



# Puzzling over Subsequence-Query Extensions: Disjunction and Generalised Gaps\*

André Frochoux  and Sarah Kleest-Meißner   
 Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany,  
 {andre.frochoux|kleemeis}@informatik.hu-berlin.de

## Abstract

A query model for sequence data was introduced in [11] in the form of subsequence-queries with wildcards and gap-size constraints (swg-queries, for short). These queries consist of a pattern over an alphabet of variables and types, as well as a global window size and a number of local gap-size constraints. We propose two new extensions of swg-queries, which both enrich the expressive power of swg-queries in different ways: subsequence-queries with generalised gap-size constraints (swgg-queries, for short) and disjunctive subsequence-queries (dswg-queries, for short). We discuss a suitable characterisation of containment, a classical property considered in database theory, and adapt results concerning the discovery of swg-queries to both, swgg-queries and dswg-queries.

## 1 Introduction

Applications in different domains like cluster monitoring [20], urban transportation [3], and in finance[19], use models for sequence data, which define an order for a set of data items [4]. Respective systems enable the definition of queries which detect patterns of data items describing a *situation of interest* (*soi* for short), for example error occurrence, in a specific order and temporal context.

Finding a suitable query is a non-trivial task. A user may know the time at which a certain job fails execution, but does not exactly conceive a situation which forecasts the failure. It was therefore suggested to automatically discover a query from historic sequence data which describes the *soi*. Such a query may then be used in pro-active applications where they shall anticipate a *soi* to prepare for it accordingly [2].

In [11] a formal model (referred to as *swg-queries*) was proposed, which covers the essence of discovering a query from sequence data. In a nutshell, an swg-query consists of a pattern over an alphabet of variables and types, a global window size and a tuple of local gap-size constraints. Syntactically, swg-queries are so-called Angluin-style patterns with variables, but with a semantics adapted to sequence data: each variable in the query string ranges only over a single symbol and the query matches if, after replacing the variables by single data items, it occurs as a subsequence that satisfies the window size and local gap-size constraints. Angluin-style patterns were introduced in [1] and play a central role for inductive inference, in formal language theory and combinatorics on words (see [18], [15], [16]). Concepts and algorithms from inductive inference of so-called pattern languages, that can be described by Angluin-style patterns, can be adapted to swg-queries. Especially the notion of *descriptive patterns* (already introduced in [1], see also [7], [8]) forms a key concept and enables the adaptation of *Shinohara's algorithm* [17] for Angluin-style patterns. This algorithm computes a descriptive Angluin-style pattern upon input of a finite set of sequences of data items. The corresponding adaptation to

---

\*This article is the full version of a contribution accepted at the 15th Alberto Mendelzon International Workshop on Foundations of Data Management (2023). Both authors contributed equally.

swg-queries including some extensions were presented in [11], and lifted to a multi-dimensional data model in [12].

Subsequences in general have extensively been studied both in a purely combinatorial sense (in formal language theory, logic and combinatorics on words) and algorithmically (in string algorithms and bioinformatics); see the introductions of the recent papers [9], [5] for a comprehensive list of relevant pointers. The problem of matching subsequences with gap-constraints (and analysis problems with respect to the set of all gap-constrained subsequences of given strings) has been investigated in the recent papers [6], [13] (see also [14] for a survey).

Queries defined for complex event recognition (*CER*, for short) usually use operators such as sequencing, conjunction and disjunction, Kleene closure, negation and variables which may be bound to data items in a stream [10]. Inspired by the generalised gap-size constraints described in [6] that are defined over strings other than patterns over variables and types, and the use of disjunction in CER languages, we introduce two new notions of subsequence-queries, which both extend the expressive power of swg-queries in different ways:

- *disjunctive subsequence-queries with wildcards and local gap-size constraints*, for short: *dswg-queries*, and
- *subsequence-queries with wildcards and generalised gap-size constraints*, for short: *swgg-queries*

Improving the expressive power of the underlying language used for an automatically discovered descriptive query leads to results of increased precision. Enabling disjunction is a natural and effective way to reach this. Our second approach of generalised gap-size constraints allows detecting temporal contexts not only between consecutive data items, but between any data items in the query string.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 introduces both, swgg-queries and dswg-queries, and discusses the relation to swg-queries. In Section 3, we provide a solution for the query discovery problem for both kinds of queries. Section 4 concludes the paper. Due to space limitations of the conference version, proof details had to be deferred to the appendix.

## 2 Traces and Queries

This section introduces the syntax and semantics of both, swgg-query (Section 2.1), and dswg-queries (Section 2.2). For a better understanding we consider each extension individually.

By  $\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$  we denote the set of integers, non-negative integers, and positive integers, respectively. For every set  $M$  we denote the powerset by  $\mathcal{P}(M)$ , i.e. the set of all subsets of  $M$ , and  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(M) := \{X \in \mathcal{P}(M) : X \text{ is finite}\}$  is the set of all finite subsets from  $M$ . Moreover, we write  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(M)$  for  $(\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(M) \setminus \{\emptyset\})$  and for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$ , we define  $\mathcal{P}_k(M) := \{m \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(M) \mid |m| = k\}$ . For  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  we let  $[\ell] = \{i \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1} : 1 \leq i \leq \ell\}$ . For a non-empty set  $A$  we write  $A^*$  (and  $A^+$ ) for the set of all (non-empty) strings built from symbols in  $A$ . By  $|s|$  we denote the length of a string  $s$ , and for a position  $i \in [|s|]$  we write  $s[i]$  to denote the letter at position  $i$  in  $s$ . A *factor* of a string  $s \in A^*$  is a string  $t \in A^*$  such that  $s$  is of the form  $s_1ts_2$  for  $s_1, s_2 \in A^*$ .

An *embedding* is a mapping  $e : [\ell] \rightarrow [n]$  with  $\ell \leq n$  such that  $i < j$  implies  $e(i) < e(j)$  for all  $i, j \in [\ell]$ . Let  $s$  and  $t$  be two strings with  $|s| \leq |t|$ . We say that  $s$  is a *subsequence of  $t$  with embedding  $e : [|s|] \rightarrow [|t|]$* , if  $e$  is an embedding and  $s[i] = t[e(i)]$  for every  $i \in [|s|]$ . We write  $s \preceq_e t$  to indicate that  $s$  is a subsequence of  $t$  with embedding  $e$ ; and we write  $s \preceq t$  to indicate that there exists an embedding  $e$  such that  $s \preceq_e t$ .

We model traces as finite, non-empty strings over some (finite or infinite) alphabet  $\Gamma$  of *types*. It will be reasonable to assume that  $|\Gamma| \geq 2$ . A *trace* (over  $\Gamma$ ) is a string  $t \in \Gamma^+$ . We write  $\text{types}(t)$  for the set of types that occur in  $t$ . Finally, we fix a countably infinite set  $\text{Vars}$  of *variables*, and we will always assume that  $\text{Vars}$  is disjoint with the set  $\Gamma$  of considered types.

## 2.1 Syntax and semantics of swgg-queries

**Definition 1.** An swgg-query  $q = (s, w, C)$  (over  $\text{Vars}$  and  $\Gamma$ ) is specified by

- a query string  $s \in (\text{Vars} \cup \Gamma)^+$ ,
- a global window size  $w \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1} \cup \{\infty\}$  with  $w \geq |s|$  and
- a finite set  $C$  of generalised gap-size constraints (for  $|s|$  and  $w$ ) of form

$$(c^-, c^+, r)_j \in (\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\} \times \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1})_{\mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}}$$

for  $j \in [|s| - 1]$ ,  $r \leq c^- \leq c^+$  and  $j + r \leq |s|$ .

The semantics of swgg-queries is defined as follows: each variable in  $s$  represents an arbitrary type from  $\Gamma$ . A query  $q = (s, w, C)$  matches in a trace  $t$  (in symbols:  $t \models q$ ), if the wildcards in  $s$  can be replaced by types in  $\Gamma$  in such a way that the resulting string  $s'$  satisfies the following:  $t$  contains a factor  $t'$  of length at most  $w$  such that  $s'$  occurs as a subsequence in  $t'$  and for each  $(c^-, c^+, r)_j \in C$  the gap between  $s[j]$  and  $s[j+r]$  in  $t'$  has length at least  $c^-$  and at most  $c^+$ . Gaps of range  $r$  for  $r \in [w]$  without any constraints are implicitly set to the most general constraint  $(0, \infty, r)$ .

A more formal description of these semantics relies on the following additional notation: An embedding  $e : [\ell] \rightarrow [n]$  satisfies a global window size  $w$ , if  $e(\ell) - e(1) + 1 \leq w$ . Furthermore, it satisfies a set of generalised gap-size constraints  $C$  (for  $|\ell|$  and  $w$ ) if  $c^- \leq e(j+r) - 1 - e(j) \leq c^+$ , for each  $(c^-, c^+, r)_j \in C$ .

A substitution is a mapping  $\mu : (\text{Vars} \cup \Gamma) \rightarrow (\text{Vars} \cup \Gamma)$  with  $\mu(\gamma) = \gamma$  for all  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ . We lift substitutions to mappings  $(\text{Vars} \cup \Gamma)^+ \rightarrow (\text{Vars} \cup \Gamma)^+$  in the obvious way, i.e.  $\mu(s) = \mu(s[1])\mu(s[2]) \dots \mu(s[\ell])$  for  $s \in (\text{Vars} \cup \Gamma)^+$  and  $\ell := |s|$ .

An swgg-query  $q = (s, w, C)$  matches in a trace  $t \in \Gamma^+$  (or  $t$  matches  $q$ ), if and only if there are a substitution  $\mu : (\text{Vars} \cup \Gamma) \rightarrow \Gamma$  and an embedding  $e : [\ell] \rightarrow [n]$  that satisfies  $w$  and  $C$ , such that  $\mu(s) \preceq_e t$ . We call  $(\mu, e)$  a witness for  $t \models q$ .

The model set of a query  $q$  w.r.t. to a type set  $\Delta \subseteq \Gamma$  is  $\text{Mod}_\Delta(q) := \{t \in \Delta^+ : t \models q\}$ . Note that there exist swgg-queries  $q$  such that  $\text{Mod}_\Gamma(q) = \emptyset$ . They have in common that either their generalised gap-size constraints conflict with the global window size or some gap-size constraints are in conflict among themselves. Lemma 3 characterises swgg-queries with compatible constraints.

**Example 2.** Let  $\Gamma = \{a, b\}$ . Let  $q_1 = (s, w, C_1)$  and  $q_2 = (s, w, C_2)$  be the two swgg-queries over  $\text{Vars}$ , where  $s = a a a a a$  and  $w = 10$  for both queries, and  $C_1 = ((7, 7, 3)_1, (6, 6, 3)_2, (0, 0, 1)_5)$  and  $C_2 = ((4, 4, 5)_1, (2, 5, 2)_3)$ .

$$\begin{array}{rcc}
 s & = & \begin{array}{cccccc} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ a & a & a & a & a & a \end{array} & s & = & \begin{array}{cccccc} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ a & a & a & a & a & a \end{array} \\
 C_1 & : & \underbrace{\hspace{1.5cm}}_{(7, 7, 3)_1} & \underbrace{\hspace{1.5cm}}_{(0, 0, 1)_5} & C_2 & : & \underbrace{\hspace{1.5cm}}_{(2, 5, 2)_3} \\
 & & \underbrace{\hspace{3.5cm}}_{(6, 6, 3)_2} & & & & \underbrace{\hspace{3.5cm}}_{(4, 4, 5)_1} \\
 w & : & \underbrace{\hspace{6.5cm}}_{10} & & w & : & \underbrace{\hspace{6.5cm}}_{10}
 \end{array}$$

A shortest trace over  $\Gamma$  which satisfies  $C_1$  is  $t = a b a b b b b a a a a$ . But  $t \not\models q_1$  since  $t$  does not satisfy  $w = 10$ . Since  $t$  is a shortest trace there exists no trace satisfying both,  $w$  and  $C$ . (The shortest trace is not unique since the sequences of  $b$ s could be replaced by arbitrary types from  $\Gamma$ .)

Note that  $\text{Mod}_\Gamma(q_2) = \emptyset$  holds as well since  $(4, 4, 5)_1$  and  $(2, 5, 2)_3$  are incompatible: For each trace  $t$ , substitution  $\mu$  and embedding  $e$  such that  $\mu(s) \preceq_e t$  and  $e$  satisfies  $(4, 4, 5)_1$ , the second gap-size constraint is not satisfied, since it demands at least one further type between  $e(3)$  and  $e(4)$ , contradicting  $(4, 4, 5)_1$ .

**Lemma 3.** An swgg-query  $q = (s, w, C)$  (over  $\text{Vars}$  and  $\Gamma$ ) is satisfiable, i.e.  $\text{Mod}_\Gamma(q) \neq \emptyset$ , iff there are no two sequences

$$C' = \left( (c_1^-, c_1^+, r_1')_{j_1'}, (c_2^-, c_2^+, r_2')_{j_2'}, \dots, (c_{|C'|}^-, c_{|C'|}^+, r_{|C'|}')_{j_{|C'|}' } \right)$$

and

$$C'' = \left( (c_1''^-, c_1''^+, r_1'')_{j_1''}, (c_2''^-, c_2''^+, r_2'')_{j_2''}, \dots, (c_{|C''|}''^-, c_{|C''|}''^+, r_{|C''|}'' )_{j_{|C''|}''} \right)$$

from  $C \cup \{(0, \infty, 1)_1, \dots, (0, \infty, 1)_{|s|-1}\}$  where  $j_1' = j_1''$ ,  $j_{|C'|}' + r_{|C'|}' = j_{|C''|}'' + r_{|C''|}''$ , and  $j_{i+1}' = j_i' + r_i'$  and  $j_{i+1}'' = j_i'' + r_i''$  for all  $i \in [|C'| - 1]$ , with

$$(i) \quad |s| + \sum_{i=1}^{|C'|} c_i'^- - r_i' + 1 > w \quad , \quad \text{or}$$

$$(ii) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{|C'|} c_i'^- - r_i' + 1 > \sum_{i=1}^{|C''|} c_i''^+ - r_i'' + 1.$$

For the rest of this paper, we only focus on queries with a non-empty model set.

## 2.2 Syntax and semantics of dswg-queries

**Definition 4.** A dswg-query  $q = (s, w, c)$  (over  $\text{Vars}$  and  $\Gamma$ ) is specified by

- a query string  $s = s[1] \dots s[\ell]$ , whereby  $s[i] = \begin{cases} x \in \text{Vars} \\ \chi \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma) \end{cases}$ ,
- a global window size  $w \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1} \cup \{\infty\}$  with  $w \geq |s|$  and
- a tuple  $c = (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{|s|-1})$  of local gap-size constraints (for  $|s|$  and  $w$ ), where  $c_i = (c_i^-, c_i^+) \in \mathbb{N} \times (\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\})$ , such that  $c_i^- \leq c_i^+$  for every  $i \in [|s|-1]$  and  $|s| + \sum_{i=1}^{|s|} c_i^- \leq w$ .

Note that setting all gap-size constraints of a dswg-query  $q$  to  $(0, \infty)$  corresponds to a query without gap-size constraints.

The semantics of dswg-queries is defined as follows: Again, variables in  $s$  represent an arbitrary type, and each set  $\chi$  stands for a disjunction. Intuitively, a trace  $t$  matches a query  $q = (s, w, c)$  if the variables in  $s$  can be replaced by types and each occurring of an  $\chi$  can be mapped to a single type  $\gamma \in \chi$ , such that the resulting string  $s'$  occurs as a subsequence in  $t$  that spans at most  $w$  types and the gap between  $s'[i]$  and  $s'[i+1]$  in  $t$  has length between  $c_i^-$  and  $c_i^+$ , for all  $i < \ell := |s|$ .

An alternative description of these semantics, which will be more convenient for our formal proofs, involves a bit more notation: We say that an embedding  $e : [\ell] \rightarrow [n]$  satisfies a global window size  $w$ , if  $e(\ell) - e(1) + 1 \leq w$ ; and we say that  $e$  satisfies a tuple  $c = (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{\ell-1})$  of local gap-size constraints (for  $\ell$  and  $w$ ), if  $c_i^- \leq e(i+1) - 1 - e(i) \leq c_i^+$  for all  $i < \ell$ .

A substitution of size  $\ell$  is a mapping  $\mu_\ell : ([\ell] \times \text{Vars} \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)) \rightarrow (\text{Vars} \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma))$  with:

$$\mu_\ell(i, z) = \begin{cases} x \in (\text{Vars} \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)) & , i = 1 \text{ and } z \in \text{Vars} \\ \mu_\ell(1, z) & , i > 1 \text{ and } X \in \text{Vars} \\ z' & , \emptyset \subset z' \subseteq z \text{ for all non-empty } z \subseteq_{\text{fin}} \Gamma. \end{cases}$$

We extend substitutions of size  $\ell$  to mappings  $([\ell] \times \text{Vars} \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma))^+ \rightarrow (\text{Vars} \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma))^+$  for strings  $s \in (\text{Vars} \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma))^+$  of size  $\ell$  in the obvious way, i.e.,  $\mu(s) = \mu_\ell(1, s[1])\mu_\ell(2, s[2]) \dots \mu_\ell(\ell, s[\ell])$ . Since the size of the string must match the size of the substitution, we can omit the index  $\ell$  if we apply it to a string. Particularly, we can omit the parameter  $i$  for the position if the second

parameter is a variable, as we have for all variables  $z$  that  $\mu(i, z) = \mu(i', z)$  for all  $i, i' \in [l]$ , or if the position is given by the context, i.e. we write  $\mu(s[i])$  instead of  $\mu(i, s[i])$ .

A dswg-query  $q = (s, w, c)$  matches in a trace  $t \in \Gamma^+$  (or,  $t$  matches  $q$ , in symbols:  $t \models q$ ), if and only if there are a substitution  $\mu : ([l] \times \mathbf{Vars} \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Delta)) \rightarrow \Gamma$  (i.e., there are only singletons in the co-domain of  $\mu$  and every type of  $\mu(s)$  is the unique element of its singleton) and an embedding  $e : [|s|] \rightarrow [|t|]$  that satisfies  $w$  and  $c$ , such that  $\mu(s) \preceq_e t$ . We call  $(\mu, e)$  a witness for  $t \models q$ .

**Example 5.** Let  $x_1, x_2, x_3 \in \mathbf{Vars}$  and  $\Gamma = \{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}\}$ . We consider a query  $q = (s, w, c)$ , where  $s = x_1\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}\}x_1x_2\{\mathbf{c}\}x_3\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c}\}x_1$ ,  $w = 25$  and  $c = ((0, 1), (2, \infty), (3, \infty), (0, 5), (0, 5), (1, 5), (1, 2))$ . For  $t_1, t_2 \in \Gamma^*$  we consider the trace  $t = t_1 \mathbf{c} \mathbf{a} \mathbf{b} \mathbf{c} \mathbf{a} \mathbf{b} \mathbf{c} \mathbf{a} \mathbf{b} \mathbf{c} \mathbf{b} \mathbf{c} \mathbf{b} \mathbf{a} \mathbf{c} t_2$ . We observe that  $t \models q$ , and a witness substitution and embedding can be illustrated as follows:

$$\begin{array}{rcccccccccccccccc} s & = & & x_1 & \{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}\} & & x_1 & & x_2 & \{\mathbf{c}\} & & x_3 & & \{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}\} & & x_1, \\ t & = & t_1 & \mathbf{c} & \mathbf{a} & \mathbf{b} \mathbf{b} & \mathbf{c} & \mathbf{a} \mathbf{c} \mathbf{a} & \mathbf{a} & \mathbf{c} & \mathbf{b} & \mathbf{c} & \mathbf{b} & \mathbf{c} & \mathbf{b} & \mathbf{c} & t_2. \end{array}$$

We close this subsection with two little observations. First, it is reasonable to assume that  $\chi$  is a proper subset of  $\Gamma$ , otherwise we could also use a wildcard instead of a disjunction. Second, in the case of a finite alphabet  $\Gamma$ , we obtain the possibility to express a simple kind of negation. We can build a query where  $s$  contains a substring  $s' = \mathbf{a} \chi \mathbf{b}$  with  $\chi = \Gamma \setminus \{\mathbf{c}\}$  and corresponding conditions  $c = ((0, 0), (0, 0))$  that is only matched by traces where in between of the relevant  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $\mathbf{b}$  occurs exactly one letter that is not  $\mathbf{c}$ . Unfortunately, it is not possible to express negation in general, so we cannot express the following:  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $\mathbf{b}$  have one or two letters in between, none is  $\mathbf{c}$ .

### 2.3 About containment

This section is dedicated to a characterisation of containment, a classical property considered in database theory.

An swgg-query  $q$  is called an  $(\ell, w, C)$ -swgg-query (over  $\mathbf{Vars}$  and  $\Gamma$ ) if  $q = (s, w, C)$  with  $|s| = \ell$ ,  $(\ell, w, c)$ -dswg-queries are analogously defined. The parameter  $\ell$  will be called *string length*. If the maximal size of typesets occurring in an  $(\ell, w, c)$ -dswg-query  $q$  is bounded by a number  $k \geq 1$ , we call  $q$  an  $(\ell, w, c, k)$ -dswg-query (for swgg-queries  $k$  always equals 1).

Given an swgg-query or dswg-query  $q$  we omit the prefix and call  $q$  a *query*, if  $q$  may be both, or it is clear from the context whether  $q$  is an swgg-query or dswg-query. We use  $(\ell, w, \tilde{c})$ -query (or  $(\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k)$ -query) as notation for queries which might be swgg-query or dswg-query and assume that the gap-size constraints  $\tilde{c}$  are compatible with  $\ell$  and  $w$  or satisfy Lemma 3, respectively.

We write  $\text{types}(q)$  (or  $\text{types}(s)$ ),  $\text{typesets}(q)$  (or  $\text{typesets}(s)$ ) and  $\text{vars}(q)$  (or  $\text{vars}(s)$ ) for the set of types, the set of all typesets and the set of variables, respectively, that occur in  $q$ 's query string  $s$ . I.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{types}(q) &:= \{\gamma \in \Gamma \mid \text{there ex. } i \in [|s|] : \gamma \in s[i]\} \\ \text{typesets}(q) &:= \{\chi \subseteq \Gamma \mid \text{there ex. } i \in [|s|] : s[i] = \chi\} \\ \text{vars}(q) &:= \{x \in \mathbf{Vars} \mid \text{there ex. } i \in [|s|] : s[i] = x\} \end{aligned}$$

For the reason of readability we omit braces in query strings if the set consists only of an unique element. Therefore, we write for example  $s = x_1 \mathbf{a} \mathbf{b} x_2 \mathbf{a} \{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c}\} \mathbf{b}$  instead of  $s = x_1 \{\mathbf{a}\} \{\mathbf{b}\} x_2 \{\mathbf{a}\} \{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c}\} \{\mathbf{b}\}$ . Vice versa, we can consider a query string  $s$  over  $\mathbf{Vars} \cup \Gamma$  as a string over  $\mathbf{Vars} \cup \mathcal{P}_1(\Gamma)$  where every  $s[i]$  is a singleton.

A query  $q$  is said to be *contained* in a query  $q'$  w.r.t. to a set  $\Delta \subseteq \Gamma$  (we write  $q \subseteq_{\Delta} q'$ ) if  $\text{Mod}_{\Delta}(q) \subseteq \text{Mod}_{\Delta}(q')$ .

**Definition 6.** A homomorphism from  $q'$  to  $q$  is a substitution  $h$  such that  $h(s') = s$  and the following property holds:

For every  $z \in \mathbf{Vars}$  that occurs at least twice in the query string  $s'$  of  $q'$  and is mapped to a subset of  $\Gamma$  via  $h$ , we have  $h(z)$  is a singleton.

We write  $q' \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q$  to express that there exists a homomorphism from  $q'$  to  $q$ .

This additional property of homomorphisms feels arbitrary or artificial, but it is perfectly tailored to our discovery algorithm and if the considered class of queries in Definition 6 is the class of all  $(\ell, w, C)$ -swgg-query, then in any way, we have  $s[i]$  is a singleton for all  $i \in [\ell]$ . Now, the following theorem gives a characterisation of containment.

**Theorem 7.** *Given some sufficiently large  $\Gamma$ . Let  $q$  and  $q'$  be  $(s, w, \tilde{c})$ -queries over  $\mathbf{Vars}$  and  $\Gamma$ . If  $q$  and  $q'$  are satisfiable, it holds, that:*

$$q \subseteq_{\Gamma} q' \iff q' \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q.$$

Sufficiently large, in the context of Theorem 7 means,  $|\Gamma| \geq 2$  for the case of dswg-queries. In the case of swgg-queries the size of  $\Gamma$  depends on gap-size constraints with range greater than 1. Intuitively, the necessary size of  $\Gamma$  depicts how much structure information of  $q'$  can be hidden in the gaps of  $q$ . For further information and an example consider the theorems proof from page 12 onwards.

## 2.4 Correlation to swgg-queries

Note that an swgg-query query  $q = (s, w, C)$  with  $C = \{c_1, \dots, c_{\ell-1}\}$  and  $r_i = 1$  for all  $i \in [\ell-1]$  precisely corresponds to the notion of swg-queries introduced in [11]. Let  $q$  be an  $(\ell, w, c, k)$ -query containing typesets over  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$ . If  $k = 1$  this corresponds to the syntax and semantics of swg-queries as well.

In [12] a mapping between one-dimensional and multi-dimensional sequence data was introduced, such that a multi-dimensional trace matches a multi-dimensional query if and only if the corresponding one-dimensional trace matches the corresponding one-dimensional query. This mapping can be adapted to swgg-queries and dswg-queries.

## 3 Discovery

The question of how meaningful swgg-queries and dswg-queries can be discovered from a given set of traces is of peculiar interest and was answered algorithmically in [11] for swg-queries. We adapt these results to swgg-queries and dswg-queries.

A *sample* is a finite, non-empty set  $\mathcal{S}$  of traces over  $\Gamma$ . Given a sample  $\mathcal{S}$ , let  $\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}}$  be the set of all types occurring in  $\mathcal{S}$ , i.e.  $\bigcup_{t \in \mathcal{S}} \text{types}(t)$ . The *support*  $\text{supp}(q, \mathcal{S})$  of a query  $q$  in  $\mathcal{S}$  is defined as the fraction of traces in the sample that match  $q$ , i.e.  $\text{supp}(q, \mathcal{S}) := \frac{|\{t \in \mathcal{S} : t=q\}|}{|\mathcal{S}|}$ . A *support threshold* is a rational number  $\text{sp}$  with  $0 < \text{sp} \leq 1$ . A query  $q$  is said to *cover* a sample  $\mathcal{S}$  with *support*  $\text{sp}$  if  $\text{supp}(q, \mathcal{S}) \geq \text{sp}$ . Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a sample,  $\text{sp}$  be a support threshold and  $k \in [|\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}}| - 1]$ . An  $(\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k)$ -query  $q$  is called *descriptive for  $\mathcal{S}$  w.r.t.  $(\text{sp}, (\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k))$*  if  $\text{supp}(q, \mathcal{S}) \geq \text{sp}$ , and there is no other  $(\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k)$ -query  $q'$  with  $\text{supp}(q', \mathcal{S}) \geq \text{sp}$  and  $q' \subset_{\Gamma} q$ . A type  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  (or a typeset  $\chi \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$ ) *satisfies  $\text{sp}$  w.r.t. to  $\mathcal{S}$* , if the fraction of traces containing  $\gamma$  (or some  $\gamma \in \chi$ ) is greater than or equal to  $\text{sp}$ . The set of all types (or typesets) that satisfy  $\text{sp}$  w.r.t. to  $\mathcal{S}$  is

$$\Delta(\mathcal{S}, \text{sp}) := \{\chi \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma) : \frac{|\{t \in \mathcal{S} : \text{ex. } \gamma \in \chi \text{ s.t. } \gamma \in \text{types}(t)\}|}{|\mathcal{S}|} \geq \text{sp}\}.$$

We omit  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\text{sp}$ , if they are clear from the context. For  $i \in [|\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}}| - 1]$  we write  $\Delta_i$  to denote the subset of  $\Delta$  which contains only typesets of size  $i$ . For a descriptive  $(\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k)$ -query  $q$ ,  $\text{typesets}(q) \subseteq \Delta_1 \dot{\cup} \dots \dot{\cup} \Delta_k$  holds. This corresponds to  $\Delta = \Delta_1 = \{\gamma \in \Gamma : \frac{|\{t \in \mathcal{S} : \gamma \in \text{types}(t)\}|}{|\mathcal{S}|} \geq \text{sp}\}$  if the considered query is an swgg-query.

Given an  $(\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k)$ -query  $q = (s, w, \tilde{c})$  and a symbol  $z$  from  $\text{Vars} \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$  we let  $\text{pos}(q, z) = \text{pos}(s, z) = \{i \in [\ell] : s[i] = z\}$  be set of all positions  $i$  in  $s$  that carry  $z$ . Given a set of positions  $P \subseteq [\ell]$ , and a symbol  $z \in \text{Vars} \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$  we write  $s\langle P \mapsto z \rangle$  to denote the query string  $s'$  which is obtained from  $s$  by setting  $s[i]$  to  $z$ , for all  $i \in P$ . Let  $x \in \text{Vars}$ . We write  $s\langle x \mapsto z \rangle$  as an abbreviation for  $s\langle \text{pos}(q, x) \mapsto z \rangle$ . Next, we present the algorithmical idea for query discovery:

**Compute Descriptive Query Problem (CompDescQuery):** On input of a sample  $\mathcal{S}$  over  $\Gamma$ , a support threshold  $\text{sp}$ , a string length  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , a global window size  $w \geq \ell$ , a tuple  $\tilde{c}$  of gap-size constraints, and  $k \in [|\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}}| - 1]$ , the task is to compute an  $(\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k)$ -query  $q$  that is descriptive for  $\mathcal{S}$  w.r.t.  $(\text{sp}, (\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k))$ .

Pseudocode of an algorithm solving **CompDescQuery** is provided in Algorithm 1. Given  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $\text{sp}$  and query parameters  $(\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k)$  as input, the algorithm first builds the *most general query*  $q = q_{mg}$  for  $(\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k)$ . Its query string consists of  $\ell$  distinct variables, i.e.  $s_{mg} = x_1 \dots x_\ell$ , and  $q_{mg}$  is most general in the sense that  $q' \subseteq_{\Gamma} q_{mg}$  for each  $(\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k)$ -query  $q'$ . If  $\text{supp}(q, \mathcal{S}) < \text{sp}$

---

**ALGORITHM 1:** DescrQuery( $\mathcal{S}, \text{sp}, (\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k)$ )

---

```

Input   : sample  $\mathcal{S}$ ; support threshold  $\text{sp}$  with  $0 < \text{sp} \leq 1$ ;  $(\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k)$ 
Returns: descriptive query  $q$  for  $\mathcal{S}$  w.r.t.  $(\text{sp}, (\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k))$  or error message  $\perp$ 
1  $s := s_{mg}; q := (s_{mg}, w, \tilde{c})$  // query string and query
2 if  $\text{supp}(q, \mathcal{S}) < \text{sp}$  then stop and return  $\perp$ 
3  $\Delta := \Delta_1 \dot{\cup} \dots \dot{\cup} \Delta_k$  // typesets to be considered
4  $U := \text{vars}(q); V := \emptyset$  // unvisited and available variables
5 while  $U \neq \emptyset$  do
6   select an arbitrary  $x \in U$  and let  $U := U \setminus \{x\}$  and  $\Delta_1 := \Delta_1 \cup V$ 
7   for  $i = 1$  to  $k$  do
8     replace := False
9     while  $\Delta_i \neq \emptyset$  do
10      select an arbitrary  $y \in \Delta_i$  and let  $\Delta_i := \Delta_i \setminus \{y\}$ 
11       $q' := (s\langle x \mapsto y \rangle, w, \tilde{c})$ 
12      if  $\text{supp}(q', \mathcal{S}) \geq \text{sp}$  then
13         $s := s\langle x \mapsto y \rangle; \text{replace} := \text{True}$  // ReplaceOp
14        break for loop
15      if  $\text{replace is False}$  then  $V := V \cup \{x\}$  // NoChangeOp
16 stop and return  $q := (s, w, \tilde{c})$ 

```

---

the algorithm stops and returns  $\perp$  (line 2), because no other query  $q'$  with  $q' \subseteq_{\Gamma} q = q_{mg}$  can describe  $\mathcal{S}$  with sufficient support.

Otherwise, the algorithm searches for an admissible *replacement operation* for each variable  $x \in U := \text{vars}(s) = \{x_1, \dots, x_\ell\}$  during the main loop (Line 5). A replacement operation replaces  $x$  by an element  $y \in \Delta_i$  (during the  $i$ -th iteration of the for-loop) which may be a typeset or an *available* variable  $y \in V$  (if  $i=1$ ). The replacement operation is stored in  $q$  and called *admissible* if the resulting query satisfies the support threshold (lines 11–13). If  $\text{supp}(\langle \text{pos}(q, x) \mapsto y \rangle, \mathcal{S}) < \text{sp}$  for all  $y \in \Delta_i$  and all  $i \in [k]$  the query string remains unchanged and  $x$  gets available (line 15). After each variable in  $\text{vars}(s_{mg})$  has been considered, the algorithm terminates and produces the current query as output (line 16).

Next we depict an exemplaric run of Algorithm 1. We refer to the appendix for a brief discussion, why  $\Delta$  is passed through incrementally in Line 7.

**Example 8.** Let  $\Gamma = \{a, b, c\}$  and  $x_1, x_2, x_3 \in \text{Vars}$ . Consider the sample  $\mathcal{S} = \{a b b, a c c\}$ ,  $\text{sp} = 1.0$ ,  $\ell = w = 3$ ,  $c = ((0, 0), (0, 0))$  and  $k = 2$ .

On input  $(\mathcal{S}, \text{sp}, (\ell, w, c, k))$  the algorithm first generates  $q = (x_1 x_2 x_3, w, c)$ . Since  $q$  satisfies the support threshold the algorithm proceeds by computing  $\Delta = \{\{a\}\} \dot{\cup} \{\{a, b\}, \{a, c\}, \{b, c\}\}$ .

Assume the algorithm selects  $x := x_3$  during the first iteration of the main loop. It turns out that  $\Delta_1 = \{\{a\}\}$  does not contain a typeset for an admissible replacement of  $x_3$ . Hence, the algorithm considers  $\Delta_2$  during the second transition of the for-loop in Line 7. The only admissible replacement is  $s(x_3 \mapsto \{b, c\})$ , and  $s$  is replaced by  $x_1x_2\{b, c\}$  ( $V$  remains empty).

Let us assume that during the second transition through the main loop the algorithm selects  $x := x_1$  and  $y := \{a\} \in \Delta_1$ . The replacement of  $x_1$  by  $\{a\}$  is admissible (as it has support 1 on  $\mathcal{S}$ ). Therefore,  $s$  is replaced by  $\{a\}x_2\{b, c\}$  and  $V$  remains unchanged again.

In its last iteration (during the second transition through the for-loop),  $s(x_2 \mapsto \{b, c\})$  is the only admissible replacement operation. The run terminates after this iteration and outputs the query  $q = (s, w, c)$  with  $s = \{a\}\{b, c\}\{b, c\}$ .




Figure 1: Let  $\Gamma = \{a, b, c, d\}$ ,  $\mathcal{S} = \{cabbacac b, cbbbacc b, ccbbcccb\}$ ,  $\text{sp} = 1.0$  and  $k = 2$ . Depicted is a top-down walk through  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$  for  $\mathcal{S}$ , starting with typesets of size  $k = 2$ . The typesets marked in blue represent  $\Delta$ .

Note that algorithm 1 computes an swgg-query if  $k = 1$  and generalised gap-size constraints are given. Furthermore, during each iteration of the main loop, the for-loop is transisted only once. It remains to discuss how  $\Delta$  can be calculated in case that  $k > 1$ . Starting with all subsets  $\chi$  of  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$  with  $|\chi| = k$  it suffices to explore  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$  in a top-down manner: we walk through the search space level-wise and check whether the current typesets satisfy  $\text{sp}$  w.r.t.  $\mathcal{S}$ . If this is not the case for a typeset  $\chi$ , all typesets  $\chi' \subset \chi$  can be deleted from the search space, since they do not satisfy  $\text{sp}$ . An example is depicted in Figure 1.

**Theorem 9.** *Given some sufficiently large  $\Gamma$ . Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a sample, let  $\text{sp}$  be a support threshold with  $0 < \text{sp} \leq 1$ , let  $(\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k)$  be query parameters with  $k = 1$  if  $\tilde{c} = C$ .*

- (a) *If there does not exist any  $(\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k)$ -swgg- or dswg-query that is descriptive for  $\mathcal{S}$  w.r.t.  $(\text{sp}, (\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k))$  then there is only one run of Algorithm 1 upon the defined input, and it stops in line 2 with output  $\perp$ .*
- (b) *Otherwise, every run of Algorithm 1 upon input  $(\mathcal{S}, \text{sp}, (\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k))$  terminates and outputs an swgg-query or dswg-query  $q$  (depending on  $k$ ), with  $|\chi| \leq k$  for all  $\chi \in \text{typesets}(q)$ , that is descriptive for  $\mathcal{S}$  w.r.t.  $(\text{sp}, (\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k))$ .*

We refer to the appendix for the full proof. Analysing the complexity of the algorithm, identifies two bottle necks. First the  $\Delta$ -calculation in the case of dswg-queries. This can be handled by adjusting the parameter  $k$ , i.e. by bounding the size of the disjunctive clauses in the query string. The second is already known from [11] and is caused by the recurring calls of a *matching* subroutine. The referred results imply NP-hardness for our algorithm as we can use it as well for swg-queries from [11]. Membership can be obtained by guessing a witness.

## 4 Conclusion and Future Work

We model sequence data as traces and discover descriptive queries over traces to find a characteristic template for situations of interests. Since an increased expressive power of the underlying



query language leads to a more detailed picture of sois, we extended swg-queries, introduced in [11], in two different ways. First, by generalising the gap size constraints (Section 2.1) and second, by adding the possibility of disjunctions (Section 2.2). We adopted and extended the discovery algorithm to our approach and ensured that the essential complexity properties are preserved (Section 3). Note that the extended approach can be applied to the multi-dimensional setting, analogously to [12].

For future work we will merge both extensions to one query language. We are interested in a more general notion of disjunction and negation, and a more generous possibility to describe gaps. For the latter [6] is a good yardstick. An in-depth (parameterised) complexity analysis is intended as well. Since the crucial point is the inherent complexity of the matching problem, we are working on data structures to improve the computation in practical application. In the long run we will investigate containment for relaxed query parameters  $(\ell, w, c, k)$ .

## Acknowledgments

We thank Markus L. Schmid for useful discussions. Sarah Kleest-Meißner was supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG), CRC 1404: “FONDA: Foundation of Workflows for Large-Scale Scientific Data Analysis”.

## References

- [1] Dana Angluin. Inductive inference of formal languages from positive data. *Inf. Control.*, 45(2):117–135, 1980.
- [2] Alexander Artikis, Chris Baber, Pedro Bizarro, Carlos Canudas-de-Wit, Opher Etzion, Fabiana Fournier, Paul Goulart, Andrew Howes, John Lygeros, Georgios Paliouras, Assaf Schuster, and Izchak Sharfman. Scalable proactive event-driven decision making. *IEEE Technol. Soc. Mag.*, 33(3):35–41, 2014.
- [3] Alexander Artikis, Matthias Weidlich, François Schnitzler, Ioannis Boutsis, Thomas Liebig, Nico Piatkowski, Christian Bockermann, Katharina Morik, Vana Kalogeraki, Jakub Marecek, Avigdor Gal, Shie Mannor, Dimitrios Gunopulos, and Dermot Kinane. Heterogeneous stream processing and crowdsourcing for urban traffic management. In Sihem Amer-Yahia, Vassilis Christophides, Anastasios Kementsietsidis, Minos N. Garofalakis, Stratos Idreos, and Vincent Leroy, editors, *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Extending Database Technology, EDBT 2014, Athens, Greece, March 24-28, 2014*, pages 712–723. OpenProceedings.org, 2014.
- [4] Brian Babcock, Shivnath Babu, Mayur Datar, Rajeev Motwani, and Jennifer Widom. Models and issues in data stream systems. In Lucian Popa, Serge Abiteboul, and Phokion G. Kolaitis, editors, *Proceedings of the Twenty-first ACM SIGACT-SIGMOD-SIGART Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, June 3-5, Madison, Wisconsin, USA*, pages 1–16. ACM, 2002.
- [5] Joel D. Day, Pamela Fleischmann, Maria Kosche, Tore Koß, Florin Manea, and Stefan Siemer. The edit distance to k-subsequence universality. In Markus Bläser and Benjamin Monmege, editors, *38th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, STACS 2021, March 16-19, 2021, Saarbrücken, Germany (Virtual Conference)*, volume 187 of *LIPICs*, pages 25:1–25:19. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021.

- [6] Joel D. Day, Maria Kosche, Florin Manea, and Markus L. Schmid. Subsequences with gap constraints: Complexity bounds for matching and analysis problems. *CoRR*, abs/2206.13896, 2022.
- [7] Dominik D. Freydenberger and Daniel Reidenbach. Existence and nonexistence of descriptive patterns. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 411(34-36):3274–3286, 2010.
- [8] Dominik D. Freydenberger and Daniel Reidenbach. Inferring descriptive generalisations of formal languages. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 79(5):622–639, 2013.
- [9] Pawel Gawrychowski, Maria Kosche, Tore Koß, Florin Manea, and Stefan Siemer. Efficiently testing simon’s congruence. In Markus Bläser and Benjamin Monmege, editors, *38th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, STACS 2021, March 16-19, 2021, Saarbrücken, Germany (Virtual Conference)*, volume 187 of *LIPICs*, pages 34:1–34:18. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021.
- [10] Nikos Giatrakos, Elias Alevizos, Alexander Artikis, Antonios Deligiannakis, and Minos N. Garofalakis. Complex event recognition in the big data era: a survey. *VLDB J.*, 29(1):313–352, 2020.
- [11] Sarah Kleest-Meißner, Rebecca Sattler, Markus L. Schmid, Nicole Schweikardt, and Matthias Weidlich. Discovering event queries from traces: Laying foundations for subsequence-queries with wildcards and gap-size constraints. In *25th International Conference on Database Theory, ICDT 2022*, volume 220 of *LIPICs*, pages 18:1–18:21, 2022.
- [12] Sarah Kleest-Meißner, Rebecca Sattler, Markus L. Schmid, Nicole Schweikardt, and Matthias Weidlich. Discovering multi-dimensional subsequence queries from traces - from theory to practice. In Birgitta König-Ries, Stefanie Scherzinger, Wolfgang Lehner, and Gottfried Vossen, editors, *Datenbanksysteme für Business, Technologie und Web (BTW 2023), 20. Fachtagung des GI-Fachbereichs „Datenbanken und Informationssysteme“ (DBIS), 06.-10. März 2023, Dresden, Germany, Proceedings*, volume P-331 of *LNI*, pages 511–533. Gesellschaft für Informatik e.V., 2023.
- [13] Maria Kosche, Tore Koß, Florin Manea, and Viktoriya Pak. Subsequences in bounded ranges: Matching and analysis problems. *CoRR*, abs/2207.09201, 2022.
- [14] Maria Kosche, Tore Koß, Florin Manea, and Stefan Siemer. Combinatorial algorithms for subsequence matching: A survey, 2022.
- [15] Florin Manea and Markus L. Schmid. Matching patterns with variables. In Robert Mercas and Daniel Reidenbach, editors, *Combinatorics on Words - 12th International Conference, WORDS 2019, Loughborough, UK, September 9-13, 2019, Proceedings*, volume 11682 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1–27. Springer, 2019.
- [16] Grzegorz Rozenberg and Arto Salomaa, editors. *Handbook of Formal Languages, Volume 1: Word, Language, Grammar*. Springer, 1997.
- [17] Takeshi Shinohara. Polynomial time inference of pattern languages and its application. In *Proceedings of the 7th IBM Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science, MFCS*, pages 191–209, 1982.
- [18] Takeshi Shinohara and Setsuo Arikawa. Pattern inference. In *Algorithmic Learning for Knowledge-Based Systems, GOSLER Final Report*, pages 259–291, 1995.

- [19] Kia Teymourian, Malte Rohde, and Adrian Paschke. Knowledge-based processing of complex stock market events. In *15th International Conference on Extending Database Technology, EDBT '12, Berlin, Germany, March 27-30, 2012, Proceedings*, pages 594–597. ACM, 2012.
- [20] Abhishek Verma, Luis Pedrosa, Madhukar Korupolu, David Oppenheimer, Eric Tune, and John Wilkes. Large-scale cluster management at google with borg. In Laurent Réveillère, Tim Harris, and Maurice Herlihy, editors, *Proceedings of the Tenth European Conference on Computer Systems, EuroSys 2015, Bordeaux, France, April 21-24, 2015*, pages 18:1–18:17. ACM, 2015.

## APPENDIX

This appendix contains technical details and further information which were omitted in the main part of the paper.

- Appendix A considers satisfiability of swgg-queries and contains a proof of Lemma 3.
- Appendix B provides a proof of Theorem 7 including a detailed example discussing the required size of  $\Gamma$ .
- In Appendix C the definitions of (partial) isomorphisms are given, which are crucial the proof provided in Appendix D.
- Appendix D provides detailed information on Example 8, i.e. a particular run of Algorithm 1, and a proof of Theorem 9, stating that the discovery algorithm is correct.

### A Regarding Satisfiability of swgg-queries

Let  $q = (s, w, C)$  be an swgg-query over  $\Gamma$  and  $\Delta \subseteq \Gamma$ . We define  $\text{Min}_\Delta(q)$  to be the set of all traces of minimal length matching  $q$ , i.e.  $\text{Min}_\Delta(q) := \{t \in \Delta^+ : t \models q \text{ and there exists no } t' \in \Delta^+ \text{ with } t' \models q \text{ and } |t'| < |t|\}$ . Given a trace  $t \in \text{Min}_\Gamma(q)$ , let  $g_i \in \Gamma^*$  be the *gap string* of minimal length (according to  $C$ ) between  $s[i]$  and  $s[i+1]$ , for all  $i \in [\ell-1]$ . We observe that  $w$  and  $C$  can only be compatible if  $|s| + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell-1} |g_i| \leq w$ .

Given two sequences  $C'$  and  $C''$  from  $C$  such that the generalised gap-size constraints within  $C'$  and  $C''$  are non-overlapping. Intuitively speaking,  $C'$  and  $C''$  can only be compatible if the induced gap strings (of minimal length) of  $C'$  do not contradict the upper bounds on gap strings induced by  $C''$ . These observations can be formalised as follows and ensure the satisfiability of swgg-queries.

**Lemma 3. (restated)** *An swgg-query  $q = (s, w, C)$  (over  $\text{Vars}$  and  $\Gamma$ ) is satisfiable, i.e.  $\text{Mod}_\Gamma(q) \neq \emptyset$ , iff there are no two sequences*

$$C' = \left( (c_1^-, c_1^+, r_1')_{j_1'}, (c_2^-, c_2^+, r_2')_{j_2'}, \dots, (c_{|C'|}^-, c_{|C'|}^+, r_{|C'|}')_{j_{|C'|}' } \right)$$

and

$$C'' = \left( (c_1''^-, c_1''^+, r_1'')_{j_1''}, (c_2''^-, c_2''^+, r_2'')_{j_2''}, \dots, (c_{|C''|}''^-, c_{|C''|}''^+, r_{|C''|}'' )_{j_{|C''|}'' } \right)$$

from  $C \cup \{(0, \infty, 1)_1, \dots, (0, \infty, 1)_{|s|-1}\}$  where  $j_1' = j_1''$ ,  $j_{|C'|}'+r_{|C'|}' = j_{|C''|}''+r_{|C''|}''$ , and  $j_{i+1}' = j_i'+r_i'$  and  $j_{i+1}'' = j_i''+r_i''$  for all  $i \in [|C'| - 1]$ , with

$$(i) \quad |s| + \sum_{i=1}^{|C'|} c_i^{t-} - r_i' + 1 > w \quad , \quad \text{or}$$

$$(ii) \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{C}'|} c_i^- - r_i' + 1 > \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{C}''|} c_i''^+ - r_i'' + 1$$

*Proof (Sketch).* First, it is easy to verify, that an swgg-query  $q = (s, w, C)$  with

$$C \subseteq \{(0, \infty, 1)_1, \dots, (0, \infty, 1)_{|s|-1}\}$$

has a model by assigning every variable of  $s$  to some arbitrary element of  $\Gamma$ .

We observe that  $\mathcal{C}'$  and  $\mathcal{C}''$  are non-overlapping and connected sequences of conditions, that means, taking a component  $(c^-, c^+, r)_j$  of such a sequence, it speaks about the gaps between position  $j$  and  $r + j$  of the query string and the following condition connects seamlessly. So the sequence speaks about an entire (part) of the query string. Note, that every sequence can be enriched by conditions of form  $(0, \infty, 1)$  to an non-overlapping and connected sequence speaking about the entire query string.

Next, for such a sequence  $C$  the sum  $\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{C}|} c_i^- - r_i + 1$  is the sum of all minimal gaps and  $\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{C}|} c_i^+ - r_i + 1$  is the sum of all maximal gaps fulfilled by all models of the (part of the) query string.

Hence, obviously, the first inequality states that the minimal size of a model is larger than the global size  $w$ . And for the second inequality, we have that for (part of) the query string the total number of gap filling letters in the model has to be bigger in the minimum than in the required maximum. Therefore, both subsets of the condition set of the query contradict each other.

Finally, we have, if there are two non-overlapping and connected sequences of conditions  $\mathcal{C}'$  and  $\mathcal{C}''$ , such that  $\mathcal{C}'$  fulfills the first inequality or both fulfill the second inequality, than the model set of  $q$  is empty, i.e.  $\text{Mod}_\Gamma(q) = \emptyset$ .  $\square$

## B About Homomorphisms

**Theorem 7. (restated)** *Given some sufficiently large  $\Gamma$ . Let  $q$  and  $q'$  be  $(s, w, \tilde{c})$ -queries over  $\text{Vars}$  and  $\Gamma$ . If  $q$  and  $q'$  are satisfiable, it holds, that:*

$$q \subseteq_\Gamma q' \iff q' \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q.$$

*Proof.* The Theorem 7 is an immediate consequence of Proposition 10 for dswg-queries and of Proposition 11 in the case of swgg-queries. (Recall that dswg-queries are satisfiable in any way.)  $\square$

**Proposition 10.** *Let  $q$  and  $q'$  be  $(\ell, w, c)$ -dswg-queries over  $\text{Vars}$  and  $\Gamma$ .*

1. *If  $q' \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q$  then  $q \subseteq_\Gamma q'$ .*
2. *Let  $\Delta \subseteq \Gamma$  be such that  $|\Delta| \geq 2$  and  $\Delta \supseteq \text{types}(q)$ . If  $q \subseteq_\Delta q'$  then  $q' \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q$ .*

*Proof.* For the proof let  $s$  and  $s'$  be the query strings of  $q$  and  $q'$ , respectively.

(1): Let  $h$  be a homomorphism from  $q'$  to  $q$ . It is to show that  $q \subseteq_\Gamma q'$ . Let  $t$  be arbitrary choosen from  $\text{Mod}_\Gamma(q)$ . Our aim is to show that  $t \in \text{Mod}_\Gamma(q')$ . Therefore, we consider a witness  $(\mu, e)$  for  $t \models q$ . Recall,  $e$  is an embedding  $e : [\ell] \rightarrow [|t|]$  and  $\mu$  is a substitution of size  $\ell$ , such that:

- 1.) For every position  $i \in [\ell]$  where  $s[i] \in \text{typesets}(q)$ , we have  $t[e(i)] \in s[i]$ .<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Recall, we switch between elements of  $\Gamma$  and singleton subsets of  $\Gamma$  in the context of letters in a string.

- 2.) For every fixed variable  $z \in \text{vars}(q)$  and all positions  $i_1, \dots, i_k \in [\ell]$ , with  $z = s[i_1] = \dots = s[i_k]$ , we have  $\mu(i_1, s[i_1]) = \dots = \mu(i_k, s[i_k]) = \mu(z) = t[e(i_1)] = \dots = t[e(i_k)]$ .

Let  $\mu'$  be defined via  $\mu'(z) = \mu(h(z))$ . We claim that  $(\mu', e)$  is a witness for  $t \models q'$ , i.e.,  $\mu'(s') \preceq_e t$ . We already know that  $(\mu, e)$  is a witness for  $t \models q$ . Hence,  $e$  satisfies the global window size  $w$  and the local gap-size constraints  $c$ , and for all  $i \leq \ell$  we have  $\mu(s[i]) = t[e(i)]$ . Consider an arbitrary  $i \in [\ell]$ . We need to show that  $\mu'(s'[i]) = t[e(i)]$ . By our choice of  $\mu'$  we have  $\mu'(s'[i]) = \mu(h(i, s'[i]))$ . Since  $h$  is a homomorphism, we have

- 1.) for every variable  $z'$  on position  $i$  of  $s'$  that is mapped via  $h$  to a variable  $z$  in  $s$ , that:

$$\mu'(z') = \mu'(s'[i]) = \mu(h(z')) = \mu(z) = t[e(i)]$$

- 2.) for every variable  $z'$  that only occurs at one position  $i$  in  $s'$  and that is mapped via  $h$  to a (non-empty) subset  $\chi \subseteq_{\text{fin}} \Gamma$ , that:

$$\mu'(z') = \mu'(s'[i]) = \mu(i, h(z')) = \mu(i, \chi) = t[e(i)]$$

- 3.) for every variable  $z'$  that occurs at least twice at positions  $i_1, \dots, i_k \in [\ell]$  in  $s'$  and that therefore is mapped via  $h$  to an element  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ , that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu'(z') &= \mu'(s'[i_1]) = \dots = \mu'(s'[i_k]) \\ &= \mu(i_1, h(z')) = \dots = \mu(i_k, h(z')) \\ &= \mu(\gamma) = \gamma = t[e(i_1)] = \dots = t[e(i_k)] \end{aligned}$$

and, finally

- 4.) for every (non-empty)  $\chi' \subseteq_{\text{fin}} \Gamma$  at position  $i$  in  $s'$  that is mapped via  $h$  to an (non-empty)  $\chi \subseteq \chi'$ , that:

$$\mu'(i, \chi') = \mu'(s'[i]) = \mu(i, h(\chi')) = \mu(i, \chi) = t[e(i)] \in \chi \subseteq \chi'$$

and therefore  $t[e(i)] \in \chi'$ .

In the end, it proves that  $(\mu', e)$  is a witness for  $t \in \text{Mod}_\Gamma(q')$ .

(2): Let  $\Delta \subseteq \Gamma$  with  $|\Delta| \geq 2$  and  $\Delta \supseteq \text{types}(q)$ , and let  $q \subseteq_\Delta q'$ . Our aim is to show that  $q' \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q$ . We claim that  $h(i, s'[i]) = s[i]$  is an homomorphism from  $q'$  to  $q$ .

We fix an arbitrary  $\gamma_0 \in \Delta$ . For every  $i < \ell$  let  $g_i$  be the ‘‘gap string’’ consisting of  $c_i^-$  copies of the symbol  $\gamma_0$ . Let

$$\tilde{s} := s[1] g_1 s[2] g_2 \cdots s[\ell-1] g_{\ell-1} s[\ell].$$

For each substitution  $\mu : ([\ell] \times \text{Vars} \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Delta)) \rightarrow \Gamma$  of size  $\ell$  (recall, there are only singletons in the co-domain of  $\mu$  and every type of  $\mu(s)$  is the unique element of its singleton) consider the trace  $t_\mu := \mu(\tilde{s})$ . Obviously, we have  $t_\mu \models q$ , as this is witnessed by  $(\mu, e)$  where  $e(1) = 1$ ,  $e(2) = 2 + c_1^-$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $e(j) = j + \sum_{i < j} c_i^-$  for all  $j \in [\ell]$  (note, by assumption, we have  $\Delta \supseteq \text{types}(q)$ ).

Furthermore, we have  $q \subseteq_\Delta q'$ , that implies  $t_\mu \models q'$ . Let  $(\zeta_\mu, e_\mu)$  be a witness for  $t_\mu \models q'$ . Since  $t_\mu$  has length exactly  $\ell + \sum_{i < \ell} c_i^-$ , there exists only one embedding that satisfies the local gap-size constraints  $c$ , namely the embedding  $e$ . I.e.,  $e_\mu = e$ . Furthermore, since  $(\zeta_\mu, e)$  is a witness for  $t_\mu \models q'$ , we know that  $\zeta_\mu(s'[i]) = t_\mu[e(i)]$  for all  $i \leq \ell$ . And by our choice of  $t_\mu$  and  $e$  we have  $t_\mu[e(i)] = \mu(s[i])$  for all  $i \leq \ell$ . I.e.,

$$\zeta_\mu(s'[i]) = \mu(s[i]) \tag{1}$$

for all  $i \leq \ell$  and all substitutions  $\mu : ([\ell] \times \text{Vars} \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Delta)) \rightarrow \Gamma$ .

Now consider an arbitrary  $i \in [\ell]$ .

Case 1:  $s'[i] = \chi \subseteq_{\text{fin}} \Gamma$ .

Then, by definition of  $h$  we have  $h(s'[i]) = h(i, \chi) = s[i]$ . We have to show that  $s[i] \subseteq s'[i]$ . For contradiction, assume that  $s[i] \not\subseteq s'[i]$ , hence there exists a type  $\gamma \in s[i] \setminus s'[i]$ .

Then, let  $\mu : ([\ell] \times \mathbf{Vars} \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Delta)) \rightarrow \Gamma$  be a substitution with  $\mu(s[i]) = \gamma$ . Then, by (1), we have  $\mu(s[i]) = \zeta_\mu(s'[i]) = \gamma$ . But due to the definition of substitution  $\zeta_\mu(s'[i]) \neq \gamma$ , since  $\gamma \notin \chi$ , contradicting our choice of  $\mu$  and  $q \subseteq_\Delta q'$ , respectively.

Case 2:  $s'[i] \in \text{vars}(q')$ . Let  $x := s'[i]$ . Again, by definition, we have  $h(s'[i]) = h(i, x) = s[i]$ . We are done, iff  $x$  occurs only once in  $s'$ .

Otherwise, let  $i_1, \dots, i_k$  be elements of  $[\ell]$ , such that  $s'[i] = s'[i_1] = \dots = s'[i_k] = x$ . We have to show that

- a)  $s[i] = s[i_1] = \dots = s[i_k]$ .
- b) if  $s[i] \subseteq_{\text{fin}} \Delta$  then  $s[i]$  is a singleton.

proof of a) For contradiction, assume that  $s[j] \neq s[j']$  for some  $j, j' \in \{i, i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ . Then, let  $\mu : ([\ell] \times \mathbf{Vars} \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Delta)) \rightarrow \Gamma$  be a substitution with  $\mu(s[j]) \neq \mu(s[j'])$  (such a substitution exists because  $|\Delta| \geq 2$  and  $\Delta \supseteq \text{types}(q)$ ). Then, by (1), we have  $\zeta_\mu(s'[j]) \neq \zeta_\mu(s'[j'])$ , contradicting our choice of  $\mu$  and  $q \subseteq_\Delta q'$ , respectively.

proof of b) We already know, that  $s[i] = s[i_1] = \dots = s[i_k]$ . For contradiction, we assume that there are  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \Gamma$  such that  $\gamma_1 \neq \gamma_2$  and  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \chi := s[i_1] = s[i_2]$ . Now again, let  $\mu : ([\ell] \times \mathbf{Vars} \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Delta)) \rightarrow \Gamma$  be a substitution with  $\gamma_1 = \mu(s[i_1]) \neq \mu(s[i_2]) = \gamma_2$ . It holds that  $t_\mu \models q$ , but for every  $t'$  with  $t' \models q'$  and its witness  $(\mu', e)$  we need  $\mu'(i_1, x) = \mu'(i_2, x)$ , so it contradicts  $q \subseteq_\Delta q'$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 11.** *Let  $q$  and  $q'$  be  $(\ell, w, C)$ -swgg-queries over  $\mathbf{Vars}$  and  $\Gamma$ . Let  $q$  and  $q'$  be satisfiable.*

1. If  $q' \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q$  then  $\text{types}(q') \subseteq \text{types}(q)$  and  $q \subseteq_\Gamma q'$
2. Let  $\Delta \subseteq \Gamma$  be such that  $|\Delta| \geq |t| - \ell + |\text{types}(q)| + 1$  for  $t \in \text{Min}_\Delta(q)$  and  $\Delta \supseteq \text{types}(q)$ . Then the following is true.

$$\text{If } q \subseteq_\Delta q' \text{ then } q' \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q.$$

Before we start to prove Proposition 11, let us consider the size of  $\Delta$  and thereby  $\Gamma$ . For every query  $q$  we defined

$$\text{Min}_\Delta(q) := \left\{ t \in \Delta^+ : \begin{array}{l} t \models q \text{ and} \\ \text{there exists no } t' \in \Delta^+ \text{ with } t' \models q \text{ and } |t'| < |t| \end{array} \right\}.$$

**Example 12.** *If  $|\Gamma|$  is big enough, then two query strings  $s$  and  $s'$  provide a good intuition, whether  $q \subseteq_\Gamma q'$  holds, or not. But if the size of  $\Gamma$  is small and the queries string size is small compared to the size of traces  $t \in \text{Min}_\Gamma(q)$  then containment may hold since the essence of  $q'$  can be hidden in the gaps of  $s$ , while there exists no homomorphism from  $q'$  to  $q$ .*

Let  $\Gamma = \{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}\}$ . Let  $q = (s, w, C)$  and  $q' = (s', w, C)$  for  $C = \{(5, 5, 3)_1\}$  be swgg-queries with  $s = \mathbf{a} \mathbf{b} \mathbf{c} \mathbf{a}$  and  $s' = \mathbf{a} \mathbf{x} \mathbf{x} \mathbf{a}$ . Caused by the condition  $(5, 5, 3)_1$ , we have  $|t| = 7$  for every  $t \in \text{Min}_\Gamma(q)$ . Hence, there exist  $i$  and  $j \in \{2, \dots, 6\}$ ,  $i \neq j$ , with  $t[i] = t[j]$ , since we only have three symbols in  $\Gamma$  to fill up the gap. Therefore, for every  $t \in \text{Mod}_\Gamma(q)$  it holds that  $t \in \text{Mod}_\Gamma(q')$ , but there exists no homomorphism  $h$  from  $q'$  to query. To avoid this repetition of types within the gap and to ensure that  $q \not\subseteq_\Delta q'$ , three (instead of one) additional types are needed, apart from  $\mathbf{b}$  and  $\mathbf{c}$ .

of Proposition 11. For the proof let  $s$  and  $s'$  be the query strings of  $q$  and  $q'$ , respectively.

(1): The proof of (1) is exactly the proof of Proposition 10(1) for the special case that the homomorphism maps directly to elements of  $\Gamma$ .

(2): Let  $q$  and  $q'$  be satisfiable and let  $\Delta \subseteq \Gamma$  be such that  $|\Delta| \geq |t| - \ell + |\text{types}(q)| + 1$  for  $t \in \text{Min}_\Delta(q)$  and  $\Delta \supseteq \text{types}(q)$ .

Our aim is to show that  $q' \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q$ . We claim that  $h(s'[i]) = s[i]$  is an homomorphism from  $q'$  to  $q$ .

We fix an arbitrary  $\gamma_0 \in \Delta$  that does not occur in  $s$ . Let  $\Delta_{\text{nTypes}} := \Delta \setminus \{\text{types}(q) \cup \{\gamma_0\}\}$  be the set of at least  $|t| - \ell$  new types. We call the set  $\Delta_{\text{base}} := \Delta \setminus \Delta_{\text{nTypes}}$  the set of base types. Next, let  $t_{\text{min}}$  be an arbitrary element from (the non-empty set)  $\text{Min}_\Delta(q)$ . We consider the following string from  $\Delta^+$  of length  $|t_{\text{min}}|$ :

$$\tilde{t} := s[1] g_1 s[2] g_2 \cdots s[\ell-1] g_{\ell-1} s[\ell]$$

where  $s$  is a subsequence of  $\tilde{t}$  with embedding  $e$  that satisfies the set of generalised gap-size constraints  $C$  and  $g_1, \dots, g_{\ell-1}$  are strings over  $\Delta_{\text{nTypes}}^+$  in a way, such that any symbol  $\gamma \in \Delta_{\text{nTypes}}^+$  occurs only once in  $g_1 \dots g_{\ell-1}$ . This is possible since for  $t \in \text{Min}_\Delta(q)$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta_{\text{nTypes}}^+| &= |\Delta| - (|\text{types}(q)| + 1) \\ &\geq |t| - \ell + |\text{types}(q)| + 1 - (|\text{types}(q)| + 1) \\ &= |t| - \ell = \sum_{i \in [\ell-1]} |g_i|. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we choose the positions of  $s[i]$  for all  $i \in \{2, \dots, \ell-1\}$  as left as possible with respect to the constraints  $C$ .

Now, we choose an arbitrary substitution  $\mu : \text{vars}(s) \cup \Delta_{\text{base}} \rightarrow \Delta_{\text{base}}$ . Note,  $\mu$  is a substitution since we have  $\text{types}(q) \subset \Delta_{\text{base}}$  and no letter of  $s$  is mapped to a new symbol in  $\Delta_{\text{nTypes}}$ .

Next, we consider the trace  $t_\mu := \mu(\tilde{t})$ . Then  $t_\mu \models q$  holds, as this is witnessed by  $(\mu, e)$ . By assumption, we have  $q \subseteq_\Gamma q'$ . Hence,  $t_\mu \models q'$ . Our choice of  $t$  ensures that there is a  $\zeta$  such that  $(\zeta, e)$  witnesses  $t_\mu \models q'$ .

Assume not. Let  $(\zeta', e')$  with  $e' \neq e$  be a witness of  $t_\mu \models q'$ . This implies that at least one  $s'[i]$  is mapped to a type  $\gamma \in \Delta_{\text{nTypes}}$  via  $\zeta'$ , since it must be mapped into a gap string and can not be mapped to  $\mu(s[i])$ . Since  $e$  satisfies the conditions  $C$ , this can be caused by two reasons:

- $s'[i] = \gamma$ . Then we obtain  $\tilde{t}'$  from  $\tilde{t}$  by replacing  $\gamma$  by any arbitrary  $\gamma' \neq \gamma \in \Delta$ . Again,  $\mu(\tilde{t}')$  contains no  $\gamma$  and  $\mu(\tilde{t}') \models q$ . That contradicts  $q \subseteq_\Delta q'$ , as every trace  $t$  with  $t \models q'$  must have a position  $j$  such that  $t[j] = \gamma$ .
- There exist an  $x \in \text{vars}(q')$  and some  $j \in [\ell]$ , such that  $s'[i] = s'[j] = x$ . First we remark that  $s'[j]$  can not be mapped to some type  $\gamma'$  from a gap string, cause all positions in gap strings of  $\tilde{t}$  are pairwise disjoint by construction. On the other hand, no  $s'[j]$  can be mapped via  $\zeta'$  to a position of  $t_\mu$  obtained by some  $\mu(s[i])$ , since  $\mu(s[i]) \in \Delta_{\text{base}}$ . Both together implies  $\zeta'(s'[i]) \neq \zeta'(s'[j])$  but  $s'[i] = s'[j] = x$ , indicating that  $\zeta'$  is not a substitution.

The remaining case that  $s'[i] = x \in \text{vars}(q')$  and  $x$  occurs only once in the query string  $s'$  can not prevent a witness with embedding  $e$ , hence we can choose  $\zeta(x) = \zeta(s[i])$ .

The fact that  $(\mu, e)$  witnesses  $t_\mu \models q$  and  $(\zeta, e)$  witnesses  $t_\mu \models q'$  implies that

$$\mu(s[i]) = \zeta(s'[i]), \quad \text{for all } i \in [\ell]. \quad (2)$$

Now consider an arbitrary  $i \in [\ell]$  and recall that we want to prove that  $h(s[i]) = s'[i]$ .

Case 1:  $s'[i] \in \Delta$ . Let  $\gamma := s'[i]$ . Precisely, we have  $\gamma \in \Delta_{\text{base}}$ . Then, by definition of  $h$  we have  $h(s'[i]) = h(\gamma) = \gamma$ . We have to show that  $s[i] = \gamma$ . For contradiction, assume that  $s[i] \neq \gamma$ . That implies:

- a) If  $s[i] = \gamma' \in \Delta$  then  $\mu(s[i]) = \mu(\gamma') = \gamma' \neq \gamma = \zeta(\gamma') = \zeta([s'[i]])$ , contradicting (2).
- b) If  $s[i] = x \in \text{vars}(q)$ , then let  $\text{pos}(s, x)$  be the set of all positions  $j \in [\ell]$  such that  $s[j] = x$ . We obtain  $\tilde{t}'$  from  $\tilde{t}$  by replacing  $\gamma$  by any arbitrary  $\gamma' \neq \gamma \in \Delta$  at all positions  $e(j)$  for  $j \in \text{pos}(s, x)$ . Again,  $\mu(\tilde{t}')$  does not contain  $\gamma$  and  $\mu(\tilde{t}') \models q$ . That contradicts  $q \subseteq_{\Delta} q'$ , as every trace  $t$  with  $t \models q'$  must include a position  $j$  such that  $t[j] = \gamma$ .

Case 2:  $s'[i] \in \text{vars}(q')$ . Let  $x := s'[i]$ . Again, by definition, we have  $h(s'[i]) = h(x) = s[i]$ . We are done, if  $x$  occurs only once in  $s'$ .

Otherwise, let  $i_1, \dots, i_k$  be elements of  $[\ell]$ , such that  $s'[i] = s'[i_1] = \dots = s'[i_k] = x$ . By definition of substitutions, we have  $\zeta(s'[i]) = \zeta(s'[i_1]) = \dots = \zeta(s'[i_k])$ . We have to show that

$$s[i] = s[i_1] = \dots = s[i_k].$$

For contradiction, assume that  $s[j] \neq s[j']$  for some  $j, j' \in \{i, i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ .

- a) Having  $\Delta \ni \gamma = s[j] \neq s[j'] = \gamma' \in \Delta$  contradicts (2) since it implies  $\gamma = \mu(\gamma) = \mu(s[j]) \neq \zeta(s[j']) = \zeta(\gamma') = \gamma'$ .
- b) Let  $\text{vars}(q) \ni y = s[j] \neq s[j'] \in \Delta \cup \text{vars}(q)$ . Then let  $\text{pos}(s, y)$  be the set of all positions  $i' \in [\ell]$  where  $s[i'] = y$ . We obtain  $\tilde{t}'$  from  $\tilde{t}$  by replacing  $\mu(s[j])$  by some arbitrary  $\gamma' \neq \mu(s[j']) \in \Delta$  at all positions  $e(i')$  for  $i' \in \text{pos}(s, y)$ . Again,  $\mu(\tilde{t}')$  contains no  $\gamma$  and  $\mu(\tilde{t}') \models q$ . That contradicts  $q \subseteq_{\Delta} q'$ , as every trace  $t$  with  $t \models q'$  must have a position  $j$  such that  $t[j] = \gamma$ .

This completes the proof of Proposition 11.

As a remark, we state that the choice of the size  $|\Delta| := \max(1, \text{types}(q)) + |t| - \ell$  for  $t \in \min \text{Min}_{\Delta}(q)$  is worst case minimal, therefore consider Example 12.  $\square$

## C About Isomorphisms

**Definition 13.** Two  $(\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k)$ -queries  $q = (s, w, \tilde{c})$  and  $q' = (s', w, \tilde{c})$  are called isomorphic (denoted by  $q \cong q'$ ) if there is a bijection  $\pi : (\text{vars}(q) \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)) \rightarrow (\text{vars}(q') \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma))$  such that  $\pi(s[i]) = s'[i]$  for all  $i \in [\ell]$  and  $\pi|_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)} = \text{id}$ .

**Corollary 14.** Given some sufficiently large  $\Gamma$ . For all  $(\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k)$ -queries  $q$  and  $q'$  over  $\Gamma$  and  $\text{Vars}$  we have:

$$q \cong q' \iff (q \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q' \text{ and } q' \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q) \iff \text{Mod}_{\Gamma}(q) = \text{Mod}_{\Gamma}(q')$$

*Proof.* Since we assume  $|\Gamma| \geq 2$  in the case of dswg-queries, or  $|\Gamma| \geq |t| - |s| + |\text{types}(q)| + 1$  in the case of swgg-queries, respectively, the equivalence  $(q \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q' \text{ and } q' \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q) \iff \text{Mod}_{\Gamma}(q) = \text{Mod}_{\Gamma}(q')$  is a direct consequence of Theorem 7.

If  $q \cong q'$ , then there is a bijection  $\pi : (\text{vars}(q) \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)) \rightarrow (\text{vars}(q') \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma))$  such that  $\pi(\chi) = \chi$  for all  $\chi \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$  and  $\pi(s[i]) = s'[i]$  for all  $i \in [\ell]$ . By definition,  $\pi$  is also a homomorphism from  $q$  to  $q'$ , and  $\pi^{-1}$  is a homomorphism from  $q'$  to  $q$  (note that since  $\pi(\chi) = \chi$  for all  $\chi \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$  and  $\pi^{-1}$  is injective,  $\pi^{-1}$  is also a substitution). Hence,  $q \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q'$  and  $q' \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q$ .

It remains to prove that  $(q \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q' \text{ and } q' \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q)$  implies  $q \cong q'$ . Let  $h : (\text{Vars} \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)) \rightarrow (\text{Vars} \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma))$  and  $h' : (\text{Vars} \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)) \rightarrow (\text{Vars} \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma))$  be homomorphisms from  $q$  to  $q'$



and from  $q'$  to  $q$ , respectively. (Note that we can omit the index  $\ell$  and the parameter  $i$  for the position because it is given by the context.) By definition, this means that  $h(\chi) = h'(\chi) = \chi$  for all  $\chi \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$ , and  $h(s[i]) = s'[i]$  and  $h'(s'[i]) = s[i]$  for all  $i \in [\ell]$ . We claim that  $h$  actually witnesses  $q \cong q'$ , i.e.  $h$  is a bijection  $(\text{vars}(q) \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)) \rightarrow (\text{vars}(q') \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma))$  such that  $h(\chi) = \chi$  for all  $\chi \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$ , and  $h(s[i]) = s'[i]$  for all  $i \in [\ell]$ .

We already observed that  $h(\chi) = \chi$  for all  $\chi \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$ , and  $h(s[i]) = s'[i]$  for all  $i \in [\ell]$  holds. Thus, it only remains to prove that  $h$  is a bijection.

Let  $x, y \in \text{vars}(q) \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$  with  $x \neq y$  and  $h(x) = h(y)$ . If  $x, y \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$ , then  $h(x) = x \neq y = h(y)$ , which contradicts  $h(x) = h(y)$ . If  $x \in \text{vars}(q)$  and  $y = \chi \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$ , then there exists a  $p \in [\ell]$  with  $s[p] = x$  and, since  $h(s[p]) = s'[p]$  and  $h(s[p]) = h(x) = h(y) = \chi$ , we have  $s'[p] = \chi$ , which contradicts  $h'(s'[p]) = s[p] = x$ . The case where  $x \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$  and  $y \in \text{vars}(q)$  can be dealt with analogously. If  $x, y \in \text{vars}(q)$ , then there are  $p, r \in [\ell]$  with  $s[p] = x$  and  $s[r] = y$ . Since  $h(s[p]) = s'[p]$ ,  $h(s[r]) = s'[r]$  and  $h(s[p]) = h(s[r])$  by our assumption it holds that  $s'[p] = s'[r]$ . However, this implies that  $h'(s'[p]) = h'(s'[r])$ , i.e.  $s[p] = s[r]$ , which contradicts the assumption that  $x \neq y$ . Consequently,  $h$  is injective.

In order to prove that  $h$  is surjective, let  $x \in \text{vars}(q') \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$ . If  $x = \chi \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$  then  $h(\chi) = \chi$  by the definition of  $h$  and since  $h'$  exists as well. If  $x \in \text{vars}(q')$ , then there exists a position  $p \in [\ell]$  with  $s'[p] = x$ . Since  $h$  is a homomorphism from  $q$  to  $q'$ , it satisfies  $h(s[p]) = s'[p] = x$ , which means that there exists  $y \in \text{vars}(q) \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$  with  $h(y) = x$  and  $y = s[p]$ . Consequently,  $h$  is surjective. Finally, we have shown that  $h$  is injective and surjective, and therefore  $h$  is a bijection.  $\square$

**Definition 15.** Let  $q = (s, w, \tilde{c})$  and  $q' = (s', w, \tilde{c})$  be two  $(\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k)$ -queries and  $I \subset [\ell]$ . We say that  $q$  is partially isomorphic to  $q'$  w.r.t  $I$  (denoted by  $q \sim_I q'$ ) if, and only if

1. for all  $i, j \in I$  we have:

$$s[i] = s[j] \Leftrightarrow s'[i] = s'[j], \quad \text{and}$$

2. for all  $i \in I$  we have:

$$s[i] \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma) \Leftrightarrow s'[i] \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma) \quad \text{and} \quad s[i] \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma) \Rightarrow s[i] = s'[i].$$

**Lemma 16.** For all  $(\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k)$ -queries  $q$  and  $q'$  we have:

$$q \sim_{[\ell]} q' \iff q \cong q'.$$

*Proof.* Assume that  $q \cong q'$ . Then there exists a bijection  $\pi : (\text{vars}(q) \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)) \rightarrow (\text{vars}(q') \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma))$  such that  $\pi(\chi) = \chi$  for all  $\chi \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$  and  $\pi(s[i]) = s'[i]$  for all  $i \in [\ell]$ . Since  $\pi$  is the identity on  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$ , it holds for all  $i \in [\ell]$  with  $s[i] \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$  that  $s[i] = \pi(s[i]) = s'[i] \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$ . This also implies  $s'[i] = s'[j]$  for all  $i, j \in I$  with  $s[i] = s[j]$  and  $s[i], s[j] \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$ . For all  $i, j \in I$  with  $s[i] = s[j]$  and  $s[i], s[j] \in \text{vars}(q)$  it holds that  $s'[i], s'[j] \in \text{vars}(q')$ . Since  $\pi$  is injective,  $\pi(s'[i]) = \pi(s'[j])$  holds, which in turn implies  $s'[i] = s'[j]$ .

For direction " $\implies$ " we have  $q \sim_{[\ell]} q'$  by assumption. Let  $s$  and  $s'$  be the query strings of  $q$  and  $q'$ , respectively. For every  $x \in \text{vars}(q)$  let  $i_x := \min\{i \in [\ell] : s[i] = x\}$ . Define  $\pi : (\text{vars}(q) \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)) \rightarrow (\text{vars}(q') \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma))$  via  $\pi(\chi) = \chi$  for all  $\chi \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$  and  $\pi(x) = s'[i_x]$  for all  $x \in \text{vars}(q)$ .

First, note that  $\pi$  is injective: Consider  $x, y \in \text{vars}(q)$  with  $\pi(x) = \pi(y)$ . Then,  $s'[i_x] = s'[i_y]$ . By item 1 we obtain  $s[i_x] = s[i_y]$ , i.e.  $x = y$ .

Furhtermore,  $\pi$  is surjective: Consider an arbitrary  $y \in \text{vars}(q')$ . Let  $j_y := \min\{j \in [\ell] : s'[j] = y\}$ . Let  $x := s[j_y]$ . Then,  $x = s[i_x] = s[j_y]$ , and by item 1 of Definition 15 we obtain that  $s'[i_x] = s'[j_y]$ . Hence,  $y = s'[j_y] = s'[i_x] = \pi(x)$ .

In summary,  $\pi$  is a bijection from  $(\text{vars}(q) \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma))$  to  $(\text{vars}(q') \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma))$  with  $\pi(\chi) = \chi$  for all  $\chi \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$ . It remains to prove that  $\pi(s[i]) = s'[i]$  for all  $i \in [\ell]$ . Consider an arbitrary

$i \in [\ell]$ . If  $s[i] \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$  then, by item 2 of Definition 15 and the definition of  $\pi$ , we have  $\pi(s[i]) = s[i] = s'[i]$ . Assume  $s[i] = x \in \text{vars}(q)$ . Since  $s[i] = s[i_x]$ , we obtain from item 1 of Definition 15 that  $s'[i] = s'[i_x]$ . Thus,  $\pi(s[i]) = \pi(x) = s'[i_x] = s'[i]$ , which completes the proof of Lemma 16.  $\square$

**Remark 17.** *Given some sufficiently large  $\Gamma$ . Hence, by Theorem 7 and Corollary 14 we know that a query  $q$  is descriptive for a sample  $\mathcal{S}$  w.r.t.  $(\text{sp}, (\ell, w, \tilde{c}))$  if, and only if,  $q$  is an  $(\ell, w, \tilde{c})$ -query with  $\text{supp}(q, \mathcal{S}) \geq \text{sp}$ , and there is no other  $(\ell, w, \tilde{c})$ -query  $q'$  with  $\text{supp}(q, \mathcal{S}) \geq \text{sp}$  and  $q \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q'$  and  $q \not\cong q'$ .*

## D About Discovering

We briefly discuss why  $\Delta$  is passed through incrementally in Line 7 on an intuitive level by picking up the example in section 3.

**Example 8 (extended).** *Let  $\Gamma = \{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}\}$  and  $x_1, x_2, x_3 \in \text{Vars}$ . Consider the sample  $\mathcal{S} = \{\mathbf{a} \mathbf{b} \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{a} \mathbf{c} \mathbf{c}\}$ ,  $\text{sp} = 1.0$ ,  $\ell = w = 3$ ,  $c = ((0, 0), (0, 0))$  and  $k = 2$ .*

*On input  $(\mathcal{S}, \text{sp}, (\ell, w, c, 2))$  the algorithm first generates  $q = (x_1 x_2 x_3, w, c)$ . Since  $q$  satisfies the support threshold the algorithm proceeds by computing  $\Delta = \{\{\mathbf{a}\}\} \dot{\cup} \{\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}\}, \{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c}\}, \{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}\}\}$ . Assume the algorithm selects  $x := x_3$  during the first iteration of the main loop. It turns out that  $\Delta_1 = \{\{\mathbf{a}\}\}$  does not contain a typeset for an admissible replacement of  $x_3$ . Hence, the algorithm considers  $\Delta_2$  during the second transition of the for-loop in Line 7. The only admissible replacement is  $s\langle x_3 \mapsto \{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}\} \rangle$ , and  $s$  is replaced by  $x_1 x_2 \{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}\}$  ( $V$  remains empty).*

*Let us assume that during the second transition through the main loop the algorithm selects  $x := x_1$  and  $y := \{\mathbf{a}\} \in \Delta_1$ . The replacement of  $x_1$  by  $\{\mathbf{a}\}$  is admissible (as it has support 1 on  $\mathcal{S}$ ). Therefore,  $s$  is replaced by  $\{\mathbf{a}\} x_2 \{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}\}$  and  $V$  remains unchanged again.*

*In its last iteration (during the second transition through the for-loop),  $s\langle x_2 \mapsto \{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}\} \rangle$  is the only admissible replacement operation. The run terminates after this iteration and outputs the query  $q = (s, w, c)$  with  $s = \{\mathbf{a}\} \{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}\} \{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}\}$ .*

*Now consider the case where Line 7 is omitted and  $y$  is chosen from  $\Delta \cup V$ . Then replacing  $x_1$  by  $\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}\}$  is an admissible replacement, but the resulting query  $q' = (s', w, c)$  with  $s' = \{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}\} \{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}\} \{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}\}$  is not be descriptive (due to  $q \subseteq_{\Gamma} q'$ ).*

**Theorem 9. (restated)** *Given some sufficiently large  $\Gamma$ . Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a sample, let  $\text{sp}$  be a support threshold with  $0 < \text{sp} \leq 1$ , let  $(\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k)$  be query parameters with  $k = 1$  if  $\tilde{c} = C$ .*

- (a) *If there does not exist any  $(\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k)$ -swgg- or dswg-query that is descriptive for  $\mathcal{S}$  w.r.t.  $(\text{sp}, (\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k))$  then there is only one run of Algorithm 1 upon the defined input, and it stops in line 2 with output  $\perp$ .*
- (b) *Otherwise, every run of Algorithm 1 upon input  $(\mathcal{S}, \text{sp}, (\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k))$  terminates and outputs an swgg-query or dswg-query  $q$  (depending on  $k$ ), with  $|\chi| \leq k$  for all  $\chi \in \text{typesets}(q)$ , that is descriptive for  $\mathcal{S}$  w.r.t.  $(\text{sp}, (\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k))$ .*

*Proof.* First, consider the case that there does not exist any swgg- or dswg-query with parameters  $(\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k)$  that is descriptive for  $\mathcal{S}$  w.r.t.  $(\text{sp}, (\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k))$ . Note that this implies  $\text{supp}(q_{mg}, \mathcal{S}) < \text{sp}$ , whereby  $q_{mg}$  is the most general query for  $(\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k)$ . Recall that the query string of  $q_{mg}$  is of form  $s_{mg} = x_1 \dots x_{\ell}$ , and  $q_{mg}$  is most general in the sense that  $q' \subseteq_{\Gamma} q_{mg}$  for each  $(\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k)$ -query  $q'$ . Hence, for every  $(\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k)$ -query  $q'$  with  $\text{Mod}_{\Gamma}(q) \subseteq \text{Mod}_{\Gamma}(q_{mg})$  it holds that  $\text{supp}(q, \mathcal{S}) \leq \text{supp}(q_{mg}, \mathcal{S}) < \text{sp}$ . Therefore, the algorithm stops in Line 2 and outputs an error message  $\perp$ . This proves statement (a).

The second statement (b) of Theorem 9 is an immediate consequence of the Propositions 18 and 19 for swgg-queries and dswg-queries, respectively.  $\square$

**Proposition 18.** *Given some sufficiently large  $\Gamma$ . Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a sample, let  $\text{sp}$  be a support threshold with  $0 < \text{sp} \leq 1$ , let  $(\ell, w, C)$  be query parameters and let  $q_{mg}$  be the most general query for  $(\ell, w, C)$ . In case that  $\text{supp}(q_{mg}, \mathcal{S}) \geq \text{sp}$ , every run of Algorithm 1 upon input  $(\mathcal{S}, \text{sp}, (\ell, w, C))$  terminates and outputs an swgg-query  $q$ , that is descriptive for  $\mathcal{S}$  w.r.t.  $(\text{sp}, (\ell, w, C))$ .*

*Proof (Sketch).* For the special case where  $q_{mg}$  is an swg-query, [11] provided the following result: The algorithm obtained from Algorithm 1 by starting with an arbitrary input query  $q$  instead of  $(\ell, w, \tilde{c})$ , outputs either a query  $q'$  that is descriptive for  $\mathcal{S}$  w.r.t.  $(\text{sp}, (\ell, w, c))$  and satisfies  $q' \subseteq_{\Gamma} q$  or, in case that no such  $q'$  exists, the message  $\perp$ .

Note that despite the slight difference regarding the input parameters the algorithms only differ in the matching routine due to the generalised gap-size constraints: because of  $\text{supp}(q_{mg}, \mathcal{S}) \geq \text{sp}$ , for the most general query defined in line 1, every run of  $\text{DescrQuery}(\mathcal{S}, \text{sp}, (\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k))$  will reach Line 5 and proceed from there on. Since the query string of an swgg-queries is solely defined over  $\text{Vars} \cup \Gamma$ , i.e.  $k = 1$ ,  $\Delta$  is set to

$$\Delta_1 = \left\{ \gamma \in \Gamma : \frac{|\{t \in \mathcal{S} : \gamma \in \text{types}(t)\}|}{|\mathcal{S}|} \geq \text{sp} \right\}$$

in line 3 and is extended by the set of currently available variables  $V$  in line 6 for each iteration of the main loop. Note that the for-loop is only passed once during each transition through the main loop.

Hence, a run of Algorithm 1 for  $k = 1$  equals a run of the algorithm presented in [11] which gets as input the Sample  $\mathcal{S}$ , the support threshold  $\text{sp}$  and the query  $q_{mg}$ , except for a different black box matching routine. Thus, the results regarding the descriptiveness of the output query carry over from [11] to the case that Algorithm 1 computes an swgg-query.  $\square$

**Proposition 19.** *Let  $|\Gamma| \geq 2$ . Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a sample, let  $\text{sp}$  be a support threshold with  $0 < \text{sp} \leq 1$ , let  $(\ell, w, c, k)$  be query parameters and let  $q_{mg}$  be the most general query for  $(\ell, w, c, k)$ . In case that  $\text{supp}(q_{mg}, \mathcal{S}) \geq \text{sp}$ , every run of Algorithm 1 upon input  $(\mathcal{S}, \text{sp}, (\ell, w, c, k))$  terminates and outputs an dswg-query  $q$ , with  $|\chi| \leq k$  for all  $\chi \in \text{typesets}(q)$ , that is descriptive for  $\mathcal{S}$  w.r.t.  $(\text{sp}, (\ell, w, c, k))$ .*

*Proof.* Throughout the proof, we heavily make use of Remark 17, that holds for dswg-queries already if  $|\Gamma| \geq 2$ .

Assume  $\text{supp}(q_{mg}, \mathcal{S}) \geq \text{sp}$ , for the most general disjunctive query defined in line 1. In this case, every run of  $\text{DescrQuery}(\mathcal{S}, \text{sp}, (\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k))$  will reach Line 5 and proceed from there on. Let  $\Delta$  be the set of typesets defined in Line 3. Note that every query  $q'$  that is descriptive for  $\mathcal{S}$  w.r.t.  $(\text{sp}, (\ell, w, c, k))$ , satisfies  $\text{typesets}(q') \subseteq \Delta$ , because otherwise,  $\text{supp}(q', \mathcal{S})$  would be  $< \text{sp}$ . Especially, for each query  $q$  that is computed by Algorithm 1 it holds that  $\text{typesets}(q) \subseteq \Delta$ , and  $|\chi| \leq k$  for all  $\chi \in \Delta$  (due to line 3). Hence, all typesets occurring in  $q$  have size less or equal to  $k$ .

Let us first argue that every iteration  $r$  of the outer **while**-loop starting in Line 5, will eventually end. To see this, first, note that the set of available types and variables  $\Delta \cup V$  will always be finite, since it is bounded by the number of types and typesets occurring in the given sample and the number of variables in  $s_{mg}$ , which equals  $\ell$ . During the  $i$ -th (of a bounded number of  $k$ ) iterations through the for-loop, the inner while loop starting in Line 9 ends after at most  $|\Delta_i|$  iterations and during each iteration the current variable is either replaced by a typeset or variable or remains in the query string if no replacement operation is possible.

Let us now fix a particular run of  $\text{DescrQuery}(\mathcal{S}, \text{sp}, (\ell, w, \tilde{c}, k))$ . Let  $q_0 = q_{mg}$ ,  $s_0 = s_{mg}$ ,  $U_0 := \text{vars}(q_0)$  and  $V_0 := \emptyset$ . And for every  $r \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$  let  $s_r$ ,  $U_r$ ,  $V_r$  be the query string  $s$  and the sets  $U$  and  $V$  at the end of the  $r$ -th iteration through the **while**-loop, and let  $q_r$  be the query  $(s_r, w, \tilde{c})$ . Furthermore, for each  $r \geq 1$  let  $x_r$  be the particular element in  $U$  that is chosen at the beginning of the  $r$ -th iteration through the outer **while**-loop.

By induction on  $r$  and by construction of the algorithm, it is straightforward to prove the following claim.

**Claim 20.** *For every  $r \geq 1$  we have*

1.  $U_r = \text{vars}(q_0) \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_r\}$  and  $U_r \cap V_r = \emptyset$  and  $U_r \cup V_r = \text{vars}(s_r)$ .
2.  $\text{typesets}(q_r) \subseteq \Delta$  and  $\text{supp}(q_r, \mathcal{S}) \geq \text{sp}$ .
3.  $q_{r-1} \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q_r$ .
4. For every  $x \in U_r$  we have  $\text{pos}(s_r, x) = \text{pos}(s_0, x)$ .
5.  $s_r[j] = s_{r-1}[j]$  for all  $j \in [\ell] \setminus \text{pos}(s_0, x_r)$ .

From this claim we obtain that after  $\hat{r} := |\text{vars}(q_0)| = \ell$  iterations through the algorithm's outer **while**-loop, the algorithm's run terminates with  $U_{\hat{r}} = \emptyset$  and outputs an  $(\ell, w, c, k)$ -query  $q_{\hat{r}}$  with  $\text{supp}(q_{\hat{r}}, \mathcal{S}) \geq \text{sp}$  and  $q_0 \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q_{\hat{r}}$  (i.e., by Theorem 7,  $q_{\hat{r}} \subseteq_{\Gamma} q_0$ ).

We need to show that this query  $q_{\hat{r}}$  is descriptive for  $\mathcal{S}$  w.r.t.  $(\text{sp}, (\ell, w, c, k))$ . For contradiction, assume that it is not. Then, according to Remark 17, there exists an  $(\ell, w, c, k)$ -query  $q'$  with  $\text{supp}(q', \mathcal{S}) \geq \text{sp}$  and  $q_{\hat{r}} \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q'$  and  $q' \not\cong q_{\hat{r}}$ .

From Claim 20(3) we know that  $q_r \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q_{\hat{r}}$  for all  $r \leq \hat{r}$ , and hence  $q_{\hat{r}} \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q'$  yields that

$$q_r \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q' \quad \text{for all } r \in \{0, 1, \dots, \hat{r}\}. \quad (\dagger)$$

Let  $s'$  be the query string of  $q'$ . In order to deduce the desired contradiction, the notion of partially isomorphic queries will be crucial. For each  $r \in \{0, 1, \dots, \hat{r}\}$  let

$$I_r := \{i \in [\ell] : s_0[i] \in \Gamma\} \cup \bigcup_{\nu=1}^r \text{pos}(s_0, x_{\nu}).$$

Note that  $I_0 = \emptyset$  and  $|I_r| = r$  for all  $r \geq 1$ , since  $\text{typesets}(q_0) = \emptyset$  and each variable occurs only once in  $s_0$ . The next claim provides the most crucial technical contribution of our proof.

**Claim 21.** *For every  $r \in \{0, 1, \dots, \hat{r}\}$  we have  $q_r \sim_{I_r} q'$ .*

Before turning to the proof of Claim 21 let us first argue how the claim serves for completing the proof of Theorem 9. For  $r = \hat{r}$  we know that  $U_{\hat{r}} = \emptyset$ . Hence,  $\{x_1, \dots, x_{\hat{r}}\} = \text{vars}(q_0)$  and  $I_{\hat{r}} = [\ell]$ . From Claim 21 we obtain  $q_{\hat{r}} \sim_{[\ell]} q'$ . But, by Lemma 16 this implies that  $q_{\hat{r}} \cong q'$ , contradicting our assumption that  $q_{\hat{r}} \not\cong q'$ . Thus, all that remains to complete the proof of Theorem 9 is to prove Claim 21.

*Proof of Claim 21.*

We proceed by induction on  $r$ . For the induction base with  $r = 0$  recall that  $q_0 = q_{mg}$ . Thus,  $I_0 = \emptyset$ , which immediately implies that  $q_0 \sim_{I_0} q'$ .

For the induction step consider an arbitrary  $r \geq 1$ . At the beginning of the  $r$ -th iteration of the main loop the situation is as follows:  $U = U_{r-1} \neq \emptyset$  and  $s = s_{r-1}$  and, by Claim 20(1),  $U_{r-1} = \text{vars}(q_0) \setminus \{x_{\nu} : 1 \leq \nu \leq r-1\}$ . Recall that by  $x_r$  we denote the particular element of  $U_{r-1}$  chosen at the beginning of the  $r$ -th iterations through the main loop.

The induction hypothesis states that  $q_{r-1} \sim_{I_{r-1}} q'$  holds. We have to show that  $q_r \sim_{I_r} q'$  holds as well, whereby  $I_r = I_{r-1} \cup \text{pos}(s_0, x_r)$ . From  $(\dagger)$  we know that  $q_r \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q'$ . Thus, the following is true:

1. For all  $i, j \in [\ell]$ : If  $s_r[j] = s_r[i]$  then  $s'[j] = s'[i]$ .

2. For all  $i \in [\ell]$ : If  $s_r[i] \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$  then  $\emptyset \subset s'[i] \subseteq s_r[i]$ .

Furthermore, by Claim 20(5),  $s_r$  coincides with  $s_{r-1}$  on all positions  $i \in [\ell]$  with  $i \notin \text{pos}(s_0, x_r)$ .

Recall that  $|\text{pos}(s_0, x_r)|=1$  due to  $s_0 = s_{mg}$ . To ease notation we simply write  $p_r$  to denote the unique position of  $x_r$  in  $s_0$ . Since  $p_r \notin I_{r-1}$ , the induction hypothesis  $q_{r-1} \sim_{I_{r-1}} q'$  hence implies that  $q_r \sim_{I_{r-1}} q'$ . In order to prove that  $q_r \sim_{I_r} q'$ , it only remains to prove the following:

i For all  $j \in I_{r-1}$ : If  $s'[j] = s'[p_r]$  then  $s_r[j] = s_r[p_r]$ .

ii If  $s'[p_r] \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$  then  $s_r[p_r] \subseteq s'[p_r]$ .

By the definition of the algorithm, the query  $q_r$  is obtained from  $q_{r-1}$  by performing exactly one replacement operation using a typeset (**TypeRep**) (line 13 with  $y \in \Delta_i \setminus V$ ), one replacement operation using a variable (**VarRep**) (line 13 with  $y \in V$ ) or no replacement operation (**NoChange**) in line 15. Note that a **NoChange** will only be performed if the following conditions are true:

For every typeset  $\chi \in \Delta$  the query  $q_\chi := q_{r-1}\langle x_r \mapsto \chi \rangle$  does not satisfy  $\text{supp}(q_\chi, \mathcal{S}) \geq \text{sp}$ . (\*)<sub>r</sub>

and

For every variable  $y \in V_{r-1}$  the query  $q_y := q_{r-1}\langle x_r \mapsto y \rangle$  does not satisfy  $\text{supp}(q_y, \mathcal{S}) \geq \text{sp}$ . (\*\*)<sub>r</sub>

**Claim 22.** *Let  $p_r$  be the position of  $x_r$  in  $s_0$ .*

- (\*)<sub>r</sub> implies that  $s'[p_r] \in \text{Vars}$ .
- (\*\*)<sub>r</sub> implies that  $s'[p_r] \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$  or  $s'[p_r] \neq s'[j]$  for all  $j \in I_{r-1}$ .

*Proof.* Let us first focus on the claim's first statement. Let  $p_r$  be the position of  $x_r$  in  $s_0$  and let (\*)<sub>r</sub> be satisfied, i.e. there exists no  $\chi \in \Delta$  such that replacing  $x_r$  by  $\chi$  yields a query that satisfies **sp**. For contradiction, assume  $s'[p_r] = \chi \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$ . By the choice of  $\Delta$  and since  $\text{supp}(q', \mathcal{S}) \geq \text{sp}$ , we know that  $\chi \in \Delta$ . For  $q_\chi := q_{r-1}\langle x_r \mapsto \chi \rangle$  we have  $q_\chi \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q'$  because  $q_{r-1} \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q'$  and  $s'[p_r] = \chi$ . Therefore,  $\text{supp}(q_\chi, \mathcal{S}) \geq \text{supp}(q', \mathcal{S}) \geq \text{sp}$ , contradicting (\*)<sub>r</sub>. This completes the proof of the first statement.

Let us now turn to the second statement of Claim 22. Let  $p_r$  be the position of  $x_r$  in  $s_0$  and let (\*\*)<sub>r</sub> be satisfied, i.e. there exists no available variable  $y \in V_{r-1}$  such that replacing  $x_r$  by  $y$  yields a query that satisfies **sp**. If  $s'[p_r] \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$  we are done. Consider the case where  $s'[p_r] \in \text{Vars}$  and assume for contradiction that there exists a  $k \in I_{r-1}$  such that  $s'[p_r] = s'[k]$ . Let  $y := s_{r-1}[k]$ . From  $q_{r-1} \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q'$  and  $s'[k] \in \text{Vars}$  we obtain  $y \in \text{Vars}$ . Since  $k \in I_{r-1}$  we then obtain that there is a  $\nu \in \{1, \dots, r-1\}$  such that  $\{k\} \in \text{pos}(s_0, x_\nu)$ . We claim that  $x_\nu \in V_{r-1}$ . For contradiction, assume that  $x_\nu \notin V_{r-1}$ . By Claim 20(1) we have  $\text{vars}(s_{r-1}) = U_{r-1} \cup V_{r-1}$ , and hence  $y \in U_{r-1}$ . From Claim 20(4) we obtain that  $\text{pos}(s_{r-1}, y) = \text{pos}(s_0, y)$ . Hence,  $\{k\} = \text{pos}(s_0, y) \cap \text{pos}(s_0, x_\nu)$ . This implies that  $y = x_\nu$  and due to  $x_\nu \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{r-1}\}$  it holds that  $y \in \{x_1, \dots, x_{r-1}\}$ . But this is a contradiction to  $y \in U_{r-1} = \text{vars}(q_0) \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_{r-1}\}$ . Thus, we have shown that  $y \in V_{r-1}$ .

Consider the query  $q_y := q_{r-1}\langle x_r \mapsto y \rangle$ , and let  $s_y$  be the query string of  $q_y$ . It holds that  $q_y \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q'$  since we already know that  $q_{r-1} \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q'$ . I.e., there is a homomorphism  $h : (\text{Vars} \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)) \rightarrow (\text{Vars} \cup \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma))$  from  $q_{r-1}$  to  $q'$ . This  $h$  also is a homomorphism from  $q_y$  to  $q'$ . To see this, note that for  $\{p_r\} \in \text{pos}(s_{r-1}, x_r)$  we have  $h(s_y[p_r]) = h(y) = h(s_{r-1}[k]) = s'[k] = s'[p_r]$ ; and for every other position  $j \in [\ell] \setminus \text{pos}(s_{r-1}, x_r)$  we have  $h(s_y[j]) = h(s_{r-1}[j]) = s'[j]$ . Therefore,  $\text{supp}(q_y, \mathcal{S}) \geq \text{sp}$  which contradicts (\*\*)<sub>r</sub>. This ends the proof of Claim 22.

To complete the proof of Claim 21 we now distinguish between the three cases depending on whether the query  $q_r$  is obtained from  $q_{r-1}$  by performing a **TypeRep**, a **VarRep**, or a **NoChange**. Our aim is to show that in all cases the conditions (i) and (ii) are satisfied. Let us briefly recall these conditions:

i For all  $j \in I_{r-1}$ : If  $s'[j] = s'[p_r]$  then  $s_r[j] = s_r[p_r]$ .

ii If  $s'[p_r] \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}^+(\Gamma)$  then  $s_r[p_r] \subseteq s'[p_r]$ .

*Case 1:*  $q_r$  is obtained from  $q_{r-1}$  by replacing the current variable  $x_r$  in  $s_{r-1}$  by a typeset  $\chi \in \Delta$ , i.e.  $s_r = s_{r-1}\langle x_r \mapsto \chi \rangle$ . Let  $p_r$  the position of  $x_r$  in  $s_{r-1}$ . By (2) we have  $\emptyset \subset s'[p_r] \subseteq s[p_r] = \chi$ . Since  $\Delta$  is walked through incrementally in line 7  $\chi$  is minimal in the following sense: for each  $\chi' \in \Delta$  with  $\chi' \subset \chi$  it holds that  $\text{supp}(q_{r-1}\langle x_r \mapsto \chi' \rangle) < \text{sp}$ . Hence,  $s[p_r] = \chi \subseteq s'[p_r]$  holds as well, since otherwise  $s'[p_r] = \chi' \subset \chi$  with contradicts  $\text{supp}(q_r, \mathcal{S}) \geq \text{sp}$ . In particular (ii) is satisfied. To see that (i) is satisfied, consider  $\{p_r\} \in \text{pos}(s_0, x_r)$  and a  $j \in I_{r-1}$  with  $s'[p_r] = s'[j] = \chi$ . From  $j \in I_{r-1}$  and  $q_r \sim_{I_{r-1}} q'$  we obtain that  $s_r[p_r] = \chi = s_r[j]$ . Hence, (i) is satisfied.

*Case 2:*  $q_r$  is obtained from  $q_{r-1}$  by replacing the variable  $x_r$  in  $s_{r-1}$  by an available variable  $y \in V_{r-1}$ , i.e. the query string of  $q_r$  is  $s_r = s_{r-1}\langle x_r \mapsto y \rangle$ . According to Claim 20(1) there exists an  $r' \leq r-1$  such that  $y = x_{r'}$ . Furthermore, by definition of the algorithm, a variable can only be included into the set  $V$  in case of a **NoChange**, i.e. neither a **TypeRep** nor a **VarRep** was possible. Therefore, in the  $r'$ -th iteration of the algorithm's main loop, i.e. the outer while-loop, the variable  $x_{r'}$  was included into the set  $V$ . But this means that the conditions  $(*)_r$  and  $(**)_r$  are satisfied. Let  $\{p_{r'}\} \in \text{pos}(s_0, x_{r'})$ . The first statement of Claim 22 tells us that  $s'[p_{r'}] \in \text{Vars}$ . Note that  $p_{r'} \in I_{r'} \subseteq I_{r''}$  for all  $r'' \geq r'$ . Hence, by Claim 20(5) we obtain that  $y = x_{r'} = s_{r'}[p_{r'}] = s_{r''}[p_{r'}]$  for all  $r'' \geq r'$ . In particular, for  $r'' = r$  we obtain that  $y = s_r[p_{r'}]$ . Hence, we have  $s_r[p_{r'}] = y = s_r[p_r]$  for  $\{p_r\} \in \text{pos}(s_0, x_r)$ . From  $q_r \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} q'$  we obtain that  $s'[p_{r'}] = s'[p_r]$ . Since  $s'[p_{r'}] \in \text{Vars}$  we obtain that  $s'[p_r] \in \text{Vars}$ . This proves that condition (ii) is satisfied.

Let us now turn to condition (i). Let  $\{p_r\} \in \text{pos}(s_0, x_r)$  and choose an arbitrary  $j \in I_{r-1}$  such that  $s'[j] = s'[p_r]$ . We want to prove that  $s_r[j] = s_r[p_r]$ . As shown above,  $s'[j] = s'[p_r] = s'[p_{r'}]$ . From  $j, p_{r'} \in I_{r-1}$  and  $q_r \sim_{I_{r-1}} q'$  we obtain that  $s_r[j] = s_r[p_{r'}]$ . And we already know that  $s_r[p_{r'}] = y = s_r[p_r]$ . This proves condition (i).

*Case 3:*  $q_r$  is obtained from  $q_{r-1}$  by performing no replacement operation at all. In this case we know that the statements  $(*)_r$  and  $(**)_r$  are satisfied. From Claim 22 we obtain for  $\{p_r\} \in \text{pos}(s_0, x_r)$  that  $s'[p_r] \in \text{Vars}$  and  $s'[j] \neq s'[p_r]$  for all  $j \in I_{r-1}$ . Hence, both (i) and (ii) are trivially satisfied.

In all three cases we have shown that (i) and (ii) are satisfied, and thus we have  $q_r \sim_{I_r} q'$ . This completes the proof of Claim 21.

In summary the proof of Proposition 19 is now completed. □