

Keyword Search in the Deep Web

Andrea Cali¹

Davide Martinenghi²

Riccardo Torlone³

¹Birkbeck, University of London, UK, andrea@dcs.bbk.ac.uk

²Politecnico di Milano, Italy, davide.martinenghi@polimi.it

³Università Roma Tre, Italy, torlone@dia.uniroma3.it

Abstract

The Deep Web is constituted by data that are accessible through Web pages, but not readily indexable by search engines as they are returned in dynamic pages. In this paper we propose a conceptual framework for answering keyword queries on Deep Web sources represented as relational tables with so-called access limitations. We formalize the notion of optimal answer, characterize queries for which an answer can be found, and present a method for query processing based on the construction of a query plan that minimizes the accesses to the data sources.

1 Introduction

It is well known that the portion of the Web indexed by search engines constitutes only a very small fraction of the data available online. The vast majority of the data, commonly referred to as *Deep Web*, is “hidden” in local databases whose content can only be accessed by manually filling up Web forms. This happens for instance when we need to find a flight from Italy to Japan on the Web site of an airline company. This immediately poses an interesting challenge, i.e., how to automatically retrieve relevant information from the Deep Web – a problem that has been deeply investigated in recent years (see, e.g., [4, 11, 36, 3] for discussion).

Usually, a data source in the Deep Web is conceptually modeled by a relational table in which some columns, called *input* attributes, represent fields of a form that need to be filled in so as to retrieve data from the source, while all the others, called *output* attributes, represent values that are returned to the user. Consider for instance the following relations in which the i superscript denotes the input attributes.

$r_1 =$	<i>Dept</i> ^t	<i>Emp</i>	t_{11}	
	IT	John		t_{12}
	AI	Mike		

$r_2 =$	<i>Emp</i> ^s	<i>Proj</i>	t_{21}	
	John	P1		t_{22}
	Ann	P2		
Mike	P2			

$r_3 =$	<i>Proj</i> ^s	<i>Emp</i>	<i>Role</i>	t_{31}	
	P1	John	DBA		t_{32}
	P1	Ann	Analyst		

Relation r_1 represents a form that, given a department, returns all the employees working in it; relation r_2 a form that, given an employee, returns all the projects he/she works on; and relation r_3 a form that, given a project, returns the employees working in it along with their role. These access modalities are commonly referred to as *access limitations*, in that data can only be queried according to given patterns.

Different approaches have been proposed in the literature for querying databases with access limitations: conjunctive queries [8], natural language [33], and SQL-like statements [31]. In this paper, we address the novel problem of accessing the Deep Web by just providing a set of keywords, in the same way in which we usually search for information on the Web with a search engine.

Consider for instance the case in which the user only provides the keywords “DBA” and “IT” for querying the portion of the Deep Web represented by the relations above. Intuitively, he/she is searching for employees with the DBA role in the IT department. Given the access limitations, this query can be concretely answered by first accessing relation r_1 using the keyword *IT*, which allows us to extract the tuple t_{11} . Then, using the value *John* in t_{11} , we can extract the tuple t_{21} from relation r_2 . Finally, using the value *P1* in t_{21} , we can extract the tuples t_{31} and t_{32} from relation r_3 . Now, since t_{31} contains *DBA*, it turns out that the set of tuples $\{t_{11}, t_{21}, t_{31}\}$ is a possible answer to the input query in that the set is connected (every two tuples in it share a constant) and contains the given keywords. However, the tuple t_{21} is somehow redundant and can be safely eliminated from the solution, since the set $\{t_{11}, t_{31}\}$ is also connected and contains the keywords. This example shows that, in this context, the keyword query answering problem can be involved and tricky, even in simple situations.

In the rest of this paper, we formally investigate this problem in depth. We first propose, in Section 2, a precise semantics of (optimal) answer to a keyword query in the Deep Web. We then tackle, in Section 3, the problem of finding an answer to a keyword query by assuming that the domains of the keywords are known in advance. This allows us to perform static analysis to immediately discard irrelevant cases from our consideration. In this framework, in Section 4 we introduce the notion of minimal query plan aimed at efficiently retrieving an answer to a keyword query and, in Section 5, we present a technique for its automatic generation that can be generalized to cases in which the domains of the keyword are unknown. Section 6 discusses related work. Section 7 ends the paper with some conclusions and future works. All proofs of our claims are available in the appendix.

This technical report is the extended version of [13].

2 Preliminaries and problem definition

We model data sources as relations of a relational database and we assume that, albeit autonomous, they have “compatible” attributes. For this, we fix a set of *abstract domains* $\mathbf{D} = \{D_1, \dots, D_m\}$, which, rather than denoting concrete value types (such as string or integer), represent data types at a higher level of abstraction (for instance, *car* or *country*). Therefore, in an abstract domain an object is uniquely represented by a value. The set of all values is denoted by $\mathcal{D} = \bigcup_{i=1}^m D_i$. For simplicity, we assume that all abstract domains are disjoint. We then say that a (*relation*) *schema* r , customarily indicated as $r(A_1, \dots, A_k)$, is a set of attributes $\{A_1, \dots, A_k\}$, each associated with an abstract domain $dom(A_i) \in \mathbf{D}$, $1 \leq i \leq k$. A *database schema* \mathcal{S} is a set of *schemas* $\{r_1, \dots, r_n\}$.

As usual, given a schema r , a *tuple* t over r is a function that associates a value $c \in dom(A)$ with each attribute $A \in r$, and a *relation instance* $r^{\mathcal{I}}$ of r is a set of tuples over r . For simplicity, we also write $dom(c)$ to indicate the domain of c . A (database) instance \mathcal{I} of a database schema $\mathcal{S} = \{r_1, \dots, r_n\}$ is a set of relation instances $\{r_1^{\mathcal{I}}, \dots, r_n^{\mathcal{I}}\}$, where $r_i^{\mathcal{I}}$ denotes the relation instance of r_i in \mathcal{I} .

For the sake of simplicity, in the following we assign the same name to attributes of different schemas that are defined over the same abstract domain.

Definition 1 (Access pattern) *An access pattern Π for a schema $r(A_1, \dots, A_k)$ is a mapping $\Pi : \{A_1, \dots, A_k\} \rightarrow M$, where $M = \{i, o\}$ is called access mode, and i and o denote input and output, respectively; A_i is correspondingly called an input (resp., output) attribute for r wrt Π .*


Henceforth, we denote input attributes with an ‘ i ’ superscript, e.g., A^i . Moreover, we assume that each relation has exactly one access pattern.

Definition 2 (Binding) *Let A'_1, \dots, A'_ℓ be all the input attributes for r wrt Π ; any tuple $\mathfrak{b} = \langle c_1, \dots, c_\ell \rangle$ such that $c_i \in dom(A'_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ is called a binding for r wrt Π .*

Definition 3 (Access) *An access is a pair $\langle \Pi, \mathfrak{b} \rangle$, where Π is an access pattern for a schema r and \mathfrak{b} is a binding for r wrt Π . The output of such an access on an instance \mathcal{I} is the set \mathcal{T} of all tuples in the relation $r^{\mathcal{I}} \in \mathcal{I}$ over r that match the binding, i.e., such that $\mathcal{T} = \sigma_{A_1=c_1, \dots, A_\ell=c_\ell}(r)$.*

Intuitively, we can only access a relation if we can provide a binding for it, i.e., a value for every input attribute.

Definition 4 (Access path) *Given an instance \mathcal{I} for a database schema \mathcal{S} , a set of access patterns $\mathbf{\Pi}$ for the relations in \mathcal{S} , and a set of values $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$, an access path on \mathcal{I} (for \mathcal{S} , $\mathbf{\Pi}$ and \mathcal{C}) is a sequence $\xrightarrow{\mathfrak{b}_1}_{r_1^{\mathcal{I}}} \mathcal{T}_1 \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{b}_2}_{r_2^{\mathcal{I}}} \dots \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{b}_n}_{r_n^{\mathcal{I}}} \mathcal{T}_n$, where, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, (i) \mathfrak{b}_i is a binding for a relation $r_i \in \mathcal{S}$ wrt a pattern $\Pi_i \in \mathbf{\Pi}$ for r_i , (ii) \mathcal{T}_i is the output of access $\langle \Pi_i, \mathfrak{b}_i \rangle$ on \mathcal{I} , and (iii) each value in \mathfrak{b}_i either occurs in \mathcal{T}_j with $j < i$ or is a value in \mathcal{C} .*



(a) Reachable portion \mathcal{I}' , given $\{c_0\}$. (b) Join graph of \mathcal{I}' . (c) Two answers to KQ q .

Figure 1: Illustration of Examples 1, 2, and 3.

Definition 5 (Reachable portion) A tuple t in \mathcal{I} is said to be reachable given \mathcal{C} if there exists an access path P (for \mathcal{S} , $\mathbf{\Pi}$ and \mathcal{C}) such that t is in the output of some access in P ; the reachable portion $reach(\mathcal{I}, \mathbf{\Pi}, \mathcal{C})$ of \mathcal{I} is the set of all reachable tuples in \mathcal{I} given \mathcal{C} .

In the following, we will write $\mathcal{S}^{\mathbf{\Pi}}$ to refer to schema \mathcal{S} under access patterns $\mathbf{\Pi}$.

Example 1 Consider the following instance \mathcal{I} of a schema $\mathcal{S}^{\mathbf{\Pi}} = \{r_1(A_1^i, A_2), r_2(A_2^i, A_1), r_3(A_1^i, A_2, A_3)\}$.

$$r_1 = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline A_1^i & A_2 \\ \hline c_0 & c_1 \\ \hline c_2 & c_3 \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{l} t_{11} \\ t_{12} \end{array} \quad r_2 = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline A_2^i & A_1 \\ \hline c_1 & c_2 \\ \hline c_4 & c_2 \\ \hline c_1 & c_6 \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{l} t_{21} \\ t_{22} \\ t_{23} \end{array} \quad r_3 = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline A_1^i & A_2 & A_3 \\ \hline c_2 & c_1 & c_8 \\ \hline c_5 & c_4 & c_8 \\ \hline c_6 & c_8 & c_9 \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{l} t_{31} \\ t_{32} \\ t_{33} \end{array}$$

Then, for instance, $\{t_{11}\}$ is the output of the access with binding $\langle c_0 \rangle$ wrt $r_1(A_1^i, A_2)$, and $\xrightarrow{\langle c_0 \rangle}_{r_1^i} \{t_{11}\} \xrightarrow{\langle c_1 \rangle}_{r_2^i} \{t_{21}, t_{23}\}$, is an access path for \mathcal{S} , $\mathbf{\Pi}$ and $\mathcal{C} = \{c_0\}$, since, given \mathcal{C} , we can extract t_{11} from r_1 and, given $\{c_1\}$ from t_{11} , we can extract t_{21} and t_{23} from r_2 . The reachable portion of \mathcal{I} , given \mathcal{C} , is $reach(\mathcal{I}, \mathbf{\Pi}, \mathcal{C}) = \{t_{11}, t_{12}, t_{21}, t_{23}, t_{31}, t_{33}\}$, while $\{t_{22}, t_{32}\} \cap reach(\mathcal{I}, \mathbf{\Pi}, \mathcal{C}) = \emptyset$. Figure 1a shows the reachable portion \mathcal{I}' of \mathcal{I} given \mathcal{C} along with the access paths used to extract it, with dotted lines enclosing outputs of accesses. ■

The definition of answer to a keyword query in our setting requires the preliminary notion of join graph.

Definition 6 (Join graph) Given a set \mathcal{T} of tuples, the join graph of \mathcal{T} is a node-labeled undirected graph $\langle N, E \rangle$ constructed as follows: (i) the nodes N are labeled with tuples of \mathcal{T} , with a one-to-one correspondence between tuples of \mathcal{T} and nodes of N ; and (ii) there is an arc between two nodes n_1 and n_2 whenever the tuples labeling n_1 and n_2 have at least one value in common.

Example 2 Consider instance \mathcal{I} of Example 1 and the reachable portion \mathcal{I}' of \mathcal{I} given $\{c_0\}$, shown in Figure 1a. The join graph of \mathcal{I}' is shown in Figure 1b. ■

A *keyword query* (KQ) is a non-empty set of values in \mathcal{D} called *keywords*.

Definition 7 (Answer to a KQ) An answer to a KQ q against a database instance \mathcal{I} over a schema \mathcal{S}^Π is a set of tuples \mathcal{A} in $\text{reach}(\mathcal{I}, \Pi, q)$ such that: (i) each keyword $k \in q$ occurs in at least one tuple t in \mathcal{A} ; (ii) the join graph of \mathcal{A} is connected; (iii) no proper subset $\mathcal{A}' \subset \mathcal{A}$ satisfies both Conditions (i) and (ii) above.

It is straightforward to see that there could be several answers to a KQ; below we give a widely accepted criterion for ranking such answers [50].

Definition 8 Let $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$ be two answers to a KQ q on an instance \mathcal{I} . We say that \mathcal{A}_1 is better than \mathcal{A}_2 if $|\mathcal{A}_1| \leq |\mathcal{A}_2|$. The optimal answers are those of minimum size.

Example 3 Consider a KQ $q = \{c_1, c_8\}$ over the instance \mathcal{I} of Example 1. Figure 1a shows two possible answers: $\mathcal{A}_1 = \{t_{11}, t_{31}\}$ and $\mathcal{A}_2 = \{t_{11}, t_{23}, t_{33}\}$. \mathcal{A}_1 is better than \mathcal{A}_2 and is the optimal answer to q . ■

In the following sections we will tackle the following problem.

Problem 1 To efficiently find an (optimal) answer to a KQ.

3 Detecting non-answerable queries

In this section, we tackle Problem 1 by assuming that the domains of the keywords are known in advance. This allows us to perform static analysis to immediately discard irrelevant cases from our consideration. We will later show how to extend our techniques to cover the cases in which the domains of the keywords are not known. For convenience of notation, we sometimes write $c: D$ to denote value c and indicate that $\text{dom}(c) = D$. In addition, in our examples, the name of an attribute will also indicate its abstract domain.

3.1 Compatible queries

In order to focus on meaningful queries, in this and in the following subsection, we semantically characterize queries for which an answer might be found.

Definition 9 (Compatibility) A KQ q is said to be compatible with a schema \mathcal{S} if there exist a set of access patterns Π and an instance \mathcal{I} over \mathcal{S}^Π such that there is an answer to q against \mathcal{I} .

Example 4 The KQ $q_1 = \{a: A, c: C\}$ is not compatible with schema $\mathcal{S}_1 = \{r_1(A, B), r_2(C, D)\}$, since no set of tuples from \mathcal{S} containing all the keywords in q_1 can ever be connected, independently of the access patterns for \mathcal{S}_1 . Conversely, q_1 is compatible with $\mathcal{S}_2 = \{r_1(A, B), r_3(B, C)\}$, as witnessed by a possible answer $\{r_1(a, b), r_3(b, c)\}$ and patterns Π such that $\mathcal{S}_2^\Pi = \{r_1(A^i, B), r_3(B, C)\}$.

Similarly, KQ $q_2 = \{a: A, a': A\}$ is compatible with a schema $\mathcal{S}_3 = \{r_1(A, B)\}$, as witnessed by a possible answer $\{r_1(a, b), r_1(a', b)\}$ and patterns Π such that $\mathcal{S}_3^\Pi = \{r_1(A^i, B)\}$. However, q_2 is not compatible with a schema $\mathcal{S}_4 = \{r_4(A)\}$, since a unary relation, alone, can never connect two keywords. ■

In order to check compatibility of a KQ with a schema, we refer to the notion of schema join graph and then proceed as described in Algorithm 1.

Definition 10 (Schema join graph) *Given a schema \mathcal{S} , the schema join graph of \mathcal{S} is a node-labeled undirected graph $\langle \mathcal{N}, E \rangle$ constructed as follows: (i) the nodes \mathcal{N} are labeled with relations of \mathcal{S} , with a one-to-one correspondence between relations of \mathcal{S} and nodes of \mathcal{N} ; and (ii) there is an arc between two nodes N_1 and N_2 in \mathcal{N} (including self-loops) whenever the relations labeling N_1 and N_2 have at least one attribute with the same domain.*

Algorithm 1: Checking compatibility ($\text{compatible}(q, \mathcal{S})$)

Input: Schema \mathcal{S} , KQ $q = \{k_1, \dots, k_{|q|}\}$

Output: **true** if q is compatible with \mathcal{S} , **false** otherwise

1. **if** $\exists k_i \in q$ s.t. no attribute in \mathcal{S} has domain $\text{dom}(k_i)$ **then return false**
 2. $\mathcal{J} :=$ schema join graph of \mathcal{S} excluding the relations of arity 1
 3. **for** i in $1 \dots |q| - 1$
 4. **if** \exists no path in \mathcal{J} connecting two attributes with domains $\text{dom}(k_i)$ and $\text{dom}(k_{i+1})$
 5. **return false**
 6. **return true**
-

The main idea behind Algorithm 1 is that the domains of any two keywords in the KQ must be properly connected in the schema join graph. In order for an answer to ever be possible, we must find an instance that exhibits a witness (i.e., a set of tuples) satisfying all the conditions of Definition 7.

Proposition 1 *Algorithm 1 correctly checks compatibility in PTIME.*

3.2 Answerable queries

A stricter requirement than compatibility is given by the notion of answerability.

Definition 11 (Answerability) *A KQ q is answerable against a schema \mathcal{S}^Π if there is an instance \mathcal{I} over \mathcal{S}^Π such that there is an answer to q against \mathcal{I} .*

Example 5 Consider KQ $q = \{a: A, c: C\}$ and schema $\mathcal{S}_1^\Pi = \{r(A^i, B), s(B, C, D^i)\}$. Although q is compatible with \mathcal{S}_1 , it is not answerable against \mathcal{S}_1^Π , since no tuple from \mathcal{S}_1 can be extracted under Π (no values for domain D are available). Conversely, q is answerable against $\mathcal{S}_2^\Pi = \{r(A^i, B), s(B^i, C, D)\}$, since an answer like $\{r(a, b), s(b, c, d)\}$ could be extracted by first accessing r with binding $\langle a \rangle$, thus extracting value b , and then s with binding $\langle b \rangle$. ■

In order to check answerability, we need to check that all the required relations can be accessed according to the access patterns. To this end, we first refer to a schema enriched with unary relations representing the keywords in the KQ.¹

Definition 12 (Expanded schema) Let q be a KQ over a schema \mathcal{S}^Π . The expanded schema \mathcal{S}_q^Π of \mathcal{S}^Π wrt. q is defined as $\mathcal{S}_q^\Pi = \mathcal{S}^\Pi \cup \{r_c(C) | c \in q\}$, where r_c is a new unary relation, not occurring in \mathcal{S}^Π , whose only attribute C is an output attribute with abstract domain $\text{dom}(C) = \text{dom}(c)$.

Then, we use the notion of dependency graph (d-graph) to denote output-input dependencies between relation arguments, indicating that a relation under access patterns needs values from other relations.

Definition 13 (d-graph) Let q be a KQ over a schema \mathcal{S}^Π . The d-graph $G_q^{\mathcal{S}^\Pi}$ is a directed graph $\langle \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E} \rangle$ defined as follows. For each attribute A of each relation in the expanded schema \mathcal{S}_q^Π , there is a node in \mathcal{N} labeled with A 's access mode and abstract domain. There is an arc $u \frown v$ in \mathcal{E} whenever: (i) u and v have the same abstract domain; (ii) u is an output node; and (iii) v is an input node.

Some relations are made invisible by the access patterns and can be discarded.

Definition 14 (Visibility) An input node $v_n \in \mathcal{N}$ in a d-graph $\langle \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E} \rangle$ is visible if there is a sequence of arcs $u_1 \frown v_1, \dots, u_n \frown v_n$ in \mathcal{E} such that (i) u_1 's relation has no input attributes, and (ii) v_i 's and u_{i+1} 's relation are the same, for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. A relation is visible if all of its input nodes are.

Example 5 (cont.). Consider the KQ and the schemas from Example 5. The d-graphs $G_q^{\mathcal{S}_1^\Pi}$ and $G_q^{\mathcal{S}_2^\Pi}$ are shown in Figures 2a and Figure 2b, respectively. ■

Algorithm 2 efficiently checks answerability of a KQ q by means of compatibility with a schema in which all non-visible relations have been eliminated.

Algorithm 2: Checking answerability ($\text{answerable}(q, \mathcal{S}^\Pi)$)

Input: Schema \mathcal{S}^Π , KQ $q = \{k_1, \dots, k_{|q|}\}$
Output: **true** if q is answerable against \mathcal{S}^Π , **false** otherwise
1. $\mathcal{S}' :=$ largest subset of \mathcal{S} s.t. all relations in \mathcal{S}'^Π are visible
2. **return** $\text{compatible}(q, \mathcal{S}')$

Proposition 2 Algorithm 2 correctly checks answerability in PTIME.

Example 6 Consider a KQ $q = \{a: A, c: C\}$ and a schema $\mathcal{S}^\Pi = \{r(A^i, B), s(C^i, D), u(B, D, E^i)\}$. Relation u is not visible in $G_q^{\mathcal{S}^\Pi}$ (Figure 2c). According to Algorithm 2, q is not answerable in \mathcal{S}^Π , since q is not compatible with schema $\{r(A, B), s(C, D)\}$ (i.e., \mathcal{S} without relation u). ■

¹If other values are known besides the keywords, this knowledge may be represented by means of appropriate unary relations with output mode in the schema.




Figure 2: D-graphs from the Examples.

4 Extracting query answers

Once a KQ is known to be answerable, we need to devise a strategy to extract the corresponding answers. The simplest approach, pursued in [12], consists in extracting the entire reachable portion, by making all possible accesses with all values (either known from the KQ or, in turn, extracted via some access), and then “carving” out answers from it. Such an approach may perform a lot of unnecessary accesses. Note also that, consistently with Problem 1, users often simply need to quickly obtain just *one* answer (if any), and prefer to save potentially costly accesses. In the following, we therefore tackle Problem 1 while aiming to avoid unnecessary accesses. We still assume, for now, that the domains of the keywords are known in advance.

Minimality of query plans. Ideally, given an answerable KQ q and a schema \mathcal{S}^{II} , we would like to be able to devise a strategy that always performs a minimal amount of accesses to return an answer to q against every possible instance \mathcal{I} over \mathcal{S}^{II} . Let $\mathbf{P}_q^{\mathcal{S}^{\text{II}}}$ be the set of *query plans* for q and \mathcal{S}^{II} , i.e., all the deterministic programs that, for any instance \mathcal{I} of \mathcal{S}^{II} , compute an answer to q against \mathcal{I} by performing accesses to the relations in \mathcal{S}^{II} . Let $\text{Acc}(P, \mathcal{I})$ indicate the set of accesses made by query plan $P \in \mathbf{P}_q^{\mathcal{S}^{\text{II}}}$ to obtain an answer to q . A query plan $P \in \mathbf{P}_q^{\mathcal{S}^{\text{II}}}$ is *minimal* if, for every instance \mathcal{I} over \mathcal{S}^{II} and for every other query plan $P' \in \mathbf{P}_q^{\mathcal{S}^{\text{II}}}$, we have $|\text{Acc}(P, \mathcal{I})| \leq |\text{Acc}(P', \mathcal{I})|$. Unfortunately, minimality is, in general, unattainable.

Proposition 3 *There are KQs that admit no minimal query plan.*

With this negative result, our best hope is to attain a weaker form of minimality. A query plan P for q and \mathcal{S}^Π *dominates* P' if for every instance \mathcal{I} over \mathcal{S}^Π we have $|Acc(P, \mathcal{I})| \leq |Acc(P', \mathcal{I})|$ and there is an instance \mathcal{I}' over \mathcal{S}^Π such that $|Acc(P, \mathcal{I}')| < |Acc(P', \mathcal{I}')|$; P is *weakly minimal* if no query plan $P' \in \mathbf{P}_q^{\mathcal{S}^\Pi}$ dominates it.

In the following, we will illustrate how to build a weakly minimal query plan over examples of increasing complexity. We do this by resorting to the notion of access defined in Section 2 and to standard relational algebra operations.

Queries with a single keyword. The simplest case regards KQs with a single keyword. For such queries, each answer, if any exists, consists of exactly one tuple and is therefore optimal. We should therefore look for an access path ending with such a relation.

Example 7 Consider the KQ $q = \{a: A\}$ and the schema $\mathcal{S}^\Pi = \{r(A^i, B), s(B^i, C)\}$. There is only one visible relation (r) in \mathcal{S}_q^Π containing the domain of keyword a . It therefore suffices to extract tuples from r . Since we only know a value (a) to use as a binding for r and there is no way to extract more values from abstract domain A , the best thing we can do, on any instance \mathcal{I} , is to access r with binding $\langle a \rangle$, i.e., to use the access path $\xrightarrow{\langle a \rangle}_{r, \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{T}_r$. Each of the resulting tuples in \mathcal{T}_r , if any, will be an optimal answer to q . The overall cost is 1 access to r . There is no need, of course, to access s with the values in $\pi_B(s)$. ■

In some cases there may be more than one kind of access path to obtain an answer. We extract values starting with the shortest paths so as to try to reduce the number of accesses.

Example 8 Consider now schema $\mathcal{S}^\Pi = \{r(A^i, B), s(C), u(C^i, A), v(D^i, A)\}$. There are now two visible relations (r and u) in \mathcal{S}_q^Π containing the domain of keyword a . We can either directly access r with $\langle a \rangle$ or we can access s , thus retrieving values for domain C , and then use these values to access u . Since, on any instance \mathcal{I} , any access path in $\mathbf{P} = \{\xrightarrow{\langle \cdot \rangle}_{s, \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{T}_s \xrightarrow{\langle \cdot \rangle}_{u, \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{T}_u \mid \langle \cdot \rangle \in \mathcal{T}_s\}$ requires two accesses to find an answer, we start with $\xrightarrow{\langle a \rangle}_{r, \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{T}_r$. Only if $\mathcal{T}_r = \emptyset$ do we use a path in \mathbf{P} to check whether an answer exists. Again, all answers found in this way are necessarily optimal. The overall cost in the worst case is 1 access to r , 1 to s and $|s|$ to u . ■

Queries with more than one keyword. When a KQ involves more than one keyword, we must find appropriate access paths connecting them.

Example 9 Consider the schema $\mathcal{S}^\Pi = \{r(A^i, B), s(B^i, C)\}$ and the KQ $q = \{a, c\}$. Suitable access paths are of the form $\xrightarrow{\langle a \rangle}_{r, \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{T}_r \xrightarrow{\langle \cdot \rangle}_{s, \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{T}_s$ with $\langle \cdot \rangle \in \pi_B(\mathcal{T}_r)$. Every set of tuples in $\{\{t_r, t_s\} \mid t_r \bowtie t_s \in \sigma_{C=c}(\mathcal{T}_r \bowtie \mathcal{T}_s)\}$ is an optimal answer to q . The overall cost in the worst case is 1 access to r and $|\pi_B(\sigma_{A=a}(r))|$ to s . ■

The case of Example 9 features a single kind of access path as well as the guarantee that a non-empty extraction of the keywords necessarily contains an answer. This does not hold when there is a relation with at least two output arguments. In such cases, we use the `peel` procedure (Algorithm 3) to make sure that the keywords are connected and to remove redundant tuples.

Algorithm 3: Removing tuples to obtain an answer (`peel`(\mathcal{T}, q))

Input: Set of tuples \mathcal{T} , KQ q

Output: Answer to q against \mathcal{T} or `nil` if no answer

1. **if** $\neg \text{connected}(q, \mathcal{T})$ **then return nil**
 2. **let** $\mathcal{T}' := \mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}'' := \emptyset$
 3. **while** $\mathcal{T}'' \neq \mathcal{T}'$
 4. **let** $\mathcal{T}'' := \mathcal{T}'$
 5. **for each** $t \in \mathcal{T}''$ **if** $\text{connected}(q, \mathcal{T}' \setminus \{t\})$ **then let** $\mathcal{T}' := \mathcal{T}' \setminus \{t\}$
 6. **return** \mathcal{T}'
-

Example 10 Consider the schema $\mathcal{S}^{\Pi} = \{r(A, B), s(B^i, C)\}$ and the KQ $q = \{a, c\}$. A suitable query plan, essentially corresponding to the access paths $\xrightarrow{\langle a \rangle}_{r^{\mathcal{I}}} \mathcal{T}_r \xrightarrow{\langle c \rangle}_{s^{\mathcal{I}}} \mathcal{T}_s$, with $\langle c \rangle \in \pi_B(\mathcal{T}_r)$, but avoiding useless accesses and computations, is shown in Figure 3. Consider the instance $\mathcal{I} = \{r(a, b), r(a_1, b), r(a_1, b_1), r(a_2, b_2), s(b_1, c), s(b_3, c_1)\}$ over \mathcal{S}^{Π} . With the query plan of Figure 3 we extract $\mathcal{T}_r \cup \mathcal{T}_s = \mathcal{I} \setminus \{s(b_3, c_1)\}$, with 1 access to r and 3 to s , and the returned (optimal) answer is $\mathcal{I} \setminus \{s(b_3, c_1), r(a_2, b_2)\}$. ■

1. $\xrightarrow{\langle a \rangle}_{r^{\mathcal{I}}} \mathcal{T}_r$
2. **if** $\langle a \rangle \notin \pi_A(\mathcal{T}_r)$ **then return nil**
3. **for each** $\langle c \rangle \in \pi_B(\mathcal{T}_r)$
4. $\xrightarrow{\langle c \rangle}_{s^{\mathcal{I}}} \mathcal{T}_s$
5. **if** $\langle c \rangle \in \pi_C(\mathcal{T}_s)$ **then return** `peel`($\mathcal{T}_r \cup \mathcal{T}_s, \{a, c\}$)
6. **return nil**

Figure 3: Query plan for Example 10

Determining an optimal answer from the reachable portion corresponds to finding a Steiner tree of its join graph [50], i.e., a minimal-weight subtree of this graph involving a subset of its nodes. An efficient method for solving this problem in the context of keyword search over structured data is presented in [32], where a *q-fragment* can model our notion of answer. Yet, when optimality is not required, a simple technique (quadratic in the size of \mathcal{I}) to obtain an answer, shown in Algorithm 3, consists in trying to remove any tuple from the set as long as the set after the removal contains all the keywords and remains connected. The `connected` test can be run in linear time (the problem is in LOGSPACE [48]). The set returned by Algorithm 3 depends on the order in which the tuples are enumerated (line 5), but this is irrelevant if we do not need an optimal answer.

The most complex scenarios involve schemas whose d-graph allows a cyclic chain of relations feeding values to other relations, which in turn determine extractions with access paths whose length cannot be bounded a priori.

Example 11 Consider schema $\mathcal{S}^{\Pi} = \{r(A^i, B), s(B^i, C, A)\}$ and KQ $q = \{a, c\}$. The d-graph $G_q^{\mathcal{S}^{\Pi}}$ (Figure 2d) clearly shows a cyclic chain of relations

providing values to one another (from r to s , then back to r). The best strategy is as follows. Any access path of the form $\xrightarrow{\langle a \rangle}_{r\mathcal{I}} \mathcal{T}_r \xrightarrow{\langle b \rangle}_{s\mathcal{I}} \mathcal{T}_s$, with $\theta \in \pi_B(\mathcal{T}_r)$, is the shortest candidate to extract an answer: the first extraction (using the first value in $\pi_B(\mathcal{T}_r)$) requires two accesses (one to r and one to s), while all subsequent extractions (with the other values in $\pi_B(\mathcal{T}_r)$) require one more access to s . Any answer found this way is necessarily optimal. However, longer access paths may be used to find answers. In particular, any path attempted so far may be extended by traversing once more r and then s with the values obtained previously. Let \mathcal{T}_s^* be the set of all the tuples extracted from s so far; this new round will then consist in trying any of the access paths of the form $\xrightarrow{\langle b_r \rangle}_{r\mathcal{I}} \mathcal{T}_r \xrightarrow{\langle b_s \rangle}_{s\mathcal{I}} \mathcal{T}_s$, with $\theta_r \in \pi_A(\mathcal{T}_s^*)$ and $\theta_s \in \pi_B(\mathcal{T}_r)$. So, we first access r with the first value for θ_r , then s with the first value for θ_s (with two more accesses). If no answer is found, we access s with the next value for θ_s (with one more access), and proceed this way until either an answer is found or there are no more values to try for θ_s . At this point, we access r with the next value for θ_r and s with the first corresponding value for θ_s (with two more accesses), and continue in a similar fashion. When all bindings are tried, we extend again the previous access paths by traversing once more r and then s . We proceed until either an answer is found or no new values are discovered (and thus no new accesses are possible). ■

Note that even if we explore access paths sortedly (by increasing length), we have in general no guarantee to find the optimal answers first.

Example 11 (cont.). Consider the KQ and the schema from Example 11 and the instance $\mathcal{I} = \{r(a, b_1), s(b_1, c_1, a_1), r(a_1, b_2), s(b_2, c, a_2), r(a_2, b_3), s(b_3, c, a)\}$. The access path $\xrightarrow{\langle a \rangle}_{r\mathcal{I}} \{r(a, b_1)\} \xrightarrow{\langle b_1 \rangle}_{s\mathcal{I}} \{s(b_1, c_1, a_1)\} \xrightarrow{\langle a_1 \rangle}_{r\mathcal{I}} \{r(a_1, b_2)\} \xrightarrow{\langle b_2 \rangle}_{s\mathcal{I}} \{s(b_2, c, a_2)\}$ clearly determines an answer consisting of the 4 tuples $\{r(a, b_1), s(b_1, c_1, a_1), r(a_1, b_2), s(b_2, c, a_2)\}$, obtained with 4 accesses (no alternative access paths were possible so far). However, adding the accesses in $\xrightarrow{\langle a_2 \rangle}_{r\mathcal{I}} \{r(a_2, b_3)\} \xrightarrow{\langle b_3 \rangle}_{s\mathcal{I}} \{s(b_3, c, a)\}$ determines the answer $\{s(b_3, c, a)\}$, of size 1, which is optimal. ■

5 Query plan generation

In this section we discuss the generation of a query plan similar to those shown in the previous section. To this end, we first identify those relations in the schema that are potentially useful for retrieving an answer, i.e., they may provide either a keyword or values that, in turn, allow extracting a keyword.

Definition 15 *Let q be a KQ, \mathcal{S}^Π a schema, \mathcal{J} the schema join graph of \mathcal{S} , and N a node in \mathcal{J} whose relation r is visible in $G_q^{\mathcal{S}^\Pi}$. Node N is said to be useful for q and \mathcal{S}^Π if r has an attribute A such that either (i) $\exists k \in q : \text{dom}(k) = \text{dom}(A)$, or (ii) A is output and there is a useful node N' with an input attribute A' such that $\text{dom}(A) = \text{dom}(A')$.*

We now introduce the notion of witness, as a means to represent access paths.

Definition 16 (Witness) *Let $q = \{k_1, \dots, k_{|q|}\}$ be a KQ, \mathcal{S}^Π a schema, and $N_1, \dots, N_{|q|}$ be nodes in the schema join graph \mathcal{J} of \mathcal{S} such that N_i 's relation has an attribute with domain $\text{dom}(k_i)$, for $1 \leq i \leq |q|$. Let \mathcal{P} be a path on \mathcal{J} traversing all the nodes $N_1, \dots, N_{|q|}$ and ending with $N_{|q|}$. Let \mathcal{S}' be the subset of \mathcal{S} containing only the relations occurring in \mathcal{P} . Path \mathcal{P} is a witness for q in \mathcal{S}^Π if all its nodes are useful for q and \mathcal{S}' .*

The idea is to map each witness to an access path and each node in a witness to a relation in the schema. However, there may be infinitely many witnesses due to cycles in the schema join graph. For this reason, Algorithm 4 takes care of enumerating all witnesses sorted by the minimum number of accesses required to access all relations in the witness, thus finding a possible answer. We first check whether the KQ is answerable (line 1), then we initialize some containers for access results (line 2) and domain values including the keywords (line 3). In the main extraction cycle, we select the most promising witness, i.e., the one that requires the least number of accesses to complete (line 5), and then we traverse it in all possible ways in a depth-first fashion with the values we know (line 6). For pseudocode simplicity, if an answer is found, it will be returned directly within the `followPathDepthFirst` subroutine (similarly if no answer are possible) with the `exit` instruction (all exit points are boxed for visual clarity); else we keep going as long as there are useful extractions to be done (line 4). The traversal of the witness takes place in the `followPathDepthFirst` subroutine as shown in Example 11. For each binding formable with the known values (line 10), we access the first relation in the witness, and take care of not making the access if it was already made (line 11). With that, we update our knowledge of tuples (line 12) and values (line 13) and check if an answer was extracted, and in that case stop the traversal, exiting from `extract` with the found answer (line 14). We stop the traversal also as soon as we know that no answer can ever be found (line 15). Otherwise we continue the traversal (line 16). When all bindings are tried, the subroutine returns the control to its caller, thus backtracking to the previous choice. Note that no answer can be extracted when relation r contains an attribute with the domain of a keyword k , but k does not occur in \mathcal{T}_r and $\text{dom}(k)$ does not occur in any later node in \mathcal{P} or in any other unexplored witness.

Note that the stopping condition in line 4 is met when all the bindings formable with the known values have been attempted to access all the relations of the useful nodes. Enumerating the witnesses in increasing order of accesses to be made (line 5) is key in order to achieve weak minimality. This is similar to enumerating by length of the witness, with the proviso that one may traverse the witness with fewer accesses than nodes, since the same relation may occur more than once in the witness or may have been previously accessed.

Proposition 4 *Algorithm 4 correctly computes the answer to a KQ and $\text{extract}(q, \mathcal{S}^\Pi, \cdot)$ is a weakly minimal query plan for q and \mathcal{S}^Π .*

Algorithm 4: Query answer extraction ($\text{extract}(q, \mathcal{S}^{\Pi}, \mathcal{I})$)

Input: Schema \mathcal{S}^{Π} , KQ q , instance \mathcal{I} Output: An answer to q against \mathcal{I} (**nil** if no answer exists)Bookkeeping: Tuple containers $\mathcal{T}_r \forall r \in \mathcal{S}$, value containers $\mathcal{T}_D \forall \text{domain } D \text{ in } \mathcal{S}$

1. **if** $\neg \text{answerable}(q, \mathcal{S}^{\Pi})$ **then exit** with result nil
 2. $\mathcal{T}_r := \emptyset \forall r \in \mathcal{S}$
 3. $\mathcal{T}_D := \{k \mid k \in q \wedge \text{dom}(k) = D\} \forall \text{domain } D \text{ occurring in } \mathcal{S}$
 4. **while** there is a witness for q in \mathcal{S}^{Π} with something to extract
 5. $\mathcal{P} :=$ the next witness for q in \mathcal{S}^{Π} by number of accesses to be made
 6. **followPathDepthFirst**(\mathcal{P}) // NB: this may cause exiting the main procedure with a result
 7. **exit** with result nil // no answer was found

 - Subroutine: **followPathDepthFirst**(\mathcal{P}), \mathcal{P} is a path
 8. **if** \mathcal{P} is empty **then return** // path entirely explored
 9. $r :=$ relation of the first node in \mathcal{P}
 10. **for each** binding θ for r formable with values in $\bigcup_D \mathcal{T}_D$
 11. **if** θ is a new binding for r **then** $\xrightarrow{\theta, r, x} \mathcal{T}_r^+$ **else** $\mathcal{T}_r^+ = \emptyset$
 12. $\mathcal{T}_r := \mathcal{T}_r \cup \mathcal{T}_r^+$ // updating knowledge of r
 13. **for each** domain D in r $\mathcal{T}_D := \mathcal{T}_D \cup \pi_D(\mathcal{T}_r^+)$ // updating knowledge of D
 14. **if** $\mathcal{A} := \text{peel}(\bigcup_{r \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{T}_r, q) \neq \text{nil}$ **then exit** everything with result \mathcal{A} // if an answer exists, stop
 15. **if** no answer possible **then exit** everything with result nil // if no answer may exist, stop
 16. **followPathDepthFirst**(path \mathcal{P} without the first node) // continuing extraction
-

Let us finally assume that the domains of the keywords are not known in advance. We can adopt a strategy similar to Algorithm 4, with the difference that, initially, unlike what is done in line 3, the keywords are added to all the domain containers \mathcal{T}_D . Then, as soon as a tuple containing a keyword k is extracted by some access, the domain $\text{dom}(k)$ is discovered and k can be removed from the containers for the other domains.

6 Related Work

To our knowledge, this is the first paper that proposes a comprehensive approach to the problem of querying the Deep Web using keywords. In an earlier work [12], we have just defined the problem and provided some preliminary insights on query processing.

The problem of query processing in the Deep Web has been widely investigated in the last years, with different approaches and under different perspectives including: data crawling [47], integration of data sources [29], query plan optimization [8], indexing through pre-computation of forms [36], question answering [33], and generic structured query models [31]. However, none of them has tackled the problem that we have addressed in this paper.

The idea of querying structured data using keywords emerged more than a decade ago [1, 2] as a way to provide high-level access to data and free the user from the knowledge of query languages and data organization. Since then, a lot of work has been done in this field (see, e.g., [50] for a survey) but never in the context of the Deep Web. This problem has been investigated in the

context of various data models: relational [32], semi-structured [34], XML [28], and RDF [49]. Within the relational model, the common assumption is that an answer to a keyword query is a graph of minimal size in which the nodes represent tuples, the edges represent foreign key references between them, and the keywords occur in some node of the graph [30]. Our definition of query answer follows this line but it is more general, since it is only based on the presence of common values between tuples, while not forcing the presence of foreign keys.

The various approaches to keyword query answering over relational databases are commonly classified into two categories: *schema-based* and *schema-free*. Schema-based approaches [1, 30] make use, in a preliminary phase, of the database schema to build SQL queries that are able to return the answer. Conversely, schema-free approaches [2, 27, 32, 34] rely on exploration techniques over a graph-based representation of the whole database. Since the search for an optimal answer consists in finding a minimal *Steiner tree* on the graph, which is known to be an NP-Complete problem [26], the various proposals rely on heuristics aimed at generating approximations of Steiner trees. Our approach makes use of the schema of the data sources but cannot be classified in any of the approaches above since, given the access limitations, it rather relies on building a minimal query plan of accesses to the data sources.

This paper builds on prior work by integrating schema-awareness with graph-based exploration techniques. Unlike conventional methods, it explicitly models access constraints and defines a query processing framework that minimizes access costs. Similar ideas have been explored in the context of structured data and databases with known schemas [9, 11, 7, 6]. However, this work extends these principles to the Deep Web, proposing efficient query plan generation and optimization strategies for dynamically retrieved data. By addressing this gap, the paper lays the foundation for scalable and practical keyword search over inaccessible data repositories.

We observe that the access patterns used here are a form of integrity constraints that can be exploited for query optimization, schema specification and data maintenance [38, 15, 16, 37, 39, 14, 22, 21, 20, 10], and it should be interesting to study the interaction between access patterns and integrity constraints proper.

It should also be interesting to understand whether preferences and context information — a ubiquitous concern in databases [18, 41] — can be used to drive the selection of query plans so as to retrieve answers in a best-first manner, unlike the semantics-agnostic criterion used here to produce suitable answers.

Keyword searches are common components of larger pipelines involving data scraping and searching based on Machine Learning steps [42, 44, 45, 46], with data retrieved from sources of different nature, such as RFID [24, 23], pattern mining [43], crowdsourcing applications [25, 5, 35], and streaming data [19], often mixing different levels of data distribution and access policies [40, 17].

7 Conclusions and future work

In this paper, we have defined the problem of keyword search in the Deep Web and provided a method for query answering in this context that aims at minimizing the number of accesses to the data sources.

We believe that several interesting issues can be studied in the framework defined in this paper. We plan, e.g., to leverage known values (besides the keywords) and ontologies to speed up the search for an optimal answer as well as to consider the case in which nodes and arcs of the join graph are weighted to model source availability and proximity, respectively.

References

- [1] Sanjay Agrawal, Surajit Chaudhuri, and Gautam Das. Dbxplorer: A system for keyword-based search over relational databases. In *ICDE*, pages 5–16, 2002.
- [2] Gaurav Bhalotia et al. Keyword searching and browsing in databases using BANKS. In *ICDE*, pages 431–440, 2002.
- [3] Meghyn Bienvenu et al. Dealing with the deep web and all its quirks. In *Proc. of VLDS*, pages 21–24, 2012.
- [4] He Bin, Patel Mitesh, Zhang Zhen, and Chang Kevin Chen-Chuan. Accessing the deep web. *Commun. ACM*, 50(5):94–101, May 2007.
- [5] Alessandro Bozzon, Ilio Catallo, Eleonora Ciceri, Piero Fraternali, Davide Martinenghi, and Marco Tagliasacchi. A framework for crowdsourced multimedia processing and querying. In *Proceedings of the First International Workshop on Crowdsourcing Web Search, Lyon, France, April 17, 2012*, pages 42–47, 2012.
- [6] Andrea Cali, Diego Calvanese, and Davide Martinenghi. Dynamic query optimization under access limitations and dependencies. *Journal of Universal Computer Science*, 15(21):33–62, 2009.
- [7] Andrea Cali and Davide Martinenghi. Conjunctive query containment under access limitations. In Qing Li, Stefano Spaccapietra, Eric S. K. Yu, and Antoni Olivé, editors, *Conceptual Modeling - ER 2008, 27th International Conference on Conceptual Modeling, Barcelona, Spain, October 20-24, 2008. Proceedings*, volume 5231 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 326–340. Springer, 2008.
- [8] Andrea Cali and Davide Martinenghi. Querying data under access limitations. In *ICDE*, pages 50–59, 2008.
- [9] Andrea Cali and Davide Martinenghi. Querying data under access limitations. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Data Engineering, ICDE 2008, April 7-12, 2008, Cancún, México*, pages 50–59, 2008.

- [10] Andrea Cali and Davide Martinenghi. Querying incomplete data over extended ER schemata. *Theory Pract. Log. Program.*, 10(3):291–329, 2010.
- [11] Andrea Cali and Davide Martinenghi. Querying the deep web. In *EDBT*, pages 724–727, 2010.
- [12] Andrea Cali, Davide Martinenghi, and Riccardo Torlone. Keyword search in the deep web. In *Proc. of the 9th AMW*, 2015.
- [13] Andrea Cali, Davide Martinenghi, and Riccardo Torlone. Keyword queries over the deep web. In Isabelle Comyn-Wattiau, Katsumi Tanaka, Il-Yeol Song, Shuichiro Yamamoto, and Motoshi Saeki, editors, *Conceptual Modeling - 35th International Conference, ER 2016, Gifu, Japan, November 14-17, 2016, Proceedings*, volume 9974 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 260–268, 2016.
- [14] Henning Christiansen and Davide Martinenghi. Symbolic constraints for meta-logic programming. *Appl. Artif. Intell.*, 14(4):345–367, 2000.
- [15] Henning Christiansen and Davide Martinenghi. Simplification of database integrity constraints revisited: A transformational approach. In Maurice Bruynooghe, editor, *Logic Based Program Synthesis and Transformation, 13th International Symposium LOPSTR 2003, Uppsala, Sweden, August 25-27, 2003, Revised Selected Papers*, volume 3018 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 178–197. Springer, 2003.
- [16] Henning Christiansen and Davide Martinenghi. Simplification of integrity constraints for data integration. In Dietmar Seipel and Jose Maria Turull Torres, editors, *Foundations of Information and Knowledge Systems, Third International Symposium, FoIKS 2004, Wilhelminenberg Castle, Austria, February 17-20, 2004, Proceedings*, volume 2942 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 31–48. Springer, 2004.
- [17] Paolo Ciaccia and Davide Martinenghi. FA + TA < FSA: Flexible score aggregation. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, CIKM 2018, Torino, Italy, October 22-26, 2018*, pages 57–66, 2018.
- [18] Paolo Ciaccia, Davide Martinenghi, and Riccardo Torlone. Foundations of context-aware preference propagation. *J. ACM*, 67(1):4:1–4:43, 2020.
- [19] Gianni Costa, Giuseppe Manco, and Elio Masciari. Dealing with trajectory streams by clustering and mathematical transforms. *J. Intell. Inf. Syst.*, 42(1):155–177, 2014.
- [20] Hendrik Decker and Davide Martinenghi. Avenues to flexible data integrity checking. In *17th International Workshop on Database and Expert Systems Applications (DEXA 2006), 4-8 September 2006, Krakow, Poland*, pages 425–429. IEEE Computer Society, 2006.

- [21] Hendrik Decker and Davide Martinenghi. A relaxed approach to integrity and inconsistency in databases. In Miki Hermann and Andrei Voronkov, editors, *Logic for Programming, Artificial Intelligence, and Reasoning, 13th International Conference, LPAR 2006, Phnom Penh, Cambodia, November 13-17, 2006, Proceedings*, volume 4246 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 287–301. Springer, 2006.
- [22] Hendrik Decker and Davide Martinenghi. Getting rid of straitjackets for flexible integrity checking. In *18th International Workshop on Database and Expert Systems Applications (DEXA 2007), 3-7 September 2007, Regensburg, Germany*, pages 360–364. IEEE Computer Society, 2007.
- [23] Bettina Fazzinga, Sergio Flesca, Filippo Furfaro, and Elio Masciari. Rfid-data compression for supporting aggregate queries. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.*, 38(2):11, 2013.
- [24] Bettina Fazzinga, Sergio Flesca, Elio Masciari, and Filippo Furfaro. Efficient and effective RFID data warehousing. In Bipin C. Desai, Domenico Saccà, and Sergio Greco, editors, *International Database Engineering and Applications Symposium (IDEAS 2009), September 16-18, 2009, Cetraro, Calabria, Italy*, ACM International Conference Proceeding Series, pages 251–258, 2009.
- [25] Luca Galli, Piero Fraternali, Davide Martinenghi, Marco Tagliasacchi, and Jasminko Novak. A draw-and-guess game to segment images. In *2012 International Conference on Privacy, Security, Risk and Trust, PASSAT 2012, and 2012 International Conference on Social Computing, SocialCom 2012, Amsterdam, Netherlands, September 3-5, 2012*, pages 914–917, 2012.
- [26] M. R. Garey, R. L. Graham, and D. S. Johnson. The complexity of computing Steiner minimal trees. *SIAM J. on Applied Mathematics*, 32(4):835–859, 1977.
- [27] Konstantin Golenberg, Benny Kimelfeld, and Yehoshua Sagiv. Keyword proximity search in complex data graphs. In *SIGMOD*, pages 927–940, 2008.
- [28] Lin Guo, Feng Shao, Chavdar Botev, and Jayavel Shanmugasundaram. Xrank: ranked keyword search over xml documents. In *SIGMOD*, pages 16–27, 2003.
- [29] Bin He, Zhen Zhang, and Kevin Chen-Chuan Chang. Metaquerier: querying structured web sources on-the-fly. In *Proc. of SIGMOD*, pages 927–929, 2005.
- [30] Vagelis Hristidis and Yannis Papakonstantinou. Discover: Keyword search in relational databases. In *VLDB*, pages 670–681, 2002.
- [31] Hasan M. Jamil and Hosagrahar V. Jagadish. A structured query model for the deep relational web. In *CIKM*, pages 1679–1682, 2015.

- [32] Benny Kimelfeld and Yehoshua Sagiv. Finding and approximating top-k answers in keyword proximity search. In *PODS*, pages 173–182, 2006.
- [33] Jens Lehmann et al. Deqa: Deep web extraction for question answering. In *ISWC'12*, pages 131–147. Springer-Verlag, 2012.
- [34] Guoliang Li et al. EASE: an effective 3-in-1 keyword search method for unstructured, semi-structured and structured data. In *SIGMOD*, pages 903–914, 2008.
- [35] Babak Loni, Maria Menendez, Mihai Georgescu, Luca Galli, Claudio Masari, Ismail Sengör Altingövde, Davide Martinenghi, Mark Melenhorst, Raynor Vliedendhart, and Martha Larson. Fashion-focused creative commons social dataset. In *Multimedia Systems Conference 2013, MMSys '13, Oslo, Norway, February 27 - March 01, 2013*, pages 72–77, 2013. (GGS: B-).
- [36] Jayant Madhavan, Loredana Afanasiev, Lyublena Antova, and Alon Y. Halevy. Harnessing the deep web: Present and future. In *CIDR*, 2009.
- [37] Davide Martinenghi. Simplification of integrity constraints with aggregates and arithmetic built-ins. In Henning Christiansen, Mohand-Said Hacid, Troels Andreasen, and Henrik Legind Larsen, editors, *Flexible Query Answering Systems, 6th International Conference, FQAS 2004, Lyon, France, June 24-26, 2004, Proceedings*, volume 3055 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 348–361. Springer, 2004.
- [38] Davide Martinenghi. *Advanced Techniques for Efficient Data Integrity Checking*. PhD thesis, Roskilde University, Dept. of Computer Science, Roskilde, Denmark, 2005. Available in *Datalogiske Skrifter*, vol. 105, Roskilde University, Denmark.
- [39] Davide Martinenghi and Henning Christiansen. Transaction management with integrity checking. In Kim Viborg Andersen, John K. Debenham, and Roland R. Wagner, editors, *Database and Expert Systems Applications, 16th International Conference, DEXA 2005, Copenhagen, Denmark, August 22-26, 2005, Proceedings*, volume 3588 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 606–615. Springer, 2005.
- [40] Davide Martinenghi and Marco Tagliasacchi. Cost-aware rank join with random and sorted access. *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, 24(12):2143–2155, 2012.
- [41] Davide Martinenghi and Riccardo Torlone. Querying context-aware databases. In Troels Andreasen, Ronald R. Yager, Henrik Bulskov, Henning Christiansen, and Henrik Legind Larsen, editors, *Flexible Query Answering Systems, 8th International Conference, FQAS 2009, Roskilde, Denmark, October 26-28, 2009. Proceedings*, volume 5822 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 76–87. Springer, 2009.

- [42] Elio Masciari. Trajectory clustering via effective partitioning. In Troels Andreasen, Ronald R. Yager, Henrik Bulskov, Henning Christiansen, and Henrik Legind Larsen, editors, *Flexible Query Answering Systems, 8th International Conference, FQAS 2009, Roskilde, Denmark, October 26-28, 2009. Proceedings*, volume 5822 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 358–370, 2009.
- [43] Elio Masciari, Shi Gao, and Carlo Zaniolo. Sequential pattern mining from trajectory data. In Bipin C. Desai, Josep Lluís Larriba-Pey, and Jorge Bernardino, editors, *17th International Database Engineering & Applications Symposium, IDEAS '13, Barcelona, Spain - October 09 - 11, 2013*, pages 162–167. ACM, 2013.
- [44] Elio Masciari, Giuseppe Massimiliano Mazzeo, and Carlo Zaniolo. Analysing microarray expression data through effective clustering. *Inf. Sci.*, 262:32–45, 2014.
- [45] Elio Masciari, Vincenzo Moscato, Antonio Picariello, and Giancarlo Sperli. A deep learning approach to fake news detection. In Denis Helic, Gerhard Leitner, Martin Stettinger, Alexander Felfernig, and Zbigniew W. Ras, editors, *Foundations of Intelligent Systems - 25th International Symposium, ISMIS 2020, Graz, Austria, September 23-25, 2020, Proceedings*, volume 12117 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 113–122. Springer, 2020.
- [46] Elio Masciari, Vincenzo Moscato, Antonio Picariello, and Giancarlo Sperli. Detecting fake news by image analysis. In Bipin C. Desai and Wan-Sup Cho, editors, *IDEAS 2020: 24th International Database Engineering & Applications Symposium, Seoul, Republic of Korea, August 12-14, 2020*, pages 27:1–27:5. ACM, 2020.
- [47] Sriram Raghavan and Hector Garcia-Molina. Crawling the hidden web. In *VLDB*, pages 129–138, 2001.
- [48] Omer Reingold. Undirected connectivity in log-space. *J. ACM*, 55(4), 2008.
- [49] Thanh Tran et al. Top-k exploration of query candidates for efficient keyword search on graph-shaped (rdf) data. In *ICDE*, pages 405–416, 2009.
- [50] Jeffrey Xu Yu, Lu Qin, and Lijun Chang. Keyword search in relational databases: A survey. *IEEE Data Eng. Bull.*, 33(1):67–78, 2010.

Appendix

Proof of Proposition 1

Proof. First, note that if the domain of a keyword is not present in \mathcal{S} , the keyword may never be found, and thus the algorithm returns **false** (line 1). Also, note that relations of arity 1 are irrelevant for connecting two keywords in

an answer: indeed, if a keyword k occurs in an atom of a unary relation and is connected to another keyword k' , then it must also occur in a non-unary atom. Therefore, such relations are not taken into account for checking connectedness (line 2). In the remainder of Algorithm 1, **false** is returned when the domains of two keywords in q can never be connected in the schema join graph \mathcal{J} (line 4), which entails that q is not compatible with \mathcal{S} . Conversely, when Algorithm 1 returns **true**, then, for $1 \leq i \leq |q| - 1$, \mathcal{J} has a path (of, say, n_i nodes) connecting the domain of a keyword k_i in q to the domain of keyword k_{i+1} in q . Therefore, one can build a sequence of n_i tuples $t_{i,1}, \dots, t_{i,n_i}$ such that $t_{i,1}$ contains keyword k_i , t_{i,n_i} contains k_{i+1} , and $t_{i,j}$ shares a value with $t_{i,j+1}$ for $1 \leq j < n_i$. Note that we may also have a path of 1 node (on, say, relation r) such that (i) $\text{dom}(k_i) = \text{dom}(k_{i+1})$, and (ii) only one attribute in r uses domain $\text{dom}(k_i)$. In this special case, we set $n_i = 2$ and we build a sequence of 2 tuples $t_{i,1}, t_{i,2}$, both on r , connected by sharing a value on one of the other attributes in r (which is necessarily non-unary).

This construction step can be repeated for every two keywords k_i and k_{i+1} , for $1 \leq i \leq |q| - 1$, thus obtaining an overall set of tuples $\mathcal{T} = t_{1,1}, \dots, t_{1,n_1}, t_{2,1}, \dots, t_{2,n_2}, \dots, t_{|q|-1,1}, \dots, t_{|q|-1,n_{|q|-1}}$. Note that the join graph of \mathcal{T} is connected, since every sequence $t_{i,1}, \dots, t_{i,n_i}$ is connected, and every two consecutive sequences are connected, since both t_{i,n_i} and $t_{i+1,1}$ share the same keyword k_{i+1} . Since \mathcal{T} is connected and contains all the keywords in q , \mathcal{T} (or a subset thereof) is an answer to q against an instance $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{T}$.

All the steps in Algorithm 1 are polynomial in the size of the schema or of the query, and line 4 amounts to checking reachability, which is again polynomial in the size of the schema. \square

Proof of Proposition 2

Proof. No tuple can be extracted from a non-visible relation. Certainly, if no path in the schema join graph of \mathcal{S}' can be found that connects two keywords in q , then no connected set of tuples with these keywords can be extracted.

Conversely, if such paths can be found for all pairs of keywords in q , then a set of tuples \mathcal{T} providing an answer to q can be formed in the same way as in the proof of Proposition 1. The presence of access patterns may in some case force some values in \mathcal{T} to coincide, but this does not affect connectedness of \mathcal{T} .

Visibility can be checked in PTIME since it amounts to checking reachability (at the level of a relation) on a (dependency) graph. Compatibility was shown to be in PTIME in the proof of Proposition 1. Therefore answerability is also in PTIME. \square

Proof of Proposition 3

Proof. Consider a KQ $q = \{a: A, b: B\}$ and a schema $\mathcal{S}^\Pi = \{r(A^i, B), s(A, B^i)\}$. Any query plan $P \in \mathbf{P}_q^{\mathcal{S}^\Pi}$ must either first access r with the binding $\langle a \rangle$ or access s with the binding $\langle c \rangle$. Now, consider the instances

$\mathcal{I}_1 = \{r(a, b)\}$ and $\mathcal{I}_2 = \{s(a, b)\}$. If P accesses r first, then there exists another query plan P' such that $Acc(P', \mathcal{I}_2) \subset Acc(P, \mathcal{I}_2)$, since the access to r is useless to find the answer $s(a, b)$. Similarly, if P accesses s first, then such an access is useless to find the answer $r(a, b)$ from \mathcal{I}_1 . Therefore, there is no minimal query plan for q and \mathcal{S}^Π . \square

Proof of Proposition 4

Proof. Correctness follows from the fact that all possible ways of extracting an answer are eventually found (by enumerating all witnesses), and by correctness of the `peel` procedure, which we use after each extraction to check if an answer was found.

Weak minimality follows from the fact that the strategy used in Algorithm 4 is never dominated by another strategy. Indeed, the first witness \mathcal{P} attempted by Algorithm 4 is the one that requires the least amount of accesses. Take any query plan P not attempting an access path along \mathcal{P} as its first choice: then there would be an instance \mathcal{I} (providing an answer that can be extracted with an access path along \mathcal{P}) in which $Acc(P, \mathcal{I}) > Acc(\text{extract}(q, \mathcal{S}^\Pi, \cdot), \mathcal{I})$, i.e., P would incur more accesses than Algorithm 4. The same argument would apply to any query plan making the same first choice as Algorithm 4 but a different second attempt to extract an answer, since the second witness is the second-best choice by number of accesses to be made; and so on for the following choices. Note that two query plans attempting the same paths in the same order might still differ by the order in which the different bindings are attempted (as in the enumeration in line 10 in the `followPathDepthFirst` subroutine). However, by a symmetry argument, if there is an instance \mathcal{I} in which Algorithm 4 incurs more accesses than another query plan differing by the order in which the bindings are attempted, then, since these are deterministic algorithms and their choices are always the same when the knowledge is the same, there must also be an instance \mathcal{I}' in which the opposite happens. We can therefore conclude that any query plan making different choices than Algorithm 4 will incur more accesses in at least one instance. Therefore Algorithm 4 is weakly minimal. \square