other two are probably folklore, but we were not able to find them explicitly stated anywhere.

5 THE InsideOut ALGORITHM

5.1 Algorithmic Warm-ups

We first present a simple solution to the FAQ-SS problem. Recall FAQ-SS denotes the special case of FAQ when all variable aggregates are the same: i.e. $\oplus^{(i)} = \oplus, \forall i > f$, and $(\mathbf{D}, \oplus, \otimes)$ is a commutative semiring. Our aim is to gently introduce the reader to the duality of backtracking-search and dynamic programming, and to the main idea of variable elimination.

5.1.1 Backtracking search. Consider the SumProd form of the FAQ expression (1) when there is no free variable and all aggregates are the same semiring aggregate. In this case, we write the expression as

$$\varphi = \bigoplus_{\mathbf{x}} \bigotimes_{S \in \mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) = \bigoplus_{x_1 \in \mathsf{Dom}(X_1)} \left(\bigoplus_{\mathbf{x}_{[n]-\{1\}}} \bigotimes_{S \in \mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S \mid x_1) \right).$$

We can evaluate this expression by going through each value of x_1 and computing the inner expression 'conditioned' on this x_1. The naïve implementation of this strategy wastes time if there is any x_1 for which *some* conditional factor $\psi_S(\cdot \mid x_1)$ is identically $\mathbf{0}$. Thus, the obvious idea is to first compute the set I_1 of values x_1 for which $\psi_S(\cdot \mid x_1) \not\equiv \mathbf{0}$ *for all* factors ψ_S. Then, recursively compute the expression

$$\varphi = \bigoplus_{x_1 \in I_1} \left(\bigoplus_{\mathbf{x}_{[n]-\{1\}}} \bigotimes_{S \in \mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S \mid x_1) \right).$$

Given that the input factors are represented using the listing format (i.e. only non-$\mathbf{0}$ entries are listed), computing the above expression recursively is a join algorithm in disguise, and any of the algorithms from [2, 67, 69, 89] works. We call this the OutsideIn algorithm, as it evaluates the expression from the outer-most aggregate to the inner-most. It will serve as the algorithmic building block of InsideOut. In fact, the OutsideIn algorithm works even if there were free variables. The following is almost immediate.

Theorem 5.1. *Let φ be an* FAQ-SS*-query whose hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ has n vertices and m hyperedges. Algorithm* OutsideIn *computes φ in time $O(n \cdot m \cdot \log N \cdot \mathsf{AGM}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathcal{V}))$, where $N = \max_{S \in \mathcal{E}} \|\psi_S\|$.*

Proof. Consider an FAQ-SS query φ with free variables $\mathbf{X}_{[f]}$. As discussed, OutsideIn is basically LeapFrog Triejoin [89]: (1) it finds – by backtracking search – all tuples $\mathbf{x}_{[n]}$ for which $\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) \neq \mathbf{0}$ for all $S \in \mathcal{E}$. For each found tuple, the algorithm adds the product $\bigotimes_{S \in \mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)$ to the entry $\varphi(\mathbf{x}_{[f]})$. Hence, the overall runtime is dominated by the backtracking search itself, which can be bounded by $O(n \cdot m \cdot \log N \cdot \mathsf{AGM}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathcal{V}))$ (see [69]). □

OutsideIn is backtracking search [30, 42] which was known 50 years ago in the AI and constraint programming world. In the PGM literature, the method of conditioning search is similar, but the main theoretical objective is so that the conditioning graph is acyclic [78]. The main advantage of backtracking search is that it requires very little extra space. The main disadvantage is that it might have to resolve the same subproblem multiple times. The duality between backtracking search and dynamic programming is well-known in the constraint programming literature [81]. The next section explores the other side of this duality: the dynamic programming side.

5.1.2 Dynamic programming with variable elimination. To solve the FAQ-SS problem using variable elimination [31, 93, 94], the idea is to "fold" common factors, exploiting the distributive law:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(\mathbf{x}_{[f]}) &= \bigoplus_{x_{f+1}} \cdots \bigoplus_{x_n} \bigotimes_{S \in \mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) \\ &= \bigoplus_{x_{f+1}} \cdots \bigoplus_{x_{n-1}} \bigotimes_{S \in \mathcal{E} - \partial(n)} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) \otimes \underbrace{\left(\bigoplus_{x_n} \bigotimes_{S \in \partial(n)} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) \right)}_{\text{new factor } \psi'_{U_n - \{n\}}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the equality follows from the fact that $\otimes$ distributes over $\oplus$, and recall from (6) and (7) that $\partial(n)$ denotes all edges incident to n in $\mathcal{H}$ and $U_n = \cup_{S \in \partial(n)} S$. Note that the problem of computing the intermediate factor $\psi'_{U_n - \{n\}}$ is *exactly* an FAQ-SS instance, where there is only one bound variable X_n, and $|U_n| - 1$ free variables. Assume for the moment that we can somehow efficiently compute $\psi'_{U_n - \{n\}}$.

After computing $\psi'_{U_n - \{n\}}$, the resulting problem is another instance of FAQ-SS on a modified multi-hypergraph $\mathcal{H}_{n-1}$, constructed from $\mathcal{H}_n := \mathcal{H}$ by removing vertex n along with all edges in $\partial(n)$, and *adding back* a new hyperedge

$U_n - \{n\}$. Recursively, we continue this process until all variables $X_n, \ldots, X_{f+1}$ are eliminated. Textbook treewidth-based results for PGM inference are obtained this way [59]. In the database context (i.e. given an FAQ-query over the Boolean semiring), the intermediate result $\psi'_{U_n-\{n\}}$ is essentially an intermediate materialized relation of a query plan.

5.2 The InsideOut Algorithm

5.2.1 Introducing the indicator projections. While correct, basic variable elimination as described in Section 5.1.2 is potentially not very efficient for sparse input factors, i.e. factors whose sizes are smaller than the product of the domain sizes. The main reason is that the product that was factored out (i.e. $\otimes_{S\in\mathcal{E}-\partial(n)}\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)$) might annihilate many entries of the intermediate result $\psi'_{U_n-\{n\}}$, while we have spent so much time computing $\psi'_{U_n-\{n\}}$. For example, for an $S \notin \partial(n)$ and tuple $\mathbf{y}_S$ such that $S \subseteq U_n$ and $\psi_S(\mathbf{y}_S) = \mathbf{0}$, we do not need to compute the entries $\psi'_{U_n-\{n\}}(\mathbf{x}_{U_n-\{n\}})$ for which $\mathbf{y}_S = \mathbf{x}_S$: those entries will be killed later anyhow. The idea is then to only compute those $\psi'_{U_n-\{n\}}(\mathbf{x}_{U_n-\{n\}})$ values that will 'survive' the other factors. One simple way to achieve this is to allow for the factors that were factored out of the scope of X_n to still participate in computing $\psi'_{U_n-\{n\}}(\mathbf{x}_{U_n-\{n\}})$:

$$\psi'_{U_n-\{n\}}(\mathbf{x}_{U_n-\{n\}}) = \bigoplus_{x_n}\left[\left(\bigotimes_{S\in\partial(n)}\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)\right)\otimes\left(\bigotimes_{\substack{S\notin\partial(n),\\ S\cap U_n\neq\emptyset}}\underbrace{\psi_{S/U_n}(\mathbf{x}_{S\cap U_n})}_{\text{indicator projection}}\right)\right] \tag{8}$$

For some $S \in \mathcal{E} - \partial(n)$ with $S \cap U_n \neq \emptyset$, the participation of a factor ψ_S in computing $\psi'_{U_n-\{n\}}$ is only to "confirm" that entries computed are not wasteful; thus, only their indicator projections participate and not the real factors ψ_S themselves. In database terms, one can also think of the definition of $\psi'_{U_n-\{n\}}$ in (8) as a simultaneous semijoin reduction of the main product $\bigotimes_{S\in\partial(n)}\psi_S$ with all of the "tables" ψ_S for which $S \cap U_n \neq \emptyset$.

The problem defined in (8) is an FAQ-SS instance with $|U_n|-1$ free variables, which we can solve using the OutsideIn algorithm as described in Section 5.1.1. Note the important point that, algorithmically we do not perform the "semijoins" individually; rather, we compute the multiway-join using a worst-case optimal join algorithm.

5.2.2 The general case. We finally describe how InsideOut deals with a general FAQ-query defined by the expression (1). Recall that each operator $\oplus^{(i)}$ for $f < i \leq n$ either forms a semiring with $\otimes$ or is $\otimes$ itself. Let us see how the last variable can be eliminated in this general scenario. The elimination depends on two cases.

Case 1: $(\mathbf{D}, \oplus^{(n)}, \otimes)$ forms a semiring. In this case we apply the same strategy as before: we compute the intermediate factor $\psi_{U_n-\{n\}}$ defined in (8) using OutsideIn. After that, we get another FAQ instance on a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}_{n-1}$ constructed from $\mathcal{H}_n := \mathcal{H}$ by removing vertex n along with all edges in $\partial(n)$, and adding back a new hyperedge $U_n - \{n\}$.

Case 2: $\oplus^{(n)} = \otimes$. In this case, we rewrite the expression as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi(\mathbf{x}_{[f]}) &= \bigoplus_{x_{f+1}}^{(f+1)}\cdots\bigoplus_{x_n}^{(n)}\bigotimes_{S\in\mathcal{E}}\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)\\
&= \bigoplus_{x_{f+1}}^{(f+1)}\cdots\bigoplus_{x_{n-1}}^{(n-1)}\left(\bigoplus_{x_n}^{(n)}\bigotimes_{S\in\mathcal{E}}\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)\right)\\
&= \bigoplus_{x_{f+1}}^{(f+1)}\cdots\bigoplus_{x_{n-1}}^{(n-1)}\left(\bigotimes_{x_n}\bigotimes_{S\in\mathcal{E}}\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)\right)\\
&= \bigoplus_{x_{f+1}}^{(f+1)}\cdots\bigoplus_{x_{n-1}}^{(n-1)}\left(\bigotimes_{S\in\mathcal{E}}\bigotimes_{x_n}\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)\right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \bigoplus_{x_{f+1}}^{(f+1)} \cdots \bigoplus_{x_n}^{(n-1)} \bigotimes_{S \notin \partial(n)} \underbrace{\left(\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)\right)^{|\mathrm{Dom}(X_n)|}}_{\psi'_S} \otimes \Big(\bigotimes_{S \in \partial(n)} \underbrace{\bigotimes_{x_n} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)}_{\psi'_{S-\{n\}}}\Big) \tag{9}$$

Thus, in Case 2, the new FAQ instance has as its input the factors $\psi'_S(\mathbf{x}_S) := \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)^{|\mathrm{Dom}(X_n)|}$ for $S \notin \partial(n)$, and the factors $\psi'_{S-\{n\}}(\mathbf{x}_{S-\{n\}}) := \otimes_{x_n} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)$ for $S \in \partial(n)$. Also, the new instance has a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}_{n-1}$ that is obtained from $\mathcal{H}_n := \mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ by removing vertex n from $\mathcal{V}$ and from all hyperedges in $\mathcal{E}$.

By repeatedly applying the above process on the resulting FAQ instance with hypergraph $\mathcal{H}_{n-1}$, we eliminate the remaining bound variables $X_{n-1}, \ldots, X_{f+1}$ and obtain a sequence of FAQ instances with hypergraphs $\mathcal{H}_{n-2}, \ldots, \mathcal{H}_f$. We formally define below how to construct this sequence of hypergraphs. The construction here differs from the one given earlier in Definition 4.8 in how we eliminate vertices k corresponding to product variables, i.e. $\oplus^{(k)} = \otimes$. (Also while we only described hypergraphs $\mathcal{H}_n, \ldots, \mathcal{H}_f$ in our discussion above, for later convenience we will define below the additional hypergraphs $\mathcal{H}_{f-1}, \ldots, \mathcal{H}_1$.)

Definition 5.2 (Elimination hypergraph sequence)**.** Let φ be an FAQ-query with hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V} = [n], \mathcal{E})$. We define a sequence of hypergraphs $\mathcal{H}_k = (\mathcal{V}_k = [k], \mathcal{E}_k)$, for $k = n, n-1, \ldots, 1$, called the *elimination hypergraph sequence* of φ (with respect to the input variable ordering $\sigma = (1, \ldots, n)$) as follows. Let $\mathcal{H}_n = (\mathcal{V}_n = [n], \mathcal{E}_n) := \mathcal{H}$. For $k = n, n-1, \ldots, 2$, construct $\mathcal{H}_{k-1} = (\mathcal{V}_{k-1}, \mathcal{E}_{k-1})$ from $\mathcal{H}_k = (\mathcal{V}_k, \mathcal{E}_k)$ as follows. Define

$$\partial(k) := \{S \in \mathcal{E}_k \mid k \in S\}, \qquad U_k := \bigcup_{S \in \partial(k)} S, \qquad \mathcal{V}_{k-1} := \mathcal{V}_k - \{k\}.$$

- If $k > f$ and $\oplus^{(k)} = \otimes$, then $\mathcal{E}_{k-1}$ is obtained from $\mathcal{E}_k$ by removing k from all edges in $\mathcal{E}_k$, i.e.

$$\mathcal{E}_{k-1} := (\mathcal{E}_k - \partial(k)) \cup \{S - \{k\} \mid S \in \partial(k)\}.$$

- Otherwise, $\mathcal{E}_{k-1}$ is obtained from $\mathcal{E}_k$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{E}_{k-1} := (\mathcal{E}_k - \partial(k)) \cup \big\{U_k - \{k\}\big\}.$$

We now discuss how to compute the new factors in Eq. (9), namely ψ'_S for $S \notin \partial(n)$ and $\psi'_{S-\{n\}}$ for $S \in \partial(n)$.

First, consider the factors ψ'_S for $S \notin \partial(n)$. When "passing through" a product aggregate, these factors are powered up, point-wise, by a power of $|\mathrm{Dom}(X_n)|$. By repeated squaring, the number of multiplications needed is within

$$\sum_{S \in \mathcal{E} - \partial(n)} 2 \cdot \|\psi_S\| \cdot \lceil \log_2 |\mathrm{Dom}(X_n)| \rceil.$$

So these factors are generally changed to new factors with the same size.

There is one case in which we do not have to power them up: when $\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)$ is an idempotent element under the product aggregate $\otimes$. In particular, if we knew that $\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) \in \{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}\}$ for all $\mathbf{x}_S$, then $\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)^{|\mathrm{Dom}(X_n)|} = \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)$ and we can factor out ψ_S as in the semiring case. This is indeed the case for the instances of FAQ that were reduced from QCQ and #QCQ as shown in Example A.20 and Example 1.3. Motivated by those two examples, we define the following concept.

Definition 5.3 (Idempotent product aggregate)**.** An aggregate $\oplus^{(k)}$ is called an *idempotent product aggregate* (with respect to the input variable ordering σ) if it is a product aggregate in which for all $S \in \mathcal{E}_k - \partial(k)$, the (intermediate) factor ψ_S has as its range the idempotent elements of the operator $\otimes$. In particular, if $\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) \in \{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}\}$ for all $S \in \mathcal{E}_k - \partial(k)$, then $\oplus^{(k)}$ is an idempotent product aggregate whenever $\oplus^{(k)} = \otimes$.

Note again that for the FAQ instances which are constructed from the reductions from QCQ and #QCQ, *all* product aggregates are idempotent. In such a case, we can rewrite (9) as

$$\varphi(\mathbf{x}_{[f]}) = \bigoplus_{x_{f+1}}^{(f+1)} \cdots \bigoplus_{x_n}^{(n-1)} \bigotimes_{S \notin \partial(n)} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) \otimes \big(\bigotimes_{S \in \partial(n)} \underbrace{\bigotimes_{x_n} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)}_{\psi'_{S-\{n\}}}\big).$$

Now, consider the factors $\psi'_{S-\{n\}}$ for $S \in \partial(n)$ in (9). Each factor $\psi'_{S-\{n\}}$ can be thought of as a "product marginalization" of the factor ψ_S, where we "marginalize out" the X_n variable.

To summarize, in Case 2 we can compute each one of the new factors ψ'_S and $\psi'_{S-\{n\}}$ in (9) individually. Therefore we do not have to solve the costly intermediate FAQ-SS instance $\psi'_{U_n-\{n\}}$ given by (8) as was done in Case 1.

5.2.3 Output representation. Let $\mathcal{H}_f = (\mathcal{V}_f = [f], \mathcal{E}_f)$ denote the hypergraph of the FAQ instance resulting from eliminating all bound variables $X_n, \ldots, X_{f+1}$, as described in Definition 5.2. With some abuse of notation, let $\psi_S, S \in \mathcal{E}_f$ denote the set of input factors to the $\mathcal{H}_f$ instance. The output to FAQ is now the expression

$$\varphi(\mathbf{x}_{[f]}) = \bigotimes_{S \in \mathcal{E}_f} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S), \tag{10}$$

which is an FAQ instance with *all* free variables. We can compute the output directly by running OutsideIn on (10). However, we can achieve a better runtime if we first compute the output in the *factorized representation* (see Olteanu and Závodný [73]) and then report it (i.e. convert it to the listing representation).

In particular, to achieve the better runtime, we start with eliminating the free variables $X_f, X_{f-1}, \ldots, X_1$. To that end, we define the following **01**-OR operator over the domain of $\{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}\}$.

Definition 5.4 (01-OR). Given $a, b \in \{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}\}$, define the **01**-*OR* of a and b, denoted by $a \,\textcircled{\scriptsize 01}\, b$, as follows.

$$a \,\textcircled{\scriptsize 01}\, b := \begin{cases} \mathbf{0} & \text{if } a = b = \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{1} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Clearly $(\{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}\}, \textcircled{\scriptsize 01}, \otimes)$ is a commutative semiring. Using this semiring, we define the following FAQ-SS query that doesn't have any free variables and has a value that belongs to $\{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}\}$:

$$\overline{\varphi}() = \bigcirc\!\!\!

Finally, we report the output by running OutsideIn on the following expression instead of (10)

$$\varphi(\mathbf{x}_{[f]}) = \left(\bigotimes_{S\in\mathcal{E}_f} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)\right) \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{k\in[f]} \psi_{U_k}(\mathbf{x}_{U_k})\right). \tag{13}$$

The fact that (13) defines exactly the same function as (10) follows from the following trivial observation: for every fixed tuple $\mathbf{x}_{[f]}$, $\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) \neq \mathbf{0}$ for all $S \in \mathcal{E}_f$ implies $\psi_{S/S}(\mathbf{x}_S) = \mathbf{1}$ for all $S \in \mathcal{E}_f$, which in turns implies $\psi_{U_k}(\mathbf{x}_{U_k}) = \mathbf{1}$, for all $k \in [f]$.

Eliminating free variables and then recovering them back by (13) are equivalent to the two phases of the Yannakakis algorithm [90]. Our implementation of InsideOut in LogicBlox follows the elimination/recovery method. The reason OutsideIn is faster on (13) than on (10) is that the factors ψ_{U_k} help filter out potential tuples $\mathbf{x}_{[f]}$ for which $\varphi(\mathbf{x}_{[f]}) = \mathbf{0}$. We will see in the analysis below the effect of this idea in the overall runtime. The entire algorithm is sketched out in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 InsideOut for FAQ

Require: Hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V} = [n], \mathcal{E})$, factors ψ_S, $S \in \mathcal{E}$, set $F = [f]$ of free variables
Require: FAQ query φ in the form (1)

$\mathcal{E}_n \leftarrow \mathcal{E}$
for ($k \leftarrow n$ **downto** 1) **do**
  $\partial(k) \leftarrow \{S \in \mathcal{E}_k \mid k \in S\}$
  if ($k > f$ and $(\mathbf{D}, \oplus^{(k)}, \otimes)$ is a semiring) or ($k \leq f$) **then**
    $U_k \leftarrow \bigcup_{S\in\partial(k)} S$
    if $k > f$ **then**
      $\psi_{U_k - \{k\}}(\mathbf{x}_{U_k-\{k\}}) = \bigoplus_{x_k}^{(k)} \left(\bigotimes_{S\in\partial(k)} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)\right) \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{\substack{S\in\mathcal{E}_k-\partial(k),\\ S\cap U_k\neq\emptyset}} \psi_{S/U_k}(\mathbf{x}_{S\cap U_k})\right)$
    else
      $\psi_{U_k}(\mathbf{x}_{U_k}) = \bigotimes_{\substack{S\in\mathcal{E}_k,\\ S\cap U_k\neq\emptyset}} \psi_{S/U_k}(\mathbf{x}_{S\cap U_k})$
      $\psi_{U_k-\{k\}}(\mathbf{x}_{U_k-\{k\}}) = \bigoplus_{x_k}^{(\mathbf{01})} \psi_{U_k}(\mathbf{x}_{U_k})$
    $\mathcal{E}_{k-1} \leftarrow (\mathcal{E}_k - \partial(k)) \cup \{U_k - \{k\}\}$
  else
    for each $S \in \partial(k)$ **do**
      Compute the product marginalization factors $\psi_{S-\{k\}}(\mathbf{x}_{S-\{k\}}) = \bigotimes_{x_k} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)$
    for each $S \in \mathcal{E}_k - \partial(k)$ **do**
      if Range of ψ_S is **not** idempotent wrt $\otimes$ **then**
        $\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) = \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)^{|\mathrm{Dom}(X_k)|}$, for all $\mathbf{x}_S$ where $\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)$ is not $\otimes$-idempotent
    $\mathcal{E}_{k-1} \leftarrow (\mathcal{E}_k - \partial(k)) \cup \{S - \{k\} \mid S \in \partial(k)\}$
Output φ by running OutsideIn on FAQ-expression (13)

5.3 Analysis

From notations introduced in Definition 5.2, and recalling the AGM-bound definition (4), the following is the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 5.5. *Suppose φ is an* FAQ *query whose hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ has n vertices and m hyperedges. Let $N := \max_{S\in\mathcal{E}} \|\psi_S\|$. Define*

$$K := [f] \cup \left\{k \in [n] - [f] \mid \oplus^{(k)} \neq \otimes\right\}. \tag{14}$$

For each $k \in [n] - K$, $S \in \mathcal{E}_k - \partial(k)$, define

$$\mathsf{Idem}_k(\psi_S) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if the range of } \psi_S \text{ is idempotent w.r.t. } \otimes \\ 2^{\lceil \log_2 |\mathsf{Dom}(X_k)| \rceil} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, the InsideOut *algorithm (Algorithm 1) computes φ in time*

$$O\Bigg(n^2 \cdot m + \sum_{k\in K} |U_k|^2 \cdot |\{S \in \mathcal{E}_k : S \cap U_k \neq \emptyset\}| \cdot \log N \cdot \mathsf{AGM}_{\mathcal{H}_k}(U_k) + \sum_{\substack{k\in[n]-K \\ S\in\partial(k)}} |S| \cdot \|\psi_S\| + \sum_{\substack{k\in[n]-K \\ S\in\mathcal{E}_k-\partial(k)}} |S| \cdot \mathsf{Idem}_k(\psi_S) \cdot \|\psi_S\| + f^2 \cdot (f+m) \cdot \log N \cdot \|\varphi\|\Bigg). \tag{15}$$

Proof. The runtime of InsideOut is the sum of the runtimes of n variable elimination steps plus the time needed to report the output at the end. For each $k = n, ..., 1$, we need $O(n \cdot m)$ time to compute $\partial(k)$ and U_k (when $k \in K$) in a naive way, thus we have a data-independent term of $O(n^2 \cdot m)$ in the runtime expression. Moreover, for each $k = n, ..., 1$, the (data-dependent) cost of the kth-elimination step depends on whether the kth variable aggregate is a product aggregate or not:

- If $k > f$ and $\oplus^{(k)} = \otimes$ (i.e. if $k \in [n]-K$), then the runtime is the total time needed to compute the intermediate factors shown in (9). Based on the discussion of Case 2 in Section 5.2.2, each factor ψ'_S for $S \in \mathcal{E}_k - \partial(k)$ can be computed in time $O(|S| \cdot \mathsf{Idem}_k(\psi_S) \cdot \|\psi_S\|)$, whereas each factor $\psi'_{S-\{k\}}$ for $S \in \partial(k)$ can be computed in time $O(|S| \cdot \|\psi_S\|)$.
- If $k \in [K]$, then the runtime is dominated by the OutsideIn algorithm's runtime to compute the intermediate factor $\psi_{U_k-\{k\}}$. From Theorem 5.1, this runtime is bounded by

  $$O\left(|U_k| \cdot |\{S \in \mathcal{E}_k : S \cap U_k \neq \emptyset\}| \cdot \log N_k \cdot \mathsf{AGM}_{\mathcal{H}_k}(U_k)\right),$$

  where $N_k := \max\left\{\|\psi_{S/U_k}\| \mid S \in \mathcal{E}_k, S \cap U_k \neq \emptyset\right\}$. We can naively bound N_k by $N^{|U_k|}$.

The final invocation of OutsideIn on (13) reports the output (in listing representation) in linear time (modulo a log factor) in $\|\varphi\|$, just like the output phase of Yannakakis algorithm [90]. This is because the participations of the factors ψ_{U_k}, $k \in [f]$ in the formula ensures that every binding of the backtracking search algorithm is part of an output tuple. In particular, this final invocation of OutsideIn involves f variables and at most $f + m$ factors (specifically f factors ψ_{U_k} for $k \in [f]$ and at most m factors ψ_S for $S \in \mathcal{E}_f$). Therefore, it runs in time $O(f \cdot (f+m) \cdot (\log \|\varphi\|) \cdot \|\varphi\|)$. We can naively bound $\log \|\varphi\|$ by $f \log N$. □

In the above discussion and analysis of InsideOut, we eliminated the variables $X_n, X_{n-1}, \ldots, X_1$ in the order given by the input FAQ-expression (1). However, as Example 5.6 shows, there is no reason to force InsideOut to follow this particular order. In particular, there might be a different variable ordering for which the overall runtime of InsideOut is *a lot* smaller and the algorithm still works correctly on that ordering.

Example 5.6 (Effect of variable ordering on runtime)**.** We illustrate InsideOut and the effect of different variable orderings on the runtime of InsideOut with an example. Consider the following FAQ query (without free variables).

$$\varphi = \max_{x_1} \max_{x_2} \prod_{x_3} \sum_{x_4} \max_{x_5} \max_{x_6} \psi_{\{1,5\}} \psi_{\{2,5\}} \psi_{\{1,3,4\}} \psi_{\{2,3,6\}}.$$

Here, the support of each factor determines the variables so we do not write down the parameters of each factor for the sake of brevity. Also, in this example we consider $\mathbf{D} = \mathbb{R}_+$ and every input factor has range $\mathbf{D}$. Now, a straightforward run of the InsideOut algorithm (Algorithm 1) using the variable ordering $(X_1, \ldots, X_6)$ evaluates the above expression as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi &= \max_{x_1} \max_{x_2} \prod_{x_3} \sum_{x_4} \max_{x_5} \max_{x_6} \psi_{\{1,5\}} \psi_{\{2,5\}} \psi_{\{1,3,4\}} \psi_{\{2,3,6\}} \\
\text{(re-write)} &= \max_{x_1} \max_{x_2} \prod_{x_3} \sum_{x_4} \max_{x_5} \psi_{\{1,5\}} \psi_{\{2,5\}} \psi_{\{1,3,4\}} \max_{x_6} \psi_{\{2,3,6\}} \\
\text{(spent } O(N)\text{-time)} &= \max_{x_1} \max_{x_2} \prod_{x_3} \sum_{x_4} \max_{x_5} \psi_{\{1,5\}} \psi_{\{2,5\}} \psi_{\{1,3,4\}} \psi_{\{2,3\}} \\
\text{(re-write)} &= \max_{x_1} \max_{x_2} \prod_{x_3} \sum_{x_4} \psi_{\{1,3,4\}} \psi_{\{2,3\}} \max_{x_5} \psi_{\{1,5\}} \psi_{\{2,5\}} \\
\text{(spent } O(N^2)\text{-time)} &= \max_{x_1} \max_{x_2} \prod_{x_3} \sum_{x_4} \psi_{\{1,3,4\}} \psi_{\{2,3\}} \psi_{\{1,2\}} \\
\text{(re-write)} &= \max_{x_1} \max_{x_2} \prod_{x_3} \psi_{\{2,3\}} \psi_{\{1,2\}} \sum_{x_4} \psi_{\{1,3,4\}} \\
\text{(spent } O(N)\text{-time)} &= \max_{x_1} \max_{x_2} \prod_{x_3} \psi_{\{2,3\}} \psi_{\{1,2\}} \psi_{\{1,3\}} \\
\text{(re-write)} &= \max_{x_1} \max_{x_2} \left(\prod_{x_3} \psi_{\{2,3\}} \right) \left(\prod_{x_3} \psi_{\{1,2\}} \right) \left(\prod_{x_3} \psi_{\{1,3\}} \right) \\
\text{(spent } \tilde{O}(N^2)\text{-time)} &= \max_{x_1} \max_{x_2} \psi_{\{2\}} \bar{\psi}_{\{1,2\}} \psi_{\{1\}} \\
\text{(re-write)} &= \max_{x_1} \psi_{\{1\}} \max_{x_2} \psi_{\{2\}} \bar{\psi}_{\{1,2\}} \\
\text{(spent } O(N^2)\text{-time)} &= \max_{x_1} \psi_{\{1\}} \bar{\psi}_{\{1\}} \\
\text{(spent } O(N)\text{-time)} &= \psi_{\emptyset}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\bar{\psi}_{\{1,2\}}(x_1, x_2) = \psi_{\{1,2\}}(x_1, x_2)^{|\mathrm{Dom}(X_3)|}$, for every (x_1, x_2). Because $\psi_{\{1,2\}} := \max_{x_5} \psi_{\{1,5\}} \psi_{\{2,5\}}$, there can be up to N^2 non-zero entries in $\psi_{\{1,2\}}$. Each one of those entries can be raised to a power of $|\mathrm{Dom}(X_3)|$ by repeated squaring using $O(\log N)$ multiplications for a total time of $O(N^2 \log N) = \tilde{O}(N^2)$. The overall runtime of the algorithm is thus $\tilde{O}(N^2)$.

Next, let us see how a slight change in the assumption of the input factors allows us to conclude that the aggregate on X_3 is an idempotent product aggregate, and that allows for a *different variable ordering* to be equivalent to the

original variable ordering, and that helps reduce the overall runtime of InsideOut. Suppose we knew that all input factors have range $\{0,1\}$. Then, we can evaluate the query as follows.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varphi &= \max_{x_1}\max_{x_2}\prod_{x_3}\sum_{x_4}\max_{x_5}\max_{x_6}\psi_{\{1,5\}}\psi_{\{2,5\}}\psi_{\{1,3,4\}}\psi_{\{2,3,6\}} \\
\text{(re-write)} &= \max_{x_1}\max_{x_2}\prod_{x_3}\sum_{x_4}\max_{x_5}\psi_{\{1,5\}}\psi_{\{2,5\}}\psi_{\{1,3,4\}}\max_{x_6}\psi_{\{2,3,6\}} \\
\text{(spent } O(N)\text{-time)} &= \max_{x_1}\max_{x_2}\prod_{x_3}\sum_{x_4}\max_{x_5}\psi_{\{1,5\}}\psi_{\{2,5\}}\psi_{\{1,3,4\}}\psi_{\{2,3\}} \\
\text{(re-write)} &= \max_{x_1}\max_{x_2}\prod_{x_3}\sum_{x_4}\psi_{\{1,3,4\}}\psi_{\{2,3\}}(\max_{x_5}\psi_{\{1,5\}}\psi_{\{2,5\}}) \\
\text{(re-write)} &= \max_{x_1}\max_{x_2}\prod_{x_3}\psi_{\{2,3\}}(\max_{x_5}\psi_{\{1,5\}}\psi_{\{2,5\}})\sum_{x_4}\psi_{\{1,3,4\}} \\
\text{(spent } O(N)\text{-time)} &= \max_{x_1}\max_{x_2}\prod_{x_3}\psi_{\{2,3\}}(\max_{x_5}\psi_{\{1,5\}}\psi_{\{2,5\}})\psi_{\{1,3\}} \\
\text{(re-write)} &= \max_{x_1}\max_{x_2}\left(\prod_{x_3}\psi_{\{2,3\}}\right)\left(\prod_{x_3}(\max_{x_5}\psi_{\{1,5\}}\psi_{\{2,5\}})\right)\left(\prod_{x_3}\psi_{\{1,3\}}\right) \\
\text{(}\times\text{ is acting idempotently)} &= \max_{x_1}\max_{x_2}\left(\prod_{x_3}\psi_{\{2,3\}}\right)\left(\max_{x_5}\psi_{\{1,5\}}\psi_{\{2,5\}}\right)\left(\prod_{x_3}\psi_{\{1,3\}}\right) \\
\text{(spent } O(N)\text{-time)} &= \max_{x_1}\max_{x_2}\psi_{\{2\}}\left(\max_{x_5}\psi_{\{1,5\}}\psi_{\{2,5\}}\right)\psi_{\{1\}} \\
\text{(re-arrange)} &= \max_{x_1}\max_{x_2}\max_{x_5}\psi_{\{2\}}\psi_{\{1,5\}}\psi_{\{2,5\}}\psi_{\{1\}} \\
\text{(a } \textbf{crucial re-arrangement}\text{)} &= \max_{x_5}\max_{x_1}\max_{x_2}\psi_{\{2\}}\psi_{\{1,5\}}\psi_{\{2,5\}}\psi_{\{1\}} \\
\text{(re-arrange)} &= \max_{x_5}\max_{x_1}\psi_{\{1,5\}}\psi_{\{1\}}\max_{x_2}\psi_{\{2\}}\psi_{\{2,5\}} \\
\text{(spent } O(N)\text{-time)} &= \max_{x_5}\max_{x_1}\psi_{\{1,5\}}\psi_{\{1\}}\psi_{\{5\}} \\
\text{(re-arrange)} &= \max_{x_5}\psi_{\{5\}}\max_{x_1}\psi_{\{1,5\}}\psi_{\{1\}} \\
\text{(spent } O(N)\text{-time)} &= \max_{x_5}\psi_{\{5\}}\bar{\psi}_{\{5\}} \\
\text{(spent } O(N)\text{-time)} &= \psi_{\emptyset}
\end{aligned}
$$

So in this case the fact that all factors inside the scope of $\times$ have ranges which are $\{0,1\}$, the idempotent elements of $\times$, we are able to reduce the runtime down to $O(N)$. The key is, if we ran InsideOut with the variable ordering $(X_5, X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_6)$ then we would have achieved a runtime of $O(N)$.

The main technical contributions of this paper lie in answering the following two questions:

(1) How do we know which variable orderings are equivalent to the original FAQ-query expression?
(2) How do we find the "best" variable ordering among all equivalent variable orderings in an efficient way (better than brute-force search)?

The next sections formalize the above two questions.

5.4 Equivalent variable orderings

We first formalize the concept of "equivalent variable ordering":

Definition 5.7 (EVO(φ))**.** Let φ be an FAQ-query written in the form (1) of Section 1.2. A *φ-equivalent variable ordering* is a vertex ordering $\sigma = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ of the hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ satisfying the following conditions:

(a) The set $\{v_1, \ldots, v_f\}$ is exactly $F = [f]$. In other words, in the φ-equivalent variable ordering, the free variables come first (in any order).

(b) The function φ' defined by

$$\varphi'(\mathbf{x}_F) := \bigoplus_{x_{v_{f+1}}}^{(v_{f+1})} \cdots \bigoplus_{x_{v_n}}^{(v_n)} \bigotimes_{S \in \mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)$$

is identical to the function φ no matter what the input factors are.[9]

Let EVO(φ) denote the set of all φ-equivalent variable orderings.

In many applications, we know a specific class of input factors that are allowed in the corresponding FAQ problem. For example, in logic applications the input factors are often $\{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}\}$-valued functions. This motivates a stronger definition of EVO.

Definition 5.8 (EVO($\varphi, \mathcal{F}$))**.** Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a class of functions with range $\mathbf{D}$. Let EVO($\varphi, \mathcal{F}$) denote the set of all φ-equivalent variable orderings under the promise that all input factors come from $\mathcal{F}$. In other words, the definition of EVO($\varphi, \mathcal{F}$) is the same as that in Definition 5.7, except that we only require φ' to be the same as φ for all input factors belonging to $\mathcal{F}$.

5.5 FAQ-width of a variable ordering

We now address the second question of what it means to be the "best" variable ordering. With respect to the analysis of InsideOut in Theorem 5.5, naturally the "best" variable ordering is a variable ordering in EVO(φ) which minimizes the runtime (15). The EVO constraint makes it trickier to find an optimal variable ordering for the general FAQ problem, as opposed to the typical variable elimination in the graphical model, matrix computation, and constraint satisfaction domains where all variable orderings are in EVO(φ). To illustrate this point, Section E in the appendix presents two examples (namely MCM and DFT) where minimizing (15) is easy. These examples explain two entries in the summary Table 1.

In general, however, without knowing a bit more about the structure of the problem it is hard(er) to derive a general result on how to find a variable ordering to minimize (15). In particular, in these examples we have been lucky that every permutation of the variable aggregates yields an expression that is equivalent to the original FAQ expression (1). This is because in these examples there is only *one* variable aggregate which is the + operator. The second thing that helps with these examples is that we know (a good estimate of) the sizes of the indicator projections; so we can plug them in expression (15). In general, these sizes are highly instance-dependent.

Minimizing (15) is a bit unwieldy, thus we slightly relax the runtime analysis of InsideOut to obtain a better behaved expression than that in (15).

[9] Here, we assume that the variable domains, the range $\mathbf{D}$, and the aggregates are fixed and known in advance, but the input factors are not.

Proposition 5.9. *Following notations defined in Theorem 5.5 and the notion of $\rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}$ from Section 4.2, the* InsideOut *algorithm (Algorithm 1) computes φ in time*

$$O\left(n^3 \cdot m \cdot \log N \cdot N^{\max_{j\in K} \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U_j)} + f^2 \cdot (f+m) \cdot \log N \cdot \|\varphi\|\right) \tag{16}$$

Proof. For the sake of brevity, define $w = \max_{j\in K} \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U_j)$. We use the same analysis as that in the proof of Theorem 5.5. However, we further bound $\|\psi_S\|$ by N^w and also replace all the $\mathsf{AGM}_{\mathcal{H}_k}(U_k)$ terms by N^w. Note that every factor ψ_S is either an input factor ($S \in \mathcal{E}$) or an intermediate factor ($S = U_k - \{k\}$ for some k).

- If ψ_S was an input factor then $\|\psi_S\| \le N \le N^w$ because $w \ge 1$. If ψ_S is an intermediate factor ($S = U_k - \{k\}$), then with exactly the same reasoning as in the proof of Theorem 5.1, $\|\psi_S\|$ can be bounded by $\mathsf{AGM}_{\mathcal{H}}(U_k)$ which is upperbounded by N^w.
- Next, for $k \in K$, we show that the computation time of $\psi_{U_k - \{k\}}$ using OutsideIn can be bounded by $O(n^2 \cdot m \cdot \log N \cdot \mathsf{AGM}_{\mathcal{H}}(U_k))$ instead of $O(n^2 \cdot m \cdot \log N \cdot \mathsf{AGM}_{\mathcal{H}_k}(U_k))$.[10] Since $\mathsf{AGM}_{\mathcal{H}}(U_k) \le N^w$, we would be done. This simple but subtle fact is best explained using the language of database join. For each $k \in [n]$ and $S \in \mathcal{E}_k$, define a relation
$$R(\psi_S) := \{\mathbf{x}_S \mid \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) \neq \mathbf{0}\}.$$
The runtime of OutsideIn computing $\psi_{U_k - \{k\}}$ is precisely the same runtime when we use a worst-case optimal join algorithm to compute the natural join
$$Q = \bowtie_{\substack{S\in\mathcal{E}_k \\ S\cap U_k \neq \emptyset}} R(\psi_{S/U_k}).$$
The runtime bound $\mathsf{AGM}_{\mathcal{H}_k}(U_k)$ is a bound on the maximum number of possible output tuples of Q. Now, consider the query
$$Q' = \bowtie_{\substack{S\in\mathcal{E} \\ S\cap U_k \neq \emptyset}} R(\psi_{S/U_k}).$$
Then, it is easy to see that $Q \subseteq Q'$, and thus the maximum number of output tuples of Q is bounded by the maximum number of output tuples of Q', which is $\mathsf{AGM}_{\mathcal{H}}(U_k)$.

□

In addition to the term $\|\varphi\|$ required to report the output, the key parameter that controls the complexity of the algorithm is the quantity $\max_{j\in K}\left\{\rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U_j)\right\}$. This quantity is a function of the variable ordering $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ we chose to write the input query φ on. As aforementioned, there might be multiple ways of writing the same FAQ query, leading to wildly different runtimes for InsideOut. We have seen this effect in Example 5.6, and have formalized what an "equivalent ordering" means in the previous section. The following definition follows naturally:

Definition 5.10 (Fractional FAQ-width of a variable ordering)**.** Let σ be a φ-equivalent variable ordering. Define the sequence of hypergraphs $\mathcal{H}^\sigma_k$ along with the sets U^σ_k as in Definition 5.2 (but with respect to σ). The *fractional* FAQ *width* of a variable ordering σ is the quantity

$$\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma) := \max_{j\in K}\left\{\rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U^\sigma_j)\right\}. \tag{17}$$

[10] Note that the bound $\mathsf{AGM}_{\mathcal{H}_k}(U_k)$ is computed from the best fractional edge cover of U_k using hyperedges $\mathcal{E}_k$, which – compared to $\mathcal{E}$ – has additional intermediate hyperedges/relations and also lack hyperedges/relations from $\mathcal{E}$ which belong to $\partial(j)$ for $j > k$.

(Recall the Definition of K from (14). Recall also from Section 1.2 that we are only interested in FAQ queries for which there is at least one semiring aggregate. Therefore K in the above definition cannot be empty.)

From the above definition, we can interpret Proposition 5.9 as basically saying that InsideOut runs in time $\tilde{O}(N^{\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma)} + \|\varphi\|)$, where $\tilde{O}$ hides a factor that is polynomial in query size and logarithmic in data size.

In the next few sections, we study the main problem of how to select a φ-equivalent variable ordering σ with the minimum $\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma)$.

Definition 5.11 ($\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi)$)**.** The following quantity is called the FAQ-*width* of an FAQ-query φ:

$$\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi) := \min\{\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma) \mid \sigma \in \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)\}$$

Definition 5.12 ($\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi, \mathcal{F})$)**.** Given an FAQ-query φ and a class $\mathcal{F}$ of functions with range $\mathbf{D}$, let $\mathsf{EVO}(\varphi, \mathcal{F})$ be defined as in Definition 5.8. The FAQ-width of φ w.r.t. the class $\mathcal{F}$ of input functions is defined as follows:

$$\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi, \mathcal{F}) := \min\{\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma) \mid \sigma \in \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi, \mathcal{F})\}$$

In some cases, $\mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)$ consists of all $n!$ permutations, making it "easy" to solve the above optimization problem. Appendix F.1 presents several immediate consequences of this easy case. In particular, faqw generalizes fractional hypertree widths (fhtw, see [48]), because the following follows directly from Corollary 4.13:

Proposition 5.13. *Let φ be an* FAQ *query with hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$. If $\mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)$ contains all $n!$ variable orderings, then* $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi) = \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H})$.

In general, however, the question of determining whether a given variable ordering σ belongs to $\mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)$ is a tricky question to answer formally. In particular, the answer depends on what exactly we meant by a variable aggregate, a factor aggregate, the variable domain sizes, and the range $\mathbf{D}$. This difficulty is analogous to the situation in logic when one wants to decide whether two (first-order, e.g.) formulas of specific forms are logically equivalent [18][11].

Our approach to solving this problem was outlined in Figure 1, and is summarized again as follows.

- We define a class of variable orderings for a given input FAQ-query φ. This class will be precisely the set of linear extensions $\mathsf{LinEx}(P)$ of a partially ordered set (poset) on variables called the *precedence poset* P. The precedence poset is defined on a tree called the *expression tree* of the input query φ. The expression tree can be constructed in polynomial time in query complexity.
- We show that every variable ordering in $\mathsf{LinEx}(P)$ is φ-equivalent. This is the "soundness" of $\mathsf{LinEx}(P)$.
- We define a combinatorial notion called *component-wise equivalence*, which is a relation between pairs of variable orderings. We show that component-wise equivalence preserves EVO-membership *and* preserves faqw.
- We show that every variable ordering in EVO is component-wise equivalent to some ordering in $\mathsf{LinEx}(P)$. This is called "strong completeness" of $\mathsf{LinEx}(P)$. In particular, by tracing component-wise equivalent variable orderings starting from $\mathsf{LinEx}(P)$, one can list *all* of EVO in exponential time and find the ordering that minimizes faqw. (Moreover, by directly applying the definition of component-wise equivalence, we can check whether a given variable ordering is in EVO in polynomial time.)

[11] We thank Balder ten Cate for pointing out to us the essence of the difficulty and the reference.

- However, we can do better. We prove that $\mathsf{LinEx}(P)$ variable orderings is all we need to consider, because every φ-equivalent variable ordering σ either belongs to $\mathsf{LinEx}(P)$ or $\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma) = \mathsf{faqw}(\pi)$ for some $\pi \in \mathsf{LinEx}(P)$. This shows the "completeness" of $\mathsf{LinEx}(P)$ as far as the width is concerned.

The completeness result rests on the assumption that different variable aggregates do not commute. (Even this simple statement needs clarification, which is done in Proposition 6.6.) Because the final result is a bit technically involved, we present our results incrementally in several stages, by relaxing one assumption at a time. Each time an assumption is relaxed, a couple of ideas are introduced to deal with the relaxation. It should be noted, however, that in the end there is only one theorem and one algorithm.

In Appendix F.1 we describe the above steps when applied to FAQ-SS without free variables (i.e. SumProd), which is the case when determining $\mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)$ is trivial. Appendix F.2 covers a simple but non-trivial case when φ has two blocks of semiring aggregates. The reader who would like to read at a slower pace can start with those two sections in the appendix, where we also connect our results to known results in PGM, joins, Yannakakis algorithm, and #CQ.

In Section 6.1, we present our solution for the case when there is an arbitrary number of semiring aggregates but no product aggregates. This is when the idea of an expression tree is introduced. Finally, in Sections 6.2 and 6.3 we cover the most general cases.

6 CHARACTERIZING EQUIVALENT VARIABLE ORDERINGS

6.1 FAQ with only semiring aggregates

This section presents the characterization of EVO results for FAQ where every variable aggregate forms a semiring with the product aggregate. (Note that there can be an arbitrary number of different types of semirings.) In particular, we consider the FAQ-query of the form

$$\varphi(\mathbf{x}_{[f]}) = \bigoplus_{x_{f+1}}^{(f+1)} \cdots \bigoplus_{x_n}^{(n)} \bigotimes_{S \in \mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) \tag{18}$$

where $(\mathbf{D}, \oplus^{(i)}, \otimes)$ is a commutative semiring for every $i > f$ (i.e. the set K as defined in (14) is $[n]$).

The main aim in this section is to illustrate the key technical idea of the *expression tree*. The expression tree defines the *precedence poset*. One key component of our completeness results is the notion of *component-wise equivalence* between two variable orderings. Component-wise equivalence preserves FAQ-width and φ-equivalence. We will show two important facts about the precedence poset:

- (Soundness) Every linear extension of the precedence poset is a φ-equivalent variable ordering.
- (Completeness) Every φ-equivalent variable ordering is component-wise equivalent to (hence has the same FAQ-width as) some linear extension of the precedence poset. Therefore, $\mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)$ is *completely* characterized using component-wise equivalence and the precedence poset. Moreover, to compute/approximate $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi)$, we *only* need to consider linear extensions of the precedence poset.

In Section 7, we will use the structure of the expression tree to compute a variable ordering to approximate $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi)$, using an approximation algorithm for fhtw as a blackbox. Thus, the expression tree is crucial in guiding the construction of a good variable ordering.

6.1.1 Expression tree and precedence poset. The expression tree is defined on a sequence of *tagged variables* along with a hypergraph. In such a sequence, every vertex i (or equivalently variable X_i) is tagged with its corresponding operator $\oplus^{(i)}$; or, if the variable is a free variable then its tag is *free*. Given a sequence σ of tagged variables, a *tag block*

is a maximal subsequence of consecutive variables in σ with the same tag. The first tag block of a sequence σ of tagged variables is the longest prefix of σ consisting of variables of the same tag.

Definition 6.1 (Expression tree)**.** The *expression tree* for φ is a rooted tree P. Every node of the tree is a set of variables. We construct the expression tree using two steps: the *compartmentalization step* and the *compression step*. In the compartmentalization step, we construct the expression tree based on the connected component structures of the FAQ-query relative to the hypergraph structure $\mathcal{H}$. In the compression step we collapse the tree to make it shorter whenever possible.

Compartmentalization. In this step, initially we start off with the sequence of variables with their corresponding tags exactly as written in (18). In particular, the sequence starts with f free variables (whose tags are 'free'), and then the i'th variable with tag $\oplus^{(i)}$ for $i = f+1, \ldots, n$. For technical reasons, we add a dummy variable X_0 to the beginning of the sequence with a free tag too. So the sequence we start off with is the following

$$\sigma = \left\langle (X_0, \text{'free'}), \ldots, (X_f, \text{'free'}), (X_{f+1}, \oplus^{(f+1)}), \ldots, (X_n, \oplus^{(n)}) \right\rangle.$$

The vertex X_0 is an isolated vertex of the hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$. Now given a tagged variable sequence σ and a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$, we build the tree by constructing a node L containing all variables in the first tag block L of σ, and node L has a tag which is the same tag as that of its variables. This node L will be the root of the expression tree. (The effect of the dummy variable X_0 is that, even if the original query has no free variable, the first block L still has X_0 in it.) If L contains all variables already, then naturally the tree has only one node. Otherwise, for each connected component $C = (\mathcal{V}(C), \mathcal{E}(C))$ of $\mathcal{H} - L$ we construct a sequence σ_C of tagged variables by listing all variables in $\mathcal{V}(C)$ in exactly the same relative order as they appeared in σ. From the sequence σ_C and the hypergraph C, we recursively construct the expression tree P_C. Finally, we connect all the roots of (sub)expression trees P_C to the node L. This completes the compartmentalization step. After everything is done, we also remove the dummy variable X_0 from the expression tree P. If originally there was no free variable, the tree has an empty root node and the subtrees correspond to the connected components of $\mathcal{H}$. (See Example 6.2 and Figure 2.)


Compression. Now, in the expression tree P that resulted from the compartmentalization step, as long as there is still a node L whose tag is the same as a child node L' of the tree P, we merge the child into L; namely, we set $L := L \cup L'$, remove L', and connect all subtrees under L' to become subtrees of L. Repeat this step until no further merging is possible. (See Figure 3.)

Note that the compression step can make some nodes L larger and the final tree T shorter than the tree that resulted from the compartmentalization step alone. This step is crucial for getting the correct expression tree. If φ is an instance of FAQ-SS, then P is a tree of depth ≤ 1 where the root node contains all free variables (if any) and its children (if any) contain the rest of the variables.


Example 6.2 (Intuition behind expression tree)**.** Consider the following FAQ query that has two different semiring aggregates ($\sum$ and max) and no free variables:

$$\varphi = \sum_{x_1} \sum_{x_2} \max_{x_3} \sum_{x_4} \sum_{x_5} \max_{x_6} \max_{x_7} \psi_{12}\psi_{135}\psi_{14}\psi_{246}\psi_{27}\psi_{37}.$$


(ψ_{12} above denotes a factor whose support is $\{X_1, X_2\}$, and so on.) The hypergraph of φ is depicted in Figure 2a. The compartmentalization step of the construction of the expression tree is depicted in Figures 2b through 2d. Figures 3a and 3b depict the compression step. The final expression tree appears on the right of Figure 3b.




(a) $\varphi = \sum_{x_1}\sum_{x_2}\max_{x_3}\sum_{x_4}\sum_{x_5}\max_{x_6}\max_{x_7}\psi_{12}\,\psi_{135}\,\psi_{14}\,\psi_{246}\,\psi_{27}\,\psi_{37}$



(b) $\varphi = \sum_{x_1}\sum_{x_2}\psi_{12}\left(\max_{x_3}\sum_{x_5}\max_{x_7}\psi_{135}\,\psi_{27}\,\psi_{37}\right)\left(\sum_{x_4}\max_{x_6}\psi_{14}\,\psi_{246}\right)$




(c) $\varphi = \sum_{x_1}\sum_{x_2}\psi_{12}\left(\max_{x_3}\sum_{x_5}\psi_{135}\max_{x_7}\psi_{27}\,\psi_{37}\right)\left(\sum_{x_4}\max_{x_6}\psi_{14}\,\psi_{246}\right)$




(d) $\varphi = \sum_{x_1}\sum_{x_2}\psi_{12}\left(\max_{x_3}\sum_{x_5}\psi_{135}\max_{x_7}\psi_{27}\,\psi_{37}\right)\left(\sum_{x_4}\psi_{14}\max_{x_6}\psi_{246}\right)$

Fig. 2. The compartmentalization step of the expression tree from Example 6.2, depicted using colors. (2a) depicts the hypergraph of the FAQ query: $\varphi = \sum_{x_1}\sum_{x_2}\max_{x_3}\sum_{x_4}\sum_{x_5}\max_{x_6}\max_{x_7}\psi_{12}\psi_{135}\psi_{14}\psi_{246}\psi_{27}\psi_{37}$. For simplicity, the dummy free variable X_0 is ignored in this example. (2b) shows the first part of the compartmentalization step, where the first tag block is $L = \{1, 2\}$. After removing L, the query breaks into two connected components: the red and the blue. The expression tree at this point appears on the right. Each color is used to denote correspondence between parts of the query expression, hypergraph, and expression tree having that color. (2c) shows how to apply compartmentalization recursively on the red component, while (2d) shows the blue component compartmentalization.



(a) $\varphi = \sum_{x_1} \sum_{x_2} \psi_{12} \left(\max_{x_3} \max_{x_7} \psi_{27}\, \psi_{37} \sum_{x_5} \psi_{135} \right) \left(\sum_{x_4} \psi_{14} \max_{x_6} \psi_{246} \right)$



(b) $\varphi = \sum_{x_1} \sum_{x_2} \sum_{x_4} \psi_{12}\, \psi_{14} \left(\max_{x_3} \max_{x_7} \psi_{27}\, \psi_{37} \sum_{x_5} \psi_{135} \right) \left(\max_{x_6} \psi_{246} \right)$

Fig. 3. The compression step of the expression tree from Example 6.2. Recall that Figure (2d) (right) depicted the expression tree at the end of the compartmentalization step. (3a) shows a compression where node $\{7\}$ is merged into its parent $\{3\}$ (since they both have the same tag "max"). (3b) shows another compression where $\{4\}$ is merged into $\{1, 2\}$. Since no further compression is possible, (3b) (right) depicts the final expression tree.

Definition 6.3 (Precedence poset)**.** The expression tree defines a partial order on the variables. Abusing notation we will also use P to denote the partial order $([n], \preceq)$. In this poset, for any pair $u, v \in [n]$, we write $u \preceq_P v$ if $u = v$ or u belongs to a strict ancestor of v in the expression poset P. In particular, different variables in the same node of the expression tree are not comparable in this partial order. We call this partial order the *precedence poset*. Let $\mathsf{LinEx}(P)$ denote the set of all linear extensions of the poset.

6.1.2 What makes two aggregates different? Before proving soundness and completeness, we need a small technical detour. Recall that aggregates are simply binary operators under $\mathbf{D}$.

Definition 6.4 (Different aggregates)**.** Two aggregates $\oplus$ and $\bar{\oplus}$ are *different* if there is a pair $a, b \in \mathbf{D}$ such that

$$a \oplus b \neq a \bar{\oplus} b.$$

Otherwise they are *identical*.

Definition 6.5 (Mutually commutative aggregates)**.** Two aggregates $\oplus$ and $\bar{\oplus}$ are said to be *mutually commutative* if for every $a, b, c, d \in \mathbf{D}$, we have $(a \oplus b) \bar{\oplus} (c \oplus d) = (a \bar{\oplus} c) \oplus (b \bar{\oplus} d)$.

Recall that in FAQ, all semirings share the same $\mathbf{0}$ (since one '$\mathbf{0}$' must annihilate the rest). Thus, if we select $a = d = \mathbf{0}$ in the above equality, then we obtain $b \bar{\oplus} c = b \oplus c$, for every $b, c \in \mathbf{D}$. This means

Proposition 6.6. *Any two aggregates are mutually commutative if and only if they are identical.*

(Note that it is possible for semantically different aggregates to be identical under $\mathbf{D}$ by accident. For example, in the $\{0,1\}$ domain min and $\times$ are identical.) In this paper, we assume that two different aggregates in the input FAQ-expression are not functionally identical. Recall that we also assumed $|\mathsf{Dom}(X_i)| \geq 2$ for every $i \in [n]$ (otherwise the aggregate on that X_i is trivial and can be ignored).

Proposition 6.7. *Suppose $\oplus$ and $\bar{\oplus}$ are different binary operators (under the domain $\mathbf{D}$), then for every $i, j \in [n]$, there is a function $\phi_{ij} : \mathsf{Dom}(X_i) \times \mathsf{Dom}(X_j) \to \mathbf{D}$ for which*

$$\bigoplus_{x_i \in \mathsf{Dom}(X_i)} \bar{\bigoplus_{x_j \in \mathsf{Dom}(X_j)}} \phi_{ij}(x_i, x_j) \neq \bar{\bigoplus_{x_j \in \mathsf{Dom}(X_j)}} \bigoplus_{x_i \in \mathsf{Dom}(X_i)} \phi_{ij}(x_i, x_j). \tag{19}$$

Proof. From the analysis above, the two operators do not commute. Hence, there are four members $a, b, c, d \in \mathbf{D}$ so that $(a \oplus b) \bar{\oplus} (c \oplus d) \neq (a \bar{\oplus} c) \oplus (b \bar{\oplus} d)$. Fix arbitrary elements $x_i^1 \neq x_i^2 \in \mathsf{Dom}(X_i)$ and $x_j^1 \neq x_j^2 \in \mathsf{Dom}(X_j)$. Define

$$\phi_{ij}(x_i, x_j) := \begin{cases} a & \text{if } (x_i, x_j) = (x_i^1, x_j^1) \\ b & \text{if } (x_i, x_j) = (x_i^2, x_j^1) \\ c & \text{if } (x_i, x_j) = (x_i^1, x_j^2) \\ d & \text{if } (x_i, x_j) = (x_i^2, x_j^2) \\ \mathbf{0} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{20}$$

Then, $\bigoplus_{x_i} \bar{\bigoplus_{x_j}} \phi_{ij}(x_i, x_j) = (a \bar{\oplus} c) \oplus (b \bar{\oplus} d) \neq (a \oplus b) \bar{\oplus} (c \oplus d) = \bar{\bigoplus_{x_j}} \bigoplus_{x_i} \phi_{ij}(x_i, x_j)$. □

Given $i, j \in [n]$, $x_i^1 \neq x_i^2 \in \mathsf{Dom}(X_i)$, $x_j^1 \neq x_j^2 \in \mathsf{Dom}(X_j)$, we define an 'identity' function $\phi_{ij}^{(\mathbf{I})} : \mathsf{Dom}(X_i) \times \mathsf{Dom}(X_j) \to \mathbf{D}$ as follows.

$$\phi_{ij}^{(\mathbf{I})}(x_i, x_j) := \begin{cases} \mathbf{1} & \text{if } (x_i, x_j) = (x_i^1, x_j^1) \text{ or } (x_i, x_j) = (x_i^2, x_j^2) \\ \mathbf{0} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{21}$$

We will use both ϕ_{ij} and $\phi_{ij}^{(\mathbf{I})}$ in the proofs below.

6.1.3 Soundness and completeness. We are now fully equipped to show that $\mathsf{LinEx}(P)$ is sound.

Theorem 6.8 ($\mathsf{LinEx}(P) \subseteq \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)$)**.** *Every linear extension of the precedence poset P is φ-equivalent.*

Proof. Let P be the expression tree constructed using only the compartmentalization step. This expression tree already defines a poset on variables. We will first show that every linear extension of this *compartmentalization poset* is φ-equivalent. We prove this claim by induction on the number of tag blocks of the input sequence. Let σ denote the input sequence of tagged variables with input hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$.

In the base case σ has only one tag block. All variables in the sequence belong to the same node of the compartmentalization expression tree. This means every permutation of variables is a linear extension of the poset, which is what we expect because every permutation is φ-equivalent.

In the inductive step, suppose σ has at least two tag blocks with the first block being the set L of variables. Then, each sub-sequence σ_C for each connected component of $\mathcal{H} - L$ defines an FAQ-expression φ_C on the set of conditional factors $\left\{\psi_S(\cdot \mid \mathbf{x}_L) \mid S \in \mathcal{E} \wedge S \cap \mathcal{V}(C) \neq \emptyset\right\}$. When we condition on the first L variables, the expression $\varphi(\cdot \mid \mathbf{x}_L)$ completely factorizes into a product of the FAQ-expressions φ_C. (Another way to put this is that φ can be written

as a series of aggregates on variables in L, with a product of φ_C inside.) By induction, every linear extension of the compartmentalization poset for σ_C is φ_C-equivalent. Those linear extensions can be put together in an arbitrary interleaving way to form $\varphi(\cdot \mid \mathbf{x}_L)$. This observation completes the proof of the claim, because every linear extension of the expression poset for φ consists of variables in L, followed by arbitrary interleavings of linear extensions of the expression posets for the φ_C.

Next, we consider the expression tree after the compression step. We show that every linear extension of the final precedence poset is φ-equivalent by induction on the number of merges of a child node L' to a parent node L (which both must have the same tag). To see this, we can take a linear extension σ of the expression tree *before* the merge where all variables in L and in L' are consecutive in σ. Then, because all variables in $L \cup L'$ have the same tag, we can permute them in any way and still obtain a φ-equivalent variable ordering. □

It would have been nice if every φ-equivalent variable ordering is a linear extension of P. Unfortunately this is not true. Consider the following FAQ-query

$$\varphi = \sum_{x_1} \sum_{x_2} \max_{x_3} \max_{x_4} \sum_{x_5} \psi_{15}\psi_{25}\psi_{13}\psi_{24},$$

where all factors have range $\mathbb{R}_+$ so that all variables are semiring variables. In this case the expression tree has four nodes: one empty root, a node containing $\{1, 2, 5\}$ and two children $\{3\}$ and $\{4\}$. The linear extensions will enforce that X_1, X_2, X_5 come before X_3 and X_4. Notice that the original variable ordering $\sigma = (1, 2, 3, 4, 5)$ is *not* a linear extension of the precedence poset P. Hence, this example already shows that $\mathsf{LinEx}(P)$ is a *proper* subset of $\mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)$, i.e. $\mathsf{LinEx}(P) \subsetneq \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)$. Moreover, this example gives us some hints about what needs to be done with $\mathsf{LinEx}(P)$ in order to obtain all of $\mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)$, and at the same time shows that those variable orderings that are missing from $\mathsf{LinEx}(P)$ are irrelevant to the computation of $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi)$, as we explain next. In particular, it is easy to see that we can rewrite φ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi &= \sum_{x_1} \sum_{x_2} \max_{x_3} \max_{x_4} \sum_{x_5} \psi_{15}\psi_{25}\psi_{13}\psi_{24} \\
&= \sum_{x_5} \sum_{x_1} \sum_{x_2} \max_{x_3} \max_{x_4} \psi_{15}\psi_{25}\psi_{13}\psi_{24} \\
&= \sum_{x_5} \left(\sum_{x_1} \max_{x_3} \psi_{15}\psi_{13} \right) \cdot \left(\sum_{x_2} \max_{x_4} \psi_{25}\psi_{24} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

From the above, we know that when conditioned on X_5, the expression factorizes and we can interleave the two factors together in any way we want allowing for 4 to come before 1, or for 3 to come before 2; namely,

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi &= \sum_{x_5} \sum_{x_2} \max_{x_4} \sum_{x_1} \max_{x_3} \psi_{15}\psi_{25}\psi_{13}\psi_{24} \\
&= \sum_{x_5} \sum_{x_1} \max_{x_3} \sum_{x_2} \max_{x_4} \psi_{15}\psi_{25}\psi_{13}\psi_{24}.
\end{aligned}$$

However, it can be verified that

$$\mathsf{faqw}(5, 2, 4, 1, 3) = \mathsf{faqw}(5, 1, 3, 2, 4) = \mathsf{faqw}(5, 1, 3, 2, 4) = \mathsf{faqw}(\sigma)$$

for any $\sigma \in \mathsf{LinEx}(P)$ where 5 comes first in σ, and where P is the expression tree of the query. Note that we can take the linear extensions of the factorized components $\{1, 3\}$ and $\{2, 4\}$ and interleave them in any way, as long as we still

respect their relative order within each component. However, these interleavings do not add anything of value as far as the faqw is concerned.

Another way to think about the above example is that we could have arbitrarily selected one variable in the first tag block of φ, then constructed a compartmentalization expression tree with that variable as the root. (One variable at a time instead of one tag block at a time.) Then, by the same reasoning we used in the proof of Theorem 6.8, every linear extension of this 'variable-wise' poset is φ-equivalent. However, this idea alone also does not capture all of $\mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)$ because it will forbid the selection of X_5 as the first variable in the above example. Thus, it is crucial that we construct the compressed expression tree first, to determine which variable *can* come first in a φ-equivalent variable ordering. Ultimately, the set $\mathsf{LinEx}(P)$ gives us a canonical way of listing the variable orderings that really matter in evaluating φ.

In what follows, we implement the above informal discussion and intuition by showing that every φ-equivalent variable ordering has the same width as some ordering in $\mathsf{LinEx}(\varphi)$. The following lemma says that the expression tree indeed gives us a complete list of variables that can occur first (after the free variables) in any φ-equivalent ordering.

Lemma 6.9. *For every variable ordering $\pi = (u_1, \ldots, u_n) \in \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)$, the variable u_{f+1} must belong to a child node of the root of the expression tree.*[12]

Proof. Let φ^π denote the function defined by the FAQ-query with π as the variable ordering (over the same input factors as φ). Our aim is to show that if the conclusion of the lemma does not hold then there exist input factors ψ_S for which $\varphi^\pi \not\equiv \varphi$.

Suppose for the sake of contradiction that u_{f+1} belongs to a node L whose parent is L_p, and L_p is not the root of the expression tree P. Let $\overline{L}_a$ denote union of all the (strict) ancestors of L_p in the expression tree. From the construction of the expression tree, the vertices in the set $\{u_{f+1}\} \cup L_p$ belong to the same connected component of the graph $\mathcal{H} - \overline{L}_a$. Let $i_0 := u_{f+1}, i_1, \ldots, i_k \in L_p$ be the shortest path in the Gaifman graph[13] of $\mathcal{H} - \overline{L}_a$ from u_{f+1} to L_p. Then, the vertices $i_1, \ldots, i_{k-1}$ do not belong to $L_p \cup \overline{L}_a$; and, there are distinct hyperedges $S_1, \ldots, S_k$ of $\mathcal{H}$ such that $\{i_{j-1}, i_j\} \subseteq S_j$ for all $j \in [k]$.

For each variable $\ell \in \{i_0, \ldots, i_k\}$, we fix two arbitrary values $x^1_\ell \neq x^2_\ell \in \mathsf{Dom}(X_\ell)$ and for each $\ell' \in [n] - \{i_0, \ldots, i_k\}$, we fix one arbitrary value $e_{\ell'} \in \mathsf{Dom}(X_{\ell'})$. For the sake of brevity, denote $\bigoplus = \bigoplus^{(i_0)}$ and $\bar{\bigoplus} = \bigoplus^{(i_k)}$.

Now, we construct an input set of factors ψ_S, $S \in \mathcal{E}$, for which $\varphi^\pi \not\equiv \varphi$.

- Define the factor ψ_{S_k} by

$$\psi_{S_k}(\mathbf{x}_{S_k}) := \begin{cases} \phi_{i_{k-1}i_k}(x_{i_{k-1}}, x_{i_k}) & \text{if } x_{\ell'} = e_{\ell'} \text{ for all } \ell' \in S_k - \{i_0, \ldots, i_k\} \\ \mathbf{0} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{22}$$

  where $\phi_{i_{k-1}i_k}$ is the function defined in (20).
- For every $j \in [k-1]$, define

$$\psi_{S_j}(\mathbf{x}_{S_j}) := \begin{cases} \phi^{(\mathbf{I})}_{i_{j-1}i_j}(x_{i_{j-1}}, x_{i_j}) & \text{if } x_{\ell'} = e_{\ell'} \text{ for all } \ell' \in S_j - \{i_0, \ldots, i_k\} \\ \mathbf{0} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{23}$$

  where $\phi^{(\mathbf{I})}_{i_{j-1}i_j}$ is the 'identity' function defined in (21). (Think of these factors as little 2×2 identity matrices.)

[12] Recall that $\{u_1, \ldots, u_f\}$ are the free variables, which are located in the root of the expression tree. And, if $f = 0$ then the root of the expression tree is empty.

[13] Given a hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, the *Gaifman graph* of $\mathcal{H}$ is a graph $G = (V, E)$ where $V := \mathcal{V}$ and $E := \{\{i, j\} \mid \exists S \in \mathcal{E} \text{ where } \{i, j\} \subseteq S\}$.

- Finally, for every $S' \in \mathcal{E} - \{S_1, \ldots, S_k\}$, define

$$\psi_{S'}(\mathbf{x}_{S'}) := \begin{cases} \mathbf{1} & \text{if } x_{\ell'} = e_{\ell'} \text{ for all } \ell' \in S' - \{i_0, \ldots, i_k\} \\ \mathbf{0} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Because i_0 is the first in π after the free variables, $\varphi^{\pi}(e_1, \ldots, e_f)$ will evaluate to the left hand side of (19). (Imagine running the InsideOut algorithm to evaluate φ^{π}.) Next, to get a contradiction, we pick an ordering $\sigma \in \mathsf{LinEx}(P)$ such that i_0 precedes all variables that are at the same or lower level in the expression tree. By Theorem 6.8, we know that $\sigma \in \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)$. In σ, i_k precedes i_0 which in turn precedes all of $\{i_1, \ldots, i_{k-1}\}$. Hence, when we compute $\varphi(e_1, \ldots, e_f)$ using the ordering σ (and the InsideOut algorithm) we get the right hand side of (19). Thus, $\varphi^{\pi} \not\equiv \varphi$ as desired. □

The next definition realizes the intuition that if we construct the precedence tree using the one-variable-at-a-time strategy (as opposed to the one-tag-block-at-a-time strategy), then we can interleave the linear extensions of connected components arbitrarily and still get a variable ordering which is φ-equivalent with the same FAQ-width. Since the interleaving can happen at any level, the definition is inductive.

Definition 6.10 (Component-wise equivalence)**.** Let φ be an FAQ-query where all variable aggregates are semiring aggregates. Let $\sigma = (v_1, \ldots, v_n) \in \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)$ be a variable ordering. Let $\pi = (u_1, \ldots, u_n)$ be another variable ordering with $\{u_1, \ldots, u_f\} = F$. Then, π is said to be *component-wise equivalent* (or CW-equivalent) to σ if and only if:

- either $n = 1$,
- or $\mathcal{H}$ has at least two connected components, and for each connected component $C = (\mathcal{V}(C), \mathcal{E}(C))$ of $\mathcal{H}$, π_C is CW-equivalent to σ_C, where σ_C (respectively, π_C) is the variable ordering of $\mathcal{V}(C)$ that is consistent with σ (respectively, π),
- or $u_1 = v_1$, and for each connected component $C = (\mathcal{V}(C), \mathcal{E}(C))$ of $\mathcal{H} - \{v_1\}$, π_C is CW-equivalent to σ_C, where σ_C (respectively, π_C) is the ordering of $\mathcal{V}(C)$ that is consistent with σ (respectively, π).

Given a set of variable orderings $\Lambda \subseteq \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)$, we use $\mathsf{CWE}(\Lambda)$ to denote the set of all variable orderings that are CW-equivalent to some variable ordering in Λ.

Proposition 6.11. *Let π be a variable ordering that is* CW*-equivalent to $\sigma \in \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)$. Then, we have $\pi \in \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)$ and* $\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma) = \mathsf{faqw}(\pi)$.

Proof. We can prove that $\pi \in \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)$ by induction in a very similar way to the proof of Theorem 6.8 (the compartmentalization poset). The proof is thus omitted.

To prove that $\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma) = \mathsf{faqw}(\pi)$, we will need to prove a stronger induction hypothesis. In particular, we inductively prove that σ and π induce identical rooted tree decompositions (or sets of tree decompositions if the hypergraph is not connected) (see Proposition C.2).

The base case of $n = 1$ holds trivially. The inductive step where $\mathcal{H}$ has at least two connected components (i.e. the second case in Definition 6.10) also holds trivially. Consider the inductive step where $u_1 = v_1$ (i.e. the third case in Definition 6.10). By induction for each connected component $C = (\mathcal{V}(C), \mathcal{E}(C))$ of $\mathcal{H} - \{v_1\}$, σ_C and π_C induce the same rooted tree decomposition (T_C, χ_C). For each hyperedge $S_C \in \mathcal{E}(C)$ corresponding to a hyperedge $(S := S_C \cup \{v_1\}) \in \mathcal{E}$, let t be the node of T_C that is closest to the root of T_C and satisfies $S_C \subseteq \chi_C(t)$. (Because (T_C, χ_C) is induced by a variable ordering σ_C, t must be unique for a fixed S_C, since $\chi_C(t)$ must correspond to $U_j^{\sigma_C}$ for the unique $v_j \in \mathcal{V}(C)$ where $S_C \in \partial^{\sigma_C}(v_j)$. See Sections 4.4 and C and Proposition C.2 for more details.) We add $\{v_1\}$ to $\chi_C(t)$ and to $\chi_C(t')$ for all

ancestors t' of t in T_C. We construct a tree decomposition (T, χ) of $\mathcal{H}$ by creating a root node t with $\chi(t) = \{v_1\}$ and connecting all the tree decompositions (T_C, χ_C) to become subtrees of t. Now the tree decomposition (T, χ) is induced by both σ and π. □

The following theorem shows the completeness part.

Theorem 6.12 ($\mathsf{EVO}(\varphi) = \mathsf{CWE}(\mathsf{LinEx}(P))$)**.** *A variable ordering σ is φ-equivalent if and only if it is* CW*-equivalent to some linear extension of the precedence poset P.*

Proof. We only need to show that $\mathsf{EVO}(\varphi) \subseteq \mathsf{CWE}(\mathsf{LinEx}(P))$ because the reverse containment follows from Proposition 6.11 and Theorem 6.8. Also, without loss of generality we can assume that the root F of the expression tree P is empty, and it has one child node L. (If there were different connected components, they can interleave arbitrarily and we prove each of them separately.)

Fix an arbitrary $\sigma = (v_1, \ldots, v_n) \in \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)$. Then $v_1 \in L$ by Lemma 6.9. For each connected component C of $\mathcal{H} - \{v_1\}$, define a sub-query φ_C with variable ordering σ_C on the conditional factors $\left\{\psi_S(\cdot \mid x_{v_1}) \mid S \in \mathcal{E} \wedge S \cap \mathcal{V}(C) \neq \emptyset\right\}$, where σ_C is the subsequence of σ obtained by picking out vertices in $\mathcal{V}(C)$. Let P_C be the precedence poset of the expression tree for φ_C. By induction on the number of variables, we know $\sigma_C \in \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi_C) \subseteq \mathsf{CWE}(\mathsf{LinEx}(P_C))$. Hence, there exists $\pi_C \in \mathsf{LinEx}(P_C)$ that is CW-equivalent to σ_C.

The expression tree P_C for φ_C consists of an empty root (with 'free' tag). This root has only one child node L_C. The subtree rooted at L_C is called an L_C-subtree. The expression tree P can be constructed from all the L_C-subtrees as follows. We create a root R containing a single node v_1 and we add an empty parent to R. Now we attach all the L_C subtrees to become subtrees of R (such that each node L_C is now a child node of R.) Then, we merge into R every child node L_C that has the same tag as R (which is the tag of v_1). The resulting tree is exactly the expression tree P, and the resulting $R = L$ is the union of $\{v_1\}$ with all nodes L_C that have the same tag as v_1.

From this observation, we can pick a variable ordering π that is consistent with all π_C such that π starts with v_1, followed by variables in $L - \{v_1\}$. (Recall that because each $\pi_C \in \mathsf{LinEx}(P_C)$, each π_C must start with the variables in L_C.) It follows that $\pi \in \mathsf{LinEx}(P)$ and π is CW-equivalent to σ. □

Now, we give an example of component-wise equivalence (Definition 6.10) and the role it plays in completeness (Theorem 6.12).

Example 6.13 (Component-wise equivalence and completeness)**.** Consider the following FAQ query with two different semiring aggregates ($\sum$ and max) and three variables, all are bound.

$$\varphi = \sum_{x_1} \max_{x_2} \sum_{x_3} \psi_{12}\psi_{13}.$$

(ψ_{ij} above denotes an input factor whose support is $\{X_i, X_j\}$.) For this query,

$$\mathsf{EVO}(\varphi) = \{(1,2,3), (1,3,2), (3,1,2)\}.$$

Ignoring the dummy free variable X_0, the expression tree of φ consists of a root with the tag '$\sum$' containing the variables $\{X_1, X_3\}$ and a single child node with tag 'max' containing $\{X_2\}$. Therefore, $\mathsf{LinEx}(P) = \{(1,3,2), (3,1,2)\} \subseteq \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)$, as suggested by Theorem 6.8. Note that the original ordering $(1,2,3) \notin \mathsf{LinEx}(P)$. However, $(1,2,3)$ is component-wise equivalent to $(1,3,2)$ (See Definition 6.10). Therefore,

$$\mathsf{CWE}(\mathsf{LinEx}(P)) = \{(1,3,2), (1,2,3), (3,1,2)\} = \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi),$$

just as predicted by Theorem 6.12. Moreover, by Proposition 6.11, $\mathsf{faqw}((1,2,3)) = \mathsf{faqw}((1,3,2)) = 1$. Therefore, when searching for the variable ordering with the best FAQ-width, the ordering $(1,2,3)$ is redundant, hence it is sufficient to consider $\mathsf{LinEx}(P)$, just as suggested by Corollary 6.14. In particular, removing those redundant variable ordering is *precisely* what makes it possible to *efficiently* search for and find (an approximation of) the best variable ordering , as we will see later in Section 7.

Proposition 6.11 and Theorem 6.12 imply the following result, which is precisely what we need to approximate $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi)$ in Section 7.1.

Corollary 6.14. $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi) = \min\{\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma) \mid \sigma \in \mathsf{LinEx}(P)\}$.

6.2 FAQ with an inner FAQ-formula closed under idempotent elements

Now, we generalize the results of Section 6.1 to FAQ-expressions that have "idempotent" product aggregates (in addition to semiring aggregates). In particular, this section considers FAQ-expressions of the following special form (that is still more general than that of Section 6.1).

6.2.1 Problem specification. Before defining the special case of FAQ that we solve in this section, we need to define and clarify a couple of concepts. Let $\mathbf{D}_I \subseteq \mathbf{D}$ be a set of idempotent elements of $\otimes$ under the domain $\mathbf{D}$. A variable aggregate $\oplus$ is said to be *closed under* $\mathbf{D}_I$ if $a \oplus b \in \mathbf{D}_I$ whenever both a and b belong to $\mathbf{D}_I$. (Recall that $\oplus$ may or may not be the same as $\otimes$). In the FAQ context, the two elements $\mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{1}$ are idempotent elements of $\otimes$. Hence, the canonical example is $\mathbf{D}_I = \{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}\}$: max and $\times$ are closed under $\{0,1\}$, $\vee$ and $\wedge$ are closed under $\{\mathsf{true}, \mathsf{false}\}$, $\cup$ and $\cap$ are closed under $\{2^U, \emptyset\}$, etc. If $\mathbf{D}$ is a matrix domain then there might be more than two idempotent elements under matrix multiplication.

Note that if a semiring aggregate $\oplus$ is closed under $\mathbf{D}_I$, then it is also closed under $\mathbf{D}_I \cup \{\mathbf{0}\}$; however, it is not necessarily closed under $\mathbf{D}_I \cup \{\mathbf{1}\}$. On the other hand, a product aggregate is always closed under $\mathbf{D}_I \cup \{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}\}$.

Definition 6.15 (Identical aggregates under a subset $\mathbf{D}' \subseteq \mathbf{D}$)**.** Given a set $\mathbf{D}' \subseteq \mathbf{D}$ and two aggregates $\oplus, \bar{\oplus}$ (that are not necessarily closed under $\mathbf{D}'$), $\oplus, \bar{\oplus}$ are said to be *identical under* $\mathbf{D}'$ if for all $a, b \in \mathbf{D}'$, we have

$$a \oplus b = a \bar{\oplus} b.$$

Note that two aggregates might be identical under $\mathbf{D}'$ but not under $\mathbf{D}$ (by accident).

Definition 6.16 (Problem Formulation)**.** In this section, we consider an FAQ-query φ of the following form:

$$\varphi(\mathbf{x}_{[f]}) = \bigoplus_{x_{f+1}}^{(f+1)} \cdots \bigoplus_{x_{f+\ell}}^{(f+\ell)} \bigoplus_{x_{f+\ell+1}}^{(f+\ell+1)} \cdots \bigoplus_{x_n}^{(n)} \bigotimes_{S \in \mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S), \tag{24}$$

where

(1) All input factors have range $\mathbf{D}_I$, such that $\mathbf{D}_I$ is a set of idempotent elements of $\otimes$, $\{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}\} \subseteq \mathbf{D}_I$, and $\otimes$ is closed under $\mathbf{D}_I$.[14]
(2) The integer ℓ satisfies $0 \le \ell \le n - f$.
(3) For $f + 1 \le i \le f + \ell$, $\bigoplus^{(i)}$ is a semiring aggregate that is not closed under $\mathbf{D}_I$. In particular, there exist $g_1, g_2 \in \mathbf{D}_I$ where $g_1 \bigoplus^{(i)} g_2 \neq \left(g_1 \bigoplus^{(i)} g_2\right)^e$ for any integer $e \ge 2$ (which implies $g_1 \bigoplus^{(i)} g_2 \notin \mathbf{D}_I$).

[14] If $\mathbf{D}_I$ is the set of *all* idempotent elements of $\otimes$, then $\otimes$ is closed under $\mathbf{D}_I$, because for any two elements $a, b \in \mathbf{D}_I$, we have $(a \otimes b) \otimes (a \otimes b) = a \otimes (b \otimes b) \otimes a = a \otimes b \otimes a = (a \otimes a) \otimes b = a \otimes b$.

(4) For $f+\ell+1 \le i \le n$, $\bigoplus^{(i)}$ is closed under $\mathbf{D}_I$. (It could be either a product or semiring aggregate.)
(5) For every $f+1 \le i,j \le n$ such that $\bigoplus^{(i)}$ and $\bigoplus^{(j)}$ are semiring aggregates, if $\bigoplus^{(i)}$ and $\bigoplus^{(j)}$ are not identical under $\mathbf{D}$, then they are not identical under $\mathbf{D}_I$.

A compact way to write the above FAQ expression is

$$\varphi(\mathbf{x}_F) = \bigoplus_{x_{f+1}}^{(f+1)} \cdots \bigoplus_{x_{f+\ell}}^{(f+\ell)} \varphi' \tag{25}$$

where φ' is a general FAQ expression whose aggregates are closed under $\mathbf{D}_I$. This special case of FAQ captures the QCQ and #QCQ instances from Example A.20 and Example 1.3, both of which can be written in the above form.

Example 6.17 (#QCQ-revisited)**.** In #QCQ, φ' is basically a QCQ formula. In particular, although the input factors have range $\{0,1\}$, the output is computed under the range $\mathbf{D} = \mathbb{N}$. Hence by choosing $\mathbf{D}_I = \{0,1\}$, we can compute the "QCQ-part" of #QCQ over $\mathbf{D}_I$ exploiting the fact that all product aggregates are idempotent (as in Definition 5.3), and the "#-part" of #QCQ over the full domain $\mathbf{D}$ while enjoying the fact that there are no product aggregates.

More specifically, in #QCQ we have two aggregates $(\max, \times)$ that are closed under $\mathbf{D}_I$ (those are equivalent to the logical $\vee, \wedge$), and one aggregate $+$ which is not (e.g. $1+1 \notin \{0,1\}$). Notice that because of this, $+$ cannot be identical under $\mathbf{D}_I$ to either max or $\times$ (even if we use any different arithmetic interpretation of the logical $\vee, \wedge$ other than $\max, \times$). Hence, #QCQ satisfies the last condition above in the problem formulation.

In this special case of FAQ, as long as the variable ordering lists $\mathbf{X}_{[f+\ell]}$ first (in any order), then all product aggregates are idempotent (see Definition 5.3). Our aim is to find a good variable ordering for φ in the set $\mathrm{EVO}(\varphi, \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{D}_I))$, where $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{D}_I)$ is the set of factors whose range is $\mathbf{D}_I$ (See Definition 5.8). Notice that in this context, $\mathrm{EVO}(\varphi, \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{D}_I))$ is a stronger notion and harder to deal with than $\mathrm{EVO}(\varphi)$. In particular, a variable ordering σ can still be in $\mathrm{EVO}(\varphi, \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{D}_I))$ even if the output evaluates differently under σ for some input factors whose range is $\mathbf{D}$, as long as those factors don't have range $\mathbf{D}_I \subseteq \mathbf{D}$.

6.2.2 Non-mutually-commutative aggregates vs. non-identical aggregates. From the discussion of Section 6.1.2, a necessary condition for two variable aggregates (possibly products) to be mutually commutative under $\mathbf{D}_I$ is that for all $a,b,c,d \in \mathbf{D}_I$, we have

$$(a \oplus b) \bar{\oplus} (c \oplus d) = (a \bar{\oplus} c) \oplus (b \bar{\oplus} d).$$

(Notice that $\oplus, \bar{\oplus}$ are not necessarily closed under $\mathbf{D}_I$, and that is why the above necessary condition is not sufficient for the two aggregates to be mutually commutative under $\mathbf{D}_I$). We recognize two cases:

- If both $\oplus$ and $\bar{\oplus}$ are semiring aggregates, then by selecting $a = d = \mathbf{0}$ (since $\mathbf{0} \in \mathbf{D}_I$), we obtain $b \bar{\oplus} c = b \oplus c$ for every $b, c \in \mathbf{D}_I$. Hence, no two semiring aggregates commute under $\mathbf{D}_I$ unless they are identical under $\mathbf{D}_I$. However, our problem formulation requires any two semiring aggregates that are identical under $\mathbf{D}_I$ to be identical under $\mathbf{D}$ as well.
- If exactly one of the two aggregates is a product, say $\bar{\oplus} = \otimes$, then by selecting $a = d = \mathbf{0}$ and $b = c = \mathbf{1}$, we get a contradiction ($\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{0}$). Hence, $\oplus, \otimes$ do not commute under $\mathbf{D}_I$.
- If exactly one of the two aggregates is a product, say $\bar{\oplus} = \otimes$, while the other ($\oplus$) is a semiring aggregate that is not closed under $\mathbf{D}_I$, then by our problem formulation above there is an alternative choice of a,b,c,d that shows that $\bar{\oplus}$ and $\oplus$ do not commute. In particular, since there exist $g_1, g_2 \in \mathbf{D}_I$ where $g_1 \oplus g_2 \neq (g_1 \oplus g_2)^2$, we can select $a = c = g_1$ and $b = d = g_2$ and get a contradiction. This alternative choice will be useful later.

We infer the following variant of Proposition 6.7: (Notice that the range of ϕ_{ij} is now $\mathbf{D}_I$ instead of $\mathbf{D}$.)

Proposition 6.18. *Suppose that $\oplus$ and $\bar{\oplus}$ are either semiring aggregates that are not identical under $\mathbf{D}$ or one of them is a product aggregate (while the other is not). Then for every $i, j \in [n]$, there is a function $\phi_{ij} : \mathsf{Dom}(X_i) \times \mathsf{Dom}(X_j) \to \mathbf{D}_I$ for which*

$$\bigoplus_{x_i \in \mathsf{Dom}(X_i)} \bar{\bigoplus}_{x_j \in \mathsf{Dom}(X_j)} \phi_{ij}(x_i, x_j) \neq \bar{\bigoplus}_{x_j \in \mathsf{Dom}(X_j)} \bigoplus_{x_i \in \mathsf{Dom}(X_i)} \phi_{ij}(x_i, x_j). \tag{26}$$

Proof. If both $\oplus$ and $\bar{\oplus}$ are semiring aggregates, then ϕ_{ij} is defined exactly the same as in the proof of Proposition 6.7. If exactly one aggregate is a product, say $\bar{\oplus} = \otimes$, then ϕ_{ij} is defined as follows. Fix arbitrarily elements $x_i^1 \neq x_i^2 \in \mathsf{Dom}(X_i)$, $x_j^1 \in \mathsf{Dom}(X_j)$ such that x_j^1 is not the last in $\mathsf{Dom}(X_j)$ (i.e. there is $x_j^2 \in \mathsf{Dom}(X_j)$ such that $x_j^2 > x_j^1$). Define

$$\phi_{ij}(x_i, x_j) := \begin{cases} \mathbf{1} & \text{if } \left(x_i = x_i^1 \wedge x_j \leq x_j^1\right) \text{ or } \left(x_i = x_i^2 \wedge x_j > x_j^1\right) \\ \mathbf{0} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{27}$$

Then,

$$\bigoplus_{x_i} \bar{\bigoplus}_{x_j} \phi_{ij}(x_i, x_j) = \mathbf{0} \neq \mathbf{1} = \bar{\bigoplus}_{x_j} \bigoplus_{x_i} \phi_{ij}(x_i, x_j).$$

□

Note that in the above proof if exactly one aggregate is a product, say $\bar{\oplus} = \otimes$, while the other ($\oplus$) is a semiring aggregate that is *not* closed under $\mathbf{D}_I$, then we can utilize our problem formulation in Definition 6.16 and define $\phi_{ij}(x_i, x_j)$ alternatively as follows: Let $g_1, g_2 \in \mathbf{D}_I$ satisfy $g_1 \oplus g_2 \neq (g_1 \oplus g_2)^e$ for all integers $e \geq 2$ (as guaranteed by Definition 6.16). Fix arbitrary elements $x_i^1, x_i^2 \in \mathbf{D}_I$.

$$\phi_{ij}(x_i, x_j) := \phi_i'(x_i) := \begin{cases} g_1 & \text{if } x_i = x_i^1 \\ g_2 & \text{if } x_i = x_i^2 \\ \mathbf{0} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{28}$$

Then,

$$\bigoplus_{x_i} \bar{\bigoplus}_{x_j} \phi_{ij}(x_i, x_j) = g_1 \oplus g_2 \neq (g_1 \oplus g_2)^{|\mathsf{Dom}(X_j)|} = \bar{\bigoplus}_{x_j} \bigoplus_{x_i} \phi_{ij}(x_i, x_j). \tag{29}$$

(Recall from Section 1.2 that $|\mathsf{Dom}(X_j)| \geq 2$.) The alternate function $\phi_{ij}(x_i, x_j)$ given by (28) depends only on x_i. This nice property will be useful later.

6.2.3 Expression tree and precedence poset. The approach in this section and the next mirrors that of Section 6.1. However, dealing with the product aggregates (under the φ' part of the query, as in (25)) requires extra care. In particular, the corresponding variables do not play a role in determining the connected components when we construct the expression tree. And they do not contribute directly to the width $\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma)$, because $\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma)$ is defined only over U_k for $k \in K$ (where K was defined by (14)). While the discussion in this section is meant for FAQ of the form (24), it might be helpful if the reader uses #QCQ as the running example for this section.

Definition 6.19 (Extended components and dangling set of $(\mathcal{H}, W)$)**.** Given a hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ and a set $W \subseteq \mathcal{V}$, the extended components of $(\mathcal{H}, W)$ are defined as follows: For each connected component $C = (\mathcal{V}(C), \mathcal{E}(C))$ of $\mathcal{H} - W$, we construct a hypergraph $(\mathcal{V}'(C), \mathcal{E}'(C))$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}'(C) &:= \mathcal{V}(C) \cup \left\{w \in W \mid \exists S \in \mathcal{E} \text{ where } S \cap \mathcal{V}(C) \neq \emptyset \text{ and } w \in S\right\} \\ \mathcal{E}'(C) &:= \left\{S \in \mathcal{E} \mid S \cap \mathcal{V}(C) \neq \emptyset\right\} \end{aligned}$$

The hypergraphs $(\mathcal{V}'(C), \mathcal{E}'(C))$ are called the *extended components* of $(\mathcal{H}, W)$.

Moreover the set

$$D := \bigcup_{\substack{S \in \mathcal{E} \\ S \subseteq W}} S$$

is called the *dangling set* of $(\mathcal{H}, W)$.

Definition 6.20 (Expression tree)**.** The *expression tree* for the query φ is a rooted tree P. Every node of the tree is a set of variables, and the tree is constructed via a *query extension* step, a *compartmentalization* step and a *compression* step. The query extension step is completely new compared to Section 6.1, the compartmentalization step is a bit trickier than that of Section 6.1, while the compression step is identical.

Query extension. Given the input FAQ-query φ of the form (24), we extend φ as follows: For every i satisfying $f+1 \le i \le f+\ell$ (hence $\bigoplus^{(i)}$ is a semiring aggregate that is not closed under $\mathbf{D}_I$) and for every j where $\bigoplus^{(j)} = \bigotimes$ (hence $f+\ell+1 \le j \le n$), if there is no hyperedge S satisfying $\{i, j\} \subseteq S$, then we add a new hyperedge $\{i, j\}$ and a corresponding input factor $\psi_{\{i,j\}}(x_i, x_j)$ to the input FAQ query φ. (The new factor $\psi_{\{i,j\}}(x_i, x_j)$ can be defined to be identically $\mathbf{1}$ so that it does not change the value of φ.)

Compartmentalization. In this step, initially we start off with the sequence of variables with their corresponding tags exactly as they appear in the FAQ query that resulted from the query extension step. We also apply the same trick of adding a dummy free variable X_0 as was done in Section 6.1, i.e. we start off with the sequence

$$\sigma = \left\langle (X_0, \text{“free”}), (X_1, \text{“free”}), \ldots, (X_f, \text{“free”}), (X_{f+1}, \oplus^{(f+1)}), \ldots, (X_n, \oplus^{(n)}) \right\rangle$$

and with the hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ (of the extended query) which has an extra isolated vertex X_0 marked with a “free” tag.

Now given a tagged variable sequence σ and a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$, we build the tree by constructing a node L containing the first tag block. Then, we do the following.

- Let W be the set of all product variables in σ that do not belong to L.
- We construct the extended components $(\mathcal{V}'(C), \mathcal{E}'(C))$ of $(\mathcal{H} - L, W)$ and we also construct the dangling set D of $(\mathcal{H} - L, W)$, as in Definition 6.19.
- Now, for each extended component $(\mathcal{V}'(C), \mathcal{E}'(C))$, we construct a sequence σ_C (of tagged variables) by listing all variables in $\mathcal{V}'(C)$ in exactly the same relative order they appeared in σ. From the sequence σ_C and the hypergraph $(\mathcal{V}'(C), \mathcal{E}'(C))$ we recursively construct the expression tree P_C.
- Finally, we connect all subtrees P_C to the node L. **And**, we create a node that contains the dangling set D (if D is not empty) and connect it to L as well.
- The dummy variable X_0 is removed after everything is done. This completes the compartmentalization step. Note that after compartmentalization all variables in the same node of P have the same tag.


Compression. Now, in the expression tree P that resulted from the compartmentalization step, as long as there is still a node L whose tag is the same as a child node L' of the tree P, we merge the child into L. Repeat this step until no further merging is possible.

Before proceeding with the proof, we present an example to illustrate the computation of the expression tree in the presence of product aggregates.


Example 6.21 (Intuition behind expression tree)**.** Consider the following FAQ query that has product aggregates ($\prod$) in addition to two different semiring aggregates ($\sum$ and max):

$$\varphi = \sum_{x_1} \max_{x_2} \prod_{x_3} \max_{x_4} \max_{x_5} \prod_{x_6} \psi_{123}\psi_{125}\psi_{14}\psi_{34}\psi_6.$$

(ψ_{123} above denotes an input factor $\psi_{123}(x_1, x_2, x_3)$, and so on…) Suppose all input factors $\psi_{123}, \psi_{125}, \ldots$ have range $\mathbf{D}_I = \{0, 1\}$. Let $\mathbf{D}$ be $\mathbb{N}$. Both max and $\times$ are closed under $\{0, 1\}$, while + is not. Hence, by comparison to the format in (24), $f = 0$ and $\ell = 1$. Notice that because max is closed under $\mathbf{D}_I$ while + is not, max and + are not identical under $\mathbf{D}_I$. Hence, the last condition in Definition 6.16 is satisfied. The hypergraph of the above query is depicted in Figure 4a. The query extension step of the construction of the expression tree is depicted in Figure 4b. The compartmentalization step is depicted in Figure 5, and the compression step is depicted in Figure 6. The final expression tree appears on the right of Figure 6a.



(a) $\varphi = \sum_{x_1} \max_{x_2} \prod_{x_3} \max_{x_4} \max_{x_5} \prod_{x_6} \psi_{123}\ \psi_{125}\ \psi_{14}\ \psi_{34}\ \psi_6$



(b) $\varphi = \sum_{x_1} \max_{x_2} \prod_{x_3} \max_{x_4} \max_{x_5} \prod_{x_6} \psi_{123}\ \psi_{125}\ \psi_{14}\ \psi_{34}\ \psi_6\ \psi_{16}$

Fig. 4. The query extension step of the construction of expression tree from Example 6.21. Fig. 4a shows the hypergraph of original query $\varphi = \sum_{x_1} \max_{x_2} \prod_{x_3} \max_{x_4} \max_{x_5} \prod_{x_6} \psi_{123}\psi_{125}\psi_{14}\psi_{34}\psi_6$. Fig. 4b shows the query after adding the new factor ψ_{16} (which had to be added because $\sum_{x_1}$ is a semiring aggregate that is not closed under $\mathbf{D}_I$, $\prod_{x_6}$ is a product aggregate, and there is no hyperedge already containing $\{1, 6\}$).


The following proposition follows directly from Definition 6.19. In particular, since vertices in W are not taken into account while determining the connectivity of extended components of $(\mathcal{H}, W)$ removing a subset $U \subseteq W$ cannot break a single extended component into multiple ones.



$$\text{(a) } \varphi = \sum_{x_1} \max_{x_2} \prod_{x_3} \left(\left(\max_{x_5} \psi_{123}\ \psi_{125} \right) \left(\max_{x_4} \psi_{14}\ \psi_{34} \right) \left(\prod_{x6} \psi_6\ \psi_{16} \right) \right)$$

$$= \sum_{x_1} \max_{x_2} \left(\prod_{x_3} \max_{x_5} \psi_{123}\ \psi_{125} \right) \left(\prod_{x_3} \max_{x_4} \psi_{14}\ \psi_{34} \right) \left(\prod_{x3} \prod_{x6} \psi_6\ \psi_{16} \right)$$

$$= \sum_{x_1} \left(\max_{x_2} \prod_{x_3} \max_{x_5} \psi_{123}\ \psi_{125} \right) \left(\prod_{x_3} \max_{x_4} \psi_{14}\ \psi_{34} \right) \left(\prod_{x6} \psi_6\ \psi_{16} \right)$$




$$\text{(b) } \varphi = \sum_{x_1} \left(\max_{x_2} \max_{x_5} \psi_{125} \prod_{x_3} \psi_{123} \right) \left(\prod_{x_3} \max_{x_4} \psi_{14}\ \psi_{34} \right) \left(\prod_{x6} \psi_6\ \psi_{16} \right)$$

Fig. 5. The compartmentalization step of the construction of the expression tree from Example 6.21, depicted using colors. For simplicity, the dummy free variable X_0 is ignored in this example. Fig. 5a shows the first part of the compartmentalization step, where the first tag block $L = \{1\}$ and the set of product variables $W = \{3, 6\}$. After removing both L and W, we get two connected components: $\{2, 5\}$ and $\{4\}$ (in addition to an empty component $\{\}$). By adding back the product variables that were removed from hyperedges of each component, we get the two *extended components*: $\{2, 3, 5\}$ and $\{3, 4\}$. We also get the *dangling set* $\{6\}$. We can see that for each fixed value x_1, the conditional query $\varphi(\cdot|x_1)$ can indeed be factored into a product of three sub-queries corresponding to the two extended components $\{2, 3, 5\}$ and $\{3, 4\}$ along with the dangling set $\{6\}$. (Note that closure and idempotence of $\times$ under $\mathbf{D}_I$ are both used to prove that $\prod_{x_3} \prod_{x_6} \psi_6 \psi_{16} = \prod_{x_6} \psi_6 \psi_{16}$.) Fig. 5b show the compartmentalization of each one of the resulting two extended components.

Proposition 6.22. *Given a hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ and a set $W \subseteq \mathcal{V}$, if $(\mathcal{H}, W)$ has only one extended component (and an empty dangling set), then for any $U \subseteq W$, $(\mathcal{H} - U, W - U)$ has only one extended component (and an empty dangling set) as well.*

Corollary 6.23. *The construction of the expression tree from Definition 6.20 satisfies the following properties:*

(a) *In the compartmentalization step, whenever the tag of L is $\otimes$, $(\mathcal{H} - L, W)$ cannot have more than one extended component (and the dangling set must be empty).*
(b) *In the compression step, there cannot be a node L and a child node L' that both have the tag $\otimes$.*
(c) *In the final expression tree, each node whose tag is $\otimes$ must have at most one child, and the tag of that child (if it exists) is not $\otimes$.*



(a) $\varphi = \sum_{x_1} \left(\max_{x_2} \max_{x_5} \psi_{125} \prod_{x_3} \psi_{123} \right) \left(\prod_{x_3} \max_{x_4} \psi_{14}\, \psi_{34} \right) \left(\prod_{x6} \psi_6\, \psi_{16} \right)$

Fig. 6. The compression step of the expression tree from Example 6.21. In the expression tree in Fig. 5b that resulted from the compartmentalization step, we can merge node $\{5\}$ into its parent $\{2\}$ resulting in the above tree.

Proof. First, we prove part (a). Initially because we are adding a dummy free variable X_0, the first tag block $L = F$ has the tag "free". To construct the expression tree, we recursively construct an expression tree for each extended component $(\mathcal{V}'(C), \mathcal{E}'(C))$ of $(\mathcal{H} - L, W)$ (where W is the set of product variables in $\mathcal{H}$ that are *not* in L). For each one of those extended components, we recursively construct an expression tree for each extended component, and so on…Hence apart from the time when the first tag block L was F, we can assume that in the compartmentalization step, $(\mathcal{H}, \overline{W})$ has only one extended component (and an empty dangling set) where $\overline{W}$ is the set of *all* product variables in $\mathcal{H}$.

Now, suppose $(\mathcal{H}, \overline{W})$ has a single extended component (and an empty dangling set). Let L, the first tag block of $\mathcal{H}$, have the tag $\otimes$. By Proposition 6.22, $(\mathcal{H} - L, W := \overline{W} - L)$ has only one extended component (and an empty dangling set), which proves part (a). Moreover, the first tag block for this extended component cannot have the tag $\otimes$ because otherwise this tag block should have been part of L itself (by definition of tag block). This proves part (b). Part (c) follows from (a) and (b). □

Unlike free and semiring variables, it is possible for the same product variable to appear multiple times in the expression tree. In Example 6.21 above, X_3 occurs twice in the expression tree, depicted in Fig. 6a. We can think of those two occurrences of X_3 as two different variables X_3 and X_3' with identical domains $\mathrm{Dom}(X_3) = \mathrm{Dom}(X_3')$ and rewrite φ as:

$$\varphi = \sum_{x_1} \left(\max_{x_2} \max_{x_5} \psi_{125} \prod_{x_3} \psi_{123} \right) \left(\prod_{x_3'} \max_{x_4} \psi_{14}\psi_{34} \right) \left(\prod_{x6} \psi_6 \psi_{16} \right)$$

Luckily, the distribution of product variables (with their multiple copies) in the expression tree exhibits some nice properties, some of which do not even hold for semiring variables. Those nice properties enable us to take care of multiple copies of product variables.

In particular, given integers $i, j \in [n] - [f], i < j$, where $\oplus^{(i)} = \oplus^{(j)}$ is a semiring aggregate, it is possible for X_j to be a strict ancestor of X_i in the expression tree, due to the compression step. (X_j is a strict ancestor of X_i if $X_j \in L$, $X_i \in L'$, and L is a strict ancestor of L' in the expression tree.) For example, consider the following FAQ-query.

$$\varphi = \bigoplus_{x_1} \bar{\bigoplus}_{x_2} \bigoplus_{x_3} \bigoplus_{x_4} \psi_{12}\psi_{23}\psi_{14}.$$

The expression tree roughly corresponds to the following re-writing of the query:

$$\varphi = \bigoplus_{x_1} \bigoplus_{x_4} \left[\bar{\bigoplus}_{x_2} \left(\bigoplus_{x_3} \psi_{12}\psi_{23}\psi_{14} \right) \right].$$

Although X_3 comes before X_4 in the original expression, X_4 is now a strict ancestor of X_3 in the expression tree. However, the following lemma says that the above scenario is impossible if $\oplus^{(i)} = \oplus^{(j)}$ is a product aggregate. The lemma also allows us to show that the comparison relation formed by the expression tree is indeed a partial order.

Lemma 6.24. *The expression tree satisfies the following properties.*

(a) *For any $i \in [n] - [f]$ such that $\oplus^{(i)} = \otimes$, no copy of X_i is a strict ancestor of another copy of X_i.*
(b) *For any $i, j \in [n] - [f]$ such that $i < j$ and $\oplus^{(i)} = \oplus^{(j)} = \otimes$, no copy of X_j is a strict ancestor of any copy of X_i.*

Proof. First, we prove that the expression tree before the compression step (after performing only the query extension and compartmentalization steps) satisfies the above properties. The proof is by induction on the number of tag blocks. In the base case where there is only one tag block, the expression tree has only one node and the lemma follows trivially.

In the inductive step, suppose the tagged sequence has at least two tag blocks with L being the first tag block. The expression tree P can be constructed by constructing the expression trees P_C of the extended components $(\mathcal{V}'(C), \mathcal{E}'(C))$ and then connecting them to the root node L. No P_C contains any variable in L. Assuming the properties hold for each P_C, they will hold for P as well.

Finally, we prove that the final expression step (after the compression step) satisfies the above properties. The proof is by induction on the number of merges of a child node L' into a parent node L (which both have the same tag). Thanks to part (b) of Corollary 6.23, we only need to consider the case where the tag of L (and L') is not $\otimes$. After merging, only L' can become an ancestor of some new nodes (that were not descendants of L' before merging). But since the tag of L' is not $\otimes$, the induction holds. □

Now we are ready to show that the expression tree defines a partial order on the variables. Let P be the expression tree of φ as defined in Definition 6.20. Define a binary relation $\preceq_P \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ on the variables $\mathcal{V}$ as follows. For any pair $u, v \in \mathcal{V}$, we write $u \preceq_P v$ if $u = v$ or u belongs to a strict ancestor of v in the expression poset P. (Note that the same variable u might occur several times in the expression tree, hence it is not immediately obvious that $\preceq_P$ is indeed a partial order.)

Corollary 6.25. *The binary relation $\preceq_P$ defines a partially ordered set.*

Proof. Reflexivity and transitivity hold trivially. We check the antisymmetry property of $\preceq_P$. Suppose $u \preceq_P v$, $v \preceq_P u$, but $u \neq v$. It cannot be the case that both u and v are semiring variables, because each semiring variable occurs only once in P. If u is a semiring variable and v is not, then v is both a strict ancestor and a strict descendant of u. This means v is a strict ancestor of a copy of itself, violating part (a) of Lemma 6.24. So we are left with the case when both u and v are product variables. But in this case, one of them (say, u) comes before the other (say, v) in the original expression φ, and thus by part (b) of Lemma 6.24 v cannot be an ancestor of u. □

The above corollary justifies the correctness of the precedence poset definition.

Definition 6.26 (Precedence poset)**.** The *precedence poset* is the partially ordered set $P = (\mathcal{V}, \preceq_P)$. (We abuse notation and use P to denote the poset also.) Also, as in Definition 6.3 we let $\mathsf{LinEx}(P)$ denote the set of linear extensions of P.

We next prove the soundness of $\mathsf{LinEx}(P)$. For that we need a new lemma.

Lemma 6.27. *The precedence poset P satisfies the following property: For every $f+1 \le i \le f+\ell$ (hence $\bigoplus^{(i)}$ is a semiring aggregate that is not closed under $\mathbf{D}_I$) and for every j where $\bigoplus^{(j)} = \bigotimes$, we have $i \preceq_P j$.*

Proof. The lemma holds thanks to the query extension step of the construction of the expression tree (Definition 6.20). First, we prove that the expression tree after the query extension and compartmentalization steps (and before the compression step) satisfies the following property: Every variable X_i for $f+1 \le i \le f+\ell$ is a strict ancestor of every product variable X_j in the expression tree. The proof is by induction on the number of tag blocks. The base case of one tag block holds trivially. In the inductive step, suppose the tagged sequence has at least two tag blocks with L being the first tag block. We recognize two cases:

Case 1. If the tag of L is $\otimes$, then there cannot be any variable X_i for $f+1 \le i \le f+\ell$ since X_i should have appeared in an earlier tag block by Definition 6.16. Hence, the property holds trivially.

Case 2. If the tag of L is not $\otimes$, then each extended component $(\mathcal{V}'(C), \mathcal{E}'(C))$ that contains any variable X_i for $f+1 \le i \le f+\ell$ must also contain every product variable X_j thanks to the factors $\psi_{\{i,j\}}$ that were added in the query extension step. Assuming the property holds for the expression tree for each extended component $(\mathcal{V}'(C), \mathcal{E}'(C))$, it will hold for the combined expression tree as well.

Finally, we prove that the expression tree after the compression step satisfies the above property as well. We do that by induction on the number of merges of a child node L' into a parent node L (which both have the same tag). When we merge, the only constraints $i \preceq_P j$ that are removed from $\preceq_P$ are the ones where $i \in L$, $j \in L'$. But since for those constraints we have $\oplus^{(i)} = \oplus^{(j)}$, the induction holds. □

Theorem 6.28 ($\mathsf{LinEx}(P) \subseteq \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi, \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{D}_I))$)**.** *Every linear extension of the precedence poset is φ-equivalent.*

Proof. Similar to the proof of Theorem 6.8, we first consider the expression tree constructed using only the query extension and compartmentalization steps, without the compression step. (In Example 6.21, that would be the poset defined by the tree on the right of Figure 5b.) From the proof of Lemma 6.24 and then repeating the same proof of Corollary 6.25, this expression tree also defines a partially ordered set, which we call the *compartmentalization poset*. We first prove soundness for the compartmentalization poset. A slightly tricky issue in this case compared to that of Theorem 6.8 is the multiple occurrences of some product variables. Let $\sigma = (1, \ldots, n)$ be the variable ordering used to write φ. We prove the soundness of the compartmentalization poset by induction on the number of tag blocks of the input sequence.

The base of one single tag block holds trivially. In the inductive step, suppose σ has at least two tag blocks with L being the first tag block. Let W be the set of product variables not in L. For each extended component $(\mathcal{V}'(C), \mathcal{E}'(C))$ of $(\mathcal{H}-L, W)$, we form a sub-sequence σ_C, which defines an FAQ-expression φ_C. This expression φ_C is on the conditional factors $\psi_S(\cdot \mid \mathbf{x}_L)$ for each $S \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $S \cap \mathcal{V}(C) \neq \emptyset$. (Recall that $\mathcal{V}(C)$ is different from $\mathcal{V}'(C)$ because $\mathcal{V}'(C)$ also contains some product variables from W.) We also construct the expression φ_D for the dangling set D of $(\mathcal{H}-L, W)$. This expression is on the conditional factors $\psi_S(\cdot \mid \mathbf{x}_L)$ for each $S \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $S - L \subseteq W$.

Claim 1. The conditional factor $\varphi(\cdot|\mathbf{x}_L)$ can be factorized into a product of the FAQ-expressions φ_C and φ_D (if D is not empty).

To prove Claim 1, first notice that $\varphi(\cdot|\mathbf{x}_L)$ can be written as

$$\varphi(\mathbf{x}_L|\mathbf{x}_L) \quad = \quad \bigoplus_{\mathbf{x}_{[n]-L}} \bigotimes_{S \in \mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S|\mathbf{x}_L)$$

$$= \bigoplus_{\mathbf{x}_{[n]-L}} \bigotimes_{C} \underbrace{\left(\bigotimes_{S: S \cap \mathcal{V}(C) \neq \emptyset} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S|\mathbf{x}_L) \right)}_{=: \overline{\varphi}_C(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{V}'(C) \cup L}|\mathbf{x}_L)} \otimes \underbrace{\left(\bigotimes_{S: S-L \subseteq W} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S|\mathbf{x}_L) \right)}_{=: \overline{\varphi}_D(\mathbf{x}_{D \cup L}|\mathbf{x}_L)}$$

For simplicity, suppose that the dangling set D is empty, i.e. there is no hyperedge S where $S - L \subseteq W$. Depending on the aggregate $\oplus^{(n)}$, we recognize two cases:

- If $\oplus^{(n)}$ is a semiring aggregate, let C_n be the (unique) component where $n \in \mathcal{V}(C_n)$. Then, $\varphi(\cdot|\mathbf{x}_L)$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(\mathbf{x}_L|\mathbf{x}_L) &= \bigoplus_{\mathbf{x}_{[n-1]-L}} \bigoplus_{x_n}^{(n)} \bigotimes_{C} \overline{\varphi}_C(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{V}'(C) \cup L}|\mathbf{x}_L) \\ &= \bigoplus_{\mathbf{x}_{[n-1]-L}} \left[\left(\bigoplus_{x_n}^{(n)} \overline{\varphi}_{C_n}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{V}'(C_n) \cup L}|\mathbf{x}_L) \right) \otimes \bigotimes_{C: n \notin \mathcal{V}(C)} \overline{\varphi}_C(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{V}'(C) \cup L}|\mathbf{x}_L) \right] \end{aligned}$$

- If $\oplus^{(n)}$ is a product aggregate, then there can be multiple components C where $n \in \mathcal{V}'(C)$ and we can rewrite $\varphi(\cdot|\mathbf{x}_L)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(\mathbf{x}_L|\mathbf{x}_L) &= \bigoplus_{\mathbf{x}_{[n-1]-L}} \bigotimes_{x_n} \bigotimes_{C} \overline{\varphi}_C(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{V}'(C) \cup L}|\mathbf{x}_L) \\ &= \bigoplus_{\mathbf{x}_{[n-1]-L}} \left[\bigotimes_{C: n \in \mathcal{V}'(C)} \left(\bigotimes_{x_n} \overline{\varphi}_C(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{V}'(C) \cup L}|\mathbf{x}_L) \right) \otimes \bigotimes_{C: n \notin \mathcal{V}'(C)} \overline{\varphi}_C(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{V}'(C) \cup L}|\mathbf{x}_L)^{|\mathrm{Dom}(X_n)|} \right] \\ &= \bigoplus_{\mathbf{x}_{[n-1]-L}} \left[\bigotimes_{C: n \in \mathcal{V}'(C)} \left(\bigotimes_{x_n} \overline{\varphi}_C(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{V}'(C) \cup L}|\mathbf{x}_L) \right) \otimes \bigotimes_{C: n \notin \mathcal{V}'(C)} \overline{\varphi}_C(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{V}'(C) \cup L}|\mathbf{x}_L) \right] \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

  The last step above relies on the idempotence of $\otimes$ under $\mathbf{D}_I$.

By repeatedly applying the above process on the aggregates $\oplus^{(n-1)}, \ldots, \oplus^{(|L|+1)}$, we can factorize $\varphi(\cdot|\mathbf{x}_L)$ into

$$\varphi(\mathbf{x}_L|\mathbf{x}_L) = \bigotimes_{C} \underbrace{\left(\bigoplus_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{V}'(C)}} \overline{\varphi}_C(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{V}'(C) \cup L}|\mathbf{x}_L) \right)}_{=: \varphi_C(\mathbf{x}_L|\mathbf{x}_L)} \tag{31}$$

Note that by Definition 6.16 for every product aggregate $\oplus^{(i)} = \otimes$, all subsequent aggregates $\oplus^{(i+1)}, \ldots, \oplus^{(n)}$ are closed under $\mathbf{D}_I$. Hence, we can repeatedly use idempotence in the same way as above. Note also that if the dangling set D was not empty, then eq. (31) would have an additional factor $\varphi_D(\mathbf{x}_L|\mathbf{x}_L) := \bigotimes_{\mathbf{x}_D} \overline{\varphi}_D(\mathbf{x}_{D \cup L}|\mathbf{x}_L)$.

Now, let $\pi = (u_1, \ldots, u_n)$ be an arbitrary linear extension of the compartmentalization poset for φ (hence $\{u_1, \ldots, u_{|L|}\} = L$). For each extended component $(\mathcal{V}'(C), \mathcal{E}'(C))$, let π_C denote the subsequence of π obtained by picking out variables in $\mathcal{V}'(C)$. Then, π_C is a linear extension of the (compartmentalization) poset for φ_C, and thus $\pi_C \in \mathrm{EVO}(\varphi_C, \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{D}_I))$ by induction. Let $k := u_{|L|+1}$. We recognize two cases depending on the aggregate $\oplus^{(k)}$.

- If $\oplus^{(k)}$ is a semiring aggregate, let C_k be the (unique) component where $k \in \mathcal{V}(C_k)$ (hence π_{C_k} must begin with the variable k). Then, we can rewrite $\varphi(\cdot|\mathbf{x}_L)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(\mathbf{x}_L|\mathbf{x}_L) &= \left[\bigoplus_{x_k}^{(k)}\left(\bigoplus_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{V}'(C_k)-\{k\}}} \overline{\varphi}_{C_k}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{V}'(C_k)\cup L}|\mathbf{x}_L)\right)\right] \otimes \bigotimes_{C:k\notin\mathcal{V}(C)}\left(\bigoplus_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{V}'(C)}} \overline{\varphi}_C(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{V}'(C)\cup L}|\mathbf{x}_L)\right)\\ &= \bigoplus_{x_k}^{(k)}\left[\left(\bigoplus_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{V}'(C_k)-\{k\}}} \overline{\varphi}_{C_k}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{V}'(C_k)\cup L}|\mathbf{x}_L)\right) \otimes \bigotimes_{C:k\notin\mathcal{V}(C)}\left(\bigoplus_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{V}'(C)}} \overline{\varphi}_C(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{V}'(C)\cup L}|\mathbf{x}_L)\right)\right]\end{aligned}$$

- If $\oplus^{(k)}$ is a product aggregate, then there can be multiple components C for which $k \in \mathcal{V}'(C)$, and for each such component C, we have π_C begins with the variable k. Moreover by Lemma 6.27, all subsequent aggregates in π, $\oplus^{(u_{|L|+2})}, \ldots, \oplus^{(u_n)}$ are closed under $\mathbf{D}_I$. Therefore, we can rewrite $\varphi(\cdot|\mathbf{x}_L)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}&\varphi(\mathbf{x}_L|\mathbf{x}_L)\\ =\ &\left[\bigotimes_{x_k}\bigotimes_{C:k\in\mathcal{V}'(C)}\left(\bigoplus_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{V}'(C)-\{k\}}} \overline{\varphi}_C(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{V}'(C)\cup L}|\mathbf{x}_L)\right)\right] \otimes \bigotimes_{C:k\notin\mathcal{V}'(C)}\left(\bigoplus_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{V}'(C)}} \overline{\varphi}_C(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{V}'(C)\cup L}|\mathbf{x}_L)\right)\\ =\ &\bigotimes_{x_k}\left[\bigotimes_{C:k\in\mathcal{V}'(C)}\left(\bigoplus_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{V}'(C)-\{k\}}} \overline{\varphi}_C(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{V}'(C)\cup L}|\mathbf{x}_L)\right) \otimes \bigotimes_{C:k\notin\mathcal{V}'(C)}\left(\bigoplus_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{V}'(C)}} \overline{\varphi}_C(\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{V}'(C)\cup L}|\mathbf{x}_L)\right)\right] \qquad (32)\end{aligned}$$

  The last step above relies on $\otimes$ and all aggregates $\oplus_{\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{V}'(C)}}$ being closed under $\mathbf{D}_I$ (as guaranteed by Lemma 6.27) and on $\otimes$ being idempotent under $\mathbf{D}_I$.

By repeatedly applying the above process on the aggregates $\oplus^{(u_{|L|+2})}, \ldots, \oplus^{(u_n)}$, we can show that the FAQ-expression φ^π defined by the variable ordering π is identical to φ. This proves soundness for the compartmentalization poset.

Finally, we prove soundness for the final poset after the compression step. Recall from part (b) of Corollary 6.23 that product variables play no role in the compression step. Hence, this part of the proof is identical to the corresponding part of the proof of Theorem 6.8. □

To prove completeness of $\mathsf{LinEx}(P)$, we will need the following lemma which basically says that in any equivalent variable ordering, product variables must appear after semiring variables that are not closed under $\mathbf{D}_I$.

Lemma 6.29. *Every variable ordering $\pi = (u_1, \ldots, u_n) \in \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi, \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{D}_I))$ satisfies the following property: for every variable u_i where $\oplus^{(u_i)}$ is a semiring aggregate that is not closed under $\mathbf{D}_I$ and for every variable u_j where $\oplus^{(u_j)} = \otimes$, we have $i < j$.*

Proof. Suppose otherwise that there is a variable u_i where $\oplus^{(u_i)}$ is a semiring aggregate that is not closed under $\mathbf{D}_I$ and another variable u_j where $\oplus^{(u_j)} = \otimes$ and $i > j$. Note that by Definition 6.16, u_i must appear before u_j in the original FAQ expression φ, i.e. $u_i < u_j$. Let φ^π be the expression φ with the aggregates permuted using the variable ordering π. We define input factors ψ_S for which $\varphi^\pi \not\equiv \varphi$ as follows. For every variable $\ell \in [n] - \{u_i, u_j\}$, we fix one arbitrary value $e_\ell \in \mathsf{Dom}(X_\ell)$. For the sake of brevity, denote $\oplus = \oplus^{(u_i)}$ and $\bar{\oplus} = \oplus^{(u_j)}$. Pick an arbitrary input factor

ψ_{S_i} where $u_i \in S_i$ and define ψ_{S_i} as follows (where $\phi'_{u_i}(x_{u_i})$ was defined by (28)):

$$\psi_{S_i}(\mathbf{x}_{S_i}) \coloneqq \begin{cases} \phi'_{u_i}(x_{u_i}) & \text{if } x_l = e_l \text{ for all } l \in S_i - \{u_i, u_j\} \\ \mathbf{0} & \text{if there is } l \in S_i - \{u_i, u_j\} \text{ where } x_l \neq e_l \text{ and } l \text{ is a semiring variable} \\ \mathbf{1} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Every other input factor ψ_S for $S \in \mathcal{E} - \{S_i\}$ is defined as follows:

$$\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) \coloneqq \begin{cases} \mathbf{1} & \text{if } x_l = e_l \text{ for all } l \in S - \{u_i, u_j\} \\ \mathbf{0} & \text{if there is } l \in S - \{u_i, u_j\} \text{ where } x_l \neq e_l \text{ and } l \text{ is a semiring variable} \\ \mathbf{1} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Note that φ evaluates to the left-hand side of (29) while φ^π evaluates to the right-hand side (where i and j in (29) are replaced here by u_i and u_j respectively). □

We now follow the script of Section 6.1 to prove the completeness of $\mathsf{LinEx}(P)$.

Lemma 6.30. *For every variable ordering $\pi = (u_1, \ldots, u_n) \in \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi, \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{D}_I))$, the variable u_{f+1} must belong to a child node of the root of the expression tree.*

Proof Sketch. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 6.9. The main difference is that instead of considering a connected component, we will be considering an extended component. Hence in the path ($i_0 \coloneqq u_{f+1}, i_1, \ldots, i_k \in L_p$), we can assume that none of the intermediate vertices $i_1, \ldots, i_{k-1}$ is a product variable. In addition, instead of using the $\phi_{i_{k-1}i_k}$ defined in Proposition 6.7, we will be using the one defined in Proposition 6.18 (whose range is $\mathbf{D}_I$). Also for all $S \in \mathcal{E}$, instead of $\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)$ being $\mathbf{0}$ whenever there is a variable $\ell' \in S - \{i_0, \ldots, i_k\}$ for which $x_{\ell'} \neq e_{\ell'}$, the value of $\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)$ could now be $\mathbf{0}$ or $\mathbf{1}$ depending on whether $\bigoplus^{(\ell')}$ is a semiring or product aggregate. In particular, if there is $\ell' \in S - \{i_0, \ldots, i_k\}$ for which $x_{\ell'} \neq e_{\ell'}$ and $\bigoplus^{(\ell')}$ is a semiring aggregate, then $\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) = \mathbf{0}$. Otherwise, if there is $\ell' \in S - \{i_0, \ldots, i_k\}$ for which $x_{\ell'} \neq e_{\ell'}$ and $\bigoplus^{(\ell')}$ is a product aggregate, then $\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) = \mathbf{1}$. Otherwise, $\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)$ is defined as in the proof of Lemma 6.9.

Note the subtle issue that if some factor ψ_S that we used in the above construction was a factor that was added to φ in the query extension step of the construction of the expression tree (Definition 6.20), then the above construction does not work (because the original FAQ query φ does not have such a factor). Therefore, we need to verify that non of the factors $\psi_{S_1}, \ldots, \psi_{S_k}$ defined by equations (22) and (23) corresponds to a factor that was added in the query extension step (and not to an original input factor).

- None of the vertices $i_1, \ldots, i_{k-1}$ is a product variable, and therefore none of the factors $\psi_{S_2}, \ldots, \psi_{S_{k-1}}$ could have been added in the query extension step (since each factor that is added in the query extension step has one product variable and one semiring variable that is not closed under $\mathbf{D}_I$).
- It is not possible for i_k to be a product variable and i_{k-1} to be a semiring variable that is not closed under $\mathbf{D}_I$ at the same time. This is because $i_k \in L_p$, $i_{k-1} \notin L_p \cup \overline{L}_a$ (hence i_k is a strict ancestor of i_{k-1} in the expression tree P) however by Lemma 6.27 we should have had $i_{k-1} \preceq_P i_k$. Therefore, ψ_{S_k} in (22) could not have been added in the query extension step.
- If $i_0 = u_{f+1}$ was a product variable and i_1 was a semiring variable that is not closed under $\mathbf{D}_I$, then ψ_{S_1} could have been added in the query extension step. However in this particular case, we could have used Lemma 6.29 directly to show that $\pi \notin \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi, \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{D}_I))$.

□

The definition of componentwise-equivalence remains the same as that of Section 6.1 except that instead of taking connected components, we will be taking extended components (See Definition 6.19).

Definition 6.31 (Componentwise-equivalence)**.** Let φ be an FAQ-query of the form (24), $\mathcal{H}$ be the hypergraph of φ, W be the set of all product variables in φ, $\sigma = (v_1, \ldots, v_n) \in \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi, \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{D}_I))$ be a variable ordering. Let $\pi = (u_1, \ldots, u_n)$ be another variable ordering with $\{u_1, \ldots, u_f\} = F$. Then, π is said to be *componentwise-equivalent* (or shortly CW-equivalent) to σ if and only if:

- either $n = 1$,
- or $(\mathcal{H}, W)$ has at least two extended components, and for each extended component $(\mathcal{V}'(C), \mathcal{E}'(C))$ of $(\mathcal{H}, W)$, π_C is CW-equivalent to σ_C, where σ_C (respectively, π_C) is the variable ordering of $\mathcal{V}'(C)$ that is consistent with σ (respectively, π),
- or $u_1 = v_1$, and for each extended component $(\mathcal{V}'(C), \mathcal{E}'(C))$ of $(\mathcal{H} - \{v_1\}, W - \{v_1\})$, π_C is CW-equivalent to σ_C, where σ_C (respectively, π_C) is the ordering of $\mathcal{V}'(C)$ that is consistent with σ (respectively, π).

Given a set of variable orderings $\Lambda \subseteq \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi, \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{D}_I))$, we use $\mathsf{CWE}(\Lambda)$ to denote the set of all variable orderings that are CW-equivalent to some variable ordering in Λ.

Notice that variables in the dangling set can be placed anywhere later in the ordering, and hence they are ignored in the above definition.

The following proposition can be proved in exactly the same way as Proposition 6.11, hence the proof is omitted.

Proposition 6.32. *Let π be a variable ordering that is* CW*-equivalent to $\sigma \in \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi, \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{D}_I))$, we have $\pi \in \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi, \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{D}_I))$ and $\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma) = \mathsf{faqw}(\pi)$.*

Theorem 6.33 ($\mathsf{EVO}(\varphi, \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{D}_I)) = \mathsf{CWE}(\mathsf{LinEx}(P))$)**.** *Let φ be an* FAQ*-expression of the form* (24)*. A variable ordering σ is φ-equivalent if and only if it is* CW*-equivalent to some ordering π which is a linear extension of the precedence poset P.*

Proof. Similar to the proof of Theorem 6.12. The containment $\mathsf{CWE}(\mathsf{LinEx}(P)) \subseteq \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi, \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{D}_I))$ follows from Proposition 6.32 and Theorem 6.28. Hence, we only need to prove the other direction.

We prove the containment $\mathsf{EVO}(\varphi, \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{D}_I)) \subseteq \mathsf{CWE}(\mathsf{LinEx}(P))$ by induction with a slightly stronger induction hypothesis. We show that, if σ is φ-equivalent, then there is a linear extension $\pi \in \mathsf{LinEx}(P)$ that is CW-equivalent to σ and all product variables in π have exactly the same relative order as that in σ.

Without loss of generality we can assume that the root of the expression tree F is empty, and it has only one child node L. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be the hypergraph of φ, and W be the set of all product variables in φ. Fix an arbitrary $\sigma = (v_1, \ldots, v_n) \in \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)$. By Lemma 6.30, $v_1 \in L$. We recognize two cases:

- If the tag of L is not $\otimes$, then for each extended component $(\mathcal{V}'(C), \mathcal{E}'(C))$ of $(\mathcal{H} - \{v_1\}, W)$, define a sub-query φ_C with variable ordering σ_C on the conditional factors

$$\left\{\psi_S(\cdot \mid x_{v_1}) \mid S \in \mathcal{E} \wedge S \cap \mathcal{V}(C) \neq \emptyset\right\},$$

  where σ_C is the subsequence of σ obtained by picking out vertices in $\mathcal{V}'(C)$. Let P_C be the precedence poset of the expression tree for φ_C. By induction on the number of variables, we know that there is a variable ordering $\pi_C \in \mathsf{LinEx}(P_C)$ that is CW-equivalent to σ_C where product variables (if any) in π_C maintain their relative

order in σ_C. Although the same product variable(s) might appear in different extended components, we can pick a variable ordering π that is consistent with all π_C such that π starts with v_1, followed by variables in $L - \{v_1\}$. (Recall that the expression tree P can be constructed by creating a root node R containing $\{v_1\}$ with subtrees which are the expression trees P_C and then mering into R the children L_C that have the same tag as v_1. This tag is not a product in here.) In particular, to construct π, we start off with a sequence π which is a subsequence of σ consisting of only product variables. Then for each π_C, we insert the semiring variables of π_C into π while maintaining the relative order of π_C. Moreover, for every π_C where the root L_C of P_C has the same (semiring) tag as v_1, we make sure that the (semiring) variables in L_C are inserted to (and remain at) the beginning of π. Finally, we insert v_1 to the beginning of π. We can verify that the final π starts with v_1 followed by variables in $L - \{v_1\}$, π is consistent with all π_C, $\pi \in \mathsf{LinEx}(P)$, π is CW-equivalent to σ, and product variables in π maintain their relative order in σ.

- If the tag of L is $\otimes$, then $(\mathcal{H} - \{v_1\}, W - \{v_1\})$ cannot have more than on extended component $(\mathcal{V}'(C), \mathcal{E}'(C)) = \mathcal{H} - \{v_1\}$, by Proposition 6.22. Let φ_C, σ_C, and P_C be defined as before. Then, by induction there is a variable ordering $\pi_C \in \mathsf{LinEx}(P_C)$ that is CW-equivalent to σ_C where product variables (if any) in π_C maintain their relative order in σ_C. Let π start with v_1 followed by π_C. It follows that $\pi \in \mathsf{LinEx}(P)$, π is CW-equivalent to σ, and product variables in π maintain their relative order in σ.

□

Recall Definition 5.12 of $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi, \mathcal{F})$.

Corollary 6.34. *We have*

$$\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi, \mathbf{D}_I) = \min \{\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma) \mid \sigma \in \mathsf{LinEx}(P)\} .$$

6.3 General FAQ query

The only case of FAQ that does not fall under the previous section is the case where we have non-idempotent product aggregates. This general case is not very natural as there aren't many practical examples that can only be represented using this form. For completeness, we describe how to handle it in this section.

Definition 5.3 defines idempotence from an algorithmic point of view: A product aggregate is called idempotent at the time it is about to be eliminated in InsideOut if the ranges of all factors containing it at that time are idempotent w.r.t. to $\otimes$. This definition not only depends on the specific elimination ordering being used, but also on the input factors (i.e. data-dependent). While this definition makes sense from an algorithmic point of view, it does not capture idempotence at semantic level.

From a semantic point of view, we can only reason about whether the product is idempotent under the entire domain $\mathbf{D}$ (or at least a closed subset of the domain $\mathbf{D}_I$, as we did in Section 6.2). More specifically in this section, instead of thinking of idempotence as a property of each product aggregate, we will think of it as a property of the product operator $\otimes$ under the domain $\mathbf{D}$. A product operator $\otimes$ is *idempotent under* $\mathbf{D}$ if and only if $a \otimes a = a$ for all $a \in \mathbf{D}$. Here, we are interested in the case where $\otimes$ is *not* idempotent under $\mathbf{D}$.

We will explain the basic ideas using a simple example.

Example 6.35 (FAQ with non-idempotent ⊗ under **D**)**.** Consider the following FAQ.

$$\varphi = \sum_{x_1} \prod_{x_2} \sum_{x_3} \psi_{13}(x_1, x_3)\psi_2(x_2).$$

Notice that φ consists of two connected components: $\{1, 3\}$ and $\{2\}$. (And using Definition 6.19 with $W = \{2\}$ being the set of product variables, $(\mathcal{H}, W)$ consists of one extended component $\mathcal{V}'(C) = \{1, 3\}$ in addition to a dangling set $D = \{2\}$). However, assuming the product is non-idempotent under **D**, φ is written as

$$\varphi = \left[\sum_{x_1} \left(\sum_{x_3} \psi_{13}(x_1, x_3)\right)^{|\mathsf{Dom}(X_2)|}\right] \left[\prod_{x_2} \psi_2(x_2)\right].$$

Although x_2 is connected to neither x_1 nor x_3, it imposes an order on them. However if we construct the expression tree using Definition 6.1 or Definition 6.20 (without the query extension step, which was described only in the context of FAQ queries of the form given by Definition 6.16), then the expression tree is going to be equivalent to the following expression:

$$\varphi = \left[\sum_{x_1, x_3} \psi_{13}(x_1, x_3)\right] \left[\prod_{x_2} \psi_2(x_2)\right].$$

The above expression fails to capture the fact that x_1 must come before x_3. (Notice that this situation does not necessarily happen between sibling nodes in the expression tree. It could have happened between arbitrary nodes that are incomparable under the precedence poset of the expression tree.)

To solve this issue, we will use a different (and more general) query extension step than the one in Definition 6.20, then we will apply the same compartmentalization and compression steps from Definition 6.20 on the extended query. In particular, the query extension step that we will use here consists of extending all input factors in the original FAQ query by adding all product variables to each one of them. In this example, we extend ψ_{13} into ψ'_{123} which is defined for all $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathsf{Dom}(X_1) \times \mathsf{Dom}(X_2) \times \mathsf{Dom}(X_3)$ as follows.

$$\psi'_{123}(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \psi_{13}(x_1, x_3).$$

The extended φ (let's call it φ') will be

$$\varphi' = \sum_{x_1} \prod_{x_2} \sum_{x_3} \psi'_{123}(x_1, x_2, x_3)\psi_2(x_2).$$

The expression tree of the extended query φ' (constructed using the compartmentalization and compression steps of Definition 6.20) is going to be equivalent to the following expression.

$$\varphi' = \left[\sum_{x_1} \prod_{x_2} \sum_{x_3} \psi'_{123}(x_1, x_2, x_3)\right] \left[\prod_{x_2} \psi_2(x_2)\right].$$

Now, this new expression forces x_1 to come before x_3 in the order. Notice that the above extension takes place only at semantic level (i.e. during the construction of the expression tree). At algorithmic level, we will still be working over the original φ. For example after eliminating x_3 above in InsideOut, x_2 is going to be eliminated from $\sum_{x_3} \psi'_{123}(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ by raising the original $\sum_{x_3} \psi_{13}(x_1, x_3)$ to the power of $|\mathsf{Dom}(X_2)|$ (using repeated squaring).

Definition 6.36 (Expression tree and precedence poset)**.** Given an FAQ query φ (as defined in Section 1.2) with hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ and domain **D** where ⊗ is not idempotent under **D**, let K be the set of semiring aggregates and free variables (as defined by (14)) and $\bar{K} := [n] - K$ be the set of product aggregates. We define an extended FAQ query φ' with

domain $\mathbf{D}$ and hypergraph $\mathcal{H}' = ([n], \mathcal{E}')$ where

$$\mathcal{E}' := \left\{ S \cup \bar{K} \mid S \in \mathcal{E} \right\},$$

and $\varphi' : \prod_{i \in [f]} \mathsf{Dom}(X_i) \to \mathbf{D}$ is defined as

$$\varphi'(\mathbf{x}_{[f]}) := \bigoplus_{x_{f+1}}^{(f+1)} \cdots \bigoplus_{x_n}^{(n)} \bigotimes_{S' \in \mathcal{E}'} \psi'_{S'}(\mathbf{x}_{S'}),$$

where for each $S \cup \bar{K} \in \mathcal{E}'$, $\psi'_{S \cup \bar{K}} : \prod_{i \in S \cup \bar{K}} \mathsf{Dom}(X_i) \to \mathbf{D}$ is defined as

$$\psi'_{S \cup \bar{K}}(\mathbf{x}_{S \cup \bar{K}}) := \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S).$$

The expression tree of φ is constructed by applying the compartmentalization and compression steps of Definition 6.20 on the extended query φ'. The precedence poset is constructed by applying Definition 6.26 on the expression tree of φ.

Notice that because every factor in φ' contains all product variables $\bar{K}$, it doesn't really matter anymore whether product is idempotent or not. In particular, the situation of having to raise to a power of $|\mathsf{Dom}(X_i)|$ won't be happening anymore in φ' (at semantic level). Hence, we can run the exact same analysis from Section 6.2 on φ' in order to prove that:

Theorem 6.37 ($\mathsf{LinEx}(P) \subseteq \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)$)**.** *Every linear extension of the precedence poset P is φ-equivalent.*

Proof. The proof is the same as that of Theorem 6.28 except for two differences. In particular, in (30) there won't be any component C for which $n \notin \mathcal{V}'(C)$ (because $\oplus^{(n)}$ is a product aggregate and Definition 6.36 adds n to every $\mathcal{V}'(C)$). Because of that, we won't need the idempotence assumption anymore in (30). Similarly, in (32) there won't be any component C for which $k \notin \mathcal{V}'(C)$, hence we won't need idempotence or Lemma 6.27 (which we don't have here). □

Notice again that we are merely using φ' to semantically determine which orderings σ are in $\mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)$. The algorithm (e.g. InsideOut) will still be running on φ.

While the above definition of the expression tree captures completeness at an intuitive level (as we argued for in Example 6.35), achieving completeness in a rigorous way requires long definitions and unnatural assumptions. Because this class of FAQ is not very well-motivated by practical examples, we skip the rigorous completeness definitions/proofs for this section and leave them as an open problem.

Open Problem 6.38. Prove that $\mathsf{EVO}(\varphi) = \mathsf{CWE}(\mathsf{LinEx}(P))$ for FAQ queries of the general form given in Section 1.2.

7 APPROXIMATING THE FAQ-WIDTH

Given a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ and a rational number $w \geq 1$ as input, it is **NP**-hard to decide whether $\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}) \leq w$ [61]. Recently, it has been shown that even for a fixed w, and even for $w = 2$, the problem is still **NP**-hard [38]. By extension, the problem of computing a tree decomposition with the (optimal) fractional hypertree width is also **NP**-hard (since having that tree decomposition enables computing fhtw in polynomial time). As was shown in Proposition 5.13, our FAQ-width (faqw) is an exact generalization of the fractional hypertree width: it coincides with fhtw for SumProd queries and for queries where all variables are free. By extension, computing faqw and finding a tree decomposition with the optimal faqw are both **NP**-hard.

Marx [61] had suggested an approximation algorithm that, given a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$, outputs a tree decomposition of $\mathcal{H}$ whose fractional hypertree width is $O(\mathsf{fhtw}^3(\mathcal{H}))$ in time $O(|\mathcal{H}|^{O(\mathsf{fhtw}^3(\mathcal{H}))})$. Hence Marx's algorithm runs in polynomial time in $|\mathcal{H}|$ when $\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H})$ is a constant. In this section, we aim to design a polynomial-time approximation algorithm for the FAQ-width. Our algorithm is going to use any approximation algorithm for fhtw (such as Marx's) as a blackbox, and our approximation guarantee is going to be in terms of the approximation guarantee of the blackbox algorithm. Our approximation algorithm is also going to rely on the expression tree constructed in Section 6.

7.1 FAQ with only semiring aggregates

Recall the definition of the FAQ-width (Definition 5.10):

$$\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma) := \max_{k \in K} \left\{ \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U_k) \right\}.$$

When there is no product aggregate, K (as defined in (14)) is *exactly* $[n]$. Let P be the expression tree constructed from the query φ in the form (18). We define notation that will be used throughout this section. Let C be a node of the expression tree P. (This means C is a set of variables of φ, and all variables in C have the same tag.) Let L be the parent node of C (if any) in the expression tree P. We define the following sets:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{E}}(C) &:= \big\{ S \in \mathcal{E} \mid S \cap C' \neq \emptyset \\ &\qquad \text{for some } C' \text{ node in the subtree of } P \text{ rooted at } C. \big\} \qquad (33) \\ S_{L,C} &:= L \cap \left(\bigcup_{S \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}(C)} S \right) \qquad (34) \\ U(C) &:= \bigcup_{L' \text{ an ancestor of } C} \left(L' \cap \bigcup_{S \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}(C)} S \right). \qquad (35) \end{aligned}$$

If C has no parent L, then $U(C) = \emptyset$ by default and $S_{L,C}$ is undefined. We think of the set $S_{L,C}$ as the contribution of all the nodes in the C-branch to L, and the set $U(C)$ as the contribution of all the nodes in the C-branch to all the (strict) ancestors of C. Next, for every node L in the expression tree P, define the hypergraph $\mathcal{H}_L$ as follows.

- If L is a leaf node of P, then $\mathcal{H}_L = \mathcal{H}[L]$, where $\mathcal{H}[L]$ denotes the subgraph of $\mathcal{H}$ induced by L. [15]
- If L is not a leaf node of P, then $\mathcal{H}_L = (L, \mathcal{E}_L)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_L &:= \big\{ S \cap L \mid (S \in \mathcal{E}) \wedge (S \cap L \neq \emptyset) \wedge (S \cap C = \emptyset, \forall \text{ descendant } C \text{ of } L) \big\} \\ &\quad \cup \big\{ S_{L,C} \mid C \text{ a child of } L \big\}. \end{aligned}$$

  In other words, $\mathcal{E}_L$ is the set of all projections of S down to L for all hyperedges S for which S intersects L but not any descendant of L in the expression tree; and for each child C of L, $\mathcal{E}_L$ also contains the projection onto L of the union of all hyperedges S that intersect (some descendant of) C.

We next prove a simple lowerbound for $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi)$ that leads to an approximation algorithm for computing $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi)$ using an approximation algorithm for fhtw as a blackbox.

Lemma 7.1. *For any node L in the expression tree,*

$$\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi) \quad \geq \quad \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}_L)$$

[15] Given $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ and $L \subseteq \mathcal{V}$, the hypergraph $\mathcal{H}[L] := (L, \mathcal{E}[L])$ is defined by $\mathcal{E}[L] := \{S \cap L \mid S \in \mathcal{E}\}$.

$$\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi) \quad \geq \quad \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U(L)).$$

Proof. To show the first inequality, by Corollary 6.14, it is sufficient to prove that $\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma) \geq \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}_L)$ for any variable ordering $\sigma = (v_1, \ldots, v_n) \in \mathsf{LinEx}(P)$ and for any node L in the expression tree.

If L is a leaf node of the expression tree, then $\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma) \geq \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}) \geq \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}_L)$ because $\mathcal{H}_L$ is an induced subgraph of $\mathcal{H}$. Now, suppose L is not a leaf node. For any child C of L, let k be the smallest integer such that v_k belongs to some node in the subtree rooted at C. Then, due to the fact that $\sigma \in \mathsf{LinEx}(P)$, if $v_j \in L$ then $j < k$. The set U^σ_k is *precisely* equal to $U(C) \cup \{v_k\}$. This is because each time we eliminate a vertex belonging to any node in the subtree rooted at C, we insert back a hyperedge interconnecting all its neighbors (to the next hypergraph in the hypergraph sequence). And so by the time we reach U^σ_k all of the nodes in $U(C)$ belong to the same hyperedge of $\mathcal{H}^\sigma_k$. It follows that $(U^\sigma_k - \{v_k\}) \cap L = U(C) \cap L = S_{L,C}$ (since $L \cap L' = \emptyset$ for any ancestor L' of L). From this observation we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi) &= \min_\sigma \left(\max \left\{ \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U^\sigma_k) \mid k \in [n] \right\} \right) \\
&\geq \min_\sigma \left(\max \left\{ \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U^\sigma_j) \mid j \in L \right\} \right) \\
(\rho^* \text{ is monotone}) \quad &\geq \min_\sigma \left(\max \left\{ \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U^\sigma_j \cap L) \mid j \in L \right\} \right) \\
&\geq \min_\tau \left(\max \left\{ \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U^\tau_j) \mid j \in L \right\} \right) \\
&= \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}_L).
\end{aligned}$$

In the above, τ is taken only over all variable orderings of L instead of the entire set $[n]$.

We next prove the second inequality that, for any $\sigma = (v_1, \ldots, v_n) \in \mathsf{LinEx}(\varphi)$, and any node C in the expression tree, we have $\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma) \geq \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U(C))$. As we have observed above, let k be the smallest integer such that $v_k \in C$, then $U^\sigma_k = U(C) \cup \{v_k\}$. Hence, because ρ^* is monotone,

$$\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma) = \max_{j \in [n]} \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U^\sigma_j) \geq \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U^\sigma_k) \geq \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U(C)).$$

□

Theorem 7.2. *Let φ be any* FAQ *query whose hypergraph is $\mathcal{H}$ and all variable aggregates are semiring aggregates. Suppose there is an approximation algorithm that, given any hypergraph $\mathcal{H}'$, outputs a tree decomposition of $\mathcal{H}'$ with fractional hypertree width at most $g(\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}'))$ in time $t(|\mathcal{H}'|, \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}'))$ for some non-decreasing functions g, t. Then, we can in time $|\mathcal{H}| \cdot t(|\mathcal{H}|, \mathsf{faqw}(\varphi))$ compute a φ-equivalent vertex ordering σ such that*

$$\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma) \leq \mathsf{faqw}(\varphi) + g(\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi)).$$

Proof. We use the blackbox approximation algorithm for fhtw to construct a tree decomposition (T_L, χ_L) for every hypergraph $\mathcal{H}_L$ where L is a node in the expression tree. Then, from each of those tree decompositions, we construct a variable ordering σ_L for variables in the set L in the standard way. Finally, we construct the variable ordering σ for $[n]$ by concatenating all the σ_L together in any way that respects the precedence partial order.

Suppose $\sigma = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ is the resulting variable ordering. Consider an arbitrary vertex v_k. Let L be the node of the precedence tree that contains v_k. Let B be the bag in (T_L, χ_L) that v_k belonged to when it was eliminated to construct σ_L. Then, using the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 7.1, we can show that

$$U^\sigma_k \subseteq B \cup U(L). \tag{36}$$

To see this, first consider the simpler case when L is a leaf node of the expression tree. Then, when we eliminate v_k the set U_k is the union of the sets $S \in \partial(v_k)$. The part $U_k \cap L$ is covered by B because within L the elimination algorithm works on $\mathcal{H}_L$. The part $U_k - L$ is covered by the maximum *residue* left over from eliminating all vertices in L. The residue is precisely the set $U(L)$, because every time we eliminate a vertex we collect all its neighbors together into a hyperedge. By the time the last vertex from L is eliminated, the entire set $U(L)$ becomes a hyperedge. Now, if L is not a leaf node, the situation is exactly the same except for the fact that we work on the graph $\mathcal{H}_L$ which is not necessarily the same as $\mathcal{H}[L]$. The hypergraph $\mathcal{H}_L$ contains the restrictions on L of all the residues of the subtrees under L.

Next, from Lemma 7.1 and from the fact that ρ^* is subadditive, relation (36) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U_k^\sigma) &\leq \rho^*(B) + \rho^*(U(L)) \\ &\leq g(\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}_L)) + \mathsf{faqw}(\varphi) \\ &\leq g(\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi)) + \mathsf{faqw}(\varphi). \end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma) = \max_{k\in[n]} \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U_k^\sigma) \leq g(\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi)) + \mathsf{faqw}(\varphi).$$

□

7.2 FAQ with an inner FAQ-formula closed under idempotent elements

The key difference between this section and Section 7.1 is that K (defined by (14)) is not necessarily equal to $[n]$: instead it is now the union of $F = [f]$ and the set of semiring variables. Moreover instead of using $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi)$ given by Definition 5.11, we will now use $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi, \mathbf{D}_I)$ given by Definition 5.12. We will still follow the same strategy as that of Section 7.1, though the definition of the sets $S_{L,C}$ for each node L and a child C of L is a bit more delicate.

Definition 7.3 (Semiring node and product node)**.** A node in the expression tree P is called a *semiring node* if its variables have a tag forming a semiring with $\otimes$. Otherwise, the node is called a *product node*.

Let C be a node of the expression tree P. Let L be the parent node of C (if any) in the expression tree P. We define $\bar{\mathcal{E}}(C)$ differently from the previous section as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{E}}(C) \quad := \quad \big\{ & S \in \mathcal{E} \mid S \cap C' \neq \emptyset \text{ for some } \textit{semiring} \text{ node } C' \\ & \qquad \text{in the subtree of } P \text{ rooted at } C. \big\} \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

(Compare the above definition with (33).) We define $S_{L,C}$ and $U(C)$ using (34) and (35) (where the $\bar{\mathcal{E}}(C)$ referred to in (34) and (35) is now the one defined by (37)). Note in particular that if a node does not have any semiring descendant then $U(C)$ is empty. We think of $S_{L,C}$ as the *residue* imposed on S from the process of eliminating all semiring variables under the C-subtree.

We next define the hypergraphs $\mathcal{H}_L$, similar to what was defined in Section 7.1, with one small difference:

- If L is a leaf node of P, then $\mathcal{H}_L = \mathcal{H}[L]$, the subgraph of $\mathcal{H}$ induced by L.
- If L is not a leaf node of P, then $\mathcal{H}_L = (L, \mathcal{E}_L)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_L \quad := \quad & \big\{ S \cap L \mid (S \in \mathcal{E}) \wedge (S \cap L \neq \emptyset) \wedge (S \cap C = \emptyset, \forall \textit{ semiring} \text{ descendant } C \text{ of } L) \big\} \\ & \cup \big\{ S_{L,C} \mid C \text{ a child of } L \big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here is where $\mathcal{E}_L$ is different from the corresponding definition of $\mathcal{E}_L$ in Section 7.1. We only take the projection of the hyperedges S for which S does not intersect any semiring descendant of L. The key point to notice is that, if S intersects some semiring descendant, then its contribution to the node L is summarized already in some $S_{L,C}$.

We now can follow the script of Section 7.1. Note that the bound only holds for the semiring nodes.

Lemma 7.4. *For any semiring node L in the expression tree, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{faqw}(\varphi, \mathbf{D}_I) &\geq \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}_L) \\ \mathsf{faqw}(\varphi, \mathbf{D}_I) &\geq \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U(L)). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. If the semiring node L is a leaf node of the expression tree, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{faqw}(\varphi, \mathbf{D}_I) &= \min_{\sigma \in \mathsf{LinEx}(P)} \left(\max \left\{ \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U^\sigma_k) \mid k \in K \right\} \right) \\ &\geq \min_{\sigma \in \mathsf{LinEx}(P)} \left(\max \left\{ \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U^\sigma_j) \mid j \in L \right\} \right) \\ (\rho^* \text{ is monotone}) \quad &\geq \min_{\sigma \in \mathsf{LinEx}(P)} \left(\max \left\{ \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U^\sigma_j \cap L) \mid j \in L \right\} \right) \\ &\geq \min_{\tau} \left(\max \left\{ \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U^\tau_j) \mid j \in L \right\} \right) \\ &= \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}_L), \end{aligned}$$

where τ above ranges over all variable orderings of L. If the semiring node L is not a leaf node, then the rest of the proof is the same as that of Lemma 7.1 except for a couple of minor differences: We will only consider *semiring* nodes of the expression tree and *semiring* vertices in the hypergraph sequence. Also we will consider $k \in K$ instead of $k \in [n]$. □

We can now design the approximation algorithm.

Theorem 7.5. *Let φ be any* FAQ *query of the form* (24) *whose hypergraph is $\mathcal{H}$. Suppose there is an approximation algorithm that, given any hypergraph $\mathcal{H}'$, outputs a tree decomposition of $\mathcal{H}'$ with fractional hypertree width at most $g(\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}'))$ in time $t(|\mathcal{H}'|, \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}'))$ for some non-decreasing functions g, t. Then, we can in time $|\mathcal{H}| \cdot t(|\mathcal{H}|, \mathsf{faqw}(\varphi, \mathbf{D}_I))$ compute a vertex ordering $\sigma \in \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi, \mathbf{D}_I)$ such that*

$$\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma) \leq \mathsf{faqw}(\varphi, \mathbf{D}_I) + g(\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi, \mathbf{D}_I)).$$

Recall that in the proof of the corresponding Theorem 7.2 from the previous Section 7.1, we applied the blackbox approximation algorithm on each node L of the expression tree to obtain an ordering σ_L of variables in L, and then we obtained an ordering σ of all variables by concatenating together σ_L for all nodes L in an ascending order by the depth of L in the expression tree, i.e. starting from the root node and going down the expression tree.

In contrast while trying to prove Theorem 7.5 in the same way as above, we will encounter two key differences. First, for every product node L, we don't need to use the blackbox approximation algorithm to obtain an ordering σ_L because product variables play no role in the definition of the FAQ-width, hence we can just order L arbitrarily. Second, even if we obtain an ordering σ_L for every semiring node L, it is not very clear how to obtain the overall variable ordering σ because product variables can occur multiple times in the expression tree. In particular, if we try to obtain σ in the same way as above by going through every node L of the expression tree ordered by depth and listing σ_L when the

node L is a semiring node and an arbitrary order of L when L is a product node, then the resulting σ might list the same product variable multiple times in multiple contradictory locations, hence it might not be a valid variable ordering!

Proof of Theorem 7.5. Define a set $\overline{\mathcal{V}}$ whose items are either product variables or nodes L where L is a semiring node in the expression tree, i.e.

$$\overline{\mathcal{V}} := \{v \in \mathcal{V} \mid v \text{ is a product variable}\} \cup \{L \mid L \text{ is a semiring node in } P\}$$

Define a binary relation $\preceq_{\overline{P}} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{V}} \times \overline{\mathcal{V}}$ as follows. For every pair $u, v \in \overline{\mathcal{V}}$, we have $u \preceq_{\overline{P}} v$ iff

- either $u = v$,
- or there are two nodes L, L' in the expression tree P where L is a strict ancestor of L' and

$$(u = L \vee u \in L) \wedge (v = L' \vee v \in L')$$

By a very similar proof to that of Corollary 6.25, we can prove that $\preceq_{\overline{P}}$ indeed defines a partial order on $\overline{\mathcal{V}}$. Let $\overline{\sigma}$ be an ordering of $\overline{\mathcal{V}}$ which is an arbitrary linear extension of this partial order $\preceq_{\overline{P}}$. We can obtain an ordering σ of the original set of variables $\mathcal{V}$ using the ordering $\overline{\sigma}$ (of $\overline{\mathcal{V}}$) as follows. For every L appearing in the ordering $\overline{\sigma}$ where L is a semiring node of P, we use the blackbox approximation algorithm to construct a tree decomposition (T_L, χ_L) for the hypergraph $\mathcal{H}_L$. Then, from this tree decomposition, we construct a variable ordering σ_L for variables in the set L. Finally, we replace the occurrence of L in $\overline{\sigma}$ by the variable ordering σ_L. After repeating these steps for every L, we call the final variable ordering σ. Then σ is a linear extension of the precedence poset P.

Suppose $\sigma = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ is the resulting variable ordering. Consider an arbitrary vertex v_k in a semiring node L. Following the argument in the proof of Theorem 7.2, we can see that $U_k^\sigma \subseteq B \cup U(L)$. From Lemma 7.4 and from the fact that ρ^* is subadditive, it follows that

$$\rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U_k^\sigma) \le \rho^*(B) + \rho^*(U(L)) \le g(\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}_L)) + \mathsf{faqw}(\varphi, \mathbf{D}_I) \le g(\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi, \mathbf{D}_I)) + \mathsf{faqw}(\varphi, \mathbf{D}_I).$$

The rest of the proof is identical to that of Theorem 7.2. □

Note that requiring different copies of the same variable to be consecutive is not necessary for InsideOut to work. The algorithm works even if we consider them to be different variables on the same domain. However, the collapsing of different copies back to the original copy is needed for the rigor of the definition of $\mathsf{EVO}(\varphi, \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{D}_I))$. Note also that Theorem 7.5 implies Theorem F.16 and Theorem 7.2.

Given a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ with fractional hypertree width of $\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H})$, Marx's approximation algorithm [61] computes a tree decomposition of $\mathcal{H}$ whose fractional hypertree width is $O(\mathsf{fhtw}^3(\mathcal{H}))$ in time $O(|\mathcal{H}|^{O(\mathsf{fhtw}^3(\mathcal{H}))})$. By plugging this algorithm into Theorem 7.5, we obtain an approximation algorithm for $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi, \mathbf{D}_I)$ that, given an FAQ query φ, computes a variable ordering $\sigma \in \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi, \mathbf{D}_I)$ with $\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma) = O(\mathsf{faqw}^3(\varphi, \mathbf{D}_I))$ in time $O(|\mathcal{H}|^{O(\mathsf{faqw}^3(\varphi, \mathbf{D}_I))})$. If $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi, \mathbf{D}_I)$ is bounded by a constant, then the runtime becomes $\mathrm{poly}(|\mathcal{H}|) = \tilde{O}(1)$. (Recall from Table 1 that in this paper we use $\tilde{O}$ to hide a factor that is polynomial in the query size.) From this discussion, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 7.6. *Let φ be any* FAQ *query of the form defined in* (24). *Suppose $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi, \mathbf{D}_I) \le c$ for some constant c. Then, the query can be answered in time*

$$\tilde{O}\left(N^{O(\mathsf{faqw}^3(\varphi, \mathbf{D}_I))} + \|\varphi\|\right).$$

7.2.1 Corollaries in Logic. Using the reduction in Example A.20 from QCQ to FAQ, we obtain

Corollary 7.7. QCQ *is tractable for the class of quantified conjunctive queries* φ *where* faqw *is bounded.*

To determine which classes of QCQ formulas are tractable, Chen and Dalmau [25] defined the notion of a *prefixed graph* and its width. The definition is in the beginning of Section III of their paper. The prefix graph's width corresponds exactly to to the quantity $\max_\sigma \max_{k\in K}\{|U_k|\}$. Since $\rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U_k) \le |U_k|$, $\text{faqw}(\varphi, \mathbf{D}_I)$ is a stronger notion and our result implies the main positive result in their paper (the first part of Theorem 3.1). Furthermore, we can construct families of QCQ instances for which $\text{faqw}(\varphi, \mathbf{D}_I)$ is bounded but the prefix graph's width is unbounded. For example, consider the following quantified conjunctive query

$$\Phi = \forall X_1 \cdots \forall X_n \exists X_{n+1} \left(S(X_1, \ldots, X_n) \wedge \bigwedge_{i\in[n]} R(X_i, X_{n+1}) \right).$$

Chen-Dalmau's prefix graph's width is $n+1$ in this case, but faqw is 2. Consequently, our result is strictly stronger. The next corollary resolves an open question posed at the end of Durand and Mengel's paper [35].

Corollary 7.8. #QCQ *is tractable for the class of quantified conjunctive queries* φ *whose* faqw *is bounded.*

8 INPUT AND OUTPUT REPRESENTATION

Thus far we stated our results for the case when the input and output factors are in the listing representation (Definition 4.1). Tracing back at the key steps of InsideOut (and OutsideIn) algorithm, it is easy to see that the algorithm works for a more general setting than just the listing representation. Section 8.1 presents the two conditions that we need from the input factor representation for all our previous arguments to go through. In Sections 8.2 and 8.3, we consider more compressed forms of input factor representations than the listing representation. In particular, Section 8.2 considers other representations that can be reduced to the listing representation (at the cost of having to compute a modified FAQ), which means we can still use InsideOut as is. In Section 8.3 we consider even more succinct representations where the reductions in Section 8.2 are too costly. In particular, for the special case of SAT and #SAT, we show that we can replace OutsideIn with a more specific algorithm, which allows us to recover known results on polynomial-time solvability of certain classes of SAT and #SAT formulas. While these results only re-prove existing results, we consider these as an illustration of the power of the FAQ (and variable elimination) framework. We then switch to considering situations where one might be interested in output representations other than the listing representation in Section 8.4. Finally in Section 8.5, we consider the case when the output and input representations match, which naturally leads to the notion of composing FAQs. FAQ composition is also needed in Section 8.2. For the sake of clarity, we will almost exclusively focus on FAQ-SS in this section.

8.1 The factor oracle

In many application areas of FAQ, there are *many* ways the input factors can be represented. Appendix G lists some of the main representations collected from areas such as logic, PGM, and matrix computation. It should be obvious that the computational complexity of FAQ is highly dependent on how the inputs are specified. To generalize our results, we advocate for the following oracle model, which is sufficiently general to capture existing models of input and output representations. We note that our assumptions here are met by all of the representations discussed here and in Appendix G – the only difference is in the price the oracle pays to answer the query.

Assumption 1 (Conditional query assumption)**.** We assume that $\mathrm{Dom}(X_i)$ are totally ordered.[16] Each factor oracle for ψ_S is capable of answering the following query called the *conditional query*. Let $0 \le k \le n-1$ be any integer such that $k+1 \in S$. Let $\mathbf{x}_{[k]} = (x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ be a vector such that $\psi_S(\cdot \mid \mathbf{x}_{[k]}) \not\equiv \mathbf{0}$. Let $y \in \mathrm{Dom}(X_{k+1})$ be arbitrary. Then, the factor oracle for ψ_S can return a *minimum* value $x_{k+1} > y$ for which $\psi_S(\cdot \mid \mathbf{x}_{[k+1]}) \not\equiv \mathbf{0}$, i.e.

$$x^S_{k+1} = \min \left\{ x_{k+1} \mid (x_{k+1} > y) \wedge \left(\psi_S(\cdot \mid \mathbf{x}_{k+1}) \not\equiv \mathbf{0}\right) \right\}.$$

If no such x^S_{k+1} exists, then $+\infty$ (just a symbol) is returned.

A *value query* returns the value $\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)$ for some given $\mathbf{x}_S$. For simplicity we will also call those value queries conditional queries.

The second assumption about the input oracles is the following.

Assumption 2 (Product-marginalization assumption)**.** Let ψ_S be an input oracle and $i \in S$. The input oracle for ψ_S can return another oracle on $S - \{i\}$, denoted by $\psi_{S-\{i\}}$, defined by

$$\psi_{S-\{i\}}(\mathbf{x}_{S-\{i\}}) = \bigotimes_{x_i \in \mathrm{Dom}(X_i)} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S).$$

The number of $\otimes$ operations performed to compute the factor $\psi_{S-\{i\}}$ is bounded by $\|\psi_S\|$.

This assumption is reasonable because as soon as $\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) = \mathbf{0}$ we can infer that $\psi_{S-\{i\}}(\mathbf{x}_{S-\{i\}}) = \mathbf{0}$. Note also that if we use the listing representation for $\psi_{S-\{i\}}$, then we can compute entries of $\psi_{S-\{i\}}$ using at most $\|\psi_S\|$ conditional queries.

Appendix G.1 explains why the listing representation satisfies both of the above assumptions. By re-examining the previous runtime analysis of InsideOut, one can check that in the more general factor oracle model, one can prove the following generalization of Theorem 5.5:

Theorem 8.1. *Suppose the Conditional query assumption and Product-marginalization assumption are satisfied. Using notations established in Theorem 5.5, the* InsideOut *algorithm applied to φ (Algorithm 1) satisfies the following properties.*

(i) *The number of conditional queries to the factor oracles is at most*

$$\sum_{k \in K} |U_k| \cdot |\{S \in \mathcal{E} : S \cap U_k \neq \emptyset\}| \cdot \mathrm{AGM}(U_k) + \sum_{\substack{k \notin K \\ S \in \partial(k)}} \|\psi_S\| + \sum_{\substack{k \notin K \\ S \in \mathcal{E}_k - \partial(k)}} \|\psi_S\| \cdot \mathrm{Idem}_k(\psi_S) + f(f+m)\|\varphi\|. \quad (38)$$

(ii) *the total number of $\oplus^{(k)}$ operations performed is at most $\sum_{k \in K} |U_k| \cdot \mathrm{AGM}(U_k)$.*

(iii) *the number of $\otimes$ operations performed is at most*

$$\sum_{k \in K} (|\{S \in \mathcal{E} : S \cap U_k \neq \emptyset\}| - 1) \cdot \mathrm{AGM}(U_k) + \sum_{\substack{k \notin K \\ S \in \partial(k)}} \|\psi_S\| + \sum_{\substack{k \notin K \\ S \in \mathcal{E}_k - \partial(k)}} \|\psi_S\| \cdot \mathrm{Idem}_k(\psi_S) + f(f+m)\|\varphi\|. \quad (39)$$

[16] We order the domain arbitrarily if there is no natural total order; e.g. false $<$ true for a Boolean problem, or blue $<$ green $<$ red in a coloring problem.

8.2 Input representations parsimoniously reducible to FAQ

We briefly mention other representation choices for input factors. More details (including formal definitions) can be found in Appendix G.

We begin with a representation that is more wasteful than the listing representation: the "truth table" representation, which is the norm in dense matrix computation as well as inference in probabilistic graphical models. The difference from listing representation is that tuples that result in a **0** are also explicitly listed. It is trivial to convert this representation into the listing representations.

Beyond the truth tables, other known representations are more succinct than the listing representation. In the CSP literature, these include generalized disjunctive normal form (GDNF) that was first considered by Chen and Grohe [26] and decision diagram representation of Chen and Grohe [26], which is a generalization of the well-studied ordered binary decision diagrams or OBDDs. In the database literature, Olteanu and Závodný [73] considered factorized representations for conjunctive queries. Fast matrix vector multiplication has many examples of more succinct representations than the listing representation (e.g. the DFT). In the PGM world, Algebraic Decision Diagrams (or ADDs) were introduced in Bahar et al. [13].

A common property of all of the above succinct representations is that they can all be reduced to the listing representation at the expense of having to solve a more complicated FAQ problem. In particular, this leads to the problem of composing FAQ problems, which is discussed in Section 8.5.

8.3 Input representations not parsimoniously reducible to FAQ

Thus far we have analyzed the runtime of the InsideOut algorithm in terms of the sizes of the input factors, which are the number of non-zero points of each input factor. If the input factors were represented using the listing representation, then $O(|S| \cdot \|\psi_S\|)$ is precisely the input size for the factor ψ_S (assuming each functional value is of size $O(1)$). However, in some applications the input factors are much more compactly represented, and the representation of ψ_S may be exponentially smaller than $\|\psi_S\|$. The canonical example is the SAT problem, where a CNF clause ψ_S has size $\|\psi_S\| = 2^{|S|} - 1$, yet represented using only $|S|$ bits. Note that in this case we could reduce the input to the listing representation but this would suffer an exponential blowup in size, which is too expensive. In the rest of the section, we outline how we can modify our framework to handle this succinct representation of SAT and #SAT problems.

The conditional-search OutsideIn algorithm is no longer a good choice for such compact input representation, because its runtime depends heavily on the number of non-zero elements in each input factor. Also, we cannot expect the same sort of results from Section 5 to hold for SAT or #SAT, because even if the input query was α-acyclic the problem is still **NP**-hard or #**P**-hard, respectively. (Recall that α-acyclic hypergraphs have $\mathsf{fhtw} = 1$.) Recently, however, there were a couple of interesting results showing that SAT and #SAT are tractable for β-acyclic queries [19, 74].

In the relational join problem, there is also a phenomenon discovered recently where the computational difficulty we face comes from precisely the same problem of compact input factor representations. In [65], modulo a technical assumption, we showed that the minimum number of comparisons a comparison-based join algorithm performs is in the same order as the minimum number of rectangular boxes of a certain format needed to cover the entire output space. We designed an algorithm called Minesweeper whose core functionality is to determine whether or not a set of rectangular boxes covers the entire output space. In [2], the Tetris algorithm relaxed the assumption about the input boxes, and formally defined this box cover problem (or BCP). In both cases, BCP's difficulty lies precisely in the fact that the boxes represent points *not* in the output, and thus a conditional-search-style algorithm such as OutsideIn does

not work well. In Minesweeper and Tetris, the collection of supports of the rectangular boxes forms a hypergraph. Similar to the SAT and #SAT case, if this hypergraph is only α-acyclic, then the box cover problem is **NP**-hard. But, if it is β-acyclic then there is a linear time algorithm solving the box cover problem.

All of the four algorithms can be explained using the InsideOut/OutsideIn duality framework. The InsideOut algorithm remains the same – it is just variable elimination – but we have to tailor the OutsideIn algorithm to suit the compact encoding. In particular, BCP, SAT, and #SAT can all be reduced to FAQ instances in which each of the input factors ψ_S is of a special form called the *box factor*.

Definition 8.2 (Box factor)**.** A *box* with support $S = \{i_1, \ldots, i_s\}$ is a tuple $\mathbf{B} = \langle I_{i_1}, \ldots, I_{i_s}\rangle$ where $I_{i_j} \subseteq \mathsf{Dom}(X_{i_j})$ is an interval in the domain $\mathsf{Dom}(X_{i_j})$. The box is a set of points $\mathbf{x} \in \prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathsf{Dom}(X_i)$ for which $x_{i_j} \in I_{i_j}$ for all $j \in [s]$. A factor $\psi_S : \prod_{i_j \in S} \mathsf{Dom}(X_{i_j}) \to \mathbf{D}$ is called a *box factor* if there is a box $\mathbf{B}$ and a $c \in \mathbf{D}$ for which

$$\psi_S(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} c & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{1} & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \notin \mathbf{B}. \end{cases}$$

In SAT and #SAT, each CNF clause is a box factor. For example, in the clause $(X_1 \vee \bar{X}_2 \vee X_3)$, the box is $\langle\{\mathsf{false}\}, \{\mathsf{true}\}, \{\mathsf{false}\}\rangle$ (with $c = \mathsf{false}$). For SAT the domain $\mathbf{D}$ is $\{\mathsf{true}, \mathsf{false}\}$. For #SAT the domain is $\mathbb{R}_+$. Each rectangular box in BCP is clearly a box factor with Boolean domain, and looking for a point not covered by all the boxes is the same as solving the corresponding FAQ instance.

The first key to the algorithm in [74] for SAT, the algorithm in [19] for #SAT, Minesweeper in [65], and Tetris in [2] is that we can still run variable elimination, but each of the intermediate factors $\psi_{U_k - \{k\}}$ is computed and represented as a product of box factors. The second key observation is that, for β-acyclic hypergraphs, there is a variable ordering $\sigma = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ called the *nested elimination order* (NEO) such that, for every $k \in [n]$, the collection of sets in $\partial(v_k)$ forms a chain (see Proposition 4.10 and its proof in Appendix C). This nesting allows us to keep the box factor representation of the intermediate factors compact, i.e. each intermediate factor $\psi_{U_k - \{v_k\}}$ is a product of a "small" number of box factors.

Since Minesweeper and Tetris take a bit of work to set up properly, in the following section we explain the algorithms in [74] and [19] using this idea.

8.3.1 InsideOut *for* SAT. Consider the SAT problem, where we want to know if there exists one satisfying assignment. What does "eliminating a variable" mean in this case? We have a set of clauses that contain the variable X_n. In each such clause, X_n occurs either as a positive literal X_n, or a negated variable $\bar{X}_n$. Let $\partial_P(X_n)$ be the set of clauses containing X_n, and $\partial_N(X_n)$ be the set of clauses containing $\bar{X}_n$. Then, $\partial(X_n) = \partial_P(X_n) \cup \partial_N(X_n)$. We want to construct a new boolean factor $\psi_{U_n - \{X_n\}}$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{U_n - \{X_n\}} &= \left(\bigwedge_{C \in \partial(X_n)} C|_{x_n = \mathsf{true}} \right) \vee \left(\bigwedge_{C \in \partial(X_n)} C|_{x_n = \mathsf{false}} \right) \\ &= \left(\bigwedge_{C_N \in \partial_N(X_n)} C_N|_{x_n = \mathsf{true}} \right) \vee \left(\bigwedge_{C_P \in \partial_P(X_n)} C_P|_{x_n = \mathsf{false}} \right) \\ &= \bigwedge_{C_N \in \partial_N(X_n), C_P \in \partial_P(X_n)} \left(C_N|_{x_n = \mathsf{true}} \vee C_P|_{x_n = \mathsf{false}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

But $C_N|_{x_n=\mathsf{true}}$ and $C_P|_{x_n=\mathsf{false}}$ are simply the original clauses C_N and C_P with X_n eliminated completely. Hence, the rule is: for every clause C_i containing X_n and every clause C_j containing $\bar{X}_n$, create a new clause $C_{ij} = C_i \vee C_j$ *without* X_n in it.[17] And we have a new instance of the SAT problem. This procedure is known as the *Davis-Putnam* procedure for SAT-solving. Under this procedure, we do not need to enumerate all $2^{|U_n|}$ truth assignments, so it might be faster depending on the input. On the other hand, we will run into a combinatorial explosion problem in the number of clauses. For example, after one step we might have up to $\Omega(m^2)$ clauses. Dechter and Rish [34] showed that this algorithm runs in time at most $O(n^3 9^w)$, where w is the appropriate notion of width for the SAT formula. Of course this is no better than the rough runtime of $O(mn^2 2^w)$, but the advantage is that it creates a *theory* for the proof system. We will not delve any further on this point.

What is important to note here is that the representation of the intermediate factor $\psi_{U_n - \{X_n\}}$ is a product of box factors. One interesting class of input CNF formulas is the class of β-acyclic CNF formulas. Under this class, if the vertex ordering is a nested elimination order, then we don't have the clause (or box factor) explosion problem. This is due to the fact that the set $\partial(X_k)$ forms a chain, so a variable set in $\partial(X_k)$ is a subset of another variable set in $\partial(X_k)$. When the variables in C_i are a subset of variables in C_j, the new clause C_{ij} is either a tautology (which can be removed), or is equal to C_j. (When the resolvent is a subset of one of the two resolvers, the resolution is called *subsumption resolution*.) Hence, every time we eliminate a variable X_n, we do not increase the number of clauses. So we have a polynomial-time algorithm for solving β-acyclic CNF formulas, a result that was only proved recently [74].

Theorem 8.3 (Ordyniak, Paulusma, and Szeider [74])**.** SAT *is polynomial-time solvable for the class of β-acyclic CNF formulas.*

8.3.2 InsideOut *for* #SAT. For the #SAT problem, each clause corresponds to a function to $\{0,1\}$. In particular, #SAT can be viewed as an FAQ-SS over the semiring $(\mathbb{R}_+, +, \times)$ where each clause C (whose variables are $\mathsf{vars}(C)$) corresponds to a factor $\psi_{\mathsf{vars}(C)}$ defined as

$$\psi_{\mathsf{vars}(C)}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{vars}(C)}) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{vars}(C)} \text{ satisfies } C, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We will be working with a slightly more general version of #SAT, called #WSAT, where each clause C has an associated weight ($\mathsf{weight}(C) \in \mathbb{R}_+$) such that the corresponding factor $\psi_{\mathsf{vars}(C)}$ becomes

$$\psi_{\mathsf{vars}(C)}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{vars}(C)}) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{vars}(C)} \text{ satisfies } C, \\ \mathsf{weight}(C) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(Obviously, if each clause has weight 0, then #WSAT reduces back to #SAT. Further, note that this is a re-statement of the box factor formulation from Definition 8.2 specialized to this problem.) We chose to work with #WSAT because eliminating a variable from an n-variable #WSAT instance results in an $(n-1)$-variable #WSAT instance, as we will see shortly.

[17] In proof complexity, the clause C_{ij} is called a resolvent of the two clauses C_i and C_j.

Eliminating a variable X_n in #WSAT means defining a set C'_n of weighted clauses over the variables $U_n - \{X_n\}$ such that for all $\mathbf{x}$

$$\underbrace{\prod_{C' \in C'_n} \psi_{\mathsf{vars}(C')}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{vars}(C')})}_{\psi_{U_n - \{X_n\}}(\mathbf{x}_{U_n - \{X_n\}})} = \sum_{x_n} \prod_{C \in \partial(X_n)} \psi_{\mathsf{vars}(C)}(\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{vars}(C)} \mid x_n). \tag{40}$$

A clause C' is called *monochromatic* with respect to a set of (weighted) clauses C if for every clause $C \in C$, either $(C \implies C')$ or $(C \vee C' \equiv \text{true})$. The color of C' with respect to C, denoted by $\mathsf{color}_C(C')$, is defined as:

$$\mathsf{color}_C(C') := \prod_{C \in C \mid C \Longrightarrow C'} \mathsf{weight}(C).$$

Given a clause C and a variable $X \in \mathsf{vars}(C)$, we will be using $[C]_{-X}$ to denote the clause that results from C by dropping either the literal X or $\bar{X}$ (whichever occurs in C). Let C_n be the set of clauses that contained X_n but with X_n now removed from them, i.e.

$$C_n := \left\{ [C]_{-X_n} \mid C \in \partial(X_n) \right\}.$$

Let $\pi_n = \left(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}, \ldots, X_{i_\ell}\right)$ be some arbitrarily-fixed order of $U_n - \{X_n\}$. We can define C'_n to be the set of clauses that are "minimal" w.r.t π_n and monochromatic w.r.t C_n. Formally,

$$C'_n := \left\{ C' \text{ is a clause} \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} \mathsf{vars}(C') = \left\{X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}, \ldots, X_{i_{\ell'}}\right\} \text{ for some } \ell' \in [\ell], \text{ and} \\ C' \text{ is monochromatic w.r.t } C_n \text{ while } [C']_{-X_{i_{\ell'}}} \text{ is not.} \end{array} \right\}. \tag{41}$$

Notice that for each $C' \in C'_n$, both $C' \vee X_n$ and $C' \vee \bar{X}_n$ are monochromatic w.r.t $\partial(X_n)$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{weight}(C') &= \mathsf{color}_{\partial(X_n)}(C' \vee X_n) + \mathsf{color}_{\partial(X_n)}(C' \vee \bar{X}_n) \\ &= \mathsf{color}_{\partial_P(X_n)}(C' \vee X_n) + \mathsf{color}_{\partial_N(X_n)}(C' \vee \bar{X}_n). \end{aligned}$$

It is not hard to verify that the above definition of C'_n indeed satisfies (40). However, the size of C'_n could be larger than $|\partial(X_n)|$, and $|C'_i|$ for $i < n$ could be even much larger.

β-acyclic case: When the CNF formula is β-acyclic, it is convenient to work with a nested elimination order. Let X_n be the last variable in such an order. Thanks to Proposition 4.10, we can choose $\pi_n = \left(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}, \ldots, X_{i_\ell}\right)$ such that for each clause $C \in \partial(X_n)$,

$$\mathsf{vars}(C) = \{X_n\} \cup \left\{X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}, \ldots, X_{i_k}\right\} \text{ for some } k \in [\ell].$$

While the above looks very convenient, if we define C'_n as in (41), we might end up with a clause $C' \in C'_n$ for which $\mathsf{vars}(C') \neq \mathsf{vars}(C) - \{X_n\}$ for every $C \in \partial(X_n)$. After eliminating X_n, the remaining hypergraph might not be β-acyclic anymore because of the new hyperedge $\mathsf{vars}(C')$.

To remedy the situation, let $\left(C_1, \ldots, C_{|\partial(X_n)|}\right)$ be the clauses of $\partial(X_n)$ sorted in ascending order by $|\mathsf{vars}(C_i)|$. In particular, for each $i < j \in \{1, \ldots, |\partial(X_n)|\}$, we have

$$|\mathsf{vars}(C_i)| \leq |\mathsf{vars}(C_j)| \iff \mathsf{vars}(C_i) \subseteq \mathsf{vars}(C_j).$$

(Ties can be broken arbitrarily. The above equivalence follows from Proposition 4.10 along with the fact that X_n is the last in NEO.) Define

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_P^{\leq i}(X_n) &:= \partial_P(X_n) \cap \left\{C_j\right\}_{j \leq i}, \\ \partial_N^{\leq i}(X_n) &:= \partial_N(X_n) \cap \left\{C_j\right\}_{j \leq i}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\partial_P^{<i}(X_n) \quad := \quad \partial_P(X_n) \cap \left\{C_j\right\}_{j<i},$$
$$\partial_N^{<i}(X_n) \quad := \quad \partial_N(X_n) \cap \left\{C_j\right\}_{j<i}.$$

We will choose $C'_n := \left\{C'_0, C'_1, \ldots, C'_{|\partial(X_n)|}\right\}$, where C'_0 is an empty clause whose weight is 2, and for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, |\partial(X_n)|\}$, $C'_i := [C_i]_{-X_n}$ has weight

$$\text{weight}(C'_i) := \begin{cases} 0 \text{ if } \text{color}_{\partial_P^{<i}(X_n)}(C'_i \vee X_n) + \text{color}_{\partial_N^{<i}(X_n)}(C'_i \vee \bar{X}_n) = 0, \\ \frac{\text{color}_{\partial_P^{<i}(X_n)}(C'_i \vee X_n) + \text{color}_{\partial_N^{<i}(X_n)}(C'_i \vee \bar{X}_n)}{\text{color}_{\partial_P^{<i}(X_n)}(C'_i \vee X_n) + \text{color}_{\partial_N^{<i}(X_n)}(C'_i \vee \bar{X}_n)} \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

While the above definition of C'_n still satisfies (40), we now have for each $C'_i \in C'_n$, either $\text{vars}(C'_i) = \emptyset$ or $\text{vars}(C'_i) = \text{vars}(C_i) - \{X_n\}$ for $C_i \in \partial(X_n)$. Hence after eliminating X_n, the remaining hypergraph is still β-acyclic. Moreover, $|C'_n| = |\partial(X_n)|$, which guarantees that after eliminating X_n, the resulting #WSAT instance has the same size as the original. We conclude that:

Theorem 8.4 (Brault-Baron, Capelli, and Mengel [19])**.** #SAT *is polynomial-time solvable for the class of β-acyclic CNF formulas.*

8.4 Output representation

Our framework, in addition to being able to handle multiple input representations, is also able to handle different output representations. In particular, we describe how one can modify InsideOut to obtain different output representations.

Inspired by the factorized database ideas developed by Olteanu and Závodný [73], the extension to aggregates in Bakibayev et al. [14], and inspired by the discussion in Section 8.2 regarding using an FAQ-instance as an input factor, we observe that an FAQ-expression not only defines a new function, but also stores the computation needed to compute that function. There is a spectrum of tradeoffs one can explore in terms of the time it takes to query into a function stored in a "compressed" form and the time it takes to decompress it.

In order to explain this idea more cleanly, and to simplify the presentation a bit, we will only consider FAQ-SS instances, i.e.

$$\varphi(\mathbf{x}_F) = \bigoplus_{\mathbf{x}_{[n]-F}} \bigotimes_{S \in \mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S),$$

where $F = [f]$ for some $f \in [n]$. Furthermore, we will assume that $\mathbf{D} = \{0, 1\}$.

We now illustrate how we can modify InsideOut so that we can represent the output in three different output representations (in addition to the default listing representation). We will compare these output representations across the following three axes:

(1) *Output pre-processing time:* This is the time needed to compute the output in the required form;
(2) *Value query time:* This is the time needed to check if $\varphi(\mathbf{y}) = 1$ given the query $\mathbf{y} \in \prod_{i=1}^{f} \text{Dom}(X_i)$; and
(3) *Enumeration delay:* Given the output representation, how much time it takes between reporting two consecutive output tuples, given that ultimately we want to list all output tuples.

Recall from Section 5.2.3 that InsideOut runs until it has eliminated the variables $X_n, \ldots, X_{f+1}$ and then runs OutsideIn on the resulting FAQ-SS instance φ_f corresponding to $\mathcal{H}_f$. In two of the options below, we will see how we can change this last step. Further, we will only talk about the runtime of the algorithm *after* it has eliminated the variables $X_n, \ldots, X_{f+1}$.

Listing representation. This is the default behavior of InsideOut. After spending $\tilde{O}(N^{\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma)})$ time in eliminating variables $X_n, \ldots, X_{f+1}$, it runs OutsideIn on the resulting query (10) taking time $\tilde{O}(\mathsf{AGM}(F))$ to report the output φ (where $\|\varphi\| \leq \mathsf{AGM}(F)$). Here, the output pre-processing time is $\tilde{O}(\mathsf{AGM}(F))$, the value query time is $\tilde{O}(1)$, and we have a constant enumeration delay.

Next, we consider two options where we have a smaller output pre-processing time while we can still handle the value query and enumeration operations (at potentially a larger cost than above).

FAQ *representation.* Another option is to just not do any output pre-processing *nor* eliminate the free variables. Note that the FAQ instance φ_f constructed when InsideOut eliminates X_{f+1} is a valid representation of the output. Further, the value query time is still $\tilde{O}(1)$ (by checking if for every $T \in \mathcal{E}_f$, $\psi_T(\mathbf{y}_T) = 1$). However, there is no way to construct an enumeration algorithm with a constant delay from this representation. Finally, this representation has the advantage that if one considers the input as an FAQ instance (see Section G.3), then there is a nice symmetry in that the output here is also an FAQ instance. Given the discussion in Section G.3, this generalizes the framework of Olteanu and Závodný [73] from factorized representation to FAQ representation.

$\tilde{O}(1)$*-delay enumeration representation.* Another option is to eliminate free variables but avoid running the OutsideIn algorithm at the last step (i.e. drop line 19 of Algorithm 1). In this case, we already have the output stored in a factorized representation like that from the factorized database framework. If the output was only required to be in this form, then essentially our runtime is $\tilde{O}(N^{\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma)})$ (without the $+\|\varphi\|$ term).

In this output representation, the value query time is $\tilde{O}(1)$ (since one can check if for every $i \in [f]$, $\psi_{U_i}(\mathbf{y}_{U_i}) = 1$). Perhaps more importantly, one can design a $\tilde{O}(1)$-delay enumeration function. Assume that the ψ_{U_i} are stored as a BTree/trie (with sort order $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_f$). Start with the 'first' x_1 such that $\psi_{U_1}(x_1) = 1$ and then figure out the 'first' x_2 such that $\psi_{U_2}(x_1, x_2) = 1$ and so on. It is easy to check that there is $\tilde{O}(1)$ delay in outputting every two consecutive output tuples.

FAQ *composition and message passing.* Being able to efficiently enumerate entries of a function defined by an FAQ expression might have applications, say in answering a conjunctive query in a database. Thus, the $\tilde{O}(1)$-delay enumeration representation is a decent choice. However, as we mentioned in Section 8.2 there are cases where we want to use the output of one FAQ-query to feed into the input of another FAQ-query. Thus, the output representation should allow us to efficiently answer conditional queries and product marginalization queries (e.g. universal quantifiers in logic applications).

The problem is, we do not know in advance in which variable ordering the future conditional queries and product marginalization queries will be posed. If they were posed in the same order as $X_1, \ldots, X_f$, then the $\tilde{O}(1)$-delay representation is sufficient. We can easily answer a conditional query using the intermediate factors ψ_{U_i}, $i \in [f]$, efficiently in $\tilde{O}(1)$ time.

This is where we can use the playbook of the graphical model literature. The key reason that message passing (or belief propagation) is advantageous over variable elimination is that it prepares the graphical model for future (unknown) queries. The message passing algorithm is essentially variable elimination run in all directions at once. We compute the tree decomposition of the graph $\mathcal{H}_f$ (after using InsideOut to eliminate X_i, $i > f$.) Then, we run the message passing algorithm on the bags of the tree decomposition. The overall complexity is still $\tilde{O}(N^{\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}_f)})$, but after convergence all the bags are in calibrated state, and they allow for answering conditional queries along any GYO elimination order of the tree decomposition. We leave the tradeoffs involved in realizing such an idea for a future work;

but we would like to point out that Olteanu and Závodný [73] has taken a step toward this direction in the database domain.

8.5 Composition of FAQ instances

We consider how the fractional hypertree width changes when we compose FAQ instances. More precisely we consider the following problem:

> Let $\mathcal{H}^0 = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}^0)$ be a hypergraph. For every $e \in \mathcal{E}^0$, let $\mathcal{H}^1_e = (e, \mathcal{E}^1_e)$ be a hypergraph. Let $\mathcal{H}^1$ denote the collection of hypergraphs $\{\mathcal{H}^1_e\}_{e\in\mathcal{E}^0}$. Now consider the following *composed* hypergraph $\mathcal{H}^0 \circ \mathcal{H}^1$ with $\mathcal{V}$ as the set of nodes and the edge set $\mathcal{E}^{01} = \cup_{e\in\mathcal{E}^0}\mathcal{E}^1_e$. How does $\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}^0 \circ \mathcal{H}^1)$ behave with respect to $\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}^0)$ and $\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}^1_e)$ (or in terms of other widths of these hypergraphs) for $e \in \mathcal{E}^0$?

We begin with a simple observation:

Proposition 8.5. *For every hypergraph $\mathcal{H}^0$ and a corresponding collection of hypergraphs $\mathcal{H}^1$,*

$$\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}^0 \circ \mathcal{H}^1) \le \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}^0) \cdot \max_{e\in\mathcal{E}^0} \rho^*(\mathcal{H}^1_e).$$

Proof. Let (T, χ) be a tree decomposition for $\mathcal{H}^0$ with ρ^*-width of $w = \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}^0)$. It is easy to check that (T, χ) is also a valid tree decomposition for $\mathcal{H}^0 \circ \mathcal{H}^1$. Further, we claim that for every bag B in T, $\rho^*_{\mathcal{H}^0\circ\mathcal{H}^1}(B) \le w \cdot \max_{e\in\mathcal{E}^0} \rho^*(\mathcal{H}^1_e)$, which would complete the proof.

Finally, we argue the claim. Fix any bag B and let x_e for every $e \in \mathcal{E}^0$ such that $e \cap B \neq \emptyset$ be the optimal edge cover for B (i.e. $\sum_{e\in\mathcal{E}^0:e\cap B\neq\emptyset} x_e \le w$). For every edge $e \in \mathcal{E}^0$, let $y^e_{e'}$ for every $e' \in \mathcal{E}^1_e$ be an optimal fractional edge cover for $\mathcal{H}^1_e$. Then it is easy to check that the following is a valid edge cover for B using edges from $\mathcal{H}^0 \circ \mathcal{H}^1$: for every $e' \in \mathcal{E}^{01}$ such that $e' \cap B \neq \emptyset$, define

$$z_{e'} = \sum_{e\in\mathcal{E}^0:e'\cap e\cap B\neq\emptyset, e'\,\mathcal{E}^1_e} x_e \cdot y^e_{e'}.$$

The claim follows by noting that

$$\sum_{e'\in\mathcal{E}^{01}:e'\cap B\neq\emptyset} z_{e'} \le \left(\sum_{e\in\mathcal{E}^0:e\cap B\neq\emptyset} x_e\right) \cdot \left(\max_{e\in\mathcal{E}^0:B\cap e\neq\emptyset} \sum_{e'\in\mathcal{E}^1_e:e'\cap e\cap B\neq\emptyset} y^e_{e'}\right),$$

which completes the proof. □

Remark 8.6. We note that the proof above gives a better bound than that stated in Proposition 8.5 for specific hypergraphs. However, we chose to present a uniform bound for all hypergraphs for its elegance.

It is natural to wonder if one can improve upon the bound of Proposition 8.5 in the worst-case. In particular, it is natural to wonder if we can prove a bound of the form

$$\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}^0 \circ \mathcal{H}^1) \le O\left(\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}^0) \cdot \max_{e\in\mathcal{E}^0} \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}^1_e)\right).$$

We argue next that such a bound is not achievable.

Lemma 8.7. *There exists hypergraphs $\mathcal{H}^0$ and a family of corresponding hyerpgraphs $\mathcal{H}^1$ such that there is an unbounded gap of $\Omega(|\mathcal{V}|)$ between $\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}^0 \circ \mathcal{H}^1)$ and $\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}^0) \cdot \max_{e\in\mathcal{E}^0} \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}^1_e)$*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{V} = \{a_1, \ldots, a_n, b_1, \ldots, b_n\}$. The hypergraph $\mathcal{H}^0$ has the following n hyperedges: $e_i = \{a_1, \ldots, a_n, b_i\}$. Note that this is essentially a star graph with $\text{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}^0) = 1$. Further, for every $i \in [n]$, the graph $\mathcal{H}^1_{e_1}$ is the star graph with a_i as the center and $a_1, \ldots, a_{i-1}, a_{i+1}, \ldots, a_n, b_i$ as the leaves. Note that for every $i \in [n]$, $\text{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}^1_{e_i}) = 1$.

However, note that $\mathcal{H}^0 \circ \mathcal{H}^1$ has a K_n as a subgraph (in particular the subgraph on $\{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}$ forms a clique). Further the only other edges are the n "spokes"– (a_i, b_i) for $i \in [n]$. It can be verified that $\text{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}^0 \circ \mathcal{H}^1) \geq n$, which completes the proof. □

We now come back to the question of proving an upper bound on $\text{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}^0 \circ \mathcal{H}^1)$. We first note that the argument in proof of Proposition 8.5 is wasteful since it does not make use of any tree decomposition representation of the hypergraphs in $\mathcal{H}^1$. Next we describe a simple algorithm that tries to take advantage of this choice.

We begin with an optimal ρ^*-width tree decomposition (T, χ) of $\mathcal{H}^0$ as in the proof of Proposition 8.5. Consider an arbitrary bag B in this tree decomposition. For every edge $e \in \mathcal{E}^0$ such that $e \cap B \neq \emptyset$, let (T_e, χ_e) be an optimal ρ^*-width tree decomposition for $\mathcal{H}^1_e$. Root this tree at an arbitrary bag r_e. Build new tree T' as follows: for each bag B we create a new bag B' as follows. For every edge $e \in \mathcal{E}^0$ such that $e \cap B \neq \emptyset$, add r_e to B' and hang the rest of tree T_e from B'. Using the argument in the proof of Proposition 8.5, one can argue that for every bag B', $\rho^*_{\mathcal{H}^0 \circ \mathcal{H}^1}(B') \leq \text{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}^0) \cdot \max_{e \in \mathcal{E}^0} \text{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}^1_e)$. Define χ' as follows: for every $t \in V(T)$, if $B = \chi(t)$, then $\chi'(t) = B'$. For every other vertex t (that comes from some T_e), $\chi'(t) = \chi_e(t)$. However, (T', χ') is *not* a valid tree decomposition because it might not satisfy the running intersection property. We fix this with obvious greedy 'patchup' phase. The final tree $T'' = T'$ but we will modify the bags by defining a new map χ''. For every vertex $v \in \mathcal{V}$, consider the sub-forest of T with vertices whose bags contain v. Add in the set of vertices t' to this forest such that the resulting sub-graph is a tree and for each such t', $\chi''(t') \leftarrow \chi''(t) \cup \{t'\}$ (for every t, $\chi''(t)$ is initialized to $\chi'(t)$). Note that when the patchup phase is done (T'', χ'') is indeed a valid tree decomposition for $\mathcal{H}^0 \circ \mathcal{H}^1$. It is not too hard to verify that this tree decomposition gives the following bound:

Lemma 8.8. *The following holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}^0 \circ \mathcal{H}^1) &\leq \max_{t \in V(T'')} \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}^0 \circ \mathcal{H}^1}(\chi''(t)) \\ &\leq \text{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}^0) \cdot \max_{e \in \mathcal{E}^0} \text{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}^1_e) + \max_{t \in V(T'')} \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}^0 \circ \mathcal{H}^1}(\chi''(t) - \chi'(t)). \end{aligned}$$

We finish with two remarks:

(1) In the worst-case the algorithm will result in $(T'', \chi'') = (T, \chi)$ (after reducing (T'', χ'')), in which case are back in the proof of Proposition 8.5.
(2) Lemma 8.8 for the hard instance in proof of Lemma 8.7 translates into a bound of $n + 1$, which is essentially tight.

9 CONCLUDING REMARKS

The algorithms and ideas developed in this paper are not just on paper. Implementations of join algorithms based on fractional hypertree width for counting graph patterns have shown that the theory predicts what happens in practice very well: as they are faster than existing commercial systems by at least an order of magnitude [70] for selected queries. Far beyond graph patterns, we have implemented InsideOut within the commerical LogicBlox database system [10] with great performance results. Moreover, learning from the beautiful work of Olteanu and Schleich [72, 83], we realized [66] that InsideOut can be used to train a large class of machine learning models *inside* the database. Our

implementation showed orders of magnitude speedup over the traditional data modeler route of exporting the data and running it through R or Python.

Real-world implementation of InsideOut faces two additional hurdles. The first problem is that we do not just have materialized predicates as inputs, we also have predicates such as $a < b$, $a+b = c$, negations and so on. These predicates do not have a "size". To solve this problem, one solution is to set the "size" of those predicates to be ∞ while computing the AGM-bound. For instance, if we have a sub-query of the form $Q \leftarrow R(a,b), S(b,c), a+b=c$, where R and S are input materialized predicates of size N, then by setting the size of $a+b=c$ to be infinite, $\mathsf{AGM}(Q) = N^2$. This solution does not work for two reasons. (1) If we knew $a+b=c$, then it is easy to infer that $|Q| \leq N$ and also to compute Q in time $\tilde{O}(N)$: scan over tuples in R, use $a+b=c$ to compute c, and see if $(b,c) \in S$. In other words, the AGM-bound is no longer tight. (2) The solution may give an ∞-bound when the output size is clearly bounded. Consider, for example, the query $Q \leftarrow R(a), S(b), a+b=c$; in this case, $\{a,b,c\}$ is the only hyperedge covering vertex c in the fractional edge cover. Our implementation at LogicBlox makes use of generalizations of AGM to queries with functional dependencies and immaterialized predicates (such as $a+b=c$). These new bounds are based on a linear program whose variables are marginal entropies [4, 5].

The second problem is to select a good variable ordering to run InsideOut on. In principle, one does not have to use the AGM-bound or the bounds from [4, 5] to estimate the cost of an FAQ subquery. If one were to implement InsideOut inside any RDBMS, one could poll that RDBMS's optimizer to figure out the cost of a given variable ordering. However, there are $n!$ variable orderings, and optimizer's cost estimation is time-consuming. Furthermore, some subqueries have inputs which are intermediate results. Hence, it is much faster to compute a variable ordering minimizing the faqw of the query, defined on the bounds in [4, 5]. As the problem is **NP**-hard, either an approximation algorithm (from Section 7) or a greedy heuristic suffices in our experience.

REFERENCES

[1] Abiteboul, S., Hull, R., and Vianu, V. *Foundations of Databases.* Addison-Wesley, 1995.

[2] Abo Khamis, M., Ngo, H. Q., Ré, C., and Rudra, A. Joins via geometric resolutions: Worst-case and beyond. In *Proceedings of the 34th ACM Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS 2015, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia, May 31 - June 4, 2015* (2015), T. Milo and D. Calvanese, Eds., ACM, pp. 213–228.

[3] Abo Khamis, M., Ngo, H. Q., and Rudra, A. FAQ: Questions Asked Frequently. In *Proceedings of the 35th ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGAI Symposium on Principles of Database Systems* (New York, NY, USA, 2016), PODS '16, ACM, pp. 13–28.

[4] Abo Khamis, M., Ngo, H. Q., and Suciu, D. Computing join queries with functional dependencies. In *Proceedings of the 35th ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGAI Symposium on Principles of Database Systems* (New York, NY, USA, 2016), PODS '16, ACM, pp. 327–342.

[5] Abo Khamis, M., Ngo, H. Q., and Suciu, D. What do Shannon-type inequalities, submodular width, and disjunctive datalog have to do with one another? *CoRR abs/1612.02503* (2016).

[6] Adler, I. *Width functions for hypertree decompositions.* 2006. Ph.D. Dissertation, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg. 2006.

[7] Adler, I., and Weyer, M. Tree-width for first order formulae. *Logical Methods in Computer Science 8*, 1 (2012).

[8] Aji, S. M. *Graphical models and iterative decoding.* PhD thesis, California Institute of Technology, 2000.

[9] Aji, S. M., and McEliece, R. J. The generalized distributive law. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory 46*, 2 (2000), 325–343.

[10] Aref, M., ten Cate, B., Green, T. J., Kimelfeld, B., Olteanu, D., Pasalic, E., Veldhuizen, T. L., and Washburn, G. Design and implementation of the LogicBlox system. In *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia, May 31 - June 4, 2015* (2015), T. Sellis, S. B. Davidson, and Z. G. Ives, Eds., ACM, pp. 1371–1382.

[11] Arnborg, S., and Proskurowski, A. Linear time algorithms for NP-hard problems restricted to partial k-trees. *Discrete Appl. Math. 23*, 1 (1989), 11–24.

[12] Atserias, A., Grohe, M., and Marx, D. Size bounds and query plans for relational joins. In *FOCS* (2008), IEEE Computer Society, pp. 739–748.

[13] Bahar, R. I., Frohm, E. A., Gaona, C. M., Hachtel, G. D., Macii, E., Pardo, A., and Somenzi, F. Algebraic decision diagrams and their applications. *Formal Methods in System Design 10*, 2/3 (1997), 171–206.

[14] Bakibayev, N., Kociský, T., Olteanu, D., and Zavodny, J. Aggregation and ordering in factorised databases. *PVLDB 6*, 14 (2013), 1990–2001.

[15] Bistarelli, S., Montanari, U., and Rossi, F. Semiring-based constraint satisfaction and optimization. *J. ACM 44*, 2 (Mar. 1997), 201–236.

[16] Bodlaender, H. L. Treewidth: algorithmic techniques and results. In *Mathematical foundations of computer science 1997 (Bratislava)*, vol. 1295 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.* Springer, Berlin, 1997, pp. 19–36.

[17] Bodlaender, H. L. Treewidth: characterizations, applications, and computations. In *International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science* (2006), Springer, pp. 1–14.

[18] Börger, E., Grädel, E., and Gurevich, Y. *The classical decision problem*. Universitext. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. Reprint of the 1997 original.

[19] Brault-Baron, J., Capelli, F., and Mengel, S. Understanding Model Counting for beta-acyclic CNF-formulas. In *32nd International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS 2015)* (Dagstuhl, Germany, 2015), E. W. Mayr and N. Ollinger, Eds., vol. 30 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, pp. 143–156.

[20] Brouwer, A., and Kolen, A. A super-balanced hypergraph has a nest point. Tech. Report.

[21] Cai, J., Chen, X., and Lu, P. Graph homomorphisms with complex values: A dichotomy theorem. *SIAM J. Comput. 42*, 3 (2013), 924–1029.

[22] Cai, J.-Y., Lu, P., and Xia, M. The complexity of complex weighted Boolean #CSP. *J. Comput. System Sci. 80*, 1 (2014), 217–236.

[23] Chekuri, C., and Rajaraman, A. Conjunctive query containment revisited. *Theor. Comput. Sci. 239*, 2 (2000), 211–229.

[24] Chen, H. Quantified constraint satisfaction and bounded treewidth. In *Proceedings of the 16th Eureopean Conference on Artificial Intelligence, ECAI'2004, including Prestigious Applicants of Intelligent Systems, PAIS 2004, Valencia, Spain, August 22-27, 2004* (2004), pp. 161–165.

[25] Chen, H., and Dalmau, V. Decomposing quantified conjunctive (or disjunctive) formulas. In *Proceedings of the 27th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2012, Dubrovnik, Croatia, June 25-28, 2012* (2012), IEEE Computer Society, pp. 205–214.

[26] Chen, H., and Grohe, M. Constraint satisfaction with succinctly specified relations. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci. 76*, 8 (2010), 847–860.

[27] Chen, H., and Mengel, S. A Trichotomy in the Complexity of Counting Answers to Conjunctive Queries. In *18th International Conference on Database Theory (ICDT 2015)* (Dagstuhl, Germany, 2015), M. Arenas and M. Ugarte, Eds., vol. 31 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, pp. 110–126.

[28] Cooley, J. W., and Tukey, J. W. An algorithm for the machine calculation of complex Fourier series. *Mathematics of Computation 19* (1965), 297–301.

[29] Cormen, T. H., Leiserson, C. E., Rivest, R. L., and Stein, C. *Introduction to algorithms*, second ed. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2001.

[30] Davis, M., Logemann, G., and Loveland, D. W. A machine program for theorem-proving. *Commun. ACM 5*, 7 (1962), 394–397.

[31] Dechter, R. Bucket elimination: A unifying framework for reasoning. *Artif. Intell. 113*, 1-2 (1999), 41–85.

[32] Dechter, R., Otten, L., and Marinescu, R. On the practical significance of hypertree vs. treewidth. In *ECAI 2008 - 18th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Patras, Greece, July 21-25, 2008, Proceedings* (2008), M. Ghallab, C. D. Spyropoulos, N. Fakotakis, and N. M. Avouris, Eds., vol. 178 of *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*, IOS Press, pp. 913–914.

[33] Dechter, R., and Pearl, J. Tree clustering for constraint networks. *Artificial Intelligence 38*, 3 (1989), 353–366.

[34] Dechter, R., and Rish, I. Directional resolution: The davis-putnam procedure, revisited. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning (KR'94). Bonn, Germany, May 24-27, 1994.* (1994), J. Doyle, E. Sandewall, and P. Torasso, Eds., Morgan Kaufmann, pp. 134–145.

[35] Durand, A., and Mengel, S. Structural tractability of counting of solutions to conjunctive queries. In *Joint 2013 EDBT/ICDT Conferences, ICDT '13 Proceedings, Genoa, Italy, March 18-22, 2013* (2013), W. Tan, G. Guerrini, B. Catania, and A. Gounaris, Eds., ACM, pp. 81–92.

[36] Durand, A., and Mengel, S. The complexity of weighted counting for acyclic conjunctive queries. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci. 80*, 1 (2014), 277–296.

[37] Fagin, R. Degrees of acyclicity for hypergraphs and relational database schemes. *J. ACM 30*, 3 (1983), 514–550.

[38] Fischl, W., Gottlob, G., and Pichler, R. General and fractional hypertree decompositions: Hard and easy cases. In *ACM PODS 2018, to appear* (2018).

[39] Freuder, E. C. Complexity of k-tree structured constraint satisfaction problems. In *Proceedings of the 8th National Conference on Artificial Intelligence. Boston, Massachusetts, July 29 - August 3, 1990, 2 Volumes.* (1990), H. E. Shrobe, T. G. Dietterich, and W. R. Swartout, Eds., AAAI Press / The MIT Press, pp. 4–9.

[40] Gogate, V., and Domingos, P. Structured message passing. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence, Bellevue, WA, USA, August 11-15, 2013* (2013), AUAI Press, Corvallis, Oregon.

[41] Goldberg, L. A., Grohe, M., Jerrum, M., and Thurley, M. A complexity dichotomy for partition functions with mixed signs. *SIAM J. Comput. 39*, 7 (Aug. 2010), 3336–3402.

[42] Golomb, S. W., and Baumert, L. D. Backtrack programming. pp. 516–524.

[43] Gottlob, G., Greco, G., Leone, N., and Scarcello, F. Hypertree decompositions: Questions and answers. In *Proceedings of the 35th ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGAI Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS 2016, San Francisco, CA, USA, June 26 - July 01, 2016* (2016), T. Milo and W. Tan, Eds., ACM, pp. 57–74.

[44] Gottlob, G., Leone, N., and Scarcello, F. Robbers, marshals, and guards: game theoretic and logical characterizations of hypertree width. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci. 66*, 4 (2003), 775–808.

[45] Graham, M. H. On the universal relation, 1980. Tech. Report.

[46] Greco, G., and Scarcello, F. Counting solutions to conjunctive queries: structural and hybrid tractability. In Hull and Grohe [54], pp. 132–143.

[47] Grohe, M., and Marx, D. Constraint solving via fractional edge covers. In *SODA* (2006), ACM Press, pp. 289–298.

[48] Grohe, M., and Marx, D. Constraint solving via fractional edge covers. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms 11*, 1 (2014), 4.

[49] Guruswami, V. Algorithmic results in list decoding.

[50] Guruswami, V., Umans, C., and Vadhan, S. Unbalanced expanders and randomness extractors from Parvaresh-Vardy codes. *J. ACM 56*, 4 (2009), Art. 20, 34.

[51] Gyssens, M., Jeavons, P., and Cohen, D. A. Decomposing constraint satisfaction problems using database techniques. *Artif. Intell. 66*, 1 (1994), 57–89.

[52] Gyssens, M., and Paredaens, J. A decomposition methodology for cyclic databases. In *Advances in Data Base Theory* (1982), pp. 85–122.

[53] Huang, C., and Darwiche, A. Inference in belief networks: A procedural guide. *Int. J. Approx. Reasoning 15*, 3 (1996), 225–263.

[54] Hull, R., and Grohe, M., Eds. *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS'14, Snowbird, UT, USA, June 22-27, 2014* (2014), ACM.

[55] Kask, K., Dechter, R., Larrosa, J., and Dechter, A. Unifying tree decompositions for reasoning in graphical models. *Artif. Intell. 166*, 1-2 (2005), 165–193.

[56] Khatri, C. G., and Rao, C. R. Solutions to some functional equations and their applications to characterization of probability distributions. *Sankhya: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series A 30*, 2 (1968).

[57] Koch, C. Incremental query evaluation in a ring of databases. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS 2010, June 6-11, 2010, Indianapolis, Indiana, USA* (2010), J. Paredaens and D. V. Gucht, Eds., ACM, pp. 87–98.

[58] Kohlas, J., and Wilson, N. Semiring induced valuation algebras: Exact and approximate local computation algorithms. *Artif. Intell. 172*, 11 (2008), 1360–1399.

[59] Koller, D., and Friedman, N. *Probabilistic graphical models.* Adaptive Computation and Machine Learning. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2009. Principles and techniques.

[60] Maier, D. *The Theory of Relational Databases.* Computer Science Press, 1983.

[61] Marx, D. Approximating fractional hypertree width. *ACM Trans. Algorithms 6*, 2 (Apr. 2010), 29:1–29:17.

[62] Marx, D. Tractable structures for constraint satisfaction with truth tables. *Theory Comput. Syst. 48*, 3 (2011), 444–464.

[63] Marx, D. Tractable hypergraph properties for constraint satisfaction and conjunctive queries. *J. ACM 60*, 6 (2013), 42.

[64] Newman, M. E. J. The structure and function of complex networks. *SIAM Rev. 45*, 2 (2003), 167–256 (electronic).

[65] Ngo, H. Q., Nguyen, D. T., Ré, C., and Rudra, A. Beyond worst-case analysis for joins with minesweeper. In Hull and Grohe [54], pp. 234–245.

[66] Ngo, H. Q., Nguyen, X., Olteanu, D., and Schleich, M. In-database factorized learning, 2017. Manuscript.

[67] Ngo, H. Q., Porat, E., Ré, C., and Rudra, A. Worst-case optimal join algorithms. In *PODS* (2012), M. Lenzerini and M. Benedikt, Eds., ACM, pp. 37–48.

[68] Ngo, H. Q., Porat, E., and Rudra, A. Efficiently decodable error-correcting list disjunct matrices and applications (extended abstract). In *Automata, languages and programming. Part I*, vol. 6755 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.* Springer, Heidelberg, 2011, pp. 557–568.

[69] Ngo, H. Q., Ré, C., and Rudra, A. Skew strikes back: New developments in the theory of join algorithms. In *SIGMOD RECORD* (2013), pp. 5–16.

[70] Nguyen, D. T., Aref, M., Bravenboer, M., Kollias, G., Ngo, H. Q., Ré, C., and Rudra, A. Join processing for graph patterns: An old dog with new tricks. In *Proceedings of the Third International Workshop on Graph Data Management Experiences and Systems, GRADES 2015, Melbourne, VIC, Australia, May 31 - June 4, 2015* (2015), pp. 2:1–2:8.

[71] Olshevsky, V., and Shokrollahi, M. A. Matrix-vector product for confluent cauchy-like matrices with application to confluent rational interpolation. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, May 21-23, 2000, Portland, OR, USA* (2000), F. F. Yao and E. M. Luks, Eds., ACM, pp. 573–581.

[72] Olteanu, D., and Schleich, M. F: regression models over factorized views. *PVLDB 9*, 13 (2016), 1573–1576.

[73] Olteanu, D., and Závodný, J. Size bounds for factorised representations of query results. *ACM Trans. Datab. Syst. 40*, 1 (2015).

[74] Ordyniak, S., Paulusma, D., and Szeider, S. Satisfiability of Acyclic and Almost Acyclic CNF Formulas. In *FSTTCS 2010* (2010), vol. 8.

[75] Pagh, R., and Tsourakakis, C. E. Colorful triangle counting and a mapreduce implementation. *Inf. Process. Lett. 112*, 7 (Mar. 2012), 277–281.

[76] Pan, V. Y. Nearly optimal computations with structured matrices. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, January 9-11, 2000, San Francisco, CA, USA.* (2000), D. B. Shmoys, Ed., ACM/SIAM, pp. 953–962.

[77] Pearl, J. Reverend bayes on inference engines: A distributed hierarchical approach. In *Proceedings of the National Conference on Artificial Intelligence. Pittsburgh, PA, August 18-20, 1982.* (1982), D. L. Waltz, Ed., AAAI Press, pp. 133–136.

[78] Pearl, J. Fusion, propagation, and structuring in belief networks. *Artif. Intell. 29*, 3 (Sept. 1986), 241–288.

[79] Pichler, R., and Skritek, S. Tractable counting of the answers to conjunctive queries. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci. 79*, 6 (Sept. 2013), 984–1001.

[80] Rollon, E., Larrosa, J., and Dechter, R. Semiring-based mini-bucket partitioning schemes. In *IJCAI 2013, Proceedings of the 23rd International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Beijing, China, August 3-9, 2013* (2013), F. Rossi, Ed., IJCAI/AAAI.

[81] Rossi, F., Beek, P. v., and Walsh, T. *Handbook of Constraint Programming (Foundations of Artificial Intelligence).* Elsevier Science Inc., New York, NY, USA, 2006.

[82] Scarcello, F. Query answering exploiting structural properties. *SIGMOD Record 34*, 3 (2005), 91–99.

[83] Schleich, M., Olteanu, D., and Ciucanu, R. Learning linear regression models over factorized joins. In *SIGMOD* (2016), pp. 3–18.

[84] Suri, S., and Vassilvitskii, S. Counting triangles and the curse of the last reducer. In *WWW* (2011), pp. 607–614.

[85] Tarjan, R. E., and Yannakakis, M. Simple linear-time algorithms to test chordality of graphs, test acyclicity of hypergraphs, and selectively reduce acyclic hypergraphs. *SIAM J. Comput. 13*, 3 (July 1984), 566–579.

[86] Tracy, D. S., and Singh, R. P. A new matrix product and its applications in partitioned matrix differentiation. *Statistica Neerlandica 26*, 4 (1972),

143–157.

[87] Tsourakakis, C. E. Fast counting of triangles in large real networks without counting: Algorithms and laws. In *Proceedings of the 8th IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM 2008), December 15-19, 2008, Pisa, Italy* (2008), IEEE Computer Society, pp. 608–617.

[88] Ullman, J. D. *Principles of Database and Knowledge-Base Systems, Volume II.* Computer Science Press, 1989.

[89] Veldhuizen, T. L. Triejoin: A simple, worst-case optimal join algorithm. In *ICDT* (2014), pp. 96–106.

[90] Yannakakis, M. Algorithms for acyclic database schemes. In *VLDB* (1981), pp. 82–94.

[91] Yu, C., and Ozsoyoglu, M. On determining tree-query membership of a distributed query. *Informatica 22*, 3 (1984), 261–282.

[92] Yuster, R., and Zwick, U. Fast sparse matrix multiplication. *ACM Trans. Algorithms 1*, 1 (July 2005), 2–13.

[93] Zhang, N., and Poole, D. A simple approach to Bayesian network computations. In *Proceedings of the Tenth Canadian Conference on Artificial Intelligence* (1994), pp. 171–178.

[94] Zhang, N. L., and Poole, D. Exploiting causal independence in Bayesian network inference. *J. Artificial Intelligence Res. 5* (1996), 301–328.

A MORE EXAMPLES OF PROBLEMS REDUCIBLE TO FAQ

This section presents many examples showing how FAQ captures a wide range of problems, such as graphical model inference, matrix multiplication, constraint satisfaction, quantified conjunctive query evaluation, etc. Some of the reductions to FAQ-SS are already discussed in the seminal work of Dechter [31], Aji and McEliece [9], and Kohlas and Wilson [58]; other reductions to FAQ-SS are new; all reductions to the general FAQ problem (over multiple semirings) are new. We first present the examples for FAQ-SS by considering the following semirings.

- $(\{\mathsf{true}, \mathsf{false}\}, \vee, \wedge)$: the *Boolean semiring*
- $(\mathbb{R}, +, \times)$: the *sum-product semiring*
- $(\mathbb{R}_+, \max, \times)$: the *max-product semiring*, which is essentially equivalent to the $(\mathbb{R}, \min, +)$ semiring.[18]
- $(2^U, \cup, \cap)$: the *set semiring*, where U is some set called the universe. In this case, $\emptyset$ is the additive identity, and U itself is the multiplicative identity.

A.1 The Boolean semiring

Example A.1 (Satisfiability)**.** Let φ be a CNF formula over n Boolean variables $X_1, \ldots, X_n$. Let $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ be the hypergraph of φ. Then, each clause of φ is a factor ψ_S, and the question of whether φ is satisfiable is the same as evaluating the constant function

$$\varphi = \bigvee_{\mathbf{x}} \bigwedge_{S \in \mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S).$$

Note that in this case each factor is very compactly represented. The size of each factor ψ_S is $O(|S|)$, i.e. linear in the number of variables that the factor is on. We will have much more to say about such compact representation in Sections 8 and G.

Example A.2 (k-colorability)**.** Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. Define the following instance of FAQ-SS. Let $\mathcal{H} = G$, and $\mathsf{Dom}(X_v) = [k]$ for every $v \in V$. Define a factor ψ_{uv} for every edge $uv \in E$ to be the predicate $\psi_{uv}(c_1, c_2) = (c_1 \neq c_2)$. The question of whether G is k-colorable is equivalent to evaluating the following constant function:

$$\varphi = \bigvee_{\mathbf{x}} \bigwedge_{uv \in E} \psi_{uv}(x_u, x_v).$$

Even for non-constant k, each factor in this example is also very compactly represented, amounting to an inequality.

Example A.3 (Boolean conjunctive query)**.** The Boolean conjunctive query evaluation problem (BCQ) can be written as follows. The query Φ has the attribute set $\{X_1, \ldots, X_n\}$ and the input relation set $\mathsf{atoms}(\Phi)$. Each relation $R \in \mathsf{atoms}(\Phi)$ is on attribute set $\mathsf{vars}(R) \subseteq \{X_1, \ldots, X_n\}$. We want to know if there exists a tuple satisfying all relations:

$$\Phi = \exists_{X_1} \cdots \exists_{X_n} \bigwedge_{R \in \mathsf{atoms}(\Phi)} R(\mathsf{vars}(R))$$

Define a hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{V}$ is the set of all attributes, and $\mathcal{E} = \{\mathsf{vars}(R) \mid R \in \mathsf{atoms}(\Phi)\}$. For each $S \in \mathcal{E}$ corresponding to relation R, there is a factor ψ_S where $\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) = (\mathbf{x}_S \in R)$. Then, the problem is reduced to evaluating the constant function

$$\varphi = \bigvee_{\mathbf{x}} \bigwedge_{S \in \mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S).$$

[18] If the ranges of factors are non-negative, then we can take log of the factors to turn product into sum.

Note that in this case, the typical input relation encoding is to *list* all tuples that belong to a given input relation. Thus, the inputs are not as compact as the first two examples.

Example A.4 (Constraint satisfaction)**.** The Constraint Satisfaction Problem (CSP) is reducible to FAQ-SS in the obvious way. Note that SAT, 3-colorability, BCQ are all special cases of CSP.

To summarize, the subtle issue of input encodings already shows up in the above examples. In SAT each input factor ψ_S is encoded using a clause of size $O(|S|)$. In BCQ we use the *listing encoding*, where each input factor is encoded with a table of entries whose functional values are true. The CSP problem as defined above is underspecified.

Example A.5 (Conjunctive query)**.** In the general conjunctive query evaluation (CQE) problem, the query has existential quantifiers over a subset of variables in $[n] - F$. It should be obvious that conjunctive query evaluation is reduced to the following form of FAQ-SS. The problem is to compute the output function

$$\varphi(\mathbf{x}_F) = \bigvee_{\mathbf{x}_{[n]-F}} \bigwedge_{S\in\mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S).$$

Example A.6 (Natural join query)**.** The natural join query is the CQE problem when all variables are free. Essentially, a natural join query is a *quantifier-free conjunctive query*, after some pre-processing steps. The reason we need pre-processing is because, strictly speaking in a conjunctive query the same relation might appear several times, and the same variable might appear more than once in the same atom. This point is immaterial at this point of our discussion.

Example A.7 (Coding theory)**.** Here's a typical setting in coding theory. Let q be a prime power, and $\mathbb{F}_q$ denote the field of order q. Let $n \geq k \geq 1$ be integers. Then, an $(n,k)_q$*-code* C is simply a subset of $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ of size $|\mathbb{F}_q^k|$. If every pair of codewords (i.e. members of C) have Hamming distance at least d, then we call the code an $(n,k,d)_q$-code. The List Recovery problem [49] in (modern) coding theory is the following problem. We are given, for each position $i \in [n]$ of the code, a subset $S_i \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q$ of symbols. The objective is to "recover" the set of all codewords $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \ldots, c_n) \in C$ for which $c_i \in S_i$ for all i. (Technically, we also want to give some lax where $c_i \in S_i$ for only a fraction of the positions i; but that requirement is not important for our discussion here.) List recoverable codes are codes for which, if the S_i are "small" then the list of codewords to be recovered (satisfying the above condition) is also "small." Of course, we also would like the recovery process to be as fast as possible.

The list recovery paradigm has found important applications. It should be noted that when $|S_i| = 1$ for all i then we get back the list decoding problem. Powerful *expander graphs* are constructed using the Parvaresh-Vardy family of codes, precisely because they are list recoverable [50]. In [68], we used list recovery to construct very good group testing schemes.

In the list recovery problem, we have $n+1$ factors: $\psi_{[n]}$, and ψ_i for $i \in [n]$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{[n]}(\mathbf{c}) &= \text{true iff } \mathbf{c} \in C \\ \psi_i(c) &= \text{true iff } c \in S_i. \end{aligned}$$

The FAQ-SS instance is

$$\varphi(c_1, \ldots, c_n) = \psi_{[n]}(c_1, \ldots, c_n) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^{n} \psi_i(c_i).$$

A.2 The sum-product semiring

Example A.8 (Complex network analysis)**.** In complex network analysis we often want to count the number of occurrences of a given small (induced or non-induced) subgraph H inside of a massive graph G. This problem is pervasive in social network and biological network analysis, where each occurrence of the subgraph is a "pattern" that one wants to mine from the network. A canonical example is the triangle counting problem, where we want to count the number of triangles in a given graph $G = (V, E)$. The number of triangles is used to compute the clustering coefficients [64, 84] and transitivity ratio [75, 87]. We reduce triangle counting to FAQ-SS as follows. The FAQ-SS's hypergraph is $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V} &= \{1, 2, 3\}, \\ \mathcal{E} &= \{\{1, 2\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}\} \end{aligned}$$

The domains are $\mathsf{Dom}(X_i) = V$, for $i \in [3]$. The factors are all the same: $\psi_{12} = \psi_{13} = \psi_{23} = \psi$, where

$$\psi(u, v) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \{u, v\} \in E, u < v \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(In terms of input encoding, the factor ψ can be represented with a data structure of size $O(|E|)$, for example.) The problem is to compute the constant function

$$\varphi = \sum_{x_1 \in V} \sum_{x_2 \in V} \sum_{x_3 \in V} \psi(x_1, x_2) \cdot \psi(x_1, x_3) \cdot \psi(x_2, x_3).$$

The same strategy can be used to count the number of occurrences of H in G, where H is a fixed graph. For example, H can be a k-clique.

Remark A.9. If we'd like to list *induced subgraphs*, there should be other factors indicating the *non-existence* of edges in the subgraph pattern. These factors correspond to inequalities, and they can be compactly represented.

Example A.10 (#SAT)**.** In SAT we want a Boolean answer: "is the formula satisfiable or not?" In #SAT we want a more specific piece of information: "exactly how many satisfying assignments are there?" Let Φ be a CNF formula over n Boolean variables $X_1, \ldots, X_n$. Let $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ be the hypergraph of Φ. Then for each clause C of Φ, there is a factor ψ_S where $\mathbf{X}_S$ is the set of variables occurring in C and ψ_S is defined by

$$\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mathbf{x}_S \text{ satisfies } C \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The problem of counting the number of satisfying assignments is the same as evaluating the constant function

$$\varphi = \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \prod_{S \in \mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S).$$

Example A.11 (Permanent)**.** #SAT is #**P**-complete. Another canonical #**P**-complete problem is Permanent, which is the problem of evaluating the *permanent* $\mathrm{perm}(\mathbf{A})$ of a given *binary* square matrix $\mathbf{A}$. Let S_n denote the symmetric group on $[n]$, then the permanent of $\mathbf{A} = (a_{ij})_{i,j=1}^n$ is defined as follows.

$$\mathrm{perm}(\mathbf{A}) := \sum_{\pi \in S_n} \prod_{i=1}^{n} a_{i\pi(i)}.$$

Note that perm($\mathbf{A}$) has exactly the same form as det($\mathbf{A}$) written using *Leibniz formula* except that the signs are all 1.

The Permanent problem can be written in the sum-product form as follows. Given the input matrix $\mathbf{A} = (a_{ij})$, each row index $i \in [n]$ corresponds to a vertex i and has a corresponding singleton factor ψ_i where $\psi_i(j) = a_{ij}$. Moreover, there are $\binom{n}{2}$ factors ψ_{jk} for $j \neq k \in [n]$, where $\psi_{jk}(x, y) = 1$ if $x \neq y$ and 0 if $x = y$. The problem is to evaluate the constant function

$$\varphi = \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \prod_{i \in [n]} \psi_i(x_i) \prod_{(j \neq k)} \psi_{jk}(x_j, x_k).$$

Example A.12 (Probabilistic graphical models)**.** We consider *probabilistic graphical models* (PGMs) on discrete finite domains. Without loss of generality, we restrict ourselves to *undirected graphical models* (also called *Markov Random Field*, *factor graph*, *Gibbs distribution*, etc.) If the input model is directed, we *moralize* it to get an undirected model. The model can be represented by a hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, where there are n discrete random variables $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ on finite domains $\mathsf{Dom}(X_1), \ldots, \mathsf{Dom}(X_n)$ respectively, and m *factors* (also called *potential functions*):

$$\psi_S : \prod_{i \in S} \mathsf{Dom}(X_i) \to \mathbb{R}_+.$$

Typically, we want to *learn* the model and perform *inference* from the model.[19] For example, we might want to

- Compute the marginal distribution of some set of variables
- Compute the conditional distribution $p(\mathbf{x}_A \mid \mathbf{x}_B)$ of some set of variables A given specific values to another set of variables $\mathbf{x}_B$.
- Compute $\arg\max_{\mathbf{x}_A} p(\mathbf{x}_A \mid \mathbf{x}_B)$ (for MAP queries, for example).

When we condition on some variables, we can restrict the factors to only those entries that match the conditioned variables. It is obvious that the first two questions above are special cases of the FAQ-SS problem on the sum-product semiring. (The third question is on the max-product semiring.) These are well-known facts [59].

Since matrix-vector multiplication is a special case of matrix-matrix multiplication, Example 1.1 also shows that the matrix vector multiplication problem is a special case of the FAQ-SS problem. Given the above, it also follows that computing the Discrete Fourier Transform is a special case of FAQ-SS. Next, we present another interpretation of the DFT from Aji's thesis [8], which immediately shows that our algorithm implies the Fast Fourier Transform (FFT).

Example A.13 (Discrete Fourier Transform)**.** Recall that the discrete Fourier transform (DFT) is the matrix vector multiplication where $A_{xy} = e^{i2\pi \frac{x \cdot y}{n}}$. For this example, we will consider the case when $n = p^m$ for some prime p and integer $m \geq 1$. Recall that the DFT is defined as follows:

$$\varphi(x) = \sum_{y=0}^{n-1} b_y \cdot e^{i2\pi \frac{x \cdot y}{n}}.$$

Write $x = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} x_i \cdot p^i$ and $y = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} y_j \cdot p^j$ in their base-p form. Then we can re-write the transform above as follows:

$$\varphi(x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_{m-1}) = \sum_{(y_0, \ldots, y_{m-1}) \in \mathbb{F}_p^m} b_y \cdot e^{i2\pi \frac{\sum_{0 \leq j+k \leq 2m-2} x_j \cdot y_k \cdot p^{j+k}}{n}}.$$

[19] From a Bayesian point of view, there is no difference between the two. "Learning" refers to the task of estimating the parameters of a model given the observed data. For example, we often estimate the parameters using the *Maximum A Posteriori* (MAP) estimate $\hat{\theta} = \arg\max_\theta p(\theta \mid \mathbf{x}_A) = \arg\max_\theta \{\log p(\mathbf{x}_A \mid \theta) + \log p(\theta)\}$. Here, $\mathbf{x}_A$ is the set of observed values. (MAP is also called MPE which stands for *most probable explanation*, because it is the *mode* of the posterior distribution.) "Inference" refers to the task of computing $p(\mathbf{x}_B \mid \mathbf{x}_A, \theta)$, where $\mathbf{x}_B$ are the *hidden variables* and θ are known parameters.

Recalling that $n = p^m$, note that for any $j + k \geq m$, we have $e^{i2\pi \frac{x_j \cdot y_k \cdot p^{j+k}}{n}} = 1$. Thus, the above is equivalent to

$$\varphi(x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_{m-1}) = \sum_{(y_0,\ldots,y_{m-1}) \in \mathbb{F}_p^m} b_y \cdot \prod_{0 \leq j+k < m} e^{i2\pi \frac{x_j \cdot y_k}{p^{m-j-k}}}.$$

The above immediately suggests the following reduction to FAQ-SS. Let $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ where $\mathcal{V} = \{X_0, X_1, \ldots, X_{m-1}, Y_0, Y_1, \ldots, Y_{m-1}\}$ and $\mathcal{E}$ has an edge (X_j, Y_k) for every $j, k \in \{0, 1, \ldots, m-1\}$ such that $j + k < m$. Further, there is another edge $(Y_0, Y_1, \ldots, Y_{m-1})$. The variable domains are $\mathrm{Dom}(X_i) = \mathrm{Dom}(Y_i) = \{0, 1, \ldots, p-1\}$. For every $j, k \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $j + k < m$, the corresponding factor

$$\psi_{X_j, Y_k} : \mathbb{F}_p^2 \to \mathbf{D}$$

is defined as

$$\psi_{X_j, Y_k}(x, y) = e^{i2\pi \frac{x \cdot y}{p^{m-j-k}}}.$$

Finally, the factor $\psi_{\mathbf{Y}} : \mathbb{F}_p^m \to \mathbf{D}$ is defined as

$$\psi_{\mathbf{Y}}(y_0, y_1, \ldots, y_{m-1}) = b_{(y_0, y_1, \ldots, y_{m-1})}.$$

Then the output is

$$\varphi(x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_{m-1}) = \sum_{(y_0,\ldots,y_{m-1}) \in \mathbb{F}_p^m} \psi_Y(y_0, y_1, \ldots, y_{m-1}) \cdot \prod_{0 \leq j+k < m} \psi_{X_j, Y_k}(x_j, y_k).$$

Example A.14 (Graph homomorphism function)**.** Given a (non-hyper) graph G and an $m \times m$ symmetric matrix $\mathbf{A} = (a_{ij})$. The *graph homomorphism function* is defined by

$$Z_{\mathbf{A}}(G) = \sum_{\zeta : V \to [m]} \prod_{uv \in E(G)} a_{\zeta(u), \zeta(v)}.$$

(The reader is referred to the masterpieces by Cai et al. [21], Goldberg et al. [41], references therein for a long and fascinating history of this problem.) The corresponding FAQ instance is

$$\varphi = \sum_{x_1} \cdots \sum_{x_n} \prod_{uv \in E(G)} \psi_{uv}(x_u, x_v),$$

where $\mathrm{Dom}(X_i) = [m]$, and $\psi_{uv} : [m] \times [m] \to \mathbf{D}$ are identical factors, mapping $\psi_{uv}(x_u, x_v) = a_{x_u, x_v}$.

Example A.15 (Holant problem)**.** The Holant problems can also be expressed using FAQ-SS. Essentially, in a Holant instance there is a function f_v for each vertex of a graph G, where the function is on the set of incident edges. Each edge can be assigned a domain value. The problem is to compute the sum over all edge assignments of the product of all vertex factors. See [22] for more details.

A.3 The max-product semiring

In addition to MAP queries in PGMs which are well-known to be reducible to FAQ-SS on the max-product semiring, the following is another common instance of the max-product semiring.

Example A.16 (Maximum Likelihood Decoder for Linear Codes)**.** We present the instantiation of Maximum Likelihood Decoding (MLD) for linear codes as an instance of FAQ-SS from Aji and McEliece [9]. We consider the decoding problem from a discrete memoryless channel. We assume that the alphabet is $\mathbb{F}_2$ and given $y, x \in \mathbb{F}_2$, $\psi_p(y, x)$ denotes the probability of the receiver receiving y given that x was transmitted over the channel. Let C be a binary linear code

with dimension k and block length n. Then given a received word $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ and a codeword $\mathbf{c} \in C$, the probability that the receiver receives $\mathbf{y}$ when $\mathbf{c}$ was transmitted is given by

$$\Pr[\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{c}] = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \psi_p(y_i, c_i).$$

The maximum likelihood decoder, given $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ outputs the codeword $\mathbf{c} \in C$ that is most likely, i.e. it outputs:

$$\arg\max_{\mathbf{c}\in C} \Pr[\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{c}].$$

For simplicity, we will concentrate on the related problem of computing the most likely probability, i.e.

$$\max_{\mathbf{c}\in C} \Pr[\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{c}]. \tag{42}$$

Define the hypergraph $\mathcal{V} = ([n], \mathcal{E})$ as follows. There is a singleton edge $\{i\}$ for every $i \in [n]$ (with the corresponding factor $\psi_i(Y_i, X_i) = \psi_p(Y_i, X_i)$). Further, the linear code C has an $(n-k) \times n$ parity check matrix H such that $\mathbf{c} \in C$ if and only if $H \cdot \mathbf{c}^T = \mathbf{0}$. Then for each row H_j, we have $\text{supp}(H_j) \in \mathcal{E}$. (The factor $\psi_{H_j}(\mathbf{x}_{\text{supp}(H_j)})$ is defined to be 1 if the corresponding parity check is satisfied by $\mathbf{x}$ and 0 otherwise.) It is easy to verify that the FAQ-SS instance below is equivalent to the problem in (42):

$$\varphi = \max_{x\in\mathbb{F}_q^n} \prod_{i\in[n]} \psi_i(y_i, x_i) \cdot \prod_{j\in[n-k]} \psi_{H_j}(\mathbf{x}_{\text{supp}(H_j)}).$$

A.4 The set semiring

Example A.17 (Natural join query)**.** Consider the natural join query

$$\Phi = \bowtie_{R\in\text{atoms}(\Phi)} R.$$

Let $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ be the query's hypergraph. We define a factor ψ_S for each $S \in \mathcal{E}$ as follows. The domain of the set semiring is $\mathbf{D} = 2^U$, where $U = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \text{Dom}(X_i)$. Let R be the relation corresponding to S. Then, ψ_S

$$\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) = \begin{cases} \{\mathbf{t} \mid \pi_S(\mathbf{t}) = \mathbf{x}_S\} & \text{if } \mathbf{x}_S \in R \\ \emptyset & \text{if } \mathbf{x}_S \notin R \end{cases}$$

Computing the output of Φ becomes computing the constant set-valued function

$$\varphi = \bigcup_{\mathbf{x}} \bigcap_{S\in\mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S).$$

A.5 Applications of the FAQ problem

The FAQ-SS problem is quite general, as we have seen above. However, there are at least two classes of problems which are not captured by the basic FAQ-SS formulation above.

First, consider the problem of counting the number of answers to a conjunctive query. This is called the #CQ problem [79]. If the input query is quantifier-free, then we *can* formulate the problem as FAQ-SS on the sum-product semiring by mapping true to 1 and false to 0. However, when the query does have existential quantifiers, the straightforward mapping does not work.

Second, consider the general Quantified Conjunctive Query (QCQ) problem, which has both existential and universal quantifiers (and a conjunction of atoms inside). It is not possible to reduce this problem to FAQ-SS. The related problem of counting the number of solutions to such formulas (#QCQ) is even harder.

Example A.18 (#CQ)**.** Let Φ be a conjunctive formula of the form

$$\Phi(X_1, \ldots, X_f) = \exists X_{f+1} \ldots X_n \left(\bigwedge_{R \in \text{atoms}(\Phi)} R \right),$$

and the problem is to *count* the number of assignments $(x_1, \ldots, x_f)$ such that $\Phi(x_1, \ldots, x_f)$ is satisfied. Then, we can reduce this problem to FAQ with the constant function

$$\varphi = \sum_{x_1} \cdots \sum_{x_f} \max_{x_{f+1}} \cdots \max_{x_n} \prod_{S \in \mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S).$$

Here, $\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) = \delta_{x_S \in R}$, where $R \in \text{atoms}(\Phi)$ is the atom corresponding to S. Note that $\sum$ and max are not commutative with one another.

Example A.19 (QCQ – First Reduction)**.** Let Φ be a first order formula of the form

$$\Phi(X_1, \ldots, X_f) = Q_{f+1} X_{f+1} \cdots Q_n X_n \left(\bigwedge_{R \in \text{atoms}(\Phi)} R \right),$$

where $Q_i \in \{\exists, \forall\}$, for $i > f$. The problem is to compute the relation Φ on the free variables $X_1, \ldots, X_f$. Then, we can reduce this problem to FAQ with the function

$$\varphi(x_1, \cdots, x_f) = \bigoplus_{x_{f+1}}^{(f+1)} \cdots \bigoplus_{x_n}^{(n)} \prod_{S \in \mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S).$$

Similar to Example A.18, $\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) = \delta_{x_S \in R}$, where $R \in \text{atoms}(\Phi)$ is the atom corresponding to S. And, $\bigoplus^{(i)} = \max$ if $Q_i = \exists$ and $\bigoplus^{(i)} = \min$ if $Q_i = \forall$.

There is another way to reduce QCQ to FAQ. It is this reduction that we will use later in the paper.

Example A.20 (QCQ – Second Reduction)**.** Let Φ be a first order formula of the form

$$\Phi(X_1, \ldots, X_f) = Q_{f+1} X_{f+1} \cdots Q_n X_n \left(\bigwedge_{R \in \text{atoms}(\Phi)} R \right),$$

where $Q_i \in \{\exists, \forall\}$, for $i > f$. The problem is to compute the relation Φ on the free variables $X_1, \ldots, X_f$. Then, we can reduce this problem to FAQ with the function

$$\varphi(x_1, \cdots, x_f) = \bigoplus_{x_{f+1}}^{(f+1)} \cdots \bigoplus_{x_n}^{(n)} \prod_{S \in \mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S).$$

Similar to Example A.18, $\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) = \delta_{x_S \in R}$, where $R \in \text{atoms}(\Phi)$ is the atom corresponding to S. And,

$$\bigoplus^{(i)} = \begin{cases} \max & \text{if } Q_i = \exists, \\ \times & \text{if } Q_i = \forall. \end{cases}$$

What is interesting to note about the above reduction is that the product occurs as an aggregate operator over (universally quantified) variables and also as an aggregate operator over the input factors.

Example A.21 (Example 1.3 revisited: #QCQ)**.** This is similar to the above two examples. Let Φ be a first order formula of the form

$$\Phi(X_1, \ldots, X_f) = Q_{f+1}X_{f+1} \cdots Q_n X_n \left(\bigwedge_{R \in \text{atoms}(\Phi)} R \right),$$

where $Q_i \in \{\exists, \forall\}$, for $i > f$. The problem is to *count* the number of tuples in relation Φ on the free variables $X_1, \ldots, X_f$. Then, we can reduce this problem to FAQ with the constant function

$$\varphi = \sum_{x_1} \cdots \sum_{x_f} \bigoplus_{x_{f+1}}^{(f+1)} \cdots \bigoplus_{x_n}^{(n)} \prod_{S \in \mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S).$$

Where $\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) = \delta_{\mathbf{x}_S \in R}$, where $R \in \text{atoms}(\Phi)$ is the atom corresponding to S. And,

$$\bigoplus^{(i)} = \begin{cases} \max & \text{if } Q_i = \exists, \\ \times & \text{if } Q_i = \forall. \end{cases}$$

B REDUCTIONS FROM NON-SEMIRING TO SEMIRING

In practice, we often encounter queries which have the same format as FAQ except that some of the aggregates $\oplus^{(i)}$ are neither product not semiring aggregates. Suppose that we want to compute the function

$$\varphi : \prod_{i \in [f]} \text{Dom}(X_i) \to \mathbf{D}$$

defined by

$$\varphi(\mathbf{x}_{[f]}) = \bigoplus_{x_{f+1}}^{(f+1)} \cdots \bigoplus_{x_n}^{(n)} \bigotimes_{S \in \mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S).$$

W.l.o.g. let $\oplus := \oplus^{(n)}$ be neither a product nor a semiring aggregate (Otherwise, we could have eliminated x_n as described in Section 5.2). In many situations, it is possible to find a two-way mapping between $(\mathbf{D}, \oplus, \otimes)$ and some commutative semiring $(\bar{\mathbf{D}}, \bar{\oplus}, \bar{\otimes})$ where $\bar{\mathbf{D}}$ is some extended domain and $\bar{\oplus}, \bar{\otimes}$ are extended versions of $\oplus, \otimes$ that fit the new domain $\bar{\mathbf{D}}$. If such a mapping exists, then we can transfer input factors into $\bar{\mathbf{D}}$, carry out the calculations over the semiring $(\bar{\mathbf{D}}, \bar{\oplus}, \bar{\otimes})$, and then transfer the results back to the original domain $\mathbf{D}$, in order to bypass dealing with non-semirings.

Formally, suppose that there exists a function $\bar{f} : \mathbf{D} \to \bar{\mathbf{D}}$ and a function $f : \bar{\mathbf{D}} \to \mathbf{D}$ that satisfy the following conditions:

(1) For all $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \mathbf{D}$ (where $n \geq 1$), $\bigoplus_{i \in [n]} x_i = f\left(\bar{\bigoplus}_{i \in [n]} \bar{f}(x_i)\right)$.
(2) For all $x, y \in \mathbf{D}$, $\bar{f}(x \otimes y) = \bar{f}(x) \bar{\otimes} \bar{f}(y)$.
(3) For all $\bar{x}, \bar{y} \in \bar{\mathbf{D}}$, $f(\bar{x} \bar{\otimes} \bar{y}) = f(\bar{x}) \otimes f(\bar{y})$.

Note that for $n = 1$, condition 1 above reduces to $f(\bar{f}(x)) = x$ for all $x \in \mathbf{D}$. If the above conditions are met (Examples B.2 and B.3 below), then variable elimination (Section 5.1.2) can take place as if $(\mathbf{D}, \oplus, \otimes)$ were a commutative semiring.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \varphi(\mathbf{x}_{[f]}) && (43)\\
= \; & \bigoplus_{x_{f+1}}^{(f+1)} \cdots \bigoplus_{x_{n-1}}^{(n-1)} f\left[\bar{\bigoplus}_{x_n}^{(n)} \bar{\bigotimes}_{S \in \mathcal{E}} \bar{f}\left(\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)\right) \right] && (44)\\
= \; & \bigoplus_{x_{f+1}}^{(f+1)} \cdots \bigoplus_{x_n}^{(n-1)} f\left[\left(\bar{\bigotimes}_{S: n \notin S} \bar{f}\left(\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)\right) \right) \bar{\otimes} \left(\bar{\bigoplus}_{x_n}^{(n)} \bar{\bigotimes}_{S: n \in S} \bar{f}\left(\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)\right) \right) \right] && (45)\\
= \; & \bigoplus_{x_{f+1}}^{(f+1)} \cdots \bigoplus_{x_n}^{(n-1)} \bigotimes_{S: n \notin S} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) \otimes \underbrace{f\left(\bar{\bigoplus}_{x_n}^{(n)} \bar{\bigotimes}_{S: n \in S} \bar{f}\left(\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)\right) \right)}_{\text{new factor } \psi_{U_n - \{n\}} \text{ over } \mathbf{D}}. && (46)
\end{aligned}$$

If only conditions 1 and 2 (but not 3) are met (Example B.4), then we can still apply steps (44) and (45) (but not (46)). In particular, factors $\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)$ will have to remain transformed $\bar{f}\left(\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S)\right)$ into the new domain $\bar{\mathbf{D}}$, and the new factor will be over $\bar{\mathbf{D}}$ as well. We cannot transfer back to the original domain $\mathbf{D}$ until all products $\bar{\otimes}$ have been computed.

Let $\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1} \in \mathbf{D}$ denote the identities for $\oplus, \otimes$ respectively, and $\bar{\mathbf{0}}, \bar{\mathbf{1}} \in \bar{\mathbf{D}}$ denote the identities for $\bar{\oplus}, \bar{\otimes}$ respectively. Many natural FAQ algorithms rely on zero entries in order to save computation (e.g., OutsideIn and InsideOut in Sections 5.1.1 and 5.2 respectively). Therefore, it is desired that f and $\bar{f}$ satisfy the properties $\bar{\mathbf{0}} = \bar{f}(\mathbf{0})$ and $\mathbf{0} = f(\bar{\mathbf{0}})$.

Remark B.1. Notice that conditions 1 and 3 above imply that $f(\bar{\mathbf{1}}) = \mathbf{1}$. In particular, assuming $f(\bar{\mathbf{1}}) \neq \mathbf{1}$, we have $f\left[\bar{f}(\mathbf{1}) \bar{\otimes} \bar{\mathbf{1}}\right] = f\left[\bar{f}(\mathbf{1})\right] = \mathbf{1}$, while $f\left[\bar{f}(\mathbf{1})\right] \otimes f(\bar{\mathbf{1}}) = \mathbf{1} \otimes f(\bar{\mathbf{1}}) = f(\bar{\mathbf{1}})$.

Here are a few practical examples that can clarify the above abstract ideas (In all of those examples, we have $\bar{\mathbf{0}} = \bar{f}(\mathbf{0})$, $\mathbf{0} = f(\bar{\mathbf{0}})$, $\bar{\mathbf{1}} = \bar{f}(\mathbf{1})$, and $\mathbf{1} = f(\bar{\mathbf{1}})$).

Example B.2 (Conditional average)**.** Given a set of $n \geq 1$ numbers $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}$, suppose we are interested in computing the average of the numbers x_i that satisfy a certain condition, e.g. $x_i \neq 0$. In particular, let $\mathrm{avg}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ denote the average of non-zero numbers among $x_1, \ldots, x_n$. (By convention, when all numbers are zeros, let avg be zero.)

$$\mathrm{avg}(x_1, \ldots, x_n) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x_1 = x_2 = \cdots = x_n = 0, \\ \frac{x_1 + \cdots + x_n}{\delta_{x_1 \neq 0} + \cdots + \delta_{x_n \neq 0}} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$(\mathbb{R}, \mathrm{avg}, \times)$ is not a semiring because avg is not associative (e.g., $\mathrm{avg}(\mathrm{avg}(1,2),3) \neq \mathrm{avg}(1, \mathrm{avg}(2,3))$). However, we can extend it into the commutative semiring $(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{N}, \bar{\oplus}, \bar{\otimes})$ where $\bar{\oplus}$ and $\bar{\otimes}$ are defined as follows. For all $(a_1, b_1), (a_2, b_2) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{N}$,

$$(a_1, b_1) \bar{\oplus} (a_2, b_2) := (a_1 + a_2, b_1 + b_2),$$
$$(a_1, b_1) \bar{\otimes} (a_2, b_2) := (a_1 \times a_2, b_1 \times b_2).$$

Define $\bar{f} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\bar{f}(x) := (x, \delta_{x \neq 0}).$$

Define $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $(a, b) \in (\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{N})$,

$$f(a, b) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } b = 0, \\ \frac{a}{b} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is not hard to verify that conditions 1, 2, and 3 are met in this example. Also, notice that $\mathbf{0} = 0$, $\mathbf{1} = 1$, $\bar{\mathbf{0}} = (0, 0)$ and $\bar{\mathbf{1}} = (1, 1)$.

Example B.3 (Uniqueness quantification ($\exists!$))**.** Given $n \geq 1$ Boolean variables $b_1, \ldots, b_n$, let $\mathsf{unique}(b_1, \ldots, b_n)$ denote the truth value of whether there is a unique b_i whose value is true.

$$\mathsf{unique}(b_1, \ldots, b_n) := (\exists! i \in [n] \mid b_i = \mathsf{true}).$$

The problem with unique is that it is not cumulative over $\{\mathsf{true}, \mathsf{false}\}$ (For example, $\mathsf{unique}(\mathsf{true}, \mathsf{true}, \mathsf{true}) = \mathsf{false}$ while $\mathsf{unique}(\mathsf{unique}(\mathsf{true}, \mathsf{true}), \mathsf{true}) = \mathsf{true}$.) In fact, binary unique reduces to logical XOR, while n-ary unique does not correspond to XOR for $n > 2$. Therefore, we cannot use the commutative semiring $(\{\mathsf{true}, \mathsf{false}\}, \mathrm{XOR}, \wedge)$ to solve this FAQ. However, we can extend the domain to become $\{0, 1, 2\}$ and define a commutative semiring $(\{0, 1, 2\}, \bar{\oplus}, \bar{\otimes})$

such that for all $x, y \in \{0, 1, 2\}$,

$$x \bar{\oplus} y := \min(x + y, 2),$$

$$x \bar{\otimes} y := \min(x \times y, 2).$$

Define $\bar{f} : \{\text{true}, \text{false}\} \to \{0, 1, 2\}$ such that

$$\bar{f}(\text{true}) := 1,$$

$$\bar{f}(\text{false}) := 0.$$

Define $f : \{0, 1, 2\} \to \{\text{true}, \text{false}\}$ such that for all $x \in \{0, 1, 2\}$,

$$f(x) := (x = 1).$$

Notice that conditions 1, 2, and 3 are met in this example. Also, notice that $\mathbf{0} = \text{false}$, $\mathbf{1} = \text{true}$, $\bar{\mathbf{0}} = 0$, and $\bar{\mathbf{1}} = 1$.

Example B.4 ($(\mathbb{R}, \max, \times)$)**.** $(\mathbb{R}, \max, \times)$ is not a semiring because max does not have an identity over $\mathbb{R}$. However, we can fix this by extending the domain to become $\mathbf{D} := \mathbb{R} \cup \{\text{NaN}\}$ where NaN is a special symbol having the following properties. For all $x \in \mathbf{D}$,

$$\max(x, \text{NaN}) = \max(\text{NaN}, x) = x,$$

$$\min(x, \text{NaN}) = \min(\text{NaN}, x) = x,$$

$$x \times \text{NaN} = \text{NaN} \times x = \text{NaN}.$$

Now, we have the max identity $\mathbf{0} = \text{NaN}$ and the product identity identity $\mathbf{1} = 1$. However, $(\mathbf{D}, \max, \times)$ is still not a semiring because $\times$ does not distribute over max in $\mathbb{R}$ (e.g., $-1 \times \max(1, 2) \neq \max(-1, -2)$). However, we can extend it into the commutative semiring $(\bar{\mathbf{D}}, \bar{\oplus}, \bar{\otimes})$ where

$$\bar{\mathbf{D}} := \left\{(\text{NaN}, \text{NaN})\right\} \cup \left\{(a, b) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid a \leq b\right\},$$

and for all $(a_1, b_1), (a_2, b_2) \in \bar{\mathbf{D}}$

$$(a_1, b_1) \bar{\oplus} (a_2, b_2) := (\min(a_1, a_2), \max(b_1, b_2)),$$

$$(a_1, b_1) \bar{\otimes} (a_2, b_2) := (\min(a_1 a_2, a_1 b_2, b_1 a_2, b_1 b_2), \max(a_1 a_2, a_1 b_2, b_1 a_2, b_1 b_2)).$$

Notice that $\bar{\mathbf{0}} = (\text{NaN}, \text{NaN})$ while $\bar{\mathbf{1}} = (1, 1)$.

Define $\bar{f} : \mathbf{D} \to \bar{\mathbf{D}}$ such that for all $x \in \mathbf{D}$,

$$\bar{f}(x) := (x, x).$$

Define $f : \bar{\mathbf{D}} \to \mathbf{D}$ such that for all $(a, b) \in \bar{\mathbf{D}}$,

$$f(a, b) := b.$$

This example meets conditions 1 and 2 but *not* 3.

C TREE DECOMPOSITIONS AND VARIABLE ELIMINATION

In this section, we prove Proposition 4.9, Proposition 4.10, and Lemma 4.12. To this end, we first describe ways to convert back and forth between a tree decomposition and a vertex ordering of a given hypergraph. We will also need the notion of a reduced (or non-redundant) tree decomposition.

Minimal tree decomposition. The definition of tree decompositions doesn't say anything about how large a tree decomposition is, i.e. how many vertices T has. However, many tree decompositions are "redundant" in the sense

that one bag might be a subset of another. In that case, we can *reduce* the tree decomposition as follows. Let (T, χ) be a tree decomposition of a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$. Suppose there is a bag B that is a subset of another bag B'. Note that there is a unique path $B = B_0, B_1, \ldots, B_k = B'$ because T is a tree. Then, B has to be a subset of *every* bag on this path. We can thus remove B, connect all the neighbors of B, other than B_1, to B_1. It is easy to see that the new tree is a tree decomposition of the same hypergraph still. When no such bag removal is possible, we have a *reduced tree decomposition* or a *non-redundant tree decomposition*. The following shows that reduced tree decompositions do not have too many nodes.

Proposition C.1. *Let (T, χ) be a reduced tree decomposition of a connected hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ on n vertices, then T has at most n nodes.*

Proof. Any leaf bag B of T necessarily has a private vertex v, i.e. a vertex that does not belong to any other bag. Now, suppose we remove v from B. If B is a subset of its neighbor, then we also remove B. Either way, what we end up with is a reduced tree decomposition of a hypergraph on $n-1$ vertices. Induction completes the proof. □

Tree decomposition from vertex ordering. Given any vertex ordering $\sigma = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ of a hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, we construct a tree decomposition recursively as follows. (Recall the hypergraph sequence defined in Definition 4.8.) First, by induction, we construct a tree decomposition T_{n-1} of the graph $\mathcal{H}^{\sigma}_{n-1}$ using the vertex ordering $(v_1, \ldots, v_{n-1})$. (The base case, i.e. the tree decomposition T_1 is trivial as the hypergraph $\mathcal{H}_1$ has only one vertex.) Note that $U^{\sigma}_n - \{v_n\}$ *is* a hyperedge of $\mathcal{H}^{\sigma}_{n-1}$. Let B be the bag of T_{n-1} that contains this hyperedge. Now, create a new bag U_n and connect it to B. Note that all hyperedges in $\partial^{\sigma}(v_n)$ are subsets of U^{σ}_n. One can verify by induction that this is indeed a tree decomposition of $\mathcal{H}^{\sigma}_n = \mathcal{H}$. The tree decomposition constructed this way has at most n bags, but it is not necessarily non-redundant. We reduce the tree decomposition to make it non-redundant, and refer to the final tree decomposition as a *tree decomposition induced by the vertex ordering*. The following proposition is straightforward by induction.

Proposition C.2. *In a tree decomposition (T, χ) induced by the vertex ordering $\sigma = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)$, every bag of T is a set U^{σ}_k, for some $k \in [n]$. Furthermore, (T, χ) is non-redundant.*

GYO-elimination procedure. Next we explain why the vertex ordering is the reverse of what typically is called an "elimination order". The typical way to obtain a good vertex ordering from a tree decomposition is the *GYO-elimination procedure* [45, 85, 91]. In this procedure, we repeatedly apply the following two operations on a tree decomposition: (1) remove any bag that is a subset of another bag, (2) remove any vertex that belongs to only one bag. Typically this procedure is done by fixing arbitrarily a root bag and eliminating bags and vertices from the leaves up to the root bag.

The reversed sequence of vertices that were removed is a vertex ordering whose induced (fractional) width is as good as the (fractional) width of the tree decomposition, as we show below. One key aspect of the GYO-procedure is that we could have fixed any bag as the root bag, and thus the vertices inside this bag can be eliminated last, which means they will occur first in the resulting vertex ordering.

Vertex ordering from tree decomposition. However, in this section for technical reasons we also describe a specific realization of the basic GYO-elimination procedure. Given a tree decomposition (T, χ) of $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ we construct an ordering of vertices $v_1, \ldots, v_n$ as follows. First, we make (T, χ) a reduced tree decomposition as described above. Second, we designate a node of T as the root node. For every vertex $v \in \mathcal{V}$, let t_v denote the node highest in the tree such that $v \in \chi(t_v)$. We call the bag $\chi(t_v)$ the "owner" of of v, and v a "private vertex" of $\chi(t_v)$. We construct a vertex ordering as follows:

(1) If T is empty, return the empty sequence.
(2) Otherwise, take any leaf node t of T, let P_t denote the set of private vertices of $\chi(t)$. (Because T is reduced, P_t is not empty!)
(3) Remove t from T, resulting in a tree T'. Let σ' denote the vertex ordering of $\mathcal{V} - P_t$ obtained from T' by induction. Let σ be obtained by appending vertices in P_t to the end of σ'. (Note that T' still has the same root as T.)

The resulting vertex ordering is called a vertex ordering induced by the tree decomposition. The following follows by induction.

Proposition C.3. *Let $\sigma = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ be a vertex ordering induced by a tree decomposition (T, χ), then U_k^σ is a subset of some bag of T, for every $k \in [n]$. Furthermore, the vertex ordering can be constructed in polynomial time.*

Now we are ready to characterize acyclicity and widths using vertex orderings.

Proof of Proposition 4.9. For the forward direction, assume $\mathcal{H}$ is α-acyclic. Then, there is a tree decomposition (T, χ) of $\mathcal{H}$ in which every bag is a hyperedge. Let $\sigma = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ be an induced vertex ordering of (T, χ). By Proposition C.3, $U_k^\sigma \subseteq \chi(t)$ for some $t \in V(T)$. Since $\chi(t)$ is a hyperedge of $\mathcal{H}$, $\chi(t) \in \mathcal{E}_k$ and hence $U_k^\sigma = \chi(t) \in \partial^\sigma(v_k)$.

Conversely, suppose there is a vertex ordering σ for which $U_k^\sigma \in \partial^\sigma(v_k)$ for all $k \in [n]$. By induction, $\mathcal{H}_{n-1}^\sigma$ is α-acyclic. Thus, there is a tree decomposition T_{n-1} in which every bag of T_{n-1} is a hyperedge of $\mathcal{H}_{n-1}$. There is a hyperedge $B = U_n - \{v_n\}$ in $\mathcal{H}_{n-1}$ which may not be a hyperedge of $\mathcal{H}_n$. If B is indeed not a hyperedge of $\mathcal{H}_n = \mathcal{H}$, then we replace B by U_n, add a bag for each set in $\partial(v_n) - \{U_n\}$, and connect those bags to the U_n-bag. If B *is already* a hyperedge of $\mathcal{H}$, then we create a new bag $B' = B \cup \{v_n\}$, connect it to B, and connect the remaining bags in $\partial(v_n)$ to B' as before. Either way, we have just created a tree decomposition of $\mathcal{H}$ in which every bag is a hyperedge and vice versa. □

Proposition 4.10 was shown in [65]; we reproduce a stand-alone proof here for completeness. To prove Proposition 4.10, we use a different characterization of β-acyclicity:

Proposition C.4 (See [37])**.** *A hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ is* β-acyclic *if and only if there is* **no** *sequence*

$$(F_1, u_1, F_2, u_2, \cdots, F_m, u_m, F_{m+1} = F_1)$$

with the following properties

- $m \geq 3$
- *$u_1, \ldots, u_m$ are distinct vertices of $\mathcal{H}$*
- *$F_1, \ldots, F_m$ are distinct hyperedges of $\mathcal{H}$*
- *for every $i \in [m]$, $u_i \in F_i \cap F_{i+1}$, and $u_i \notin F_j$ for every $j \in [m+1] - \{i, i+1\}$.*

.

Proof of Proposition 4.10. For the forward direction, suppose $\mathcal{H}$ is β-acyclic. A *nest point* of $\mathcal{H}$ is a vertex $v \in \mathcal{H}$ such that the collection of hyperedges containing v forms a nested sequence of subsets, one contained in the next. Any β-acyclic hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ has at least two nest points [20]. Let v_n be a nest point of $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_n$. Then, $\partial(v_n)$ is an inclusion chain and U_n is the bottom element of $\partial(v_n)$. Consequently, $\mathcal{H}_{n-1}$ is precisely $\mathcal{H} - \{v_n\}$, which is β-acyclic.

By induction there exists an elimination order $v_1, \ldots, v_{n-1}$ such that every collection $\partial(v_k)$ forms a chain, $k \in [n-1]$, Thus, the elimination order $v_1, \ldots, v_n$ satisfies the desired property.

Conversely, suppose there exists an ordering $\sigma = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ of all vertices of $\mathcal{H}$ such that every collection $\partial^\sigma(v_k)$ is a chain. Assume to the contrary that $\mathcal{H}$ is not β-acyclic. Then, there is a sequence

$$(F_1, u_1, F_2, u_2, \ldots, F_m, u_m, F_{m+1} = F_1)$$

satisfying the conditions stated in Proposition C.4. Without loss of generality, suppose u_m comes last in the vertex ordering σ, and that $u_m = v_k$ for some k. Then, the poset $\partial^\sigma(v_k)$ contains the set $F_m \cap \{v_1, \ldots, v_{k-1}\}$ and the set $F_1 \cap \{v_1, \ldots, v_{k-1}\}$. Since both u_2 and u_{m-1} come before u_m in the ordering, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u_2 &\in (F_1 \cap \{v_1, \ldots, v_{k-1}\}) - (F_m \cap \{v_1, \ldots, v_{k-1}\}) \\ u_{m-1} &\in (F_m \cap \{v_1, \ldots, v_{k-1}\}) - (F_1 \cap \{v_1, \ldots, v_{k-1}\}) . \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, $\partial^\sigma(v_k)$ is not a chain. □

Proof of Lemma 4.12. For the forward direction, consider a tree decomposition (T, χ) with g-width w and one of its induced vertex orderings $\sigma = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)$. By Proposition C.3, every set U_k^σ is a subset of some bag $\chi(t)$, $t \in V(T)$. Thus, due to g's monotonicity, $g(U_k) \le g(\chi(t)) \le w$.

Conversely, suppose there is a vertex ordering $\sigma = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ for which $g(U_k^\sigma) \le w$ for all $k \in [n]$. Let T be a tree decomposition induced by this ordering. Then, by Proposition C.2, every bag in T is some set U_k, which completes the proof. □

D MISSING DETAILS FROM THE ANALYSIS OF InsideOut

E QUICK APPLICATIONS OF InsideOut

We describe here some examples where expression (15) is "easy" to minimize. Note that to avoid cumbersome notation, up to re-indexing of variables, we have stated (15) with the assumption that the variable ordering of the input expression is from X_1 to X_n. In the examples below, the variable indices might be arranged differently from the natural 1 to n order.

Example E.1 (Matrix Chain Multiplication)**.** Consider the matrix multiplication problem and its reduction to FAQ-SS described in Example 1.1. In this problem, the set of free variables is $F = \{1, n+1\}$. Let $v_2, \ldots, v_n$ be an arbitrary permutation of $\{2, \ldots, n\}$, and let $v_1 = 1, v_{n+1} = n+1$. Then, the problem can be re-stated as computing the function

$$\varphi(x_1, x_{n+1}) = \sum_{x_{v_2}} \sum_{x_{v_3}} \cdots \sum_{x_{v_n}} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \psi_{v_i, v_{i+1}}(x_{v_i}, x_{v_{i+1}}).$$

And, expression (15) becomes

$$\tilde{O}\left(\sum_{k=2}^{n} \mathsf{AGM}_{\mathcal{H}_k}(U_k) + p_1 p_{n+1} \right). \tag{47}$$

Let us see how one can find a variable ordering $v_2, \ldots, v_n$ to minimize this expression.

Let $\ell = v_n \in \{2, \ldots, n\}$. Then, for this variable ordering $U_n = \{\ell - 1, \ell, \ell + 1\}$. In fact, it is easy to see that every set U_k will have size 3 during the elimination process; and the number of hyperedges intersecting U_k is at most 4. To fractionally cover U_n, we can bound

$$|\psi_{\ell, \ell+1}| \le p_\ell p_{\ell+1}$$

$$|\psi_{\ell-2,\ell-1/U_n}| \quad \leq \quad p_{\ell-1}.$$

Hence, we can bound the term $\mathrm{AGM}_{\mathcal{H}_n}(U_n)$ in (47) to be $p_{\ell-1} \cdot p_\ell \cdot p_{\ell+1}$. This is exactly the usual rough estimate of the cost of multiplying a $p_{\ell-1} \times p_\ell$-matrix with a $p_\ell \times p_{\ell+1}$-matrix.

Inductively, finding the best variable ordering to minimize (47) is *exactly* the same as finding the best sequence of matrix multiplications to minimize the overall multiplication cost as set up in the textbook Matrix Chain Multiplication problem [29]. This problem can be solved by dynamic programming!

Example E.2 (Matrix Vector Multiplication for structured matrices)**.** We begin with the DFT matrix. Recall that we assume that $n = p^m$ for some constant prime p. Using the bound in (47), one can show that InsideOut runs in time $O(m^4 p^m) = O(n \log^4 n)$, which is a $\log^3 n$ factor off from the $O(n \log n)$ runtime of FFT. Next, we will show that our framework as a special case contains the message passing interpretation of the FFT algorithm of Aji and McEliece [8, 9]. In particular, we will need to do some pre-processing on the input factors before running InsideOut. For every $0 \leq k < m$, define

$$\psi_{\cdot,Y_k}(x_0, \ldots, x_{m-k-1}, y_k) = \prod_{0 \leq j+k < m} \psi_{X_j,Y_k}(x_j, y_k).$$

Noting that the entire truth table representation of $\psi_{\cdot,Y_k}$ can be computed in time $O(mp^{m-k})$ and hence one can compute all the truth table of $\psi_{\cdot,Y_k}$ for $0 \leq k < m$ in time $O(mp^m) = O(n \log n)$. Note that if we have these factors pre-computed, then we want to compute the following FAQ-SS instance

$$\sum_{(y_0,\ldots,y_{m-1}) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^m} \psi_Y(y_0, \ldots, y_{m-1}) \cdot \prod_{k=0}^{m-1} \psi_{\cdot,Y_k}(x_0, \ldots, x_{m-k-1}, y_k).$$

Now consider the variable ordering $Y_{m-1}, \ldots, Y_0$ and note that U_k when eliminating Y_k (note we changed the notation from the default one), is given by $U_k = \{X_0, \ldots, X_{m-k}, Y_0, \ldots, Y_k\}$. We further note that since $\mathbf{D} = \{0, 1\}$ we do not need to use the indicator projections in InsideOut. In particular, this implies that line 7 in Algorithm 1 is computing

$$\sum_{Y_k \in \mathbb{Z}_p} \psi_{\cdot,Y_k} \cdot \psi_{U_{k+1}},$$

which can be done in $O(p^m)$ time. Since the above line is executed m times, the overall run time is $O(mp^m) = O(n \log n)$, as desired.

For the circulant matrix, we note that if one picks the variable ordering

$$W_{m-1}, \ldots, W_0, Z_{m-1}, \ldots, Z_0, Y_{m-1}, \ldots, Y_0$$

then Algorithm 1 with this variable ordering corresponds to computing $\mathbf{C} \cdot \mathbf{b}$ as computing $\mathbf{F} \cdot \mathbf{b}$ first, then computing $\mathbf{F} \cdot \mathbf{c}$ next, then computing their component-wise product $\mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{F} \cdot \mathbf{c}) \cdot (\mathbf{F} \cdot \mathbf{b})$ and then finally computing $\mathbf{F}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{u}$. Note that each of the DFT computations we just saw is done in $O(n \log n)$ leading to an overall runtime of $O(n \log n)$ to compute $\mathbf{C} \cdot \mathbf{b}$.

Next, we consider the case when $\mathbf{A}$ is the Kronecker product $\mathbf{D} \otimes \mathbf{E}$. In this case for $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{D}\otimes\mathbf{E}}$ consider the variable ordering Y_1, Y_0 and the corresponding $U_1 = \{X_1, Y_0, Y_1\}$ and $U_0 = \{X_0, X_1, Y_0\}$. To fractionally cover U_1, set $\lambda^{(1)}_{(X_1,Y_1)} = \lambda^{(1)}_{X_0,Y_0} = 1$. Similarly to cover U_0, set $\lambda^{(0)}_{X_0,Y_0} = \lambda^{(0)}_{X_1,Y_1} = 1$. Finally to cover $F = \{X_0, X_1\}$, set $\mu_{X_1,Y_1} = \mu_{X_0,Y_0} = 1$. Then (47) gives an overall runtime bound of $O(n_0^3) = O(n^{3/2})$.

We defer the discussion on the Khatri-Rao product case and now consider the case of $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{D} \circ \mathbf{E}$. Now consider the run of Algorithm 1 with variable ordering Y_0, Y_2, Y_1, Y_3. The corresponding sets are $U_0 = \{X_0, X_2, Y_0, Y_1, Y_2, Y_3\}, U_2 = \{X_0, X_2, Y_1, Y_2, Y_3\}, U_1 = \{X_0, X_1, X_2, X_3, Y_1, Y_3\}$ and $U_3 = \{X_0, X_1, X_2, X_3, Y_3\}$. We note that it is enough to cover U_0 and U_1 since $U_2 \subseteq U_0$ and $U_3 \subset U_1$. To cover U_0, set $\lambda^{(0)}_{X_0,X_2,Y_0,Y_2} = \lambda^{(0)}_{X_1,X_3,Y_1,Y_3} = 1$ and to cover U_1 set $\lambda^{(1)}_{X_0,X_2,Y_0,Y_2} = \lambda^{(1)}_{X_1,X_3,Y_1,Y_3} = 1$. Finally, to cover $F = \{X_0, X_1, X_2, X_3\}$, set $\mu_{X_0,X_2,Y_0,Y_2} = \mu_{X_1,X_3,Y_1,Y_3} = 1$. Then (47) givens an overall runtime bound of $O(n_0^6) = O(n^{3/2})$.

Finally, we consider the case when $\mathbf{A}$ is the Khatri-Rao product $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{D} \star \mathbf{E}$. Now consider the run of Algorithm 1 with variable ordering Y_0, Y_1, Y_2. The corresponding sets are $U_0 = \{X_0, X_2, Y_0, Y_1, Y_2\}, U_1 = \{X_0, X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2\}$ and $U_2 = \{X_0, X_1, X_2, Y_2\}$. Since $U_2 \subset U_1$, we only need to cover U_0 and U_1. However, if we just try and use an edge cover and then (47), then we will get the trivial quadratic runtime. However, like in the case of the DFT, we can consider the InsideOut algorithm and argue an overall runtime of $O(n^{5/3})$. Since all the factors are represented using the truth table representation, Algorithm 1 would run in the same time even if we added in the projection of the factor ψ_{X_0,Y_0,X_2,Y_2} onto $\{X_0, Y_0\}$ and the projection of ψ_{X_1,Y_1,X_2,Y_2} on to $\{X_1, Y_1\}$. With these extra factors, we can cover U_0 with $\lambda^{(0)}_{X_0,X_2,Y_0,Y_2} = \lambda^{(0)}_{X_1,Y_1} = 1$, U_1 with $\lambda^{(1)}_{X_1,X_2,Y_1,Y_2} = \lambda_{X_0,Y_0} = 1$ and $F = \{X_0, X_1, X_2\}$ by $\mu_{X_0,Y_0} = \mu_{X_1,X_2,Y_1,Y_2} = 1$. Then (47) implies an overall runtime of $O(n_0^5) = O(n^{5/3})$, as desired.

F MORE ON CHARACTERIZING EVO(φ) AND APPROXIMATING faqw(φ)

F.1 Quick applications of FAQ-SS without free variables (i.e. SumProd)

FAQ-SS without free variables is the easiest special case of FAQ because all variable orderings are φ-equivalent. In this case, every variable aggregate is a semiring aggregate. Hence, K defined by (14) reduces to $K = [n]$. Expression (16) becomes a simple quantity $\tilde{O}\left(N^{\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma)} + \|\varphi\|\right)$, where

$$\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma) = \max_{k \in [n]} \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U_k).$$

In this case, $\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma)$ is exactly the induced fractional edge cover width of σ (Definition 4.11). Thanks to Lemma 4.12, it follows that

$$\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi) = \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}).$$

However, computing (a tree decomposition with) the optimal fhtw is **NP**-hard [38, 61]. Marx [61] introduced an approximation algorithm that, given a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ with fractional hypertree width $\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H})$, computes a tree decomposition (T, χ) of $\mathcal{H}$ (or equivalently a vertex ordering σ of $\mathcal{H}$, as discussed in Section 4.4) such that the fractional hypertree width of (T, χ) is $O(\mathsf{fhtw}^3(\mathcal{H}))$ (or equivalently the induced fractional edge cover width of σ, given by Definition 4.11, is $O(\mathsf{fhtw}^3(\mathcal{H}))$) and Marx's algorithm runs in time $O(|\mathcal{H}|^{O(\mathsf{fhtw}^3(\mathcal{H}))})$. In particular, if $\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H})$ is bounded by a constant, then Marx's algorithm runs in polynomial time in $|\mathcal{H}|$. From this algorithm, we obtain the following corollaries, which are essentially what was shown in Grohe and Marx [61] applied to a wider context. (Recall from Table 1 that in this paper we use $\tilde{O}$ to hide a factor of $\log N$ where N is the data size and a polynomial factor in the query size. Therefore when $\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H})$ is bounded by a constant, Marx's algorithm runs in $\tilde{O}(1)$ time.)

Corollary F.1 (Grohe-Marx [48, 61]). *Let φ be an* FAQ-SS *query without free variables over an arbitrary semiring. Let $\mathcal{H}$, the hypergraph of φ, have a fractional hypertree width* $\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H})$ *that is* bounded *by a constant. Then φ can be solved in time*

$$\tilde{O}(N^{O(\mathsf{fhtw}^3(\mathcal{H}))} + \|\varphi\|),$$

where $\|\varphi\|$ is the time needed to report the output, and $N \geq 1$ is the input size in the listing representation.

In most of our applications, $\|\varphi\| = \tilde{O}(1)$; however, as we have seen earlier in Example A.17 and shall visit again below for the natural join problem, $\|\varphi\|$ can be a lot larger than $N^{\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H})}$. We first describe several applications where $\|\varphi\| = \tilde{O}(1)$.

Corollary F.2 (Theorem 1 from [79])**.** *Quantifier-free* #CQ *is solvable in time $\tilde{O}(N^{O(\mathsf{fhtw}^3(\mathcal{H}))})$ (under the assumption that $\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}) \leq c$ for some constant c). In particular,* #CQ *is tractable for the class of conjunctive queries with bounded fractional hypertree width.*

The following result in the probabilistic graphical model context might have been known; but we could not find a paper or textbook that proves it. (Note that $N^{\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H})} \leq D^{\mathsf{tw}(\mathcal{H})+1}$ if each input domain is of size D. And, $N^{\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H})}$ can be *arbitrarily* smaller than $D^{\mathsf{tw}(\mathcal{H})+1}$ for sparse inputs.)

Corollary F.3 (Partition function in PGM)**.** *The partition function in probabilistic graphical models can be computed in time $\tilde{O}(N^{O(\mathsf{fhtw}^3(\mathcal{H}))})$ (under the assumption that $\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}) \leq c$ for some constant c).*

For the natural join problem, there is the issue of output reporting. We next work out what InsideOut does to the set semiring formulation of the natural join problem (Example A.17), and briefly analyze the time it takes to report the output under this semiring. We prove here the $\tilde{O}(N^{\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H})} + \|\varphi\|)$-runtime of InsideOut for computing joins as shown in Table 1.

Example F.4 (InsideOut for joins under the set semiring)**.** To detail how InsideOut works with the $(2^{\mathcal{U}}, \cup, \cap)$ semiring, we describe its behavior using the familiar relational algebra notations [1]. For this problem, the input factors ψ_S are the input relations R_S; the intermediate factors are materialized intermediate relations; the indicator projections are precisely the relational algebra projections. Following (8), the first intermediate factor we want to compute is

$$R_{U_n} = \left(\bowtie_{S \in \partial(n)} R_S\right) \bowtie \left(\bowtie_{S \notin \partial(n), S \cap U_n \neq \emptyset} \pi_{U_n}(R_S)\right)$$

Then, we would like to "marginalize out" X_n under the $\cup$ operator of the set semiring. But we certainly do not want to perform set-union in a brute-force way because each tuple $\mathbf{t}_{U_n}$ is mapped to $D^{n-|U_n|}$ points in the output space $\mathcal{U}$. Luckily, all we have to do is to store R_{U_n} using a B-tree or trie data structure in an attribute order such that X_n comes *last*. This way, if we only traverse the trie on the first $|U_n| - 1$ attributes, we will have access to exactly the tuples in $R_{U_n - \{X_n\}}$. Furthermore, if later we want to also visit the tuples in R_{U_n} we can get down one more level in the trie. Thus, a trie-like index that respects the variable ordering implicitly computes the marginalization operation for us!

The next issue is how much time it takes to report the output. Since our representation of the output set is implicit, the set R_{U_1} is an implicit representation of the output. Up until the point of computing R_{U_1} we have only spent $\tilde{O}(N^{\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma)})$ time, but the total number of output tuples might be *a lot* larger than that.[20] In order to actually report *all* output tuples, we will go through each $x_1 \in R_{U_1}$, then each x_2 such that (x_1, x_2) aligns with R_{U_2}, and so forth, until R_{U_n}. This is a series of semi-join reductions in disguise; and it roughly corresponds to the second and the third phases of Yannakakis algorithm [90] performed at once. The total amount of time to report all output tuples is $O(n\|\varphi\| \log N)$, where $\|\varphi\|$ is the number of output tuples.

[20] Consider the *star* join query $\phi = \bowtie_{i=1}^{n-1} R_i(X, Y_i)$. Since ϕ is acyclic, $\mathsf{fhtw}(\phi) = 1$ but it is easy to come up with instances of the relations/factors such that the output size is as large as N^{n-1} (consider e.g. the case when each $R_i = \{1\} \times [N]$).

Corollary F.5 (Relational join)**.** *Given an optimal variable ordering, the* InsideOut *algorithm can solve the natural join query in time*

$$\tilde{O}(N^{\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H})} + \|\varphi\|)$$

where $\|\varphi\|$ *is the output size. Moreover, if an optimal ordering is not given and assuming that* $\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}) \leq c$ *for some constant* c*, the runtime becomes*

$$\tilde{O}(N^{O(\mathsf{fhtw}^3(\mathcal{H}))} + \|\varphi\|).$$

The above discussion assumes that we are presenting the output in the listing representations. There are other options which Section 8.4 discusses.

F.2 Variable ordering for FAQ with two blocks of semiring aggregates

This section highlights some of the subtle problems that arise when there are more than one variable aggregate. In particular, we consider the following instance of the FAQ problem where there are no free variables,

$$\varphi = \bigoplus_{\mathbf{x}_L} \bar{\bigoplus}_{\mathbf{x}_{[n]-L}} \bigotimes_{S\in\mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S). \tag{48}$$

The input FAQ query has two blocks of variable aggregates. In the first block, for variables X_i where $i \in L$, $\bigoplus$ is a semiring aggregate; and the second block, for variables X_i, $i \notin L$, has $\bar{\bigoplus}$ as a functionally different semiring aggregate. Example A.18 showed that #CQ can be reduced to an FAQ-instance of this form, where $\bigoplus = \sum$ and $\bar{\bigoplus} = \max$. Note that $\bigoplus$ and $\bar{\bigoplus}$ being functionally different means they are not commutative with one another, as shown in Proposition 6.6.

F.2.1 The precedence poset. Define a poset called the *precedence poset* $P = ([n], \preceq)$ over the variables as follows. Let $u \prec v$ for every pair (u, v) in the same connected component of $\mathcal{H}$ such that $u \in L$ and $v \notin L$. Let $\mathsf{LinEx}(P)$ denote the set of linear extensions of the precedence poset P. We first show that $\mathsf{LinEx}(P)$ is "sound".

Proposition F.6 ($\mathsf{LinEx}(P) \subseteq \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)$)**.** *Suppose* $\bigoplus$ *and* $\bar{\bigoplus}$ *are not identical in the domain* $\mathbf{D}$*. Given a query* φ *with only two blocks of variable aggregates as written in* (48)*, we have* $\mathsf{LinEx}(P) \subseteq \mathsf{EVO}(\varphi)$.

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{H}$ has only one connected component. Then, every linear extension of the poset P has variables in L listed before variables in $[n] - L$; the soundness of $\mathsf{LinEx}(P)$ thus follows. If $\mathcal{H}$ has multiple connected components, then expression (48) factorizes into a product over those connected components, where each factor in this product is an FAQ-expression over the variables in that connected component. So we are back to the case when there is only one connected component. This proves that $\mathsf{LinEx}(P)$ is sound. □

In Section 6.1, we prove a more general result stating that every φ-equivalent variable ordering σ has the same faqw as some $\pi \in \mathsf{LinEx}(\varphi)$. In that sense, $\mathsf{LinEx}(P)$ is also "complete" and we only need to look in $\mathsf{LinEx}(P)$ to find a σ minimizing $\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma)$. In particular, we show that

$$\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi) = \min_{\sigma\in\mathsf{LinEx}(P)} \mathsf{faqw}(\sigma). \tag{49}$$

We next explain why the precedence poset and its linear extensions help find a good variable ordering. In this case, since there is no free variable, expression (16) becomes simply $\tilde{O}\left(N^{\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma)}\right)$. However, it is no longer clear how $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi)$ is related to $\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H})$. Here are some simple properties that we can observe straightaway:

- $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi) \geq \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H})$, for any $L \subseteq [n]$.
- If $L = [n]$ or $L = \emptyset$, then $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi) = \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H})$.
- When $\emptyset \subset L \subset [n]$, the FAQ-width $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi)$ can be arbitrarily far from $\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H})$. For example, consider the star graph $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ with edges $(1, n), (2, n), \cdots, (n-1, n)$. In this case, $\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}) = 1$ because the graph is acyclic. Now, let $L = [n-1]$, then every φ-equivalent variable ordering has n as the last vertex, which means $\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma) = n - 1$ for every φ-equivalent variable ordering.

F.2.2 Relation to L-star size. Before proving our main result for this section, we analyze how the FAQ-width $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi)$ is related to the notion of width that was defined in Durand and Mengel [35, 36] for dealing with the #CQ problem. Durand and Mengel [35, 36] introduced the notion of *L-star size* of a hypergraph to characterize the complexity of counting solutions to conjunctive queries.

Definition F.7 (Independence Number $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(B)$)**.** Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a set of hyperedges and $B \subseteq \bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{F}} S$ be any set of vertices. Then, the *independence number* $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(B)$ is the maximum size of a subset $I \subseteq B$ where no two vertices from I belong to the same hyperedge in $\mathcal{F}$.

Definition F.8 (L-star size)**.** Let $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ be a hypergraph, and $L \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ be a subset of vertices. For any connected component C of $\mathcal{H} - L$ with vertex set $\mathcal{V}(C)$ and edge set $\mathcal{E}(C)$, define

$$\bar{\mathcal{E}}(C) = \{S \in \mathcal{E} \mid S \cap \mathcal{V}(C) \neq \emptyset\} \tag{50}$$

$$U(C) = L \cap \left(\bigcup_{S \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}(C)} S \right). \tag{51}$$

Then, the *L-star size* of $\mathcal{H}$, denoted by $L\text{-}\mathsf{ss}(\mathcal{H})$, is the maximum independence number $\alpha_{\mathcal{E}}(U(C))$ over all connected components C of $\mathcal{H} - L$, i.e.

$$L\text{-}\mathsf{ss}(\mathcal{H}) = \max \{\alpha_{\mathcal{E}}(U(C)) \mid C \text{ is a connected component of } \mathcal{H} - L\}$$

To relate L-ss to faqw, we need a couple of technical tools.

Lemma F.9. *Let (T, χ) be a tree decomposition of a hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, where the fractional hypertree width of (T, χ) is w. Let $L \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ be an arbitrary set of vertices of $\mathcal{H}$. Then, there exists a tree decomposition (T', χ') of $\mathcal{H}$ with the same fractional hypertree width satisfying the following condition. Let $\mathcal{V}(C_1)$ and $\mathcal{V}(C_2)$ be the vertex sets of two* different *connected components of $\mathcal{H} - L$. Then, there is no bag in (T', χ') intersecting both $\mathcal{V}(C_1)$ and $\mathcal{V}(C_2)$.*

Proof. We modify (T, χ) gradually to satisfy the required condition without increasing $\rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(B)$ for any bag B of the tree decomposition. Fix an arbitrary root r of (T, χ). While there still are two connected components C_1 and C_2 for which the desired condition is violated, we do the following.

Let B be the bag farthest from the root r such that B intersects both $\mathcal{V}(C_1)$ and $\mathcal{V}(C_2)$. In particular, every child of B intersects at most one of the two sets $\mathcal{V}(C_1)$ and $\mathcal{V}(C_2)$. Now, we split B into two bags $B_1 = B - \mathcal{V}(C_2)$, and $B_2 = B - \mathcal{V}(C_1)$. Remove B and connect both B_1 and B_2 to the parent of B. (If B is already the root, then we connect B_1 and B_2 with an edge.) Children of B which intersect $\mathcal{V}(C_i)$ are connected to B_i, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Children which do not intersect neither $\mathcal{V}(C_i)$ are connected arbitrarily to B_1 or B_2. It is straightforward to verify that we still have a tree decomposition for $\mathcal{H}$ and that $\rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(B_i) \leq \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(B)$. □

Definition F.10 (Fractional independence number $\alpha^*_{\mathcal{F}}(B)$)**.** Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a set of hyperedges and $B \subseteq \bigcup_{S\in\mathcal{F}} S$ be a set of vertices. Then, the *fractional independence number* $\alpha^*_{\mathcal{F}}(B)$ is the optimal solution to the following linear program:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum_{v\in B} x_v \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{v\in S} x_v \le 1, \quad \forall S \in \mathcal{F} \\ & x_v \ge 0, \quad \forall v \in B. \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

Proposition F.11. *Given any set of hyperedges $\mathcal{F}$ and any set of vertices $B \subseteq \bigcup_{S\in\mathcal{F}} S$, we have*

$$\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(B) \le \alpha^*_{\mathcal{F}}(B).$$

Proof. From Definition F.7, $\alpha_{\mathcal{F}}(B)$ is defined using the optimization problem (52) but with the additional constraint $x_v \in \{0,1\}, \forall v \in B$. □

Proposition F.12. *Given any hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ and any set $B \subseteq V$, we have*

$$\alpha^*_{\mathcal{E}}(B) = \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(B).$$

(Recall the definition of $\rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(B)$ from Section 4.2.)

Proof. (52) is the dual LP to (3). □

Theorem F.13. *Let φ be the* FAQ*-query defined in* (48)*. For any hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ and any subset L of vertices of $\mathcal{H}$, we have*

(i) $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi) \le (1 + L\text{-}\mathsf{ss}(\mathcal{H})) \cdot \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H})$.
(ii) $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi) \ge L\text{-}\mathsf{ss}(\mathcal{H})$.

Proof. To prove (i), we show that there exists a φ-equivalent vertex ordering σ such that $\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma) \le (1+L\text{-}\mathsf{ss}(\mathcal{H})) \cdot \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H})$. We do so by constructing a tree decomposition (T, χ) of $\mathcal{H}$ for which the fractional hypertree width of (T, χ) is at most $(1+L\text{-}\mathsf{ss}(\mathcal{H}))\cdot\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H})$, and for which there exists a GYO-elimination order where vertices in L are eliminated last.

The tree decomposition (T, χ) is constructed as follows. Let (T_L, χ_L) be a tree decomposition of $\mathcal{H}$ with fractional hypertree width equal to $\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H})$. From Lemma F.9 we can assume that every bag of (T_L, χ_L) intersects at most one set $\mathcal{V}(C)$ for each connected component C of $\mathcal{H} - L$. A bag that intersects $\mathcal{V}(C)$ is called a *C-bag*. Then, adapting an argument in [35], for every C-bag $\chi_L(t)$ ($t \in T_L$), we amend $\chi_L(t)$ with

$$\chi_L(t) = (\chi_L(t) \cup U(C)) - \mathcal{V}(C),$$

where $U(C)$ is defined as in Definition F.8. After this step is done, (T_L, χ_L) is a tree decomposition of the restriction of $\mathcal{H}$ on L. This is because the collection of all C-bags form a connected subtree of (T_L, χ_L) before the amendments.

Next, for each connected component C of $\mathcal{H} - L$, we construct a tree decomposition (T_C, χ_C) with fractional hypertree width at most $\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H})$. (This is possible because the fhtw of an *induced* subgraph is at most the fhtw of the

supergraph.) Then, for each bag $\chi_C(t)$ of (T_C, χ_C) we set

$$\chi_C(t) = \chi_C(t) \cup U(C).$$

Finally, we construct the tree decomposition (T, χ) by connecting the tree decompositions (T_C, χ_C) to the tree decomposition (T_L, χ_L). This is done by connecting an arbitrary bag of (T_C, χ_C) to a bag of (T_L, χ_L) that used to be a C-bag.

We claim the following:

Claim 1. (T, χ) is indeed a tree decomposition of $\mathcal{H}$.

Claim 2. (T, χ) has fractional hypertree width at most $\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}) \cdot (1 + L\text{-}\mathsf{ss}(\mathcal{H}))$.

Assuming the claims hold, let us complete the proof of part (i) of the theorem. We construct the L-prefixed variable ordering by showing that we can eliminate vertices from $\mathcal{V} - L$ *before* any vertex in L using the GYO-elimination procedure. Fix a connected component C of $\mathcal{H} - L$; then vertices in $\mathcal{V}(C)$ all reside in the subtree (T_C, χ_C). We now run the GYO-elimination procedure on this subtree up to its root r, which was the node that was connected to the center tree (T_L, χ_L). In this process, all vertices in $U(C)$ are not eliminated since the neighbor of r contains $U(C)$. We inductively eliminated other $\mathcal{V}(C')$ for other connected components C' of $\mathcal{H} - L$. Part (i) of the theorem is thus proved.

We next prove Claim 1. Every hyperedge $S \in \mathcal{E}$ is either completely contained in L, or $S \cap \mathcal{V}(C) \neq \emptyset$ for some C. If $S \subseteq L$, then S is a subset of some bag in (T_L, χ_L), which means it is contained in some bag of the final tree decomposition (T, χ). If $S \cap \mathcal{V}(C) \neq \emptyset$, then $S \cap \mathcal{V}(C)$ is contained in some bag of the original tree decomposition (T_C, χ_C). And so S is contained in some bag of (T_C, χ_C) after we amend each of those bags with the set $U(C)$. To verify the running intersection property (RIP), fix a vertex $v \in \mathcal{V}$. If $v \in \mathcal{V}(C)$ for some connected component C of $\mathcal{H} - L$, then RIP holds for v even after the amendments of bags in (T_C, χ_C). If $v \in L$ then its RIP property holds also because (T_L, χ_L) is a tree decomposition too.

Now, we prove Claim 2. The crucial point to notice is that each bag is amended at most once with $U(C)$ for some C. This is because a C-bag is not a C'-bag for two different connected components C and C', thanks to Lemma F.9. From Lemma 17 of Durand and Mengel [36], each set $U(C)$ can be covered by at most $L\text{-}\mathsf{ss}(\mathcal{H})$ many C-bags. In particular, for each amended bag $\chi_C(t) = \chi_C(t) \cup U(C)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(\chi_C(t)) &\leq \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}) + \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U(C)) \\ &\leq \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}) + L\text{-}\mathsf{ss}(\mathcal{H}) \cdot \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}) \\ &= (1 + L\text{-}\mathsf{ss}(\mathcal{H})) \cdot \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, each amended bag $\chi_L(t)$ is also fractionally covered by at most the same quantity, which completes the proof of the claim.

Finally, we prove part (ii) of the theorem. From Lemma F.15 below, we have

$$\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi) \geq \max_C \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U(C))$$

where C ranges overall connected components of $\mathcal{H} - L$. However by Propositions F.12 and F.11,

$$\max_C \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U(C)) = \max_C \alpha^*_{\mathcal{E}}(U(C)) \geq \max_C \alpha_{\mathcal{E}}(U(C)) = L\text{-}\mathsf{ss}(\mathcal{H}).$$

□

From the above theorem along with that the fact that any FAQ-query φ of the form (48) satisfies $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi) \geq \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H})$, we have

Corollary F.14. *For any class of* FAQ*-queries of the form* (48)*,* $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi)$ *is bounded if and only if both* L*-*$\mathsf{ss}(\mathcal{H})$ *and* $\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H})$ *are bounded.*

F.2.3 Approximating $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi)$*.* We now prove a lowerbound on $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi)$ that leads to an approximation algorithm for computing $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi)$ using an approximation algorithm for $\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H})$ as a blackbox. Recall that we are still considering the FAQ-query φ of the special form (48). Some of the ideas developed in this section will lead to the approximation algorithm for $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi)$ for the general FAQ-query case.

Let $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ be a hypergraph and $L \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ be a subset of vertices. For each connected component C of $\mathcal{H} - L$, let the sets $\bar{\mathcal{E}}(C)$ and $U(C)$ be as in Definition F.8. Define the hypergraph $\mathcal{H}_L = (L, \mathcal{E}_L)$ where

$$\mathcal{E}_L = \{S \mid S \in \mathcal{E} \wedge S \subseteq L\} \cup \{U(C) \mid C \text{ is a connected component of } \mathcal{H} - L\}\,. \tag{53}$$

The hypergraph $\mathcal{H}_L$ above is basically the same as the *contraction* of $(\mathcal{H}, L)$ defined earlier by Chen and Mengel [27].

Lemma F.15. *For any connected component* C *of* $\mathcal{H} - L$ *we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{faqw}(\varphi) &\geq \mathsf{fhtw}(C) \\ \mathsf{faqw}(\varphi) &\geq \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U(C)). \end{aligned}$$

(Note that C *itself is a hypergraph.) Furthermore,*

$$\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi) \geq \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}_L).$$

Proof. For any connected component C of $\mathcal{H} - L$, it is easy to see that

$$\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi) \geq \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}) \geq \mathsf{fhtw}(C).$$

Let $\sigma = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ be an L-prefixed variable ordering of $\mathcal{H}$ with $\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma) = \mathsf{faqw}(\varphi)$. (Such a variable ordering exists due to (49).) For a connected component C of $\mathcal{H} - L$, let k be the smallest integer such that $k > |L|$ and $v_k \in \mathcal{V}(C)$. Then, the set U_k is precisely $U(C) \cup \{v_k\}$. (This is the reason why we chose the notation $U(C)$.) To see this, note that each time we eliminate a vertex from C, we insert back a hyperedge interconnecting all its neighbors to the next hypergraph in the hypergraph sequence. And so by the time we reach U_k all of the neighbors of C in L are connected, which is the set $U(C)$. It follows that

$$\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi) = \mathsf{faqw}(\sigma) \geq \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U_k) \geq \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U(C)).$$

It remains to prove $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi) \geq \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}_L)$. From the above argument, for every connected component C of $\mathcal{H} - L$, the set $U(C)$ is a hyperedge of $\mathcal{H}^{\sigma}_{|L|}$, which is precisely the graph $\mathcal{H}_L$ defined above. We thus have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{faqw}(\varphi) &= \min_{\sigma \in \mathsf{LinEx}(P)} \left(\max \left\{ \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U^{\sigma}_k) \mid 1 \leq k \leq n \right\} \right) \\ &\geq \min_{\sigma \in \mathsf{LinEx}(P)} \left(\max \left\{ \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U^{\sigma}_k) \mid 1 \leq k \leq |L| \right\} \right) \\ &\geq \min_{\tau} \left(\max \left\{ \rho^*_{\mathcal{H}_L}(U^{\tau}_k) \mid 1 \leq k \leq |L| \right\} \right) \\ &= \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}_L), \end{aligned}$$

where τ is a variable ordering of the variables in L (as opposed to σ which was a variable ordering of $[n]$). □

Theorem F.16. *Let φ be any* FAQ *query of the form of* (48) *whose hypergraph is $\mathcal{H}$. Suppose there is an approximation algorithm that, given any hypergraph $\mathcal{H}'$, outputs a tree decomposition of $\mathcal{H}'$ with fractional hypertree width at most $g(\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}'))$ in time $t(|\mathcal{H}'|, \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}'))$ for some non-decreasing functions g, t. Then, we can in time $|\mathcal{H}| \cdot t(|\mathcal{H}|, \mathsf{faqw}(\varphi))$ compute a φ-equivalent vertex ordering σ such that*

$$\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma) \le \mathsf{faqw}(\varphi) + g(\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi)).$$

Proof. We use the blackbox approximation algorithm to construct a tree decomposition (T_C, χ_C) for every connected component C of $\mathcal{H} - L$ and also construct a tree decomposition (T_L, χ_L) for $\mathcal{H}_L = (L, \mathcal{E}_L)$. (Recall that $\mathcal{E}_L$ was defined in (53).) Then, we form a tree decomposition (T, χ) by connecting these tree decompositions together in the following way. We add the set $U(C)$ to each bag of the tree decomposition (T_C, χ_C), and arbitrarily connect any node of the tree (T_C, χ_C) to a bag B of the tree (T_L, χ_L) for which $U(C) \subseteq B$.

From Lemma F.15 and the fact that g is non-decreasing, to cover any bag of the sub-tree (T_L, χ_L) we need a fractional cover number of at most

$$g(\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}_L)) \le g(\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi)).$$

To cover any bag of the sub-tree (T_C, χ_C) (after $U(C)$ is added), we need a fractional cover number of at most

$$\rho^*_{\mathcal{H}}(U(C)) + g(\mathsf{fhtw}(C)) \le \mathsf{faqw}(\varphi) + g(\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi)).$$

Finally, we obtain σ by running the GYO-elimination procedure on the combined tree decomposition (T, χ), making sure that variables in L are eliminated *last.* □

By applying the above theorem using the fractional hypertree width approximation algorithm from Marx [61], we obtain the following corollaries. (Recall from Section F.1 that Marx's algorithm runs in time $\mathsf{poly}(\mathcal{H}) = \tilde{O}(1)$ when $\mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H})$ is bounded by a constant.)

Corollary F.17. *Let φ be any* FAQ *query of the form of* (48). *Suppose $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi) \le c$ for some constant c. Then, in polynomial time we can compute a φ-equivalent vertex ordering σ such that $\mathsf{faqw}(\sigma) = O(\mathsf{faqw}^3(\varphi))$. In particular, we can solve the* FAQ *problem of the form* (48) *in time*

$$\tilde{O}\left(N^{O\left(\mathsf{faqw}^3(\varphi)\right)}\right).$$

Corollary F.18. *Assuming $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi) \le c$ for some constant c, the* #CQ *problem is solvable in time*

$$\tilde{O}\left(N^{O\left(\mathsf{faqw}^3(\varphi)\right)}\right).$$

In particular, #CQ *is tractable for the class of conjunctive queries for which $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi)$ is bounded.*

Note that due to part(i) of Theorem F.13, the above corollary implies the result by Durand and Mengel [35] that #CQ is solvable in time $\tilde{O}(N^{\mathsf{poly}(L\text{-}\mathsf{ss}(\mathcal{H}), \mathsf{fhtw}(\mathcal{H}))})$. Moreover, Durand and Mengel [35] showed that bounded L-$\mathsf{ss}(\mathcal{H})$ is necessary for the tractability of #CQ (assuming **FPT** $\neq$ **W**[1]). By part (ii) of Theorem F.13, this implies that bounded $\mathsf{faqw}(\varphi)$ is necessary for the tractability of #CQ as well (assuming **FPT** $\neq$ **W**[1]).

G FACTOR REPRESENTATIONS

G.1 More on the factor oracle

We argue that the listing representation (Definition 4.1) satisfies both Conditional query assumption and Product-marginalization assumption as long as we choose an appropriate data structure to support listing. Furthermore, answering these queries from the data structure takes only at most $\tilde{O}(1)$ time. We will assume that the representation can depend on a given ordering σ among the variables (we will see shortly why this latter requirement is needed).

Assume the non-$\mathbf{0}$ elements of a factor ψ_S are stored in a B-Tree data structure that respects σ. In particular, we will store the tuples $\mathbf{z}$ such that $\psi_S(\mathbf{z}) \neq \mathbf{0}$ as follows. Except for the root node, all the nodes in one level correspond to the same variable, and the ordering of the variables (when sorted from the level closest to the root to the farthest) is consistent with σ. In other words, the children of the root node correspond to all x_1 such that $\psi_S(\cdot \mid x_1) \not\equiv \mathbf{0}$ and are labeled with the corresponding value of x_1. (Here we assume that 1 comes first in σ.) Further, these children are sorted in (say) increasing order of the x_1 values. Then for each child of such an x_1 we build the tree recursively for $\psi_S(\cdot \mid x_1)$. Finally, the leaves (which correspond to a vector $\mathbf{z}$ formed by concatenating the labels on the unique path from the leaf to the root) also store $\psi_S(\mathbf{z})$: we will call this the *value* of the leaf. Note that it has to be the case that $\psi_S(\mathbf{z}) \neq \mathbf{0}$.

We now argue why this listing representation satisfies the Conditional query assumption. Assume w.l.o.g. that $\sigma = (1, 2, \ldots, n)$. Then given $\mathbf{x}_{[k]}$, we go down the path in the B-Tree labeled with $\mathbf{x}_{[k]}$. Say u is the last node on this path. Then computing x_{k+1} basically corresponds to figuring out where y lies in the sorted list of values of all children of u. Thus, with a binary search we can return the desired result. Note that if the query did not respect the ordering σ, then this would not have been possible.

We now argue why the listing representation satisfies the Product-marginalization assumption. Assume that under the ordering σ, i comes last in S. Then one can perform product marginalization given i and the B-Tree representation of ψ_S as follows. Go through all leaves of ψ_S and multiply the values of all leaves with the same parent, (pretend to) throw away the leaves and store the computed product as the value of the new leaf just constructed. (We don't really throw the leaves away because marginalizing just means we pretend the depth of the trie/B-tree is one less.) Again note that we need the query to respect the ordering σ.

In all our algorithms, we will have the case that all the queries respect the ordering σ of the B-Trees. This is because the algorithm is given as an input a variable ordering σ and all its queries respect this ordering. Then in essentially linear time one can construct the B-Tree representation of all factors with a simple pre-processing step. (There is one caveat which is the indicator projections of the input factors; but those can also be pre-processed in the same amount of time.)

G.2 Truth table representation

In the *truth-table representation*, each input factor ψ_S is represented using a table of $\prod_{i \in S} |\mathrm{Dom}(X_i)|$ many rows. Each row lists the parameters and the value of the function. The value can be implicit as in the set semiring.

One example is the (dense) matrix multiplication problem where each input and output matrix is represented by listing out all of its entries. Another example is text-book description of PGM inference, where *conditional probability tables* are often assumed to use the truth-table representation.

The truth-table representation makes problems easier because the input sizes are larger. However, it should be obvious that this representation is wasteful when the input factors are *sparse*, in the sense that they might have many $\mathbf{0}$-valued entries.

It is easy to see that truth table representation can be converted to the listing format in linear time.

G.3 Succinct Representation

This section considers four specific representations of factors where the goal is to (i) have a more succinct representation of the factors than the listing representation and (ii) have an effective representation on which one can run efficient algorithms without having to "unpack" the succinct representation (into the listing representation). Our main aim will be to explain how these representations are essentially encodings of each input factor as an output of another FAQ (or FAQ-SS) instance. In particular, we will use our notation as opposed to those used in existing work.

GDNFs. We start with the generalized disjunctive normal form (GDNF) for CSPs that was first considered by Chen and Grohe [26]. Recall that in the CSP problem (Example A.4) the corresponding FAQ-SS instance is to compute

$$\varphi = \bigvee_{\mathbf{x}} \bigwedge_{S \in \mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S).$$

For the case when each of the ψ_S is presented in the listing representation, we get back the Boolean conjunctive query. In the GDNF format for each $S \in \mathcal{E}$, we have

$$\psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S) = \bigvee_{i=1}^{m_S} \bigwedge_{j \in S} \psi_S^{(i,j)}(\mathbf{x}_{\{j\}}).$$

For each $(i,j) \in [m_S] \times S$, $\psi_S^{(i,j)}$ is presented in the listing representation. We note two things: (i) the GDNF representation can bring down the representation size from $\prod_{j \in S} |\mathrm{Dom}(X_j)|$ (potentially) to $O(m_S \cdot \sum_{j \in S} |\mathrm{Dom}(X_j)|)$, which can be big savings and (ii) the effective FAQ problem that we need to solve is

$$\varphi = \bigvee_{\mathbf{x}} \bigwedge_{S \in \mathcal{E}} \bigvee_{i=1}^{m_S} \bigwedge_{j \in S} \psi_S^{(i,j)}(\mathbf{x}_{\{j\}}).$$

Decision Diagram Representation. We now consider the decision diagram representation of Chen and Grohe [26], which is a generalization of the well-studied ordered binary decision diagrams or OBDDs. Again we consider the CSP problem:

$$\varphi = \bigvee_{\mathbf{x}} \bigwedge_{S \in \mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S).$$

In the decision diagram representation each ψ_S is represented as follows. For brevity we consider $S = \{1, \ldots, s\}$:

$$\psi_S(x_1, \ldots, x_s) = \bigvee_{(y_0, y_1, \ldots, y_s)} \bigwedge_{i=1}^{s} \psi_S^{(i)}(y_{i-1}, x_i, y_i),$$

where for each S and i, $\psi_S^{(i)}$ is represented in the listing format. We make three remarks: (i) An equivalent way to think about the above representation (which is how it is presented in [26] and makes the connection to OBDDs more apparent) is the following. All the tuples $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_s)$ such that $\psi_S(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ correspond to the sequence of labels on all paths of length s in the following layered graph (with $s+1$ layers): $\psi_S^{(i)}(y_{i-1}, x_i, y_i) = 1$ if and only is there is an edge from vertex y_{i-1} (in layer $i-1$) to vertex y_i (in layer i) that is labeled x_i; (ii) It is easy to see that a GDNF representation can be converted into a decision diagram of essentially the same size and it is shown in [26] that the decision diagram representation can be exponentially smaller than any equivalent GDNF representation; (iii) Note that

the effective FAQ problem that we need to solve is

$$\varphi = \bigvee_{\mathbf{x}} \bigwedge_{S \in \mathcal{E}} \bigvee_{(y_0^S, y_1^S, \ldots, y_{|S|}^S)} \bigwedge_{i=1}^{|S|} \psi_S^{(i)}(y_{i-1}^S, x_{S[i]}, y_i^S),$$

where $S[1], S[2], \ldots, S[|S|]$ is some ordering of elements in S.

Factorized Databases. Olteanu and Závodný [73] considered factorized representations for conjunctive queries (Example A.5). Recall that we consider the following instance of FAQ-SS:

$$\varphi(\mathbf{x}_F) = \bigvee_{\mathbf{x}_{[n]-F}} \bigwedge_{S \in \mathcal{E}} \psi_S(\mathbf{x}_S).$$

In the factorized representation (called *f-representation* in [73]), each ψ_S is represented recursively as follows. In the general case either

$$\psi_S(\mathbf{x}) = \bigvee_{i=1}^{\ell} \psi_S^{\cup,i}(\mathbf{x}) \tag{54}$$

or

$$\psi_S(\mathbf{x}) = \bigwedge_{i=1}^{k} \psi_{S_i}^{\times,i}(\mathbf{x}_{S_i}), \tag{55}$$

where $S_1, \ldots, S_k$ is a partition of S. In the base case we have factors of the form $\psi_{\{j\}} : \mathsf{Dom}(X_j) \to \{0,1\}$. We make five remarks: (i) An alternate formulation of f-representation is as follows. We can represent all the $\mathbf{x}$ such that $\psi_S(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ in the following tree format. The leaves of the trees have single value for some attribute. Each of the internal nodes is either a 'union' node (corresponding to (54)) or an 'Cartesian product' node (corresponding to (55)) with the natural semantics attached to these nodes; (ii) It is easy to check that GDNFs are a special case of f-representations; (iii) A generalization of f-representation considered in [73], called *d-representations* is where one takes an f-representation and removes repeated sub-expressions: alternatively in the tree representation mentioned in (i), one 'short-circuits' sub-trees that are repeated resulting in a DAG; (iv) The main contribution of [73] is to show that if the factors are presented in a factorized representation, then the output of φ can also be represented in the same format (and they prove tight bounds on the output size): we briefly touch on compressing the output in Section 8.4; (v) One can think of φ with the factors in a factorized representation as a big FAQ instance (where each ψ_S is represented by an FAQ instance itself over the Boolean semiring, where this instance is determined by the recursive definition of ψ_S above).

Fast Matrix Vector Multiplication. We saw in Example A.13 that for the DFT matrix $\mathbf{F}$ we can represent the factor corresponding to the matrix more succinctly. We will now use the FAQ-SS formulation to describe a generic way to talk about matrices $\mathbf{A}$ for which we can get a sub-quadratic matrix vector multiplication algorithm: further, our algorithm is the same. The only thing that changes is the representation of the $\mathbf{A}$ and the elimination order. Next, we provide more details on this claim.

Recall that we are aiming to compute $\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{b}$. Assuming $n = n_0^m$ for integers $m, n_0 \geq 1$, the most general way to represent an $n \times n$ matrix $\mathbf{A} = (A_{i,j})$ is via the following factor

$$\psi_{\mathbf{A}}(x_0, \ldots, x_{m-1}, y_0, \ldots, y_{m-1}) = A_{(x_0,\ldots,x_{m-1}),(y_0,\ldots,y_{m-1})},$$

where we think of $(x_0, \ldots, x_{m-1}), (y_0, \ldots, y_{m-1})$ as integers in the range $[0, n-1]$. Now assume that there is a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{A}} = (\{X_0, \ldots, X_{m-1}, Y_0, \ldots, Y_{m-1}\}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{A}})$ such that

$$\psi_{\mathbf{A}}(x_0, \ldots, x_{m-1}, y_0, \ldots, y_{m-1}) = \prod_{e \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{A}}} \psi_e((\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_e), \tag{56}$$

where we use $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_e$ as a short hand for the projection of $\{x_0, \ldots, x_{m-1}, y_0, \ldots, y_{m-1}\}$ onto e (i.e. if $X_j \in e$ then we pick x_j and if $Y_j \in e$ then we pick y_j). With this notation in place, recall we are trying to solve the problem:

$$\phi_{\mathbf{A}\cdot\mathbf{b}}(x_0, \ldots, x_{m-1}) = \sum_{(y_0,\ldots,y_{m-1}) \in \mathbb{Z}_{n_0}^m} \psi_{\mathbf{b}}(y_0, \ldots, y_{m-1}) \cdot \prod_{e \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{A}}} \psi_e((\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_e). \tag{57}$$

Next we present some specific instantiations of the FAQ-SS instance from (56).

We begin with DFT and related matrices. In particular, recall the DFT matrix

$$\mathbf{F} = \left(f_{x,y} = e^{i2\pi \frac{x \cdot y}{n}}\right)_{0 \le x, y < n}$$

and from Example A.13 that in this case we have the hypergraph $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{F}} = (\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{F}}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{F}})$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{F}} &= \{X_0, \ldots, X_{m-1}, Y_0, \ldots, Y_{m-1}\}, \\ \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{F}} &= \{(Y_0, \ldots, Y_{m-1})\} \cup \{(X_j, Y_k)\}_{0 \le j+k < m}. \end{aligned}$$

Consider the $n \times n$ circulant matrix $\mathbf{C}$ where the first column is say the vector $(c_0, \ldots, c_{n-1})$ and the rest of the columns are a cyclic shift of the previous column. It can be shown that $\mathbf{C} \cdot \mathbf{b}$ for a vector $\mathbf{b}$ is the same as the *convolution* of $\mathbf{c} = (c_0, \ldots, c_{n-1})$ and $\mathbf{b}$. In other words,

$$\mathbf{C} \cdot \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{F}^{-1} \cdot (\mathbf{F} \cdot \mathbf{c}) \cdot (\mathbf{F} \cdot \mathbf{b}).$$

Note that the above is equivalent to the following FAQ-SS instance:

$$\phi_{\mathbf{C}\cdot\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{F}_p^m} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{F}_p^m} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{F}_p^m} b_{\mathbf{w}} \cdot c_{\mathbf{z}} \cdot \prod_{0 \le j+k < m} \psi_{Y_j, Z_k}(y_j, z_k) \cdot \prod_{0 \le j+k < m} \psi_{Y_j, W_k}(y_j, w_k) \cdot \prod_{0 \le j+k < m} \psi_{X_j, Y_k}(-x_j, y_k).$$

Next, we consider the case when the matrix $\mathbf{A}$ is itself a product of two or more matrices. For simplicity, we will only consider the case when $\mathbf{A}$ is a product of two square matrices $\mathbf{D}$ and $\mathbf{E}$ (of the same order). Both of these restrictions can be removed but we focus on these special cases since our goal is to show how our framework gives a uniform way to measure the efficiency of our algorithm for matrix vector multiplication with structured matrices $\mathbf{A}$.

We begin with the Kronecker product. Given two $n_0 \times n_0$ matrices $\mathbf{D}$ and $\mathbf{E}$, their Kronecker product $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{D} \otimes \mathbf{E}$ is defined as follows: for every $(x_0, x_1), (y_0, y_1) \in \mathbb{Z}_{n_0}^2$, $A[(x_0, x_1), (y_0, y_1)] = E[x_0, y_0] \cdot F[x_1, y_1]$. In this case, we have the hypergraph $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{D}\otimes\mathbf{E}} = (\{X_0, X_1, Y_0, Y_1\}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{D}\otimes\mathbf{E}})$, where

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{D}\otimes\mathbf{E}} = \{(X_1, Y_1), (Y_0, Y_1), (X_0, Y_0)\}.$$

Next, we consider the Khatri-Rao product [56]. We think of $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{F}$ as collection of n_0^2 matrices $\mathbf{E}^{x_2, y_2}$ and $\mathbf{F}^{x_2, y_2}$ each of which are $n_0 \times n_0$ matrices. The Khatri-Rao product $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{E} \star \mathbf{F}$ is defined as follows: for every $(x_0, x_1, x_2), (y_0, y_1, y_2) \in \mathbb{Z}_{n_0}^3$, $A[(x_0, x_1, x_2), (y_0, y_1, y_2)] = E^{x_2, y_2}[x_0, y_0] \cdot F^{x_2, y_2}[x_1, y_1]$. In this case, we have the hypergraph

$\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{E}\star\mathbf{F}} = (\{X_0, X_1, X_2, Y_0, Y_1, Y_2\}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{E}\star\mathbf{F}})$, where

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{E}\star\mathbf{F}} = \{(X_0, X_2, Y_0, Y_2), (X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2), (Y_0, Y_1, Y_2)\}.$$

Finally, we consider the Tracy-Singh product [86]. We think of $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{F}$ as collection of n_0^2 matrices $\mathbf{E}^{x_2,y_2}$ and $\mathbf{F}^{x_3,y_3}$ each of which are $n_0 \times n_0$ matrices. The Tracy-Singh product $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{E} \circ \mathbf{F}$ is defined as follows: for every $(x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3), (y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3) \in \mathbb{Z}_{n_0}^4$, $A[(x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3), (y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3)] = E^{x_2,y_2}[x_0, y_0] \cdot F^{x_3,y_3}[x_1, y_1]$. In this case, we have the hypergraph $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{E}\circ\mathbf{F}} = (\{X_0, X_1, X_2, X_3, Y_0, Y_1, Y_2, Y_2\}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{E}\circ\mathbf{F}})$, where

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{E}\circ\mathbf{F}} = \{(X_0, X_2, Y_0, Y_2), (X_1, X_3, Y_1, Y_3), (Y_0, Y_1, Y_2, Y_3)\}.$$

We conclude by noting that if one is willing to go beyond semirings and look at fields (in particular, all the matrices above are over complex numbers), then one can do faster matrix vector multiplication for a wider family of matrices [71, 76]. Since we are interested primarily in semirings in this paper, we do not further explore this connection.

G.4 Representations of sparse tables in PGMs

We now summarize the two main succinct representation of factors in PGMS (Example A.12): the first one corresponds to the listing representation (Definition 4.1) and the second one is similar to the decision diagram representation (Section G.3).

Sparse tables. This is the listing representation: only list inputs $\mathbf{y}$ in representation of ψ_S such that $\psi_S(\mathbf{y}) \neq 0$. This is called *evidence shrinking* in [53].

Algebraic Decision Diagrams. Algebraic Decision Diagrams (or ADDs) were introduced in Bahar et al. [13]. This is a succinct representation that is very closely related to the decision diagrams from Section G.3, as we shall see shortly. (Bahar et al. defined ADDs, considered some of their basic properties, and analyzed (standard) algorithms for matrix multiplication, shortest path problems and linear algebra when the inputs for the problems were represented as ADDs.)

We will present the definition of ADD for representing a single factor over bits (larger domain elements can be represented as bits and the generalization to multiple factors is straightforward). In particular consider the case when $\psi : \{0,1\}^n \to \mathbf{D}$. An ADD representation for ψ is a DAG G with the sinks (i.e. vertices in G with no outgoing edges) being labeled with values from $\mathbf{D}$. Further, each non-sink node is labeled with one of the n variables such that it is consistent with an ordering σ of the n variables. (By consistent we mean that if (u, v) is a directed edge and they are labeled $\ell(u)$ and $\ell(v)$, then $\sigma(\ell(u)) < \sigma(\ell(v))$.) Further, every non-sink node has two outgoing edges: one labeled 0 and the other 1. Given an ADD for a factor ψ one can compute $\psi(\mathbf{x})$ for an input $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ in the natural way. Start with the root r and take the branch corresponding to $x_{\ell(r)}$ and continue recursively and stop when you reach a sink s. The value of $\psi(\mathbf{x})$ is the label of s (recall that the sinks are labeled with elements from $\mathbf{D}$).

The ADD representation is very similar to the decision diagram representation presented in Section G.3. The main difference is that unlike the decision diagram case where the underlying DAG G is a layered graph, in an ADD representation G might not be a layered graph. In particular, if we put all vertices in G with the same label in a layer then there can be edges that connect layers that are not right next to each other. However, if we are willing to tolerate a blowup of $O(n)$ in the representation size, then we can indeed convert a G for any ADD representation into a layered graph G' as follows. For any edge (w_i, w_j) between layer i and j (for $j > i + 1$),[21] we replace the edge with a dummy path $(w_i, w_{i+1}), (w_{i+1}, w_{i+2}), \ldots, (w_{j-1}, w_j)$, where $w_{i+1}, \ldots, w_{j-1}$ are new nodes in G'. Further, (w_i, w_{i+1}) has the same

[21] W.l.o.g. we assume that the ordering σ is $1, \ldots, n$.

label as (w_i, w_j) while the rest of the new edges have a label of both 0 and 1 (more precisely, there are two parallel edges one labeled 0 and the other labeled 1). Finally, we add an $(n+1)$th layer and connect all sinks to distinct vertices in this layer. (Again if the sink is in layer i for $i < n$, then we'll actually need a 'dummy' path of appropriate length). Let L be the function that maps each vertex in the $(n+1)$th layer to the corresponding sink label. Given the ADD in the layered form G', one can represent ψ as before (with suitable modifications since ψ is no longer binary as in Section G.3):

$$\psi(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = \sum_{y_0, \ldots, y_{s+1}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n} \psi^{(i)}(y_{i-1}, x_i, y_i) \right) \cdot \psi^{(n+1)}(y_n, y_{n+1}) \cdot L(y_{n+1}),$$

where $\psi^{(i)}$ encodes the edges between layer $(i-1)$ and layer i (for $i \in [n+1]$). In the definition above these $\psi^{(i)}$ are binary functions and we use the listing representation for each $\psi^{(i)}$.

If the blowup by a factor of n when going from the original ADD representation to the layered representation is not acceptable, then there are potential ways to mitigate this blowup:

(1) If there are s sinks in total, then one can convert G into a layered graph G'' with an *additive* blowup of $O(sn+n^3)$. To see this note that in the construction of G' above, each sink leads to a dummy path of length $O(n)$, which justifies the $O(sn)$ term. Next note that for every edge between layers i and j (for $j > i+1$), the dummy path is the same except for the label on the first edge. In other words, all these dummy paths can have the same common suffix path of length $j - i - 1$. Note that there are $O(n^3)$ distinct such suffixes, which justifies the $O(n^3)$ term. This additive factor is advantageous over the multiplicative blowup of n when G has many more vertices when compared to n and s.

(2) Alternatively, we can encode the ADD as an FAQ instance by essentially encoding the Boolean function suggested by the ADD (modulo the labeling of the sink). More formally, let r be the root of G and let c_0 and c_1 be its two outgoing neighbors. Then it is easy to see that

$$\psi_G(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = \psi_{\ell(r)}(x_{\ell(r)}) \cdot \psi_{G_{c_1}}(x_{\ell(r)+1}, \ldots, x_n) + \bar{\psi}_{\ell(r)}(x_{\ell(r)}) \cdot \psi_{G_{c_0}}(x_{\ell(r)+1}, \ldots, x_n),$$

where $\psi_{\ell(r)}(x_{\ell(r)}) = x_{\ell(r)}$ and $\bar{\psi}_{\ell(r)}(x_{\ell(r)}) = 1 - x_{\ell(r)}$ and $\psi_{G_{c_1}}, \psi_{G_{c_0}}$ are defined recursively. Finally, for a sink u, $\psi_{G_u}(\mathbf{x}) = L(u)$. The advantage of this representation is that there is only an $O(1)$ blowup in the representation size, but now the size of the resulting FAQ instance is the same as the size of the original as opposed to our earlier representation where the size of the resulting FAQ instance only depends on n and s (but not on the size of G).

Gogate and Domingos [40] present message passing algorithms that work with both the sparse table and ADD representation. Unlike this work, which focuses on exact computation of φ, the work of [40] presents algorithms that approximate φ.