

Computing Optimal Repairs for Functional Dependencies

Ester Livshits
Technion
Haifa 32000, Israel

Benny Kimelfeld
Technion
Haifa 32000, Israel

Sudeepa Roy
Duke University
Durham, NC 27708, USA

ABSTRACT

We investigate the complexity of computing an optimal repair of an inconsistent database, in the case where integrity constraints are Functional Dependencies (FDs). We focus on two types of repairs: an optimal subset repair (optimal S-repair) that is obtained by a minimum number of tuple deletions, and an optimal update repair (optimal U-repair) that is obtained by a minimum number of value (cell) updates. For computing an optimal S-repair, we present a polynomial-time algorithm that succeeds on certain sets of FDs and fails on others. We prove the following about the algorithm. When it succeeds, it can also incorporate weighted tuples and duplicate tuples. When it fails, the problem is NP-hard, and in fact, APX-complete (hence, cannot be approximated better than some constant). Thus, we establish a dichotomy in the complexity of computing an optimal S-repair. We present general analysis techniques for the complexity of computing an optimal U-repair, some based on the dichotomy for S-repairs. We also draw a connection to a past dichotomy in the complexity of finding a “most probable database” that satisfies a set of FDs with a single attribute on the left hand side; the case of general FDs was left open, and we show how our dichotomy provides the missing generalization and thereby settles the open problem.

1. INTRODUCTION

Database inconsistency arises in a variety of scenarios and for different reasons. For instance, data may be collected from imprecise sources (social encyclopedias/networks, sensors attached to appliances, cameras, etc.) via imprecise procedures (natural-language processing, signal processing, image analysis, etc.). Inconsistency may arise when integrating databases of different organizations with conflicting information, or even consistent information in conflicting formats. Arenas et al. [5] introduced a principled approach to managing inconsistency via the notions of *repairs* and *consistent query answering*. An *inconsistent database* is a database D that violates integrity constraints, a *repair* is a consistent database D' obtained from D by a minimal sequence of operations, and the *consistent answers* to a query are the answers given in every repair D' .

Instantiations of the repair framework differ in their definitions of *integrity constraints*, *operations*, and *minimality* [1]. Common types of constraints are denial constraints [18] that include the classic functional de-

pendencies (FDs), and inclusion dependencies [11] that include the referential (foreign-key) constraints. An operation can be a *deletion* of a tuple, an *insertion* of a tuple, and an *update* of an attribute (cell) value. Minimality can be either *local*—no strict subset of the operations achieves consistency, or *global*—no smaller (or cheaper) subset achieves consistency. For example, if only tuple deletions are allowed, then a *subset repair* [12] corresponds to a local minimum (restoring any deleted tuple causes inconsistency) and a *cardinality repair* [27] corresponds to a global minimum (consistency cannot be gained by fewer tuple deletions). The *cost* of operations may differ between tuples; this can represent different levels of trust that we have in the tuples [24, 27].

In this paper, we focus on global minima under FDs via tuple deletions and value updates. Each tuple is associated with a weight that determines the cost of its deletion or a change of a single value. We study the complexity of computing a minimum repair in two settings: (a) only tuple deletions are allowed, that is, we seek a (weighted) cardinality repair, and (b) only value updates are allowed, that is, we seek what Kolahi and Lakshmanan [24] refer to as an “optimum V-repair.” We refer to the two challenges as computing an optimal subset repair (optimal S-repair) and computing an optimal update repair (optimal U-repair).

The importance of computing an optimal repair arises in the challenge of *data cleaning* [17]—eliminate errors and dirt (manifested as inconsistencies) from the database. Specifically, our motivation is twofold. The obvious motivation is in fully automated cleaning, where an optimal repair is the best candidate, assuming the system is aware of only the constraints and tuple weights. The second motivation comes from the more realistic practice of iterative, human-in-the-loop cleaning [6, 9, 13, 19]. There, the cost of the optimal repair can serve as an educated estimate for the extent to which the database is dirty and, consequently, the amount of effort needed for completion of cleaning.

As our integrity constraints are FDs, it suffices to consider a database with a single relation, which we call here a *table*. In a general database, our results can be applied to each relation individually. A table T conforms to a relational schema $R(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ where each A_i is an attribute. Integrity is determined by a set Δ of FDs. Our complexity analysis focuses primarily on *data*

complexity, where $R(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ and Δ are considered fixed and only T is considered input. Hence, we have infinitely many optimization problems, one for each combination of $R(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ and Δ . Table records have identifiers, as we wish to be able to determine easily which cells are updated in a repair. Consequently, we allow duplicate tuples (with distinct identifiers).

We begin with the problem of computing an optimal S-repair. The problem is known to be computationally hard for denial constraints [27]. As we discuss later, complexity results can be inferred from prior work [20] for FDs with a single attribute on the left hand side (lhs for short). For general FDs, we present the algorithm `OptSRepair` (Algorithm 1). The algorithm seeks opportunities for simplifying the problem by eliminating attributes and FDs, until no FDs are left (and then the problem is trivial). For example, if all FDs share an attribute A on the left hand side, then we can partition the table according to A and solve the problem separately on each partition; but now, we can ignore A . We refer to this simplification as “common lhs.” Two additional simplifications are the “consensus” and “lhs marriage.” Importantly, the algorithm terminates in polynomial time, even under *combined* complexity.

However, `OptSRepair` may fail by reaching a nonempty set of FDs where no simplification can be applied. We prove two properties of the algorithm. The first is *soundness*—if the algorithm succeeds, then it returns an optimal S-repair. More interesting is the property of *completeness*—if the algorithm fails, then the problem is NP-hard. In fact, in this case the problem is APX-complete, that is, for some $\epsilon > 0$ it is NP-hard to find a consistent subset with a cost lower than $(1+\epsilon)$ times the minimum, but *some* $(1+\epsilon')$ is achievable in polynomial time. More so, the problem remains APX-complete if we assume that the table does not contain duplicates, and all tuples have a unit weight (in which case we say that T is *unweighted*). Consequently, we establish the following dichotomy in complexity for the space of combinations of schemas $R(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ and FD sets Δ .

- If we can eliminate all FDs in Δ with the three simplifications, then an optimal S-repair can be computed in polynomial time using `OptSRepair`.
- Otherwise, the problem is APX-complete, even for unweighted tables without duplicates.

We then continue to the problem of computing an optimal U-repair. Here we do not establish a full dichotomy, but we make a substantial progress. We have found that proving hardness results for updates is far more subtle than for deletions. We identify conditions where the complexity of computing an optimal U-repair and that of computing an optimal S-repair coincide. One such condition is the common lhs (i.e., all FDs share a left-hand-side attribute). Hence, in this case, our dichotomy provides the precise test of tractability. We also show decomposition techniques that extend the opportunities of using the dichotomy. As an example, consider `PURCHASE`(product, price, buyer, email, address) and $\Delta_0 = \{\text{product} \rightarrow \text{price}, \text{buyer} \rightarrow \text{email}\}$. We can de-

compose this problem into $\Delta_1 = \{\text{product} \rightarrow \text{price}\}$ and $\Delta_2 = \{\text{buyer} \rightarrow \text{email}\}$, and consider each Δ_i , for $i = 1, 2$, independently. The complexity of each Δ_i is the same in both variants of optimal repairs, and so, polynomial time. Yet, these results do not cover all sets of FDs. For example, let $\Delta_3 = \{\text{email} \rightarrow \text{buyer}, \text{buyer} \rightarrow \text{address}\}$. Kolahi and Lakshmanan [24] proved that under Δ_3 , computing an optimal U-repair is NP-hard. Our dichotomy shows that it is also NP-hard (and also APX-complete) to compute an S-repair under Δ_3 . Yet, this FD set does not fall in our coincidence cases.

The above defined Δ_0 is an example where an optimal U-repair can be computed in polynomial time, but computing an optimal S-repair is APX-complete. We also show an example in the reverse direction, namely $\Delta_4 = \{\text{buyer} \rightarrow \text{email}, \text{email} \rightarrow \text{buyer}, \text{buyer} \rightarrow \text{address}\}$. This FD set falls in the positive side of our dichotomy for optimal S-repairs, but computing an optimal U-repair is APX-complete. The proof of APX-hardness is inspired by, but considerably more involved than, the hardness proof of Kolahi and Lakshmanan [24] for Δ_3 .

Finally, we consider approximate repairing. For the case of an optimal S-repair, the problem easily reduces to that of *weighted vertex cover*, and hence, we get a polynomial-time 2-approximation due to Bar-Yehuda and Even [7]. To approximate optimal U-repairs, we show an efficient reduction to S-repairs, where the loss in approximation is linear in the number of attributes. Hence, we obtain a constant-ratio approximation, where the constant has a linear dependence on the number of attributes. Kolahi and Lakshmanan [24] also gave an approximation for optimal U-repairs, but their worst-case approximation can be quadratic in the number of attributes. We show an infinite sequence of FD sets where this gap is actually realized. On the other hand, we also show an infinite sequence where our approximation is linear in the number of attributes, but theirs remains constant. Hence, in general, the two approximations are incomparable, and we can combine the two by running both approximations and taking the best.

Stepping outside the framework of repairs, a different approach to data cleaning is *probabilistic* [4, 20, 28]. The idea is to define a probability space over possible clean databases, where the probability of a database is determined by the extent to which it satisfies the integrity constraints. The goal is to find a *most probable database* that, in turn, serves as the clean outcome. As an instantiation, Gribkoff, Van den Broeck, and Suciu [20] identify probabilistic cleaning as the “Most Probable Database” problem (MPD): given a tuple-independent probabilistic database [14, 30] and a set of FDs, find the most probable database among those satisfying the FDs (or, put differently, condition the probability space on the FDs). They show a dichotomy for unary FDs (i.e., FDs with a single attribute on the left hand side). The case of general (not necessarily unary) FDs has been left open. It turns out that there are reductions from MPD to computing an optimal S-repair and vice versa. Consequently, we are able to generalize their dichotomy to all FDs, and hence, fully settle the open problem.

2. PRELIMINARIES

We first present some basic terminology and notation that we use throughout the paper.

2.1 Schemas and Tables

An instance of our data model is a single table where each tuple is associated with an *identifier* and a *weight* that states how costly it is to change or delete the tuple. Such a table corresponds to a *relation schema* that we denote by $R(A_1, \dots, A_k)$, where R is the *relation name* and A_1, \dots, A_k are distinct *attributes*. We say that $R(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ is *k-ary* since it has k attributes. When there is no risk of confusion, we may refer to $R(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ by simply R .

We use capital letters from the beginning of the English alphabet (e.g., A, B, C), possibly with subscripts and/or superscripts, to denote individual attributes, and capital letters from the end of the English alphabet (e.g., X, Y, Z), possibly with subscripts and/or superscripts, to denote sets of attributes. We follow the convention of writing sets of attributes without curly braces and without commas (e.g., ABC).

We assume a countably infinite domain Val of attribute values. By a *tuple* we mean a sequence of values in Val . A *table* T over $R(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ has a collection $\text{ids}(T)$ of (tuple) identifiers and it maps every identifier i to a tuple in Val^k and a positive weight; we denote this tuple by $T[i]$ and this weight by $w_T(i)$. For $i \in \text{ids}(T)$ we refer to $T[i]$ as a *tuple of* T . We denote by $T[*]$ the set of all tuples of T . We say that T is:

- *duplicate free* if distinct tuples disagree on at least one attribute, that is, $T[i] \neq T[j]$ whenever $i \neq j$;
- *unweighted* if all tuple weights are equal, that is, $w_T(i) = w_T(j)$ for all identifiers i and j .

We use $|T|$ to denote the number of tuple identifiers of T , that is, $|T| \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\text{ids}(T)|$. Let $\mathbf{t} = (a_1, \dots, a_k)$ be a tuple of T . We use $\mathbf{t}.A_j$ to refer to the value a_j . If $X = A_{i_1}, \dots, A_{i_\ell}$ is a sequence of attributes in $\{A_1, \dots, A_k\}$, then $\mathbf{t}[X]$ denotes the tuple $(\mathbf{t}.A_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{t}.A_{i_\ell})$.

EXAMPLE 2.1. Our running example is around the tables of Figure 1. The figure shows tables over the schema $\text{OFFICE}(\text{facility}, \text{room}, \text{floor}, \text{city})$, describing the location of offices in an organization. For example, the tuple $T[1]$ corresponds to an office in room 322, in the third floor of the headquarters (HQ) building, located in Paris. The meaning of the yellow background color will be clarified later. The identifier of each tuple is shown on the leftmost (gray shaded) column, and its weight on the rightmost column (also gray shaded). Note that table S_2 is duplicate free and unweighted, table S_1 is duplicate free but not unweighted, and table U_2 is neither duplicate free nor unweighted. \square

2.2 Functional Dependencies (FDs)

Let $R(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ be a schema. As usual, an FD (over R) is an expression of the form $X \rightarrow Y$ where X and Y are sequences of attributes of R . We refer to

<i>id</i>	facility	room	floor	city	<i>w</i>
1	HQ	322	3	Paris	2
2	HQ	322	30	Madrid	1
3	HQ	122	1	Madrid	1
4	Lab1	B35	3	London	2

(a) Table T

<i>id</i>	facility	room	floor	city	<i>w</i>
2	HQ	322	30	Madrid	1
3	HQ	122	1	Madrid	1
4	Lab1	B35	3	London	2

(b) Consistent subset S_1

<i>id</i>	facility	room	floor	city	<i>w</i>
1	HQ	322	3	Paris	2
4	Lab1	B35	3	London	2

(c) Consistent subset S_2

<i>id</i>	facility	room	floor	city	<i>w</i>
3	HQ	122	1	Madrid	1
4	Lab1	B35	3	London	2

(d) Consistent subset S_3

<i>id</i>	facility	room	floor	city	<i>w</i>
1	F01	322	3	Paris	2
2	HQ	322	30	Madrid	1
3	HQ	122	1	Madrid	1
4	Lab1	B35	3	London	2

(e) Consistent update U_1

<i>id</i>	facility	room	floor	city	<i>w</i>
1	HQ	322	3	Paris	2
2	HQ	322	3	Paris	1
3	HQ	122	1	Paris	1
4	Lab1	B35	3	London	2

(f) Consistent update U_2

<i>id</i>	facility	room	floor	city	<i>w</i>
1	HQ	322	30	Madrid	2
2	HQ	322	30	Madrid	1
3	HQ	122	1	Madrid	1
4	Lab1	B35	3	London	2

(g) Consistent update U_3

Figure 1: For $\text{OFFICE}(\text{facility}, \text{room}, \text{floor}, \text{city})$ and FDs $\text{facility} \rightarrow \text{city}$ and $\text{facility room} \rightarrow \text{floor}$, a table T , consistent subsets S_1, S_2 and S_3 , and consistent updates U_1, U_2 and U_3 . Changed values are marked in yellow.

X as the *left-hand side*, or *lhs* for short, and to Y as the *right-hand side*, of *rhs* for short. A table T satisfies $X \rightarrow Y$ if every two tuples that agree on X also agree on Y ; that is, for all $\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s} \in T[*]$, if $\mathbf{t}[X] = \mathbf{s}[X]$ then $\mathbf{t}[Y] = \mathbf{s}[Y]$. We say that T satisfies a set Δ of FDs if T satisfies each FD in Δ ; otherwise, T violates Δ .

An FD $X \rightarrow Y$ is *entailed by* Δ , denoted $\Delta \models X \rightarrow Y$, if every table T that satisfies Δ also satisfies the FD

$X \rightarrow Y$. The *closure* of Δ , denoted $cl(\Delta)$, is the set of all FDs over R that are entailed by Δ . The *closure* of an attribute set X (w.r.t. Δ), denoted $cl_\Delta(X)$, is the set of all attributes A such that the FD $X \rightarrow A$ is entailed by Δ . Two sets Δ_1 and Δ_2 of FDs are *equivalent* if they have the same closure (or in other words, each FD in Δ_1 is entailed by Δ_2 and vice versa, or put differently, every table that satisfies one also satisfies the other). An FD $X \rightarrow Y$ is *trivial* if $Y \subseteq X$; otherwise, it is *nontrivial*. Note that a trivial FD belongs to the closure of every set of FDs (including the empty one). We say that Δ is *trivial* if Δ does not contain any nontrivial FDs (e.g., it is empty); otherwise, Δ is *nontrivial*.

Next, we give some non-standard notation that we need for this paper. A *common lhs* of an FD set Δ is an attribute A such that $A \in X$ for all FDs $X \rightarrow Y$ in Δ . An FD set Δ is a *chain* if for every two FDs $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1$ and $X_2 \rightarrow Y_2$ it is the case that $X_1 \subseteq X_2$ or $X_2 \subseteq X_1$. Livshits and Kimelfeld [26] proved that the class of chain FD sets consists of precisely the FD sets in which the *subset repairs*, which we define in Section 2.3, can be counted in polynomial time (assuming $P \neq \#P$). The chain FD sets will arise in this work as well.

EXAMPLE 2.2. In our running example (Figure 1) the set Δ consists of the following FDs:

- $\text{facility} \rightarrow \text{city}$: a facility belongs to a single city.
- $\text{facility room} \rightarrow \text{floor}$: a room in a facility does not go beyond one floor.

Note that the FDs allow for the same room number to occur in different facilities (possibly on different floors, in different cities). The attribute *facility* is a common lhs. Moreover, Δ is a chain FD set, since $\{\text{facility}\} \subseteq \{\text{facility, room}\}$. Table T (Figure 1(a)) violates Δ , and the other tables (Figures 1(b)–1(g)) satisfy Δ . \square

An FD $X \rightarrow Y$ might be such that X is empty, and then we denote it by $\emptyset \rightarrow Y$ and call it a *consensus* FD. Satisfying the consensus FD $\emptyset \rightarrow Y$ means that all tuples agree on Y , or in other words, the column that corresponds to each attribute in Y consists of copies of the same value. For example, $\emptyset \rightarrow \text{city}$ means that all tuples have the same city. A *consensus attribute* (of Δ) is an attribute in $cl_\Delta(\emptyset)$, that is, an attribute A such that $\emptyset \rightarrow A$ is implied by Δ . We say that Δ is *consensus free* if it has no consensus attributes.

2.3 Repairs

Let $R(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ be a schema, and let T be a table. A *subset* of T is a table S that is obtained from T by eliminating tuples. More formally, table S is a subset of T if $ids(S) \subseteq ids(T)$ and for all $i \in ids(S)$ we have $S[i] = T[i]$ and $w_S(i) = w_T(i)$. If S is a subset of T , then the *distance* from S to T , denoted $dist_{\text{sub}}(S, T)$, is the weighted sum of the tuples missing from S ; that is,

$$dist_{\text{sub}}(S, T) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i \in ids(T) \setminus ids(S)} w_T(i).$$

A *value update* of T (or just *update* of T for short) is a table U that is obtained from T by changing attribute values. More formally, a table U is an update of T if $ids(U) = ids(T)$ and for all $i \in ids(U)$ we have $w_U(i) = w_T(i)$. We adopt the definition of Kohahi and Lakshmanan [24] for the distance from U to T . Specifically, if \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{t} are tuples of tables over R , then the *Hamming distance* $H(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{t})$ is the number of attributes in which \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{t} disagree, that is, $H(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{t}) = |\{j \mid \mathbf{u}.A_j \neq \mathbf{t}.A_j\}|$. If U is an update of T then the *distance* from U to T , denoted $dist_{\text{sub}}(U, T)$, is the weighted Hamming distance between U and T (where every changed value counts as the weight of the tuple); that is,

$$dist_{\text{upd}}(U, T) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i \in ids(T)} w_T(i) \cdot H(T[i], U[i]).$$

Let $R(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ be a schema, let T be table, and let Δ be a set of FDs. A *consistent subset* (of T w.r.t. Δ) is a subset S of T such that $S \models \Delta$, and a *consistent update* (of T w.r.t. Δ) is an update U of T such that $U \models \Delta$. A *subset repair*, or just *S-repair* for short, is a consistent subset that is not strictly contained in any other consistent subset. An *update repair*, or just *U-repair* for short, is a consistent update that becomes inconsistent if any set of updated values is restored to the original values in T . An *optimal subset repair* of T , or just *optimal S-repair* for short, is a consistent subset S of T such that $dist_{\text{sub}}(S, T)$ is minimal among all consistent subsets of T . Similarly, an *optimal update repair* of T , or just *optimal U-repair* for short, is a consistent update U of T such that $dist_{\text{upd}}(U, T)$ is minimal among all consistent updates of T . When there is risk of ambiguity, we may stress that the optimal S-repair (or U-repair) is *of* T and *under* Δ or *under* R and Δ .

Every (S- or U-) optimal repair is a repair, but not necessarily vice versa. Clearly, a consistent subset (respectively, update) can be transformed into a (not necessarily optimal) S-repair (respectively, U-repair), with no increase of distance, in polynomial time. In fact, we do not really need the concept of a repair per se, and the definition is given mainly for compatibility with the literature (e.g., [1]). Therefore, unless explicitly stated otherwise, we do not distinguish between an S-repair and a consistent subset, and between a U-repair and a consistent update.

We also define *approximations* of optimal repairs in the obvious ways, as follows. For a number $\alpha \geq 1$, an α -optimal S-repair is an S-repair S of T such that $dist_{\text{sub}}(S, T) \leq \alpha dist_{\text{sub}}(S', T)$ for all S-repairs S' of T , and an α -optimal U-repair is a U-repair U of T such that $dist_{\text{upd}}(U, T) \leq \alpha dist_{\text{upd}}(U', T)$ for all U-repairs U' of T . In particular, an optimal S-repair (resp., optimal U-repair) is the same as a 1-optimal S-repair (resp., 1-optimal U-repair).

EXAMPLE 2.3. In our running example (Figure 1), tables S_1, S_2 and S_3 are consistent subsets, and U_1, U_2 and U_3 are consistent updates. For clarity, we marked with yellow shading the values that were changed for constructing each U_i . We have $dist_{\text{sub}}(S_1, T) = 2$ since

the missing tuple (tuple 1) has the weight 2. We also have $dist_{\text{sub}}(S_2, T) = 2$ and $dist_{\text{sub}}(S_3, T) = 3$. The reader can verify that S_1 and S_2 are optimal S-repairs. However, S_3 is not an optimal S-repair since its distance to T is greater than the minimum. Nevertheless, S_3 is an 1.5-optimal S-repair (since $3/2 = 1.5$). Similarly, we have $dist_{\text{upd}}(U_1, T) = 2$, $dist_{\text{upd}}(U_2, T) = 3$, and $dist_{\text{upd}}(U_3, T) = 4$ (since U_3 is obtained by changing two values from a tuple of weight 2). \square

It should be noted that the values of an update U of a table T are not necessarily taken from the *active domain* (i.e., values that occur in T). An example is the value F01 of table U_1 in Figure 1(e). This has implications on the complexity of computing optimal U-repairs. We discuss a restriction on the allowed update values in Section 5.

2.4 Complexity

We adopt the conventional measure of *data complexity*, where the schema $R(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ and dependency set Δ are assumed to be *fixed*, and only the table T is considered *input*. In particular, a “polynomial” running time may have an exponential dependency on k , as in $O(|T|^k)$. Hence, each combination of $R(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ and Δ defines a distinct problem of finding an optimal repair (of the relevant type), and different combinations may feature different computational complexities.

For the complexity of approximation, we use the following terminology. In an optimization problem P , each input x has a space of solutions y , each associated with a cost $\text{cost}(x, y)$. Given x , the goal is to compute a solution y with a minimum cost. For $\alpha \geq 1$, an α -*approximation* for P is an algorithm that, for input x , produces an α -*optimal* solution y , which means that $\text{cost}(x, y) \leq \alpha \cdot \text{cost}(x, y')$ for all solutions y' . The complexity class *APX* consists of all optimization problems that have a polynomial-time constant-factor approximation. A polynomial-time reduction f from an optimization problem Q to an optimization problem P is a *strict reduction* if for all $\alpha \geq 1$, any α -optimal solution for $f(x)$ can be transformed in polynomial time into an α -optimal solution for x [25]; it is a *PTAS* (Polynomial-Time Approximation Scheme) reduction if for all $\alpha > 1$ there exists $\beta_\alpha > 1$ such that any β_α -optimal solution for $f(x)$ can be transformed in polynomial time into an α -optimal solution for x . A strict reduction is also a PTAS reduction, but not necessarily vice versa. A problem P is *APX-hard* if there is a PTAS reduction to P from every problem in APX; it is *APX-complete* if, in addition, it is in APX. If P is APX-hard, then there is a constant $\alpha_P > 1$ such that P cannot be approximated better than α_P , or else $P = \text{NP}$.

3. COMPUTING AN OPTIMAL S-REPAIR

In this section, we study the problem of computing an optimal S-repair. We begin with some conventions.

Assumptions and Notation. Throughout this section we assume that every FD has a single attribute on its right-

hand side, that is, it has the form $X \rightarrow A$. Clearly, this is not a limiting assumption, since replacing $X \rightarrow YZ$ with $X \rightarrow Y$ and $X \rightarrow Z$ preserves equivalence.

Let Δ be a set of FDs. If X is a set of attributes, then we denote by $\Delta - X$ the set Δ' of FDs that is obtained from Δ by removing each attribute of X from every lhs and rhs of every FD in Δ . Hence, no attribute in X occurs in $\Delta - X$. If A is an attribute, then we may write $\Delta - A$ instead of $\Delta - \{A\}$.

An *lhs marriage* of an FD set Δ is a pair (X_1, X_2) of distinct lhs of FDs in Δ with the following properties.

- $cl_\Delta(X_1) = cl_\Delta(X_2)$
- The lhs of every FD in Δ contains either X_1 or X_2 (or both).

EXAMPLE 3.1. A simple example of an FD set with an lhs marriage is the following FD set.

$$\Delta_{A \leftrightarrow B \rightarrow C} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow A, B \rightarrow C\} \quad (1)$$

As another example, consider the following FD set.

$$\Delta_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\text{ssn} \rightarrow \text{first}, \text{ssn} \rightarrow \text{last}, \text{first last} \rightarrow \text{ssn}, \text{ssn} \rightarrow \text{address}, \text{ssn office} \rightarrow \text{phone}, \text{ssn office} \rightarrow \text{fax}\}$$

In Δ_1 the pair $(\{\text{ssn}\}, \{\text{first}, \text{last}\})$ is an lhs marriage. \square

Finally, if S is a subset of a table T , then we denote by $w_T(S)$ the sum of weights of the tuples of S , that is,

$$w_T(S) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i \in \text{ids}(S)} w_T(i)$$

3.1 Algorithm

We now describe an algorithm for finding an optimal S-repair. The algorithm terminates in polynomial time, even under combined complexity, yet it may *fail*. If it succeeds, then the result is guaranteed to be an optimal S-repair. We later discuss the situations in which the algorithm fails. The algorithm, **OptSRepair**, is shown as Algorithm 1. The input is a set Δ of FDs and a table T , both over the same relation schema (that we do not need to refer to explicitly). In the remainder of this section, we fix Δ and T , and describe the execution of **OptSRepair** on Δ and T .

The algorithm handles four cases. The first is where Δ is trivial. Then, T is itself an optimal S-repair. The second case is where Δ has a common lhs A . Then, the algorithm groups the tuples by A , finds an optimal S-repair for each group (via a recursive call to **OptSRepair**), this time by ignoring A (i.e., removing A from the FDs of Δ), and returning the union of the optimal S-repairs. The precise description is in the subroutine **CommonLHSRep** (Subroutine 1). The third case is where Δ has a consensus FD $\emptyset \rightarrow A$. Similarly to the second case, the algorithm groups the tuples by A and finds an optimal S-repair for each group. This time, however, the algorithm returns the optimal S-repair with the maximal weight. The precise description is in the subroutine **ConsensusRep** (Subroutine 2).

The fourth (last) case is the most involved. This is the case where Δ has an lhs marriage (X_1, X_2) . In this case

Algorithm 1 OptSRepair(Δ, T)

```
1: if  $\Delta$  is trivial then           ▷ successful termination
2:   return  $T$ 
3: remove trivial FDs from  $\Delta$ 
4: if  $\Delta$  has a common lhs then
5:   return CommonLHSRep( $\Delta, T$ )
6: if  $\Delta$  has a consensus FD then
7:   return ConsensusRep( $\Delta, T$ )
8: if  $\Delta$  has an lhs marriage then
9:   return MarriageRep( $\Delta, T$ )
10: fail                               ▷ cannot find a minimum repair
```

Subroutine 1 CommonLHSRep(Δ, T)

```
1:  $A :=$  a common lhs of  $\Delta$ 
2: return  $\cup_{(a) \in \pi_A T[*]} \text{OptSRepair}(\sigma_{A=a} T, \Delta - A)$ 
```

Subroutine 2 ConsensusRep(Δ, T)

```
1: select a consensus FD  $\emptyset \rightarrow A$  in  $\Delta$ 
2: for all  $a \in \pi_A T[*]$  do
3:    $S_a := \text{OptSRepair}(\sigma_{A=a} T, \Delta - A)$ 
4:  $a_{\max} := \text{argmax}_{(a) \in \pi_A T[*]} w_T(S_a)$ 
5: return  $S_{a_{\max}}$ 
```

Subroutine 3 MarriageRep(Δ, T)

```
1: select an lhs marriage  $(X_1, X_2)$  of  $\Delta$ 
2: for all  $(\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2) \in \pi_{X_1 X_2} T[*]$  do
3:    $S_{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2} := \text{OptSRepair}(\sigma_{X_1=\mathbf{a}_1, X_2=\mathbf{a}_2} T, \Delta - X_1 X_2)$ 
4:    $w(\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2) := w_T(S_{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2})$ 
5:  $V_i := \pi_{X_i} T[*]$  for  $i = 1, 2$ 
6:  $E := \{(\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2) \mid (\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2) \in \pi_{X_1 X_2} T[*]\}$ 
7:  $G :=$  weighted bipartite graph  $(V_1, V_2, E, w)$ 
8:  $E_{\max} :=$  a maximum matching of  $G$ 
9: return  $\cup_{(\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2) \in E_{\max}} S_{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2}$ 
```

the problem is reduced to finding a maximum weighted matching of a bipartite graph. The graph, which we denote by $G = (V_1, V_2, E, w)$, consists of two disjoint node sets V_1 and V_2 , an edge set E that connects nodes from V_1 to nodes from V_2 , and a weight function w that assigns a weight $w(v_1, v_2)$ to each edge (v_1, v_2) . For $i = 1, 2$, the node set V_i is the set of tuples in the projection of T to X_i .¹ To determine the weight $w(v_1, v_2)$, we select from T the subset T_{v_1, v_2} that consists of the tuples that agree with v_1 and v_2 on X_1 and X_2 , respectively. We then find an optimal S-repair for T_{v_1, v_2} , after we remove from Δ every attribute in either X_1 or X_2 . Then, the weight $w(v_1, v_2)$ is the weight of this optimal S-repair. Next, we find a maximum matching E_{\max} of

¹In principle, it may be the case that the same tuple occurs in both V_1 and V_2 , since the tuple is in both projections. Nevertheless, we still treat the two occurrences of the tuple as distinct nodes, and so effectively assume that V_1 and V_2 are disjoint.

Algorithm 2 OSRSucceeds(Δ)

```
1: while  $\Delta$  is nontrivial do
2:   remove trivial FDs from  $\Delta$ 
3:   if  $\Delta$  has a common lhs  $A$  then
4:      $\Delta := \Delta - A$ 
5:   else if  $\Delta$  has a consensus FD  $\emptyset \rightarrow A$  then
6:      $\Delta := \Delta - X$ 
7:   else if  $\Delta$  has an lhs marriage  $(X_1, X_2)$  then
8:      $\Delta := \Delta - X_1 X_2$ 
9:   else
10:    return false
11: return true
```

G . Note that E_{\max} is a subset of E such that no node appears more than once. The returned result is then the disjoint union of the optimal S-repair of T_{v_1, v_2} over all (v_1, v_2) in E_{\max} . The precise description is in the subroutine MarriageRep (Subroutine 3).

The following theorem states the correctness and efficiency of OptSRepair.

THEOREM 3.2. *Let Δ and T be a set of FDs and a table, respectively, over a relation schema $R(A_1, \dots, A_k)$. If OptSRepair(Δ, T) succeeds, then it returns an optimal S-repair. Moreover, OptSRepair(Δ, T) terminates in polynomial time in k , $|\Delta|$, and $|T|$.*

What about the cases where OptSRepair(Δ, T) fails? We discuss it in the next section.

Approximation. An easy observation is that the computation of an optimal subset is easily reducible to the *weighted vertex-cover* problem—given a graph G where nodes are assigned nonnegative weights, find a vertex cover (i.e., a set C of nodes that intersects with all edges) with a minimal sum of weights. Indeed, given a table T , we construct the graph G that has $ids(T)$ as the set of nodes, and an edge between every i and j such that $T[i]$ and $T[j]$ contradict one or more FDs in Δ . Given a vertex cover C for G , we obtain a consistent subset S by deleting from T every tuple with an identifier in C . Clearly, this reduction is strict. As weighted vertex cover is 2-approximable in polynomial time [7], we conclude the same for optimal subset repairing.

PROPOSITION 3.3. *For all FD sets Δ , a 2-optimal S-repair can be computed in polynomial time.*

While Proposition 3.3 is straightforward, it is of practical importance as it limits the severity of the lower bounds we establish in the next section. Moreover, we will later show that the proposition has implications on the problem of approximating an optimal U-repair.

3.2 Dichotomy

The reader can observe that the success or failure of OptSRepair(Δ, T) depends only on Δ , and not on T . The algorithm OSRSucceeds(Δ), depicted as Algorithm 2, tests whether Δ is such that OptSRepair succeeds by simulating the cases and corresponding changes

to Δ . The next theorem shows that, under conventional complexity assumptions, `OptSRepair` covers *all* sets Δ such that an optimal S-repair can be found in polynomial time. Hence, we establish a dichotomy in the complexity of computing an optimal S-repair.

THEOREM 3.4. *Let Δ be a set of FDs.*

- If `OSRSucceeds`(Δ) returns true, then an optimal S-repair can be computed in polynomial time by executing `OptSRepair`(Δ, T) on the input T .
- If `OSRSucceeds`(Δ) returns false, then computing an optimal S-repair is APX-complete, and remains APX-complete on unweighted, duplicate-free tables.

Moreover, the execution of `OSRSucceeds`(Δ) terminates in polynomial time in $|\Delta|$.

Recall that a problem in APX has a constant factor approximation and, under the assumption that $P \neq NP$, an APX-hard problem cannot be approximated better than some constant factor (that may depend on the problem itself).

EXAMPLE 3.5. We now illustrate the application of Theorem 3.4 to several FD sets. Consider first the FD set Δ of our running example. The execution of `OSRSucceeds`(Δ) transforms Δ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} & \{\text{facility} \rightarrow \text{city}, \text{facility room} \rightarrow \text{floor}\} \\ (\text{common lhs}) \Rightarrow & \{\emptyset \rightarrow \text{city}, \text{room} \rightarrow \text{floor}\} \\ (\text{consensus}) \Rightarrow & \{\text{room} \rightarrow \text{floor}\} \\ (\text{common lhs}) \Rightarrow & \{\emptyset \rightarrow \text{floor}\} \\ (\text{consensus}) \Rightarrow & \{\} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, `OSRSucceeds`(Δ) is true, and hence, an optimal S-repair can be found in polynomial time.

Next, consider the FD set $\Delta_{A \leftrightarrow B \rightarrow C}$ from Example 3.1. `OSRSucceeds`($\Delta_{A \leftrightarrow B \rightarrow C}$) executes as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} & \{A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow A, B \rightarrow C\} \\ (\text{lhs marriage}) \Rightarrow & \{\emptyset \rightarrow C\} \\ (\text{consensus}) \Rightarrow & \{\} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, this is again an example of an FD set on the tractable side of the dichotomy.

As the last positive example we consider the FD set Δ_1 of Example 3.1.

$$\begin{aligned} & \{\text{ssn} \rightarrow \text{first}, \text{ssn} \rightarrow \text{last}, \text{first last} \rightarrow \text{ssn}, \text{ssn} \rightarrow \text{address}, \\ & \text{ssn office} \rightarrow \text{phone}, \text{ssn office} \rightarrow \text{fax}\} \\ (\text{lhs marriage}) \Rightarrow & \{\emptyset \rightarrow \text{address}, \text{office} \rightarrow \text{phone}, \text{office} \rightarrow \text{fax}\} \\ (\text{consensus}) \Rightarrow & \{\text{office} \rightarrow \text{phone}, \text{office} \rightarrow \text{fax}\} \\ (\text{common lhs}) \Rightarrow & \{\emptyset \rightarrow \text{phone}, \emptyset \rightarrow \text{fax}\} \\ (\text{consensus}) \Rightarrow & \{\} \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, for $\Delta = \{A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow C\}$, none of the conditions of `OSRSucceeds`(Δ) is true, and therefore, the algorithm returns false. It thus follows from Theorem 3.4 that computing an optimal S-repair is APX-complete (even if all tuple weights are the same and there are no duplicate tuples). The same applies to $\Delta = \{A \rightarrow B, C \rightarrow D\}$. \square

Table 1: FD sets over $R(A, B, C)$ used in the proof of hardness of Theorem 3.4.

Name	FDs
$\Delta_{A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C}$	$A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow C$
$\Delta_{A \rightarrow C \leftarrow B}$	$A \rightarrow C, B \rightarrow C$
$\Delta_{AB \rightarrow C \rightarrow B}$	$AB \rightarrow C, C \rightarrow B$
$\Delta_{AB \leftrightarrow AC \leftrightarrow BC}$	$AB \rightarrow C, AC \rightarrow B, BC \rightarrow A$

As another example, the following corollary of Theorem 3.4 generalizes the tractability of our running example to general chain FD sets.

COROLLARY 3.6. *If Δ is a chain FD set, then an optimal S-repair can be computed in polynomial time.*

PROOF. The reader can easily verify that when Δ is a chain FD set, `OSRSucceeds`(Δ) will reduce it to emptiness by repeatedly removing consensus attributes and common-lhs, as done in our running example. \square

3.3 Proof of Theorem 3.4

In this section we discuss the proof of Theorem 3.4. (The full proof is in the Appendix.) The positive side is a direct consequence of Theorem 3.2. For the negative side, membership in APX is due to Proposition 3.3. The proof of hardness is based on the concept of a *fact-wise reduction* [22], as previously done for proving dichotomies on sets of FDs [16, 22, 23, 26]. In our setup, a fact-wise reduction is defined as follows. Let R and R' be two relation schemas. A *tuple mapping* from R to R' is a function μ that maps tuples over R to tuples over R' . We extend μ to map tables T over R to tables over R' by defining $\mu(T)$ to be $\{\mu(t) \mid t \in T\}$. Let Δ and Δ' be sets of FDs over R and R' , respectively. A *fact-wise reduction* from (R, Δ) to (R', Δ') is a tuple mapping Π from R to R' with the following properties: (a) Π is injective, that is, for all tuples \mathbf{t}_1 and \mathbf{t}_2 over R , if $\Pi(\mathbf{t}_1) = \Pi(\mathbf{t}_2)$ then $\mathbf{t}_1 = \mathbf{t}_2$; (b) Π preserves consistency and inconsistency; that is, $\Pi(T)$ satisfies Δ' if and only if T satisfies Δ ; and (c) Π is computable in polynomial time. The following lemma is straightforward.

LEMMA 3.7. *Let R and R' be relation schemas and Δ and Δ' FD sets over R and R' , respectively. If there is a fact-wise reduction from (R, Δ) to (R', Δ') , then there is a strict reduction from the problem of computing an optimal S-repair under R and Δ to that of computing an optimal S-repair under R' and Δ' .*

In the remainder of this section, we describe the way we use Lemma 3.7. Our proof consists of four steps.

1. We first prove APX-hardness for each of the FD sets in Table 1 over $R(A, B, C)$. For $\Delta_{A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C}$ and $\Delta_{A \rightarrow C \leftarrow B}$ we adapt reductions by Gribkoff et al. [20] in a work that we discuss in Section 3.4. For $\Delta_{AB \rightarrow C \rightarrow B}$ we show a reduction from MAX-nonmixed-SAT [21]. Most intricate is the proof for $\Delta_{AB \leftrightarrow AC \leftrightarrow BC}$, where we devise a nontrivial adaptation of a reduction by Amini et al. [3] to triangle packing in graphs of bounded degree.

2. Next, we prove that whenever OSRSucceeds simplifies Δ into Δ' , there is a fact-wise reduction from (R, Δ') to (R, Δ) , where R is the underlying relation schema.
3. Then, we consider an FD set Δ that cannot be further simplified (that is, Δ does not have a common lhs, a consensus FD, or an lhs marriage). We show that Δ can be classified into one of five certain classes of FD sets (that we discuss next).
4. Finally, we prove that for each FD set Δ in one of the five classes there exists a fact-wise reduction from one of the four schemas of Table 1.

The most challenging part of the proof is identifying the classes of FD sets in Step 3 in such a way that we are able to build the fact-wise reductions in Step 4. We first identify that if an FD set Δ cannot be simplified, then there are at least two distinct local minima $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1$ and $X_2 \rightarrow Y_2$ in Δ . By a *local minimum* we mean an FD with a set-minimal lhs, that is, an FD $X \rightarrow Y$ such that no FD $Z \rightarrow W$ in Δ satisfies that Z is a strict subset of X . We pick any two local minima from Δ . Then, we divide the FD sets into five classes based on the relationships between $X_1, X_2, cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1$, which we denote by \widehat{X}_1 , and $cl_\Delta(X_2) \setminus X_2$, which we denote by \widehat{X}_2 . The classes are illustrated in Figure 2.

Each line in Figure 2 represents one of the sets X_1, X_2, \widehat{X}_1 or \widehat{X}_2 . If two lines do not overlap, it means that we assume that the corresponding two sets are disjoint. For example, the sets \widehat{X}_1 and \widehat{X}_2 in class (1) have an empty intersection. Overlapping lines represent sets that have a nonempty intersection, an example being the sets \widehat{X}_1 and \widehat{X}_2 in class (2). If two dashed lines overlap, it means that we do not assume anything about their intersection. As an example, the sets X_1 and X_2 can have an empty or a nonempty intersection in each one of the classes. Finally, if a line covers another line, it means that the set corresponding to the first line contains the set corresponding to the second line. For instance, the set \widehat{X}_2 in class (4) contains the set $X_1 \setminus X_2$, while in class (5) it holds that $(X_1 \setminus X_2) \not\subseteq \widehat{X}_2$. We remark that Figure 2 well covers the important cases that we need to analyze, but it misses a few cases. (As previously said, full details are in the Appendix.)

EXAMPLE 3.8. For each one of the five classes of FD sets from Figure 2 we will now give an example of an FD set that belongs to this class.

Class 1. $\Delta_1 = \{A \rightarrow B, C \rightarrow D\}$. In this case $X_1 = \{A\}$, $X_2 = \{C\}$, $\widehat{X}_1 = \{B\}$ and $\widehat{X}_2 = \{D\}$. Thus, $\widehat{X}_1 \cap X_2 = \emptyset$, $\widehat{X}_2 \cap X_1 = \emptyset$ and $\widehat{X}_1 \cap \widehat{X}_2 = \emptyset$ and indeed the only overlapping lines in (1) are the dashed lines corresponding to X_1 and X_2 .

Class 2. $\Delta_2 = \{A \rightarrow CD, B \rightarrow CE\}$. It holds that $X_1 = \{A\}$, $X_2 = \{B\}$, $\widehat{X}_1 = \{C, D\}$ and $\widehat{X}_2 = \{C, E\}$. Hence, $\widehat{X}_1 \cap X_2 = \emptyset$ and $\widehat{X}_2 \cap X_1 = \emptyset$, but $\widehat{X}_1 \cap \widehat{X}_2 \neq \emptyset$, and the difference from (1) is that the lines corresponding to \widehat{X}_1 and \widehat{X}_2 in (2) overlap.




Figure 2: Classes of FD sets that cannot be simplified.

Class 3. $\Delta_3 = \{A \rightarrow BC, B \rightarrow D\}$. Here, it holds that $X_1 = \{A\}$, $X_2 = \{B\}$, $\widehat{X}_1 = \{B, C, D\}$ and $\widehat{X}_2 = \{D\}$. Thus, $\widehat{X}_1 \cap X_2 \neq \emptyset$, but $\widehat{X}_2 \cap X_1 = \emptyset$. The difference from (2) is that now the lines corresponding to X_2 and \widehat{X}_1 overlap and we do not assume anything about the intersection between \widehat{X}_1 and \widehat{X}_2 .

Class 4. $\Delta_4 = \{AB \rightarrow C, AC \rightarrow B, BC \rightarrow A\}$. In this case we have three local minima. We pick two of them: $AB \rightarrow C$ and $AC \rightarrow B$. Now, $X_1 = \{AB\}$, $X_2 = \{AC\}$, $\widehat{X}_1 = \{C\}$ and $\widehat{X}_2 = \{B\}$. Thus, $\widehat{X}_1 \cap X_2 \neq \emptyset$ and $\widehat{X}_2 \cap X_1 \neq \emptyset$. The difference from (3) is that now the lines corresponding to X_1 and \widehat{X}_2 overlap. Moreover, the line corresponding to \widehat{X}_1 covers the entire line corresponding to $X_2 \setminus X_1$ and the line corresponding to \widehat{X}_2 covers the entire line corresponding to $X_1 \setminus X_2$. This means that we assume that $(X_1 \setminus X_2) \subseteq \widehat{X}_2$ and $(X_2 \setminus X_1) \subseteq \widehat{X}_1$.

Class 5. $\Delta_5 = \{AB \rightarrow C, C \rightarrow AD\}$. Here, $X_1 = \{A, B\}$, $X_2 = \{C\}$, $\widehat{X}_1 = \{C, D\}$ and $\widehat{X}_2 = \{A, D\}$, therefore $\widehat{X}_1 \cap X_2 \neq \emptyset$ and $\widehat{X}_2 \cap X_1 \neq \emptyset$. The difference from (4) is that now we assume that $(X_1 \setminus X_2) \not\subseteq \widehat{X}_2$. \square

3.4 Most Probable Database

In this section, we draw a connection to the *Most Probable Database problem* (MPD) [20]. A table in our setting can be viewed as a relation of a *tuple-independent database* [14] if each weight is in the interval $[0, 1]$. In that case, we view the weight as the probability of the corresponding tuple, and we call the table a *probabilistic table*. Such a table T represents a probability space over the subsets of T , where a subset is selected by considering each tuple $T[i]$ independently and *selecting* it with the probability $w_T(i)$, or equivalently, deleting it with the probability $1 - w_T(i)$. Hence, the probability of a subset S , denoted $\Pr_T(S)$, is given by:

$$\Pr_T(S) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(\prod_{i \in \text{ids}(S)} w_T(i) \right) \times \left(\prod_{i \in \text{ids}(T) \setminus \text{ids}(S)} (1 - w_T(i)) \right) \quad (2)$$

Given a constraint φ over the schema of T , MPD for φ is the problem of computing a subset S that satisfies φ , and has the maximal probability among all such subsets. Here, we consider the case where φ is a set Δ of

FDs. Hence MPD for Δ is the problem of computing

$$\operatorname{argmax}_{S \subseteq T, S = \Delta} \Pr_T(S).$$

Gribkoff, Van den Broeck, and Suciu [20] proved the following dichotomy for *unary* FDs, which are FDs of the form $A \rightarrow X$ having a single attribute on their lhs.

THEOREM 3.9. [20] *Let Δ be a set of unary FDs over a relational schema. MPD for Δ is either solvable in polynomial time or NP-hard.*

The question of whether such a dichotomy holds for *general* (not necessarily *unary*) FDs has been left open. The following corollary of Theorem 3.4 fully resolves this question.

THEOREM 3.10. *Let Δ be a set of FDs over a relational schema. If $\text{OSRSucceeds}(\Delta)$ is true, then MPD for Δ is solvable in polynomial time; otherwise, it is NP-hard.*

PROOF. We first show a reduction from MPD to the problem of computing an optimal S-repair. Let T be an input for MPD. By a *certain tuple* we refer to a tuple identifier $i \in \text{ids}(T)$ such that $w_T(i) = 1$. We assume that the set of certain tuples satisfies Δ collectively, since otherwise the probability of any consistent subset is zero (and we can select, e.g., the empty subset as a most likely solution). We can then replace each probability 1 with a probability that is smaller than, yet close enough to 1, so that every consistent subset that excludes a certain fact is less likely than any subset that includes all certain facts. In addition, as observed by Gribkoff et al. [20], tuples with probability at most 0.5 can be eliminated, since we can always remove them from any (consistent) subset without reducing the probability. Hence, we assume that $0.5 < w_T(i) < 1$ for all $i \in \text{ids}(T)$. From (2) we conclude the following.

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_T(S) &= \left(\prod_{i \in \text{ids}(S)} \frac{w_T(i)}{1 - w_T(i)} \right) \times \left(\prod_{i \in \text{ids}(T)} (1 - w_T(i)) \right) \\ &\propto \left(\prod_{i \in \text{ids}(S)} \frac{w_T(i)}{1 - w_T(i)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

The reason for the proportionality (\propto) is that all consistent subsets share the same right factor of the first product. Hence, we construct a table T' that is the same as T , except that $w_{T'}(i) = \log(w_T(i)/(1 - w_T(i)))$ for all $i \in \text{ids}(T')$, and then a most likely database of T is the same² as an optimal S-repair of T' .

For the “otherwise” part we show a reduction from the problem of computing an optimal S-repair of an *unweighted* table to MPD. The reduction is straightforward: given T , we set the weight $w_T(i)$ of each tuple to 0.9 (or any fixed number greater than 0.5). From (2) it follows that a consistent subset is most probable if and only if it has a maximal number of tuples. \square

²We do not need to make an assumption of infinite precision to work with logarithms, since the algorithms we use for computing an optimal S-repair can replace addition and subtraction with multiplication and division, respectively.

COMMENT 3.11. When considering unary FDs, there is a disagreement between our tractability condition (Algorithm 2) and that of Gribkoff et al. [20]. In particular, the FD set $\Delta_{A \leftrightarrow B \rightarrow C}$ defined in (1) is classified as polynomial time in our dichotomy while NP-hard by Gribkoff et al. [20]. This is due to a gap in their proof of hardness.³ \square

4. COMPUTING AN OPTIMAL U-REPAIR

In this section, we focus on the problem of finding an optimal U-repair and an approximation thereof. We devise general tools for analyzing the complexity of this problem, compare it to the problem of finding an optimal S-repair (discussed in the previous section), and identify sufficient conditions for efficient reductions between the two problems. Yet, unlike S-repairs, the existence of a full dichotomy for computing an optimal U-repair remains an open problem.

Notation. Let Δ be a set of FDs. An *lhs cover* of Δ is a set C of attributes that hits every lhs, that is, $X \cap C \neq \emptyset$ for every $X \rightarrow Y$ in Δ . We denote the minimum cardinality of an lhs cover of Δ by $\text{mlc}(\Delta)$. For instance, if Δ is nonempty and has a common lhs (e.g., Figure 1), then $\text{mlc}(\Delta) = 1$. For a set Δ of FDs, $\text{attr}(\Delta)$ denotes the set of attributes that appear in Δ (i.e., the union of lhs and rhs over all the FDs in Δ). Two FD sets Δ_1 and Δ_2 (over the same schema) are *attribute disjoint* if $\text{attr}(\Delta_1)$ and $\text{attr}(\Delta_2)$ are disjoint. For example, $\{A \rightarrow BC, C \rightarrow D\}$ and $\{E \rightarrow FG\}$ are attribute disjoint.

4.1 Reductions between FD Sets

In this section we show two reductions between sets of FDs. The following theorem implies that to determine the complexity of the union of two attribute-disjoint FD sets, it suffices to look at each set separately.

THEOREM 4.1. *Suppose that $\Delta = \Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2$ where Δ_1 and Δ_2 are attribute disjoint. The following are equivalent for all $\alpha \geq 1$.*

1. An α -optimal U-repair can be computed in polynomial time under Δ .
2. An α -optimal U-repair can be computed in polynomial time under each of Δ_1 and Δ_2 .

If we have a polynomial-time algorithm to compute an α -optimal solution for Δ , it can be used to obtain an α -optimal solution for Δ_1 by setting all attributes not in $\text{attr}(\Delta_1)$ to 0, and running the algorithm (similarly for Δ_2). In the reverse direction, it can be shown that simply composing α -optimal solutions of Δ_1, Δ_2 gives an α -optimal solution for Δ .

EXAMPLE 4.2. Consider the following set of FDs.

$$\Delta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\text{item} \rightarrow \text{cost}, \text{buyer} \rightarrow \text{address}\}$$

³This has been established in a private communication with the authors of [20].

We will later show that if Δ consists of a single FD, then an optimal U-repair can be computed in polynomial time. Hence, we can compute an optimal U-repair under $\Delta_1 = \{\text{item} \rightarrow \text{cost}\}$ and under $\Delta_2 = \{\text{buyer} \rightarrow \text{phone}\}$. Then, Theorem 4.1 implies that an optimal U-repair can be computed in polynomial time under Δ as well.

Now consider the following set of FDs.

$$\Delta' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\text{item} \rightarrow \text{cost}, \text{buyer} \rightarrow \text{address}, \text{address} \rightarrow \text{state}\}$$

Kolahi and Lakshmanan [24] proved that it is NP-hard to compute an optimal U-repair for $\{A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow C\}$, by reduction from the problem of finding a minimum vertex cover of a graph G . Their reduction is, in fact, a PTAS reduction if we use vertex cover in a graph of a bounded degree [2]. Hence, computing an optimal U-repair is APX-hard for this set of FDs. Theorem 4.1 then implies that it is also APX-hard for Δ' . \square

Next, we discuss the problem in the presence of consensus FDs. The following theorem states that such FDs do not change the complexity of the problem. Recall that, for a set Δ of FDs and a set X of attributes, the set $\Delta - X$ denotes the set of FDs that is obtained from Δ by removing each attribute of X from the lhs and rhs of every FD. Also recall that $cl_\Delta(\emptyset)$ is the set of all consensus attributes.

THEOREM 4.3. *Let Δ be a set of FDs. There is a strict reduction from computing an optimal U-repair for Δ to computing an optimal U-repair for $\Delta - cl_\Delta(\emptyset)$, and vice versa.*

The proof (given in the Appendix) uses Theorem 4.1 and a special treatment of the case where all FDs are consensus. As an example of applying Theorem 4.3, if Δ consists of *only* consensus FDs, then an optimal U-repair can be computed in polynomial time, since $\Delta - cl_\Delta(\emptyset)$ is empty. As another example, if Δ is the set $\{\emptyset \rightarrow D, AD \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow CD\}$ then $\Delta - cl_\Delta(\emptyset) = \{A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow C\}$ and, according to Theorem 4.3, computing an optimal U-repair is APX-hard, since this problem is hard for $\{A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow C\}$ due to Kolahi and Lakshmanan [24], as explained in Example 4.2.

4.2 Reductions to/from Subset Repairing

In this section we establish several results that enable us to infer complexity results for the problem of computing an optimal U-repair from that of computing an optimal S-repair via polynomial-time reductions. These results are based on the following proposition, which shows that we can transform a consistent update into a consistent subset (with no extra cost) and, in the absence of consensus FDs, a consistent subset into a consistent update (with some extra cost). We give the proof here, as it shows the actual constructions.

PROPOSITION 4.4. *Let Δ be a set of FDs and T a table. The following can be done in polynomial time.*

1. *Given a consistent update U , construct a consistent subset S such that $dist_{\text{sub}}(S, T) \leq dist_{\text{upd}}(U, T)$.*

2. *Given a consistent subset S , and assuming that Δ is consensus free, construct a consistent update U such that $dist_{\text{upd}}(U, T) \leq mlc(\Delta) \cdot dist_{\text{sub}}(S, T)$.*

PROOF. We construct S from U by excluding any $i \in ids(T)$ such that $T[i]$ has at least one attribute updated in U (i.e., $H(T[i], U[i]) \geq 1$). We construct U from S as follows. Let C be an lhs cover of minimum cardinality $mlc(\Delta)$. The tuple of each $i \in ids(S)$ is left intact, and for $i \in ids(T) \setminus ids(S)$ we update the value of $T[i].A$ for each attribute $A \in C$ to a fresh constant from our infinite domain Val . Since C is an lhs cover and there are no consensus FDs, for all $X \rightarrow Y$ in Δ it holds that two distinct tuples in U that agree on X must correspond to intact tuples; hence, U is consistent (as S is consistent). \square

As we discuss later in Section 4.4, Proposition 4.4, combined with Proposition 3.3, reestablishes the result of Kolahi and Lakshmanan [24], stating the computing a U-repair is in APX. We also establish the following additional consequences of Proposition 4.4. The first is an immediate corollary (that we refer to later on) about the relationship between optimal repairs.

COROLLARY 4.5. *Let Δ be a set of FDs, T a table, S^* an optimal S-repair of T , and U^* an optimal U-repair of T . Then $dist_{\text{sub}}(S^*, T) \leq dist_{\text{upd}}(U^*, T)$. Moreover, if Δ is consensus free, then $dist_{\text{upd}}(U^*, T) \leq mlc(\Delta) \cdot dist_{\text{sub}}(S^*, T)$.*

The second consequence relates to FD sets Δ with a common lhs, that is, $mlc(\Delta) = 1$.

COROLLARY 4.6. *Let Δ be an FD set with a common lhs. There is a strict reduction from the problem of computing an optimal S-repair to that of computing an optimal U-repair, and vice versa.*

For example, if Δ consists of a single FD, then an optimal U-repair can be computed in polynomial time. Additional examples follow.

EXAMPLE 4.7. To illustrate the use of Corollary 4.6, consider the FD set Δ of our running example (Figure 1). Since Δ has a common lhs, and we have established in Example 3.5 that an optimal S-repair for Δ can be found in polynomial time (i.e., Δ passes the test of OSRSucceeds), we get that an optimal U-repair can also be computed in polynomial time for Δ .

As another illustration, consider the following FD set.

$$\Delta_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\text{id country} \rightarrow \text{passport}, \text{id passport} \rightarrow \text{country}\}$$

Again, as Δ_1 has a common lhs, and Δ_1 passes the test of OSRSucceeds (by applying common lhs followed by an lhs marriage), from Theorem 3.4 we conclude that an optimal U-repair can be found in polynomial time.

Finally, consider the following set of FDs.

$$\Delta_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\text{state city} \rightarrow \text{zip}, \text{state zip} \rightarrow \text{country}\}$$

The reader can verify that Δ_2 fails OSRSucceeds, and therefore, from Theorem 3.4 we conclude that computing an optimal U-repair is APX-complete. \square

By combining Theorem 4.3, Corollary 4.6, and Corollary 3.6, we conclude the following.

COROLLARY 4.8. *If Δ is a chain FD set, then an optimal U-repair can be computed in polynomial time.*

PROOF. If Δ is a chain FD set, then so is $\Delta - cl_{\Delta}(\emptyset)$. Theorem 4.3 states that computing an optimal U-repair has the same complexity under the two FD sets. Moreover, if $\Delta - cl_{\Delta}(\emptyset)$ is nonempty, then it has at least one common lhs. From Corollary 4.6 we conclude that the problem then strictly reduces to computing an S-repair, which, by Corollary 3.6, can be done in polynomial time. \square

Hence, for chain FD sets, an optimal repair can be computed for both subset and update variants.

4.3 Incomparability to S-Repairs

Corollaries 4.6 and 4.8 state cases where computing an optimal S-repair has the same complexity as computing an optimal U-repair. A basic case (among others) that the corollaries do not cover is in the following proposition, where again both variants have the same (polynomial-time) complexity.

PROPOSITION 4.9. *Under $\Delta = \{A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow A\}$, an optimal U-repair can be computed in polynomial time.*

For $\Delta = \{A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow A\}$, although $mlc(\Delta) = 2$, we show that $dist_{\text{upd}}(U^*, T) = dist_{\text{sub}}(S^*, T)$ for an optimal U-repair U^* and an optimal S-repair S^* for any table T over R . Since Δ passes the test of OSRSucceeds (by applying lhs marriage), from Theorem 3.4 an optimal S-repair can be computed in polynomial time, and therefore an optimal U-repair of $\{A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow A\}$ can also be computed in polynomial time.

Do the two variants of optimal repairs feature the same complexity for every set of FDs? Next, we answer this question in a negative way.

We have already seen an example of an FD set Δ where an optimal U-repair can be computed in polynomial time, but finding an S-repair is APX-complete. Indeed, Example 4.2 shows that $\{A \rightarrow B, C \rightarrow D\}$ is a tractable case for optimal U-repairs; yet, it fails the test of OSRSucceeds, and is therefore hard for optimal S-repairs (Theorem 3.4).

Showing an example of the other direction is more involved. The FD set in this example is $\Delta_{A \leftrightarrow B \rightarrow C}$ from Example 3.1. In Example 3.5 we showed that $\Delta_{A \leftrightarrow B \rightarrow C}$ passes the test of OSRSucceeds, and therefore, an optimal S-repair can be computed in polynomial time. This is not the case for an optimal U-repair.

THEOREM 4.10. *For the relation schema $R(A, B, C)$ and the FD set $\Delta_{A \leftrightarrow B \rightarrow C}$, computing an optimal U-repair is APX-complete, even on unweighted, duplicate-free tables.*

The proof of hardness in Theorem 4.10 is inspired by, yet different from, the reduction of Kolahi and Lakshmanan [24] for showing hardness for $\{A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow C\}$.

The reduction is from the problem of finding a minimum vertex cover of a graph $G(V, E)$. Every edge $\{u, v\} \in E$ gives rise to the tuples $(u, v, 0)$ and $(v, u, 0)$. In addition, each vertex $v \in V$ gives rise to the tuple $(v, v, 1)$. The proof shows that there is a consistent update of cost at most $2|E| + k$ (assuming a unit weight for each tuple) if and only if G has a vertex cover of size at most k . To establish a PTAS reduction, we use the APX-hardness of vertex cover when G is of bounded degree [2]. The challenging (and interesting) part of the proof is in showing that a consistent update of cost $2|E| + k$ can be transformed into a vertex cover of size k ; this part is considerably more involved than the corresponding proof of Kolahi and Lakshmanan [24].

We conclude with the following corollary, stating the existence of FD sets where the two variants of the problem feature different complexities.

COROLLARY 4.11. *There exist FD sets Δ_1 and Δ_2 such that:*

1. *Under Δ_1 an optimal S-repair can be computed in polynomial time, but computing an optimal U-repair is APX-complete.*
2. *Under Δ_2 an optimal U-repair can be computed in polynomial time, but computing an optimal S-repair is APX-complete.*

4.4 Approximation

In this section we discuss approximations for optimal U-repairs. The combination of Propositions 3.3 and 4.4 gives the following.

THEOREM 4.12. *Let Δ be a set of FDs, and $\alpha = 2 \cdot mlc(\Delta)$. An α -optimal U-repair can be computed in polynomial time.*

Note that the approximation ratio can be further improved by applying Theorem 4.1: if Δ is the union of attribute-disjoint FD sets Δ_1 and Δ_2 , then an α -optimal U-repair can be computed (under Δ) where

$$\alpha = 2 \cdot \max\{mlc(\Delta_1), mlc(\Delta_2)\}.$$

Kolahi and Lakshmanan [24] have also given a constant-factor approximation algorithm for U-repairs (assuming Δ is fixed). To compare their ratio with ours, we first explain their ratio.

Let Δ be a set of FDs and assume (without loss of generality) that the rhs of each FD consists of a single attribute. Kolahi and Lakshmanan [24] define two measures on Δ . By $MFS(\Delta)$ we denote the maximum number of attributes involved in the lhs of any FD in Δ . An *implicant* of an attribute A is a set X of attributes such that $X \rightarrow A$ is in the closure of Δ . A *core implicant* of A is a set C of attributes that hits every implicant of A (i.e., $X \cap C \neq \emptyset$ whenever $X \rightarrow A$ is in the closure of Δ). A *minimum core implicant* of A is a core implicant of A with the smallest cardinality. By $MCI(\Delta)$ we denote the size of the largest minimum core implicant over all attributes A .

THEOREM 4.13. [24] *For any set Δ of FDs, an α -optimal U-repair can be computed in polynomial time where $\alpha = (MCI(\Delta) + 2) \cdot (2MFS(\Delta) - 1)$.*

In both Theorems 4.12 and 4.13, the approximation ratios are constants under data complexity, but depend on Δ . It is still unknown whether there is a constant α that applies to all FD sets Δ . Yet, it is known that a constant-ratio approximation cannot be obtained in polynomial time under *combined complexity* (where R , T , and Δ are all given as input) [24].

Although the proof of Theorem 4.12 is much simpler than the non-trivial proof of Theorem 4.13 given in [24], it can be noted that the approximation ratios in these two theorems are not directly comparable. If k is the number of attributes, then the worst-case approximation ratio in Theorem 4.13 is quadratic in k , while the worst-case approximation in Theorem 4.12 is linear in k (precisely, linear in $\min(k, |\Delta|)$). Moreover, an easy observation is that the ratio between the two approximation ratios can be at most linear in k . In the remainder of this section, we illustrate the difference between the approximations with examples.

First, we show an infinite sequence of FD sets where the approximation ratio of Theorem 4.12 is $\Theta(k)$ and that of Theorem 4.13 is $\Theta(k^2)$. For a natural number $k \geq 1$, we define Δ_k as follows.

$$\Delta_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{A_0 \cdots A_k \rightarrow B_0, B_0 \rightarrow C, B_1 \rightarrow A_0, \dots, B_k \rightarrow A_0\}$$

The approximation ratio for Δ_k given by Theorem 4.12 is $2(k+2)$. For the approximation ratio of Theorem 4.13, we have $MFS(\Delta_k) = k+1$ (due to the FD $A_0 \cdots A_k \rightarrow B$) and $MCI(\Delta_k) = k$ (since the core implicant of A_0 is $\{B_1, \dots, B_k\}$). Hence, the approximation ratio of Theorem 4.13 grows quadratically with k (i.e., it is $\Theta(k^2)$).

On the other hand, following is a sequence of FD sets in which the approximation ratio of Theorem 4.12 grows linearly with k , while that of Theorem 4.13 is a constant.

$$\Delta'_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{A_0 A_1 \rightarrow B_0, A_1 A_2 \rightarrow B_1, \dots, A_k A_{k+1} \rightarrow B_k\}$$

Here, the approximation ratio of Theorem 4.12 is $\Theta(k)$ (since $mlc(\Delta'_k)$ is $\lceil (k+1)/2 \rceil$), but that of Theorem 4.13 is constant, since $MFS(\Delta'_k) = 2$ and $MCI(\Delta'_k) = 1$.

The following theorem shows that computing an optimal U-repair for both Δ_k and Δ'_k is a hard problem, thus an approximation is, indeed, needed.

THEOREM 4.14. *Let $k \geq 1$ be fixed. Computing an optimal U-repair is APX-complete for:*

1. $R(A_0, \dots, A_k, B_0, \dots, B_k, C)$ and Δ_k ;
2. $R(A_0, \dots, A_{k+1}, B_0, \dots, B_k)$ and Δ'_k .

The proof for Δ_k is by a reduction from computing an optimal U-repair under $\{A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow C\}$ (see Example 4.2). For Δ'_k , we first show that the problem is APX-hard for $k = 1$. In this case, the FD set contains two FDs $A_0 A_1 \rightarrow B_0$ and $A_1 A_2 \rightarrow B_1$, thus A_1 is a common lhs, and Corollary 4.6, combined with the fact that computing an optimal S-repair under $\{A \rightarrow B, C \rightarrow D\}$

is APX-hard (Theorem 3.4), imply that computing an optimal U-repair is APX-hard as well. Then, we construct a reduction from computing an optimal U-repair under Δ'_k for $k = 1$ to computing an optimal U-repair under Δ'_k for $k > 1$.

Clearly, one can take the benefit of the approximations of both Theorems 4.12 and 4.13 by computing U-repairs by both algorithms and selecting the one with the smaller cost. As we showed, this combined approximation outperforms each of its two components.

5. DISCUSSION AND FUTURE WORK

We investigated the complexity of computing an optimal S-repair and an optimal U-repair. For the former, we established a dichotomy over all sets of FDs (and schemas). For the latter, we developed general techniques for complexity analysis, showed concrete complexity results, and explored the connection to the complexity of S-repairs. We presented approximation results and, in the case of U-repairs, compared to the approximation of Kolahi and Lakshmanan [24]. In the case of S-repairs, we drew a direct connection to probabilistic database repairs, and completed a dichotomy by Gribkoff et al. [20] to the entire space of FDs. Quite a few directions are left for future investigation, and we conclude with a discussion of some of these.

As our results are restricted to FDs, an obvious important direction is to extend our study to other types of integrity constraints, such as denial constraints [18], conditional FDs [10], referential constraints [15], and tuple-generating dependencies [8]. Moreover, the repair operations we considered are either exclusively tuple deletions or exclusively value updates. Hence, another clear direction is to allow mixtures of deletions, insertions and updates, where the cost depends on the operation type, the involved tuple, and the involved attribute (in the case of updates).

Our understanding of the complexity of computing an optimal U-repair is considerably more restricted than that of an optimal S-repair. We would like to complete our complexity analysis for optimal U-repairs into a full dichotomy. More fundamentally, we would like to incorporate restrictions on the allowed value updates. Our results are heavily based on the ability to update *any cell* with *any value* from an infinite domain. A natural restriction on the update repairs is to allow revising only certain attributes, possibly using a finite (small) space of possible new values. It is not clear how to incorporate such a restriction in our results and proof techniques.

In the case of S-repairs, we are interested in incorporating *preferences*, as in the framework of *prioritized repairing* by Staworko et al. [29]. There, priorities among tuples allow to eliminate subset repairs that are inferior to others (where “inferior” has several possible interpretations). It may be the case that priorities are rich enough to clean the database unambiguously [23]. A relevant question is, then, what is the minimal number of tuples that we need to delete in order to have an unambiguous repair? Alternatively, how many preferences are needed for this cause?

6. REFERENCES

- [1] F. N. Afrati and P. G. Kolaitis. Repair checking in inconsistent databases: algorithms and complexity. In *ICDT*, pages 31–41. ACM, 2009.
- [2] P. Alimonti and V. Kann. Some apx-completeness results for cubic graphs. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 237(1-2):123–134, 2000.
- [3] O. Amini, S. Pérennes, and I. Sau. Hardness and approximation of traffic grooming. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 410(38-40):3751–3760, 2009.
- [4] P. Andritsos, A. Fuxman, and R. J. Miller. Clean answers over dirty databases: A probabilistic approach. In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Data Engineering, ICDE 2006, 3-8 April 2006, Atlanta, GA, USA*, page 30. IEEE Computer Society, 2006.
- [5] M. Arenas, L. E. Bertossi, and J. Chomicki. Consistent query answers in inconsistent databases. In *PODS*, pages 68–79. ACM, 1999.
- [6] A. Assadi, T. Milo, and S. Novgorodov. DANCE: data cleaning with constraints and experts. In *33rd IEEE International Conference on Data Engineering, ICDE 2017, San Diego, CA, USA, April 19-22, 2017*, pages 1409–1410. IEEE Computer Society, 2017.
- [7] R. Bar-Yehuda and S. Even. A linear-time approximation algorithm for the weighted vertex cover problem. *J. Algorithms*, 2(2):198–203, 1981.
- [8] C. Beeri and M. Y. Vardi. Formal systems for tuple and equality generating dependencies. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 13(1):76–98, 1984.
- [9] M. Bergman, T. Milo, S. Novgorodov, and W. Tan. QOCO: A query oriented data cleaning system with oracles. *PVLDB*, 8(12):1900–1903, 2015.
- [10] P. Bohannon, W. Fan, F. Geerts, X. Jia, and A. Kementsietsidis. Conditional functional dependencies for data cleaning. In *ICDE*, pages 746–755. IEEE, 2007.
- [11] M. A. Casanova, R. Fagin, and C. H. Papadimitriou. Inclusion dependencies and their interaction with functional dependencies. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 28(1):29–59, 1984.
- [12] J. Chomicki and J. Marcinkowski. Minimal-change integrity maintenance using tuple deletions. *Inf. Comput.*, 197(1-2):90–121, 2005.
- [13] M. Dallachiesa, A. Ebaid, A. Eldawy, A. K. Elmagarmid, I. F. Ilyas, M. Ouzzani, and N. Tang. NADEEF: a commodity data cleaning system. In *SIGMOD*, pages 541–552. ACM, 2013.
- [14] N. N. Dalvi and D. Suciu. Efficient query evaluation on probabilistic databases. In *VLDB*, pages 864–875. Morgan Kaufmann, 2004.
- [15] C. J. Date. Referential integrity. In *VLDB*, pages 2–12. VLDB Endowment, 1981.
- [16] R. Fagin, B. Kimelfeld, and P. G. Kolaitis. Dichotomies in the complexity of preferred repairs. In *PODS*, pages 3–15. ACM, 2015.
- [17] W. Fan and F. Geerts. *Foundations of Data Quality Management*. Synthesis Lectures on Data Management. Morgan & Claypool Publishers, 2012.
- [18] T. Gaasterland, P. Godfrey, and J. Minker. An overview of cooperative answering. *J. Intell. Inf. Syst.*, 1(2):123–157, 1992.
- [19] F. Geerts, G. Mecca, P. Papotti, and D. Santoro. The LLUNATIC data-cleaning framework. *PVLDB*, 6(9):625–636, 2013.
- [20] E. Gribkoff, G. V. den Broeck, and D. Suciu. The most probable database problem. In *BUDA*, 2014.
- [21] J. Håstad. Some optimal inapproximability results. *J. ACM*, 48(4):798–859, 2001.
- [22] B. Kimelfeld. A dichotomy in the complexity of deletion propagation with functional dependencies. In *PODS*, pages 191–202, 2012.
- [23] B. Kimelfeld, E. Livshits, and L. Peterfreund. Detecting ambiguity in prioritized database repairing. In *ICDT*, volume 68 of *LIPICs*, pages 17:1–17:20. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2017.
- [24] S. Kolahi and L. V. S. Lakshmanan. On approximating optimum repairs for functional dependency violations. In *ICDT*, volume 361, pages 53–62. ACM, 2009.
- [25] M. W. Krentel. The complexity of optimization problems. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 36(3):490–509, 1988.
- [26] E. Livshits and B. Kimelfeld. Counting and enumerating (preferred) database repairs. In *PODS*, pages 289–301, 2017.
- [27] A. Lopatenko and L. E. Bertossi. Complexity of consistent query answering in databases under cardinality-based and incremental repair semantics. In *ICDT*, pages 179–193, 2007.
- [28] T. Rekatsinas, X. Chu, I. F. Ilyas, and C. Ré. Holoclean: Holistic data repairs with probabilistic inference. *PVLDB*, 10(11):1190–1201, 2017.
- [29] S. Staworko, J. Chomicki, and J. Marcinkowski. Prioritized repairing and consistent query answering in relational databases. *Ann. Math. Artif. Intell.*, 64(2-3):209–246, 2012.
- [30] D. Suciu, D. Olteanu, R. Christopher, and C. Koch. *Probabilistic Databases*. Morgan & Claypool Publishers, 1st edition, 2011.

APPENDIX

A. DETAILS FROM SECTION 3

In this section, we prove Theorem 3.4.

THEOREM 3.4. *Let Δ be a set of FDs.*

- *If $\text{OSRSucceeds}(\Delta)$ returns true, then an optimal S-repair can be computed in polynomial time by executing $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta, T)$ on the input T .*
- *If $\text{OSRSucceeds}(\Delta)$ returns false, then computing an optimal S-repair is APX-complete, and remains APX-complete on unweighted, duplicate-free tables.*

Moreover, the execution of $\text{OSRSucceeds}(\Delta)$ terminates in polynomial time in $|\Delta|$.

A.1 Tractability Side

We start by proving the positive side of Theorem 3.4. Figure 3 illustrates our proof. The idea is the following: we start with a table T_0 and an FD set Δ_0 , for which we want to find an optimal S-repair. Then, we apply the simplifications (represented by the red arrows in the figure) until it is no longer possible. We can find an optimal S-repair in polynomial time if we have a trivial set of FDs at this point (which can also be empty). In order to prove that, we show for each one of the simplifications (common lhs, consensus FD and lhs marriage), that if the problem after the simplification can be solved in polynomial time, then we can use this solution to solve the original problem (before the simplification). The lemmas that appear next the black arrows in the figure contain our proofs.

LEMMA A.1. *Let T be a table, and let Δ be a set of FDs, such that Δ has a common lhs A . If for each $a \in \pi_A T[*]$, $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta - A, \sigma_{A=a} T)$ returns an optimal S-repair of $\sigma_{A=a} T$ w.r.t. $\Delta - A$, then $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta, T)$ returns an optimal S-repair of T w.r.t. Δ .*

PROOF. Assume that for each $a \in \pi_A T[*]$, it holds that $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta - A, \sigma_{A=a} T)$ returns an optimal S-repair of $\sigma_{A=a} T$ w.r.t. $\Delta - A$. We contend that the algorithm $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta, T)$ returns an optimal S-repair of T w.r.t. Δ . Since the condition of line 4 of OptSRepair is satisfied, the subroutine CommonLHSRep will be called. Thus, we have to prove that $\text{CommonLHSRep1}(\Delta, T)$ returns an optimal S-repair of T .

Let J be the result of $\text{CommonLHSRep}(\Delta, T)$. We will start by proving that J is consistent. Let us assume, by way of contradiction, that J is not consistent. Thus, there are two tuples \mathbf{t}_1 and \mathbf{t}_2 in J that violate an FD $Z \rightarrow W$ in Δ . Since $A \in Z$ (as A is a common lhs attribute), the tuples \mathbf{t}_1 and \mathbf{t}_2 agree on the value of attribute A . Assume that $\mathbf{t}_1.A = \mathbf{t}_2.A = a$. By definition, there is an FD $(Z \setminus \{A\}) \rightarrow (W \setminus \{A\})$ in $\Delta - A$. Clearly, the tuples \mathbf{t}_1 and \mathbf{t}_2 agree on all the attributes in $Z \setminus \{A\}$, and since they also agree on the attribute A , there exists an attribute $B \in (W \setminus \{A\})$ such that $\mathbf{t}_1.B \neq \mathbf{t}_2.B$. Thus, \mathbf{t}_1 and \mathbf{t}_2 violate an FD in $\Delta - A$, which is a contradiction to the fact that $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta - A, \sigma_{A=a} T)$ returns an optimal S-repair of $\sigma_{A=a} T$ that contains both \mathbf{t}_1 and \mathbf{t}_2 .

Next, we will prove that J is an optimal S-repair of T . Let us assume, by way of contradiction, that this is not the case. That is, there is another consistent subset J' of T , such that the weight of the tuples in $T \setminus J'$ is lower than the weight of the tuples in $T \setminus J$. In this case, there exists at least one value a' of attribute A , such that the weight of the tuples $\mathbf{t} \in (T \setminus J')$ for which it holds that $\mathbf{t}.A = a'$ is lower than the weight of such tuples in $T \setminus J$. Let $H = \{\mathbf{h}_1, \dots, \mathbf{h}_r\}$ be the set of tuples from T for which it holds that $\mathbf{h}_j.A = a'$. Let $\{\mathbf{f}_1, \dots, \mathbf{f}_n\}$ be the set of tuples in $H \cap J$, and let $\{\mathbf{g}_1, \dots, \mathbf{g}_m\}$ be the set of tuples in $H \cap J'$. It holds that $w_T(H \setminus J) > w_T(H \setminus J')$. We claim that $\{\mathbf{g}_1, \dots, \mathbf{g}_m\}$ is a consistent subset of $\sigma_{A=a'} T$, which is a contradiction to the fact that $\{\mathbf{f}_1, \dots, \mathbf{f}_n\}$ is an optimal S-repair of $\sigma_{A=a'} T$. Let us assume, by way of contradiction, that $\{\mathbf{g}_1, \dots, \mathbf{g}_m\}$ is not a consistent subset of $\sigma_{A=a'} T$. Thus, there exist two tuples \mathbf{g}_{j_1} and \mathbf{g}_{j_2} in $\{\mathbf{g}_1, \dots, \mathbf{g}_m\}$ that violate an FD, $Z \rightarrow W$, in $\Delta - A$. By definition, there is an FD $(Z \cup \{A\}) \rightarrow (W \cup Y)$ in Δ , where $Y \subseteq \{A\}$, and since \mathbf{g}_{j_1} and \mathbf{g}_{j_2} agree on the value of attribute A , they clearly violate this FD, which is a contradiction to the fact that they both appear in J' (which is a consistent subset of T). \square

LEMMA A.2. *Let T be a table, and let Δ be a set of FDs, such that Δ contains a consensus FD $\emptyset \rightarrow X$. If for each $a \in \pi_X T[*]$, $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta - X, \sigma_{X=a} T)$ returns an optimal S-repair of $\sigma_{X=a} T$ w.r.t. $\Delta - X$, then $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta, T)$ returns an optimal S-repair of T w.r.t. Δ .*

PROOF. Assume that for each $a \in \pi_X T[*]$, it holds that $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta - X, \sigma_{X=a} T)$ returns an optimal S-repair of $\sigma_{X=a} T$ w.r.t. $\Delta - X$. We contend that the algorithm $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta, T)$ returns an optimal S-repair of T w.r.t. Δ . Note that the condition of line 4 cannot be satisfied, since there is no attribute that appears on the left-hand side of $\emptyset \rightarrow X$. Since the condition of line 6 of OptSRepair is satisfied, the subroutine ConsensusRep will be called. Thus, we have to prove that $\text{ConsensusRep}(\Delta, T)$ returns an optimal S-repair of T .

Let J be the result of $\text{ConsensusRep}(\Delta, T)$. We will start by proving that J is consistent. Let us assume, by way of contradiction, that J is not consistent. Thus, there are two tuples \mathbf{t}_1 and \mathbf{t}_2 in J that violate an FD $Z \rightarrow W$ in Δ . Note that \mathbf{t}_1 and \mathbf{t}_2 agree on the value of the attributes in X (since $\text{ConsensusRep}(\Delta, T)$ always returns a set of




Figure 3: An illustration of our proof of the positive side of Theorem 3.4. We start with an FD set Δ_0 and apply simplifications to it, until we get a trivial set of FDs Δ . The red arrows represent simplifications and the dashed blue arrows represent renaming of a set of FDs. A black arrow from Δ' to Δ means that if we can also find an optimal S-repair for Δ' in polynomial time, then we can find an optimal S-repair for Δ in polynomial time. The proof is in the lemma that appears next to the corresponding black arrow.

tuples that agree on the value of the attributes in X). Assume that $\mathbf{t}_1[X] = \mathbf{t}_2[X] = a$. Thus, it holds that there exists an attribute $A' \in W$, such that $\mathbf{t}_1.A' \neq \mathbf{t}_2.A'$. By definition, there is an FD $(Z \setminus X) \rightarrow (W \setminus X)$ in $\Delta - X$. Clearly, the tuples \mathbf{t}_1 and \mathbf{t}_2 agree on all the attributes in $Z \setminus X$, but do not agree on the attribute $A' \in (W \setminus X)$. Thus, \mathbf{t}_1 and \mathbf{t}_2 violate an FD in $\Delta - X$, which is a contradiction to the fact that $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta - X, \sigma_{X=a}T)$ returns an optimal S-repair of $\sigma_{X=a}T$ that contains both \mathbf{t}_1 and \mathbf{t}_2 .

Next, we will prove that J is an optimal S-repair of T . Let us assume, by way of contradiction, that this is not the case. That is, there is another consistent subset J' of T , such that the weight of the tuples in $T \setminus J'$ is lower than the weight of the tuples in $T \setminus J$. Clearly, each consistent subset of T only contains tuples that agree on the value of attribute A (that is, tuples that belong to $\sigma_{X=a}T$ for some value a). The instance J is an optimal S-repair of $\sigma_{X=a'}T$ for some value a' . If $J' \subseteq \sigma_{X=a'}T$, then we get a contradiction to the fact that J is an optimal S-repair of $\sigma_{X=a'}T$. Thus, $J' \subseteq \sigma_{X=a''}T$ for some other value a'' . In this case, the optimal S-repair of $\sigma_{X=a''}T$ has a higher weight than the optimal S-repair of $\sigma_{X=a'}T$, which is a contradiction to the fact that ConsensusRep returns an optimal S-repair of $\sigma_{X=a}T$ that has the highest weight among all such optimal S-repairs. \square

LEMMA A.3. *Let T be a table, and let Δ be a set of FDs, such that Δ has an lhs marriage (X_1, X_2) and does not have a common lhs. If it holds that $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta - X_1X_2, \sigma_{X_1=a_1, X_2=a_2}T)$ returns an optimal S-repair of $\sigma_{X_1=a_1, X_2=a_2}T$ w.r.t. $\Delta - X_1X_2$ for each pair $(a_1, a_2) \in \pi_{X_1X_2}T[*]$, then $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta, T)$ returns an optimal S-repair of T w.r.t. Δ .*

PROOF. Assume that for each $(a_1, a_2) \in \pi_{X_1X_2}T[*]$, it holds that $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta - X_1X_2, \sigma_{X_1=a_1, X_2=a_2}T)$ returns an optimal S-repair of $\sigma_{X_1=a_1, X_2=a_2}T$ w.r.t. $\Delta - X_1X_2$. We contend that the algorithm $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta, T)$ returns an optimal S-repair of T w.r.t. Δ . We assumed that Δ does not have a common lhs, thus the condition of line 4 is not satisfied. The condition of line 6 cannot be satisfied as well, since neither $X_1 \subseteq \emptyset$ nor $X_2 \subseteq \emptyset$ (as we remove trivial FDs from Δ in line 3). The condition of line 8 on the other hand is satisfied, thus the algorithm will call subroutine MarriageRep and return the result. Thus, we have to prove that $\text{MarriageRep}(\Delta, T)$ returns an optimal S-repair of T .

Let us denote by J the result of $\text{MarriageRep}(\Delta, T)$. We will start by proving that J is consistent. Let \mathbf{t}_1 and \mathbf{t}_2 be two tuples in T . Note that it cannot be the case that $\mathbf{t}_1[X_1] \neq \mathbf{t}_2[X_1]$ but $\mathbf{t}_1[X_2] = \mathbf{t}_2[X_2]$ (or vice versa), since in this case the matching that we found for the graph G contains two edges (a_1, a_2) and (a'_1, a_2) , which is impossible. Moreover, if it holds that $\mathbf{t}_1[X_1] \neq \mathbf{t}_2[X_1]$ and $\mathbf{t}_1[X_2] \neq \mathbf{t}_2[X_2]$, then \mathbf{t}_1 and \mathbf{t}_2 do not agree on the left-hand side of any FD in Δ (since we assumed that for each FD $Z \rightarrow W$ in Δ it either holds that $X_1 \subseteq Z$ or $X_2 \subseteq Z$). Thus, $\{\mathbf{t}_1, \mathbf{t}_2\}$ satisfies all the FDs in Δ . Now, let us assume, by way of contradiction, that J is not consistent. Thus, there are two tuples \mathbf{t}_1 and \mathbf{t}_2 in J that violate an FD $Z \rightarrow W$ in Δ . That is, \mathbf{t}_1 and \mathbf{t}_2 agree on all the attributes in Z , but do not agree on at least one attribute $B \in W$. As mentioned above, the only possible case is that $\mathbf{t}_1[X_1] = \mathbf{t}_2[X_1] = a_1$ and $\mathbf{t}_1[X_2] = \mathbf{t}_2[X_2] = a_2$. In this case, \mathbf{t}_1 and \mathbf{t}_2 both belong to $\sigma_{X_1=a_1, X_2=a_2}T$, and they do not agree on an attribute $B \in (W \setminus (X_1 \cup X_2))$. The FD $(Z \setminus (X_1 \cup X_2)) \rightarrow (W \setminus (X_1 \cup X_2))$ belongs to $\Delta - X_1X_2$, and clearly \mathbf{t}_1 and \mathbf{t}_2 also violate this FD, which is a contradiction to the fact that J only contains an optimal S-repair of $\sigma_{X_1=a_1, X_2=a_2}T$ and does not contain any other tuples from $\sigma_{X_1=a_1, X_2=a_2}T$ (recall that we assumed that $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta - X_1X_2, \sigma_{X_1=a_1, X_2=a_2}T)$ returns an optimal S-repair for each $(a_1, a_2) \in \pi_{X_1X_2}T[*]$).

Next, we will prove that J is an optimal S-repair of T . Let us assume, by way of contradiction, that this is not the case. That is, there is another consistent subset J' of T , such that the weight of the tuples in $T \setminus J'$ is lower than the

weight of the tuples in $T \setminus J$, and J' is an optimal S-repair of T . Note that the weight of the matching corresponding to J is the total weight of the tuples in J (since the weight of each edge (a_1, a_2) is the weight of the optimal S-repair of $\sigma_{X_1=a_1, X_2=a_2}T$, and J contains the optimal S-repair of each $\sigma_{X_1=a_1, X_2=a_2}T$, such that the edge (a_1, a_2) belongs to the matching). Let \mathbf{t}_1 and \mathbf{t}_2 be two tuples in J' . Note that it cannot be the case that $\mathbf{t}_1[X_1] = \mathbf{t}_2[X_1]$ but $\mathbf{t}_1[X_2] \neq \mathbf{t}_2[X_2]$, since in this case, $\{\mathbf{t}_1, \mathbf{t}_2\}$ violates the FD $X_1 \rightarrow cl_\Delta(X_1)$ which is implied from Δ and this is a contradiction to the fact that J' satisfied Δ (we recall that $cl_\Delta(X_1) = cl_\Delta(X_2)$, and since $X_2 \subseteq cl_\Delta(X_2)$, it holds that $X_2 \subseteq cl_\Delta(X_1)$). Similarly, it cannot be the case that $\mathbf{t}_1[X_1] \neq \mathbf{t}_2[X_1]$ but $\mathbf{t}_1[X_2] = \mathbf{t}_2[X_2]$. Hence, it either holds that $\mathbf{t}_1[X_1] = \mathbf{t}_2[X_1]$ and $\mathbf{t}_1[X_2] = \mathbf{t}_2[X_2]$ or $\mathbf{t}_1[X_1] \neq \mathbf{t}_2[X_1]$ and $\mathbf{t}_1[X_2] \neq \mathbf{t}_2[X_2]$. Therefore, J' clearly corresponds to a matching of G as well (the matching will contain an edge (a_1, a_2) if there is a tuple $\mathbf{t} \in J'$, such that $\mathbf{t}[X_1] = a_1$ and $\mathbf{t}[X_2] = a_2$).

Next, we claim that for each edge (a_1, a_2) that belongs to the above matching (the matching that corresponds to J'), the subinstance J' contains an optimal S-repair of $\sigma_{X_1=a_1, X_2=a_2}T$ w.r.t. $\Delta - X_1X_2$. Clearly, J' cannot contain two tuples \mathbf{t}_1 and \mathbf{t}_2 from $\sigma_{X_1=a_1, X_2=a_2}T$ that violate an FD $Z \rightarrow W$ from $\Delta - X_1X_2$ (otherwise, \mathbf{t}_1 and \mathbf{t}_2 will also violate the FD $(Z \cup Y_1) \rightarrow (W \cup Y_2)$ from Δ (where $Y_1 \subseteq (X_1 \cup X_2)$ and $Y_2 \subseteq (X_1 \cup X_2)$), which is a contradiction to the fact that J' is a consistent subset of T). Thus, J' contains a consistent set of tuples from $\sigma_{X_1=a_1, X_2=a_2}T$. If this set of tuples is not an optimal S-repair of $\sigma_{X_1=a_1, X_2=a_2}T$, then we can replace this set of tuples with an optimal S-repair of $\sigma_{X_1=a_1, X_2=a_2}T$. This will not break the consistency of J' since these tuples do not agree on the attributes in neither X_1 nor X_2 with any other tuple in J' , and each FD $Z \rightarrow W$ in Δ is such that $X_1 \subseteq Z$ or $X_2 \subseteq Z$. The result will be a consistent subset of T with a higher weight than J' (that is, the weight of the removed tuples will be lower), which is a contradiction to the fact that J' is an optimal S-repair of T . Therefore, for each edge (a_1, a_2) that belongs to the above matching, J' contains tuples with a total weight of $w_T(S_{a_1, a_2})$, where S_{a_1, a_2} is an optimal S-repair of $\sigma_{X_1=a_1, X_2=a_2}T$, and the weight of this matching is the total weight of tuples in J' . In this case, we found a matching of G with a higher weight than the matching corresponding to J , which is a contradiction to the fact that J corresponds to the maximum weighted matching of G . \square

Next, we prove Theorem 3.2.

THEOREM 3.2. *Let Δ and T be a set of FDs and a table, respectively, over a relation schema $R(A_1, \dots, A_k)$. If $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta, T)$ succeeds, then it returns an optimal S-repair. Moreover, $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta, T)$ terminates in polynomial time in k , $|\Delta|$, and $|T|$.*

PROOF. We will prove the theorem by induction on n , the number of simplifications that will be applied to Δ by OptSRepair . We start by proving the basis of the induction, that is $n = 0$. In this case, OptSRepair will only succeed if $\Delta = \emptyset$ or if Δ is trivial. Clearly, in this case, T is consistent w.r.t. Δ and an optimal S-repair of T is T itself. And indeed, $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta, T)$ will return T in polynomial time.

For the inductive step, we need to prove that if the claim is true for all $n = 1, \dots, k-1$, it is also true for $n = k$. In this case, $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta, T)$ will start by applying some simplification to the schema. Clearly, the result is a set of FDs Δ' , such that $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta', T')$ will apply $n-1$ simplifications to Δ' . One of the following holds:

- Δ has a common lhs A . In this case, the condition of line 4 is satisfied and the subroutine **CommonLHSRep** will be called. Note that $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta, T)$ will succeed only if $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta - A, \sigma_{A=a}T)$ succeeds for each $a \in \pi_A T[*]$. We know from the inductive assumption that if $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta - A, \sigma_{A=a}T)$ succeeds, then it returns an optimal S-repair. Thus, Lemma A.1 implies that $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta, T)$ returns an optimal S-repair of T w.r.t. Δ .
- Δ has a consensus FD $\emptyset \rightarrow X$. In this case, the condition of line 4 is not satisfied, but the condition of line 6 is satisfied and the subroutine **ConsensusRep** will be called. Again, $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta, T)$ will succeed only if $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta - X, \sigma_{X=a}T)$ succeeds for each $a \in \pi_X T[*]$. We know from the inductive assumption that if $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta - X, \sigma_{X=a}T)$ succeeds, then it returns an optimal S-repair. Thus, Lemma A.2 implies that $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta, T)$ returns an optimal S-repair of T w.r.t. Δ .
- Δ does not have a common lhs, but has an lhs marriage. In this case, the conditions of line 4 and line 6 are not satisfied, but the condition of line 8 is satisfied and the subroutine **MarriageRep** will be called. As in the previous cases, $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta, T)$ will succeed only if $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta - X_1X_2, \sigma_{X_1=a_1, X_2=a_2}T)$ succeeds for each $(a_1, a_2) \in \pi_{X_1X_2} T[*]$. We know from the inductive assumption that if $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta - X_1X_2, \sigma_{X_1=a_1, X_2=a_2}T)$ succeeds, then it returns an optimal S-repair. Thus, Lemma A.3 implies that $\text{OptSRepair}(\Delta, T)$ returns an optimal S-repair of T w.r.t.

It is only left to prove that OptSRepair terminates in polynomial time in k , $|\Delta|$, and $|T|$. We will first explain how checking each one of the conditions can be done in polynomial time. Then, we will provide the recurrence relation for each one of the subroutines of the algorithm. The algorithm will first check if Δ is trivial. This can be done in polynomial time as we can go over the FDs and for each one of them check if each attribute that appears on the rhs also appears on the lhs. Then, the algorithm checks if Δ has a common lhs. This can also be done in polynomial time by going over the attributes in A_1, \dots, A_k and checking for each one of them if the lhs of each FD in Δ contains

it. If this condition does not hold, then the algorithm will check if Δ has a consensus FD. This can be done in polynomial time by going over the FDs in Δ and checking for each one of them if the lhs is empty. Finally, if this condition does not hold as well, the algorithm will check if Δ has an lhs marriage. To do that in polynomial time, we can go over the FDs in Δ and for each one of them find the closure of its lhs w.r.t. Δ (it is known that this can be done in polynomial time). Then, for each pair of FDs in Δ that agree on the closure of their lhs, we have to check if one of their lhs is contained in the lhs of each other FD in Δ .

If the condition of line 4 holds, then the subroutine **CommonLHSRep** will be called. Since we have already found a common lhs A (when we were checking if the condition holds), it is only left to divide T into blocks of tuples that agree on the value of A (which again can be done in polynomial time by going over the tuples in T and for each one of them checking the value of attribute A) and make a recursive call to **OptSRepair** for each one of the blocks. The recurrence relation for this subroutine is:

$$F(k, |T|, |\Delta|) = \sum_{a \in \pi_{AT}[*]} F(k-1, |\sigma_{A=a}T|, |\Delta - A|) + \text{poly}(k, |T|, |\Delta|) \quad (3)$$

If the condition of line 6 holds, then the subroutine **ConsensusRep** will be called. This case is very similar to the previous one. Since we have already found a consensus FD $\emptyset \rightarrow X$, it is only left to divide T into blocks of tuples that agree on the value of the attributes in X and make a recursive call to **OptSRepair** for each one of the blocks. The recurrence relation for this subroutine is:

$$F(k, |T|, |\Delta|) = \sum_{a \in \pi_X T[*]} F(k - |X|, |\sigma_{X=a}T|, |\Delta - X|) + \text{poly}(k, |T|, |\Delta|) \quad (4)$$

If the condition of line 8 holds, then the subroutine **MarriageRep** will be called. In this case, we go over each pair of values (a_1, a_2) that appear in the attributes (X_1, X_2) in some tuple of T (note that there are at most $|T|$ such pairs). Then, we make a recursive call to **OptSRepair** for each one of these pairs and calculate the weight of the result S_{a_1, a_2} (clearly, this can be done in polynomial time in the size of S_{a_1, a_2}). Finally, we build the graph G and find a maximum weighted matching for the graph (which can be done in polynomial time with the Hungarian algorithm). The recurrence relation for this subroutine is:

$$F(k, |T|, |\Delta|) = \sum_{(a_1, a_2) \in \pi_{X_1 X_2} T[*]} F(k - |X_1 \cup X_2|, |\sigma_{X_1=a_1, X_2=a_2}T|, |\Delta - X_1 X_2|) + \text{poly}(k, |T|, |\Delta|) \quad (5)$$

Since finding an optimal S-repair for a trivial FD set can be done in polynomial time in the size of T , and since in each one of the three recurrence relations, the tables in the middle argument form a partition of T , a standard analysis of F shows that it is bounded by a polynomial. \square

A.2 Hardness Side

As mentioned above, our proof of hardness is based on the concept of a *fact-wise reduction* [22]. We first prove, for each one of the FD sets in Table 1 (over the schema $R(A, B, C)$), that computing an optimal S-repair is APX-complete. Then, we prove the existence of fact-wise reductions from these FD sets over the schema $R(A, B, C)$ to other sets of FDs over other schemas.

Figure 4 illustrates our proof. The idea is the following: we start with a table T_0 and an FD set Δ_0 , for which we want to find an optimal S-repair. Then, we apply the simplifications (represented by the red arrows in the figure) until it is no longer possible. We prove, for each one of the simplifications (common lhs, consensus FD and lhs marriage), that there is a fact-wise reduction from the problem after the simplification to the problem before the simplification. The problem is APX-complete if at this point we have a set of FDs that is not trivial. In this case, we pick two local minima from the FD set. We recall that an FD $X \rightarrow Y$ in Δ is a local minimum if there is no FD $Z \rightarrow W$ in Δ such that $Z \subset X$. These two local minima belong to one of five classes, that we discuss in Section 3 and later in this section. Finally, we prove for each one of the classes, that there is a fact-wise reduction to this class from one of four FD sets. To prove APX-hardness for these four sets (over the relation schema $R(A, B, C)$) we construct reductions from problems that are known to be APX-hard. A black arrow in Figure 4 represents a reduction that we construct in the lemma that appears next to the arrow.

A.2.1 Hard Schemas

We start by proving that computing an optimal S-repair for the FD sets in Table 1 is APX-complete. Proposition 3.3 implies that the problem is in APX for each one of these sets. Thus, it is only left to show that the problem is also APX-hard. Gribkoff et al. [20] prove that the MPD problem is NP-hard for both $\Delta_{A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C}$ and $\Delta_{A \rightarrow C \leftarrow B}$. Their hardness proof also holds for the problem of computing an optimal S-repair. More formally, the following hold.

LEMMA A.4. [20] *Computing an optimal S-repair for $\Delta_{A \rightarrow C \leftarrow B}$ is NP-hard.*




Figure 4: An illustration of our proof of the negative side of Theorem 3.4. We start with an FD set Δ_0 and apply simplifications to it, until we get a non trivial set of FDs Δ , that we classify into one of five classes. The red arrows represent simplifications and the dashed blue arrows represent renaming. A black arrow represents a reduction that we construct in the lemma that appears next to the arrow.

LEMMA A.5. [20] *Computing an optimal S-repair for $\Delta_{A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C}$ is NP-hard.*

They prove both of these result by showing a reduction from the MAX-2-SAT problem: given a 2-CNF formula φ , determine what is the maximum number of clauses in φ which can be simultaneously satisfied. In their reductions it holds that the maximum number of clauses that can be simultaneously satisfied is exactly the size of an optimal S-repair of the constructed table T (which is unweighted and duplicate-free). The problem MAX-2-SAT is known to be APX-hard. However, this is not enough to prove APX-hardness for our problem, as we would like to approximate the minimum number of tuples to delete, rather than the size of the optimal S-repair. Thus, we will now strengthen their results by proving that the complement problem of MAX-2-SAT is APX-hard. Clearly, their reductions are strict reductions from the complement problem (as the number of clauses that are not satisfied is exactly the number of tuples that are deleted from the table), thus this will complete our proof of APX-completeness for $\Delta_{A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C}$ and $\Delta_{A \rightarrow C \leftarrow B}$.

LEMMA A.6. *The complement problem of MAX-2-SAT is APX-hard.*

PROOF. It is known that there is always an assignment that satisfies at least half of the clauses in the formula. Thus, the solution to the complement problem contains at most half of the clauses. Let ψ be a 2-CNF formula. Let m be the number of clauses in ψ , let OPT_P be an optimal solution to MAX-2-SAT and let OPT_{CP} be an optimal solution to the complement problem. Then, the following hold: (a) $|OPT_P| \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot m$, (b) $|OPT_{CP}| \leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot m$, and (c) $\frac{|OPT_{CP}|}{|OPT_P|} \leq 1$. Now, let us assume, by way of contradiction, that the complement problem is not APX-hard. That is, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -optimal solution to that problem. Let S_{CP} be such a solution. Then,

$$|S_{CP}| - |OPT_{CP}| \leq \epsilon \cdot |OPT_{CP}| \quad (6)$$

We will now show that in this case, S_P (which consists of the clauses that do not belong to S_{CP} , thus $|S_P| = m - |S_{CP}|$) is an ϵ -optimal solution for MAX-2-SAT.

$$|S_P| - |OPT_P| = (m - |S_{CP}|) - (m - |OPT_{CP}|) = |OPT_{CP}| - |S_{CP}| \geq -\epsilon \cdot |OPT_{CP}| \geq -\epsilon \cdot |OPT_P| \quad (7)$$

It follows that for each $\epsilon > 0$, we can get a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -optimal solution for MAX-2-SAT by finding a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -optimal solution to the complement problem and selecting all of the clauses that do not belong to this solution, which is a contradiction to the fact that MAX-2-SAT is APX-hard. \square

We can now conclude that the following hold.

LEMMA A.7. *Computing an optimal S-repair for $\Delta_{A \rightarrow C \leftarrow B}$ is APX-complete.*




Figure 5: An illustration of the reduction used by Amini et al. [3] to prove APX-hardness for the problem of finding the maximum number of edge disjoint triangles in a tripartite graph with a bounded degree.

PROOF. This is straightforward based on Lemma A.4, Lemma A.6 and our observation that the reduction of Gribkoff et al. [20] is a strict reduction from the complement problem of MAX-2-SAT. \square

LEMMA A.8. *Computing an optimal S-repair for $\Delta_{A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C}$ is APX-complete.*

PROOF. This is straightforward based on Lemma A.5, Lemma A.6 and our observation that the reduction of Gribkoff et al. [20] is a strict reduction from the complement problem of MAX-2-SAT. \square

Next, we prove that computing an optimal S-repair for $\Delta_{AB \leftrightarrow AC \leftrightarrow BC}$ is APX-complete as well. To do that, we construct a reduction from the problem of finding the maximum number of edge-disjoint triangles in a tripartite graph with a bounded degree B. Amini et al. [3] (who refer to this problem as MECT-B) proved that this problem is APX-complete. Again, in our reduction, it holds that the maximum number edge-disjoint triangles is exactly the size of an optimal S-repair of the constructed table T . Thus, our reduction is a strict reduction from the complement problem. Hence, we first prove that the complement problem of MECT-B is APX-hard for tripartite graphs that satisfy a specific property. We use the reduction of Amini et al. [3] to prove that. They build a reduction from the problem of finding a maximum bounded covering by 3-sets: given a collection of subsets of a given set that contain exactly three elements each, such that each element appears in at most B subsets, find the maximum number of disjoint subsets. In their reduction, they construct a tripartite graph, such that for each subset $S_i = (x, y, z)$, they add to the graph the structure from Figure 5. Note that the nodes $a_i[1] \dots a_i[9]$ are unique for this subset, while the nodes $x[0], x[1], y[0], y[1], z[0], z[1]$ will appear only once in the graph, even if they appear in more than one subset. Thus, we can build a set of edge-disjoint triangles for the constructed tripartite graph by selecting, for each subset, six out of the thirteen triangles (the even ones). This is true since the even triangles do not share an edge with any other triangle. We can now conclude, that in their reduction, they construct a tripartite graph with the following property: the maximum number of edge-disjoint triangles in the graph is at least $\frac{6}{13}$ of the total number of triangles. We denote a graph that satisfies this property by $\frac{6}{13}$ -tripartite graph. Thus, we can conclude the following:

LEMMA A.9. *The problem MECT-B for $\frac{6}{13}$ -tripartite graphs is APX-hard.*

We will now prove that the complement problem is APX-hard as well.

LEMMA A.10. *The complement problem of MECT-B for $\frac{6}{13}$ -tripartite graphs is APX-hard.*

PROOF. Let g be a $\frac{6}{13}$ -tripartite graph. Then, the solution to the complement problem contains at most $\frac{7}{13}$ of the total number of triangles. Let m be the number of triangles in g , let OPT_P be an optimal solution to MECT for g and let OPT_{CP} be an optimal solution to the complement problem. Thus, the following hold: (a) $|OPT_P| \geq \frac{6}{13} \cdot m$, (b) $|OPT_{CP}| \leq \frac{7}{13} \cdot m$, and (c) $\frac{|OPT_{CP}|}{|OPT_P|} \leq \frac{7}{6}$. Now, let us assume, by way of contradiction, that the complement problem is not APX-hard. That is, for every $\epsilon > 0$, we can find a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -optimal solution to that problem. Let S_{CP} be such a solution. Then,

$$|S_{CP}| - |OPT_{CP}| \leq \epsilon \cdot |OPT_{CP}| \quad (8)$$

We will now show that in this case, S_P (which consists of the triangles that do not belong to S_{CP} , thus $|S_P| = m - |S_{CP}|$) is a $\frac{7}{6}\epsilon$ -optimal solution for MECT-B.

$$|S_P| - |OPT_P| = (m - |S_{CP}|) - (m - |OPT_{CP}|) = |OPT_{CP}| - |S_{CP}| \geq -\epsilon \cdot |OPT_{CP}| \geq -\frac{7}{6}\epsilon \cdot |OPT_P| \quad (9)$$

It follows that for each $\epsilon' > 0$, we can get an ϵ' -optimal solution for MECT by finding a $(1 + \frac{6}{7}\epsilon')$ -optimal solution to the complement problem, which is a contradiction to the fact that MECT-B is APX-hard for g , as implied by Lemma A.9. \square

Next, we introduce our reduction from MECT-B to the problem of computing an optimal S-repair for $\Delta_{AB \leftrightarrow AC \leftrightarrow BC}$.

LEMMA A.11. *Computing an optimal S-repair for $\Delta_{AB \leftrightarrow AC \leftrightarrow BC}$ is APX-complete.*

PROOF. We construct a reduction from the problem of finding the maximum number of edge-disjoint triangles in a tripartite graph with a bounded degree. The input to this problem is a tripartite graph g with a bounded degree B . The goal is to determine what is the maximum number of edge-disjoint triangles in g (that is, no two triangles share an edge). We assume that g contains three sets of nodes: $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$, $\{b_1, \dots, b_l\}$ and $\{c_1, \dots, c_r\}$. Given such an input, we will construct the input T for our problem as follows. For each triangle in g that consists of the nodes a_i , b_j , and c_k , T will contain a tuple (a_i, b_j, c_k) . We will now prove that there are at least m edge-disjoint triangles in g if and only if there is a consistent subset of T that contains at least m tuples.

The “if” direction. there is a consistent subset J of T that contains at least m tuples. The FD $AB \rightarrow C$ implies that a consistent subset cannot contain two tuples (a_i, b_j, c_{k_1}) and (a_i, b_j, c_{k_2}) such that $c_{k_1} \neq c_{k_2}$. Moreover, the FD $AC \rightarrow B$ implies that it cannot contain two tuples (a_i, b_{j_1}, c_k) and (a_i, b_{j_2}, c_k) such that $b_{j_1} \neq b_{j_2}$, and the FD $BC \rightarrow A$ implies that it cannot contain two tuples (a_{i_1}, b_j, c_k) and (a_{i_2}, b_j, c_k) such that $a_{i_1} \neq a_{i_2}$. Thus, the two triangles $(a_{i_1}, b_{j_1}, c_{k_1})$ and $(a_{i_2}, b_{j_2}, c_{k_2})$ in g that correspond to two tuples $(a_{i_1}, b_{j_1}, c_{k_1})$ and $(a_{i_1}, b_{j_1}, c_{k_1})$ in J , will not share an edge (they can only share a single node). Hence, there are at least m edge-disjoint triangles in g .

The “only if” direction. Assume that there are at least m edge-disjoint triangles $\{t_1, \dots, t_m\}$ in g . We can build a consistent subset J of T as follows: for each triangle (a_i, b_j, c_k) in $\{t_1, \dots, t_m\}$ we will add the tuple (a_i, b_j, c_k) to J . Thus, J will contain m tuples. It is only left to show that J is consistent. Let us assume, by way of contradiction, that J is not consistent. That is, there are two tuples (a_1, b_1, c_1) and (a_2, b_2, c_2) in J that violate an FD in $\Delta_{AB \leftrightarrow AC \leftrightarrow BC}$. If the tuples violate the FD $AB \rightarrow C$, it holds that $a_1 = a_2$ and $b_1 = b_2$. Thus, the corresponding two triangles from $\{t_1, \dots, t_m\}$ share the edge (a_1, b_1) , which is a contradiction to the fact that $\{t_1, \dots, t_m\}$ is a set of edge-disjoint triangles. Similarly, if the tuples violate the FD $AC \rightarrow B$, then the corresponding two triangles share an edge (a_1, c_1) , and if they violate the FD $BC \rightarrow A$, the corresponding two triangles share an edge (b_1, c_1) . To conclude, there exists a consistent subset of T that contains at least m facts, and that concludes our proof.

Clearly, our reduction is a strict reduction from the complement problem of MECT-B (as the number of triangles that are not part of the set of edge-disjoint triangles is exactly the number of tuples that are deleted from T), thus Lemma A.10 implies that our problem is indeed APX-complete. \square

Finally, we construct a reduction from the problem MAX-non-mixed-SAT to the problem of computing an optimal S-repair for $\Delta_{AB \rightarrow C \rightarrow B}$. Note that the following holds.

LEMMA A.12. *The complement problem of MAX-non-mixed-SAT is APX-hard.*

PROOF. The proof is identical to the proof of Lemma A.6. \square

Thus, if we construct a reduction that is a strict reduction from the complement problem, this will conclude our proof of APX-completeness for $\Delta_{AB \rightarrow C \rightarrow B}$.

LEMMA A.13. *Computing an optimal S-repair for $\Delta_{AB \rightarrow C \rightarrow B}$ is APX-complete.*

PROOF. We construct a reduction from MAX-Non-Mixed-SAT to the problem of computing an optimal S-repair for $\Delta_{AB \rightarrow C \rightarrow B}$. The input to the first problem is a formula ψ with the free variables x_1, \dots, x_n , such that ψ has the form $c_1 \wedge \dots \wedge c_m$ where each c_j is a clause. Each clause is a conjunction of variables from one of the following sets: (a) $\{x_i : i = 1, \dots, n\}$ or (b) $\{\neg x_i : i = 1, \dots, n\}$ (that is, each clause either contains only positive variables or only negative variables). The goal is to determine what is the maximum number of clauses in the formula ψ that can be simultaneously satisfied. Given such an input, we will construct the input T for our problem as follows. For each $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, m$, T will contain the following tuples:

- $(c_j, 1, x_i)$, if c_j contains only positive variables and x_i appears in c_j .
- $(c_j, 0, x_i)$, if c_j contains only negative variables and $\neg x_i$ appears in c_j .

The weight of each tuple will be 1 (that is, T is an unweighted, duplicate-free table). We will now prove that there is an assignment that satisfies at least k clauses in ψ if and only if there is a consistent subset of the constructed table T that contains at least k tuples.

The “if” direction. Assume that there is a consistent subset J of T that contains at least k tuples. The FD $AB \rightarrow C$ implies that no consistent subset of T contains two tuples (c_j, b_j, x_{i_1}) and (c_j, b_j, x_{i_2}) such that $x_{i_1} \neq x_{i_2}$. Thus, each consistent subset contains at most one tuple (c_j, b_j, x_i) for each c_j . We will now define an assignment τ as follows: $\tau(x_i) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} b_j$ if there exists a tuple (c_j, b_j, x_i) in J for some c_j . Note that the FD $C \rightarrow B$ implies that no consistent subset contains two tuples $(c_{j_1}, 1, x_i)$ and $(c_{j_2}, 0, x_i)$, thus the assignment is well defined. Finally, as mentioned above, J contains a tuple (c_j, b_j, x_i) for k clauses c_j from ψ . If x_i appears in c_j without negation, it holds that $b_j = 1$, thus $\tau(x_i) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1$ and c_j is satisfied. Similarly, if x_i appears in c_j with negation, it holds that $b_j = 0$, thus $\tau(x_i) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0$ and c_j is satisfied. Thus, each one of these k clauses is satisfied by τ and we conclude that there exists an assignment that satisfies at least k clauses in ψ .

The “only if” direction. Assume that $\tau : \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is an assignment that satisfies at least k clauses in ψ . We claim that there exists a consistent subset of T that contains at least k tuples. Since τ satisfies at least k clauses, for each one of these clauses c_j there exists a variable $x_i \in c_j$, such that $\tau(x_i) = 1$ if x_i appears in c_j without negation or $\tau(x_i) = 0$ if it appears in c_j with negation. Let us build a consistent subset J as follows. For each c_j that is satisfied by τ we will choose exactly one variable x_i that satisfies the above and add the tuple $R_{2fd}(c_j, b_j, x_i)$ (where $\tau(x_i) = b_j$) to J . Since there are at least k satisfied clauses, J will contain at least k tuples, thus it is only left to prove that J is consistent. Let us assume, by way of contradiction, that J is not consistent. Since J contains one tuple for each satisfied c_j , no two tuples violate the FD $AB \rightarrow C$. Thus, J contains two tuples $(c_{j_1}, 1, x_i)$ and $(c_{j_2}, 0, x_i)$, but this is a contradiction to the fact that τ is an assignment (that is, it cannot be the case that $\tau(x_i) = 1$ and $\tau(x_i) = 0$ as well).

Clearly, our reduction is a strict reduction from the complement problem of MAX-non-mixed-SAT (as the number of clauses that are not satisfied is exactly the number of tuples that are deleted from T), thus Lemma A.13 implies that our problem is indeed APX-complete. \square

A.2.2 Fact-Wise Reductions

Let R be a schema and let Δ be a set of FDs over R . Recall that an FD set Δ is a chain if for every two FDs $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1$ and $X_2 \rightarrow Y_2$ it is the case that $X_1 \subseteq X_2$ or $X_2 \subseteq X_1$. Note that as long as Δ is a chain, it either contains a common lhs, or a consensus FD. Thus, if we reach a point where we cannot apply any simplifications to the problem, the set of FDs is not a chain. In the rest of this section, we will use the following definition: an FD $X \rightarrow Y$ is a *local minimum* of Δ if there is no other FD $Z \rightarrow W$ in Δ such that $Z \subset X$. If Δ is not a chain set of FDs, then it contains at least two distinct local minima $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1$ and $X_2 \rightarrow Y_2$ (by distinct we mean that $X_1 \neq X_2$). Thus, if no simplification can be applied to Δ , one of the following holds:

- $(cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1) \cap cl_\Delta(X_2) = \emptyset$ and $(cl_\Delta(X_2) \setminus X_2) \cap cl_\Delta(X_1) = \emptyset$.
- $(cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1) \cap (cl_\Delta(X_2) \setminus X_2) \neq \emptyset$, $(cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1) \cap X_2 = \emptyset$ and $(cl_\Delta(X_2) \setminus X_2) \cap X_1 = \emptyset$.
- $(cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1) \cap X_2 \neq \emptyset$ and $(cl_\Delta(X_2) \setminus X_2) \cap X_1 = \emptyset$.
- $(cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1) \cap X_2 \neq \emptyset$ and $(cl_\Delta(X_2) \setminus X_2) \cap X_1 \neq \emptyset$ and also $(X_1 \setminus X_2) \subseteq (cl_\Delta(X_2) \setminus X_2)$ and $(X_2 \setminus X_1) \subseteq (cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1)$. In this case, Δ contains at least one more local minimum. Otherwise, for every FD $Z \rightarrow W$ in Δ it holds that either $X_1 \subseteq Z$ or $X_2 \subseteq Z$. If $X_1 \cap X_2 \neq \emptyset$, then Δ contains a common lhs (an attribute from $X_1 \cap X_2$). If $X_1 \cap X_2 = \emptyset$, then Δ contains an lhs marriage.
- $(cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1) \cap X_2 \neq \emptyset$ and $(cl_\Delta(X_2) \setminus X_2) \cap X_1 \neq \emptyset$ and also $(X_2 \setminus X_1) \not\subseteq (cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1)$.

We will now prove that for each one of these cases there is a fact-wise reduction from one of the hard schemas we discusses above.

LEMMA A.14. *Let R be a schema and let Δ be an FD set over R that does not contain trivial FDs. Suppose that Δ contains two distinct local minima $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1$ and $X_2 \rightarrow Y_2$, and the following hold:*

- $(cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1) \cap cl_\Delta(X_2) = \emptyset$,
- $(cl_\Delta(X_2) \setminus X_2) \cap cl_\Delta(X_1) = \emptyset$.

Then, there is a fact-wise reduction from $(R(A, B, C), \Delta_{A \rightarrow C \leftarrow B})$ to (R, Δ) .

PROOF. We define a fact-wise reduction $\Pi : (R(A, B, C), \Delta_{A \rightarrow C \leftarrow B}) \rightarrow (R, \Delta)$, using the FDs $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1$ and $X_2 \rightarrow Y_2$ and the constant $\odot \in \text{Const}$. Let $\mathbf{t} = (a, b, c)$ be a tuple over $R(A, B, C)$ and let $\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ be the set of attributes in R . We define Π as follows:

$$\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \odot & A_k \in X_1 \cap X_2 \\ a & A_k \in X_1 \setminus X_2 \\ b & A_k \in X_2 \setminus X_1 \\ \langle a, c \rangle & A_k \in cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1 \\ \langle b, c \rangle & A_k \in cl_\Delta(X_2) \setminus X_2 \\ \langle a, b \rangle & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

It is left to show that Π is a fact-wise reduction. To do so, we prove that Π is well defined, injective and preserves consistency and inconsistency.

Π is well defined. This is straightforward from the definition and the fact that $(cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1) \cap cl_\Delta(X_2) = \emptyset$ and $(cl_\Delta(X_2) \setminus X_2) \cap cl_\Delta(X_1) = \emptyset$.

Π is injective. Let \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}' be two tuples, such that $\mathbf{t} = (a, b, c)$ and $\mathbf{t}' = (a', b', c')$. Assume that $\Pi(\mathbf{t}) = \Pi(\mathbf{t}')$. Let us denote $\Pi(\mathbf{t}) = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}') = (x'_1, \dots, x'_n)$. Note that $X_1 \setminus X_2$ and $X_2 \setminus X_1$ are not empty since $X_1 \neq X_2$. Moreover, since both FDs are minimal, $X_1 \not\subseteq X_2$ and $X_2 \not\subseteq X_1$. Therefore, there are l and p such that $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_l = a$, $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_p = b$. Furthermore, since $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1$ and $X_2 \rightarrow Y_2$ are not trivial, there are m and n such that

$\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_m = \langle a, c \rangle$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_n = \langle b, c \rangle$. Hence, $\Pi(\mathbf{t}) = \Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ implies that $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_l = \Pi(\mathbf{t}').A_l$, $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_p = \Pi(\mathbf{t}').A_p$, $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_m = \Pi(\mathbf{t}').A_m$ and also $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_n = \Pi(\mathbf{t}').A_n$. We obtain that $a = a'$, $b = b'$ and $c = c'$, which implies $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{t}'$.

Π preserves consistency. Let $\mathbf{t} = (a, b, c)$ and $\mathbf{t}' = (a', b', c')$ be two distinct tuples. We contend that the set $\{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}'\}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\Delta_{A \rightarrow C \leftarrow B}$ if and only if the set $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ is consistent w.r.t. Δ .

The “if” direction. Assume that $\{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}'\}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\Delta_{A \rightarrow C \leftarrow B}$. We prove that $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ is consistent w.r.t. Δ . First, note that each FD that contains an attribute $A_k \notin (cl_\Delta(X_1) \cup cl_\Delta(X_2))$ on its left-hand side is satisfied by $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$, since \mathbf{t} and \mathbf{t}' cannot agree on both A and B (otherwise, the FD $A \rightarrow C$ implies that $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{t}'$). Thus, from now on we will only consider FDs that do not contain an attribute $A_k \notin (cl_\Delta(X_1) \cup cl_\Delta(X_2))$ on their left-hand side. The FDs in $\Delta_{A \rightarrow C \leftarrow B}$ imply that if \mathbf{t} and \mathbf{t}' agree on one of $\{A, B\}$ then they also agree on C , thus one of the following holds:

- $a \neq a'$, $b = b'$ and $c = c'$. In this case, $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ only agree on the attributes A_k such that $A_k \in X_1 \cap X_2$ or $A_k \in X_2 \setminus X_1$ or $A_k \in cl_\Delta(X_2) \setminus X_2$. That is, they only agree on the attributes A_k such that $A_k \in cl_\Delta(X_2)$. Thus, each FD that contains an attribute $A_k \notin cl_\Delta(X_2)$ on its left-hand side is satisfied. Moreover, any FD that contains only attributes $A_k \in cl_\Delta(X_2)$ on its left-hand side, also contains only attributes $A_k \in cl_\Delta(X_2)$ on its right-hand side (by definition of a closure), thus $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ agree on both the left-hand side and the right-hand side of such FDs and $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ satisfies all the FDs in Δ .
- $a = a'$, $b \neq b'$ and $c = c'$. This case is symmetric to the previous one, thus a similar proof applies for this case as well.
- $a \neq a'$, $b \neq b'$. In this case, $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ only agree on the attributes A_k such that $A_k \in X_1 \cap X_2$. Since $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1$ and $X_2 \rightarrow Y_2$ are local minima, there is no FD in Δ that contains only attributes A_k such that $A_k \in X_1 \cap X_2$ on its left-hand side (as if there is an FD $Z \rightarrow W$ in Δ , such that $Z \subseteq X_1 \cap X_2$, then $Z \subset X_1$ in contradiction to the fact that X_1 is a local minimum). Thus, $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ do not agree on the left-hand side of any FD in Δ and $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ is consistent w.r.t. Δ .

This concludes our proof of the “if” direction.

The “only if” direction. Assume $\{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}'\}$ is inconsistent w.r.t. $\Delta_{A \rightarrow C \leftarrow B}$. We prove that $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ is inconsistent w.r.t. Δ . Since $\{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}'\}$ is inconsistent w.r.t. $\Delta_{A \rightarrow C \leftarrow B}$ it either holds that $a = a'$ and $c \neq c'$ or $b = b'$ and $c \neq c'$ (or both). In the first case, $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ agree on the attributes on the left-hand side of the FD $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1$, but do not agree on at least one attribute on its right-hand side (since the FD is not trivial). Similarly, in the second case, $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ agree on the attributes on the left-hand side of the FD $X_2 \rightarrow Y_2$, but do not agree on at least one attribute on its right-hand side. Thus, $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ does not satisfy at least one of these FDs and $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ is inconsistent w.r.t. Δ . \square

LEMMA A.15. *Let R be a schema and let Δ be an FD set over R that does not contain trivial FDs. Suppose that Δ contains two distinct local minima $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1$ and $X_2 \rightarrow Y_2$, and one of the following holds:*

- $((cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1) \cap ((cl_\Delta(X_2) \setminus X_2) \neq \emptyset, ((cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1) \cap X_2 = \emptyset$ and $((cl_\Delta(X_2) \setminus X_2) \cap X_1 = \emptyset,$
- $((cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1) \cap X_2 \neq \emptyset$ and $((cl_\Delta(X_2) \setminus X_2) \cap X_1 = \emptyset.$

Then, there is a fact-wise reduction from $(R(A, B, C), \Delta_{A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C})$ to (R, Δ) .

PROOF. We define a fact-wise reduction $\Pi : (R(A, B, C), \Delta_{A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C}) \rightarrow (R, \Delta)$, using $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1$ and $X_2 \rightarrow Y_2$ and the constant $\odot \in \text{Const}$. Let $\mathbf{t} = (a, b, c)$ be a tuple over $R(A, B, C)$ and let $\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ be the set of attributes in R . We define Π as follows:

$$\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \odot & A_k \in X_1 \cap X_2 \\ a & A_k \in X_1 \setminus X_2 \\ b & A_k \in X_2 \setminus X_1 \\ \langle a, c \rangle & A_k \in cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1 \setminus cl_\Delta(X_2) \\ \langle b, c \rangle & A_k \in cl_\Delta(X_2) \setminus X_2 \\ a & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

It is left to show that Π is a fact-wise reduction. To do so, we prove that Π is well defined, injective and preserves consistency and inconsistency.

Π is well defined. This is straightforward from the definition and the fact that $(cl_\Delta(X_2) \setminus X_2) \cap X_1 = \emptyset$ in both cases.

Π is injective. Let \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}' be two tuples, such that $\mathbf{t} = (a, b, c)$ and $\mathbf{t}' = (a', b', c')$. Assume that $\Pi(\mathbf{t}) = \Pi(\mathbf{t}')$. Let us denote $\Pi(\mathbf{t}) = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}') = (x'_1, \dots, x'_n)$. Note that $X_1 \setminus X_2$ and $X_2 \setminus X_1$ are not empty since $X_1 \neq X_2$. Moreover, since both FDs are minimal, $X_1 \not\subseteq X_2$ and $X_2 \not\subseteq X_1$. Therefore, there are l and p such that $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_l = a$,

$\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_p = b$. Furthermore, since $X_2 \rightarrow Y_2$ is not trivial, there is at least one m such that $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_m = \langle b, c \rangle$. Hence, $\Pi(\mathbf{t}) = \Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ implies that $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_l = \Pi(\mathbf{t}').A_l$, $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_p = \Pi(\mathbf{t}').A_p$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_m = \Pi(\mathbf{t}').A_m$. We obtain that $a = a'$, $b = b'$ and $c = c'$, which implies $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{t}'$.

Π preserves consistency. Let $\mathbf{t} = (a, b, c)$ and $\mathbf{t}' = (a', b', c')$ be two distinct tuples. We contend that the set $\{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}'\}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\Delta_{A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C}$ if and only if the set $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ is consistent w.r.t. Δ .

The “if” direction. Assume that $\{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}'\}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\Delta_{A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C}$. We prove that $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ is consistent w.r.t. Δ . First, note that each FD that contains an attribute $A_k \notin (cl_\Delta(X_1) \cup cl_\Delta(X_2))$ on its left-hand side is satisfied by $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$, since \mathbf{t} and \mathbf{t}' cannot agree on A (otherwise, the FDs $A \rightarrow B$ and $B \rightarrow C$ imply that $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{t}'$). Thus, from now on we will only consider FDs that do not contain an attribute $A_k \notin (cl_\Delta(X_1) \cup cl_\Delta(X_2))$ on their left-hand side. One of the following holds:

- $a \neq a'$, $b = b'$ and $c = c'$. In this case, $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ only agree on the attributes A_k such that $A_k \in X_1 \cap X_2$ or $A_k \in X_2 \setminus X_1$ or $A_k \in cl_\Delta(X_2) \setminus X_2$. That is, they only agree on the attributes A_k such that $A_k \in cl_\Delta(X_2)$. Thus, each FD that contains an attribute $A_k \notin cl_\Delta(X_2)$ on its left-hand side is satisfied. Moreover, any FD that contains only attributes $A_k \in cl_\Delta(X_2)$ on its left-hand side, also contains only attributes $A_k \in cl_\Delta(X_2)$ on its right-hand side (by definition of a closure), thus $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ agree on both the left-hand side and the right-hand side of such FDs and $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ satisfies all the FDs in Δ .
- $a \neq a'$, $b \neq b'$. In this case, $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ only agree on the attributes A_k such that $A_k \in X_1 \cap X_2$. Since $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1$ and $X_2 \rightarrow Y_2$ are minimal, there is no FD in Δ that contains only attributes A_k such that $A_k \in X_1 \cap X_2$ on its left-hand side. Thus, $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ do not agree on the left-hand side of any FD in Δ and $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ is consistent w.r.t. Δ .

This concludes our proof of the “if” direction.

The “only if” direction. Assume $\{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}'\}$ is inconsistent w.r.t. $\Delta_{A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C}$. We prove that $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ is inconsistent w.r.t. Δ . Since $\{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}'\}$ is inconsistent w.r.t. $\Delta_{A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C}$, one of the following holds:

- $a = a'$ and $b \neq b'$. For the first case of this lemma, since $(cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1) \cap (cl_\Delta(X_2) \setminus X_2) \neq \emptyset$, at least one attribute $A_k \in (cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1)$ also belongs to $cl_\Delta(X_2) \setminus X_2$ and it holds that $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_k = \langle b, c \rangle$. For the second case of this lemma, since $(cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1) \cap X_2 \neq \emptyset$, at least one attribute $A_k \in (cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1)$ also belongs to X_2 and it holds that $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_k = b$. Moreover, by definition of a closure, the FD $X_1 \rightarrow A_k$ is implied by Δ . In both cases, the tuples $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ agree on the attributes on the left-hand side of the FD $X_1 \rightarrow A_k$, but do not agree on the right-hand side of this FD. If two tuples do not satisfy an FD that is implied by a set Δ of FDs, they also do not satisfy Δ , thus $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ is inconsistent w.r.t. Δ .
- $a = a'$, $b = b'$ or $c \neq c'$. For the first case of this lemma, as mentioned above, there is an attribute $A_k \in (cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1)$ such that $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_k = \langle b, c \rangle$. Moreover, by definition of a closure, the FD $X_1 \rightarrow A_k$ is implied by Δ . The tuples $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ agree on the attributes on the left-hand side of the FD $X_1 \rightarrow A_k$, but do not agree on the right-hand side of this FD. For the second case of this lemma, since $(cl_\Delta(X_2) \setminus X_2) \cap X_1 = \emptyset$ and since the FD $X_2 \rightarrow Y_2$ is not trivial, there is at least one attribute $A_k \in (cl_\Delta(X_2) \setminus X_2)$ such that $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_k = \langle b, c \rangle$. Furthermore, the FDs $X_2 \rightarrow A_k$ is implied by Δ . The tuples $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ again agree on the attributes on the left-hand side of the FD $X_2 \rightarrow A_k$, but do not agree on the right-hand side of this FD. If two tuples do not satisfy an FD that is implied by a set Δ of FDs, they also do not satisfy Δ , thus $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ is inconsistent w.r.t. Δ .
- $a \neq a'$, $b = b'$ and $c \neq c'$. In this case, $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ agree on the attributes on the left-hand side of the FD $X_2 \rightarrow Y_2$, but do not agree on the right-hand side of this FD (since the FD is not trivial and contains at least one attribute A_k such that $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_k = \langle b, c \rangle$ on its right-hand side). Therefore, $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ is inconsistent w.r.t. Δ .

This concludes our proof of the “only if” direction. \square

LEMMA A.16. *Let R be a schema and let Δ be an FD set over R that does not contain trivial FDs. Suppose that Δ contains three distinct local minima $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1$, $X_2 \rightarrow Y_2$ and $X_3 \rightarrow Y_3$. Then, there is a fact-wise reduction from $(R(A, B, C), \Delta_{AB \leftrightarrow AC \leftrightarrow BC})$ to (R, Δ) .*

PROOF. We define a fact-wise reduction $\Pi : (R(A, B, C), \Delta_{AB \leftrightarrow AC \leftrightarrow BC}) \rightarrow (R, \Delta)$, using $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1$, $X_2 \rightarrow Y_2$ and $X_3 \rightarrow Y_3$ and the constant $\odot \in \text{Const}$. Let $\mathbf{t} = (a, b, c)$ be a tuple over $R(A, B, C)$ and let $\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ be the set of

attributes in R . We define Π as follows:

$$\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \odot & A_k \in X_1 \cap X_2 \cap X_3 \\ a & A_k \in (X_1 \cap X_2) \setminus X_3 \\ b & A_k \in (X_1 \cap X_3) \setminus X_2 \\ c & A_k \in (X_2 \cap X_3) \setminus X_1 \\ \langle a, b \rangle & A_k \in X_1 \setminus X_2 \setminus X_3 \\ \langle a, c \rangle & A_k \in X_2 \setminus X_1 \setminus X_3 \\ \langle b, c \rangle & A_k \in X_3 \setminus X_1 \setminus X_2 \\ \langle a, b, c \rangle & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

It is left to show that Π is a fact-wise reduction. To do so, we prove that Π is well defined, injective and preserves consistency and inconsistency.

Π is well defined. This is straightforward from the definition.

Π is injective. Let \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}' be two tuples, such that $\mathbf{t} = (a, b, c)$ and $\mathbf{t}' = (a', b', c')$. Assume that $\Pi(\mathbf{t}) = \Pi(\mathbf{t}')$. Let us denote $\Pi(\mathbf{t}) = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}') = (x'_1, \dots, x'_n)$. Note that X_1 contains at least one attribute that does not belong to X_3 (otherwise, it holds that $X_1 \subseteq X_3$, which is a contradiction to the fact that X_3 is minimal). Thus, there exists an attribute A_l such that either $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_l = a$ or $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_l = \langle a, b \rangle$. Similarly, X_3 contains at least one attribute that does not belong to X_2 . Thus, there exists an attribute A_p such that either $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_p = b$ or $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_p = \langle b, c \rangle$. Finally, X_2 contains at least one attribute that does not belong to X_1 . Thus, there exists an attribute A_r such that either $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_r = c$ or $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_r = \langle a, c \rangle$. Hence, $\Pi(\mathbf{t}) = \Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ implies that $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_l = \Pi(\mathbf{t}').A_l$, $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_p = \Pi(\mathbf{t}').A_p$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_r = \Pi(\mathbf{t}').A_r$. We obtain that $a = a'$, $b = b'$ and $c = c'$, which implies $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{t}'$.

Π preserves consistency. Let $\mathbf{t} = (a, b, c)$ and $\mathbf{t}' = (a', b', c')$ be two distinct tuples. We contend that the set $\{t, t'\}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\Delta_{AB \leftrightarrow AC \leftrightarrow BC}$ if and only if the set $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ is consistent w.r.t. Δ .

The “if” direction. Assume that $\{t, t'\}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\Delta_{AB \leftrightarrow AC \leftrightarrow BC}$. We prove that $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ is consistent w.r.t. Δ . Note that \mathbf{t} and \mathbf{t}' cannot agree on more than one attribute (otherwise, they will violate at least one FD in $\Delta_{AB \leftrightarrow AC \leftrightarrow BC}$). Thus, $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ may only agree on attributes that appear in $X_1 \cap X_2 \cap X_3$ and in one of $(X_1 \cap X_2) \setminus X_3$, $(X_1 \cap X_3) \setminus X_2$ or $(X_2 \cap X_3) \setminus X_1$. As mentioned above, X_1 contains at least one attribute that does not belong to X_3 , thus no FD in Δ contains only attributes from $X_1 \cap X_2 \cap X_3$ and $(X_1 \cap X_3) \setminus X_2$ on its left-hand side (otherwise, X_1 will not be minimal). Similarly, no FD in Δ contains only attributes from $X_1 \cap X_2 \cap X_3$ and $(X_2 \cap X_3) \setminus X_1$ on its left-hand side and no FD in Δ contains only attributes from $X_1 \cap X_2 \cap X_3$ and $(X_1 \cap X_2) \setminus X_3$ on its left-hand side. Therefore $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ do not agree on the left-hand side of any FD in Δ , and $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ is consistent w.r.t. Δ .

The “only if” direction. Assume $\{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}'\}$ is inconsistent w.r.t. $\Delta_{AB \leftrightarrow AC \leftrightarrow BC}$. We prove that $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ is inconsistent w.r.t. Δ . Since $\{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}'\}$ is inconsistent w.r.t. $\Delta_{AB \leftrightarrow AC \leftrightarrow BC}$, \mathbf{t} and \mathbf{t}' agree on two attributes, but do not agree on the third one. Thus, one of the following holds:

- $a = a'$, $b = b'$ and $c \neq c'$. In this case, $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ agree on all of the attributes that appear on the left-hand side of $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1$. Since this FD is not trivial, it must contain on its right-hand side an attribute A_k such that $A_k \notin X_1$. That is, there is at least one attribute A_k that appears on the right-hand side of $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1$ such that one of the following holds: (a) $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_k = c$, (b) $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_k = \langle a, c \rangle$, (c) $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_k = \langle b, c \rangle$ or (d) $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_k = \langle a, b, c \rangle$. Hence, $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ do not satisfy the FD $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1$ and $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ is inconsistent w.r.t. Δ .
- $a = a'$, $b \neq b'$ and $c = c'$. This case is symmetric to the first one. $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ agree on all of the attributes that appear on the left-hand side of $X_2 \rightarrow Y_2$, but do not agree on at least one attribute that appears on the right-hand side of the FD.
- $a \neq a'$, $b = b'$ and $c = c'$. This case is also symmetric to the first one. Here, $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ agree on the left-hand side, but not on the right-hand side of the FD $X_3 \rightarrow Y_3$.

□

LEMMA A.17. Let R be a schema and let Δ be an FD set over R that does not contain trivial FDs. Suppose that Δ contains two distinct local minima $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1$ and $X_2 \rightarrow Y_2$, and the following hold.

- $(cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1) \cap X_2 \neq \emptyset$ and $(cl_\Delta(X_2) \setminus X_2) \cap X_1 \neq \emptyset$,
- $(X_2 \setminus X_1) \not\subseteq (cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1)$.

Then, there is a fact-wise reduction from $(R(A, B, C), \Delta_{AB \rightarrow C \rightarrow B})$ to (R, Δ) .

PROOF. We define a fact-wise reduction $\Pi : (R(A, B, C), \Delta_{AB \rightarrow C \rightarrow B}) \rightarrow (R, \Delta)$, using $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1$, $X_2 \rightarrow Y_2$ and the constant $\odot \in \text{Const}$. Let $\mathbf{t} = (a, b, c)$ be a tuple over $R(A, B, C)$ and let $\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ be the set of attributes in R . We define Π as follows:

$$\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \odot & A_k \in X_1 \cap X_2 \\ c & A_k \in X_1 \setminus X_2 \\ b & A_k \in (X_2 \setminus X_1) \cap (cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1) \\ \langle a, b \rangle & A_k \in (X_2 \setminus X_1) \setminus (cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1) \\ \langle b, c \rangle & A_k \in (cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1) \setminus (X_2 \setminus X_1) \\ \langle a, b, c \rangle & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

It is left to show that Π is a fact-wise reduction. To do so, we prove that Π is well defined, injective and preserves consistency and inconsistency.

Π is well defined. This is straightforward from the definition.

Π is injective. Let \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}' be two tuples, such that $\mathbf{t} = (a, b, c)$ and $\mathbf{t}' = (a', b', c')$. Assume that $\Pi(\mathbf{t}) = \Pi(\mathbf{t}')$. Let us denote $\Pi(\mathbf{t}) = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}') = (x'_1, \dots, x'_n)$. Since the FD $X_2 \rightarrow Y_2$ is a local minimum, it holds that $X_1 \not\subseteq X_2$. Thus, there is an attribute that appears in X_1 , but does not appear in X_2 . Moreover, it holds that $(X_2 \setminus X_1) \not\subseteq (cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1)$, thus $X_2 \setminus X_1$ contains at least one attribute that does not appear in $cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1$. Therefore, there are l and p such that $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_l = c$, $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_p = \langle a, b \rangle$. Hence, $\Pi(\mathbf{t}) = \Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ implies that $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_l = \Pi(\mathbf{t}').A_l$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_p = \Pi(\mathbf{t}').A_p$. We obtain that $a = a'$, $b = b'$ and $c = c'$, which implies $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{t}'$.

Π preserves consistency. Let $\mathbf{t} = (a, b, c)$ and $\mathbf{t}' = (a', b', c')$ be two distinct tuples. We contend that the set $\{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}'\}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\Delta_{AB \rightarrow C \rightarrow B}$ if and only if the set $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ is consistent w.r.t. Δ .

The “if” direction. Assume that $\{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}'\}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\Delta_{AB \rightarrow C \rightarrow B}$. We prove that $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ is consistent w.r.t. Δ . One of the following holds:

- $b \neq b'$ and $c \neq c'$. In this case, $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ only agree on the attributes A_k such that $A_k \in X_1 \cap X_2$. Since $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1$ and $X_2 \rightarrow Y_2$ are local minima, there is no FD in Δ that contains on its left-hand side only attributes A_k such that $A_k \in X_1 \cap X_2$. Thus, $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ do not agree on the left-hand side of any FD in Δ and $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ is consistent w.r.t. Δ .
- $a \neq a'$, $b = b'$ and $c = c'$. Note that in this case $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ agree on all of the attributes that belong to $cl_\Delta(X_1)$, and only on these attributes. Any FD in Δ that contains only attributes from $cl_\Delta(X_1)$ on its left-hand side, also contains only attributes from $cl_\Delta(X_1)$ on its right-hand side (by definition of closure). Thus, $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ satisfy all the FDs in Δ .
- $a \neq a'$, $b = b'$ and $c \neq c'$. In this case, $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ only agree on the attributes A_k such that $A_k \in X_1 \cap X_2$ or $A_k \in (X_2 \setminus X_1) \cap (cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1)$. Since the FD $X_2 \rightarrow Y_2$ is a local minimum, and since X_2 contains an attributes that does not belong to $cl_\Delta(X_1)$, no FD in Δ contains on its left-hand side only attributes A_k such that $A_k \in X_1 \cap X_2$ or $A_k \in (X_2 \setminus X_1) \cap (cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1)$. Thus, $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ do not agree on the left-hand side of any FD in Δ and $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ is consistent w.r.t. Δ .

This concludes our proof of the “if” direction.

The “only if” direction. Assume $\{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}'\}$ is inconsistent w.r.t. $\Delta_{AB \rightarrow C \rightarrow B}$. We prove that $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ is inconsistent w.r.t. Δ . Since $\{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}'\}$ is inconsistent w.r.t. $\Delta_{AB \rightarrow C \rightarrow B}$, one of the following holds:

- $a = a'$, $b = b'$ and $c \neq c'$. In this case, $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ agree on all of the attributes that appear in X_2 . Since $X_2 \rightarrow Y_2$ is not trivial, there is an attribute A_k in Y_2 that does not belong to X_2 . That is, one of the following holds: (a) $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_k = c$, (b) $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_k = \langle b, c \rangle$ or (c) $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_k = \langle a, b, c \rangle$. Thus, $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ violates the FD $X_2 \rightarrow Y_2$ and it is inconsistent w.r.t. Δ .
- $b \neq b'$ and $c = c'$. In this case, $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ agree on all of the attributes that appear in X_1 . Since $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1$ is not trivial, there is an attribute A_k in Y_1 that does not belong to X_1 . That is, one of the following holds: (a) $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_k = b$, (b) $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_k = \langle a, b \rangle$, (c) $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_k = \langle b, c \rangle$ or (d) $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_k = \langle a, b, c \rangle$. Thus, $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ violates the FD $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1$ and it is again inconsistent w.r.t. Δ .

This concludes our proof of the “only if” direction. \square

Next, we show that whenever OptSRepair simplifies an FD set Δ into an FD set Δ' , there is a fact-wise reduction from (R, Δ') to (R, Δ) , where R is the underlying relation schema. Note that for each one of the simplifications, we just remove a set of attributes from the schema and the FDs in Δ . Thus, we will show that there is a fact-wise reduction from $(R, \Delta - X)$ to (R, Δ) , where X is a set of attributes.

LEMMA A.18. *Let $R(A_1, \dots, A_m)$ be a relation schema and let Δ be an FD set over R . Let $X \subseteq \{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$ be a set of attributes. Then, there is a fact-wise reduction from $(R, \Delta - X)$ to (R, Δ) .*

PROOF. We define a fact-wise reduction $\Pi : (R, \Delta - X) \rightarrow (R, \Delta)$, using the constant $\odot \in \text{Const}$. Let \mathbf{t} be a tuple over R . We define Π as follows:

$$\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \odot & A_k \in X \\ t.A_k & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

It is left to show that Π is a fact-wise reduction. To do so, we prove that Π is well defined, injective and preserves consistency and inconsistency.

Π is well defined. This is straightforward from the definition.

Π is injective. Let \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}' be two distinct tuples over R . Since $t \neq t'$, there exists an attribute A_j in $\{A_1, \dots, A_k\} \setminus X$, such that $t.A_j \neq t'.A_j$. Thus, it also holds that $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_j \neq \Pi(\mathbf{t}').A_j$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}) \neq \Pi(\mathbf{t}')$.

Π preserves consistency. Let \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}' be two distinct tuples over R . We contend that the set $\{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}'\}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\Delta - X$ if and only if the set $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ is consistent w.r.t. Δ .

The “if” direction. Assume that $\{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}'\}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\Delta - X$. We prove that $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ is consistent w.r.t. Δ . Let us assume, by way of contradiction, that $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ is inconsistent w.r.t. Δ . That is, there exists an FD $Z \rightarrow W$ in Δ , such that $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ agree on all the attributes in Z , but do not agree on at least one attribute B in W . Clearly, it holds that $B \notin X$ (since $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_i = \Pi(\mathbf{t}').A_i = \odot$ for each attribute $A_i \in X$). Note that the FD $(Z \setminus X) \rightarrow (W \setminus X)$ belongs to $\Delta - X$. Since $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_k = t.A_k$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}').A_k = t'.A_k$ for each attribute $A_k \notin X$, the tuples \mathbf{t} and \mathbf{t}' also agree on all the attributes on the left-hand side of the FD $(Z \setminus X) \rightarrow (W \setminus X)$, but do not agree on the attribute B that belongs to $W \setminus X$. Thus, \mathbf{t} and \mathbf{t}' violate an FD in Δ , which is a contradiction to the fact that the set $\{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}'\}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\Delta - X$.

The “only if” direction. Assume $\{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}'\}$ is inconsistent w.r.t. $\Delta - X$. We prove that $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ is inconsistent w.r.t. Δ . Since $\{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}'\}$ is inconsistent w.r.t. $\Delta - X$, there exists an FD $Z \rightarrow W$ in $\Delta - X$, such that \mathbf{t} and \mathbf{t}' agree on all the attributes on the left-hand side of the FD, but do not agree on at least one attribute B on its right-hand side. The FD $(Z \cup X) \rightarrow (W \cup X')$ (for some $X' \subseteq X$) belongs to Δ , and since $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_k = t.A_k$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}').A_k = t'.A_k$ for each attribute $A_k \notin X$, and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}).A_k = \Pi(\mathbf{t}').A_k = \odot$ for each attribute $A_k \in X$, it holds that $\Pi(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Pi(\mathbf{t}')$ agree on all the attributes in $Z \cup X$, but do not agree on the attribute $B \in (W \cup X')$, thus $\{\Pi(\mathbf{t}), \Pi(\mathbf{t}')\}$ is inconsistent w.r.t. Δ . \square

The following lemmas are straightforward based on Lemma A.18.

LEMMA A.19. *Let R be a relation schema and let Δ be an FD set over R . If Δ has a common lhs A , then there is a fact-wise reduction from $(R, \Delta - A)$ to (R, Δ) .*

LEMMA A.20. *Let R be a relation schema and let Δ be an FD set over R . If Δ has a consensus FD, $\emptyset \rightarrow X$, then there is a fact-wise reduction from $(R, \Delta - X)$ to (R, Δ) .*

LEMMA A.21. *Let R be a relation schema and let Δ be an FD set over R . If Δ has an lhs marriage, (X_1, X_2) , then there is a fact-wise reduction from $(R, \Delta - X_1 X_2)$ to (R, Δ) .*

LEMMA A.22. *Let R be a relation schema and let Δ be an FD set over R . If no simplification can be applied to Δ and $\text{OSRSucceeds}(\Delta)$ returns false, then computing an optimal S-repair for Δ is APX-complete.*

PROOF. If no simplification can be applied to Δ and $\text{OSRSucceeds}(\Delta)$ returns false, then Δ is not trivial and also not empty. Note that in this case, Δ cannot be a chain. Otherwise, Δ contains a global minimum, which is either an FD of the form $\emptyset \rightarrow X$, in which case Δ has a consensus FD, or an FD of the form $X \rightarrow Y$, where $X \neq \emptyset$, in which case it holds that $X \subseteq Z$ for each FD $Z \rightarrow W$ in Δ and Δ has a common lhs. Thus, Δ contains at least two local minima $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1$ and $X_2 \rightarrow Y_2$ (that is, no FD $Z \rightarrow W$ in Δ is such that $Z \subset X_1$ or $Z \subset X_2$). Note that we always remove trivial FDs from Δ before applying a simplification, thus we can assume that Δ does not contain trivial FDs. One of the following holds:

1. $(cl_\Delta(X_2) \setminus X_2) \cap X_1 = \emptyset$. We divide this case into three subcases:
 - $(cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1) \cap cl_\Delta(X_2) = \emptyset$. In this case, Lemma A.7 and Lemma A.14 imply that computing an optimal S-repair is APX-hard.
 - $(cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1) \cap (cl_\Delta(X_2) \setminus X_2) \neq \emptyset$ and $(cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1) \cap X_2 = \emptyset$. In this case, Lemma A.8 and Lemma A.15 imply that computing an optimal S-repair is APX-hard.
 - $(cl_\Delta(X_1) \setminus X_1) \cap X_2 \neq \emptyset$. In this case, Lemma A.8 and Lemma A.15 imply that computing an optimal S-repair is APX-hard.
2. $(cl_\Delta(X_2) \setminus X_2) \cap X_1 \neq \emptyset$. We divide this case into three subcases:

- $(cl_{\Delta}(X_1) \setminus X_1) \cap X_2 \neq \emptyset$ and it holds that $(X_1 \setminus X_2) \subseteq (cl_{\Delta}(X_2) \setminus X_2)$ and $(X_2 \setminus X_1) \subseteq (cl_{\Delta}(X_1) \setminus X_1)$. In this case, Δ contains at least one more local minimum. Otherwise, for every FD $Z \rightarrow W$ in Δ it holds that either $X_1 \subseteq Z$ or $X_2 \subseteq Z$. If $X_1 \cap X_2 \neq \emptyset$, then Δ has a common lhs, which is an attribute from $X_1 \cap X_2$. If $X_1 \cap X_2 = \emptyset$, then Δ does not have a common lhs, but has an lhs marriage. In both cases, we get a contradiction to the fact that no simplifications can be applied to the Δ . Thus, Lemma A.11 and Lemma A.16 imply that computing an optimal S-repair is APX-hard.
- $(cl_{\Delta}(X_1) \setminus X_1) \cap X_2 \neq \emptyset$ and it holds that $(X_2 \setminus X_1) \not\subseteq (cl_{\Delta}(X_1) \setminus X_1)$. In this case, Lemma A.13 and Lemma A.17 imply that computing an optimal S-repair is APX-hard.

Proposition 3.3 implies that computing an optimal S-repair is always in APX, thus the problem is actually APX-complete in each one of these cases. This concludes our proof of the lemma. \square

Finally, we prove the following.

LEMMA A.23. *Let R be a relation schema and let Δ be an FD set over R . If $\text{OSRSucceeds}(\Delta)$ returns false, then computing an optimal S-repair for Δ is APX-complete.*

PROOF. We will prove the lemma by induction on n , the number of simplifications that will be applied to Δ by OSRSucceeds . The basis of the induction is $n = 0$. In this case, Lemma A.22 implies that computing an optimal S-repair is indeed APX-complete. For the inductive step, we need to prove that if the claim is true for all $n = 1, \dots, k-1$, it is also true for $n = k$. In this case, $\text{OSRSucceeds}(\Delta)$ will start by applying a simplification to the problem. One of the following holds:

- Δ has a common lhs A . Note that $\text{OSRSucceeds}(\Delta)$ will return false only if $\text{OSRSucceeds}(\Delta - A)$ returns false. From the inductive step we know that if $\text{OSRSucceeds}(\Delta - A)$ returns false, then computing an optimal S-repair for $\Delta - A$ is APX-complete. Thus, Lemma A.19 implies that computing an optimal S-repair for Δ is APX-hard.
- Δ has a consensus FD $\emptyset \rightarrow X$. The algorithm $\text{OSRSucceeds}(\Delta)$ will return false only if $\text{OSRSucceeds}(\Delta - X)$ returns false. From the inductive step we know that if $\text{OSRSucceeds}(\Delta - X)$ returns false, then computing an optimal S-repair for $\Delta - X$ is APX-complete. Thus, Lemma A.20 implies that computing an optimal S-repair for Δ is APX-hard.
- Δ has an lhs marriage (X_1, X_2) . Again, $\text{OSRSucceeds}(\Delta)$ will return false only if $\text{OSRSucceeds}(\Delta - X_1X_2)$ returns false. From the inductive step we know that if $\text{OSRSucceeds}(\Delta - X_1X_2)$ returns false, then computing an optimal S-repair for $\Delta - X_1X_2$ is APX-complete. Thus, Lemma A.19 implies that computing an optimal S-repair for Δ is APX-hard.

Proposition 3.3 implies that computing an optimal S-repair is always in APX, thus the problem is APX-complete in each one of these cases. This concludes our proof of the lemma. \square

B. DETAILS FROM SECTION 4

B.1 Proof of Theorem 4.1

In this section we prove Theorem 4.1.

THEOREM 4.1. *Suppose that $\Delta = \Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2$ where Δ_1 and Δ_2 are attribute disjoint. The following are equivalent for all $\alpha \geq 1$.*

1. An α -optimal U-repair can be computed in polynomial time under Δ .
2. An α -optimal U-repair can be computed in polynomial time under each of Δ_1 and Δ_2 .

First we show the following proposition:

PROPOSITION B.1. *For a schema R and a table T over R , if U^*, U_1^*, U_2^* denote optimal U-repairs for $\Delta, \Delta_1, \Delta_2$ respectively, where $\Delta = \Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2$ and Δ_1, Δ_2 are attribute disjoint, then*

$$\text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U^*, T) = \text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_1^*, T) + \text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_2^*, T)$$

PROOF. Let us denote the Hamming distance of a tuple $\text{id } i \in \text{ids}(T)$ in U^* and T with respect to a subset of attributes $P \subseteq \text{attr}(\Delta)$ as $H_P(T[i], U^*[i])$ (i.e., the the number of attributes in P where $T[i]$ and $U^*[i]$ differ). Since U^* is an optimal U-repair for Δ , any attribute $\notin \text{attr}(\Delta)$ is not updated in U^* (otherwise we can change U^* in poly-time such that all attributes $\notin \text{attr}(\Delta)$ which will reduce the distance, contradicting that U^* is optimal). Clearly, for any $i \in \text{ids}(T)$, $H(T[i], U^*[i]) = H_{\text{attr}(\Delta)}(T[i], U^*[i]) = H_{\text{attr}(\Delta_1)}(T[i], U^*[i]) + H_{\text{attr}(\Delta_2)}(T[i], U^*[i])$. Hence from U^* we can create two repairs U_1^*, U_2^* , one for Δ_1 and one for Δ_2 , by taking the attribute values in $\text{attr}(\Delta_1)$ (resp. $\text{attr}(\Delta_2)$) from U , and keeping the remaining unchanged as in T , leading to $\text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U^*, T) = \text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_1^*, T) + \text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_2^*, T)$. Note that U_1^* is an optimal U-repair for Δ_1 , otherwise combining with U_2^* we get a U-repair U_0^* for Δ of smaller distance than U^* contradicting the optimality of U^* . Similarly, U_2^* is an optimal U-repair of Δ_2 . \square

PROOF OF THEOREM 4.1. We now prove the theorem.

(1) \rightarrow (2). Suppose an α -optimal U-repair can be computed in polynomial time under Δ for any schema R and any table T on R by an algorithm $P_\Delta(T)$. We create another table T_0 from T by keeping the values of attributes of $\text{attr}(\Delta_1)$ the same for all tuples, and changing the values of all other attributes of all tuples to 0. Let $U_0^*, U_{01}^*, U_{02}^*$ denote optimal solutions for $\Delta, \Delta_1, \Delta_2$ for T_0 . From Proposition B.1, for T' ,

$$\text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_0^*, T_0) = \text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_{01}^*, T_0) + \text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_{02}^*, T_0) \quad (10)$$

Since no FDs are violated in Δ_2 in T_0 , $T_0 = U_{02}^*$, and $\text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_{02}^*, T_0) = 0$. Therefore,

$$\text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_0^*, T_0) = \text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_{01}^*, T_0) \quad (11)$$

Then we run the algorithm $P_\Delta(T_0)$ on T_0 to obtain an α -optimal U-repair U_0 for T_0 in polynomial time with respect to Δ , i.e.,

$$\text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_0, T_0) \leq \alpha \text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_{01}^*, T_0) \quad (12)$$

We obtain a U-repair U_{01} for Δ_1 and T_0 from U_0 by copying the attribute values in $\text{attr}(\Delta_1)$ from U_0 and keeping the other attributes unchanged as in T_0 . Hence

$$\text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_{01}, T_0) \leq \text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_0, T_0) \leq \alpha \text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_{01}^*, T_0) = \alpha \text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_{01}^*, T_0) \quad (13)$$

Since the attributes $\notin \text{attr}(\Delta_1)$ are unchanged in U_{01} and U_{01}^* , and the attribute values of $\text{attr}(\Delta_1)$ are the same in T_0 and T , U_{01} is also a U-repair of T with $\text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_{01}, T_0) = \text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_{01}, T)$, and U_{01}^* is also an optimal U-repair of T with $\text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_{01}^*, T_0) = \text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_{01}^*, T)$, and hence,

$$\text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_{01}, T) \leq \alpha \text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_{01}^*, T) \quad (14)$$

This gives an α -optimal U-repair of T for Δ_1 in polynomial time (similar argument holds for Δ_2).

(2) \rightarrow (1). This direction is simpler, and we argue that an α -optimal U-repair of Δ can be obtained by composing α -optimal U-repairs U_1, U_2 of Δ_1, Δ_2 for a table T over schema R . Suppose U^*, U_1^*, U_2^* are optimal U-repairs of $\Delta, \Delta_1, \Delta_2$ respectively. Since U_1, U_2 are α -optimal U-repairs,

$$\text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_1, T) \leq \alpha \text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_1^*, T) \text{ and } \text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_2, T) \leq \alpha \text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_2^*, T) \quad (15)$$

We construct a U-repair U of Δ by choosing attribute values in $\text{attr}(\Delta_1)$ from U_1 values in $\text{attr}(\Delta_2)$ from U_2 , and choosing all other attribute values from T . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U, T) &= \text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_1, T) + \text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_2, T) \\ &\leq \alpha (\text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_1^*, T) + \text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_2^*, T)) \quad \text{from (15)} \\ &= \alpha \text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U^*, T) \quad \text{from Proposition B.1} \end{aligned}$$

Hence U is an α -optimal U-repair for Δ . \square

B.2 Proof of Theorem 4.3

In this section we prove Theorem 4.3.

THEOREM 4.3. *Let Δ be a set of FDs. There is a strict reduction from computing an optimal U-repair for Δ to computing an optimal U-repair for $\Delta - \text{cl}_\Delta(\emptyset)$, and vice versa.*

To prove this theorem, first we show the following proposition:

PROPOSITION B.2. *For a consensus FD $\emptyset \rightarrow A$, an optimal U-repair can be computed in polynomial time.*

PROOF. Consider a table T over a schema R that violates the FD $\emptyset \rightarrow A$, i.e., at least two tuples in T have two distinct values of A . For every distinct value a of A in T , let M_a denote the set of tuples \mathbf{t} such that $\mathbf{t}.A = a$, i.e., $M_a = \sigma_{A=a}T$. We obtain a repair of T as follows: for every distinct value a of A , compute the total weight of the tuples in M_a , i.e., compute $W_a = \sum_{\mathbf{t} \in M_a} w_{\mathbf{t}}$ (slightly abusing the notation for weights). Choose the value of a , say a_0 , having the maximum value of W_a among all such a 's. Keep the tuples in M_{a_0} unchanged, and update every other tuple $\mathbf{t} \in M_a$, $a \neq a_0$, such that $\mathbf{t}.A = a_0$. Clearly, this new table, say U , is a consistent update since now every tuple \mathbf{t} in T will have $\mathbf{t}.A = a_0$.

To see that U is an optimal U-repair, first note that a repair with a better distance cannot be obtained by setting the A values to a fresh constant from the infinite domain, since instead choosing a value from the active domain saves the cost of the repair for at least one tuple in T . Now assume some other value $a_1 \neq a_0$ has been chosen for all tuples in T in a repair U_1 such that $\text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_1, T) < \text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U, T)$. Then $\text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_1, T) = \sum_{i \in \text{ids}(T)} w_T(i) \cdot H(T[i], U_1[i]) = \sum_{a \neq a_1} \sum_{\mathbf{t} \in M_a} w_{\mathbf{t}}$ (since the Hamming distance is 1 for all $a \neq a_1$, and is 0 for a_1) $= \sum_{a \neq a_1} W_a = (\sum_{\mathbf{t} \in T} w_{\mathbf{t}}) - W_{a_1}$, whereas $\text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U, T) = (\sum_{\mathbf{t} \in T} w_{\mathbf{t}}) - W_{a_0}$. Since $W_{a_0} \geq W_{a_1}$, $\text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_1, T) \geq \text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U, T)$ contradicting the assumption that $\text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_1, T) < \text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U, T)$. Hence U is an optimal U-repair. \square

From Theorem 4.1 and B.2, the corollary below follows:

COROLLARY B.3. *For the consensus FD $\emptyset \rightarrow cl_\Delta(\emptyset)$, where $cl_\Delta(\emptyset)$ is the set of all consensus attributes, an optimal U-repair can be computed in polynomial time.*

In addition, the following proposition is straightforward.

PROPOSITION B.4. *The two sets of FDs Δ and $\Delta' = \{\emptyset \rightarrow cl_\Delta(\emptyset)\} \cup (\Delta - cl_\Delta(\emptyset))$ are equivalent, and for any table T , and α -optimal solution for Δ is also an α -optimal solution for Δ' , and vice versa.*

Using the above results, we prove Theorem 4.3.

PROOF. To show strict reductions, we show the following two directions:

α -optimal U-repair of Δ to an α -optimal U-repair of $\Delta - cl_\Delta(\emptyset)$. Using (i) Proposition B.4 and the fact that (ii) $\{\emptyset \rightarrow cl_\Delta(\emptyset)\}$ and $(\Delta - cl_\Delta(\emptyset))$ are attribute disjoint, from Theorem 4.1, an α -optimal U-repair of $\Delta - cl_\Delta(\emptyset)$ can be computed in polynomial time if an α -optimal U-repair of Δ can be computed in polynomial time.

α -optimal U-repair of $\Delta - cl_\Delta(\emptyset)$ to an α -optimal U-repair of Δ . Note that an optimal U-repair of $\Delta - cl_\Delta(\emptyset)$ (which is also an α -optimal U-repair for any $\alpha \geq 1$) can be computed in polynomial time (by Corollary B.3). Therefore, using Proposition B.4 and the fact that $\{\emptyset \rightarrow cl_\Delta(\emptyset)\}$ and $(\Delta - cl_\Delta(\emptyset))$ are attribute disjoint, this direction also follows from Theorem 4.1. \square

B.3 Proof of Proposition 4.9

PROPOSITION 4.9. *Under $\Delta = \{A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow A\}$, an optimal U-repair can be computed in polynomial time.*

For the FD set $\Delta = \{A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow A\}$, the goal is to show that an optimal U-repair can be computed in polynomial time. Note that the FDs $\{A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow A\}$ imply that in a consistent update, one value of A cannot be associated with multiple values of B and vice versa.

PROOF. For $\Delta = \{A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow A\}$, although $mlc(\Delta) = 2$, we argue below that still $dist_{\text{upd}}(U^*, T) = dist_{\text{sub}}(S^*, T)$ for an optimal U-repair U^* and an optimal S-repair S^* for a table T over R . From Corollary 4.5,

$$dist_{\text{sub}}(S^*, T) \leq dist_{\text{upd}}(U^*, T) \quad (16)$$

Given S^* , we can create a consistent update U by keeping the tuples in S^* unchanged, and updating the A or B values of all deleted tuples in S^* as follows. Consider any tuple $\mathbf{t} \in T \setminus S^*$. There must exist a tuple $\mathbf{s} \in S^*$ with either $\mathbf{t}.A = \mathbf{s}.A$ or $\mathbf{t}.B = \mathbf{s}.B$, otherwise, \mathbf{t} could be included in S^* violating the optimality of S^* . Suppose there is a tuple $\mathbf{s} \in S^*$ with $\mathbf{t}.A = \mathbf{s}.A$ without loss of generality. Then we change the value of $\mathbf{t}.B$ to $\mathbf{s}.B$ with the Hamming distance = 1. Hence we get a consistent update U with

$$dist_{\text{sub}}(S^*, T) \geq dist_{\text{upd}}(U, T) \quad (17)$$

Combining (16) and (17), U is an optimal U-repair.

Since Δ passes the test of OSRSucceeds (by applying lhs marriage), from Theorem 3.4 an optimal S-repair S^* can be computed in polynomial time, from which an optimal U-repair of $\{A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow A\}$ can be computed in polynomial time as described above. \square

B.4 Proof of Theorem 4.10

In this section we prove Theorem 4.10.

THEOREM 4.10. *For the relation schema $R(A, B, C)$ and the FD set $\Delta_{A \leftrightarrow B \rightarrow C}$, computing an optimal U-repair is APX-complete, even on unweighted, duplicate-free tables.*

As discussed in Section 4.3, we give a reduction from the vertex cover problem in bounded-degree graphs (known to be APX-complete) showing that the size of the minimum vertex cover is k if and only if the distance of the optimal U-repair for the constructed instance is $2|E| + k$ (where E is the set of edges in the original graph). This proof is inspired by the NP-hardness proof for $\Delta = \{A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow C\}$ in [24], but needs some additional machinery to extend the reduction to $\Delta_{A \leftrightarrow B \rightarrow C}$.

Construction. The input to minimum vertex cover problem is a graph $G(V, E)$. The goal is to find a vertex cover C for G (a set of vertices that touches every edge in G), such that no other vertex cover C' of G contains less vertices than C (that is, $|C'| < |C|$). This problem is known to be NP-hard even for bounded degree graphs. Given such an input, we will construct the input I for our problem as follows. Let $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ be the set of vertices in g and let $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_m\}$ be the set of edges in g . For each edge $e_r = (v_i, v_j)$ in E , the instance I will contain the following tuples:

- $(v_i, v_j, 0)$,
- $(v_j, v_i, 0)$.

In addition, for each vertex $v_i \in V$, the instance I will contain the following tuple:

- $(v_i, v_i, 1)$,

Let C_{min} be a minimum vertex cover of G . We will now prove the following results:

1. For each vertex cover C of G of size k , there is a U-repair of I with a distance $2|E| + k$.
2. No U-repair of I has a distance $2|E| + k$ for some $k < |C_{min}|$.

Then, we can conclude that the size of the minimum vertex cover of G is m if and only if the distance of the optimal U-repair of I is $2|E| + m$.

Proof of (1). We will now prove that for each vertex cover C of g of size k , there is a U-repair of I with distance $2|E| + k$. Assume that C is a vertex cover of g that contain k vertices. We can build a U-repair J of I as follows: for each edge $e_r = (v_i, v_j)$, if $v_i \in C$, then we will change the tuples $(v_i, v_j, 0)$ and $(v_j, v_i, 0)$ to $(v_i, v_i, 0)$. Otherwise, we will change these two tuples to $(v_j, v_j, 0)$ (note that in this case, since v_i does not belong to the vertex cover, v_j does). Moreover, for each vertex v_i that belongs to C , we will change the tuple $(v_i, v_i, 1)$ to $R(v_i, v_i, 0)$. Note that if a vertex v_i does not belong to C , the instance J will not contain any tuple of the form $(v_i, v_i, 0)$, thus the tuple $(v_i, v_i, 1)$ does not agree on the value of A or B with any other tuple in J , and is not in conflict with any other tuple. On the other hand, if a node v_i does belong to C , the instance J will only contain tuples of the form $(v_i, v_i, 0)$ for v_i , since in this case we change the tuple $(v_i, v_i, 1)$ to $(v_i, v_i, 0)$. Thus, J is indeed a U-repair. Finally, for each edge $(v_i, v_j) \in E$ we update one cell in each of the tuples $(v_i, v_j, 0)$ and $(v_j, v_i, 0)$ ($2|E|$ cell updates), and for each vertex $V_i \in C$ we update one cell in the tuple $(v_i, v_i, 1)$ (k cell updates), thus the distance of J is $2|E| + k$.

Proof of (2). In order to prove this part of the lemma (that is, that no U-repair of I is of distance $2|E| + k$ for some $k < |C_{min}|$), we first have to prove the following lemma, which is a nontrivial part of the proof.

LEMMA B.5. *Let J be a U-repair of I that updates t tuples of the form $(v_i, v_j, 0)$ for some $t < 2|E|$. Then, there is a U-repair J' of I , that updates at least $t + 1$ tuples of the form $(v_i, v_j, 0)$, such that the distance of J' is lower or equal to the distance of J .*

PROOF. Since it holds that $t < 2|E|$, there is at least one tuple $(v_1, v_2, 0)$, for some $v_1, v_2 \in V$ that is not updated by J . We will now show that we can build another U-repair J' , that updates the tuple $(v_1, v_2, 0)$ (as well as every tuple that is updated by J), such that the distance of J' is lower or equal to the distance of J . That is, J' will update at least $t + 1$ tuples of the form $(v_i, v_j, 0)$.

The tuple $\mathbf{t}_1 = (v_1, v_2, 0)$ is in conflict with the tuples $\mathbf{t}_2 = (v_1, v_1, 1)$ and $\mathbf{t}_3 = (v_2, v_2, 1)$. Moreover, these two tuples are in conflict with the tuple $\mathbf{t}_4 = (v_2, v_1, 0)$. We will now show that since the tuple \mathbf{t}_1 is not updated by J and J is consistent, J must make at least four changes to the tuples in $\{\mathbf{t}_2, \mathbf{t}_3, \mathbf{t}_4\}$. The following holds:

1. To resolve the conflict between \mathbf{t}_1 and \mathbf{t}_2 (that agree only on the value of attribute A), we have to either change the value of attribute A in \mathbf{t}_2 to another value, or change the values of both attributes B and C to v_2 and 0 , respectively. In the first case, since \mathbf{t}_2 is still in conflict with \mathbf{t}_4 (as they only agree on the value of attribute B), we also have to change the value of attribute B in one of \mathbf{t}_2 or \mathbf{t}_4 . In the second case, \mathbf{t}_2 and \mathbf{t}_4 are no longer in conflict, thus we do not have to make any more changes. In both cases, the distance of the update is 2.
2. To resolve the conflict between \mathbf{t}_1 and \mathbf{t}_3 (that agree only on the value of attribute B), we have to either change the value of attribute B in \mathbf{t}_3 to another value, or change the values of both attributes A and C to v_1 and 0 , respectively. In the first case, since \mathbf{t}_3 is still in conflict with \mathbf{t}_4 (as they only agree on the value of attribute A), we also have to change the value of attribute A in one of \mathbf{t}_3 or \mathbf{t}_4 . In the second case, \mathbf{t}_3 and \mathbf{t}_4 are no longer in conflict, thus we do not have to make any more changes. In both cases, the cost of the update is 2.

Note that the updates presented in (1) and (2) above are independent (as they change different attributes in different tuples), thus we have to combine them to resolve all of the conflicts among the tuples in $\{\mathbf{t}_1, \mathbf{t}_2, \mathbf{t}_3, \mathbf{t}_4\}$, and the total cost of updating the tuples \mathbf{t}_2 , \mathbf{t}_3 and \mathbf{t}_4 in J is at least 4. Moreover, note that it is not necessary to change the value of attribute A in both \mathbf{t}_3 and \mathbf{t}_4 or change the value of attribute B in both \mathbf{t}_2 and \mathbf{t}_4 , since changing just one of them resolves the conflict between the tuples. If J updates both of these values, then the cost of updating the tuples \mathbf{t}_2 , \mathbf{t}_3 and \mathbf{t}_4 is increased by one for each pair of tuples (\mathbf{t}_2 and \mathbf{t}_4 , or \mathbf{t}_3 and \mathbf{t}_4) updated together. We will use this observation later in the proof.

Now, we will build an instance J' that updates each one of the tuples updated by J , as well as the tuple \mathbf{t}_1 . We will prove that the distance of J' is not higher than the distance of J . We will start by adding these four tuples to J' :

1. Instead of the tuple \mathbf{t}_1 $((v_1, v_2, 0))$, we will insert the tuple $(v_1, v_1, 0)$.

2. Instead of the tuple \mathbf{t}_2 $((v_1, v_1, 1))$, we will insert the tuple $(v_1, v_1, 0)$.
3. Instead of the tuple \mathbf{t}_3 $((v_2, v_2, 1))$, we will insert the tuple $(v_2, v_2, 0)$.
4. Instead of the tuple \mathbf{t}_4 $((v_2, v_1, 0))$, we will insert the tuple $(v_2, v_2, 0)$.

So far we only updated one cell in each of the four tuples discussed above. Thus, the current cost is 4. As mentioned above, the cost of changing these tuples in J is at least 4, thus so far we did not exceed the cost of J . From now on, we will look at the rest of the tuples in J and insert each one of them to J' (in some cases, only after updating them to resolve some conflict).

5. For each tuple \mathbf{t} that appears in J that is not in conflict with one of $(v_1, v_1, 0)$ or $(v_2, v_2, 0)$, we insert \mathbf{t} to J' .

Clearly, J' is consistent at this point, and since those tuples are updated by J' in exactly the same way they were updated by J , we did not exceed the distance of J . Each one of the remaining tuples is in conflict with one of $(v_1, v_1, 0)$ or $(v_2, v_2, 0)$, thus we have to update it before inserting it to J' .

6. Each tuple \mathbf{t} such that $\mathbf{t}.A = v_1$ is in conflict with the tuple $(v_1, v_1, 0)$. Since the tuple $(v_1, v_2, 0)$ belongs to J and J is consistent, it holds that $\mathbf{t} = (v_1, v_2, 0)$. There are a few possible cases:
 - If the original tuple \mathbf{t} (the tuple in the instance I) was of the form $(v_i, v_j, 0)$ for some $v_i \neq v_1$ and $v_j \neq v_2$, then J updated two cells in this tuple. We will replace this tuple in J' with the tuple $(v_1, v_1, 0)$. Note that the cost is the same (since we again update two cells).
 - If the original tuple \mathbf{t} was of the form $(v_1, v_j, 0)$ for some $v_j \neq v_2$, then J updated one cell in this tuple. We will replace this tuple in J' with the tuple $(v_1, v_1, 0)$. Again, the cost is the same.
 - If the original tuple was of the form $(v_i, v_2, 0)$ for some $v_i \neq v_1$, we will replace it with the tuple $(v_2, v_2, 0)$ with no additional cost.
 - If the original tuple was of the form $(v_i, v_i, 1)$ for some $v_i \notin \{v_1, v_2\}$ (we already handled the case where v_i is one of v_1 or v_2), then J updated three cells in this tuple (the values in all of the attributes are different from the values in the tuple $(v_1, v_2, 0)$), and we will replace it with the tuple $(v_2, v_2, 0)$ with no additional cost.
7. Each tuple \mathbf{t} such that $\mathbf{t}.B = v_2$ is in conflict with the tuple $(v_2, v_2, 0)$. Again, since the tuple $(v_1, v_2, 0)$ belongs to J and J is consistent, it holds that $\mathbf{t} = (v_1, v_2, 0)$. This case is symmetric to the previous one, thus we will not elaborate on all of the possible cases.

So far, we inserted to J' one tuple (either $(v_1, v_1, 0)$ or $(v_2, v_2, 0)$) for each of the four tuples in $\{\mathbf{t}_1, \mathbf{t}_2, \mathbf{t}_3, \mathbf{t}_4\}$, one tuple for each tuple in J that is not in conflict with neither $(v_1, v_1, 0)$ nor $(v_2, v_2, 0)$, and one tuple (again either $(v_1, v_1, 0)$ or $(v_2, v_2, 0)$) for each tuple in J that agrees with $(v_1, v_1, 0)$ only on the value of attribute A or agrees with $(v_2, v_2, 0)$ only on the value of attribute B . It is left to insert each tuple that agrees with $(v_1, v_1, 0)$ on the value of attribute B or agrees with $(v_2, v_2, 0)$ on the value of attribute A .

8. Each tuple \mathbf{t} such that $\mathbf{t}.A = v_2$ is in conflict with the tuple $(v_2, v_2, 0)$. Note that in this case it holds that $\mathbf{t}.B \neq v_2$, since J is consistent and also contains the tuple $(v_1, v_2, 0)$. Assume that \mathbf{t} is the tuple (v_2, v_i, x) for some $v_i \in V$. Again, there are a few possible cases:
 - If the original tuple \mathbf{t} (the tuple in the instance I) was of the form (v_j, v'_i, y) for some $v_j \neq v_2$ and $v'_i \neq v_i$, then J updated at least two cells in this tuple in J . We will replace this tuple in J' with the tuple $(v_2, v_2, 0)$, with no additional cost.
 - If the original tuple \mathbf{t} was of the form $(v_2, v'_i, 0)$ for some $v'_i \neq v_i$, then J updated at least one cell in this tuple (the value of attribute B). We will replace this tuple in J' with the tuple $(v_2, v_2, 0)$, with no additional cost.
 - If the original tuple \mathbf{t} was of the form (v_j, v_i, x) for some $v_j \neq v_2$, then J updated at least one cell in this tuple (the value of attribute A). We will replace this tuple in J' with the tuple $(y_i, v_i, 0)$, for some new value y_i that depends on i , with no additional cost.
9. Each tuple \mathbf{t} such that $\mathbf{t}.B = v_1$ is in conflict with the tuple $(v_1, v_1, 0)$. This case is symmetric to the previous one, thus we will not elaborate on all of the possible cases.

At this point, J' contains tuples of the form $(v_1, v_1, 0)$ and $(v_2, v_2, 0)$, tuples from J that are not in conflict with these tuples, and tuples of the form $(y_i, v_i, 0)$. Note that we insert a tuple $(y_i, v_i, 0)$ to J' only if there is a tuple (v_2, v_i, x) in J for some $v_i \neq v_2$. Since the tuple (v_2, v_i, x) belongs to J , no other tuple \mathbf{t}' such that $\mathbf{t}'.B = v_i$ also belongs to J , unless the tuples are identical, and all of these identical tuples are replaced by the same tuple. Thus, there is no tuple \mathbf{t}'' in J , that is not in conflict with one of $(v_1, v_1, 0)$ or $(v_2, v_2, 0)$, such that $\mathbf{t}'' .B = v_i$, and the tuple $(y_i, v_i, 0)$ agrees on the value of attribute B only with other tuples that look exactly the same. Moreover, the tuple $(y_i, v_i, 0)$ agrees on the value of attribute A only with other tuples that look exactly the same, since we use a new value y_i that does not appear in any other tuple in the instance. Thus, no tuple $(y_i, v_i, 0)$ is in conflict with the rest of the tuples in J' , and J' is consistent. Moreover, since we only replaced tuples with no additional cost, so far we did not exceed the distance of J .

Finally, there are just two more cases that we have not covered yet. Assume that \mathbf{t} is the tuple (v_2, v_i, x) for some $v_i \neq v_2$, and assume that the original tuple \mathbf{t} was the tuple $(v_2, v_i, 0)$ and $v_i \neq v_1$ (if $v_i = v_1$ then we have already covered this case). Then, it may be the case that the tuple was not updated by J at all. Since the tuple (v_2, v_i, x) belongs to J and J is consistent, no other tuple $\mathbf{t}' \in J$ is such that $\mathbf{t}' \cdot A = v_2$ (unless they are identical). Thus, J updated the value of attribute A in both \mathbf{t}_3 (the tuple $(v_2, v_2, 1)$) and \mathbf{t}_4 (the tuple $(v_2, v_1, 0)$). As mentioned in the observation at the beginning of this proof, if J updated both these values, then the cost of updating the tuples \mathbf{t}_2 , \mathbf{t}_3 and \mathbf{t}_4 is at least 5 (and not at least 4 as we assumed so far). Thus, in this case, we can use the additional cost that we have, to change one more cell in the tuple (v_2, v_i, x) .

Similarly, if J contains a tuple \mathbf{t} of the form (v_i, v_1, x) for some $v_i \neq v_1$, and the original tuple \mathbf{t} was the tuple $(v_i, v_1, 0)$ and $v_i \neq v_2$, then J updated the value of attribute B in in both \mathbf{t}_2 (the tuple $(v_1, v_1, 1)$) and \mathbf{t}_4 (the tuple $(v_2, v_1, 0)$). This again gives us an additional cost to update one more cell in the tuple (v_i, v_1, x) . Thus, we will do the following:

10. If the tuple (v_2, v_i, x) for some $v_i \notin \{v_1, v_2\}$ belongs to J , and the original tuple was $(v_2, v_i, 0)$, then we replace this tuple in J' with the tuple $(v_2, v_2, 0)$ with an additional cost of at most one.
11. If the tuple (v_j, v_1, x) for some $v_j \notin \{v_1, v_2\}$ belongs to J , and the original tuple was $(v_j, v_1, 0)$, then we replace this tuple in J' with the tuple $(v_1, v_1, 0)$ with an additional cost of at most one.

At this point, we have inserted to J' one tuple for each tuple in J , and as explained above, J' is now consistent. Moreover, we never exceeded to the of J , thus we found a new U-repair J' that updates each tuple updated by J , as well as the tuple $(v_1, v_2, 0)$ and that concludes our proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma B.5 implies that for each U-repair J of I that updates t tuples of the form $(v_i, v_j, 0)$ for some $t < 2|E|$, there is a U-repair J' of I , that updates all of the tuples of the form $(v_i, v_j, 0)$, such that the distance of J' is lower or equal to the distance of J . Thus, each U-repair of I is of distance at least $2|E|$.

Finally, we can prove that no U-repair of I is of distance $2|E| + k$ for some $k < |C_{min}|$. The proof of this part of the lemma is very similar to the proof of [24]. Each U-repair of I has a distance $2|E| + k$ for some k . Let us assume, by way of contradiction, that there is a U-repair of I that updates $2|E| + k$ cells, for some $k < |C_{min}|$ (where C_{min} is a minimum vertex cover of g). Let J be the optimal U-repair of I (clearly, in this case, J updates $x = 2|E| + k'$ cells, for some $k' < |C_{min}|$). Lemma B.5 implies that we can assume that J updates all of the tuples of the form $(v_i, v_j, 0)$. Let $\{f_1, \dots, f_l\}$ be the set of tuples of the form $(v_i, v_i, 1)$ that are updated by J , and let $C' = \{v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_l}\}$ be the set of the vertices that appear in those facts. Since J updates all of the $2|E|$ tuples of the form $(v_i, v_j, 0)$, the distance of J is greater or equal to $2|E| + |C'|$, thus we get that $2|E| + |C_{min}| > 2|E| + k' \geq 2|E| + |C'|$, and $|C'| < |C_{min}|$. Therefore, C' cannot be a cover of g (since the size of the minimum vertex cover is $|C_{min}|$). Thus, there are at least $|C_{min}| - |C'|$ edges (v_i, v_j) in g , such that neither $v_i \in C'$ nor $v_j \in C'$ (that is, J doesn't update the tuple $(v_i, v_i, 1)$ and also doesn't update the tuple $(v_j, v_j, 1)$). For each one of these $|C_{min}| - |C'|$ edges, we have to change at least 4 cells in the tuples $(v_i, v_j, 0)$ and $(v_j, v_i, 0)$ (the values of attributes A and B), thus the distance of J is greater or equal to $4(|C_{min}| - |C'|) + 2(|E| - (|C_{min}| - |C'|)) + |C'| = 2|C_{min}| + 2|E| - |C'|$. Finally, we get that $2|E| + |C_{min}| \geq 2|C_{min}| + 2|E| - |C'|$, that is $|C'| \geq |C_{min}|$, which is a contradiction to the tuple that $|C'| < |C_{min}|$.

The last step is to show that our reduction is a PTAS reduction. Since our reduction is from the problem of finding a minimum vertex cover for a graph of a bounded degree B , the size of the minimum vertex cover is at least $\frac{|E|}{B}$ (as each vertex covers at most B edges). Now, let us assume, by way of contradiction, that finding an optimal U-repair under $\{A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow A, A \rightarrow C\}$ is not APX-hard. That is, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -optimal solution to that problem. Let S_U be the such a solution and let OPT_U be an optimal solution. Then,

$$dist(S_U) - dist(OPT_U) \leq \epsilon \cdot dist(OPT_U) \quad (18)$$

We will now show that in this case, S_C (which is the vertex cover corresponding to the the U-repair S_U) is a $(1 + 2B)\epsilon$ -optimal solution to the minimum vertex cover problem. Let OPT_C be an optimal solution to the problem. We recall that $|OPT_C| \geq \frac{|E|}{B}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} |S_C| - |OPT_C| &= (dist(S_U) - 2|E|) - (dist(OPT_U) - 2|E|) = dist(S_U) - dist(OPT_U) \leq \\ &\epsilon \cdot dist(OPT_U) = \epsilon \cdot (|OPT_C| + 2|E|) \leq \epsilon \cdot (|OPT_C| + 2B|OPT_C|) = (1 + 2B)\epsilon \cdot |OPT_C| \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

It follows that for each $\epsilon > 0$, we can get an ϵ -optimal solution for the minimum vertex cover problem by finding a $(1 + \frac{1}{1+2B})\epsilon$ -optimal solution to the problem of computing an optimal U-repair, which is a contradiction to the fact that the minimum vertex cover problem is APX-hard.

B.5 Proof of Theorem 4.14

In this section we prove Theorem 4.14.

THEOREM 4.14. *Let $k \geq 1$ be fixed. Computing an optimal U-repair is APX-complete for:*

1. $R(A_0, \dots, A_k, B_0, \dots, B_k, C)$ and Δ_k ;
2. $R(A_0, \dots, A_{k+1}, B_0, \dots, B_k)$ and Δ'_k .

We start by proving the first part of the theorem, that is, we prove the following.

LEMMA B.6. *Let $k \geq 1$ be fixed. For the schema $R(A_0, \dots, A_k, B_0, \dots, B_k, C)$ and FD set $\Delta_k = \{A_0 \dots A_k \rightarrow B_0, B_0 \rightarrow C, B_1 \rightarrow A_0, \dots, B_k \rightarrow A_0\}$, computing an optimal U-repair is APX-complete.*

PROOF. We reduce it from the problem of finding an optimal U-repair for $\{A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow C\}$ on a schema $S(A, B, C)$ that has been shown to be NP-hard by Kolahi and Lakshmanan even if all tuples have the same weight and there are no duplicate tuples [24] by a reduction from vertex cover. Since there exists a constant factor approximation for optimal U-repair and degree-bounded vertex cover is known to be APX-hard, this reduction suffices to prove that Δ_k is APX-complete.

Construction. Given a table T_S on $S(A, B, C)$, we construct a table T_R on $R(A_0, \dots, A_k, B_0, \dots, B_k, C)$, where for every tuple $\mathbf{s} = (a, b, c)$ in T_S , we create a tuple $\mathbf{r} = (0, a, 0, 0, \dots, 0, b, 0, 0, \dots, 0, c)$ in T_R , i.e., $\mathbf{r}.A_1 = \mathbf{s}.A$, $\mathbf{r}.B_0 = \mathbf{s}.B$, $\mathbf{r}.C = \mathbf{s}.C$, and \mathbf{t} has value 0 in the remaining columns A_0, A_2, \dots, A_k and B_1, \dots, B_k . We claim that T_S has a consistent update of distance $\leq M$ if and only if T_R has a consistent update of distance $\leq M$.

The “if” direction. Suppose S has a consistent update U_S of distance M . We can obtain a consistent update U_R of R of the same distance by updating the A_1, B_0, C values of T_R as in T_S , and leave A_0, A_2, \dots, A_k and B_1, \dots, B_k unchanged in T_R . If $B_0 \rightarrow C$ is violated in U_R for two tuples $\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2$, $B \rightarrow C$ will also be violated for the corresponding tuples s_1, s_2 in U_S . If $A_0 \dots A_k \rightarrow B_0$ is violated for two tuples $\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2$ in U_R , they must have different values of B_0 but the same value of $A_0 \dots A_k$, i.e., the same value of $A_1 = A$ in U_S (since A_0, A_2, \dots, A_k are all 0 in U_R), violating the FD $A \rightarrow B_0$ in U_S and contradicting that it is a consistent update of T_S . The FDs $B_1 \rightarrow A_0, \dots, B_k \rightarrow A_0$ are satisfied in U_R since all of A_0 and B_1, \dots, B_k have values 0.

The “only if” direction. Suppose we have a consistent update U_R of T_R of distance M . We will transform U_R to another consistent update U'_R such that only A_1, B_0, C attributes are updated, and all of B_1, \dots, B_k and A_0, A_2, \dots, A_k are unchanged from T_R (all tuples have values 0 in all these attributes in U'_R).

To achieve this, consider the subset of tuple identifiers $M_R \subseteq \text{ids}(T_R)$ such that for any tuple $\mathbf{t} = T_R[i]$, $i \in M_R$, at least one attribute from B_1, \dots, B_k or A_0, A_2, \dots, A_k has been updated in U_R (not equal to 0, and therefore $H(T_R[i], U_R[i]) \geq 1$). For all tuples with identifiers in M_R , we update U_R to U'_R by (i) keeping all attributes in B_1, \dots, B_k and A_0, A_2, \dots, A_k as 0 (unchanged from T_R), and (ii) assigning a fresh constant from the infinite domain Val to attribute A_1 in each tuple (changed from T_R); therefore for all $i \in M_R$, $H(T_R[i], U'_R[i]) = 1$. Since tuples with identifiers $\notin M_R$ remain the same in U_R and U'_R , and the tuples with identifiers $i \in M_R$ have $H(T_R[i], U_R[i]) \geq 1$ and $H(T_R[i], U'_R[i]) = 1$, therefore, the $\text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U'_R, T_R) \leq \text{dist}_{\text{upd}}(U_R, T_R)$, i.e., this transformation does not increase the distance.

Next we argue that U'_R is a consistent update for T_R where all tuples have values 0 in all all attributes in B_1, \dots, B_k and A_0, A_2, \dots, A_k . (a) Since U_R was a consistent update, it satisfied the FD $B_0 \rightarrow C$, and since neither of B_0 and C is changed in U'_R from U_R , this FD is still satisfied in U'_R . (b) For the FDs $B_1 \rightarrow A_0, \dots, B_k \rightarrow A_0$, since all tuples in U'_R have values 0 in all these attributes, so all of these FDs are satisfied in U'_R as well. (c) For the final FD $A_0 \dots A_k \rightarrow B_0$, for tuples with identifiers $\notin M_R$, this FD is satisfied since they have the same value of the attributes $A_0 \dots A_k, B_0$ in U_R and U'_R . For tuples with identifiers $\in M_R$, they received a fresh constant in U'_R for attribute A_1 , so they do not interfere with each other and with the tuples with identifiers $\notin M_R$, and therefore the FD $A_0 \dots A_k \rightarrow B_0$ is satisfied in U'_R . Hence U'_R is a consistent update for T_R .

Hence, we have a new consistent update U'_R of R with distance $\leq M$ where only A_1, B_0, C are updated. Suppose $U_S = \rho_{(A, B, C)}[\pi_{A_1 B_0 C} U_R]$ (project U'_R to $A_1 B_0 C$ and rename A_1 to A and B_0 to B). It can be seen that U_S satisfies the FD $B \rightarrow C$, since $B_0 \rightarrow C$ is maintained in U'_R . It also satisfies the FD $A \rightarrow B$, since otherwise there are two tuples $\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2 \in U_S$ with the same value of A and different values of B . This implies that the corresponding tuples $\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2$ in U_R have the same value of A_1 and different values of B_0 . Since both $\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2$ have the same values of all attributes in A_0, A_2, \dots, A_k (all 0), together with A_1 , they have the same values of $A_0 \dots A_k$ but different values of B_0 , violating the FD $A_0 \dots A_k \rightarrow B$, and contradicting the tuple that U'_R is a consistent update of R . Hence we get a consistent update U_S of S of at most distance M . \square

Next, we prove the second part of the theorem. That is, we prove the following.

LEMMA B.7. *Let $k \geq 1$ be fixed. For the schema $R(A_0, \dots, A_{k+1}, B_0, \dots, B_k)$ and FD set $\Delta'_k = \{A_0 A_1 \rightarrow B_0, A_1 A_2 \rightarrow B_1, \dots, A_k A_{k+1} \rightarrow B_k\}$, computing an optimal U-repair is APX-complete.*

PROOF. We have previously established membership in APX for the problem of computing an optimal U-repair (see Section 4), thus it is only left to show that the problem is APX-hard. We start by proving that computing

an optimal U-repair under Δ'_k for $k = 1$ is APX-hard. In this case, the set of FDs contains two FDs $A_0A_1 \rightarrow B_0$ and $A_1A_2 \rightarrow B_1$. This FD set has a common lhs A_1 , thus Corollary 4.6, combined with the fact that computing an optimal S-repair for an FD set of the form $\{A \rightarrow B, C \rightarrow D\}$ is APX-hard, imply that computing an optimal U-repair is APX-hard as well.

Next, we construct a reduction from computing an optimal U-repair under Δ'_k for $k = 1$ to computing an optimal U-repair under Δ'_k for $k > 1$. Given a table T over the schema $R(A_0, A_1, A_2, B_0, B_1)$, we construct a table T' over the schema $\bar{R}(A_0, \dots, A_{k+1}, B_0, \dots, B_k)$, where for every tuple $\mathbf{t} = (a_0, a_1, a_2, b_0, b_1)$ in T , we create a tuple $\mathbf{t}' = (a_0, a_1, a_2, \odot, \dots, \odot, b_0, b_1, \odot, \dots, \odot)$ in T' . That is, $\mathbf{t}' \cdot A = \mathbf{t} \cdot A$ for every $A \in \{A_0, A_1, A_2, B_0, B_1\}$, and $\mathbf{t}' = \odot$ for the rest of the attributes. We claim that T has a consistent update of distance $\leq m$ if and only if T' has a consistent update of distance $\leq m$.

The “if” direction. Suppose that T has a consistent update U of distance m . We can obtain a consistent update U' of T' that has the same distance by updating the values of A_0, A_1, A_2, B_0, B_1 in T' in exactly the same way we update these values in T , and leave the values in the rest of the attributes in T' unchanged. Clearly, each FD that is not one of $A_0A_1 \rightarrow B_0$ or $A_1A_2 \rightarrow B_1$ is satisfied by U' (since we did not change the values of the attributes in $\{B_2, \dots, B_k\}$, thus all the tuples in U' have the same value \odot in these attributes, and they agree on the rhs of each of these FDs). Moreover, if two tuples \mathbf{t} and \mathbf{t}' violate one of $A_0A_1 \rightarrow B_0$ or $A_1A_2 \rightarrow B_1$, then the corresponding two tuples in U also violate these FDs, which is a contradiction to the fact that U is a consistent update of T . Clearly, the distance of both updates is the same.

The “only if” direction. Suppose we have a consistent update U' of T' of distance m . We can obtain a consistent update U of T that has a lower or equal distance by updating the values of A_0, A_1, A_2, B_0, B_1 in T in exactly the same way we update these values in T' . Let us assume, by way of contradiction, that U is inconsistent. In this case, there are two tuples \mathbf{t}_1 and \mathbf{t}_2 in U that violate one of $A_0A_1 \rightarrow B_0$ or $A_1A_2 \rightarrow B_1$. There is a tuple \mathbf{t}'_1 in U' that agrees with \mathbf{t}_1 on the value of each one of the attributes in $\{A_0, A_1, A_2, B_0, B_1\}$. Similarly, there is a tuple \mathbf{t}'_2 in U' that agrees with \mathbf{t}_2 on the value of each one of the attributes in $\{A_0, A_1, A_2, B_0, B_1\}$. Clearly, these two tuples also violate the FDs $A_0A_1 \rightarrow B_0$ or $A_1A_2 \rightarrow B_1$, which is a contradiction to the fact that U' is a consistent update of T' . Clearly, the distance of U is at most m (it can be lower than M if U' also updates values in the attributes not in $\{A_0, A_1, A_2, B_0, B_1\}$). \square