A New Decidable Class of Tuple Generating Dependencies: The Triangularly-Guarded Class

Vernon Asuncion and Yan Zhang
School of Computing, Engineering and Mathematics
Western Sydney University, Australia

Abstract
In this paper we introduce a new class of tuple-generating dependencies (TGDs) called triangularly-guarded TGDs, which are TGDs with certain restrictions on the atomic derivation track embedded in the underlying rule set. We show that conjunctive query answering under this new class of TGDs is decidable. We further show that this new class strictly contains some other decidable classes such as weak-acyclic, guarded, sticky and shy, which, to the best of our knowledge, provides a unified representation of all these aforementioned classes.

1 Introduction
In the classical database management systems (DBMS) setting, a query Q is evaluated against a database D. However, it has come to the attention of the database community the necessity to also include ontological reasoning and description logics (DLs) along with standard database techniques [Calvanese et al., 2007]. As such, the ontological database management systems (ODBMS) has arisen. In ODBMS, the classical database is enhanced with an ontology [Baader et al., 2016] in the form of logical assertions that generate new intensional knowledge. A powerful form of such logical assertions is the tuple-generating dependencies (TGDs), i.e., Horn rules extended by allowing existential quantifiers to appear in the rule heads [Cabibbo, 1998; Patel-Schneider and Horrocks, 2007; Cali et al., 2009].

Queries are evaluated against a database D and set of TGDs Σ (i.e., D ∪ Σ) rather than just D, as in the classical setting. Since for a given database D, a set Σ of TGDs, and a conjunctive query Q, the problem of determining if D ∪ Σ |= Q, called the conjunctive query answering (CQ-Ans) problem, is undecidable in general [Beeri and Vardi, 1981; Baget et al., 2011; Rosati, 2011; Cali et al., 2012; Cali et al., 2013], a major research effort has been put forth to identifying syntactic conditions on TGDs for which CQ-Ans is decidable. Through these efforts, we get the decidable syntactic classes: weakly-acyclic (WA) [Fagin et al., 2005], acyclic graph of rule dependencies (aGRD) [Baget et al., 2011], linear, multi-linear, guarded, weakly-guarded (W-GUARDED) [Rosati, 2006; Cali et al., 2013], sticky, sticky-join, weakly-sticky-join (WSJ) [Cali et al., 2012], Gogacz and Marcinkowski, 2017], shy (SHY) [Leone et al., 2012] and weakly-recursive (WR) [Civil and Rosati, 2012]. The weakly-recursive class is only defined for the so-called simple TGDs, which are TGDs where the variables are only allowed to occur once in each atom and each atom do not mention constants [Civil and Rosati, 2012].

Another research direction that sprangs up from those previously identified classes is the possibility of obtaining more expressive languages by a direct combination (i.e., union) of those classes, e.g., see [Krotzsch and Rudolph, 2011; Cali et al., 2012; Grau et al., 2013; Gottlob et al., 2013]. A major challenge then in this direction is that the union of two decidable classes is not necessarily decidable [Baget et al., 2011], e.g., it has been shown in [Gottlob et al., 2013] that the union of the classes linear and sticky is undecidable.

At a model theoretic level, the results in [Rosati, 2006] and [Barany et al., 2010] had respectively shown that the finite model property holds for the linear and guarded fragments of TGDs. It is folklore that a class of first-order (FO) theories C is said to have the finite model (FM) property if φ ∈ C satisfiable iff φ has a finite model. The recent work in [Gogacz and Marcinkowski, 2017] had further extended the result in [Rosati, 2006] for linear TGDs into the sticky-join TGDs. As will be revealed from this paper, our work further generalizes these previous results.

Despite these efforts, there are still some examples of simple TGDs that do not fall under the aforementioned classes.

Example 1. Let Σ₁ be a set of TGDs comprising of the following rules:

\[ \sigma_{11} : t(X, Y) \land \exists Z t(Y, Z) \land u(Y, Z), \] (1)
\[ \sigma_{12} : t(X, Y) \land u(Y, Z) \rightarrow t(Y, Z) \land u(X, Y). \] (2)

Then it can be checked that Σ₁ does not fall into any of the classes previously mentioned above, and neither is it glut-guarded (G-GUARDED) [Krotzsch and Rudolph, 2011] nor tame (TAME) [Gottlob et al., 2013]. On the other hand, because none of the head atoms “t(Y, Z)” and “u(X, Y)” of \( \sigma_{12} \) mentions the two cyclically-affected body variables “X” and “Z” together (which is under some pattern that we will generalize in Section 3), then it can be shown that for any
where $TGDs$ that strictly contains several of the main syntactic classes, including WA, W-GUARDED, WSI, G-GUARDED, SHY, TAME and WR.

The rest of the paper is structured into three main parts as follows: Section 2 provides background notions and definitions about databases, TGDs and the problem of (boolean) conjunctive query answering; Section 3 introduces the triangularly-guarded TG class of TGDs; while Section 4 looks at the main results and shows that TG is both decidable and strictly contains some of the main syntactic classes mentioned above, and also concludes the paper with some remarks.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Basic notions and notations

We assume three countably infinite pairwise disjoint sets $\Gamma_{\forall}$, $\Gamma_{\exists}$ and $\Gamma_0$ of variables, constants and labeled nulls, respectively. We further assume that $\Gamma_{\forall}$ is partitioned into two disjoint sets $\Gamma_{\forall}^r$ and $\Gamma_{\forall}^\exists$ (i.e., $\Gamma_{\forall} = \Gamma_{\forall}^r \cup \Gamma_{\forall}^\exists$), where $\Gamma_{\forall}^r$ and $\Gamma_{\forall}^\exists$ denote the sets of universally ($\forall$) and existentially ($\exists$) quantified variables, respectively. We also assume that the set of labeled nulls $\Gamma_0$ contains elements of the form $\{n_i | i \in \mathbb{N}\}$, where $\mathbb{N}$ is the set of natural numbers. Intuitively, $\Gamma_0$ is the set of “fresh” Skolem terms that are disjoint from the set of constants $\Gamma_{\forall}$.

A relational schema $R$ (or just schema) is a set of relational symbols (or predicates), where each is associated with some number $n \geq 0$ called its arity. We denote by $r/n$ as the relational symbol $r \in R$ whose arity is $n$, and by $|r|$ as the arity of $r$, i.e., $|r| = n$. We further denote by $r[i]/j$ as the $j$-th argument (or attribute) of $r$ where $i \in \{0, \ldots, |r|\}$. We denote by $ARG(r)$ as the set of arguments $\{r[i] | i \in \{0, \ldots, |r|\}\}$ of $r$. We extend this notion to the relational symbols $R$, i.e., $ARG(R) = \bigcup_{r \in R} ARG(r)$.

A term $t$ is any element from the set $\Gamma_{\forall} \cup \Gamma_{\exists} \cup \Gamma_0$. Then an atom $a$ is a construct of the form $r(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ such that: (1) $r \in R$; (2) $n = |r|$; and (3) $t_i$ (for $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$) is a term. We denote tuples of atoms by $\overrightarrow{a}$, e.g., $\overrightarrow{a} = a_1 \ldots a_i$, $\overrightarrow{b} = a_1 \ldots a_m$, $\overrightarrow{c} = c_1 \ldots c_n$, etc., and its length by $|\overrightarrow{a}|$.

We denote by $REL(a)$, $TERMS(a)$, $VAR(a)$, $CONST(a)$ and $NULLS(a)$ the relational symbol, the set of terms, variables, constants and labeled nulls mentioned in atom $a$, respectively. We extend this notion to sets or tuples of atoms $S$ such that $TERMS(S)$, $VAR(S)$, $CONST(S)$ and $NULLS(S)$ denotes the sets $\bigcup_{a \in S} TERMS(a)$, $\bigcup_{a \in S} VAR(a)$, $\bigcup_{a \in S} CONST(a)$ and $\bigcup_{a \in S} NULLS(a)$, respectively. We say that a tuple of atoms $\overrightarrow{a} = a_1 \ldots a_i$ is connected if either: (1) $\overrightarrow{a}$ is an atom, or (2) $TERMS(a_i) \cap TERMS(a_{i+1}) \neq \emptyset$ holds, for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, l - 1\}$.

An instance $I$ is any set (can be infinite) of atoms such that $VAR(I) = \emptyset$, i.e., contains no variables. A database $D$ is a finite set of ground atoms $VAR(D) = \emptyset$ and $NULLS(D) = \emptyset$.

Given an atom $a = r(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$, we denote by $ARG(a)$ as the set of arguments $\{r[i] | i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\}$. For a tuple of variables $X$ and atom $a = r(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$, we denote by $ARG(a) \setminus X$ as the set of arguments $\{r[i] | i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $t_i = X\}$, i.e., the set of arguments in $ARG(a)$ but restricted to those mentioned variables from $X$. Symmetrically, using similar notions to the “ARG” concept just previously mentioned above, for a given atom $a = r(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ and set of arguments $A \subseteq ARG(a)$, we denote by $VAR(a) \setminus A$ as the set of variables $\{X | t_i = X \land r[i] \in A\}$, i.e., the set of all the variables mentioned in $a$ but restricted to those appearing in argument positions from $A$.

Given two sets of terms $T_1$ and $T_2$, an assignment $\theta : T_1 \rightarrow T_2$ is a function from $T_1$ onto $T_2$ such that $t \in (T_1 \cap \Gamma_{\exists})$ implies $\theta(t) = t$, i.e., identity for the constants $\Gamma_{\exists}$. Then for a given atom $a = r(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$, a set of terms $T$ and an assignment $\theta : VAR(a) \rightarrow T$, a substitution of $a$ under $\theta$ (or just substitution for convenience), denoted $a \theta$ (or sometimes $\theta(a)$), is the atom such that $a \theta = r(\theta(t_1), \ldots, \theta(t_n))$. We naturally extend to conjunctions of atoms $a_1 \land \ldots \land a_n$, so that $\theta(a_1 \land \ldots \land a_n) = \theta(a_1) \land \ldots \land \theta(a_n)$. Given two assignments $\theta_1 : T_1 \rightarrow T_2$ and $\theta_2 : T_2 \rightarrow T_3$, we denote by $\theta_2 \circ \theta_1$ as the composition of $\theta_2$ with $\theta_1$ such that $\theta_2 \circ \theta_1 : T_1 \rightarrow T_3$ and $(\theta_2 \circ \theta_1)(t) = \theta_2(\theta_1(t))$, for all $t \in T_1$. Then, lastly, given two assignments $\theta_1 : T_1 \rightarrow T_2$ and $\theta_2 : T_2 \rightarrow T_3$, we denote by $\theta_1 \cap \theta_2$ as the restriction of the assignment $\theta_1$ to the domain $T_1 \subseteq T_2$ such that $\theta_1 \cap \theta_2 : T_1 \rightarrow T_2$, and where $\theta_1 \cap \theta_2(t) = \theta_1(t)$ in $T_2$, for each $t \in T \subseteq T_1$.

2.2 TGDs, BCQ-Ans and Chase

A tuple generating dependency (TGD) rule $\sigma$ of schema $R$ is a first-order (FO) formula of the form $\forall X \exists Y \left( \Phi(X, Y) \rightarrow \exists Z \Psi(Y, Z) \right)$, (3)

where:

- $X = X_1 \ldots X_k$, $Y = Y_1 \ldots Y_l$ and $Z = Z_1 \ldots Z_m$ are pairwise disjoint tuple of variables, and where they are called the local, shared and existential variables, respectively, and thus, we assume that $XY \subseteq \Gamma_{\forall}$ and $Z \subseteq \Gamma_{\exists}$;
- $\Phi(X, Y) = b_1(V_1) \land \ldots \land b_n(V_n)$ is a conjunction of atoms such that $V_i \subseteq XY$ and $b_i \in R$, for $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$;
- $\Psi(Y, Z) = r_1(W_1) \land \ldots \land r_m(W_m)$ is a conjunction of atoms where $W_i \subseteq YZ$ and $r_i \in R$, for $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$.

For a given TGD $\sigma$ of the form (3), we denote by $BD(\sigma)$ as the set of atoms $\{b_1(V_1), \ldots, b_n(V_n)\}$, which we also refer to as the body of $\sigma$. Similarly, by $HD(\sigma)$ we denote the set of atoms $\{r_1(W_1), \ldots, r_m(W_m)\}$, which we also refer to as the head of $\sigma$. For convenience, when it is clear from the context, we simply drop the quantifiers in (3) such that a TGD rule $\sigma$ of the form (3) can simply be referred to as: $\Phi(X, Y) \rightarrow \Psi(Y, Z)$. Then, for a given set of TGDs $\Sigma$, we denote by $ATOMS(\Sigma)$ as the set of all atoms occurring in $\Sigma$ such that $ATOMS(\Sigma) = \bigcup_{\sigma \in \Sigma} (BD(\sigma) \cup HD(\sigma))$, and by $REL(\Sigma)$ as the set of all relational symbols mentioned in $\Sigma$. Then lastly, for convenience later on, for a given rule $\sigma$ of the form (3) and atom $a \in HD(\sigma)$, we denote by $\forall VAR(a)$ and $\exists VAR(a)$ as
the set of variables \( \text{VAR}(a) \cap Y \) and \( \text{VAR}(a) \cap Z \), respectively, i.e., the set of all the universally (\( \forall \)) and existentially (\( \exists \)) quantified variables of \( a \), respectively. We extend this notion to the TGD rule \( \sigma \) of the form \( 3 \), so that we set \( \text{VAR}(\sigma) = XYZ \), \( \forall \text{VAR}(\sigma) = XY \) and \( \exists \text{VAR}(\sigma) = Z \).

A boolean conjunctive query (BCQ) \( Q \) is a FO formula \( \exists X \varphi(X) \to q \) such that \( \varphi(X) = r_1(Y_1) \land \ldots \land r_i(Y_i) \), where \( r_i \in R \) and \( Y_i \subseteq X \), for each \( i \in \{1, \ldots, l\} \), and where we set \( \text{BD}(Q) = \{r_1(Y_1), \ldots, r_i(Y_i)\} \). Given a database \( D \) and a set of TGDs \( \Sigma \), we say that \( D \cup \Sigma \) entails \( Q \), denoted \( D \cup \Sigma \models Q \), iff \( D \cup \Sigma \models \exists X \varphi(X) \). The central problem tackled in this work is the boolean conjunctive query answering (BCQ-Ans): given a database \( D \), a set of TGDs \( \Sigma \) and BCQ Answering, \( \Sigma \) does \( D \cup \Sigma \models Q \). It is well known that BCQ-Ans is undecidable in general [Beeri and Vardi, 1981].

The chase procedure (or just chase) [Maier et al., 1979; Johnson and Klug, 1984; Fagin et al., 2005; Deutsch et al., 2008; Zhang et al., 2015] is a main algorithmic tool proposed for checking implication dependencies [Maier et al., 1979]. For an instance \( I \), an assignment \( \eta \) and TGD \( \sigma = \Phi(X, Y) \to \Psi(Y, Z) \), we have that \( I \models \eta \Phi(X, Y) \to \eta \Psi(Y, Z) \); then \( I \models \Phi(X, Y) \to \Psi(Y, Z) \) is called a single chase step as follows: \( I \models \eta \Phi(X, Y) \to \eta \Psi(Y, Z) \). An infinite chase sequence \( I_0 \models \Phi(X, Y) \to I \models \Psi(Y, Z) \subseteq I \), where \( \Psi(Y, Z) \in \Sigma \) implies \( \exists \eta' : XYZ \to \Gamma \cup \Gamma_1 \) and \( \eta' \Phi(X, Y) = \eta \), such that \( \eta' \Psi(Y, Z) \subseteq I_k \) and \( k > i \). Then finally, we let \( \text{chase}(D, \Sigma) = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} I_i \).

Theorem 1. [Deutsch et al., 2008; Cali et al., 2012] Given a database \( D \), TGDs \( \Sigma \) and BCQ \( Q \), \( D \cup \Sigma \models Q \) iff \( \text{chase}(D, \Sigma) \models Q \).

2.3 Cyclically-affected arguments

As observed in [Leone et al., 2012], the notion of affected arguments in [Cali et al., 2013] can sometimes consider arguments that may not actually admit a “firing” mapping \( \forall \)-variables into nulls. For this reason, it was introduced in [Leone et al., 2012] the notion of a “null-set.” Given a set of TGDs \( \Sigma \), let \( a \in \text{ATOMS}(\Sigma) \), \( a \in \text{ARG}(a) \) and \( X = \text{VAR}(a) \). Then the null-set of \( a \) under a \( \Sigma \) denoted as \( \text{NULL}(a, \Sigma) \) (or just \( \text{NULL}(a) \) if clear from the context) is defined as follows: If \( a \in \text{HD}(\sigma) \), for some \( \sigma \in \Sigma \), then: (1) \( \text{NULL}(a, \Sigma) = \{n_1^a\} \) if \( \text{VAR}(a)_{\sigma} = X \in \exists \text{VAR}(\sigma) \), or (2) \( \text{NULL}(a, \Sigma) = \) the intersection of all null-sets \( \text{NULL}(b, b) \) such that \( b \in \text{BD}(\sigma), a \in \text{ARG}(b) \) and \( \text{VAR}(b)_{\sigma} = X \). Otherwise, if \( a \in \text{BD}(\sigma) \), for some \( \sigma \in \Sigma \).

1We assume that \( (\sigma, X) \neq (\sigma', X') \) implies \( n_1^X \neq n_2^X \), for each pair of elements \( (n_1^X, n_2^X) \) of all null-sets [Leone et al., 2012].

Borrowing similar notions from [Krotzsch and Rudolph, 2011] used in the identification of the so-called glut variables, the existential dependency graph \( G_2(\Sigma) \) is a graph \( (N, E) \), whose nodes \( N \) is the union of all \( \text{NULL}(a, \Sigma) \), where \( a \in \text{ATOMS}(\Sigma) \) and \( a \in \text{ARG}(a) \), and edges:

\[
E = \{(n_1^a, n_2^a) \mid \exists \sigma \in \Sigma \text{ of form } 3, \forall Y \in \Sigma, \text{null-set } \text{NULL}(a, \Sigma) = \{n_1^a\}, \text{null-set } \text{NULL}(a, \Sigma) = \{n_2^a\}, \text{for some } a \in \text{HD}(\sigma) \text{ and } Z \in \Sigma \},
\]

where \( \bigcap \text{NULL}(a, \Sigma) \) denotes the intersection of all \( \text{NULL}(b, b, \Sigma) \) such that \( b \in \text{BD}(\sigma), a \in \text{ARG}(b) \) and \( Y = \text{VAR}(b)_{\sigma} \). Note that our definition of a dependency graph here generalizes the existential dependency graph in [Krotzsch and Rudolph, 2011] by combining the notion of null-sets in [Leone et al., 2012]. Then with the graph \( G_2(\Sigma) = (N, E) \) as defined above, we denote by \( \text{CYC-NULL}(\Sigma) \) as the smallest subset of \( N \) such that \( n_1^a \in \text{CYC-NULL}(\Sigma) \) iff: (1) \( n_1^a \) is in a cycle in \( G_2(\Sigma) \), or (2) \( n_1^a \) is reachable from some other node \( n_1^a \), \( \in \text{CYC-NULL}(\Sigma) \), where \( n_1^a \), is in a cycle in \( G_2(\Sigma) \).

3 Triangularly-Guarded (TG) TGDs

This section now introduces the triangularly-guarded class of TGDs, which is the basis for our approach. We begin with an instance of a BCQ-Ans problem that corresponds to a need of an infinity number of labeled nulls in the underlying chase derivation.

Example 2 (Unbounded nulls). Let \( \Sigma_2 = \{\sigma_{11}, \sigma_{12}\} \) be the set of TGDs obtained from \( \Sigma_1 = \{\sigma_{11}, \sigma_{12}\} \) of Example 1 by just changing the rule \( \sigma_{12} \) into the rule \( \sigma_{12} ' \) such that:

\[
\sigma_{12} ' : f(X, Y) \land u(Y, Z) \to f(X, Z) \land u(X, Y).
\]

Then we have that \( \sigma_{12} ' \) of \( \Sigma_2 \) above is obtained from \( \sigma_{12} \) of \( \Sigma_1 \) by changing the variable “\( Y \)” in the head atom “\( f(X, Y) \)” of \( \sigma_{12} \) into “\( X \)” i.e., to obtain “\( f(X, Z) \)”. Intuitively, this allows the two variables “\( X \)” and “\( Y \)” to act as place holders that combines labeled nulls together in the head atom “\( f(X, Z) \)” of \( \sigma_{12} \). Now let \( D_2 = \{\{\text{c}_1, \text{c}_2\}, \{\text{c}_1, \text{c}_2\}\} \) be a database, where \( \text{c}_1, \text{c}_2 \in G_1 \) and \( \text{c}_1 \neq \text{c}_2 \), and \( Q_2 \) the BCQ \( \exists X f(X, Y) \to q \). Then we have that \( D_2 \cup \Sigma_2 \cup \{\neg \exists X f(X, Y)\} = D_2 \cup \Sigma_2 \cup \{\forall X \neg f(X, Y)\} \) can only be satisfied by the infinite model \( M \) of the form \( M = D_2 \cup \bigcup_{i \leq i < j} \{\epsilon, c_1, c_2\} \), where we assume \( i \neq j \) implies \( c_1 \neq c_2 \). Therefore, since \( D_2 \cup \Sigma_2 \cup \{\forall X \neg f(X, Y)\} \) is satisfiable, (almost infinitely), it follows that \( D_2 \cup \Sigma_2 \models Q_2 \).

In database \( D_2 \) and set TGDs \( \Sigma_2 = \{\sigma_{11}, \sigma_{12} '\} \) of Example 2 we get from \( \sigma_{11} \) the sequence of atoms \( t(c_2, n_1), t(n_1, n_2), t(n_2, n_1), \ldots, t(n_k-1, n_k) \) \( \in \text{chase}(D_2, \Sigma_2) \), where \( n_i \in \Gamma_1 \), for each \( i \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \). Moreover, by the repeated applications of \( \sigma_{12} ' \), we further get that \( t(n_i, n_k) \in \text{chase}(D_2, \Sigma_2) \), for each \( i \in \{1, \ldots, k - 1\} \), i.e., \( n_i \) and \( n_k \), for each \( i \in \{1, \ldots, k - 1\} \), will be “pulled” together in some relation
of \( t \) in \( \text{chase}(D_2, \Sigma_2) \). As such, for the given BCQ \( Q_2 = \exists X (X, X) \rightarrow q \) also from Example 2, since \( D_2 \cup \Sigma_2 \models Q_2 \) iff \( D_2 \cup \Sigma_2 \cup \{ \langle X, t(X, X) \rangle \} \) is not satisfiable, then the fact that we have to satisfy the literal “\( t(X, X) \)” for all “\( X \)” and because \( t(n_1, n_k) \in \text{chase}(D_2, \Sigma_2) \), for \( i \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\} \), implies that each of the \( n_i \) must be of different values from \( n_k \), and thus cannot be represented by a finite number of distinct labeled nulls.

### 3.1 Triangular-components of TGD extensions

In contrast to \( \Sigma_2 \) from Example 2, what we aim to achieve now is to identify syntactic conditions on TGDs so that such a “distinguishable relation” of labeled nulls is limited in the chase derivation. This leads BCQ-Ans to be such, we can actually re-use these nulls without introducing new ones in the chase derivation. This leads BCQ-Ans to be decidable.

**Definition 1 (TGD extension).** Given a set of TGDs \( \Sigma \), we denote by \( \Sigma^+ \) as the extension of \( \Sigma \), and is inductively defined as follows:

\[
\Sigma^0 = \{ \langle \text{BD}(\sigma), \text{HD}(\sigma) \rangle \mid \sigma \in \Sigma \};
\]

\[
\Sigma^{i+1} = \Sigma^i \cup \{ \langle B_1 \eta_1 \cup B_2, H_2(\eta_2 \circ \theta) \rangle \mid \{B_1, H_1\} \in \Sigma^i, \{B_2, H_2\} \in \Sigma^i \}
\]

and where \( \eta_1 : \text{VAR}(B_1 \cup H_1) \longrightarrow \text{TERMS}(B_1 \cup H_1) \) and \( \eta_2 : \text{VAR}(B_2 \theta \cup H_2 \theta) \longrightarrow \text{TERMS}(B_1 \eta_1 \cup B_2 \theta \cup H_2 \theta) \) such that:

1. \( \theta \) is a renaming (bijective) substitution such that \( \text{VAR}(B_1 \cup H_1) \cap \text{VAR}(B_2 \theta \cup H_2 \theta) = \emptyset \);
2. \( \exists H'_1 \subseteq H_1 \) and \( \exists B'_2 \subseteq B_2 \theta \) such that \( H'_1 \eta_1 = B'_2 \theta \eta_2 \)

3. \( B' = B_2(\eta_2 \circ \theta) \backslash B_2 \eta_2 \).

Then we set \( \Sigma^+ = \Sigma^\infty \) as the fixpoint of \( \Sigma^i \). We note that even though \( \Sigma^+ \) can be infinite in general, it follows from Theorem 5 that it is enough to consider a finite number of iterations \( \Sigma^j \) to determine “recursive triangular-components” (as will be defined exactly in Definition 2).

The TGD extension \( \Sigma^+ \) of \( \Sigma \) contains as elements pairs of sets of atoms of the form “\( \langle B, H \rangle \)”.

### 3.2 Triangularly-guarded TGDs

In this section, we now introduce the key notion of triangularly-guarded TGDs, which are the triangular-components. It will first be necessary to introduce the following notions of cyclically-affected only and link variables of body atoms, as well as variable markups that borrows some concepts from Call et al., 2012.

We first introduce the notion of cyclically-affected only variables in the body (i.e., set \( B \)) of some pair \( \langle B, H \rangle \) for some \( \Sigma \) where \( \Sigma \) is a set of TGDs. So towards this purpose, for a given pair \( \langle B, H \rangle \in \Sigma^+ \), we define \( \text{VAR}(\Sigma, B) \) (i.e., “\( \text{VAR}^+ \)” is read var-hat) as the set of variables: \( \{X \mid X \in \text{VAR}(B) \} \cap \text{nulls}(\Sigma) \neq \emptyset \rangle \), where \( \text{nulls}(\Sigma, x, \sigma) \mid \Sigma \) denotes the intersection of the unions \( \bigcup_{b \in \text{ARG}(\Sigma \cdot b, b' \in \text{ARG}(\cdot')) } \sigma : \Sigma \mid \text{nulls}(b, b', \Sigma) \)

for each pair \( \langle b, b' \rangle \) such that \( b \in \text{ARG}(\Sigma \cdot b, b' \in \text{ARG}(\cdot')) \).

For convenience and when clear from the context, we simply refer to \( \text{VAR}(\Sigma, B) \) as \( \text{VAR}(B) \). Intuitively, variables in
\( \overline{\text{VAR}}(B) \) are placement for which an infinite number of labeled nulls can possibly be propagated in the set of atoms \( B \) with respect to \( \Sigma \). Loosely speaking, if \( B = BD(\sigma) \), for some set of TGDs \( \Sigma \), then \( \overline{\text{VAR}}(B) \) contains the glut-variables in [Körtzsch and Rudolph, 2011] that also fails the shyness property [Leone et al., 2012] (please see Section 2.3 of this paper).

Next, we introduce the link variables between “body atoms”. Given two atoms \( b_1, b_2 \in B \), for some \( \langle B, H \rangle \in \Sigma^{\ast} \) where \( \Sigma \) is a set of TGDs, we set \( \text{LINK}(\Sigma^{\ast}, B, b_1, b_2) \) (or just \( \text{LINK}(B, b_1, b_2) \) when clear from the context) as the set of variables in the intersections \( (\text{VAR}(b_1) \cap \text{VAR}(b_2)) \cap \overline{\text{VAR}}(\Sigma, B) \). Intuitively, \( \text{LINK}(B, b_1, b_2) \) denotes the cyclically-affectoned only variables of \( B \) that can actually “join” (link) two common nulls between the body atoms \( b_1 \) and \( b_2 \) that can be obtained through some firing substitution.

Lastly, we now introduce the notion of variable markup. Let \( a, c \) and \( a' \) be three atoms such that \( \text{REL}(a) = \text{REL}(a') \). Then similarly to [Cali et al., 2012], we define the “markup procedure” as follows. For the base case, we let \( a^0 \) (resp. \( c^0 \)) denote the atom obtained from \( a \) (resp. \( c \)) by marking each variable \( X \in \text{VAR}(a) \) (resp. \( X \in \text{VAR}(c) \)) such that \( X \notin \text{VAR}(c) \) (resp. \( X \notin \text{VAR}(a) \)).

Inductively, we define \( a'^{i+1} \) (resp. \( c'^{i+1} \)) to be the atom obtained from \( a' \) (resp. \( c' \)) as follows: for each variable \( X \in \text{VAR}(c) \) (resp. \( X \in \text{VAR}(a') \)), if each variables in positions \( \text{ARG}(c) \setminus X \) (resp. \( \text{ARG}(a') \setminus X \)) occurs as marked in \( c \) (resp. \( a' \)), then each occurrence of \( X \) is marked in \( a' \) (resp. \( c' \)) to obtain the new atom \( c^{i+1} \) (resp. \( a'^{i+1} \)). Then naturally, we denote by \( a^\infty \) (resp. \( c^\infty \)) as the fixpoint of the markup applications. Finally, we denote by \( m\text{-VAR}(a, c, a') \) as the set of all the marked variables mentioned only in \( a^\infty \) under atoms \( c \) and \( a' \) as obtained through the method above.

Loosely speaking, in the aforementioned variable markup above, we can think of \( a \) as corresponding to some “body atom” while \( c \) and \( a' \) as “head atoms” that are reachable through the TGD extension \( \Sigma^{\ast} \) (see Definition 1) as will respectively occur in some derivation track. Intuitively, the marked variables represent element positions that may fail the “sticky-join” property, i.e., disappear in the derivation track. Intuitively, the sticky-join property insures decidability because only a finite number of elements can circulate among the derivation tracks. As will be revealed in following Definition 2 we further note that we only consider marked variables in terms of the triple \( \langle a, c, a' \rangle \) because we only consider them for “recursive triangular-components.”

**Definition 2 (Recursive triangular-components).** Let \( \Sigma \) be a set of TGDs and \( \Sigma^{\ast} \) its extension as defined in Definition 1. Then a recursive triangular-component (RTC) \( T \) is a tuple

\[
\langle (B, H), \{a, b, c\}, \{X, Z\}, a' \rangle,
\]

where: 1.) \( (B, H) \in \Sigma^{\ast} \); 2.) \( \{a, b\} \subseteq B \), \( a \neq b \) and \( c \in H \); 3.) \( a' \) is an atom and there exists an assignment \( \theta : \text{VAR}(a) \rightarrow \text{VAR}(a') \) such that \( a \theta = a' \) and either one of the following holds:

(a) \( c = a' \), or
(b) \( \exists (B', H') \in \Sigma^{\ast} \) and function \( \eta : \text{VAR}(B' \theta' \cup H' \theta') \rightarrow \Gamma_c \cup \Gamma_v \), where \( \theta' \) is just a renaming substi-

ution such that \( \text{VAR}(B' \theta' \cup H' \theta') \cap \text{VAR}(B \cup H) = \emptyset \), and where \( c \in \eta \cap (\eta \circ \theta') \) and \( a' \in H' \).

4.) \( X \) and \( Z \) are two distinct variables where \( \{X, Z\} \subseteq \overline{\text{VAR}}(B) \), and \( X \in \text{VAR}(a), Z \in \text{VAR}(b), \{X, Z\} \subseteq \text{VAR}(c) \) and \( X \in \overline{\text{VAR}(a')} \); and lastly, 5.) there exists a tuple of distinct atoms \( \mathbf{d} = d_1 \ldots d_m \subseteq B \) such that

(a) \( a = d_1 \) and \( d_m = b \), and for each \( i \in \{1, \ldots, m-1\} \), there exists \( Y_i \in \text{LINK}(B, d_i, d_{i+1}) \);

(b) for some \( i \in \{1, \ldots, m-1\} \), there exists \( Y' \in \text{LINK}(B, d_i, d_{i+1}) \) \{X, Z\} such that \( Y' \in \overline{\text{VAR}(a')} \).

Loosely speaking, a recursive triangular-component (RTC) \( T \) of the form (8) (see Definition 2 and Figure 1), can possibly enfore an infinite cycle of labeled nulls being “pulled” together into a relation in the chase derivation. We explain this by using again the TGDs \( \Sigma_2 = \{\sigma_{12}, \sigma_{21}\} \) and database \( D_2 \) of Example 2. Here, let us assume that \( B = BD(\sigma_{12}) \) and \( H = \text{HD}(\sigma_{12}) \) such that \( (B, H) \) is the pair mentioned in (8).

Then with the body atoms \( \langle t(X, Y), u(Y, Z), b \rangle \in BD(\sigma_{12}) \) and head atom \( \langle t(X, Z), u(Y, Z), b \rangle \in \text{HD}(\sigma_{12}) \) also standing for the atoms \( a, b \) and \( c \) in (3), respectively, then we can form the RTC:

\[
\langle (B, H), \langle t(X, Y), u(Y, Z), t(X, Z), (X, Z) \rangle \rangle.
\]

(9)

We note here from Condition 3.) of Definition 2 that the atom \( c' \) in (3) is also the head atom “\( t(X, Z) \)”, i.e., the choice \( a = c' \) of Condition 3.) holds in this case. For simplicity, we note that out example RTC in (9) retains the names of the variables “\( X \)” and “\( Y \)” mentioned in (3). Loosely speaking, for two atoms \( \langle n_1, n_2 \rangle, \langle t(n_1, n_2) \rangle \in \text{chase}(D_2, \Sigma_2) \), we have that rule \( \sigma_{12} \) and its head atom “\( t(X, Z) \)” would combine the two nulls “\( n_1 \)” and “\( n_2 \)” into a relation “\( \langle t(n_1, n_2) \rangle \)” in \( \text{chase}(D_2, \Sigma_2) \). Since the variable “\( X \)” is retained in each RTC cycle via Condition 4.) (see Figure 1), this makes possible that nulls held by “\( X \)” in each cycle (in some substitution) to be pulled together into some other nulls held by “\( Z \)” as derived through the head atom “\( t(X, Z) \)”.

We further note that the connecting variable “\( Y \)” between the two body atoms “\( t(X, Y) \)” and “\( u(Y, Z) \)” corresponds to the variables \( Y_i \in \text{LINK}(B, d_i, d_{i+1}) \) (point (a) of Condition 5.), and for some \( i, \) some \( Y' \in \text{LINK}(B, d_i, d_{i+1}) \) \{X, Z\} also appears as marked (i.e., \( Y' \in m\text{-VAR}(a, c, a') \)) in point (b) of Condition 5.) with respect to the atom \( a' \). Intuitively, we require in (b) of Condition 5.) that some of these variables \( Y' \) occur as marked (w.r.t. \( a' \)) so that labeled nulls of some link variables have a chance to disappear in the RTC cycle for otherwise, they can only link and combine a bounded number of labeled nulls due to the sticky-join property [Cali et al., 2012].

**Example 4.** Consider again the pair \( p_{21} = \{\langle t(X_1, V), s(V), t(V, Z_1) \rangle \} \subseteq \Sigma^3_2 \) from Example 3. Then with the pair \( p_{21} \) standing for \( (B, H) \) in (6), the atoms “\( t(X_1, V) \)”, “\( t(V, Z_1) \)”, “\( t(X_1, Z_1) \)” and “\( t(X_1, Z_1) \)” for the atoms \( a, b, c \) and \( c' \) in (5), respectively, and variables \( \langle X_1, Z_1 \rangle \) for the variables \( \langle X, Z \rangle \) in (5), then we can get a corresponding RTC \( T_{11} = \langle p_{21}, \langle t(X_1, V), t(V, Z_1), t(X_1, Z_1) \rangle, (X_1, Z_1) \rangle, t(X_1, Z_1) \rangle \rangle \) as illustrated in Figure 2.
there exists some atom of the form (8) (see Definition 2 and Figure 1), we have that follows that:

Example 5. Consider again the TGDs \( \Sigma_1 \) in Example 7 containing rules \( \sigma_{11} \) and \( \sigma_{12} \). Then because there cannot be any derivation track that would combine the two variables “X” and “Z” of rule \( \sigma_{12} \) into a single head atom in \( \Sigma_1 \), it follows that \( \Sigma_1 \) cannot have any RTC. Therefore, it trivially follows from Definition 2 that \( \Sigma_1 \) is in the class TG.

4 Main Results and Concluding Remarks

We now examine the important properties of this TG class of TGDs. In particular, we show that BCQ-Ans under the new class TG of TGDs is decidable.

Definition 4 (Interchangeable nulls). Let \( \bar{a} = a_1 \ldots a_l \) be a tuple of atoms where \( \text{TERM}(\bar{a}) \subseteq \Gamma_i \). Then we say that \( n_1 \) and \( n_2 \) are \( \bar{a} \)-interchangeable under \( \text{chase}(D, \Sigma) \) if for each connected tuple of atoms \( \bar{a} \theta = \theta(a_1) \ldots \theta(a_l) \subseteq \text{chase}(D, \Sigma) \), where \( \theta \) is a bijective (renaming) substitution, we have that \( \{n_1, n_2\} \subseteq \text{NULLS}(\bar{a} \theta) \) implies there exists an assignment \( \theta' : \text{NULLS}(\bar{a} \theta) \rightarrow \Gamma_i \) such that: (1) \( \theta'(n_1) = \theta'(n_2) \); and (2) \( \bar{a} \theta' \in \text{chase}(D, \Sigma) \).

Intuitively, with the tuple of atoms \( \bar{a} = a_1 \ldots a_l \) as above, we have that \( n_1 \) and \( n_2 \) are “\( \bar{a} \)”-interchangeable under \( \text{chase}(D, \Sigma) \) guarantees that if for some BCQ \( Q = \exists X \phi(X) \rightarrow q \) we have that \( \text{chase}(D, \Sigma) \models Q \), then if \( \phi \equiv \theta(a_1) \land \ldots \land \theta(a_l) \) for some renaming substitution \( \theta \) (i.e., \( \bar{a} \) is the same “type” as \( \phi \)), then we have that simultaneously replacing all occurrences of \( n_1 \) by \( n_2 \) in \( \text{chase}(D, \Sigma) \) would not affect the fact that \( \text{chase}(D, \Sigma) \models Q \).

Before we present the following Theorem 2 it is necessary to firstly introduce the notion level in a chase that we define inductively as follows: for an atom \( a \in D \), we set level\((a) = 0 \); then inductively, for \( a \in \text{chase}(D, \Sigma) \) obtained via some chase step \( I_k \xrightarrow{\sigma, \eta} I_{k+1} \), we set level\((a) = \max\{ \text{level}(b) | b \in \text{BD}(\sigma, \eta) \} + 1 \). Then finally, for some given \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), we set \( \text{chase}^k(D, \Sigma) = \{ a | a \in \text{chase}(D, \Sigma) \text{ and level}(a) \leq k \} \). Intuitively, \( \text{chase}^k(D, \Sigma) \) is the instance containing atoms that can be derived in a fewer or equal to \( k \) chase steps.

Theorem 2 (Bounded nulls). Let \( D \) be a database and \( \Sigma \in TG \). Then for each tuple of atoms \( \bar{a} \), \( \exists n \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( \forall k \in \mathbb{N} \), we have that \( n_k \in \text{NULLS}(\text{chase}^n(D, \Sigma)) \) implies \( \exists n_k \in \text{NULLS}(\text{chase}^n(D, \Sigma)) \) where \( \Gamma_N \) in \( \text{chase}(D, \Sigma) \).

Proof (Sketch). A contradiction can be derived by assuming that \( \exists \bar{a}, \forall N \in \mathbb{N}, \exists k \in \mathbb{N}, \forall n_k \in \mathbb{N}, \exists n_k \in \Gamma_N \), where: \( n_k \in \text{NULLS}(\text{chase}^n(D, \Sigma)) \) implies the existence of an infinite distinguishing relation among all those nulls \( n_k \) and \( n_{k+1} \). Therefore, it follows that there must exist some RTC \( T \) of the form \( (8) \) in \( \Sigma \) and where there is no body atom \( \bar{a} \) that guards variables “X” and “Z”, i.e., \( \{X, Z\} \subseteq \text{VAR}(\bar{a}) \) (see Definition 3).

Theorem 3 (Finite model property). For database \( D \), TGDs \( \Sigma \in TG \) and BCQ \( Q \), \( D \cup \Sigma \cup \{\neg Q\} \) have the FM property.

Proof (Sketch). Let \( \bar{a} = a_1 \ldots a_l = \text{BD}(x) \), for some \( x \in \Sigma \cup \{Q\} \). Then by Lemma 2 each of the null \( n_k \in \text{NULLS}(\text{chase}^n(D, \Sigma)) \) is always \( \bar{a} \)-interchangeable with some null \( n_k \in \text{NULLS}(\text{chase}^n(D, \Sigma)) \). It then follows that \( \text{chase}(D, \Sigma) \) can be represented by a finite number of nulls from which the finite model property follows.

Theorem 4 (Comparison with other syntactic classes). For each class \( C \in \{ \text{WA}, \text{W-GUARDED}, \text{WSJ}, \text{G-GUARDED}, \text{SHY}, \text{TAME}, \text{WR} \} \), we have that \( C \subseteq TG \).

Proof (Sketch). A contradiction is derived by assuming that \( C \in \{ \text{WA}, \text{W-GUARDED}, \text{WSJ}, \text{G-GUARDED}, \text{SHY}, \text{TAME}, \text{WR} \} \) but where \( C \notin TG \), since we have by Definition 3 that \( C \notin TG \) implies that there exists some RTC where the variables \( X \) and \( Z \) are not guarded by some atom \( \bar{a} \in D \).

Theorem 5 (Computational complexities). (1) Determining if \( \Sigma \in TG \) is in 2-ExpTime (upper-bound) but is PSPACE-hard (lower-bound); (2) The BCQ-Ans combined complexity problem under the class TG is in 4-ExpTime (upper-bound) but is 3-ExpTime-hard (lower-bound).

In this paper, we have introduced a new class of TGDs called triangulaingly-guarded TGDs (TG), for which BCQ-Ans is decidable as well as having the FM property (Theorems 2 and 3). We further showed that TG strictly contains the...
current main syntactic classes: WA, W-GUARDED, WSJ, G-GUARDED, SHY, TAME and WR (Theorem 4), which, to the best of our knowledge, provides a unified representation of those aforementioned TGD classes.
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