

Query Rewriting with Disjunctive Existential Rules and Mappings

Michel Leclère¹, Marie-Laure Mugnier¹, Guillaume Pérution-Kihli¹

¹LIRMM, Inria, University of Montpellier, CNRS, France

{leclere,mugnier}@lirmm.fr, guillaume.perution-kihli@inria.fr

Abstract

We consider the issue of answering unions of conjunctive queries (UCQs) with disjunctive existential rules and mappings. While this issue has already been well studied from a chase perspective, query rewriting within UCQs has hardly been addressed yet. We first propose a sound and complete query rewriting operator, which has the advantage of establishing a tight relationship between a chase step and a rewriting step. The associated breadth-first query rewriting algorithm outputs a minimal UCQ-rewriting when one exists. Second, we show that for any “truly disjunctive” nonrecursive rule, there exists a conjunctive query that has no UCQ-rewriting. It follows that the notion of finite unification sets (fus), which denotes sets of existential rules such that any UCQ admits a UCQ-rewriting, seems to have little relevance in this setting. Finally, turning our attention to mappings, we show that the problem of determining whether a UCQ admits a UCQ-rewriting through a disjunctive mapping is undecidable. We conclude with a number of open problems.

This report contains the paper accepted at KR 2023 and an appendix with full proofs.

1 Introduction

Existential rules (Cali, Gottlob, and Kifer 2008; Baget et al. 2009; Cali, Gottlob, and Lukasiewicz 2009), aka tuple generating dependencies (Beeri and Vardi 1984), are an extension of datalog (i.e., first-order function-free Horn rules), which allows for existentially quantified variables in the rule heads, e.g., $\forall x(\text{human}(x) \rightarrow \exists y \text{isParent}(y, x))$. They have become a popular language to model ontologies and do reasoning on data. Then, a key issue is *ontology-mediated query answering*, which consists of computing the answers to a query on a knowledge base (KB), composed of a set of facts (or data) F and an ontology \mathcal{O} . In this context, most works focus on the prominent class of (unions of) conjunctive queries ((U)CQs). There are two main dual techniques to compute the answers to a query Q : the *chase*, which enriches the facts F by performing a fixpoint computation with the ontology \mathcal{O} until a canonical model of F and \mathcal{O} is obtained (then Q is evaluated on this canonical model), and *query rewriting*, where Q is rewritten using \mathcal{O} into a query Q' , such that for any set of facts F , the evaluation of Q' on F yields the answers to Q on the KB. Query answering with general existential

rules is undecidable, however a wide range of decidable subclasses have been defined, based on syntactic restrictions that ensure the termination of chase-like or query rewriting techniques. Tuple generating dependencies (TGDs) are also the main formalism to represent *schema mappings*, which are high-level specifications of the relationships between two database schemas (Fagin et al. 2005). Schema mappings are at the core of many data interoperability tasks, such as data exchange, data integration or peer data management. More specifically, a mapping is a set of TGDs, with bodies and heads expressed on disjoint sets of predicates, namely \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} , called the *source* and the *target* schemas. Given a database instance I on \mathcal{S} and a mapping \mathcal{M} , a query expressed on \mathcal{T} is posed on the set of facts produced from I by triggering \mathcal{M} ; again, query answering can be solved by *chasing* I with \mathcal{M} or *rewriting* Q with \mathcal{M} into a query that is evaluated on I . Since mappings are inherently nonrecursive, both techniques always terminate. Finally, in the Ontology-Based Data Access (OBDA) framework (Poggi et al. 2008), mappings specify relationships between a database schema and an ontology. Here, existential rules can be used as a uniform language to express both the ontology and the mapping (Buron, Mugnier, and Thomazo 2021).

Existential rules generalize popular description logics (DLs) used to do reasoning on data, such as DL-Lite (Calvanese et al. 2007), \mathcal{EL} (Baader, Brandt, and Lutz 2005; Lutz, Toman, and Wolter 2009) and more expressive Horn-DLs (Krötzsch, Rudolph, and Hitzler 2006). However, they do not capture *nondeterministic* features, as offered by some key DLs such as \mathcal{ALC} (Schmidt-Schauß and Smolka 1991) or the Semantic Web ontology language OWL (W3C 2009).

In this paper, we consider the extension of existential rules with *disjunction*, e.g., $\forall x \forall y (\text{isGrandParent}(x, y) \rightarrow \exists z_1 (\text{isParent}(x, z_1) \wedge \text{isMother}(z_1, y)) \vee \exists z_2 (\text{isParent}(x, z_2) \wedge \text{isFather}(z_2, y)))$. From a KR perspective, the usefulness of such rules has long been acknowledged for ontology modeling, but also for expressing nondeterministic guessing in problem solving, see e.g., (Eiter, Gottlob, and Mannila 1997). From a database perspective, disjunction in schema mappings received considerable attention in the context of *mapping management*, where mapping composition and inversion

emerged as fundamental operators (Bernstein and Ho 2007; Arenas et al. 2010). Indeed, disjunction is required to express several kinds of inverse mappings, like so-called quasi-inverses or maximum recovery mappings (Fagin et al. 2008; Arenas, Pérez, and Riveros 2008). Beside the issue of constructing such mappings, the design of associated query answering techniques is highly relevant. For instance, in a peer data management system, a mapping \mathcal{M} from peer P_1 to peer P_2 allows to rewrite a query on P_2 in terms of P_1 , while an inverse of \mathcal{M} allows to rewrite a query on P_1 in terms of P_2 . As another example, consider a mapping \mathcal{M} from schema A to schema B , and assume that A evolves into A' , which is expressed by a mapping \mathcal{M}' ; the relation between A' and B can be obtained by inverting \mathcal{M}' and composing it with \mathcal{M} ; then, a query on B can be translated into a query on A' by rewriting it first with \mathcal{M} , then with the inverse of \mathcal{M}' (Pérez 2013). Such scenario is also relevant in OBDA, taking for B an ontology instead of a schema.

So far, reasoning with disjunctive existential rules has been mainly studied through the *chase*. It was shown that decidable classes of (conjunctive) existential rules, based on the behavior of the chase, can be generalized to disjunctive rules in a quite natural way, whether in relation to acyclicity notions (Carral, Dragoste, and Krötzsch 2017) or based on guardedness (Alviano et al. 2012; Gottlob et al. 2012; Bourhis et al. 2016), although these generalizations come with a huge increase in the complexity of query answering.

In contrast, *query rewriting* within UCQs has been barely addressed yet. A notable exception is the work in (Alfonso, Chortaras, and Stamou 2021), which provides a rewriting technique based on first-order resolution (see Section 3). A large body of work has studied the rewritability of ontology-mediated queries, i.e., pairs of the form (Q, \mathcal{O}) with Q a (UCQ) and \mathcal{O} an ontology, into query languages of various expressivity. However, for ontologies expressed in fragments of disjunctive existential rules, most studies target expressive rewriting languages, like disjunctive datalog (Bienvenu et al. 2014; Ahmetaj, Ortiz, and Simkus 2018). As far as we are aware, the only result directly relevant to our purpose comes from the fine-grained complexity study in (Gerasimova et al. 2020), which provides syntactic rewritability conditions for ontology-mediated queries where the ontology is composed of a single specific disjunctive rule, called a covering axiom (see Section 4).

Our contributions are the following:

- We first define a sound and complete query rewriting operator for UCQs and disjunctive existential rules, which has the advantage of establishing a tight relationship between a chase step and a rewriting step (Theorem 3). The associated breadth-first query rewriting algorithm outputs a minimal UCQ-rewriting when one exists (Theorem 4).
- We then turn our attention to the notion of *finite unification sets (fus)*, which denotes sets of existential rules for which any UCQ is UCQ-rewritable, i.e., admits a finite sound and complete rewriting under the form of a UCQ. Noting that the known *fus* classes for conjunctive existential rules do not seem to be generalizable to disjunc-

tive rules, we show that, in fact, for *any* “truly disjunctive” nonrecursive rule, there is a CQ that is not UCQ-rewritable (Theorem 5). This leads to question the relevance of *fus* for disjunctive rules and to consider the problem of whether a specific UCQ is UCQ-rewritable.

- Finally, considering (disjunctive) mappings, we show that the problem of determining whether a given UCQ on the target schema admits a UCQ-rewriting on the source schema is undecidable (Theorem 6).

Based on these results, we conclude with a number of open problems.

2 Preliminaries

Generalities. We consider logical vocabularies of the form $\mathcal{V} = (\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{C})$, where \mathcal{P} is a finite set of predicates and \mathcal{C} is a (possibly infinite) set of constants. A *term* on \mathcal{V} is a constant from \mathcal{C} or a variable. An *atom* on \mathcal{V} has the form $p(\mathbf{t})$ where $p \in \mathcal{P}$ is a predicate of arity n and \mathbf{t} is a tuple of terms on \mathcal{V} with $|\mathbf{t}| = n$. An atom with predicate p is also called a p -atom. Given a formula or set of formulas S , we denote by $\text{vars}(S)$, $\text{consts}(S)$ and $\text{terms}(S)$ its sets of variables, constants and terms, respectively. We will often see a tuple \mathbf{x} of pairwise distinct variables as a set. We denote by \models and \equiv classical logical entailment and equivalence, respectively. Given two sets of atoms S_1 and S_2 , a *homomorphism* h from S_1 to S_2 is a substitution of $\text{vars}(S_1)$ by $\text{terms}(S_2)$ such that $h(S_1) \subseteq S_2$ (we say that S_1 *maps* to S_2 by h). It is well-known that, when we see S_1 and S_2 as existentially closed conjunctions of atoms, $S_2 \models S_1$ iff S_1 maps to S_2 .

A *safe copy* of an atom set S is obtained from S by a bijective renaming of its variables with *fresh* variables (i.e., that do not occur elsewhere in the context of the computation).

Knowledge base. A *set of facts* F is a possibly infinite set of atoms, logically seen as an existentially closed conjunction. When this set is finite we call it a *fact base*. A *disjunctive existential rule* R (or simply rule hereafter) is a closed formula of the form

$$\forall \mathbf{x} \forall \mathbf{y} (B[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}] \rightarrow \bigvee_{i=1}^n \exists \mathbf{z}_i H_i[\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{z}_i])$$

where $n \geq 1$, B and the H_i are non-empty finite conjunctions of atoms with $\text{vars}(B) = \mathbf{x} \cup \mathbf{y}$ and $\text{vars}(H_i) = \mathbf{x}_i \cup \mathbf{z}_i$, $\mathbf{x} = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i$ and \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} and the \mathbf{z}_i are pairwise disjoint; B is the *body* of R , also denoted by $\text{body}(R)$, and $\{H_1, \dots, H_n\}$ is the *head* of R , also denoted by $\text{head}(R)$. We also denote by $\text{head}_i(R)$ the i -th disjunct H_i of the head of R . The set \mathbf{x} is the *frontier* of R and is denoted by $\text{fr}(R)$. Its elements are called frontier variables. The set \mathbf{z}_i is the set of *existential variables* of H_i , also denoted by $\text{exist}(H_i)$, and the union of all the $\text{exist}(H_i)$ is the set of existential variables of R , also denoted by $\text{exist}(R)$. Note that constants may occur anywhere. For brevity, we often denote by $B \rightarrow H_1 \vee \dots \vee H_n$ a rule with body B and head $\{H_1, \dots, H_n\}$. A rule R is *conjunctive* if $n = 1$. A (disjunctive) rule R is (disjunctive) *datalog* if $\text{exist}(R) = \emptyset$.

A (disjunctive) *knowledge base* (KB) is a pair (F, \mathcal{R}) , where F is a fact base and \mathcal{R} is a finite set of (disjunctive) existential rules. We assume w.l.o.g. that distinct rules in \mathcal{R} have disjoint sets of variables. In examples, we may reuse variables for simplicity.

Disjunctive chase. A rule $R = B \rightarrow H_1 \vee \dots \vee H_n$ is *applicable* on a fact base F if there is a homomorphism h from $\text{body}(R)$ to F . The pair (R, h) is called a *trigger* on F . The application of (R, h) to F is denoted by $\alpha_{\vee}(F, R, h)$; it produces a set of n fact bases, each obtained by adding to F a set of atoms obtained from $\text{head}_i(R)$ by replacing each frontier variable x by $h(x)$ and each existential variable by a fresh variable. We denote by h^{safe_i} the extension of h that safely renames $\text{exist}(\text{head}_i(R))$ by fresh variables. Then:

$$\alpha_{\vee}(F, R, h) = \{F \cup h^{\text{safe}_i}(\text{head}_i(R)) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$$

The disjunctive chase procedure iteratively applies triggers towards a fixpoint. This procedure is often seen as the construction of a tree, see in particular (Bourhis et al. 2016; Carral, Dragoste, and Krötzsch 2017).

Definition 1 (Derivation tree). *A derivation tree \mathcal{T} of a KB (F, \mathcal{R}) is a (possibly infinite) rooted labeled tree (V, E, λ) , where V is the set of vertices, E the set of edges, and λ a vertex labeling function inductively defined as follows:*

- $\lambda(r) = F$ for the root r of \mathcal{T} ;
- For each vertex v with children $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$, there is a trigger (R, h) on $\lambda(v)$ with $R = B \rightarrow H_1 \vee \dots \vee H_n \in \mathcal{R}$ and the restriction of λ to the domain $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ is a bijection to $\alpha_{\vee}(\lambda(v), R, h)$.

Note that we do not impose any criterion of trigger applicability, as we do not aim at studying a particular chase strategy. A *branch* γ of a rooted tree is a maximal path from the root; we denote by $\text{nodes}(\gamma)$ its set of vertices. Given a derivation tree \mathcal{T} , we denote by $\Gamma(\mathcal{T})$ the set of all its branches. A trigger (R, h) on F is *satisfied* (by F) if there is an extension h' of h with $h'(\text{head}_i(R)) \subseteq F$ for some i . A derivation tree (V, E, λ) is *fair* if, for each branch γ and each vertex $v \in \text{nodes}(\gamma)$, any trigger on $\lambda(v)$ is satisfied in a $\lambda(v')$ with $v' \in \text{nodes}(\gamma)$. Finally, a *chase tree* is a fair derivation tree.

Definition 2 (Disjunctive chase result). *The result of a disjunctive chase of F by \mathcal{R} is $\text{chase}(F, \mathcal{R}) = \{ \bigcup_{v \in \text{nodes}(\gamma)} \lambda(v) \mid \gamma \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T}) \}$ where \mathcal{T} is a chase tree and λ its labeling function.*

From a logical viewpoint, the chase result is a *disjunction* of existentially closed conjunctions of atoms. Neither the chase tree nor the chase result are unique, however all the results entail the same queries (see next Theorem 1). Although the degree of each vertex in a chase tree is bounded by the maximal number of disjuncts in a rule head, the tree may have infinite branches, and an infinite number of them. When the chase tree is finite, the result of the chase is the (finite) set of fact bases associated with its leaves.

It is sometimes convenient to consider a linearization of a finite derivation tree, which we call a derivation. A *derivation* of $(\{F\}, \mathcal{R})$ is a finite sequence of sets of fact bases and triggers $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{F}_0 = \{F\}) \xrightarrow{t_1} \mathcal{F}_1 \xrightarrow{t_2} \dots \xrightarrow{t_k} \mathcal{F}_k$ where $t_i = (R, h)$ is a trigger of $R \in \mathcal{R}$ on an $F_j \in \mathcal{F}_{i-1}$ and $\mathcal{F}_i = (\mathcal{F}_{i-1} \setminus \{F_j\}) \cup \alpha_{\vee}(F_j, R, h)$, for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. To each finite derivation tree can be assigned a derivation obtained from any total ordering of the trigger applications associated with the inner vertices in the tree, in a compatible way with the parent-child partial order. When \mathcal{R} is a set of conjunctive rules, a derivation tree is a path and the \mathcal{F}_i in a derivation are singletons; then, a derivation can be seen as a sequence of fact bases (instead of sets of fact bases).

Query Answering. A *conjunctive query* (CQ) Q takes the form $\exists \mathbf{y} \phi[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]$, where \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} are disjoint tuples of variables, and ϕ is a finite conjunction of atoms with $\text{vars}(\phi) = \mathbf{x} \cup \mathbf{y}$. The variables in \mathbf{x} are called *answer variables*.

A *Boolean CQ* has no answer variables. In a *full CQ*, all variables are answer variables. An *atomic CQ* has a single atom. A (Boolean) *union of conjunctive queries* (UCQ) is a disjunction of (Boolean) CQs with the same tuple of answer variables \mathbf{x} . For clarity, we denote a UCQ by \mathcal{Q} and a CQ by Q . A set of facts F *answers positively* to a Boolean CQ Q if $F \models Q$. More generally, a tuple of constants \mathbf{c} is an *answer* to a CQ Q on F if there is a substitution s such that $s(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{c}$ and $F \models s(Q)$. This extends to a UCQ \mathcal{Q} and a set of sets of facts \mathcal{F} : a tuple of constants \mathbf{c} is an answer to \mathcal{Q} on \mathcal{F} if for every $F_i \in \mathcal{F}$, there is a CQ $Q_j \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that \mathbf{c} is an answer to Q_j on F_i .

W.l.o.g. we focus in this paper on Boolean queries, to avoid technicalities related to answer variables. Hence, in the following, by UCQ and CQ we refer to *Boolean* queries, unless otherwise specified. We will often see a CQ as a set of atoms, and a UCQ as a set of atoms sets.

The following theorem states that the disjunctive chase provides a sound and complete procedure to decide whether a UCQ is entailed by a disjunctive KB.

Theorem 1 (from (Bourhis et al. 2016)). *Let \mathcal{Q} be a (Boolean) UCQ and (F, \mathcal{R}) be a disjunctive KB. Then $F, \mathcal{R} \models \mathcal{Q}$ iff $\text{chase}(F, \mathcal{R}) \models \mathcal{Q}$ (i.e., $F_i \models \mathcal{Q}$ for all $F_i \in \text{chase}(F, \mathcal{R})$).*

Example 1 (Colorability). *Let F be a fact base on predicates v (vertex) and e (edge) describing a graph G . Let $R = v(x) \rightarrow g(x) \vee r(x)$ (“Every vertex has color green or red”). Then, $\text{chase}(F, \{R\})$ yields all ways of coloring each vertex. Let the UCQ $\mathcal{Q} = \{Q_1, Q_2\}$ with $Q_1 = \{g(u), e(u, w), g(w)\}$ and $Q_2 = \{r(u), e(u, w), r(w)\}$. The KB $(F, \{R\})$ answers positively to \mathcal{Q} iff G is not 2-colorable.*

Given UCQs \mathcal{Q}_1 and \mathcal{Q}_2 , we say that \mathcal{Q}_1 is *more specific* than \mathcal{Q}_2 if $\mathcal{Q}_1 \models \mathcal{Q}_2$. Note that $\mathcal{Q}_1 \models \mathcal{Q}_2$ iff for all $Q_1 \in \mathcal{Q}_1$, there is $Q_2 \in \mathcal{Q}_2$ such that $Q_1 \models Q_2$ (i.e., Q_2 maps to Q_1 by homomorphism). A CQ Q is *minimal* if it has no strict subset $Q' \subsetneq Q$ such that $Q' \equiv Q$ (i.e., $Q' \models Q$). A UCQ \mathcal{Q} is *minimal* if it has no strict subset $\mathcal{Q}' \subsetneq \mathcal{Q}$ such that $\mathcal{Q} \equiv \mathcal{Q}'$ (whether each CQ in the UCQ is itself minimal is not

relevant for our results). A *cover* of a UCQ \mathcal{Q} is a minimal subset $\mathcal{Q}' \subseteq \mathcal{Q}$ such that $\mathcal{Q} \equiv \mathcal{Q}'$. It is known that, given two equivalent UCQs \mathcal{Q}_1 and \mathcal{Q}_2 , there is a bijection from any cover of \mathcal{Q}_1 to any cover of \mathcal{Q}_2 that maps each CQ in \mathcal{Q}_1 to an equivalent CQ in \mathcal{Q}_2 (see, e.g., (König et al. 2015)).

Mappings. Given two disjoint sets of predicates \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} , respectively called the *source* and the *target* predicates, a *source-to-target* (or \mathcal{S} -to- \mathcal{T}) rule R is such that $\text{body}(R)$ uses predicates in \mathcal{S} and $\text{head}(R)$ uses predicates in \mathcal{T} . A (disjunctive) mapping \mathcal{M} on $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$ is a finite set of \mathcal{S} -to- \mathcal{T} (disjunctive) rules. In this setting, a fact base (or database instance) is expressed on \mathcal{S} and a query on \mathcal{T} . Note that the chase of a fact base with a mapping is always finite.

UCQ rewritability. In the following, by *rewriting* of a UCQ \mathcal{Q} with a set of rules \mathcal{R} , we mean a possibly infinite set of CQs \mathcal{Q}' , such that for all fact base F , if $F \models \mathcal{Q}'$ then $F, \mathcal{R} \models \mathcal{Q}$ (in other words, a rewriting is by definition *sound*). A rewriting \mathcal{Q}' of \mathcal{Q} with \mathcal{R} is *complete* if for all fact base F , if $F, \mathcal{R} \models \mathcal{Q}$ then $F \models \mathcal{Q}'$. A finite complete rewriting is called a *UCQ-rewriting*. A pair $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R})$ is called *UCQ-rewritable* if it admits a UCQ-rewriting. The set \mathcal{R} itself is called *UCQ-rewritable* if for any UCQ \mathcal{Q} , the pair $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R})$ is UCQ-rewritable. In the framework of conjunctive existential rules, a UCQ-rewritable set is also called a *finite unification set (fus)* (Baget et al. 2011). We shall extend this term to disjunctive rules.

Example 2 (Transitivity). Let $R = p(x, y) \wedge p(y, z) \rightarrow p(x, z)$. The (Boolean) CQ $Q_1 = \{p(a, b)\}$, where a and b are constants, has no UCQ-rewriting with $\{R\}$, while the (Boolean) CQ $Q_2 = \{p(u, v)\}$ has one, which is $\{Q_2\}$. Indeed, any complete rewriting of Q_1 is infinite as it contains all the “paths” of p -atoms from a to b , which are pairwise incomparable by homomorphism. In contrast, the atom $p(u, v)$ maps by homomorphism to any path of p -atoms.

Finally, we recall some fundamental notions on rewriting with *conjunctive* existential rules. We will rely on these to define rewriting with disjunctive rules.

Query rewriting with conjunctive existential rules In the setting of conjunctive existential rules, query rewriting can be performed using *piece-unifiers*; these are a generalization of classical unifiers that take care of existential variables in rule heads by unifying sets of atoms instead of single atoms (Salvat and Mugnier 1996; Baget et al. 2009). In short, a piece-unifier unifies a subset Q' of a CQ Q and a subset H' of a rule head, such that existential variables from H' are unified only with variables of Q' that do not occur in $Q \setminus Q'$. Next, we call *separating variables* of Q' (w.r.t. Q) the variables of Q' that also occur in $Q \setminus Q'$. It is convenient to represent a unifier as a partition of a set of terms rather than a substitution. Hence, we say that a partition P of a set of terms is *admissible* if no class of P contains two constants; we associate a substitution u with an admissible partition P_u by selecting one term in each class with priority given to constants: for each class C in P_u , let t_i be the selected term, then for every $t_j \in C$, we set $u(t_j) = t_i$.

Definition 3 (Piece-unifier). ¹ Let Q be a CQ and $R = B \rightarrow H$ be a conjunctive existential rule such that $\text{vars}(Q) \cap \text{vars}(B \cup H) = \emptyset$. A piece-unifier of Q with R is a triple $\mu = (Q', H', P_u)$ with $Q' \neq \emptyset$, $Q' \subseteq Q$, $H' \subseteq H$, and P_u is an admissible partition on $\text{terms}(Q') \cup \text{terms}(H')$ such that:

1. $u(Q') = u(H')$, with u a substitution associated with P_u ;
2. If a class $C \in P_u$ contains an existential variable (from H'), then the other terms in C are non-separating variables from Q' .

Let $\mu = (Q', H', P_u)$ be a piece-unifier of Q with $R : B \rightarrow H$ and u a substitution associated with P_u . The application of μ produces the following CQ:

$$\beta(Q, R, \mu) = u(B) \cup u(Q \setminus Q')$$

Example 3 (Piece-Unifier). Let $R = p(x, y) \rightarrow \exists z p_1(x, z) \wedge p_2(y, z)$ and $Q_1 = \{p_1(u, v), s(v)\}$. There is no piece-unifier of Q_1 with R since v is a separating variable of $Q'_1 = \{p_1(u, v)\}$, hence cannot be unified with z . Let $Q_2 = \{p_1(u, v), s(u)\}$: now, there is a piece-unifier of Q_2 with R , namely $\mu_2 = (\{p_1(u, v)\}, \{p_1(x, z)\}, P_{u_2})$ with $P_{u_2} = \{\{x, u\}, \{y\}, \{z, v\}\}$. Taking the substitution $u_2 = \{u \mapsto x, v \mapsto z\}$, we obtain $\beta(Q_2, R, \mu_2) = \{p(x, y), s(x)\}$. Finally, let $Q_3 = \{p_1(u, v), p_2(u, w), p_1(t, v), s(t)\}$, and $Q'_3 = Q_3 \setminus \{s(t)\}$. The triple $\mu_3 = (Q'_3, \text{head}(R), P_{u_3})$ with $P_{u_3} = \{\{x, y, t, u\}, \{z, v, w\}\}$ is a piece-unifier of Q_3 with R . If we select x and z in P_{u_3} , $\beta(Q_3, R, \mu_3) = \{p(x, x), s(x)\}$.

A *piece-rewriting* of a UCQ \mathcal{Q} with a (conjunctive) rule set \mathcal{R} is a UCQ \mathcal{Q}_k obtained by a finite sequence of piece-unifier applications, i.e., $(\mathcal{Q}_0 = \mathcal{Q}), \dots, \mathcal{Q}_k$ ($k \geq 0$) such that, for all $0 < i \leq k$, there is a piece-unifier μ of $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{i-1}$ with $R \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $\mathcal{Q}_i = \mathcal{Q}_{i-1} \cup \{\beta(Q, R, \mu)\}$.

As stated below, piece-unifiers provide a sound and complete query rewriting procedure:

Theorem 2 (from (Baget et al. 2011)). *For any (conjunctive) KB (F, \mathcal{R}) and UCQ \mathcal{Q} , there is a derivation of (F, \mathcal{R}) leading to an F_i such that $F_i \models \mathcal{Q}$ iff there is a piece-rewriting \mathcal{Q}_j of \mathcal{Q} with \mathcal{R} such that $F \models \mathcal{Q}_j$.*

It follows that, when a pair $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R})$ is UCQ-rewritable, a UCQ-rewriting can be obtained as a piece-rewriting. Let us point out that a conjunctive mapping is always UCQ-rewritable (or *fus*). Indeed, since it is made of \mathcal{S} -to- \mathcal{T} rules, the application of a piece-unifier of a CQ Q produces a CQ with strictly fewer atoms on \mathcal{T} than Q . Also, CQs that contain predicates on \mathcal{T} are useless in a rewriting.

3 Query Rewriting with Disjunctive Rules

Our generalization of query rewriting to disjunctive rules relies on a simple idea: a query \mathcal{Q} can be rewritten with a rule $R = B \rightarrow H_1 \vee \dots \vee H_n$ if each H_i contributes to partially answer \mathcal{Q} . Therefore, a unification step consists of unifying each H_i (using a piece-unifier) with a safe copy Q_i of a CQ from \mathcal{Q} ; safe copies ensure that the CQs involved in

¹In non-Boolean queries, answer variables have to be treated as separating variables.

the unification have pairwise disjoint sets of variables. Note that several safe copies of the same CQ from \mathcal{Q} can be involved. This yields a new CQ made of $\text{body}(R)$ and the remaining parts of the unified CQs, according to some aggregation of the piece-unifiers. We need a few auxiliary notions to specify this aggregation. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of partitions (not necessarily of the same set). The *join* of \mathcal{P} , denoted by $\text{join}(\mathcal{P})$, is the partition obtained from \mathcal{P} by making the union of the partitions in \mathcal{P} , then merging all non-disjoint classes until fixed point. E.g., given \mathcal{P} composed of partitions $\{\{x, u\}, \{y, v\}, \{z, w\}\}$ and $\{\{x, y, a\}, \{z', t\}\}$, we obtain $\text{join}(\mathcal{P}) = \{\{x, u, y, v, a\}, \{z, w\}, \{z', t\}\}$. We say that a set of partitions associated with piece-unifiers is *admissible* if its join is an admissible partition (i.e., it does not contain a class with two constants).

Definition 4 (Disjunctive Piece-Unifier and One-step Piece-Rewriting). *Let a rule $R = B \rightarrow H_1 \vee \dots \vee H_n$ and a UCQ \mathcal{Q} . A disjunctive piece-unifier μ_\vee of \mathcal{Q} with R is a set $\{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n\}$ such that:*

- for $1 \leq i \leq n$, $\mu_i = (Q'_i, H'_i, P_{u_i})$ is a (conjunctive) piece-unifier of Q_i , a safe copy of a CQ from \mathcal{Q} , with the (conjunctive) rule $B \rightarrow H_i$;
- and $\mathcal{P}_{u_\vee} = \{P_{u_1}, \dots, P_{u_n}\}$ is admissible.

Given a substitution u_\vee associated with $\text{join}(\mathcal{P}_{u_\vee})$, the application of μ_\vee produces the CQ

$$\beta_\vee(\mathcal{Q}, R, \mu_\vee) = u_\vee(B) \cup \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq n} u_\vee(Q_i \setminus Q'_i)$$

The one-step piece-rewriting of \mathcal{Q} w.r.t. μ_\vee is

$$\mathcal{Q} \cup \{\beta_\vee(\mathcal{Q}, R, \mu_\vee)\}$$

Example 4. Let $R = p(x, y) \rightarrow \exists z_1 r(x, z_1) \vee \exists z_2 r(y, z_2)$ and the UCQ $\mathcal{Q} = \{Q\}$ with $Q = \{s(u), r(u, v)\}$. Let $Q_1 = \{s(u_1), r(u_1, v_1)\}$ and $Q_2 = \{s(u_2), r(u_2, v_2)\}$ be two safe copies of Q , and let $\mu_\vee = \{\mu_1, \mu_2\}$ with $\mu_1 = (\{r(u_1, v_1)\}, \{r(x, z_1)\}, \{\{u_1, x\}, \{v_1, z_1\}\})$ and $\mu_2 = (\{r(u_2, v_2)\}, \{r(y, z_2)\}, \{\{u_2, y\}, \{v_2, z_2\}\})$. Assume we give priority to variables from R , i.e., we take the substitution $u_\vee = \{u_1 \mapsto x, v_1 \mapsto z_1, u_2 \mapsto y, v_2 \mapsto z_2\}$. Then $\beta_\vee(\mathcal{Q}, R, \mu_\vee) = \{p(x, y), s(x), s(y)\}$.

Definition 5 (Piece-Rewriting). *Given a disjunctive rule set \mathcal{R} , a UCQ \mathcal{Q}' is a piece-rewriting (or simply rewriting when clear from the context) of a UCQ \mathcal{Q} with \mathcal{R} if there is a finite sequence (called rewriting sequence) $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}_0, \mathcal{Q}_1, \dots, \mathcal{Q}_k = \mathcal{Q}'$ ($k \geq 0$), such that for all $0 < i \leq k$, there is a disjunctive piece-unifier μ_\vee of \mathcal{Q}_{i-1} with $R \in \mathcal{R}$ such that \mathcal{Q}_i is the one-step rewriting of \mathcal{Q}_{i-1} w.r.t. μ_\vee .*

The following lemmas highlight fundamental properties of α_\vee and β_\vee .

Lemma 1 (Preservation of entailment by α_\vee and β_\vee). *Let R be a disjunctive rule.*

1. For any fact bases F_1 and F_2 such that $F_2 \models F_1$: if there is a trigger (R, h_1) on F_1 then there is a trigger (R, h_2) on F_2 such that $\alpha_\vee(F_2, R, h_2) \models \alpha_\vee(F_1, R, h_1)$.

2. For any UCQs \mathcal{Q}_1 and \mathcal{Q}_2 such that $\mathcal{Q}_2 \models \mathcal{Q}_1$: if there is a (disjunctive) piece-unifier μ_2 of \mathcal{Q}_2 with R then either $\beta_\vee(\mathcal{Q}_2, R, \mu_2) \models \mathcal{Q}_1$, or there is a (disjunctive) piece-unifier μ_1 of \mathcal{Q}_1 with R such that $\beta_\vee(\mathcal{Q}_2, R, \mu_2) \models \beta_\vee(\mathcal{Q}_1, R, \mu_1)$.

The second lemma clarifies the tight relationship between α_\vee and β_\vee (we recall that fact bases and CQs have the same logical form; this is also true of finite sets of fact bases and UCQs).

Lemma 2 (Composition of α_\vee and β_\vee). *Let R be a disjunctive rule.*

1. For any fact base F : if there is a trigger (R, h) on F then there is a (disjunctive) piece-unifier μ of $\alpha_\vee(F, R, h)$ with R such that $F \models \beta_\vee(\alpha_\vee(F, R, h), R, \mu)$.
2. For any UCQ \mathcal{Q} : if there is a piece-unifier μ of \mathcal{Q} with R then there is a trigger (R, h) on $\beta_\vee(\mathcal{Q}, R, \mu)$ such that $\alpha_\vee(\beta_\vee(\mathcal{Q}, R, \mu), R, h) \models \mathcal{Q}$.

These two lemmas are keys to establish the soundness and completeness of piece-rewriting, as stated next.

Theorem 3 (Soundness and completeness of piece-rewriting). *Let \mathcal{R} be a set of disjunctive rules and \mathcal{Q} be a UCQ. Then, for any fact base F , holds $F, \mathcal{R} \models \mathcal{Q}$ iff there is a piece-rewriting \mathcal{Q}' of \mathcal{Q} such that $F \models \mathcal{Q}'$.*

Proof. (Sketch) We show that there is a derivation of $(\{F\}, \mathcal{R})$ leading to an \mathcal{F}_i such that $\mathcal{F}_i \models \mathcal{Q}$ iff there is a rewriting \mathcal{Q}_j of \mathcal{Q} with \mathcal{R} such that $F \models \mathcal{Q}_j$ (with moreover $j \leq i$). This equivalence relies on the following two lemmas, which are corollaries of previous Lemmas 1 and 2. Given any Boolean UCQ \mathcal{Q} , disjunctive rule R and fact base F , the following holds (see Figure 1):

- (Backward-forward Lemma) For any disjunctive piece-unifier μ_\vee of \mathcal{Q} with R , if $F \models \beta_\vee(\mathcal{Q}, R, \mu_\vee)$ then there is a trigger (R, h) on F such that $\alpha_\vee(F, R, h) \models \mathcal{Q}$;
- (Forward-backward Lemma) For any trigger (R, h) on F , if $\alpha_\vee(F, R, h) \models \mathcal{Q}$ then either $F \models \mathcal{Q}$ or there is a disjunctive piece-unifier μ_\vee of \mathcal{Q} with R , such that $F \models \beta_\vee(\mathcal{Q}, R, \mu_\vee)$.

The (\Rightarrow) direction of the theorem is proved by induction on the length k of a derivation from $\{F\}$ to \mathcal{F}_k such that $\mathcal{F}_k \models \mathcal{Q}$, using forward-backward Lemma (which itself follows from Lemma 2 (Point 1) and Lemma 1 (Point 2)). The (\Leftarrow) direction is proved by induction on the length k of a rewriting sequence from \mathcal{Q} to \mathcal{Q}_k such that $F \models \mathcal{Q}_k$, using backward-forward Lemma (which itself follows from Lemma 2 (Point 2) and Lemma 1 (Point 1)). \square

To actually compute a UCQ-rewriting of \mathcal{Q} when one exists, it is convenient to proceed in a breadth-first manner, i.e., extend \mathcal{Q} at each step with all the CQs that can be generated with (new) disjunctive piece-unifiers. More specifically, we inductively define the following operator W , which takes as input a UCQ \mathcal{Q} and a disjunctive rule set \mathcal{R} , and returns a possibly infinite set of CQs:

- $W_0(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}) = \mathcal{Q}$




Figure 1: Correspondences between β_V (in blue) and α_V (in red)

- For $i > 0$, $W_i(Q, \mathcal{R}) = W_{i-1}(Q, \mathcal{R}) \cup \{\beta_V(W_{i-1}(Q, \mathcal{R}), R, \mu_V) \mid \mu_V \text{ piece-unifier with } R \in \mathcal{R}\}$
- Finally, $W(Q, \mathcal{R}) = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} W_i(Q, \mathcal{R})$.

Proposition 1 (Properties of W). *For any UCQ Q and disjunctive rule set \mathcal{R} , the following holds:*

1. $W(Q, \mathcal{R})$ is a complete rewriting of (Q, \mathcal{R}) .
2. If (Q, \mathcal{R}) admits a UCQ-rewriting Q' , then there is $i \geq 0$ such that $Q' \equiv W_i(Q, \mathcal{R})$.

Proof. (1) Each $W_i(Q, \mathcal{R})$ is a piece-rewriting of Q with \mathcal{R} and, for any piece-rewriting Q' of Q with \mathcal{R} , there is i such that $Q' \subseteq W_i(Q, \mathcal{R})$. Hence, the union of all the $W_i(Q, \mathcal{R})$ is a complete rewriting of Q . (2) If (Q, \mathcal{R}) admits a UCQ-rewriting Q' , then by Theorem 3 it admits a complete piece-rewriting Q'' , and both are necessarily equivalent. Then, $Q'' \subseteq W_i(Q, \mathcal{R})$ for some i and, since Q'' is complete, $Q'' \equiv W_i(Q, \mathcal{R})$. \square

We propose a query rewriting algorithm (see Algorithm 1) that mimics the computation of $W(Q, \mathcal{R})$, while including two optimizations at each step $i > 0$. First, it only considers *new* disjunctive piece-unifiers, i.e., those that involve at least one CQ generated at step $i-1$. Second, it removes redundant CQs in the rewriting under construction, by the computation of a cover. More specifically, Q^* denotes the rewriting under construction and Q_{new} the set of CQs generated at a given step. The function `cover` (Lines 1 and 6) returns a cover of the given set. The function `generate` (Line 5) takes as input the current rewriting Q^* , its subset Q_{prev} of CQs generated at the previous step, as well as \mathcal{R} , and returns the set of generated CQs, i.e., all the $\beta_V(Q^*, R, \mu_V)$ where μ_V is a new disjunctive piece-unifier. This yields the set Q_{new} . To compute a cover of $Q^* \cup Q_{new}$, priority is given to Q^* in case of query equivalence, for termination reasons. The function `removeMoreSpecific` takes as input two sets of CQs and returns the first set minus its queries more specific than a query of the second set. The computation of a cover of $Q^* \cup Q_{new}$ is decomposed into three steps (Lines 6-8): compute a cover of Q_{new} ; remove from Q_{new} the queries more specific than a query from Q^* ; and remove from Q^* the queries more specific than a query from Q_{new} . Then, Q_{new} is added to Q^* (Line 9). We remind that a query may have rewritings of unbounded size but still a UCQ-rewriting (see Example 2), hence the role of the cover computation is not only to remove redundancies but also to ensure that the algorithm halts when a UCQ-rewriting has been found.

Algorithm 1: BREADTH-FIRST REWRITING

Data: UBCQ Q and set of disjunctive rules \mathcal{R}
Result: A sound and complete rewriting of Q

- 1 $Q_{new} \leftarrow \text{cover}(Q)$; // new CQs
- 2 $Q^* \leftarrow Q_{new}$; // result
- 3 **while** $Q_{new} \neq \emptyset$ **do**
- 4 $Q_{prev} \leftarrow Q_{new}$ // CQs from the preceding step
- 5 $Q_{new} \leftarrow \text{generate}(Q^*, Q_{prev}, \mathcal{R})$; // new CQs
- 6 $Q_{new} \leftarrow \text{cover}(Q_{new})$
- 7 $Q_{new} \leftarrow \text{removeMoreSpecific}(Q_{new}, Q^*)$
- 8 $Q^* \leftarrow \text{removeMoreSpecific}(Q^*, Q_{new})$
- 9 $Q^* \leftarrow Q^* \cup Q_{new}$
- 10 **return** Q^*

The correctness of the algorithm is based on the soundness and completeness of the W operator, however attention should be paid to the potential impact of query removal on completeness (Lines 6 to 8). Indeed, when a CQ Q_2 is removed because it is more specific than another CQ Q_1 , we have to ensure that any CQ that could be generated using Q_2 is more specific than another CQ already present in the current rewriting, or than a CQ that can be generated using Q_1 . Fortunately, this property is ensured by Lemma 1 (Point 2), considering Q^* and Q_{new} at the end of Line 5, then taking $Q_2 = Q^* \cup Q_{new}$ and $Q_1 = Q_2 \setminus \{Q_2\}$.

Theorem 4. *Algorithm 1 computes a sound and complete rewriting. Moreover, it halts and outputs a minimal rewriting when (Q, \mathcal{R}) is UCQ-rewritable.*

Proof. By induction on the number of iterations of the while loop, we prove the following invariant of the algorithm, using Lemma 1 (Point 2): after step i , Q^* is equivalent to $W_i(Q, \mathcal{R})$. Then, soundness and completeness follow from Proposition 1. Line 7 ensures that Q_{new} becomes empty when Q^* is a complete rewriting. Since a cover of Q^* is computed at each step, the output set is of minimal size. \square

Further remarks on completeness. When it comes to practical implementations, one may find simpler to rely on (conjunctive) piece-unifiers that unify the smallest possible subsets of a CQ. Such piece-unifiers are called *single-piece* (König et al. 2015). In the specific case of datalog, a single-piece unifier unifies a single atom of a CQ with a rule head. Piece-rewriting restricted to single-piece unifiers is complete for conjunctive rules (König et al. 2015), but it is no longer so with disjunctive rules. This occurs already in the case of disjunctive datalog, as illustrated next.

Example 5. *Consider again the colorability example (Ex. 1) with $R = v(x) \rightarrow g(x) \vee r(x)$ and $Q = \{Q_1, Q_2\}$ with $Q_1 = \{g(u), e(u, w), g(w)\}$ and $Q_2 = \{r(u), e(u, w), r(w)\}$. With single-piece unifiers we obtain CQs that have the shape of “chains” with a g -atom or an r -atom at each extremity. However, there are also rewritings without any occurrence of g nor r , and the only way of obtaining them is to unify two query atoms together. For instance, the CQ $\{v(u), e(u, u)\}$ is obtained by unifying, on*

the one hand both g -atoms of a safe copy of Q_1 with $g(x)$, and on the other hand both r -atoms of a safe copy of Q_2 with $r(x)$. More generally, using such piece-unifiers, one can produce all the CQs that describe the odd-length cycles in the graph. Note that these CQs are incomparable with the CQs generated with single-piece unifiers. This example also shows that a UCQ may have no UCQ-rewriting although each of its CQs has one (which is here the CQ itself).

Related work. To the best of our knowledge, (Alfonso, Chortaras, and Stamou 2021) is the only previous work proposing a UCQ rewriting technique for general disjunctive existential rules. This technique is based on a restricted form of first-order resolution, where at each step a CQ is unified with a disjunct of a rule head (using a conjunctive piece-unifier), which produces a new disjunctive rule with fewer disjunctions; when the unified rule is conjunctive, (the negation of) a CQ is produced. In comparison, the main advantages of our proposal are the following: (1) a rewriting step directly produces a CQ and not a rule, (2) intermediate rules, which may not lead to a CQ, are avoided, and (3) there is a direct correspondence between a chase step and a rewriting step, which makes it easier to study the properties of query rewriting, especially as the rule set is not updated.

4 What are *fus* Disjunctive Rules?

We now address the question of identifying classes of disjunctive rules that are UCQ-rewritable. By extension of the term coined for conjunctive existential rules, we also call them *fus*. To the best of our knowledge, the only *fus* class of disjunctive rules mentioned in the literature (Alfonso, Chortaras, and Stamou 2021) is actually a slight extension of *fus* conjunctive rules: this class consists of disjunctive rules with an empty frontier and it is shown that such rules can be safely added to a set of *fus* conjunctive rules. As a matter of fact, known *fus* classes of conjunctive rules do not seem to be extensible to the disjunctive case. And worse, the straightforward extension of syntactic criteria that underlie *fus* in the conjunctive case seems to easily lead to undecidability of query answering, as shown for example in (Morak 2021) for the syntactic restriction called stickiness (Calì, Gottlob, and Pieris 2010).

At first glance, one may expect *nonrecursive* disjunctive rule sets to be *fus*, as it happens for conjunctive rules. However, it is not the case, as shown by the next example: a CQ (on unary predicates) may have no UCQ-rewriting even with a *single non-recursive body-atomic* (disjunctive) data-log rule.

Example 6. Let the rule $R = p(x, y) \rightarrow t_1(x) \vee t_2(y)$ and the BCQ $Q = \{t_1(u), t_2(u)\}$. Then the pair $(\{Q\}, \{R\})$ has no UCQ-rewriting. Indeed, a complete rewriting contains all the CQs of the following shape for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$t_2(u_0) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^n p(u_{i-1}, u_i) \right) \wedge t_1(u_n)$$

All these queries are pairwise incomparable w.r.t. homomorphism. Let us detail the first rewriting step. To unify $\{Q\}$ with R , we have to make two safe copies of Q , let Q_1 and Q_2 , which are respectively unified with $t_1(x)$ and $t_2(y)$. This produces the CQ $\{t_2(x), p(x, y), t_1(y)\}$, isomorphic to $\{t_2(u_0), p(u_0, u_1), t_1(u_1)\}$. If we switch the unified atoms of $\text{head}(R)$, we obtain an isomorphic CQ. All subsequent rewriting steps lead to longer paths of p -atoms.

A similar observation follows from (Gerasimova et al. 2020), which focuses on a specific disjunctive rule of the form $A(x) \rightarrow T(x) \vee F(x)$, called a covering axiom and denoted by cov_A ; their complexity results imply that the singleton set $\{\text{cov}_A\}$ is not *fus*,² which can be checked for instance by considering the query $Q = \{T(u), p(u, v), F(v)\}$.

Next, we show that such observations can be generalized to almost *any* source-to-target disjunctive rule. Evidently, we have to exclude disjunctive rules that are equivalent to a conjunctive rule, as classes of *fus* conjunctive rules are known. We also exclude *disconnected* rules, i.e., rules R such that $\text{body}(R) \cup \text{head}(R)$ is not a connected set of atoms (where connectivity is defined in the obvious way based on shared variables). Note that a rule with a head H_i that has an empty frontier is disconnected, as well as a rule whose body has a connected component with an empty frontier. However, a rule with a disconnected body may not be disconnected, since head atoms may connect several connected components of the body (e.g., a “product” rule like $b_1(x) \wedge b_2(y) \rightarrow t_1(x) \vee t_2(y) \vee p(x, y)$ is not disconnected).

Example 7 (*Fus disconnected rule*). Let the disconnected rule $R = b(x) \rightarrow t_1(x) \vee \exists z t_2(z)$. R is not equivalent to a conjunctive rule. Let us check that it is *fus*. Given any UCQ Q , let Q_2 be the subset of Q that contains all the CQs that can be unified with $\exists z t_2(z)$. Any $Q \in Q_2$ necessarily contains a disconnected component of the form $\exists u t_2(u)$. Moreover, it is useless to unify Q with $t_1(x)$: in such case, let Q_2 be the CQ unified with $\exists z t_2(z)$, then the obtained rewriting is more specific than Q_2 . Hence, we can ignore all the produced CQs that contain a connected component of the form $\exists u t_2(u)$. Rewriting $Q \setminus Q_2$ with the conjunctive rule set $\mathcal{R} = \{b(x) \wedge (Q_2 \setminus \{\exists u t_2(u)\}) \rightarrow t_1(x) \mid Q_2 \in Q_2\}$, which belongs to the *fus* class called domain restricted (Baget et al. 2011).

In the next theorem, we restrict the head of the rule to a disjunction of two atom sets, to keep the proof simple.

Theorem 5. Let $R = B \rightarrow H_1 \vee H_2$ be a source-to-target rule that is not disconnected nor equivalent to a conjunctive rule. Then, there is a CQ Q such that $(\{Q\}, \{R\})$ is not UCQ-rewritable.

²That paper studies syntactic conditions on ontology-mediated CQs of the form (Q, cov_A) that determine the data complexity of query answering and the rewritability in some target query language. In particular, it is shown that if a (connected) CQ Q has no term x with both atoms $T(x)$ and $F(x)$ and contains at least one F -atom and one T -atom then answering (Q, cov_A) is L-hard for data complexity. Since answering a UCQ-rewritable ontology-mediated query is in AC^0 for data complexity, and $AC^0 \subset L$, it follows that no cov_A is *fus*.

Proof. (Sketch) Let $R = B[\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{y}] \rightarrow \exists \mathbf{z}_1 H_1[\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{z}_1] \vee \exists \mathbf{z}_2 H_2[\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{z}_2]$, where:

- $\text{fr}(R) = \mathbf{x}_1 \cup \mathbf{x}_2$; \mathbf{x}_1 and \mathbf{x}_2 may share variables;
- $\mathbf{x}_i \neq \emptyset$ ($i = 1, 2$) since R is not disconnected.

We build the following (Boolean) CQ:

$$Q = \{H_1^s[\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{w}_1], p(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2), H_2^s[\mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{w}_2]\}$$

where each $H_i^s[\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{w}_i]$ is a safe copy of $H_i[\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{z}_i]$ and p is a fresh predicate. Note that, since R is connected, both H_1 and H_2 have a frontier variable, and frontier variables being renamed in each H_i^s , the arity of p is at least 2. In $p(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2)$ the order on the variables is important: a fixed order is chosen on \mathbf{x}_i (hence, \mathbf{v}_i) and the tuple \mathbf{v}_1 comes before the tuple \mathbf{v}_2 . Hence, $p(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2)$ can be seen as “directed” from \mathbf{v}_1 to \mathbf{v}_2 . We then proceed in two steps.

1. We show that we can produce an infinite set \mathcal{Q} whose element CQs are pairwise incomparable by homomorphism. Let $Q_0 = Q$. At each step $i \geq 1$, Q_i is produced from a safe copy of Q unified with H_1 and a safe copy of Q_{i-1} unified with H_2 . The piece-unifiers unify H_1^s (resp. H_2^s) in Q (resp. Q_{i-1}) according to the isomorphism from H_1^s (resp. H_2^s) to H_1 (resp. H_2). Any CQ Q_k in \mathcal{Q} is connected and follows the “pattern” $H_2^s.p.(B.p)^k.H_1^s$, where occurrences of p -atoms all have the same direction; hence, two “adjacent” p -atoms, i.e., that share variables with the same copy B_i of a B , cannot be mapped one onto the other (by a homomorphism that maps B_i to itself).
2. We show that no CQ Q' that can be produced by piece-rewriting maps by homomorphism to a CQ from \mathcal{Q} , except by isomorphism. When there is no (conjunctive) piece-unifier that unifies $H_1[\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{w}_1]$ in Q with $H_2[\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{z}_2]$ (the same holds if we exchange H_1 and H_2), all the produced Q' are more specific than (including isomorphic to) CQs from \mathcal{Q} . Otherwise, assume that a CQ Q' is produced by unifying $H_1[\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{w}_1]$ with $H_2[\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{z}_2]$. If Q' can be mapped by homomorphism to a $Q_n \in \mathcal{Q}$, the arguments of any p -atom in Q' must be pairwise distinct variables. We show that it leads to have R equivalent to the conjunctive rule $B \rightarrow H_i$ (with $i = 1$ or $i = 2$), which contradicts the hypothesis on R .

It follows that \mathcal{Q} is a subset of any sound and complete rewriting of $\{Q\}$ with $\{R\}$, hence the pair $(\{Q\}, \{R\})$ does not admit a UCQ-rewriting. \square

One interest of the above proof is to provide a general construction that applies to any rule (fulfilling the conditions of the theorem). Also, the proof can be generalized to a rule head with k disjuncts, taking Q containing a safe copy of each H_i plus a p -atom that connects these copies through their frontier variables.

Given this result, the notion of *fus* disjunctive rules does not seem to be particularly relevant. Studying the problem of deciding whether a pair $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R})$ is UCQ-rewritable seems

more interesting, although it is known to be undecidable already for (conjunctive) datalog rules.³ Again, little is known about classes of disjunctive rules and UCQs for which this problem would be decidable. Let us point out a few immediate cases of UCQ-rewritable pairs $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R})$:

- \mathcal{Q} is composed of atomic CQs and \mathcal{R} is a set of disjunctive linear existential rules (i.e., rules with an atomic body). Indeed, only atomic CQs can be produced, and there is a finite number of them on a given set of predicates. This case was already noticed in (Bourhis et al. 2016).
- \mathcal{Q} is composed of atomic queries and \mathcal{R} is a set of \mathcal{S} -to- \mathcal{T} rules. The produced CQs are obtained from the rule bodies by specializing their frontier (i.e., merging variables and replacing them by constants occurring in \mathcal{Q} and rule heads). Hence, there is a finite number of them.
- \mathcal{Q} is composed of variable-free CQs⁴ and \mathcal{R} is a set of lossless existential rules (i.e., such that all the variables in a rule body are frontier). Then, no variable is introduced by rewriting, hence the number of terms in a CQ is bounded by $|\text{consts}(\mathcal{Q}) \cup \text{consts}(\mathcal{R})|$.

5 Disjunctive Mappings

We now consider UCQ-rewritability with (disjunctive) mappings. Let \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} be the sets of source and target predicates, respectively, and let \mathcal{M} be a mapping on $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$. Given a query on \mathcal{T} , the aim is to obtain a complete rewriting w.r.t. fact bases on \mathcal{S} . Because \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} are disjoint, CQs that contain atoms on \mathcal{T} are useless in a rewriting. Hence, we define a *mapping rewriting* as a rewriting on \mathcal{S} and use the notation \mathcal{S} -rewriting to distinguish it from a rewriting on $\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{T}$. An \mathcal{S} -rewriting \mathcal{Q}' of a UCQ \mathcal{Q} with \mathcal{M} is *complete* if, for all fact base F on \mathcal{S} , if $F, \mathcal{M} \models \mathcal{Q}$ then $F \models \mathcal{Q}'$. A finite complete \mathcal{S} -rewriting is called a *UCQ- \mathcal{S} -rewriting*.

Example 8 (Colorability). *We adapt Example 5 to transform the rule into a mapping. Let $\mathcal{S} = \{v, e\}$, $\mathcal{T} = \{\hat{e}, g, r\}$ and $\mathcal{M} = \{m_1, m_2\}$, with:*

$$\begin{aligned} m_1 &= e(x, y) \rightarrow \hat{e}(x, y) \\ m_2 &= v(x) \rightarrow g(x) \vee r(x). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathcal{Q} = \{Q_1, Q_2\}$ with $Q_1 = \{g(u), \hat{e}(u, w), g(w)\}$ and $Q_2 = \{r(u), \hat{e}(u, w), r(w)\}$. Any complete \mathcal{S} -rewriting of \mathcal{Q} contains CQs that describe all the cycles of odd length (in other words, it defines non-2-colorability). All the other CQs that can be produced by piece-rewriting contain predicates g and r , hence are discarded.

Note that a query may have a UCQ- \mathcal{S} -rewriting, while it does not have any UCQ-rewriting (on $\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{T}$), as illustrated by the next example.

³This follows from the undecidability of determining whether a datalog program is uniformly bounded (Gaifman et al. 1993). Indeed, a datalog program \mathcal{R} is uniformly bounded iff the pair $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R})$ is UCQ-rewritable for any *full* atomic query Q . In turn, UCQ-rewritability of $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R})$ can be reduced to UCQ-rewritability of (Q', \mathcal{R}) with Q' a Boolean CQ.

⁴If non-Boolean CQs are considered, \mathcal{Q} can be extended to a set of full CQs.

Example 9. Let $\mathcal{S} = \{p\}$ and $\mathcal{T} = \{t_1, t_2\}$. Consider the (Boolean) CQ $Q = \{t_1(u), t_2(u)\}$ and the rule $R = p(x, y) \rightarrow t_1(x) \vee t_2(y)$ from Example 6. While the pair $(\{Q\}, \{R\})$ has no UCQ-rewriting, which is empty. Indeed, all the CQs that can be obtained by piece-rewriting contain an atom on \mathcal{T} .

Let *disjunctive mapping rewritability* be the following problem: Given a disjunctive mapping \mathcal{M} on $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$ and a UCQ \mathcal{Q} on \mathcal{T} , does $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{M})$ have a UCQ- \mathcal{S} -rewriting?

Theorem 6. *Disjunctive mapping rewritability is undecidable.*

Proof. (Sketch) We build a reduction from the following undecidable problem: Given a (Boolean) CQ Q and a set of (conjunctive) datalog rules \mathcal{R} , is the pair $(\{Q\}, \mathcal{R})$ UCQ-rewritable? W.l.o.g. we assume that rules in \mathcal{R} have no constants (and an atomic head). The reduction translates each instance (Q, \mathcal{R}) defined on a set of predicates \mathcal{P} , into an instance $(\mathcal{Q}^{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}}, \mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}})$ of the disjunctive mapping rewritability problem, defined on a pair of predcat sets $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$ such that:

- $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{P} \cup \{T\}$, where T is a fresh unary predicate,
- \mathcal{T} is the union of: (1) a set of predicates in bijection with \mathcal{S} , where \hat{p} denotes the predicate obtained from $p \in \mathcal{S}$, and (2) a set of fresh predicates in bijection with \mathcal{R} , where p_{R_i} denotes the predicate associated with the rule R_i ; the arity of each p_{R_i} is $|\text{fr}(R_i)|$.

Given a conjunction Q (on \mathcal{P}), we denote by Q^T the conjunction (on \mathcal{S}) obtained from Q by adding a T -atom on each term; given a conjunction Q (on \mathcal{S}), we denote by \hat{Q} the conjunction (on \mathcal{T}) obtained from Q by renaming all the predicates p into \hat{p} . Hence, $\widehat{Q^T}$ is obtained by performing the first operation, then the second. Given $\mathbf{x} = x_1, \dots, x_n$, $T[\mathbf{x}]$ denotes the conjunction $T(x_1) \wedge \dots \wedge T(x_n)$. Similarly, $\hat{T}[\mathbf{x}] = \hat{T}(x_1) \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{T}(x_n)$.

Let Q and $\mathcal{R} = \{R_1, \dots, R_n\}$, where $R_i = B_i[\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i] \rightarrow H_i[\mathbf{x}_i]$. The instance $(\mathcal{Q}^{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}}, \mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}})$ is defined as follows:

- $\mathcal{Q}^{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}} = \{Q_Q\} \cup \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}}$ with:
 $Q_Q = \widehat{Q^T}$,
 $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{R}} = \{Q_{R_i} = \exists \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i (\widehat{B_i})^T[\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i] \wedge p_{R_i}(\mathbf{x}_i) \mid R_i \in \mathcal{R}\}$
- $\mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}} = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{R}} \cup \mathcal{M}_{trans}$ with:
 $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{R}} = \{m_{R_i} = T[\mathbf{x}_i] \rightarrow p_{R_i}(\mathbf{x}_i) \vee \hat{H}_i(\mathbf{x}_i) \mid R_i \in \mathcal{R}\}$
 $\mathcal{M}_{trans} = \{p(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow \hat{p}(\mathbf{x}) \mid p \in \mathcal{S}\}$

Based on the natural bijection between the CQs $Q_{\mathcal{P}}$ defined on \mathcal{P} and the CQs $(Q_{\mathcal{P}})^T$ defined on \mathcal{S} , we prove that $Q_{\mathcal{P}}$ belongs to a rewriting of $\{Q\}$ with \mathcal{R} iff $(Q_{\mathcal{P}})^T$ belongs to a rewriting of $\mathcal{Q}^{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}}$. Note that set membership is up to isomorphism throughout the proof. More specifically, we first prove the following lemmas:

1. For any CQ Q_w in a piece-rewriting of $\{Q\}$ with \mathcal{R} , $(Q_w)^T$ belongs to a piece-rewriting of $\mathcal{Q}^{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}}$. Indeed, to each R_i are associated a CQ Q_{R_i} and a rule m_{R_i} that allow to simulate any rewriting step performed with R_i , using fresh predicate p_{R_i} .

2. Any CQ Q_S in an \mathcal{S} -rewriting of $\mathcal{Q}^{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}}$ is of the form $Q_S = (Q_{\mathcal{P}})^T$, with $Q_{\mathcal{P}}$ the subset of Q_S on \mathcal{P} .
3. For any CQ of the form $(Q_{\mathcal{P}})^T$, with $Q_{\mathcal{P}}$ on \mathcal{P} , that belongs a piece-rewriting of $\mathcal{Q}^{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}}$, $Q_{\mathcal{P}}$ belongs to a piece-rewriting of $\{Q\}$ with \mathcal{R}^* , where \mathcal{R}^* is the reflexive and transitive closure of \mathcal{R} by unfolding (i.e., rule composition). Note that \mathcal{R}^* is logically equivalent to \mathcal{R} .

We rely on these lemmas to prove the following: if there is a UCQ-rewriting of $(\{Q\}, \mathcal{R})$ then there is a UCQ- \mathcal{S} -rewriting of $(\mathcal{Q}^{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}}, \mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}})$. The proof of the opposite direction is similar. Let \mathcal{Q} be a UCQ-rewriting of $(\{Q\}, \mathcal{R})$. Then there is a piece-rewriting \mathcal{Q}_i of $\{Q\}$ with \mathcal{R} such that $\mathcal{Q}_i \equiv \mathcal{Q}$. By Lemma 1, there is a piece-rewriting \mathcal{Q}_j of $\mathcal{Q}^{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}}$ that contains all the CQs of the form $(Q_w)^T$ in bijection with the Q_w in \mathcal{Q}_i . By definition, \mathcal{Q}_j is a finite rewriting of $(\mathcal{Q}^{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}}, \mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}})$ and the subset \mathcal{Q}_j^S of \mathcal{Q}_j that contains only the CQs on \mathcal{S} is a finite \mathcal{S} -rewriting of $(\mathcal{Q}^{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}}, \mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}})$. Now, assume \mathcal{Q}_j^S is not complete, i.e., there is a CQ that belongs to an \mathcal{S} -rewriting of $(\mathcal{Q}^{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}}, \mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}})$ but that is not more specific than a CQ in \mathcal{Q}_j^S ; by Lemma 2, such CQ is of the form $(Q_{\mathcal{P}})^T$. Then there is a piece-rewriting \mathcal{Q}'_j of $\mathcal{Q}^{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}}$ that contains a CQ entailed by $(Q_{\mathcal{P}})^T$; hence such CQ is also on \mathcal{S} , and by Lemma 2 it is of the form $(Q'_{\mathcal{P}})^T$. By Lemma 3, $Q'_{\mathcal{P}}$ belongs to a piece-rewriting of $\{Q\}$ with \mathcal{R}^* . Since $\mathcal{R}^* \equiv \mathcal{R}$, there is a CQ equivalent to $Q'_{\mathcal{P}}$ in some rewriting of $(\{Q\}, \mathcal{R})$. Since \mathcal{Q}_i is complete, there is $Q_c \in \mathcal{Q}_i$ such that $Q'_{\mathcal{P}} \models Q_c$. Hence, $(Q'_{\mathcal{P}})^T \models (Q_c)^T$, so $(Q_{\mathcal{P}})^T \models (Q_c)^T$; by Lemma 1, $(Q_c)^T \in \mathcal{Q}_j$, hence $(Q_c)^T \in \mathcal{Q}_j^S$, which contradicts the fact that $(Q_{\mathcal{P}})^T$ is not more specific than a CQ in \mathcal{Q}_j^S . \square

6 Perspectives

In conclusion, UCQ rewriting with disjunctive existential rules appears to be extremely challenging. The main classes that ensure termination for conjunctive rules fail to be generalized. As suggested by previous work in (Gerasimova et al. 2020) and our Theorem 5, the *fus* notion applied to disjunctive rules does not seem to add much w.r.t. *fus* conjunctive rules. However, it might be more relevant in the context of mappings (when it becomes UCQ- \mathcal{S} -rewritability), which still has to be studied. Beside, a number of interesting issues remain open, in relationship with the finite rewritability of a pair $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R})$. We list here some of them:

1. Clarify the boundary between decidability and undecidability for the problem of determining whether a pair $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R})$ is UCQ-rewritable, according to specific classes of rules (and queries). In particular, UCQ-rewritability is decidable for guarded conjunctive rules and some of their generalizations (Barceló et al. 2018), does this extend to the disjunctive case?
2. We have shown that the UCQ- \mathcal{S} -rewritability of a pair $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{M})$ is undecidable (Theorem 6). Is it still the case for a pair $(\{Q\}, \mathcal{M})$ where Q is a CQ?

3. Our undecidability proof for UCQ- \mathcal{S} -rewritability (Theorem 6) exploits the fact that rewritings are restricted to predicates in \mathcal{S} . If we consider instead UCQ-rewritings with source-to-target rules, we know that the problem can only be simpler, as there is an easy reduction from UCQ-rewritability with \mathcal{S} -to- \mathcal{T} -rules to UCQ- \mathcal{S} -rewritability with mappings (one simply has to add a mapping rule per target predicate to give it an existence at the source level). Is the UCQ-rewritability of a pair $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R})$ decidable when \mathcal{R} is a set of \mathcal{S} -to- \mathcal{T} rules?
4. Design an algorithm that, given a pair $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{M})$, outputs a UCQ- \mathcal{S} -rewriting for this pair when one exists.

Acknowledgements

This work is partly supported by the ANR project CQFD (ANR-18-CE23-0003).

References

- Ahmetaj, S.; Ortiz, M.; and Simkus, M. 2018. Rewriting guarded existential rules into small datalog programs. In Kimelfeld, B., and Amsterdamer, Y., eds., *21st International Conference on Database Theory, ICDT 2018, March 26-29, 2018, Vienna, Austria*, volume 98 of *LIPICs*, 4:1–4:24. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik.
- Alfonso, E. M.; Chortaras, A.; and Stamou, G. 2021. Ucq-rewritings for disjunctive knowledge and queries with negated atoms. *Semantic Web* 12(4):685–709.
- Alviano, M.; Faber, W.; Leone, N.; and Manna, M. 2012. Disjunctive datalog with existential quantifiers: Semantics, decidability, and complexity issues. *Theory Pract. Log. Program.* 12(4-5):701–718.
- Arenas, M.; Pérez, J.; Reutter, J. L.; and Riveros, C. 2010. Foundations of schema mapping management. In Paredaens, J., and Gucht, D. V., eds., *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS 2010, June 6-11, 2010, Indianapolis, Indiana, USA*, 227–238. ACM.
- Arenas, M.; Pérez, J.; and Riveros, C. 2008. The recovery of a schema mapping: bringing exchanged data back. In Lenzerini, M., and Lembo, D., eds., *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS 2008, June 9-11, 2008, Vancouver, BC, Canada*, 13–22. ACM.
- Baader, F.; Brandt, S.; and Lutz, C. 2005. Pushing the EL envelope. In Kaelbling, L. P., and Saffiotti, A., eds., *IJCAI-05, Proceedings of the Nineteenth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, July 30 - August 5, 2005*, 364–369. Professional Book Center.
- Baget, J.-F.; Leclère, M.; Mugnier, M.-L.; and Salvat, E. 2009. Extending Decidable Cases for Rules with Existential Variables. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2009*, 677–682.
- Baget, J.; Leclère, M.; Mugnier, M.; and Salvat, E. 2011. On rules with existential variables: Walking the decidability line. *Artif. Intell.* 175(9-10):1620–1654.
- Barceló, P.; Berger, G.; Lutz, C.; and Pieris, A. 2018. First-order rewritability of frontier-guarded ontology-mediated queries. In Lang, J., ed., *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2018, July 13-19, 2018, Stockholm, Sweden*, 1707–1713. ijcai.org.
- Beeri, C., and Vardi, M. Y. 1984. A proof procedure for data dependencies. *J. ACM* 31(4):718–741.
- Bernstein, P. A., and Ho, H. 2007. Model management and schema mappings: Theory and practice. In Koch, C.; Gehrke, J.; Garofalakis, M. N.; Srivastava, D.; Aberer, K.; Deshpande, A.; Florescu, D.; Chan, C. Y.; Ganti, V.; Kanne, C.; Klas, W.; and Neuhold, E. J., eds., *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Very Large Data Bases, University of Vienna, Austria, September 23-27, 2007*, 1439–1440. ACM.
- Bienvenu, M.; ten Cate, B.; Lutz, C.; and Wolter, F. 2014. Ontology-based data access: A study through disjunctive datalog, csp, and MMSNP. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.* 39(4):33:1–33:44.
- Bourhis, P.; Manna, M.; Morak, M.; and Pieris, A. 2016. Guarded-based disjunctive tuple-generating dependencies. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.* 41(4):27:1–27:45.
- Buron, M.; Mugnier, M.; and Thomazo, M. 2021. Parallelisable existential rules: a story of pieces. In Bienvenu, M.; Lakemeyer, G.; and Erdem, E., eds., *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning, KR 2021, Online event, November 3-12, 2021*, 162–173.
- Cali, A.; Gottlob, G.; and Kifer, M. 2008. Taming the infinite chase: Query answering under expressive relational constraints. In Brewka, G., and Lang, J., eds., *Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning: Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference, KR 2008, Sydney, Australia, September 16-19, 2008*, 70–80. AAAI Press.
- Cali, A.; Gottlob, G.; and Lukasiewicz, T. 2009. A General Datalog-Based Framework for Tractable Query Answering over Ontologies. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS 2009*, 77–86. ACM.
- Cali, A.; Gottlob, G.; and Pieris, A. 2010. Advanced processing for ontological queries. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 3(1):554–565.
- Calvanese, D.; De Giacomo, G.; Lembo, D.; Lenzerini, M.; and Rosati, R. 2007. Tractable Reasoning and Efficient Query Answering in Description Logics: The DL-Lite Family. *Journal of Automated Reasoning* 39(3):385–429.
- Carral, D.; Dragoste, I.; and Krötzsch, M. 2017. Restricted chase (non)termination for existential rules with disjunctions. In Sierra, C., ed., *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2017, Melbourne, Australia, August 19-25, 2017*, 922–928. ijcai.org.
- Eiter, T.; Gottlob, G.; and Mannila, H. 1997. Disjunctive datalog. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.* 22(3):364–418.
- Fagin, R.; Kolaitis, P. G.; Miller, R. J.; and Popa, L. 2005.

- Data exchange: semantics and query answering. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 336(1):89–124.
- Fagin, R.; Kolaitis, P. G.; Popa, L.; and Tan, W. C. 2008. Quasi-inverses of schema mappings. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.* 33(2):11:1–11:52.
- Gaifman, H.; Mairson, H. G.; Sagiv, Y.; and Vardi, M. Y. 1993. Undecidable optimization problems for database logic programs. *J. ACM* 40(3):683–713.
- Gerasimova, O.; Kikot, S.; Kurucz, A.; Podolskii, V. V.; and Zakharyashev, M. 2020. A data complexity and rewritability tetrachotomy of ontology-mediated queries with a covering axiom. In Calvanese, D.; Erdem, E.; and Thielscher, M., eds., *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning, KR 2020, Rhodes, Greece, September 12-18, 2020*, 403–413.
- Gottlob, G.; Manna, M.; Morak, M.; and Pieris, A. 2012. On the complexity of ontological reasoning under disjunctive existential rules. In Rován, B.; Sassone, V.; and Widmayer, P., eds., *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science 2012 - 37th International Symposium, MFCS 2012, Bratislava, Slovakia, August 27-31, 2012. Proceedings*, volume 7464 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 1–18. Springer.
- König, M.; Leclère, M.; Mugnier, M.; and Thomazo, M. 2015. Sound, complete and minimal ucq-rewriting for existential rules. *Semantic Web* 6(5):451–475.
- Kőnig, D. 1927. Über eine schlussweise aus dem endlichen ins unendliche. *Acta litt. sci. Reg. Univ. Hung. Franciscose Josephinae, Sect. sci. math.* 3(2-3):121–130.
- Krötzsch, M.; Rudolph, S.; and Hitzler, P. 2006. On the complexity of Horn description logics. In Cuenca Grau, B.; Hitzler, P.; Shankey, C.; and Wallace, E., eds., *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on OWL: Experiences and Directions*, volume 216 of *CEUR WS Proceedings*. CEUR-WS.org.
- Lutz, C.; Toman, D.; and Wolter, F. 2009. Conjunctive Query Answering in the Description Logic \mathcal{EL} Using a Relational Database System. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2009*, 2070–2075.
- Morak, M. 2021. Sticky existential rules and disjunction are incompatible. In Bienvenu, M.; Lakemeyer, G.; and Erdem, E., eds., *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning, KR 2021, Online event, November 3-12, 2021*, 691–695.
- Pérez, J. 2013. The inverse of a schema mapping. In Kolaitis, P. G.; Lenzerini, M.; and Schweikardt, N., eds., *Data Exchange, Integration, and Streams*, volume 5 of *Dagstuhl Follow-Ups*. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. 69–95.
- Poggi, A.; Lembo, D.; Calvanese, D.; Giacomo, G. D.; Lenzerini, M.; and Rosati, R. 2008. Linking data to ontologies. *J. Data Semant.* 10:133–173.
- Salvat, E., and Mugnier, M. 1996. Sound and complete forward and backward chaining of graph rules. In Eklund, P. W.; Ellis, G.; and Mann, G., eds., *Conceptual Structures: Knowledge Representation as Interlingua, 4th International Conference on Conceptual Structures, ICCS '96, Sydney, Australia, August 19-22, 1996, Proceedings*, volume 1115 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 248–262. Springer.
- Schmidt-Schauß, M., and Smolka, G. 1991. Attributive concept descriptions with complements. *Artif. Intell.* 48(1):1–26.
- W3C. 2009. *OWL 2 Web Ontology Language: Document Overview*. W3C Recommendation. Available at <http://www.w3.org/TR/owl2-overview/>.

Appendix

A Proofs of Section 3

In these proofs, we reuse some notations and results from (Baget et al. 2011) and (König et al. 2015).

Let $h : X \rightarrow T$ and $h' : X' \rightarrow T'$ be two substitutions such that, $\forall x \in X \cap X', h(x) = h'(x)$. Then we note $h + h' : X \cup X' \rightarrow T \cup T'$ the substitution defined by: if $x \in X$, $(h + h')(x) = h(x)$, otherwise $(h + h')(x) = h'(x)$.

Proposition 2 (was Prop. 23 in (Baget et al. 2011)). *Let F be a fact base, Q be a CQ, $\mathbf{x} \subseteq \text{vars}(Q)$, $\{Q_1, \dots, Q_k\}$ be a partition of the atoms of Q such that $\text{vars}(Q_i) \cap \text{vars}(Q_j) \subseteq \mathbf{x}$ for all Q_i and Q_j with $i \neq j$, and h_1, \dots, h_k homomorphisms from Q_i to F such that, $\forall t \in \mathbf{x}, \forall 1 \leq i \leq j \leq k, h_i(t) = h_j(t)$; then the substitution $h_1 + \dots + h_k$ is a homomorphism from Q to F .*

Given a partition P on a set of terms, we denote by $P[t]$ the class of P containing the term t .

Definition 6 (Partition induced by a substitution). *A partition P on terms \mathcal{T} induced by a substitution s is such that for every $t, t' \in \mathcal{T}$, if $s(t) = s(t')$ then $t' \in P[t]$ (i.e. $P[t] = P[t']$) and P is the thinnest partition with this property. Let C be a class of P , we call selected element of C , which we denote t_C , the unique element of C such that $s(t_C) = t_C$.*

The three next propositions are immediate.

Proposition 3. *Let \mathcal{F} be a set of set of facts and \mathcal{Q} be a UCQ: $\mathcal{F} \models \mathcal{Q}$ iff for each $F \in \mathcal{F}$, there exists a $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that Q maps to F .*

Proposition 4. *A partition induced by a substitution is admissible.*

Proposition 5. *Let F and F' be two fact bases and s a substitution from F to F' such that $s(F) = F'$. Then, any substitution u_s associated with P_s , the partition induced by s , on the terms of F and F' , is such that $u_s(F) = u_s(F')$.*

The following propositions 6 and 7 correspond to **Lemma 1** (Point 1 and Point 2, respectively) in the paper. Figures 2 and 3 depict these propositions.

Proposition 6. *Let F_1, F_2 be two fact bases such that $F_1 \models F_2$ and a disjunctive rule R such that there exists a trigger (R, h_2) on F_2 . Then, there exists a trigger (R, h_1) on F_1 such that $\alpha_V(F_1, R, h_1) \models \alpha_V(F_2, R, h_2)$.*




Figure 2: Preservation of entailment by α_V (Prop. 6)

Proof. Let $R = B \rightarrow H_1 \vee \dots \vee H_n$. Since $F_1 \models F_2$, we have a homomorphism h from F_2 to F_1 . Moreover, (R, h_2) being a trigger on F_2 , taking $h_1 = h \circ h_2$, we have (R, h_1) is a trigger on F_1 and $\alpha_V(F_2, R, h_2) = \{F_2^i = F_2 \cup h_2^{s_{afe_{i-2}}}(H_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ and $\alpha_V(F_1, R, h_1) = \{F_1^i = F_1 \cup (h \circ h_2)^{s_{afe_{i-1}}}(H_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. Let us build a homomorphism h^i from F_2^i to F_1^i , for $1 \leq i \leq n$. For each i , we first consider the homomorphism h_{H_i} from $h_2^{s_{afe_{i-2}}}(H_i)$ to $(h \circ h_2)^{s_{afe_{i-1}}}(H_i)$, defined as follows:

$\forall t \in \text{vars}(h_2^{s_{afe_{i-2}}}(H_i))$:

- if $t \in h_2(\text{fr}(R))$, then $h_{H_i}(t) = h(t)$;
- otherwise, $h_{H_i}(t) = .^{s_{afe_{i-1}}}((.^{s_{afe_{i-2}}})^{-1}(t))$.

h and h_{H_i} satisfy the conditions of Proposition 2 (with $\mathbf{x} = h_{H_i}(\text{fr}(R))$). As a consequence, $h^i = h + h_{H_i}$ is a homomorphism from F_2^i to F_1^i . Thus, $\alpha_V(F_1, R, h_1) \models \alpha_V(F_2, R, h_2)$. \square

Proposition 7. *Let \mathcal{Q}_1 and \mathcal{Q}_2 be UCQs such that $\mathcal{Q}_2 \models \mathcal{Q}_1$, and let R be a disjunctive rule. Then, for any disjunctive piece-unifier μ_V^2 of \mathcal{Q}_2 with R :*

1. either $\beta_V(\mathcal{Q}_2, R, \mu_V^2) \models \mathcal{Q}_1$;
2. or, there is a piece-unifier μ_V^1 of \mathcal{Q}_1 with R such that $\beta_V(\mathcal{Q}_2, R, \mu_V^2) \models \beta_V(\mathcal{Q}_1, R, \mu_V^1)$.




Figure 3: Preservation of entailment by β_v (Prop. 7)

Proof. Let $R = B \rightarrow H_1 \vee \dots \vee H_n$. Let Q_2^1, \dots, Q_2^n be the safe copies of CQs in \mathcal{Q}_2 of which subsets $Q_2^{1'}, \dots, Q_2^{n'}$ are unified with, respectively, H_1', \dots, H_n' , subsets of respectively H_1, \dots, H_n , to define $\mu_v^2 = \{(Q_2^{1'}, H_1', P_{u_1}^2), \dots, (Q_2^{n'}, H_n', P_{u_n}^2)\}$ the disjunctive piece-unifier of \mathcal{Q}_2 with R . Let $P_{u_v^2} = \text{join}(\{P_{u_1}^2, \dots, P_{u_n}^2\})$ and let u_v^2 be the substitution associated with $P_{u_v^2}$. Let h_1, \dots, h_n be the homomorphisms associated with each Q_2^i , that map a Q_1^i in \mathcal{Q}_1 to Q_2^i (note that since each Q_2^i is a safe copy of a CQ in \mathcal{Q}_2 then there exists a CQ Q_1^i in \mathcal{Q}_1 that maps on it). We consider two cases:

- Either, one of the Q_1^i maps by h_i to the non-rewritten part of Q_2^i , so this Q_1^i maps to the CQ added to the \mathcal{Q}_2 by the one-step piece-rewriting, i.e. there exists $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $Q_1^i \in \mathcal{Q}_1$ such that $h_i(Q_1^i) \subseteq (Q_2^i \setminus Q_2^{i'})$, then $u_v^2 \circ h_i$ is a homomorphism from Q_1^i to $u_v^2(Q_2^i \setminus Q_2^{i'}) \subseteq \beta_v(\mathcal{Q}_2, R, \mu_v^2)$. Thus $\beta_v(\mathcal{Q}_2, R, \mu_v^2) \models Q_1^i \models Q_1$.
- Otherwise, for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, we now consider that Q_1^i is a safe copy of the CQ in \mathcal{Q}_1 that maps to Q_2^i and h_i is the homomorphism (extended by considering this safe renaming) from Q_1^i to Q_2^i . Let $Q_1^{i'}$ be the maximal subset of Q_1^i that maps to $Q_2^{i'}$ by h_i , i.e. $Q_1^{i'} \subseteq Q_1^i$, $h_i(Q_1^{i'}) \subseteq Q_2^{i'}$ and $h_i(Q_1^i \setminus Q_1^{i'}) \cap Q_2^{i'} = \emptyset$. Let H_i'' be the maximal subset of H_i' that is unified by u_v^2 with the subset $h_i(Q_1^{i'})$ of $Q_2^{i'}$, i.e. $H_i'' \subseteq H_i'$, $u_v^2(H_i'') = u_v^2(h_i(Q_1^{i'}))$ and $u_v^2(H_i' \setminus H_i'') \cap u_v^2(h_i(Q_1^{i'})) = \emptyset$. Let $P_{u_i}^1$ the partition induced by $u_v^2 \circ h_i$ on $\text{terms}(H_i'' \cup Q_1^{i'})$. By construction, $\mu_v^1 = (Q_1^{i'}, H_i'', P_{u_i}^1)$ is thus a piece-unifier between Q_1^i and H_i . Since for each $1 \leq i < j \leq n$, $Q_1^{i'}$ and $Q_1^{j'}$ does not share any variable, then we can define $h = h_1 + \dots + h_n$. We have that $u_v^2 \circ h$ is a homomorphism from $Q_1^1 \wedge \dots \wedge Q_1^n$ to $u_v^2(H_1'' \wedge \dots \wedge H_n'')$. Let $P_{u_v^1}$ be the partition induced by $u_v^2 \circ h$ on $\text{terms}(Q_1^1 \wedge \dots \wedge Q_1^n) \cup \text{terms}(H_1'' \wedge \dots \wedge H_n'')$: it is admissible since it is built from a substitution (Proposition 4). Moreover, we have $P_{u_v^1} = \text{join}(P_{u_1}, \dots, P_{u_n})$ and thus, μ_v^1 is a disjunctive unifier of \mathcal{Q}_1 with R .

We now prove that $\beta_v(\mathcal{Q}_2, R, \mu_v^2) \models \beta_v(\mathcal{Q}_1, R, \mu_v^1)$. We build a substitution s from the selected elements of the classes in $P_{u_v^1}$ which are variables, to the selected elements of the classes in $P_{u_v^2}$ as follows: for any class $C \in P_{u_v^1}$, if t_C is a variable of a H_i'' , then $s(t_C) = u_v^2(t_C)$, otherwise $s(t_C) = u_v^2(h(t))$ (t occurs in a $Q_1^{i'}$). Note that for any term t in $P_{u_v^1}$, we have $s(u_v^1(t)) = u_v^2(h(t))$. We build now a substitution h' from $\text{vars}(\beta_v(\mathcal{Q}_1, R, \mu_v^1))$ to $\text{terms}(\beta_v(\mathcal{Q}_2, R, \mu_v^2))$ by considering three cases according to the part of $\beta_v(\mathcal{Q}_1, R, \mu_v^1)$ in which the variables occurs (in a Q_1^i but not in $Q_1^{i'}$, in $\text{body}(R)$ but not in H_i'' , or in the remaining part corresponding to the images of $\text{vars}(Q_1^i) \cap \text{vars}(Q_1^{i'})$ by u_v^1):

- if $x \in \text{vars}(Q_1^i) \setminus \text{vars}(Q_1^{i'})$, $h'(x) = h(x)$;
- if $x \in \text{vars}(\text{body}(R)) \setminus \text{vars}(\bigcup_{i=1}^n H_i'')$, $h'(x) = u_v^2(x)$;
- if $x \in u_v^1(\bigcup_{i=1}^n (\text{vars}(Q_1^i) \cap \text{vars}(Q_1^{i'})))$ (or alternatively $x \in u_v^1(\text{fr}(R) \cap \text{vars}(\bigcup_{i=1}^n H_i''))$), $h'(x) = s(x)$.

We conclude by showing that h' is a homomorphism from $\beta_v(\mathcal{Q}_1, R, \mu_v^1) = u_v^1(\text{body}(R)) \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^n u_v^1(Q_1^i \setminus Q_1^{i'})$ to $\beta_v(\mathcal{Q}_2, R, \mu_v^2) = u_v^2(\text{body}(R)) \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^n u_v^2(Q_2^i \setminus Q_2^{i'})$ with two points:

- $h'(u_v^1(\text{body}(R))) = u_v^2(\text{body}(R))$. Indeed, for any variable x of $\text{body}(R)$:
 - * either $x \in \text{vars}(\text{body}(R)) \setminus \text{vars}(\bigcup_{i=1}^n H_i'')$, so $h'(u_v^1(x)) = h'(x) = u_v^2(x)$ (because u_v^1 is a substitution from $\text{vars}(\bigcup_{i=1}^n (Q_1^i \cup H_i''))$);
 - * or $x \in \text{fr}(R) \cap \text{vars}(\bigcup_{i=1}^n H_i'')$, so $h'(u_v^1(x)) = s(u_v^1(x)) = u_v^2(h(x)) = u_v^2(x)$ (because h is a substitution from $\text{vars}(\bigcup_{i=1}^n Q_1^i)$ and recall that for any term t in $P_{u_v^1}$, $s(u_v^1(t)) = u_v^2(h(t))$).
- $h'(u_v^1(Q_1^i \setminus Q_1^{i'})) \subseteq u_v^2(Q_2^i \setminus Q_2^{i'})$ for each $1 \leq i \leq n$. In fact, we'll show that $h'(u_v^1(Q_1^i \setminus Q_1^{i'})) = u_v^2(h(Q_1^i \setminus Q_1^{i'}))$ and since $h(Q_1^i \setminus Q_1^{i'}) \subseteq Q_2^i \setminus Q_2^{i'}$ we'll be able to conclude. To show that $h'(u_v^1(Q_1^i \setminus Q_1^{i'})) = u_v^2(h(Q_1^i \setminus Q_1^{i'}))$, just see that for any $x \in \text{vars}(Q_1^i \setminus Q_1^{i'})$:
 - * either $x \in (\text{vars}(Q_1^{i'}) \cap \text{vars}(Q_1^i))$, then $h'(u_v^1(x)) = s(u_v^1(x)) = u_v^2(h(x))$;

* or $x \in (\text{vars}(Q_1^i) \setminus \text{vars}(Q_1^{i'}))$, then $h'(u_\vee^1(x)) = h'(x) = h(x) = u_\vee^2(h(x))$ (because u_\vee^1 is a substitution from $\text{vars}(\bigcup_{i=1}^n (Q_1^{i'} \cup H_i^{i'}))$ and u_\vee^2 is a substitution from variables of $\bigcup_{i=1}^n (Q_2^{i'} \cup H_i^{i'})$ and $h(x) \notin \text{vars}(\bigcup_{i=1}^n (Q_2^{i'} \cup H_i^{i'}))$).

□

The following propositions 8 and 9 correspond to **Lemma 2** (Point 1 and Point 2, respectively) in the paper.

Proposition 8. *Let a fact base F , a disjunctive rule R , a trigger (R, h) on F and let \mathcal{Q} be the UCQ $\alpha_\vee(F, R, h)$. Then there exists a disjunctive piece-unifier μ_\vee of \mathcal{Q} with R such that $F \models \beta_\vee(\mathcal{Q}, R, \mu_\vee)$.*




Figure 4: Corresponding application of β_\vee to the UCQ obtained by α_\vee is entailed by the original factbase (Prop. 8)

Proof. Let $\mathcal{Q} = \alpha_\vee(F, R, h) = \{Q_i = F \cup h^{safe_i}(\text{head}_i(R)) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. We build $\mu_\vee = \{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n\}$ a disjunctive piece-unifier as follows: for $1 \leq i \leq n$, $\mu_i = (Q_i', \text{head}_i(R), P_{u_i})$ with $Q_i' = \rho_i \circ h^{safe_i}(\text{head}_i(R))$ (ρ_i being a safe renaming of Q_i) and P_{u_i} the partition induced by $\rho_i \circ h^{safe_i}$ on $\text{terms}(Q_i') \cup \text{terms}(\text{head}_i(R))$.

First, we show that each μ_i is a piece-unifier of $\rho_i(Q_i)$ with $\text{body}(R) \rightarrow \text{head}_i(R)$:

- $Q_i' \subseteq \rho_i(Q_i)$ because $h^{safe_i}(\text{head}_i(R)) \subseteq Q_i$ and $Q_i' = \rho_i(h^{safe_i}(\text{head}_i(R)))$;
- P_{u_i} the partition induced by $\rho_i \circ h^{safe_i}$ is admissible (thanks to Proposition 4);
- any u_i associated with P_{u_i} is such that $u_i(\text{head}_i(R)) = u_i(Q_i')$ (thanks to Proposition 5);
- for each existential variable z from $\text{head}_i(R)$ we have $P_{u_i}[z] = \{z, \rho_i \circ h^{safe_i}(z)\}$ and $\rho_i \circ h^{safe_i}(z)$ is not a separating variable because z is safely renamed twice, first by h^{safe_i} and secondly by ρ_i .

Then, we show that the partition $P_{u_\vee} = \text{join}(\{P_{u_1}, \dots, P_{u_n}\})$ is admissible.

Since each P_{u_i} is admissible, the non-admissibility of their join would be only due to a variable that appears in two classes with different constants from two partitions. The only variables that can be shared between two partitions of a set of piece-unifiers build from safe copies of CQs are the frontier variables of the considered disjunctive rule. But if a frontier variable shared by two $\text{head}_i(R)$ is mapped on a constant, then it is mapped on the same constant because each P_{u_i} is induced by $\rho_i \circ h^{safe_i}$ and only h can send a variable to a constant.

μ_\vee is therefore a disjunctive piece-unifier from \mathcal{Q} with R . Let u_\vee be a substitution associated with P_{u_\vee} .

Let $F' = \beta_\vee(\mathcal{Q}, R, \mu_\vee) = u_\vee(B) \cup \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq n} u_\vee(\rho_i(Q_i) \setminus Q_i') = u_\vee(B) \cup \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq n} u_\vee(\rho_i(F \cup h^{safe_i}(\text{head}_i(R))) \setminus (\rho_i \circ h^{safe_i})(\text{head}_i(R))) \subseteq u_\vee(B) \cup \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq n} u_\vee(\rho_i(F))$ (note this inclusion is not a simple equality because $F \cap h^{safe_i}(\text{head}_i(R))$

can be not-empty).

We have just to observe that $\rho_1^{-1} + \dots + \rho_n^{-1} + h$ is a homomorphism from $u_\vee(B) \cup \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq n} u_\vee(\rho_i(F))$ to F :

- $(\rho_1^{-1} + \dots + \rho_n^{-1} + h)(u_\vee(\rho_i(F))) = F$, indeed:
 - If F contains only constants, it is straightforward;
 - If F contains some variables, then they were renamed in $\rho_i(F)$. u_\vee can only maps variables into two distinct sets of terms:
 - * Assume that a variable of $\rho_i(F)$ is mapped to a variable in $\text{terms}(Q_i')$. Then, ρ_i^{-1} allows to recover the initial variable that was in F (because no variable of F can be in the same class of P_{u_i} as an existential variable of R and the other variables come from the application of ρ_i);
 - * Otherwise, assume it is mapped to a variable in $\text{terms}(\text{head}_i(R))$. Then, h allows to recover the initial variable in F (since these variables can only appear in Q_i through the frontier variables of R thanks to the application of h on $\text{head}_i(R)$).
- $(\rho_1^{-1} + \dots + \rho_n^{-1} + h)(u_\vee(B)) = h(B) \subseteq F$, indeed, by a similar reasoning:
 - Assume that a variable in B is sent by u_\vee to a variable in $\text{terms}(Q_i')$, then ρ_i^{-1} allows to recover the variable in F to which h maps this variable from B ;

- Assume it is mapped by u_\vee to a variable in $\text{terms}(\text{head}_i(R))$, then we simply have a variable in the domain of h since it can only be a frontier variable.

Since $F' \subseteq u_\vee(B) \cup \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq n} u_\vee(\rho_i(F))$, it follows that $\rho_1^{-1} + \dots + \rho_n^{-1} + h$ maps F' to F .

□

Proposition 9. *Let \mathcal{Q} be a UCQ, R be a disjunctive rule, μ_\vee be a disjunctive piece-unifier of \mathcal{Q} with R and F be the fact base $\beta_\vee(\mathcal{Q}, R, \mu_\vee)$. Then, there exists a trigger (R, h) on F such that $\alpha_\vee(F, R, h) \models \mathcal{Q}$.*




Figure 5: Corresponding application of α_\vee to the CQ obtained by β_\vee entails the original UCQ (Prop. 9)

Proof. Let $\mu_\vee = \{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n\}$, and let u_\vee be a substitution associated with $\text{join}(\{P_{u_1}, \dots, P_{u_n}\})$ with each P_{u_i} being the partition in each μ_i . (R, u_\vee) is a trigger on $F = \beta_\vee(\mathcal{Q}, R, \mu_\vee)$ since $u_\vee(\text{body}(R)) \subseteq F$. Let $\mathcal{F}' = \alpha_\vee(F, R, u_\vee) = \{F'_i = F \cup u_\vee^{safe_i}(\text{head}_i(R)) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$.

To prove that $\mathcal{F}' \models \mathcal{Q}$, we'll show that for each F'_i , the CQ Q_i that is a safe copy of a CQ in \mathcal{Q} and was unified by μ_i with $\text{head}_i(R)$ maps to F'_i by the homomorphism $u_\vee^{safe_i}$. Then, let ρ_i be the renaming substitution that produced Q_i from a CQ $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$, we'll have $u_\vee^{safe_i} \circ \rho_i$ is a homomorphism from this Q to F'_i . Thus by Proposition 3, we can conclude that $\mathcal{F}' \models \mathcal{Q}$.

Let's now show that $u_\vee^{safe_i}$ maps Q_i to F'_i :

- u_\vee maps $Q_i \setminus Q'_i$ into $u_\vee(Q_i \setminus Q'_i) \subseteq F \subseteq F'_i$ and since $u_\vee^{safe_i}$ is an extension of u_\vee to the existential variables of R , $u_\vee^{safe_i}(Q_i \setminus Q'_i) = u_\vee(Q_i \setminus Q'_i)$, so $u_\vee^{safe_i}$ maps $Q_i \setminus Q'_i$ into F'_i .
- $u_\vee^{safe_i}$ maps Q'_i into $u_\vee^{safe_i}(\text{head}_i(R)) \subseteq F'_i$ because first u_\vee unifies Q'_i and $H'_i \subseteq \text{head}_i(R)$, i.e. $u_\vee(Q'_i) = u_\vee(H'_i)$, and second $.safe_i$ maps $u_\vee(\text{head}_i(R))$ into $u_\vee^{safe_i}(\text{head}_i(R))$;

□

Lemma 3 (Backward-forward Lemma). *Let F be a fact base, \mathcal{Q} be a UCQ and R be a disjunctive rule. For any disjunctive piece-unifier μ_\vee of \mathcal{Q} with R , if $F \models \beta_\vee(\mathcal{Q}, R, \mu_\vee)$ then there is a trigger (R, h) on F such that $\alpha_\vee(F, R, h) \models \mathcal{Q}$.*

Proof. Thanks to the Proposition 9, we know that there is a trigger (R, h) on $F_2 = \beta_\vee(\mathcal{Q}, R, \mu_\vee)$ such that $\alpha_\vee(F_2, R, h) \models \mathcal{Q}$. Then, from Proposition 6, we know that if $F \models F_2$, then we have $\alpha_\vee(F, R, h) \models \alpha_\vee(F_2, R, h)$. And thus, $\alpha_\vee(F, R, h) \models \mathcal{Q}$ which is what we wanted to prove. □

Lemma 4 (Forward-backward Lemma). *Given any trigger (R, h) on F , if $\alpha_\vee(F, R, h) \models \mathcal{Q}$ then either $F \models \mathcal{Q}$ or there is a disjunctive piece-unifier μ_\vee of \mathcal{Q} with R , such that $F \models \beta_\vee(\mathcal{Q}, R, \mu_\vee)$.*

Proof. Thanks to Proposition 8, we know that there is a disjunctive piece-unifier μ_\vee^2 of $\mathcal{Q}_2 = \alpha_\vee(F, R, h)$ with R such that $F \models \beta_\vee(\mathcal{Q}_2, R, \mu_\vee^2)$. Then, from Proposition 7, we know that if $\mathcal{Q}_2 \models \mathcal{Q}$, either $\beta_\vee(\mathcal{Q}_2, R, \mu_\vee^2) \models \mathcal{Q}$ or there exists μ_\vee such that $\beta_\vee(\mathcal{Q}_2, R, \mu_\vee^2) \models \beta_\vee(\mathcal{Q}, R, \mu_\vee)$. Since $F \models \beta_\vee(\mathcal{Q}_2, R, \mu_\vee^2)$, we have either $F \models \mathcal{Q}$ or $F \models \beta_\vee(\mathcal{Q}, R, \mu_\vee)$, which was what we wanted to prove. □

Corollary 1 (of Lemma 4). *Let \mathcal{F} be a set of fact bases, $F \in \mathcal{F}$, R a disjunctive rule and (R, h) a trigger on F . Let \mathcal{F}_1 be the set of fact bases obtained by the immediate derivation of (\mathcal{F}, R) by the trigger (R, h) , i.e. $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F} \setminus \{F\} \cup \alpha_\vee(F, R, h)$. Then, if $\mathcal{F}_1 \models \mathcal{Q}$, either $\mathcal{F} \models \mathcal{Q}$ or there exists a unifier μ_\vee of \mathcal{Q} with R such that $\mathcal{F} \models \{\beta_\vee(\mathcal{Q}, R, \mu_\vee)\} \cup \mathcal{Q}$.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{F} \setminus \{F\} \models \mathcal{Q}$, we just have to prove that either $F \models \mathcal{Q}$ or $F \models \beta_\vee(\mathcal{Q}, R, \mu_\vee)$, which is exactly Lemma 4. □

We extend the notion of disjunctive chase result to any derivation tree or derivation sequence. So we call *derivation tree result* the set of fact bases $res(\mathcal{T}) = \{ \bigcup_{v \in nodes(\gamma)} \lambda(v) \mid \gamma \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T}) \}$ where \mathcal{T} is any derivation tree and λ its labeling function. Also,

we call *derivation sequence result* the set of fact bases $res(\mathcal{D}) = \mathcal{F}_n$ where \mathcal{F}_n is the last set of fact bases in the derivation \mathcal{D} .

Note that if \mathcal{T} is finite, we have $res(\mathcal{T}) \equiv res(\mathcal{D})$ for any derivation \mathcal{D} that we can assign to \mathcal{T} . Indeed, for each finite sequence \mathcal{D}_n of length n , \mathcal{F}_n corresponds exactly to the labels of the leaves of a derivation tree built from the same trigger applications: hence, \mathcal{F}_n is isomorphic to $res(\mathcal{T})$.

Lemma 5. *Let Q be a CQ, $\mathcal{T} = (V, E, \lambda)$ be a derivation tree, γ be a branch of \mathcal{T} and $F_\gamma \in res(\mathcal{T})$ the set of facts associated with γ , i.e. $F_\gamma = \bigcup_{v \in nodes(\gamma)} \lambda(v)$. If a homomorphism h maps Q to F_γ , then there is a vertex $v \in \gamma$ such that $\lambda(v) \models Q$.*

Proof. To each atom of F_γ , we give a rank that corresponds to the depth⁵ of the vertex of γ where it was produced. Since $h(Q)$ is finite, let k be the maximum rank of the atoms in $h(Q)$. Let v be the vertex at depth k in γ , we have $h(Q) \subseteq \lambda(v)$, so $\lambda(v) \models Q$. \square

Theorem 7. *Let a UCQ Q , a set of disjunctive rules \mathcal{R} and a fact base F . Then $chase(F, \mathcal{R}) \models Q$ iff there exists a finite derivation tree \mathcal{T} of (F, \mathcal{R}) such that $res(\mathcal{T}) \models Q$.*

Proof. (\Leftarrow) We only need to extend the derivation tree \mathcal{T} , in a fair way, to add what is missing in the tree. Indeed, by definition of the result of a derivation tree / disjunctive chase, each fact base of $chase(F, \mathcal{R})$ includes at least one fact base of $res(\mathcal{T})$, so $chase(F, \mathcal{R}) \models res(\mathcal{T})$ and thus $chase(F, \mathcal{R}) \models Q$.

(\Rightarrow) Let $\mathcal{T}_C = (V, E, \lambda)$ the fair derivation tree used to define $chase(F, \mathcal{R})$, i.e. $chase(F, \mathcal{R}) = \{F_\gamma = \bigcup_{v \in nodes(\gamma)} \lambda(v) \mid \gamma \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T}_C)\}$. For each $F_\gamma \in chase(F, \mathcal{R})$, let $\mathcal{Q}_\gamma \subseteq Q$ the set of CQs that maps to F_γ (\mathcal{Q}_γ contains at least one CQ, cf. Proposition 3). By lemma 5, for each CQ in \mathcal{Q}_γ there is a vertex $v \in \gamma$ such that $\lambda(v) \models Q_\gamma$. In each branch γ , we select v_γ the highest of these vertices in γ .

These selected vertices are called the terminal vertices. We build the subtree \mathcal{T}' of \mathcal{T}_C by deleting from \mathcal{T}_C all the vertices that are successors of a terminal vertex. Thus every branch of \mathcal{T}' is finite. We show that (1) \mathcal{T}' is still a derivation tree and (2) it is finite.

1. By construction, each node in \mathcal{T}' is either a terminal node (in which case, it is a leaf), or we did not erase any of its children (and so, its children still correspond to the result of applying a trigger). Thus, \mathcal{T}' is still a derivation tree.
2. Since each rule is finite, each node in a derivation tree has a finite number of children (it is locally finite). According to König's infinity Lemma (König 1927), "an infinite, locally finite rooted tree has an infinite branch". Its contrapositive is "a locally finite rooted tree with no infinite branch is finite". Thus, \mathcal{T}' is finite.

\square

Corollary 2 (of Theorem 7). *$F, \mathcal{R} \models Q$ iff there exists a finite derivation tree \mathcal{T} of (F, \mathcal{R}) such that $res(\mathcal{T}) \models Q$. Equivalently, $F, \mathcal{R} \models Q$ iff there exists a derivation \mathcal{D} from F with \mathcal{R} such that $res(\mathcal{D}) \models Q$.*

Theorem 3 Let (F, \mathcal{R}) be a disjunctive KB and Q be a (Boolean) UCQ. Then, $F, \mathcal{R} \models Q$ iff there is a piece-rewriting Q' of Q such that $F \models Q'$.

Proof. We show that there exists a derivation of $(\{F\}, \mathcal{R})$ leading to an \mathcal{F}_i such that $\mathcal{F}_i \models Q$ iff there exists a piece-rewriting Q' of Q with \mathcal{R} such that $F \models Q'$.

(\Rightarrow) We prove the first direction by induction on the number of rule applications in a derivation sequence \mathcal{D} such that Q maps to $res(\mathcal{D})$ (such a tree / derivation exists: see Corollary 2).

At rank 0, the property is trivially true by taking $Q' = Q$. Let us assume that it is true at rank n . Let $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{F}_0 = \{F\}) \xrightarrow{t_1} \dots \xrightarrow{t_n} \mathcal{F}_n \xrightarrow{(R, h)} \mathcal{F}_{n+1}$ with Q that maps to \mathcal{F}_{n+1} . By using the Corollary 1, we have either:

1. $\mathcal{F}_n \models Q$;
2. or there exists μ_\vee such that $\mathcal{F}_n \models \{\beta_\vee(Q, R, \mu_\vee)\} \cup Q$.

⁵The depth of a vertex v is defined as the length of the path from the root to v .

In both cases, we have a UCQ that maps to \mathcal{F}_n . Let us name it \mathcal{Q}_n . By induction hypothesis, there exists a piece-rewriting \mathcal{Q}' of \mathcal{Q}_n such that $F \models \mathcal{Q}'$. By definition, \mathcal{Q}_n is a one-step piece-rewriting of \mathcal{Q} , and thus \mathcal{Q}' is also a piece-rewriting of \mathcal{Q} .

(\Leftarrow) We prove the opposite direction by induction on the length of the rewriting sequence producing \mathcal{Q}' from \mathcal{Q} and relying upon Lemma 3. The property is trivially true at rank 0 by taking $\mathcal{F}_0 = \{F\}$. Let us assume it is true at rank n . Assume that \mathcal{Q}_{n+1} is obtained from \mathcal{Q} by a rewriting sequence $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}_0, \mathcal{Q}_1, \dots, \mathcal{Q}_n, \mathcal{Q}_{n+1} = \beta_\vee(\mathcal{Q}_n, R, \mu_\vee) \cup \mathcal{Q}_n$ of length $n + 1$, and $F \models \mathcal{Q}_{n+1}$. So there is a CQ Q in \mathcal{Q}_{n+1} such that $F \models Q$. We have two cases:

1. $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n$: then, by induction hypothesis, there exists \mathcal{F}_i such that $\mathcal{F}_i \models Q$, thus $\mathcal{F}_i \models \mathcal{Q}_n$ and also $\mathcal{F}_i \models \mathcal{Q}_{n+1}$.
2. $Q = \beta_\vee(\mathcal{Q}_n, R, \mu_\vee)$: then, by Lemma 3, there exists $\mathcal{F}_1 = \alpha_\vee(F, R, h)$ such that $\mathcal{F}_1 \models \mathcal{Q}_n$. So, we have that for each $F_m \in \mathcal{F}_1$, $F_m \models \mathcal{Q}_n$. And by induction hypothesis, it holds that for each F_m , there exists a derivation of $(\{F_m\}, \mathcal{R})$ leading to a \mathcal{F}_m such that $\mathcal{F}_m \models \mathcal{Q}$ and thus we have a derivation from \mathcal{F}_1 that produces \mathcal{F}_i (that is the union of all \mathcal{F}_m) such that $\mathcal{F}_i \models \mathcal{Q}$.

□

B Proofs of Section 4

Theorem 5. *Let $R = B \rightarrow H_1 \vee H_2$ be a source-to-target rule that is not disconnected nor equivalent to a conjunctive rule. Then, there is a CQ Q such that $(\{Q\}, \{R\})$ is not UCQ-rewritable.*

Proof. Let $R = B[\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{y}] \rightarrow \exists \mathbf{z}_1 H_1[\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{z}_1] \vee \exists \mathbf{z}_2 H_2[\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{z}_2]$, where:

- $\text{fr}(R) = \mathbf{x}_1 \cup \mathbf{x}_2$; \mathbf{x}_1 and \mathbf{x}_2 may share variables;
- $\mathbf{x}_i \neq \emptyset$ ($i = 1, 2$) since R is not disconnected.

We build the following Boolean CQ:

$$Q = \{H_1^s[\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{w}_1], p(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2), H_2^s[\mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{w}_2]\}$$

where each $H_i^s[\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{w}_i]$ is a safe copy of $H_i[\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{z}_i]$ and p is a fresh predicate. Note that, since R is connected, both H_1 and H_2 have a frontier variable, and frontier variables being safely renamed in each H_i^s , we have $\mathbf{v}_1 \cap \mathbf{v}_2 = \emptyset$, hence the arity of p is at least 2. In $p(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2)$ the order on the variables is important: a fixed order is chosen on \mathbf{x}_i (hence, \mathbf{v}_i) and the tuple \mathbf{v}_1 comes before the tuple \mathbf{v}_2 . Hence, $p(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2)$ can be seen as “directed” from \mathbf{v}_1 to \mathbf{v}_2 . We then proceed in two steps.

1. We show that we can produce an infinite set \mathcal{Q} whose element CQs are pairwise incomparable by homomorphism. Let $Q_0 = Q$. At each step $i \geq 1$, Q_i is produced from a safe copy of Q unified with H_1 and a safe copy of Q_{i-1} unified with H_2 . The piece-unifiers unify H_1^s (resp. H_2^s) in Q (resp. Q_{i-1}) according to the isomorphism from H_1^s (resp. H_2^s) to H_1 (resp. H_2). Any CQ Q_k in \mathcal{Q} is connected and follows the “pattern” $H_1^s.p.(B.p)^k.H_2^s$, where occurrences of p -atoms all have the same direction; hence, two “adjacent” p -atoms, i.e., that share variables with the same copy B_i of a B , cannot be mapped one onto the other (by a homomorphism that maps B_i to itself).
2. We show that no CQ Q' that can be produced by piece-rewriting maps by homomorphism to a CQ from \mathcal{Q} , except by isomorphism. When there is no (conjunctive) piece-unifier that unifies $H_1[\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{w}_1]$ in Q with $H_2[\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{z}_2]$ (then, the same holds if we exchange H_1 and H_2), all the produced Q' are more specific than (including isomorphic to) CQs from \mathcal{Q} . Otherwise, assume that a CQ Q' is produced by unifying $H_1[\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{w}_1]$ with $H_2[\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{z}_2]$. If Q' can be mapped by homomorphism to a $Q_n \in \mathcal{Q}$, the arguments of any p -atom in Q' must be pairwise distinct variables. We show that it leads to have R equivalent to the conjunctive rule $B \rightarrow H_i$ (with $i = 1$ or $i = 2$), which contradicts the hypothesis on R .

It follows that \mathcal{Q} is a subset of any sound and complete rewriting of $\{Q\}$ with $\{R\}$, hence the pair $(\{Q\}, \{R\})$ does not admit a UCQ-rewriting.

Details on step 1. We consider the infinite sequence $\mathcal{Q}_0, \dots, \mathcal{Q}_i, \dots$, where $\mathcal{Q}_0 = \{Q_0 = Q\}$ and for all $i > 0$, $\mathcal{Q}_i = \mathcal{Q}_{i-1} \cup \{Q_i\}$, where Q_i is obtained by a (disjunctive) piece-unifier that unifies safe copies of Q_0 and Q_{i-1} , with H_1 and H_2 respectively, according to the isomorphism from H_1^s (resp. H_2^s) to H_1 (resp. H_2). By an easy induction on the length k of the rewriting sequence leading to \mathcal{Q}_k ($k \geq 0$), we check that all the CQs Q_k are of the following form:

$$H_1^s[\mathbf{v}_1^0, \mathbf{w}_1] \wedge p(\mathbf{v}_1^0, \mathbf{v}_2^0) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^k B[\mathbf{v}_2^{i-1}, \mathbf{v}_1^i, \mathbf{y}_i] \wedge p(\mathbf{v}_1^i, \mathbf{v}_2^i) \right) \wedge H_2^s[\mathbf{v}_2^k, \mathbf{w}_2]$$

Moreover, Q_k is connected. Indeed, by hypothesis, R is connected, hence B is connected, or we have $\mathbf{v}_1^{i-1} \cap \mathbf{v}_2^i \neq \emptyset$, for all $i > 0$, i.e., two p -atoms adjacent to a B share a variable.

Since the two p -atoms connected to an occurrence of B are “in the same direction”, they do not fold one onto the other. Hence, if a CQ Q_i maps to a CQ Q_j ($i \neq j$), it is necessarily by an injective homomorphism. However, this is impossible, because the “chains” that underlie these CQs are of different length while the copies of H_1 and H_2 at their extremities should be mapped one onto the other. Hence, the set \mathcal{Q} defined as the union of all the \mathcal{Q}_i for $i \in \mathbb{N}$, is composed of pairwise incomparable CQs.

Details on step 2. (1) We first consider the case where there is no (conjunctive) piece-unifier that unifies $H_1[\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{w}_1]$ in Q with $H_2[\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{z}_2]$ (then, the same holds if we exchange H_1 and H_2) and show that the produced CQs are more specific than (including isomorphic to) CQs from \mathcal{Q} . Indeed, in this case, all the CQs produced are of the above general form, except that the p -atoms may be specialized, as well as the B ’s on their frontier (it is the case if we consider more specific unifiers than the ones used to build \mathcal{Q}). Let us prove it by induction on the length l of a rewriting sequence. This is true for $l = 0$. Assume this is true until $l = n$. For $l = n + 1$, let \mathcal{Q}_j and \mathcal{Q}_k , with (in simplified form) $\mathcal{Q}_j = H_1^s.p.(B.p)^j.H_2^s$ unified with H_1 and $\mathcal{Q}_k = H_1^s.p.(B.p)^k.H_2^s$ unified with H_2 . The produced CQ has the form $H_1^s.p.(B.p)^{j+k+1}.H_2^s$, hence it is more specific than \mathcal{Q}_{j+k+1} , as defined in the step 1 of the proof. (2) Otherwise, let Q_k be a CQ produced by unifying $H_1^s[\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{w}_1]$ with $H_2[\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{z}_2]$ (if we exchange H_1 and H_2 , the case is similar). If Q_k can be mapped by homomorphism to a $Q_n \in \mathcal{Q}$, any p -atom in Q_k must have pairwise distinct variables. Hence, when an atom set of the form H_1 is unified with an atom set of the form H_2 , the

(copies of the) frontier variables in each set have to remain distinct (i.e., no frontier variable can be unified with another frontier variable in the same set). From this observation and the fact that two existential variables of H_2 cannot be unified together, there is a homomorphism from $H_1^s[\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{w}_1]$ to $H_2[\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{z}_2]$, with \mathbf{v}_1 mapped to \mathbf{x}_2 . Since by construction of the rewriting, an H_1^s is never specialized (by merging two variables or replacing a variable by a constant), H_1^s is isomorphic to H_1 (with frontier variables mapped to frontier variables). Hence, there is a homomorphism h from H_1 to H_2 , with frontier variables mapped to frontier variables. Now, two cases: either $h(B)$ maps to B by a homomorphism invariant on the frontier variables of $h(B)$, and $B \rightarrow H_2 \models B \rightarrow H_1$, hence R is equivalent to the conjunctive rule $B \rightarrow H_2$, which is excluded by hypothesis; or $h(B)$ does not map to B by a homomorphism invariant on the frontier variables of $h(B)$, and it does not map to a B by a homomorphism from Q_k to Q_n , hence there is no homomorphism from Q_k to Q_n . □

C Proofs of Section 5

Recall that *disjunctive mapping rewritability* is the following problem: Given a set of disjunctive \mathcal{S} -to- \mathcal{T} -rules \mathcal{M} and a UCQ Q on \mathcal{T} , does the pair (Q, \mathcal{M}) admit a UCQ- \mathcal{S} -rewriting?

Theorem 6 Disjunctive mapping rewritability is undecidable.

To prove it, we build a reduction from the following problem: Given a Boolean CQ Q and a set of (conjunctive) datalog rules \mathcal{R} , does the pair (Q, \mathcal{R}) admit a UCQ-rewriting? This problem is undecidable, which follows from the undecidability of determining whether a datalog program is uniformly bounded (Gaifman et al. 1993). Indeed, a datalog program \mathcal{R} is uniformly bounded if and only if the pair (Q, \mathcal{R}) is UCQ-rewritable for any full atomic query Q , i.e., in which all the variables are answer variables. Since there is a finite number of non-isomorphic atomic CQs to consider, it follows that determining if a pair (Q, \mathcal{R}) is UCQ-rewritable for Q an atomic CQ is also undecidable. In turn, this problem can be reduced to the problem of determining whether a pair (Q', \mathcal{R}) is UCQ-rewritable for Q' a Boolean CQ. To build Q' , we just add to Q an atom with special predicate *answer* which contains all the variables of Q . This ensures that answer variables are properly considered when comparing two generated CQs.

W.l.o.g. we assume that datalog rules have no constants (and an atomic head).

Our reduction translates each instance (Q, \mathcal{R}) of the conjunctive datalog UCQ-rewriting problem, defined on a set of predicates \mathcal{P} , into an instance $(Q^{Q, \mathcal{R}}, \mathcal{M}^{Q, \mathcal{R}})$ of the disjunctive mapping rewritability problem, defined on a pair of predicates sets $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$ such that:

- $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{P} \cup \{T\}$, where T is a fresh unary predicate,
- \mathcal{T} is the union of: (1) a set of predicates in bijection with \mathcal{S} , where each predicate is topped with a hat (e.g. \hat{p} is obtained from p), and (2) a set of fresh predicates in bijection with \mathcal{R} , where we denote by p_{R_i} the predicate associated with the rule R_i ; the arity of each p_{R_i} is $|\text{fr}(R_i)|$.

We denote $A[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]$ a set of atoms that uses the variables in \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} . We also denote by $T[\mathbf{x}]$ the conjunction of atoms $T(x_i)$ for each $x_i \in \mathbf{x}$, i.e. $T[\mathbf{x}] = T(x_1) \wedge \dots \wedge T(x_n)$ where $|\mathbf{x}| = n$. Similarly, $\hat{T}[\mathbf{x}] = \hat{T}(x_1) \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{T}(x_n)$. Let Q any CQ (or set of atoms) on \mathcal{S} , we denote by \hat{Q} the CQ (or set of atoms) Q whose predicates have all been renamed with a hat, \hat{Q} is thus on \mathcal{T} . Let Q any CQ, we denote by Q^T the CQ Q completed with a T atom on each term. Then, \hat{Q}^T is the CQ obtained from \hat{Q} by adding its T atoms. Finally, \widehat{Q}^T is obtained from Q^T by substituting each predicate p (including T) by \hat{p} .

Definition of the reduction Let a CQ $Q = \exists \mathbf{x}_Q B_Q[\mathbf{x}_Q]$ and a datalog rule set $\mathcal{R} = \{R_1, \dots, R_n\}$ with each $R_i = B_i[\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i] \rightarrow H_i[\mathbf{x}_i]$. We define the UCQ $Q^{Q, \mathcal{R}}$ and the disjunctive datalog mapping $\mathcal{M}^{Q, \mathcal{R}}$ associated with Q and \mathcal{R} as follows:

- $Q^{Q, \mathcal{R}} = \{Q_Q\} \cup Q_{\mathcal{R}}$ with

$$Q_Q = \exists \mathbf{x}_Q \cdot \hat{B}_Q[\mathbf{x}_Q] \wedge \hat{T}[\mathbf{x}_Q], \text{ i.e., } Q_Q = \widehat{Q}^T,$$

$$Q_{\mathcal{R}} = \{Q_{R_i} = \exists \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i \cdot \hat{B}_i[\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i] \wedge p_{R_i}(\mathbf{x}_i) \wedge \hat{T}[\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i] \mid R_i \in \mathcal{R}\}$$
- $\mathcal{M}^{Q, \mathcal{R}} = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{R}} \cup \mathcal{M}_{trans}$ with

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{R}} = \{m_{R_i} = T[\mathbf{x}_i] \rightarrow p_{R_i}(\mathbf{x}_i) \vee \hat{H}_i(\mathbf{x}_i) \mid R_i \in \mathcal{R}\}$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{trans} = \{p(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow \hat{p}(\mathbf{x}) \mid p \in \mathcal{S}\}$$

Let us comment on the reduction. The UCQ $Q^{Q, \mathcal{R}}$ is built from Q and, for every $R_i \in \mathcal{R}$, a CQ Q_{R_i} . Each Q_{R_i} is composed of the conjunction of $\text{body}(R_i)$ and a special atom $p_{R_i}(\mathbf{x}_i)$, where p_{R_i} is a fresh predicate associated with R_i and \mathbf{x}_i is the frontier of R_i . The idea is that $p_{R_i}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ will be unifiable (and thus erasable) only with a corresponding mapping assertion m_{R_i} , which moreover enforces to have a CQ containing an atom unifiable with $\text{head}(R_i)$. Then, for each term t in a CQ, one adds a unary atom $T(t)$. The set of rules $\mathcal{M}^{Q, \mathcal{R}}$ is built by creating, for each rule R_i , a disjunctive rule m_{R_i} with a body that contains a $T(x)$ atom for each frontier variable x of R_i , and a head with the special atom associated with R_i as first disjunct, and $\text{head}(R_i)$ as second disjunct. Finally, the predicates from \mathcal{S} of each atom in $Q^{Q, \mathcal{R}}$ or in the head of disjunctive rules in $\mathcal{M}^{Q, \mathcal{R}}$ are turned into target predicates (i.e., renamed with a “hat”), and a set of atomic \mathcal{S} -to- \mathcal{T} rules \mathcal{M}_{trans} is added to translate the source predicates into target predicates.

Note that there is a natural bijection (up to variable renaming) between the CQs defined on \mathcal{P} and the CQs defined on \mathcal{S} that have a T -atom on each term: to Q_w on \mathcal{P} we assign the CQ Q_w^T composed of Q_w (or any CQ isomorphic to Q_w) completed by T -atoms on each term.

Then the correctness of the reduction is proved thanks to three lemmas:

- We prove in Lemma 7 that for any CQ Q_w belonging to a piece-rewriting of $\{Q\}$ with \mathcal{R} , a CQ isomorphic to Q_w^T belongs to a piece-rewriting of $Q^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$.
- We prove in Lemma 6 that any CQ Q_S belonging to an \mathcal{S} -rewriting of $Q^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$ is of the form $Q_S = (Q_{\mathcal{P}})^T$ where $Q_{\mathcal{P}}$ is a set of atoms on \mathcal{P} .
- We prove in Lemma 8 that for any CQ of the form $(Q_{\mathcal{P}})^T$, with $Q_{\mathcal{P}}$ on \mathcal{P} , belonging to a piece-rewriting of $Q^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$, a CQ isomorphic to $Q_{\mathcal{P}}$ belongs to a piece-rewriting of $\{Q\}$ with \mathcal{R}^* , where \mathcal{R}^* is the reflexive and transitive closure of \mathcal{R} by unfolding. This lemma is established by showing that any CQ in a piece-rewriting of $Q^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$ “corresponds” either to a rule from \mathcal{R}^* , or to a piece-rewriting of $\{Q\}$ with \mathcal{R}^* .

Furthermore, the proof implicitly uses the following observations:

1. Let \mathcal{Q} be a finite rewriting of $\{Q\}$ with \mathcal{R} . Then there is a piece-rewriting \mathcal{Q}_i of $\{Q\}$ with \mathcal{R} such that $\mathcal{Q} \models \mathcal{Q}_i$.
Proof: For every complete rewriting Q' of $\{Q\}$ with \mathcal{R} , we have $\mathcal{Q} \models Q'$ (indeed, let M be a model of \mathcal{Q} and h be a witnessing homomorphism from a CQ Q' in \mathcal{Q} to M . Let $F = h(Q')$. Since $F \models \mathcal{Q}$ and \mathcal{Q} is sound, we have $\mathcal{R}, F \models Q$, hence $F \models Q'$ because Q' is complete. Hence, M is a model of Q'). Since piece-rewriting is a complete procedure, there is a complete set of CQs \mathcal{Q}_i produced by a possibly infinite sequence of piece-rewritings. Then, $\mathcal{Q} \models \mathcal{Q}_i$. This means that for each CQ $Q' \in \mathcal{Q}$, there is a CQ $Q_j \in \mathcal{Q}_i$ such that $Q' \models Q_j$. We can restrict \mathcal{Q}_i to these Q_j while keeping the entailment from \mathcal{Q} .
2. Let \mathcal{Q} be a UCQ-rewriting of $\{Q\}$ with \mathcal{R} . Then there is a complete piece-rewriting \mathcal{Q}_i of $\{Q\}$ with \mathcal{R} such that $\mathcal{Q}_i \equiv \mathcal{Q}$.
Proof: Let \mathcal{Q}_i be a complete set of CQs obtained by a possibly infinite sequence of piece-rewritings of $\{Q\}$ with \mathcal{R} . As previously, we consider a model M of \mathcal{Q}_i and F a (finite)-witnessing subset of M . Since \mathcal{Q}_i is sound, we have $\mathcal{R}, F \models \mathcal{Q}$, hence $F \models \mathcal{Q}$ because \mathcal{Q} is complete. Hence, M is a model of \mathcal{Q} and $\mathcal{Q}_i \models \mathcal{Q}$. We do the same reasoning by considering a model of \mathcal{Q} to conclude that $\mathcal{Q} \models \mathcal{Q}_i$. We can restrict \mathcal{Q}_i to an equivalent finite subset because \mathcal{Q} is finite and equivalent to \mathcal{Q}_i (see e.g., Theorem 1 in (König et al. 2015)).

Proof of Theorem 6. We prove that there exists a UCQ-rewriting of $(\{Q\}, \mathcal{R})$ iff there exists a UCQ- \mathcal{S} -rewriting of $(Q^{Q,\mathcal{R}}, \mathcal{M}^{Q,\mathcal{R}})$.

(\Rightarrow) Let \mathcal{Q} be a UCQ-rewriting of $(\{Q\}, \mathcal{R})$. Then there exists a piece-rewriting \mathcal{Q}_i of $\{Q\}$ with \mathcal{R} such that $\mathcal{Q}_i \equiv \mathcal{Q}$. By Lemma 7, there is a piece-rewriting \mathcal{Q}_j of $Q^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$ that contains a subset of CQs in natural bijection with those in \mathcal{Q}_i . Let $\mathcal{Q}_j^{\mathcal{S}}$ be the subset of \mathcal{Q}_j that contains only the CQs on \mathcal{S} . $\mathcal{Q}_j^{\mathcal{S}}$ is a finite \mathcal{S} -rewriting of $(Q^{Q,\mathcal{R}}, \mathcal{M}^{Q,\mathcal{R}})$.

Suppose $\mathcal{Q}_j^{\mathcal{S}}$ is not a complete \mathcal{S} -rewriting. Then, by Lemma 6, there is a CQ $(Q_{\mathcal{P}})^T$ which belongs to an \mathcal{S} -rewriting of $(Q^{Q,\mathcal{R}}, \mathcal{M}^{Q,\mathcal{R}})$ but which is not more specific than any of the CQs in $\mathcal{Q}_j^{\mathcal{S}}$. Then there is a CQ $(Q'_{\mathcal{P}})^T$ that belongs to a piece-rewriting \mathcal{Q}'_j of $Q^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$ such that $(Q_{\mathcal{P}})^T \models (Q'_{\mathcal{P}})^T$. Then by Lemma 8, $Q'_{\mathcal{P}}$ is isomorphic to a CQ belonging to a piece-rewriting of $\{Q\}$ with \mathcal{R}^* , hence to a rewriting of $(\{Q\}, \mathcal{R})$. Since \mathcal{Q}_i is a UCQ-rewriting, there is a Q_c in \mathcal{Q}_i such that $Q'_{\mathcal{P}} \models Q_c$. Hence, $(Q'_{\mathcal{P}})^T \models (Q_c)^T$ (and thus $(Q_{\mathcal{P}})^T \models (Q_c)^T$) and, since $(Q_c)^T$ belongs to $\mathcal{Q}_j^{\mathcal{S}}$, this contradicts the assumption that $(Q_{\mathcal{P}})^T$ is not more specific than a CQ in $\mathcal{Q}_j^{\mathcal{S}}$.

(\Leftarrow) Let $\mathcal{Q}^{\mathcal{S}}$ be a UCQ- \mathcal{S} -rewriting of $(Q^{Q,\mathcal{R}}, \mathcal{M}^{Q,\mathcal{R}})$. Then there exists a piece-rewriting \mathcal{Q}_i of $Q^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$ such that $\mathcal{Q}^{\mathcal{S}} \models \mathcal{Q}_i$ (i.e., for each CQ Q' in $\mathcal{Q}^{\mathcal{S}}$, there is a CQ Q'' in \mathcal{Q}_i such that $Q' \models Q''$). Consider $\mathcal{Q}_i^{\mathcal{S}}$ the subset of \mathcal{Q}_i that contains only the CQs on \mathcal{S} . We still have $\mathcal{Q}^{\mathcal{S}} \models \mathcal{Q}_i^{\mathcal{S}}$. Since $\mathcal{Q}^{\mathcal{S}}$ is complete w.r.t. \mathcal{S} , so is $\mathcal{Q}_i^{\mathcal{S}}$. Thus $\mathcal{Q}^{\mathcal{S}} \equiv \mathcal{Q}_i^{\mathcal{S}}$. By Lemma 6, any CQ in $\mathcal{Q}_i^{\mathcal{S}}$ is of the form $(Q_{\mathcal{P}})^T$ as required in Lemma 8. So, by Lemma 8, there is a piece-rewriting \mathcal{Q}_j of $\{Q\}$ with \mathcal{R}^* that contains all the CQs in natural bijection with those in $\mathcal{Q}_i^{\mathcal{S}}$. So \mathcal{Q}_j is a finite rewriting of $\{Q\}$ with \mathcal{R}^* . Since $\mathcal{R}^* \equiv \mathcal{R}$ (see also Proposition 11), it is also a finite rewriting of $\{Q\}$ with \mathcal{R} .

Suppose \mathcal{Q}_j is not complete. Then there is a CQ $Q_{\mathcal{P}}$ that belongs to a rewriting of $(\{Q\}, \mathcal{R})$ and is not more specific than any of the CQs in \mathcal{Q}_j . Then there is a CQ $Q'_{\mathcal{P}}$ that belongs to a piece-rewriting of $\{Q\}$ with \mathcal{R} such that $Q_{\mathcal{P}} \models Q'_{\mathcal{P}}$. Then by Lemma 7, $(Q'_{\mathcal{P}})^T$ is isomorphic to a CQ belonging to a piece-rewriting of $Q^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$. Since $\mathcal{Q}_i^{\mathcal{S}}$ is complete w.r.t. \mathcal{S} , there is a $(Q_c)^T$ in $\mathcal{Q}_i^{\mathcal{S}}$ such that $(Q'_{\mathcal{P}})^T \models (Q_c)^T$. We also have $Q'_{\mathcal{P}} \models Q_c$ (hence $Q_{\mathcal{P}} \models Q_c$) and, since Q_c belongs to \mathcal{Q}_j , this contradicts the assumption that $Q_{\mathcal{P}}$ is not more specific than a CQ in \mathcal{Q}_j . \square

Proofs of the three lemmas

We first point out the following.

- Thanks to the mapping assertions \mathcal{M}_{trans} , we can always “remove the hats” from any predicate (except the p_{R_i} special predicates) in any CQ Q_w belonging to a piece-rewriting of $Q^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$; we just have to extend the rewriting sequence by using the rules in \mathcal{M}_{trans} . Moreover, if Q_w does not contain any special atom $p_{R_i}(\mathbf{x}_i)$, this extended rewriting is on \mathcal{S} , hence belongs to an \mathcal{S} -rewriting of $Q^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$.

- Another property of any CQ Q_w belonging to a piece-rewriting of $Q^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$ is that each of its terms appears in a T or \hat{T} atom. Indeed, since the CQs in $Q^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$ have a \hat{T} atom for each term and all the variables of the rules in $\mathcal{M}^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$ are frontier variables, no rewriting step introduces a new term without a \hat{T} , and the only rule that can rewrite a \hat{T} atom replaces it with a T atom.

As an immediate consequence of the previous observations, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 6. *Let Q be a CQ, \mathcal{R} be a set of datalog rules and Q_S be a CQ belonging to an \mathcal{S} -rewriting of $Q^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$. Then, Q_S is of form $(Q_P)^T$, where Q_P is a CQ on \mathcal{P} .*

Lemma 7. *Let Q be a CQ, \mathcal{R} be a set of datalog rules and Q_w be a CQ belonging to a piece-rewriting of Q with \mathcal{R} . Q_w^T is isomorphic to a CQ belonging to a piece-rewriting of $Q^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$.*

This lemma can be proved by induction thanks to the following proposition.

Proposition 10. *Let Q be a CQ, \mathcal{R} be a set of datalog rules, $R_i \in \mathcal{R}$, and let $Q_w = \beta(Q, R_i, \mu)$ where μ is a piece-unifier of Q with R_i . Let Q_{R_i} and m_{R_i} be respectively the CQ and \mathcal{S} -to- \mathcal{T} rule associated with R_i as defined in the reduction. There exists a disjunctive piece-unifier μ_\vee of $\{Q_{R_i}, \hat{Q}^T\}$ with m_{R_i} such that \hat{Q}_w^T is isomorphic to a CQ belonging to a piece-rewriting of $\{\beta_\vee(\{Q_{R_i}, \hat{Q}^T\}, m_{R_i}, \mu_\vee)\}$ with $\{T(x) \rightarrow \hat{T}(x)\}$.*

Proof. Let $R_i = B_i[\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i] \rightarrow H_i(\mathbf{x}_i)$. Since μ is a piece-unifier of Q with R_i , there is at least one atom with predicate H_i in Q , i.e., $Q = \exists \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}. H_i(\mathbf{u}) \wedge D[\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}]$ where D is any conjunction of atoms, and $Q_w = \exists \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{y}_i. B_i[\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y}_i] \wedge D[\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}]$. By the reduction, we obtain $Q_{R_i} = \exists \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i. \hat{B}_i[\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i] \wedge p_{R_i}(\mathbf{x}_i) \wedge \hat{T}[\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i]$ and $m_{R_i} = T[\mathbf{x}_i] \rightarrow p_{R_i}(\mathbf{x}_i) \vee \hat{H}_i(\mathbf{x}_i)$. We consider $\mu_\vee = \{\mu_{p_{R_i}}, \hat{\mu}\}$ where $\mu_{p_{R_i}}$ is the piece-unifier unifying $p_{R_i}(\mathbf{x}_i) \in Q_{R_i}$ and $\text{head}_1(m_{R_i})$, and $\hat{\mu}$ is the piece-unifier “isomorphic” to μ between \hat{Q} and $\text{head}_2(m_{R_i})$. More formally, given $\mu = (Q', H', P_u)$ and \hat{Q}^s a safe copy of \hat{Q} , $\hat{\mu} = ((\hat{Q}')^s, \hat{H}', P_u^s)$ where \cdot^s is the renaming function of the variables of \hat{Q} . Clearly, the join of the partitions in μ_\vee is admissible since there is no constant. Since $\hat{Q} \subseteq \hat{Q}^T$, $\hat{\mu}$ is a piece-unifier of \hat{Q}^T with the rule $T[\mathbf{x}_i] \rightarrow \hat{H}_i(\mathbf{x}_i)$, associated with $\text{head}_2(m_{R_i})$. Let u and u_{μ_\vee} be the substitutions associated with μ and μ_\vee , respectively. Then;

$$\beta_\vee(\{Q_{R_i}, \hat{Q}^T\}, m_{R_i}, \mu_\vee) = u_{\mu_\vee}(T[\mathbf{x}_i] \cup \hat{B}_i[\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i]^s \cup T[\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i]^s \cup (\hat{Q}^T \setminus \hat{Q}')^s) = u_{\mu_\vee}(\hat{B}_i[\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i]^s \cup (\hat{Q} \setminus \hat{Q}')^s)^T$$

which is isomorphic to $u(\hat{B}_i[\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i] \cup (\hat{Q} \setminus \hat{Q}'))^T = \hat{Q}_w^T$.

Since the partition associated with $\mu_{p_{R_i}}$ does not merge any frontier variables from m_{R_i} , no classes of $\hat{\mu}$ are merged in the join of the partitions of $\mu_{p_{R_i}}$ and $\hat{\mu}$. Hence, the joined partition is in bijection with P_u^s , and thus with P_u . As a consequence, $u(\hat{B}_i[\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i] \cup (\hat{Q} \setminus \hat{Q}'))^T$ is isomorphic to $u_{\mu_\vee}(\hat{B}_i[\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i]^s \cup (\hat{Q} \setminus \hat{Q}')^s)^T$. \square

Proof of Lemma 7. By induction on the length k of the rewriting sequence from $\{Q\}$ producing Q_k in which Q_w is generated, we first prove that $(\hat{Q}_w)^T$ is isomorphic to a CQ belonging to a piece-rewriting of $Q^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$:

- (k=0) $Q_w = Q$; since $Q_Q = \hat{Q}^T \in \mathcal{Q}^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$, we can produce $\hat{Q}_w^T = \hat{Q}_w^T$ by a rewriting sequence using the rule $T(x) \rightarrow \hat{T}(x)$.
- (k+1) Let $Q_{k+1} = Q_k \cup \{Q_w\}$. Assume Q_w is generated in Q_{k+1} by a piece-unifier of $Q_k \in \mathcal{Q}_k$ with $R \in \mathcal{R}$. By induction hypothesis, $(\hat{Q}_k)^T$ is isomorphic to a CQ belonging to a piece-rewriting of $Q^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$. Then, by Proposition 10, $(\hat{Q}_w)^T$ is isomorphic to a CQ belonging to a piece-rewriting of $\{\beta_\vee(\{Q_k, (\hat{Q}_k)^T\}, m_R, \mu_\vee)\}$ with $\{T(x) \rightarrow \hat{T}(x)\}$, hence a piece-rewriting of $Q^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$.

Finally, we can “remove the hats” from any CQ belonging to a piece-rewriting of $Q^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$. We just have to extend the rewriting sequence by some rewriting steps with \mathcal{M}_{trans} . Thus, since $(\hat{Q}_w)^T$ is isomorphic to a CQ belonging to a piece-rewriting of $Q^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{Q,\mathcal{R}}$, so is Q_w^T . \square

Next, we denote by \mathcal{R}^* the set of all the rules that can be obtained by composing rules from a datalog rule set \mathcal{R} . Composing two datalog rules is also known as “unfolding a rule by another”. Given two datalog rules $R_1 = B_1 \rightarrow H_1$ and $R_2 = B_2 \rightarrow H_2$, and a (most general) classical unifier u of an atom A in B_2 with the atom in H_1 , the *unfolding* of R_2 by R_1 is the rule $R_2 \circ R_1 = u(B_1) \cup u(B_2 \setminus \{A\}) \rightarrow u(H_2)$. Starting from \mathcal{R} , one can build \mathcal{R}^* by repeatedly unfolding a rule from \mathcal{R}^* by a rule from \mathcal{R} , until a fixpoint is reached (if any). Clearly, $R_1, R_2 \models R_2 \circ R_1$. Hence, \mathcal{R}^* is logically equivalent to \mathcal{R} .

Proposition 11. *Let Q be a CQ and \mathcal{R} be a set of rules. Any UCQ \mathcal{Q} is a complete rewriting of Q with \mathcal{R} iff it is a complete rewriting of Q with \mathcal{R}^* .*

Proof. For all fact base F and CQ Q , one has $F, \mathcal{R} \models Q$ iff $F, \mathcal{R}^* \models Q$. Let \mathcal{Q} be a complete rewriting of Q with \mathcal{R} . Then, for all F , $F \models \mathcal{Q}$ iff $F, \mathcal{R} \models Q$ iff $F, \mathcal{R}^* \models Q$, thus \mathcal{Q} is a complete rewriting of Q with \mathcal{R}^* . Similarly, any complete rewriting \mathcal{Q} of Q with \mathcal{R}^* is a complete rewriting of Q with \mathcal{R} . \square

Lemma 8. Let Q be a CQ, \mathcal{R} be a set of datalog rules and $Q_{\mathcal{P}}$ be a CQ on \mathcal{P} such that $(Q_{\mathcal{P}})^T$ belongs to a piece-rewriting of $Q^{\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{R}}$ through $\mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{R}}$. Then, $Q_{\mathcal{P}}$ is isomorphic to a CQ belonging to a piece-rewriting of Q with \mathcal{R}^* .

To prove the lemma, we first prove some properties of the piece-rewritings of $Q^{\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{R}}$.

Proposition 12. Let Q^w be a piece-rewriting of $Q^{\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{R}}$, Q^w can be partitioned into two sets: Q_M^w the subset of CQs without any p_{R_i} -atom, and Q_P^w the subset of CQs with exactly one p_{R_i} -atom. Furthermore, Q_P^w is a rewriting of $Q_{\mathcal{R}}$ (the subset of $Q^{\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{R}}$ containing only the queries associated with the rules from \mathcal{R}), and any \mathcal{S} -rewriting of Q^w with \mathcal{M}_{trans} is a rewriting of Q_M^w with \mathcal{M}_{trans} .

Proof. We first show that any CQ in Q^w contains at most one p_{R_i} atom:

- it is the case for $Q^{\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{R}}$;
- piece-rewriting with a renaming mapping assertion in \mathcal{M}_{trans} does not add a p_{R_i} atom;
- piece-rewriting with a disjunctive mapping assertion m_{R_i} removes a p_{R_i} atom (and does not add one), thus there remains at most one p_{R_j} atom in the produced query.

Thus $Q_M^w + Q_P^w = Q^w$.

When we use a CQ without atom p_{R_i} in a piece-rewriting step, the produced query does not have such an atom either. So, we only have to consider the queries in $Q_{\mathcal{R}}$ to generate Q_P^w .

Since p_{R_i} predicates do not belong to \mathcal{S} and no rule in \mathcal{M}_{trans} allows to rewrite a p_{R_i} -atom, only the queries in Q_M^w can generate queries on \mathcal{S} using \mathcal{M}_{trans} . \square

Definition 7 (Reverse function). Let Q^w be any rewriting of $Q^{\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{R}}$. We define a “reverse” function, noted *reverse*, from Q^w to a set of CQs plus a set of conjunctive Datalog rules, both on \mathcal{P} , as follows:

- for any $Q \in Q_M^w$, $reverse(Q) = Q_r$ where Q_r is the query obtained from Q by removing the “hats” on the predicates, then deleting the T atoms;
- for any $Q \in Q_P^w$, let $Q = (\exists \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}. p_{R_i}(\mathbf{x}) \wedge C[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}])$. Note that C is a conjunction without any p_{R_j} -atom. Then: $reverse(Q) = C_r[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}] \rightarrow H_i(\mathbf{x})$ where C_r is the conjunction obtained from C by removing the “hats” on the predicates, then deleting the T atoms, and $H_i(\mathbf{x})$ is obtained from the head of $R_i \in \mathcal{R}$ by substituting each frontier variable with the corresponding term in $p_{R_i}(\mathbf{x})$.

Proposition 13. Let Q^w be a piece-rewriting of $Q^{\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{R}}$. For any $Q_w \in Q_P^w$, $reverse(Q_w) \in \mathcal{R}^*$.

Proof. By induction on the length k of the sequence of piece-rewriting steps generating Q^w :

- ($k = 0$) Recall that $Q_P^w = Q_P^{\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{R}} = Q_{\mathcal{R}}$. Now, observe that for each query $Q_{R_i} \in Q_{\mathcal{R}}$, we have $reverse(Q_{R_i}) = R_i$ which belongs to \mathcal{R} .
- ($k + 1$) Any query $Q_w \in Q_P^w$ is either obtained in at most k piece-rewriting steps and thus $reverse(Q_w) \in \mathcal{R}^k$ by induction hypothesis, or there are two cases (by Proposition 12):
 - Q_w is generated by a piece-rewriting step from a CQ Q_k with a p_{R_i} -atom and a rule in \mathcal{M}_{trans} . Then $reverse(Q_w) = reverse(Q_k)$ and, since Q_k is generated in at most k piece-rewriting steps, by induction hypothesis, $reverse(Q_k) \in \mathcal{R}^*$.
 - Q_w is generated by a piece-rewriting step from two queries $Q_1 = (\exists \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{y}_1. p_{R_1}(\mathbf{x}_1) \wedge \hat{C}_1[\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{y}_1])$ and $Q_2 = (\exists \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{y}_2. p_{R_2}(\mathbf{x}_2) \wedge \hat{C}_2[\mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{y}_2])$ with a disjunctive rule having one of the two special predicates p_{R_1} or p_{R_2} . Assume the rule is $m_{R_1} = T[\mathbf{x}] \rightarrow p_{R_1}(\mathbf{x}) \vee \hat{H}_1(\mathbf{x})$ associated with R_1 . Let $\mu_{\vee} = \{\mu_1 = (p_{R_1}(\mathbf{x}), p_{R_1}(\mathbf{x}_1), P_1), \mu_2 = (\hat{C}'_2, \hat{H}'_1, P_2)\}$ be the disjunctive piece-unifier that has produced $Q_w = u_{\mu_{\vee}}(T \wedge \hat{C}_1 \wedge p_{R_2} \wedge (\hat{C}_2 \setminus \hat{C}'_2))$. Then, $reverse(Q_w) = u_{\mu_{\vee}}(C_1 \wedge (C_2 \setminus C'_2)) \rightarrow u_{\mu_{\vee}}(H_2)$.
By definition, $reverse(Q_1) = C_1 \rightarrow H_1$ and $reverse(Q_2) = C_2 \rightarrow H_2$. Let \cdot^s be the safe renaming of Q_2 used in μ_2 . We thus have that $\mu'_2 = (C'_2, H'_1, (P_2)^{s^{-1}})$ is a piece-unifier between C_2 , the body of $reverse(Q_2)$, and H_1 , the head of $reverse(Q_1)$. It follows that $reverse(Q_2) \circ reverse(Q_1) = u_{\mu'_2}(C_1 \wedge (C_2 \setminus C'_2)) \rightarrow u_{\mu'_2}(H_2)$.
By induction hypothesis, $reverse(Q_1)$ and $reverse(Q_2)$ belong to \mathcal{R}^* , hence $reverse(Q_2) \circ reverse(Q_1)$ belongs to \mathcal{R}^* . Since $reverse(Q_w)$ is isomorphic to $reverse(Q_2) \circ reverse(Q_1)$, it belongs to \mathcal{R}^* . \square

Proposition 14. Let Q^w be a piece-rewriting of $Q^{\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{R}}$. For any $Q_w \in Q_M^w$, $reverse(Q_w)$ is isomorphic to a CQ belonging to a piece-rewriting of $\{Q\}$ with \mathcal{R}^* .

Proof. By induction on the length k of the sequence of piece-rewriting steps generating Q^w :

- ($k = 0$) $Q_M^w = Q_M^{\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{R}} = \{Q_Q\}$ and $reverse(Q_Q) = Q$.

- $(k + 1)$ Any query $Q_w \in \mathcal{Q}_M^w$ is either obtained in at most k piece-rewriting steps, hence, by induction hypothesis, $reverse(Q_w)$ is isomorphic to a CQ belonging to a piece-rewriting of Q with \mathcal{R}^* , or there are two cases:
 - Q_w is generated by a piece-rewriting step from a CQ Q_k without p_{R_i} atom and a rule in \mathcal{M}_{trans} . Then $reverse(Q_w) = reverse(Q_k)$ and, since Q_k is generated in at most k piece-rewriting steps, by induction hypothesis $reverse(Q_k)$ is isomorphic to a CQ belonging to a piece-rewriting of Q with \mathcal{R}^* .
 - Q_w is generated by a (disjunctive) piece-rewriting step from a CQ $Q_m = (\hat{C} \wedge \hat{T})^T \in \mathcal{Q}_M^w$, a CQ $Q_R = (\hat{B}_R \wedge p_{R_i})^T$ and the rule $m_{R_i} = p_{R_i} \vee \hat{H}_i$. Let $\mu_\vee = \{\mu_i = (p_{R_i}, p_{R_i}, P_i), \mu_2 = (\hat{C}', \hat{H}'_i, P_2)\}$ be the disjunctive piece-unifier that has produced Q_w . We thus have $Q_w = \beta_\vee(\{Q_m, Q_R\}, m_{R_i}, \mu_\vee) = u_{\mu_\vee}(\hat{B}_R \wedge (\hat{C} \setminus \hat{C}') \wedge \hat{T})^T$, hence $reverse(Q_w) = u_{\mu_\vee}(B_R \wedge (C \setminus C'))$.
 By Proposition 13, $reverse(Q_R) = (B_R \rightarrow H_i) \in \mathcal{R}^*$, and by induction hypothesis, $reverse(Q_m) = C$ is isomorphic to a CQ belonging to a piece-rewriting of Q with \mathcal{R}^* . Let μ'_2 be obtained from μ_2 by replacing each predicate \hat{p} with p (i.e., removing the hats). Then, μ'_2 is a piece-unifier of $reverse(Q_m)$ with $reverse(Q_R)$ (up to a bijective variable renaming) and $\beta(reverse(Q_m), reverse(Q_R), \mu'_2) = u_{\mu'_2}(B_R \wedge (C \setminus C'))$.
 With the same arguments about the join of the partitions of μ_\vee and μ'_2 as at the end of the proof of Proposition 10, we conclude that $u_{\mu'_2}(B_R \wedge (C \setminus C'))$ is isomorphic to $u_{\mu_\vee}(B_R \wedge (C \setminus C'))$. Thus $reverse(Q_w)$ is isomorphic to a piece-rewriting of $\{Q\}$ with \mathcal{R}^* .

□

Proof of Lemma 8. Assume $(Q_{\mathcal{P}})^T$ belongs to a piece-rewriting of $\mathcal{Q}^{Q, \mathcal{R}}$ with $\mathcal{M}^{Q, \mathcal{R}}$. Since $(Q_{\mathcal{P}})^T$ is on \mathcal{S} , it belongs to \mathcal{Q}_M^w . Hence, by Proposition 14, $reverse((Q_{\mathcal{P}})^T) = Q_{\mathcal{P}}$ is isomorphic to a CQ belonging to a piece-rewriting of $\{Q\}$ with \mathcal{R}^* . □