

Query Evaluation in DatalogMTL

– Taming Infinite Query Results

Luigi Bellomarini¹, Markus Nissl², and Emanuel Sallinger^{2,3}

¹ Banca d'Italia, Italy

² TU Wien, Austria

³ University of Oxford, UK

Abstract. In this paper, we investigate finite representations of DatalogMTL. First, we introduce programs that have finite models and propose a toolkit for structuring the execution of DatalogMTL rules into sequential phases. Then, we study infinite models that eventually become constant and introduce sufficient criteria for programs that allow for such representation. We proceed by considering infinite models that are eventually periodic and show that such a representation encompasses all DatalogMTL^{FP} programs, a widely discussed fragment. Finally, we provide a novel algorithm for reasoning over finite representable DatalogMTL programs that incorporates all of the previously discussed representations.

Keywords: DatalogMTL · Temporal Reasoning.

1 Introduction

Query evaluation over temporal information is a fundamental problem in computer science, as temporal information occurs in many areas (e.g, Internet of Things, financial systems, etc.). A Datalog-based language called DatalogMTL[1] has recently received significant attention in the research community as a powerful language for reasoning over temporal information.

DatalogMTL extends Datalog with operators from metric temporal logic (MTL) interpreted over the rational timeline and allows to formulate expressions such as $\exists_{[0,5m]} \text{Signal}(x)$ to state that the signal x occurred continuously over the last 5 minutes or $\diamond_{[0,5m]} \text{Signal}(x)$ to state that the signal x occurred at least once in the last 5 minutes. Recent work identified tractable fragments (for consistency checking) by using either \exists or \diamond operators in linear rules [9].

Challenge. However such a framework allows for the formulation of rules that do not terminate, and produce infinite models. Consider the recursive rule

$$\diamond_{[7d,7d]} \text{Monday} \rightarrow \text{Monday}$$

which shifts the validity of *Monday* by one week at each application. This clearly results in an infinite result, namely the infinite set of all future Mondays, and thus

a non-terminating computation. At the same time, this *is* a rule that represents very natural domain knowledge, namely that Mondays repeat every seven days.

Producing infinite models is a frequent problem in many areas of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning, with countless solutions over the years. The core of such solutions typically lies in building **finite representations** of the infinite model produced—and subsequently using these finite models for solving the various tasks at hand. If this were possible, we could solve tasks such as building a finite representation once and solve queries for arbitrary time points with little computational effort, unrolling the finite representation on-demand to cover an arbitrary time period, etc.

Solution. In this paper, we investigate finite representations for DatalogMTL. This is in principle a wide area, which we divide into three types of finite representations:

- i *finite models* (i.e., after a certain time point no facts hold)
- ii *infinite models* that eventually become *constant* (i.e., after a certain time point the set of facts remains the same)
- iii *infinite models* that are eventually *periodic* (i.e., after a certain time point there are repeating cycles of facts)

There is a persuasive mathematical analogue of the above three types, namely in number representations: for type (i) we have numbers such as 1.234, for (ii) e.g., $1.2\bar{3}$, representing the number 1.233333... infinitely repeating, and for (iii) $1.\overline{234}$, meaning the number 1.234234... infinitely repeating.

Our main contributions are:

- We develop a **sufficient criterion to identify programs that have finite model, i.e., models of type (i)**. We call such programs *harmless*, and provide an algorithm for recognizing such harmless programs. We also show that for non-harmless programs, it is (non-trivially) database-dependent whether an infinite model is produced.
- For infinite models that eventually become constant, i.e., of type (ii), we see an interesting distinction between programs that contain \boxplus and \boxtimes . For \boxtimes we develop a **sufficient criterion called *temporal linear that allows finite representations of type (ii)***. We show that this criterion is, in some sense, optimal, as non-temporal linear programs may produce not-eventually constant models.
- For the case of \boxplus , we argue that **non-repetition of rule heads in Datalog programs is a sufficient criterion for type (ii) finite representations**. Slightly paraphrased, rules may not perform union operations. Finally, we show that when allowing both \boxtimes and \boxplus , even *both* criteria, i.e., temporal linear and union free, are not sufficient to guarantee type (ii) finite representations.
- This raises the question what we can guarantee for programs that contain both \boxtimes and \boxplus . We show that for DatalogMTL^{FP}, the forward propagating fragment of DatalogMTL which exactly contains the temporal operators \boxtimes

and \exists , we can always guarantee **type (iii) finite representations**, i.e., repeating cycles of facts.

- We provide a **single algorithm** that can produce type (i), (ii), and (iii) finite representations for all the above restrictions, i.e., will take harmless programs and produce finite models, take temporal linear programs with \diamond and produce type (ii) representations, etc.

Organization. The remainder of this work is structured as follows: In Section 2, we introduce DatalogMTL. We discuss finite models for DatalogMTL and derive our toolkit for analyzing such temporal rules in Section 3, and discuss infinite models in Section 4. We introduce a new reasoning algorithm in Section 5. We discuss related work in Section 6 and finally conclude the work in Section 7.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we introduce the basic definitions of DatalogMTL under continuous semantics [1,7,9].

Syntax of DatalogMTL. Let \mathbf{C} and \mathbf{V} be disjoint sets of *constants*, and *variables*, respectively. A *term* is either a constant or a variable. An *atom* is an expression of the form $P(\tau)$, where P is a predicate of arity $n \geq 0$ and τ is a n -tuple of terms. A *rule* is an expression of the form

$$A_1 \wedge \dots \wedge A_k \rightarrow B \quad \text{for } k \geq 0$$

where all A_i and B are literals that follow the grammar:

$$A := P(\tau) \mid \exists_{\varrho} A \mid \boxplus_{\varrho} A \mid \diamond_{\varrho} A \mid \boxtimes_{\varrho} A \mid AS_{\varrho} A \mid AU_{\varrho} A \quad B := P(\tau) \mid \exists_{\varrho} A \mid \boxplus_{\varrho} A$$

where the temporal operators \boxplus_{ϱ} , \diamond_{ϱ} , U_{ϱ} refer to the future, and \exists_{ϱ} , \boxtimes_{ϱ} , S_{ϱ} refer to the past, ϱ is a *non-negative* interval where an interval is represented in binary and of the form $\langle t1, t2 \rangle$, $t1, t2 \in \mathbb{Q}_2 \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$, $t1 \leq t2$, and \langle either open ‘(’ or closed ‘[’ and \rangle either open ‘)’ or closed ‘]’. In case of ∞ the corresponding end of the interval is defined as open. A fact is represented as $A@_{\varrho}$, where ϱ is the time-interval where the fact holds. The conjunction of A_i is the rule *body*, whereas B is the rule *head*. Instead of \wedge we sometimes use “,” to denote conjunction. A predicate $p \in P$ is *intensional* (IDB), if p occurs in the head of the rule whose body is not empty, otherwise p is *extensional* (EDB). We define the left endpoint of the interval by ϱ^- and the right endpoint by ϱ^+ . The *length of an interval* is defined as $|\varrho| = \infty$ if $\varrho^+ = \infty$, otherwise $|\varrho| = \varrho^+ - \varrho^-$. A *program* Π is a finite set

of rules and is in *temporal normal form* if it contains only rules of the form:

$$P_1(\tau_1) \wedge \dots \wedge P_n(\tau_n) \rightarrow P_0(\tau_0) \quad (n \geq 0) \quad (1)$$

$$P_1(\tau_1) \mathcal{S}_\varrho P_2(\tau_2) \rightarrow P_0(\tau_0) \quad (2)$$

$$P_1(\tau_1) \mathcal{U}_\varrho P_2(\tau_2) \rightarrow P_0(\tau_0) \quad (3)$$

$$\boxminus_\varrho P_1(\tau_1) \rightarrow P_0(\tau_0) \quad (4)$$

$$\boxplus_\varrho P_1(\tau_1) \rightarrow P_0(\tau_0) \quad (5)$$

$$\diamond_\varrho P_1(\tau_1) \rightarrow P_0(\tau_0)^* \quad (6)$$

$$\heartsuit_\varrho P_1(\tau_1) \rightarrow P_0(\tau_0)^* \quad (7)$$

Note that rules marked with * are not part of the normal form of DatalogMTL, but were mentioned as they are part of fragments that are not allowing the since and until operator.

Semantics of DatalogMTL. The semantics of this operations are defined by an interpretation \mathfrak{M} , that is based on a domain $\Delta \neq 0$ for the variables and constants in a Datalog program. The interpretation specifies for each time instant $t \in \mathbb{Q}$, predicate P and tuple a from Δ whether P is true on a at t , written as $\mathfrak{M}, t \models P(a)$. Let ν be an assignment of Δ to the individual terms, we write $\nu(c) = c$ for every constant and define inductively: [1]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{M}, t \models^\nu P(\tau) & \quad \text{iff } \mathfrak{M}, t \models P(\nu(\tau)) \\ \mathfrak{M}, t \models^\nu \boxplus_\varrho A & \quad \text{iff } \mathfrak{M}, s \models^\nu A \text{ for all } s \text{ with } s - t \in \varrho \\ \mathfrak{M}, t \models^\nu \boxminus_\varrho A & \quad \text{iff } \mathfrak{M}, s \models^\nu A \text{ for all } s \text{ with } t - s \in \varrho \\ \mathfrak{M}, t \models^\nu \heartsuit_\varrho A & \quad \text{iff } \mathfrak{M}, s \models^\nu A \text{ for some } s \text{ with } s - t \in \varrho \\ \mathfrak{M}, t \models^\nu \diamond_\varrho A & \quad \text{iff } \mathfrak{M}, s \models^\nu A \text{ for some } s \text{ with } t - s \in \varrho \\ \mathfrak{M}, t \models^\nu A \mathcal{U}_\varrho A' & \quad \text{iff } \mathfrak{M}, s \models^\nu A' \text{ for some } t' \text{ with } t' - t \in \varrho \wedge \mathfrak{M}, s \models^\nu A \text{ for all } s \in (t, t') \\ \mathfrak{M}, t \models^\nu A \mathcal{S}_\varrho A' & \quad \text{iff } \mathfrak{M}, s \models^\nu A' \text{ for some } t' \text{ with } t - t' \in \varrho \wedge \mathfrak{M}, s \models^\nu A \text{ for all } s \in (t', t) \end{aligned}$$

Fragments of DatalogMTL. Over the last years, different fragments of DatalogMTL with continuous semantics have been studied [3,4,8,9], which yield interesting data complexity classes for consistency checking. Interesting fragments are the forward propagating fragment $\text{DatalogMTL}^{\text{FP}}$, where only \boxminus and \heartsuit are allowed, or more restricted, tractable fragments, where either \heartsuit or \boxminus is allowed and in addition the rules have to be linear (i.e., only one IDB predicate is allowed in the body).

3 Finite Models and a Toolkit

In this section, we study finite models of DatalogMTL and introduce our toolkit, which structures the execution of rules into multiple phases. Let us start with the definition of a dependency graph:

Definition 1. *Given a Datalog program Π in temporal normal form, a dependency graph of rules is a directed graph $G(N, E)$, whose nodes N correspond*

to predicate names from Π , and there is a directed edge $X \rightarrow Y$ in E , with $X, Y \in N$, if there exists a rule r of Π having X as a body predicate and Y as a head predicate.

We mark an edge as special, if r is of form (2)-(7). Two predicates are *mutually temporal recursive* if they appear in the same cycle of the dependency graph of Π and the cycle contains a special edge.

We continue by defining repetition patterns, which are an important concept in the following to capture among others periods such as weekdays or months:

Definition 2. Let Σ be a DatalogMTL program, D a database, P an arbitrary predicate in Σ , and $T \in \mathbb{Q}$ a timepoint. A forward propagating repetition pattern of P is of size $n, n \in \mathbb{Q}^{>0}$, iff $P(\tau)@(t+n*x) = P(\tau)@t$, where $T \leq t < T+n$, for all $P(\tau) \in \Sigma(D)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{N}$ and all tuples τ . We say that a repetition pattern is empty, in case there is a timepoint T , such that for all $t \geq T$, $P(\tau)@t \notin \Sigma(D)$.

Intuitively, this means that the intervals of all valid facts after a timepoint T are repeated linearly (cyclic). Similarly a *backward propagating repetition pattern* of P is of size n , iff $P(\tau)@(t-n*x) = P(\tau)@t$, where $T \geq t > T-n$.

As mentioned in the introduction, there exist programs that do not terminate in general. However, certain parts of the program have no influence on the termination decision, as they always lead to finite models, such as rules containing EDB facts. This let us derive the following classification of rules in the program.

- **Harmless Rules** are intuitively all rules of the program that produce a finite model. Formally, we define a node in the dependency graph as harmless if (i) it is EDB, (ii) all inputs of the node are derived from harmless rules, or (iii) the node is part of a strongly connected component (SCC) that contains no special edges once all the incoming edges from harmless rules are removed. A rule is harmless if it contains at least one body atom that is harmless and the intervals do not contain ∞ (to exclude infinite models).
- **Harmful Rules:** A rule is harmful if it is not harmless and of type (1).
- **Dangerous Rules:** A rule is dangerous if it is not harmless or harmful.

The idea of the rule classification is as follows: Harmless rules have no impact on termination and have a finite model. This only excludes rules that are part of a cycle that may not terminate, rules that depend only on values from non-terminating cycles, or rules with infinite intervals. Harmful rules are also not critical if used in cycles, as they do not derive intervals on new time-points. As existing intervals are intersected, however in combination with dangerous rules they may not terminate. Dangerous rules may not terminate, but in certain cases (discussed in the following chapter) certain patterns (e.g., valid until infinity, or repetitions) can be detected.

Theorem 1. Given a Datalog program Π in temporal normal form, where all rules are harmless, the program terminates and produces a finite model.

Algorithm 1 Classification Algorithm of Rules

Input: Program Π
Output: Program Π , each rule assigned its type

- 1: $DG \leftarrow \text{dependencyGraph}(\Pi)$
- 2: $\text{hasChanged} \leftarrow \text{true}$
- 3: **while** hasChanged **do**
- 4: $\text{hasChanged} \leftarrow \text{false}$
- 5: $\text{components} \leftarrow \text{getSCCs}(DG)$
- 6: **for** component in components **do**
- 7: **if** component has no special edge and component has no incoming edge **then**
- 8: **for** node in component **do**
- 9: remove node from DG
- 10: **for** $\text{rule} \in \Pi$ **do**
- 11: **if** rule body contains node and has finite intervals **then**
- 12: mark rule as harmless
- 13: remove edges from DG that correspond to rule
- 14: $\text{hasChanged} \leftarrow \text{true}$
- 15: **for** $\text{rule} \in \Pi$ **do**
- 16: **if** rule is not marked and of type (1) **then**
- 17: mark rule as harmful
- 18: **else if** rule is not marked **then**
- 19: mark rule as dangerous

Proof Sketch. The idea is to show that each produced fact is limited by some fact from the database, which has a finite interval. We know that there is only one case, a cyclic SCC with a special edge, which causes non-termination. We show that by construction of the harmless fragment, we exactly exclude such a SCC. This is done, on the one hand by forcing at least one body atom to be identified as harmless (which limits intersections, e.g., rules of form 1), and on the other hand by enforcing non-infinite intervals for temporal operators (to protect against infinite models and restrict the atoms produced by the since and until operator). \square

We now present a possible classification algorithm (Algorithm 1) that takes as input a DatalogMTL program Π and marks each rule with its corresponding type. For this, we first retrieve the dependency graph (Line 1). Then we apply the algorithm as long as some nodes have been deleted from the dependency graph (Line 3). First, we calculate all strongly connected components. Such components either return a single node, if it contains no incoming edges, that is either an EDB or by construction of the algorithm a node that has already been identified as harmless, or a group of nodes, that in case they contain no special edge is harmless. In case we identified a harmless component, we can remove the nodes of the component (Line 9), mark all rules that contain such a node in the body as harmless (Line 12), and remove all edges from the dependency graph, that have been created by the harmless rules (Line 13). In the end (Line 15-19) we mark the remaining rules with the corresponding classification based on the rule type. In case there are no remaining rules, the program is harmless.




Fig. 1. Phases of a reasoning process

Based on the classification, we derive our toolkit which structures the execution of rules into three sequential phases:

1. *Init-Phase*: This phase is active as long as harmless rules derive new facts. This phase will definitely terminate, as we know that all rules are guarded by some harmless variable, which limits the derived facts of the rules to a finite model, even if some body predicate is not harmless. Note that in this phase also harmful and dangerous rules may fire.
2. *Settlement-Phase*: In this phase only harmful and dangerous rules fire. This means, that for each generated fact, at least one temporal operator in recursion contributes to the interval of the derived facts. This phase will end, in case the values have settled to an repeating pattern, i.e., there exists time points $T1$ and $T2$, where all facts before $T1$ can be represented by a backward propagating repetition pattern and all facts after $T2$ can be represented by a forward propagating repetition pattern. For example, consider a recursive rule $\diamond_{(1,3)}A \rightarrow A$, which will reach a time-point t , where $A@[t, \infty)$.
3. *Repetition-Phase*: This phase starts in case all intervals have reached a repetition pattern. The program can terminate and output all derived facts of the previous phases with the derived intervals and all facts of this phase with its repetition pattern.

Consider Figure 1 for an example of the phases with the fact $P'@0$ and rule (1) $\diamond_{[0-1]}P' \rightarrow P, Q$ (harmless), and consider: (2) $\diamond_{(2,2)}P \rightarrow P$, and (3) $\diamond_{(3,4)}Q \rightarrow Q$. The toolkit highlights the behavior of how the program evolves over time and together with the classification of the rules demonstrate that we only have to consider cycles in SCC containing dangerous rules when analyzing the termination of programs. In the following proposition we show that the termination of dangerous rules is dependent on the data, even, if we know that the given database is non-empty.

Proposition 1. *Given a DatalogMTL program Π in temporal normal form with a non-empty database D , it cannot be determined whether a cycle with dangerous rules has a finite model by only considering the program Π .*

Proof. We show this proposition by example. Consider following rule:

$$\boxminus_{[3,7]}A \rightarrow A$$

In the first case, consider a database containing only a single fact $A@[0,1]$. Then we derive no additional fact and the program terminates. In the second case consider a database containing only a single fact $A@[0,7]$. Then we derive $A@[7,10]$ (merged to $A@[0,10]$), $A@[7,13]$ (merged to $A@[0,13]$), \dots , leading to the result $A@[0,\infty)$ after infinite applications. \square

This means, we cannot study termination guarantees of dangerous programs considering only the rules in general, even when restricting to $\text{DatalogMTL}^{\text{FP}}$ or the box operator as the previous proof highlights.

Corollary 1. *Given a $\text{DatalogMTL}^{\text{FP}}$ program in temporal normal form with a non-empty database D , it cannot be determined whether a cycle with dangerous rules has a finite model by only considering the program Π .*

4 Finite Representations for Infinite Models

In this section, we look at various fragments of DatalogMTL that can be used to investigate termination in detail. In particular, we focus on the $\text{DatalogMTL}^{\text{FP}}$ fragment and its sub-fragments, i.e., fragments that have been studied intensively [10,8] as they allow to derive facts in the future based on earlier facts. Note that the results also hold for the backward propagating fragment as they are symmetrical.

4.1 Intervals of type $[T, \infty)$

We start by considering $\text{DatalogMTL}_{\diamond_{(t_1, t_2)}}$, the fragment only allowing rules of type (1) and (6), such that $t_2 > t_1$ and consider again rule (3) in Figure 1.

This example highlights, that having at least one single fact P in a cycle with a dangerous rule of type (6) always leads to a time point t , where $P@[t, \infty)$ holds. We now show this formally and start by defining temporal linearity of rules and programs:

Definition 3. *A rule is temporal linear if there is at most one body predicate that is mutually temporal recursive with the head in the dependency graph. A Datalog program is temporal linear if all its rules are temporal linear.*

Theorem 2. *Let D be a dataset and Π be a temporal linear DatalogMTL program that only uses temporal operators \diamond_{t_1, t_2} with $t_1 \neq t_2$. Let F be the (infinite) set of temporal facts that Π and D entail. There exists a time point $T \in \mathbb{Q}$ s.t. for every $t > T$, F entails $\alpha@t$ iff F entails $\alpha@T$.*

Proof Sketch. By considering a single rule of the form $\diamond_{(t_1, t_2)} P \rightarrow P$ with a single fact $P@t$ valid at a single timestamp, we observe that after n recursive applications of the rule, the fact $P@(t+t_1 * n, t+(t_1+l) * n)$, where $l = t_2 - t_1$, is retrieved. For all $n \geq N$ we retrieve $(t_1+l) * n > t_1 * (n+1)$, since $l > 0$ and the interval is increased by size l per application. Hence we can follow the interval

$[t+t1 * N, \infty)$ for this rule and for a fact $\alpha@t N = \lfloor (t1 - (\sigma^+ - \sigma^-)) / (t2 - t1) + 1 \rfloor$. By induction on the cycle length, we show that this even holds for all possible added rules. This is, by adding a rule of type (6), we can merge the operators to retrieve a new cycle length, i.e., $\diamond_{\langle t1, t2 \rangle} \diamond_{\langle t3, t4 \rangle} = \diamond_{\langle t1+t3, t2+t4 \rangle}$, by adding a rule of type (1), the second atom is not allowed to be part of the cycle, that is, by construction, either is of form $[T', \infty)$ or has no valid interval after T' , which either acts like a pass-through, or filters out the other atom. Last, we can have multiple rules with the same head atom, creating a SCC with multiple cycles or additional facts that are valid. In both cases only additional facts are added that only affect the time point at which the interval is reached, not whether it is reached. \square

Corollary 2. *Let $\diamond_{\langle t1, t2 \rangle} P \rightarrow P$, where $t2 > t1$ be the only recursive rule of a DatalogMTL program Π and a database D . This rule needs at most $n = \lfloor t1 / (t2 - t1) + 1 \rfloor$ applications to reach a time point T such that either for all $t' \geq T$ $P@t' \in \Pi(D)$ or for all $t' \geq T$ $P@t' \notin \Pi(D)$.*

Proposition 2. *There exists a dataset D and a DatalogMTL program Π that only uses temporal operators $\diamond_{t1, t2}$ with $t1 \neq t2$ such there exists no time point $T \in \mathbb{Q}$ s.t. for every $t > T$, F entails $\alpha@t$ iff F entails $\alpha@T$, where F is the (infinite) set of temporal facts that Π and D entail.*

Proof. We show this proof by example. Consider a database containing the facts $A@[0, 3]$ and $B@[2, 4]$ and the following rules:

$$A, B \rightarrow C \quad \diamond_{[3, 5]} C \rightarrow A \quad \diamond_{[5, 6]} C \rightarrow B$$

This produces the following facts: $A@[5n, 5n+3]$, $B@[5n+2, 5n+4]$, and $C@[5n+2, 5n+3]$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. \square

This proposition shows that allowing non-linear rules in the horn rule allows for the creation of patterns of the form $\diamond_{[t1, t2]}$, where $t1 = t2$, the other restriction (beside temporal linear) chosen in order to derive facts, that can be represented by a single, non-repetitive interval, namely $[T, \infty)$. In that sense, the chosen fragment is maximal as removing either of the chosen restrictions yields repetition patterns, which we discuss in the following section.

We continue to study the \boxplus operator. As we have seen in Proposition 1, the box operator $\boxplus_{(t1, t2)}$ can behave like the diamond operator in case the input interval $\langle i1, i2 \rangle$ has a certain length. To be exact, if $(i2 - i1) \geq (t2 - t1)$ and $i1 + t2 < i2$, we can replace the operator with $\diamond_{[0, t1]}$ (without considering the interval boundaries). This allows us to combine extensions and shortenings of the intervals in such a way that we can create a linear repetition pattern:

Proposition 3. *There exists a dataset D and a temporal linear DatalogMTL program Π that only uses temporal operators $\boxplus_{t1, t2}$ with $t1 \neq t2$ such there exists no time point $T \in \mathbb{Q}$ s.t. for every $t > T$, F entails $\alpha@t$ iff F entails $\alpha@T$, where F is the (infinite) set of temporal facts that Π and D entail.*

Proof. We show this proof by example. Consider a database containing the facts $A@[2, 5]$ and the following rules:

$$A \rightarrow B \quad \exists_{[1,2]} A \rightarrow B \quad \exists_{[10,12]} B \rightarrow A$$

This will produce the following facts: $A@[10n+2, 10n+5]$, and $B@[10n+2, 10n+6]$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. \square

Having identified the issue of permitting the same atom in multiple rule heads (i.e., union of atoms), we can now further restrict the reasoning fragment in order to derive a non-repetitive interval. Interestingly, we can also relax the linearity constraint, as it has no effect on the generated intervals, as shown by the following theorem:

Theorem 3. *Let D be a dataset and Π be a union-free DatalogMTL program that only uses temporal operators \exists_{t_1, t_2} with $t_1 \neq t_2$. Let F be the (infinite) set of temporal facts Π and D entail. There exists a time point $T \in \mathbb{Q}$ s.t. for every $t > T$, F entails $\alpha@t$ iff F entails $\alpha@T$.*

Proof Sketch. Usually, this operator decreases the interval length, i.e., it terminates in case a fact has length l_i after at most $\lfloor l_i/l_b + 1 \rfloor$ iterations, where $l_b = t_2 - t_1$, except when it acts like an extending diamond operator. In such a case, the operator cannot create a gap between the recursive intervals, but only extend existing ones as otherwise the intervals get truncated. The main idea of this proof builds on the fact, that due the disallowance of multiple rule heads, we can only reach a state for having a non-terminating SCC, whenever all inputs to each node are extending. Having a single node that is not extending causes a propagation to all other nodes in the SCC due to the intersections, leading to a time-point T' where there is no fact in F for every $t > T'$. \square

Corollary 3. *Let D be a dataset and Π be a DatalogMTL program that only uses temporal operators \diamond_{0, t_2} . Let F be the (infinite) set of temporal facts that Π and D entail. There exists a time point $T \in \mathbb{Q}$ s.t. for every $t > T$, F entails $\alpha@t$ iff F entails $\alpha@T$.*

Note, that this corollary does not force temporal linearity in comparison to the proof discussing the diamond operator.

In this section, we studied the use of the interval $[T, \infty)$ together with \exists and \diamond . The propositions have highlighted fragments that cause a single, non-repetitive interval as well as showed the borderlines, where such an interval is not possible anymore. We end this section, by showing that combining the feasible \diamond and \exists operations with its restrictions will not lead to an interval of type $[T, \infty)$ in general.

Proposition 4. *There exists a dataset D and a temporal linear, union-free DatalogMTL program Π that only uses temporal operators \diamond_{t_1, t_2} with $t_1 \neq t_2$ and \exists_{t_1, t_2} with $t_1 \neq t_2$, such there exists no time point $T \in \mathbb{Q}$ s.t. for every $t > T$, F entails $\alpha@t$ iff F entails $\alpha@T$, where F is the (infinite) set of temporal facts that Π and D entail.*




Fig. 2. Intersection $A, B \rightarrow C$ and union $A \rightarrow D, B \rightarrow D$

Proof. We show this proof by example. Consider a database containing the facts $A@[0,3]$ and the following rules:

$$\diamond_{[5,6]} A \rightarrow B \qquad \exists_{[4,5]} B \rightarrow A$$

This will produce the following facts: $A@[10n, 10n+3]$ and $B@[10n+5, 10n+9]$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. \square

4.2 Linear Repetition Patterns

In the previous section, we have studied the limits of representing \diamond and \exists with $[T, \infty)$ intervals. In this section, we are interested in extending the allowed intervals to multiple linear repetition patterns, that is, as described in Definition 2, intervals of the form $\langle T + p * n + k_1, T + p * n + k_2 \rangle$, where T is the initial time point, where all patterns are valid, p is the pattern length, n in \mathbb{N} , and k_1, k_2 the offset to T , for example $p = 5, k_1 = 2, k_2 = 4$, and $T = 10$, would yield the interval $\langle 12+5n, 14+5n \rangle$, that is, the intervals starting from $\langle 12, 14 \rangle, \langle 17, 19 \rangle$, etc. In case of $[T+k_1, \infty)$, we present the interval as $[T+k_1+p*n, T+k_1+p*(n+1))$. Hence, linear repetition patterns are a superset of the previously studied interval.

Lemma 1. *Let Π be a DatalogMTL^{FP} program. In case there exists for a node a repetition pattern, then such pattern is given by a duration $p = lcm(R)$, where R is a set, which contains for each edge in the dependency graph originated from rule (6) the value t_1 , of (4) the value t_2 , and for any other edge the value 0.*

Proof Sketch. We show this proof by constructing a dependency graph of the program. We observe that Rule (6), shifts always the fact t_1 steps to the right, Rule (4) t_2 steps, Rule (1) intersects the patterns and multiple heads with the same predicate union the patterns, both actions can be represented by a pattern length of the least common multiple, as this requires both patterns to repeat at the same timestamp (e.g., see Figure 2). This is, we assign to each edge derived from Rule (6) the label t_1 , from Rule (4) the label t_2 and all other edges the value 0. We then repeatedly assign to each node the lcm of the incoming edges (where incoming edges with values 0 are ignored), until no new lcm is derived in the dependency graph. That is, each node n in the end has a value v (the pattern length of the node) that is a divisor of R , i.e., a pattern of length R can be created by repeating the pattern R/v times. \square




Fig. 3. Induction Component Types: C1, C2 are type 1, C3 is type 2, C4 is type 3, and C5 is type 4

Note that the calculated pattern length may not be the repetition pattern of minimum length, as there may exist smaller patterns (i.e., a divisor of the pattern), which depends on the facts of the database.

In the previous lemma, we have shown the length of the repetition pattern in case there exist a pattern. In the following we study whether such a pattern exists for certain programs:

Lemma 2. *Let Π be a $DatalogMTL^{FP}$ program. It is sufficient to show for each strongly connected component individually in the dependency graph that there exists a repetition pattern.*

Proof Sketch. This proof is shown by induction by assuming that a repetition pattern has been shown for n strongly connected components (let's say c_k , $0 < k < n$). We show a repetition pattern for strongly connected component c_n which only depends on strongly connected components c_k . There exist four cases, visualized in Figure 3: (1) no incoming edge, which can be reduced to the base case, (2) a single SCC with one incoming edge, which possible temporal operators shift and possible extend or reduce the pattern length (3) a single SCC with two incoming edges, which is either an intersection or union, which can be solved by extending the pattern by calculating the *lcm* or (4) a SCC containing a cycle, where together with the other input of the node it is either acting as an intersection or union. This means, the pattern is either a consistent filtering operation or a consistent input of values into the cycle. Such cases can be all reduced to a single SCC. Hence it is sufficient to show the repetition pattern for each strongly connected component individually. \square

Theorem 4. *Let Σ be a $DatalogMTL^{FP}$ program. Let D be a database. Then the following holds: For each predicate P in Σ , there exists a timepoint T and*

integer n , such that $P(\tau)@(T + n * x) \in \Sigma(D)$ iff $P(\tau)@T \in \Sigma(D)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{N}$ and all tuples τ .

Proof Sketch. For a single cycle (i.e., no intersection or union, only diamond, and box), it trivially leads to such a pattern (i.e., by adding the “shiftings” of the temporal operators). We now extend by induction the SCC by considering intersections and unions by adding an additional path without intersection or union between arbitrary nodes (as intersections and unions can be created by adding additional paths). In both cases, we can show that again a pattern is reached due to consistent linear shiftings (given by the temporal operators), and the consistent propagation of the values along the SCC. \square

5 Reasoning Algorithm

In this section, we present a novel reasoning algorithm that always terminates and is capable of handling the fragments introduced in Section 4.1 and all DatalogMTL^{FP} programs.

Algorithm 2 takes as input the DatalogMTL program Π and the database D . We set the database as the initial facts in Line 1 and the initial derived patterns to empty in Line 2. Line 3 calculates the dependency graph, and in Line 4 we calculate the longest pattern length by calculating the least common multiple as discussed in Section 4. Note that for simplicity in the presentation we introduce a global pattern length instead of focusing on each strongly connected component. As a result of this simplification, the patterns of the first components are longer and the procedure takes longer to reach the final state, but such optimization can be applied without effort. In Line 5 we calculate the minimal number of repetitions, that is, a point where all EDB facts have been handled.

In Line 6 we iterate over all strongly connected components and derive in Line 7 one SCC which has no incoming edge, i.e., the repetition patterns of all incoming nodes have already been determined, and in Line 8 the corresponding rules of the SCC. Next, we initialize some variables. We store the derived new facts for checking for patterns in Line 9, whether a final pattern has been reached in Line 10 and whether it is the first execution in Line 11. The latter parameter is only used for a hint to the chase procedure in Line 13. The chase procedure follows the derivation rules of the chase procedure of DatalogMTL^{FP} for stream reasoning [10] by applying the rules exhaustively, however bounding the derived facts to the interval $[pLength * n, pLength * (n + 1))$ and encoding existing *derivedPatterns* inside the SCC. In case of *isFirst* is true, the interval is set to $[0, pLength * (n + 1))$ to produce the facts, which do not follow a repetition pattern, i.e., EDB facts and facts produced before identifying a repetition pattern of the previous component.

In Lines 15-26 we apply some checks. First, we check if a pattern is detected. For this, we *normalize* the derived facts by transforming each interval from $\langle t1, t2 \rangle$ to $\langle t1 - n * pLength, t2 - n * pLength \rangle$. In case a pattern is detected, we can stop the chase procedure and can append the derived patterns to the

Algorithm 2 Reasoning algorithm for DatalogMTL^{FP}**Input:** Program Π and Dataset D **Output:** $derivedFacts$ and $derivedPatterns$

```

1:  $derivedFacts \leftarrow D$ 
2:  $derivedPatterns \leftarrow empty$ 
3:  $DG = getDependencyGraph(\Pi)$ 
4:  $pLength \leftarrow getPatternLength(\Pi)$ 
5:  $n \leftarrow \lceil maxTimePoint(derivedFacts/pLength) \rceil$ 
6: while  $DG.length \neq 0$  do
7:    $C \leftarrow getNextSCC(DG)$ 
8:    $\Pi' \leftarrow getRules(C, \Pi)$ 
9:    $normalizedFacts \leftarrow []$ 
10:   $finalPattern \leftarrow false$ 
11:   $isFirst \leftarrow true$ 
12:  while  $finalPattern$  is  $false$  do
13:     $newFacts \leftarrow chaseProcedure(\Pi', derivedFacts, derivedPatterns, pLength, n,$ 
       $isFirst)$ 
14:     $isFirst \leftarrow false$ 
15:     $newNFacts \leftarrow normalize(newFacts, pLength, n)$ 
16:    if  $normalizedFacts$  match  $newNFacts$  then
17:       $finalPattern \leftarrow true$ 
18:       $simplifiedFacts \leftarrow simplify(normalizedFacts)$ 
19:       $derivedPatterns.append(simplifiedFacts)$ 
20:    else
21:       $normalizedFacts \leftarrow newNFacts$ 
22:       $derivedFacts.append([newFacts, n])$ 
23:       $n \leftarrow n + 1$ 
24:    if  $newFacts$  is empty then
25:       $finalPattern \leftarrow true$ 
26:     $DG.delete(C)$ 

```

output (16-18), otherwise we have to continue the loop until a pattern is derived. Note in Line 18, we added a *simplify* function. The goal of this function is to detect intervals, which span the complete length and convert them into the form $[pLength * n, \infty)$. Then (Line 24-26) we check if we derive facts at all, if not we can end the loop as no additional facts will be produced.

Note that this algorithm is a basic algorithm as multiple optimizations can be applied such as considering individual pattern lengths, applying the fact checking by sub-groups of derived facts as some recursive rules terminate earlier than others or by only applying normalization of the facts in case the number of facts matches. The detailed discussion of such optimizations is out of scope for this paper.

Let us demonstrate the algorithm with a simple example. Given a database D with a single fact $A@[0, 1]$ and a rule of the form $\diamond_{[3,4]}A \rightarrow A$. Then we only have one SCC consisting of A with a self-loop with weight 3, a corresponding $pLength = 3$, and $n = \lceil 2/3 \rceil = 1$. We derive the following facts per iteration:

1. We derive facts for $[0, 3 * 2 = 6)$, where we get a new fact $A@[3, 5]$, which is normalized to $A@[0, 2]$.
2. We derive facts for $[3 * 2 = 6, 3 * 3 = 9)$, where we get a new fact $A@[6, 9)$ (note the end gets truncated to the interval), which is normalized to $A@[0, 3)$.
3. We derive facts for $[3 * 3 = 9, 3 * 4 = 12)$, where we derive the missing part $A@[9, 9]$ and a new fact $A@[9, 12)$, which gets combined to $A[9, 12)$ and normalized to $A@[0, 3)$. The normalized fact matches, and since the interval is spanning over the complete pattern length, the interval $A@[9, \infty)$ is added to *derivedPatterns* and the loop terminates.

Theorem 5. *Algorithm 2 is sound and complete.*

6 Related Work

Temporal periodicity has been discussed in the context of rule-based systems by Chomicki and Imielinski [2] who studied Datalog_{IS}, a language that extends the predicates by one additional term to represent time and the successor function for this added term and identified there is a time point T after which the derived facts repeat with a period of p . This language is a subset of DatalogMTL, where only punctual intervals (i.e., interval of the form $[t, t]$, and the temporal operator $\diamond_{[t, t]}$ is allowed (as only one temporal term is allowed). Tuzhilin and Clifford [6] summarized different approaches of periodicity. They differ between strongly periodic sets, i.e., periods of repeated cycles (that is, periodicity as we discussed), and nearly periodic sets, i.e., periodicity that is happening or appearing at regular intervals (e.g., a meeting is once a week but not at a fixed time) and discussed possible integrations into TSQL2, but also restricted their focus to languages to point-based predicates. A general discussion about declarative rule-based, constraint-based, and symbolic approaches about temporal periodicity is provided by [5].

7 Conclusion

In this work we discussed finite presentable fragments of DatalogMTL and introduced a reasoning algorithm that exploits the special properties of these fragments. In future work, we want to extend the algorithm for wider fragments of DatalogMTL. We also plan to study the harmless-rule fragment, as with its finite model it is a promising fragment for reasoning in knowledge graphs.

Acknowledgements

The financial support by the Vienna Science and Technology Fund (WWTF) grant VRG18-013 is gratefully acknowledged.

References

1. Brandt, S., Kalayci, E.G., Ryzhikov, V., Xiao, G., Zakharyashev, M.: Querying log data with metric temporal logic. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.* **62**, 829–877 (2018)
2. Chomicki, J., Imielinski, T.: Temporal deductive databases and infinite objects. In: *PODS*. pp. 61–73. ACM (1988)
3. Kikot, S., Ryzhikov, V., Walega, P.A., Zakharyashev, M.: On the data complexity of ontology-mediated queries with MTL operators over timed words. In: *Description Logics. CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, vol. 2211. CEUR-WS.org (2018)
4. Ryzhikov, V., Walega, P.A., Zakharyashev, M.: Data complexity and rewritability of ontology-mediated queries in metric temporal logic under the event-based semantics. In: *IJCAI*. pp. 1851–1857. ijcai.org (2019)
5. Terenziani, P.: Temporal periodicity. In: *Encyclopedia of Database Systems* (2nd ed.). Springer (2018)
6. Tuzhilin, A., Clifford, J.: On periodicity in temporal databases. *Inf. Syst.* **20**(8), 619–639 (1995)
7. Walega, P.A., Grau, B.C., Kaminski, M., Kostylev, E.V.: Datalogmtl: Computational complexity and expressive power. In: *IJCAI*. pp. 1886–1892. ijcai.org (2019)
8. Walega, P.A., Grau, B.C., Kaminski, M., Kostylev, E.V.: Datalogmtl over the integer timeline. In: *KR*. pp. 768–777 (2020)
9. Walega, P.A., Grau, B.C., Kaminski, M., Kostylev, E.V.: Tractable fragments of datalog with metric temporal operators. In: *IJCAI*. pp. 1919–1925. ijcai.org (2020)
10. Walega, P.A., Kaminski, M., Grau, B.C.: Reasoning over streaming data in metric temporal datalog. In: *AAAI*. pp. 3092–3099. AAAI Press (2019)

A Proofs

In this section, we provide the proofs, where we have not provided the full version in the paper.

Theorem 1. Given a Datalog program Π in temporal normal form, where all rules are harmless, the program terminates and produces a finite model.

Proof. We have to show that a Datalog program Π in temporal normal form, where all rules are harmless, terminates. We show by case distinction that each case only produces a finite number of intervals and hence the program terminates and produces a finite model. In case the rule contains an EDB, then the produced intervals are bounded by the database and there is a maximum, finite number of intervals that can be derived. In case the rule contains a harmless node, then by the construction of the operators only a finite number of intervals can be generated, as the harmless input node only contains a finite number of intervals. In case there is a cyclic SCC, then there is only one case, which produces non-termination if new intervals are produced. That is, when there is a cycle in the SCC with a special edge, where some node’s input in the cycle is not limited by some harmless atom, i.e., an atom that has only a finite number of intervals. Note that in (iii) we do not generate new intervals, as we restrict the input of the cycle to contain only a finite number of intervals and in (i) and (ii), we exactly force the condition of limiting each node’s input by a harmless atom. This is

also enforced for since and until, as we restrict the intervals for not containing ∞ , forcing that additional since operations in the cycle do not overcome the “harmless” restriction (i.e, act as a diamond operator, when having one body atom restricted to a harmless atom). This concludes the proof that a program containing only harmless rules always terminates and produces a finite model. \square

Theorem 2. Let D be a dataset and Π be a temporal linear DatalogMTL program that only uses temporal operators \diamond_{t_1, t_2} with $t_1 \neq t_2$. Let F be the (infinite) set of temporal facts that Π and D entail. There exists a time point $T \in \mathbb{Q}$ s.t. for every $t > T$, F entails $\alpha@t$ iff F entails $\alpha@T$.

Proof. We start the proof by showing the base case, where the program Π consists of only a single rule of the form $\diamond_{(t_1, t_2)} P \rightarrow P$. Then we group the rules into categories to show that this is also true for the other rules.

Let us start with the base case by case distinction. If there are no facts in the dataset, the case is trivial by setting $T = 0$, where there is no $\alpha@0 \in F$. Hence, we have an empty set.

Let us now consider a rule with a single fact $P@t$ and let us show by induction the valid intervals of the fact. In the base case of the induction, we retrieve that $P@[t + t_1, t + t_2)$ or, since $t_1 < t_2$, we can write t_2 as $t_1 + l$, where $l = t_2 - t_1$. In this case $\}$ is close, iff t_2 is close. W.l.o.g. we assume that $\}$ is open (i.e., the smaller interval). We now assume that after n recursive application of the rule, we retrieve $P@[t + t_1 * n, t + (t_1 + l) * n)$. We now show the step that also $P@[t + t_1 * (n + 1), t + (t_1 + l) * (n + 1))$ is retrieved, which is trivially given by applying \diamond , i.e., $P@[t + t_1 * n + t_1, t + (t_1 + l) * n + (t_1 + l))$. Since $l > 0$, after N repetitions, we have the case that $t + (t_1 + l) * n > t + t_1 * (n + 1)$, i.e., $l * n > t_1$. By induction, we know that this is true for all $n \geq N$. Hence, we can retrieve the interval $[t + t_1 * N, \infty)$. Actually, we can calculate the point N by $\lfloor t_1 / (t_2 - t_1) + 1 \rfloor$, or more generally, when we already consider a fact $\alpha@\sigma$ by $\lfloor (t_1 - (\sigma^+ - \sigma^-)) / (t_2 - t_1) + 1 \rfloor$, where the numerator is the distance between the first two intervals and the denominator is the growth of the interval per application of the rule.

Let us now consider a dataset with multiple facts. Since this holds for a single fact (as shown above) this also holds for multiple facts (as it only adds additional intervals to the reasoning, may leading to an earlier reach of the desired state). This ends the first part, where we show that this holds for a single rule.

Let us now generalize this case and consider the other rules as well. By Section 3 we know that we only have to consider rules that are part of the cycle, and we can assume that there are three types we have to consider: (i) an additional rule of type (6) with its constraint of $t_2 > t_1$, (ii) a harmful rule of type (1), and (iii) different rules that produce the same head. Let us proof this by induction and case distinction. For this we assume, we have a cycle of size n and we add an additional rule to the cycle. The base case trivially holds, as discussed by studying the single rule. Let us now focus on the induction step and let us show, that after adding an additional rule there exists still a point $T \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$

so that $\alpha@t \in F$, where $t \geq T$. In case we add rule (i) to the cycle, this changes the shifting of the interval in the cycle and a new point $\alpha@t \in F$ can be derived where the interval is true (the cycle now has a bigger jump into the future). The sum of the new total shift can be calculated by combining the existing temporal operators with the new temporal operator, i.e., $\diamond_{\langle t_1, t_2 \rangle} \diamond_{\langle t_3, t_4 \rangle} = \diamond_{\langle t_1+t_3, t_2+t_4 \rangle}$. Let us now consider case (ii). With out loss of generality, we assume that the horn rule only has two body atoms A_1 and A_2 . By definition, exactly one body atom has to be part of the cycle (or in general of the SCC) due to the linearity constraint. With out loss of generality, assume this atom is A_1 . Then A_2 is derived by a previous dangerous cycle be definition. Then there is a point $T_1, T_1 < T$ where either A_2 cannot be derived anymore, i.e., leading to the fact that B is not derived and the complete cycle terminates at point $T_2, T_2 < T$ so that this complete temporal cycle does not create a fact $\alpha@T$, or A_2 is true for $[T_1, \infty)$, which means that B inherit the interval of A_1 for all $t' > T_1$. Let us now focus on type (iii). Such a case allows to connect multiple cycles to a single SCC. Note that intersections are only allowed within a single cycle as otherwise the temporal linearity constraint does not hold. Therefore, as this operation is just a union of facts, the same argument as for multiple facts in the database applies, namely that just additional facts are added to the cycle which may only reduce the time for reaching the state, hence trivially a new point $\alpha@t \in F$, where $t \geq T$ can be derived. \square

Proposition 3. Let D be a dataset and Π be a *union-free* DatalogMTL program that only uses temporal operators \boxplus_{t_1, t_2} with $t_1 \neq t_2$. Let F be the (infinite) set of temporal facts Π and D entail. There exists a time point $T \in \mathbb{Q}$ s.t. for every $t > T$, F entails $\alpha@t$ iff F entails $\alpha@T$.

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of \diamond . In the base cycle, only containing a single \boxplus rule, the rule only does not terminate in case the combination of the intervals of the fact and the operator, causes a \diamond -like operator behavior. In all other cases, we know by definition of the operator that it decreases the generated interval in comparison to the current interval by $l_b = t_2 - t_1$. This is, it terminates in case a fact has length l_i after at most $\lfloor l_i/l_b + 1 \rfloor$ iterations. Note, that when a fact contains multiple intervals, a bigger interval can be created by merging existing and generated intervals, causing a \diamond -like behavior. When we detect a \diamond -like behavior for an operator at timestamp T , then we derive the interval $[T, \infty)$. This is, because the \diamond -like operator is not allowed to shift the new interval over the end of the current interval, as otherwise a gap is created, and the created interval gets shortened as defined above.

We now study the options, when we add additional rules to the SCC by induction and assume that we already have a SCC of size n . We distinguish between two cases (as unions are not allowed), (i) an additional \boxplus operator is added, or (ii) an intersection with an IDB predicate. In case an additional \boxplus operator is added, an additional shortening of the interval for each cycle containing the new rule is applied, as the additional \boxplus rules forces by the constraint of $t_2 > t_1$, that $t_2 - t_1 > 0$, adding an additional shortening of size $t_2 - t_1$. Depending on the facts,

there are three scenarios: the interval is now shortened to a size that a cycle in the SCC does not behave like a \diamond , the interval is shortened, causing a different interval to overlap that now causes a \diamond -like cycle in the SCC, or the same interval overlaps causing no changes to the behavior of the cycles in the SCC. In all three cases there is a new point T' such that for every $t > T'$, F entails $\alpha@t$ iff F entails $\alpha@T'$. Note that by the following reasoning the first case causes an empty set for F , while in the other two cases nothing changes in the SCC. In case, there is an intersection, we have two options, either the IDB is part of a previous cycle of the SCC, then it follows (by similar reasoning of the \diamond proof) that the atom of the SCC is either filtered-out or acts like a pass-through, or both atoms are part of the cycle of the SCC. In such a case, we can reuse the property that in case, the SCC is not terminating, then there exists an interval that extends itself without causing a gap. This reasoning can be applied to the whole SCC. That is, there is a point T' such that for every $t > T'$, both inputs to the intersection are extending, causing the intersection to extend as well by the definition of the intersection. Hence there exists a time point $T \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ s.t. for every $t > T$, F entails $\alpha@t$ iff F entails $\alpha@T$. This is, as long as one fact in the SCC is not extending, the complete SCC is not extending and there exists a time point where no additional fact is produced. \square

Lemma 1. Let Π be a DatalogMTL^{FP} program. In case there exists for a node a repetition pattern, then such pattern is given by a duration $p = lcm(R)$, where R is a set, which contains for each edge in the dependency graph originated from rule (6) the value $t1$, of (4) the value $t2$, and for any other edge the value 0.

Proof. We show this lemma in two steps. First, we observe the behavior of each individual rule and then we construct a dependency graph with a labeling function assigning each edge and node the current length of the pattern.

First, observe that Rule (6), shifts always the fact $t1$ steps to the right, and Rule (4) $t2$ steps (in case the derived interval is valid) yielding a repetition pattern after each $t1$ (resp. $t2$ steps) in case the input to the rule is recursive. We further observe that Rule (1) intersects the patterns and multiple heads with the same predicate union the patterns. Both actions can be represented by a pattern length of the least common multiple, as this requires both patterns to repeat at the same timestamp (see Figure 2 for worst case examples). We therefore construct a dependency graph and assigning to each edge a labeling function as follows:

1. We assign label 0 to each edge in the DG originating from Rule 1.
2. We assign label $t1$ to each edge in the DG originating from Rule 6.
3. We assign label $t2$ to each edge in the DG originating from Rule 4.
4. We assign the lcm of all incoming edges with a label > 0 to each node in the graph. In case, there are no edges with > 0 we set the label to 0.
5. We update the edges with the lcm of the current value and the value of the outgoing node.
6. We repeat step 4 and 5 until no further changes occur.

We observe that all labels in a SCC have the same value in the end, namely the least common multiple of all labels. Hence the procedure terminates, and the determined repetition pattern is of length $p = lcm(R)$. \square

Lemma 2. Let Π be a DatalogMTL^{FP} program. It is sufficient to show for each strongly connected component individually in the dependency graph that there exists a repetition pattern.




Fig. 4. Simulation of a pattern input of a SCC inside a single SCC

Proof. We proof by induction. Let us assume that we have labeled the dependency graph according to steps (1)-(4) of Lemma 1 and have shown the repetition pattern for n strongly connected components (let's say c_k , $0 < k < n$) and we want to show that component c_n has also a repetition pattern, where c_n only depends on strongly connected components c_k . Then we have to distinguish between four cases (visualized in Figure 3):

1. The component has no incoming edges from a previous connected component. This can be reduced to the base case (a single connected component) and is not further discussed.
2. c_n is a single node, and it has one incoming edge with weight w from a strongly connected component c_k with a pattern length of l . This trivially has a repetition pattern. The pattern is calculated as $lcm(l, w)$, shifted by w time units and possible extended or reduced based on the temporal operator.
3. c_n is a single node, and it has two incoming edges with weights 0 (it is either a union or an intersection) and pattern lengths l_1 and l_2 from strongly connected component c_{k_1} and c_{k_2} . This trivially has a repetition pattern, again. The new repetition length is determined as $l = lcm(l_1, l_2)$ and the incoming patterns are either intersected or merged.

4. c_n is a component forming a cycle, i.e, each incoming edge is from a strongly connected component c_k with a pattern length of l_k . This edge only appears together with an intersection or an union as input to the node in the cycle. In general, the intersection can be interpreted as a “constant” filtering operation that removes certain timestamps and can be seen as an upper bound of the produced atoms. In contrast, in case of a union, the rule head at least contains the provided repetition pattern and can be seen as a lower bound of produced values of this node. As the input can be simulated by a single SCC, it is sufficient to show for a single strongly connected component that there exists a repetition pattern. See Figure 4 for the construction of such a single SCC, where T is the target node, i.e., the incoming node is from a strongly connected component C_k , E is the node, which database is empty, P is the node which database contains the values of the repetition pattern, I marks an intersection and U an union of the incoming edges. That is, the output of node E is always empty, hence the input of node P is always forced to be the repetition pattern, which is then also the input of node T .

This concludes the proof that each strongly connected component can be analyzed individually for the existence of repetition patterns. \square

Theorem 4. Let Σ be a DatalogMTL^{FP} program. Let D be a database. Then the following holds: For each predicate P in Σ , there exists a timepoint T and integer n , such that $P(\tau)@(T + n * x) \in \Sigma(D)$ iff $P(\tau)@T \in \Sigma(D)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{N}$ and all tuples τ .

Proof. We show this proof by induction on the the paths of a SCC. We start by a single cycle. Such a single can only contain linear rules (i.e., only one body predicate), which have no impact on the pattern as no interval is modified, diamond minus and box minus rules. We consider an arbitrary input to each node along the cycle. By definition of the temporal operators (given as $\diamond_{(t1,t2)}$, $\boxminus_{(t2,t1)}$, note that the order of $t2$ and $t1$ is swapped at box minus), we can define the total shift of the intervals by a single interval of the form $\langle \sum t1, \sum t2 \rangle$, for all $t1, t2$ in the cycle and define the pattern length as $P = \sum t1$, which stabilizes after some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, that is after all facts have synced up there intervals with the other nodes along the cycle by adjusting newly produced facts based on facts of the previous node. This is, either some box operator causes a filtering such that no additional interval is produced, else in case there is $t1 = t2$ there is a period shift of the pattern, or if $t2 > t1$, there is a point T , where we derive an interval $[T, \infty)$ for each fact in the cycle.

We now assume that we have a SCC with a pattern and we add one additional path that only contain linear, diamond minus and box minus rules (as other rules can be added by an additional path ending at a node in the path), which creates an intersection/or union at the end node of the added path (we call this node merge node, and the start node of the path the split node). There is exactly one split and one merge node in the path. Wlog. we can assume that the merge node only has one additional incoming edge, as in other cases we can create in

previous step of constructing the SCC an additional node by a linear rule, which simplifies the following description. We know that the split node causes the same outgoing pattern to both nodes, but the added path causes a different pattern length. We now show by case distinction that again a pattern can be produced: In case of union, the original SCC still produces at least the same values of the current pattern as only additional facts may be produced due to the union. We know that the cycle now gets a pattern length of the *lcm* of the merge node's incoming pattern lengths. The additional produced facts are propagated along the cycle, may causing additional facts to get valid. As the union produces always the same values (due to the consistent values of the split node), there is either a point, where every possible interval of the pattern is produced, or the split node does not receive additional intervals, causing also fixed produced intervals of the newly added path (resp. union operation). In case of an intersection in the merge node, a similar reasoning can be applied. Instead of adding additional facts, the intersection causes the removal of produced facts at the merge node. This propagates along the pattern causing possible additional intervals to be removed. Hence this may also has an influence on the split node, as less intervals may be received at the split node. This is, there is a point, where the split node either does not contain any interval, or does not change anymore, causing the same intervals to be intersected at the merge node. This concludes the proof of the existence of a repetition pattern of a SCC. \square

Theorem 5. Algorithm 2 is sound and complete.

Proof Sketch. The algorithm follows the Theorems of Section 4.2, as each SCC is encoded as a single reasoning task. The soundness and completeness of the chase procedure is given by the underlying chase procedure for a given interval and the encoding shown in Lemma 2. As this algorithm adds a pattern extraction and matching, which by Theorem 4 terminates and uses a pattern length given by Lemma 1, all patterns can be detected and the algorithm is sound and complete. \square