

Using Views to Implement Datalog Programs

Inverse Rules

Duschka's Algorithm

Inverting Rules

- ◆ Idea: “invert” the view definitions to give the global predicates definitions in terms of views and function symbols.
- ◆ Plug the globals’ definitions into the body of the query to get a direct expansion of the query into views.
- ◆ Even works when the query is a program.

Inverting Rules --- (2)

- ◆ But the query may have function symbols in its solution, and these symbols actually have no meaning.
- ◆ We therefore need to get rid of them.
- ◆ Trick comes from Huyn \rightarrow Qian \rightarrow Duschka.

Skolem Functions

- ◆ Logical trick for getting rid of existentially quantified variables.
- ◆ In terms of safe Datalog rules:
 - ◆ For each local (nondistinguished) variable X , pick a new function symbol f (the Skolem constant).
 - ◆ Replace X by $f(\text{head variables})$.

Example

$$v(X, Y) \quad :- \quad p(X, Z) \quad \& \quad p(Z, Y)$$

◆ Replace Z by $f(X, Y)$ to get:

$$v(X, Y) \quad :- \quad p(X, f(X, Y)) \quad \& \\ p(f(X, Y), Y)$$

◆ Intuition: for $v(X, Y)$ to be true, there must be some value, depending on X and Y , that makes the above body true.

HQD Rule Inversion

- ◆ Replace a Skolemized view definition by rules with:
 1. A subgoal as the head, and
 2. The view itself as the only subgoal of the body.

Example

$$v(X, Y) \quad :- \quad p(X, f(X, Y)) \quad \& \\ p(f(X, Y), Y)$$

becomes:

$$p(X, f(X, Y)) \quad :- \quad v(X, Y)$$

$$p(f(X, Y), Y) \quad :- \quad v(X, Y)$$

Running Example: Maternal Ancestors

◆ Global predicates:

- ◆ $m(X,Y)$ = "Y is the mother of X."
- ◆ $f(X,Y)$ = "Y is the father of X."

◆ manc rules:

r1: $\text{manc}(X, Y) \quad :- \quad m(X, Y)$

r2: $\text{manc}(X, Y) \quad :- \quad f(X, Z) \quad \& \quad \text{manc}(Z, Y)$

r3: $\text{manc}(X, Y) \quad :- \quad m(X, Z) \quad \& \quad \text{manc}(Z, Y)$

Example --- Continued

◆ The views:

$v1(X, Y) :- f(X, Z) \ \& \ m(Z, Y)$

$v2(X, Y) :- m(X, Y)$

◆ Inverse rules:

$r4: f(X, g(X, Y)) :- v1(X, Y)$

$r5: m(g(X, Y), Y) :- v1(X, Y)$

$r6: m(X, Y) :- v2(X, Y)$

Evaluating the Rules

- ◆ Treat views as EDB.
- ◆ Apply semi-naïve evaluation to query (Datalog program).
- ◆ In general, function symbols -> no convergence.

Evaluating the Rules

- ◆ But here, all function symbols are in the heads of global predicates.
- ◆ These are like EDB as far as the query is concerned, so no nested function symbols occur.
- ◆ One level of function symbols assures convergence.

Example

r1: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- \text{m}(X, Y)$

r2: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- \text{f}(X, Z) \ \& \ \text{manc}(Z, Y)$

r3: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- \text{m}(X, Z) \ \& \ \text{manc}(Z, Y)$

r4: $\text{f}(X, \text{g}(X, Y)) :- \text{v1}(X, Y)$

r5: $\text{m}(\text{g}(X, Y), Y) :- \text{v1}(X, Y)$

r6: $\text{m}(X, Y) :- \text{v2}(X, Y)$

◆ Assume $\text{v1}(a, b)$.

Example --- (2)

r1: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- \text{m}(X, Y)$

r2: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- \text{f}(X, Z) \ \& \ \text{manc}(Z, Y)$

r3: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- \text{m}(X, Z) \ \& \ \text{manc}(Z, Y)$

r4: $\text{f}(a, g(a, b)) :- \text{v1}(a, b)$

r5: $\text{m}(g(a, b), b) :- \text{v1}(a, b)$

r6: $\text{m}(X, Y) :- \text{v2}(X, Y)$

◆ Assume $\text{v1}(a, b)$.

Example --- (3)

r1: $\text{manc}(g(a, b), b) :- \text{m}(g(a, b), b)$

r2: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- f(X, Z) \ \& \ \text{manc}(Z, Y)$

r3: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- \text{m}(X, Z) \ \& \ \text{manc}(Z, Y)$

r4: $f(a, g(a, b)) :- v1(a, b)$

r5: $\text{m}(g(X, Y), Y) :- v1(X, Y)$

r6: $\text{m}(X, Y) :- v2(X, Y)$

◆ Assume $v1(a, b)$.

Example --- (4)

r1: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- \text{m}(X, Y)$

r2: $\text{manc}(a, b) :- \text{f}(a, \text{g}(a, b)) \ \& \ \text{manc}(\text{g}(a, b), b)$

r3: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- \text{m}(X, Z) \ \& \ \text{manc}(Z, Y)$

r4: $\text{f}(X, \text{g}(X, Y)) :- \text{v1}(X, Y)$

r5: $\text{m}(\text{g}(X, Y), Y) :- \text{v1}(X, Y)$

r6: $\text{m}(X, Y) :- \text{v2}(X, Y)$

◆ Assume $\text{v1}(a, b)$.

Example --- Concluded

- ◆ Notice that given $v1(a,b)$, we were able to infer $manc(a,b)$, even though we never found out what the value of $g(a,b)$ [the father of a] is.

Rule-Rewriting

- ◆ Duschka's approach moves the function symbols out of the seminaïve evaluation and into a rule-rewriting step.
- ◆ In effect, the function symbols combine with the predicates.
 - ◆ Possible only because there are never any nested function symbols.

Necessary Technique: Unification

- ◆ We unify two atoms by finding the simplest substitution for the variables that makes them identical.
- ◆ Linear-time algorithm known.

Example

- ◆ The unification of $p(f(X,Y), Z)$ and $p(A,g(B,C))$ is $p(f(X,Y),g(B,C))$.
- ◆ Uses $A \rightarrow f(X,Y)$; $Z \rightarrow g(B,C)$; identity mapping on other variables.
- ◆ $p(X,X)$ and $p(Y,f(Y))$ have no unification.
- ◆ Neither do $p(X)$ and $q(X)$.

Elimination of Function Symbols

- ◆ Repeat:
 1. Take any rule with function symbol(s) in the head.
 2. Unify that head with any subgoals, of any rule, with which it unifies.
 - ◆ But first make head variables be new, unique symbols.
- ◆ Finally, replace IDB predicates + function-symbol patterns by new predicates.

Example

r1: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- \text{m}(X, Y)$

r2: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- \text{f}(X, Z) \ \& \ \text{manc}(Z, Y)$

r3: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- \text{m}(X, Z) \ \& \ \text{manc}(Z, Y)$

r4: $\text{f}(X, \text{g}(X, Y)) :- \text{v1}(X, Y)$

r5: $\text{m}(\text{g}(X, Y), Y) :- \text{v1}(X, Y)$

r6: $\text{m}(X, Y) :- \text{v2}(X, Y)$

Unify



Example --- (2)

r2: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- f(X, Z) \ \& \ \text{manc}(Z, Y)$

r4: $f(A, g(B, C)) :-$

r7: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- f(X, g(B, C)) \ \& \ \text{manc}(g(B, C), Y)$

Important point: in the unification of X and A , any variable could be used, but it must appear in both these places.

Example --- (3)

r1: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- m(X, Y)$

r3: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- m(X, Z) \ \& \ \text{manc}(Z, Y)$

r5: $m(g(A, B), C) :-$

r8: $\text{manc}(g(A, B), Y) :- m(g(A, B), Y)$

r9: $\text{manc}(g(A, B), Y) :- m(g(A, B), Z) \ \& \ \text{manc}(Z, Y)$

Example --- (4)

- ◆ Now we have a new pattern:
 $\text{manc}(g(A, B), C)$.
- ◆ We must unify it with `manc` subgoals in `r2`, `r3`, `r7`, and `r9`.
- ◆ `r2` and `r7` yield nothing new, but `r3` and `r9` do.

Example --- (5)

r3: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- \text{m}(X, Z) \ \& \ \text{manc}(Z, Y)$

r9: $\text{manc}(g(A, B), Y) :- \text{m}(g(A, B), Z) \ \& \ \text{manc}(Z, Y)$

$\text{manc}(g(C, D), E)$

r10: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- \text{m}(X, g(A, B)) \ \& \ \text{manc}(g(A, B), Y)$

r11: $\text{manc}(g(A, B), Y) :-$
 $\text{m}(g(A, B), g(C, D))$
 $\ \& \ \text{manc}(g(C, D), Y)$

Cleaning Up the Rules

1. For each IDB predicate (m_{anc} in our example) introduce a new predicate for each function-symbol pattern.
2. Replace EDB predicates (m and f in our example) by their definition in terms of views, but only if no function symbols are introduced.

Justification for (2)

- ◆ A function symbol in a view is useless, since the source (stored) data has no tuples with function symbols.
- ◆ A function symbol in an IDB predicate has already been taken care of by expanding the rules using all function-symbol patterns we can construct.

New IDB Predicates

- ◆ In our example, we only need `manc1` to represent the pattern `manc(g(.,.),.)`.
- ◆ That is: $\text{manc1}(X, Y, Z) = \text{manc}(g(X, Y), Z)$.

Example --- r1

r1: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- \text{m}(X, Y)$

r5: $\text{m}(g(X, Y), Y) :- \text{v1}(X, Y)$

r6: $\text{m}(X, Y) :- \text{v2}(X, Y)$

Substitution OK; yields
 $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- \text{v2}(X, Y)$

Illegal --- yields g in head. Note the case $\text{manc}(g(.,.), .)$ is taken care of by r8.

Example --- r2 and r3

r2: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- f(X, Z) \ \& \ \text{manc}(Z, Y)$

r3: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- m(X, Z) \ \& \ \text{manc}(Z, Y)$

r4: $f(X, g(X, Y)) :- v1(X, Y)$

r5: $m(g(X, Y), Y) :- v1(X, Y)$

r6: $m(X, Y) :- v2(X, Y)$

Illegal --- put
function symbol
g in manc.

OK; yields

$\text{manc}(X, Y) :- v2(X, Z) \ \& \ \text{manc}(Z, Y)$

Example --- r4, r5, r6

- ◆ The inverse rules have played their role and do not appear in the final rules.

Example --- r7

r7: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- f(X, g(B, C)) \ \&$
 $\text{manc}(g(B, C), Y)$

r4: $f(X, g(X, Y)) :- v1(X, Y)$

Unify. Note no
function symbols are
introduced, but $X=B$.

Replace by
 $\text{manc1}(B, C, Y)$.

r7: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- v1(X, C) \ \&$
 $\text{manc1}(X, C, Y)$

Example --- r8 and r9

r8: $\text{manc}(g(A, B), Y) :- m(g(A, B), Y)$

r9: $\text{manc}(g(A, B), Y) :- m(g(A, B), Z) \ \& \ \text{manc}(Z, Y)$

r5: $m(g(X, Y), Y) :- v1(X, Y)$

Become

$\text{manc1}(A, B, Y)$

Unify; set

$B = Y.$

Unify; set

$B = Z.$

r8: $\text{manc1}(A, Y, Y) :- v1(A, Y)$

r9: $\text{manc1}(A, Z, Y) :- v1(A, Z) \ \& \ \text{manc}(Z, Y)$

Example --- r10 and r11

- ◆ No substitutions possible --- unifying m –subgoal with head of r5 or r6 introduces a function symbol into the view subgoal.

Summary of Rules

r1: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- \text{v2}(X, Y)$

r3: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- \text{v2}(X, Z) \ \& \ \text{manc}(Z, Y)$

r7: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- \text{v1}(X, C) \ \& \ \text{manc1}(X, C, Y)$

r8: $\text{manc1}(A, Y, Y) :- \text{v1}(A, Y)$

r9: $\text{manc1}(A, Z, Y) :- \text{v1}(A, Z) \ \& \ \text{manc}(Z, Y)$

Finishing Touch: Replace manc1

Substitute the bodies of r8 and r9 for the manc1 subgoal of r7.

r7: manc(X, Y) :- v1(X, C) &
manc1(X, C, Y)

r8: manc1(A, Y, Y) :- v1(A, Y)

r9: manc1(A, Z, Y) :- v1(A, Z) &
manc(Z, Y)

Becomes another
v1(X, C).

Becomes
v1(X, C) & manc(C, Y)

Final Rules

r1: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- \text{v2}(X, Y)$

r3: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- \text{v2}(X, Z) \ \&$
 $\text{manc}(Z, Y)$

r7-8: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- \text{v1}(X, Y)$

r7-9: $\text{manc}(X, Y) :- \text{v1}(X, C) \ \&$
 $\text{manc}(C, Y)$