


Matching walks that are minimal with respect to edge inclusion

Victor Marsault

LIGM, Université Gustave Eiffel, CNRS

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2325-6004>

victor.marsault@univ-eiffel.fr

2024-08-27

Abstract

In this paper we show that enumerating the set $MM(G, R)$, defined below, cannot be done with polynomial-delay in its input G and R , unless $P = NP$. R is a regular expression over an alphabet Σ , G is directed graph labeled over Σ , and $MM(G, R)$ contains walks of G . First, consider the set $Match(G, R)$ containing all walks G labeled by a word (over Σ) that conforms to R . In general, $M(G, R)$ is infinite, and $MM(G, R)$ is the finite subset of $Match(G, R)$ of the walks that are minimal according to a well-quasi-order \preceq . It holds $w \prec w'$ if the multiset of edges appearing in w is strictly included in the multiset of edges appearing in w' . Remarkably, the set $MM(G, R)$ always contains some walks that may be computed in polynomial time. Hence, it is not the case that the preprocessing phase of any algorithm enumerating $MM(G, R)$ must solve an NP-hard problem.

Keywords: Enumeration complexity, Polynomial-delay, Directed Graphs, Pattern matching, Regular expressions, Regular Path Queries.

1 Introduction

Finding walks that match regular expressions is a crucial part of the modern query languages, especially for property graph database management systems. Indeed, Regular Path Queries (RPQs), which were introduced a few decades ago [CMW87; CM90], are now the core of the languages Cypher [FG⁺18b; FG⁺18a], GSQL [DX⁺19], PGQL [PGQL] and the recent ISO standard language GQL [DF⁺22; GQL]. They are also used in SQL as part as the PGQ recent extension [DF⁺22; PGQ] and in the RDF language SPARQL [SPARQLPP].

An RPQ matches the walks conforming to an regular expression, and RPQs are well-behaved in the case where one is interested in the existence of a walk matching the regular expression. However, users seems to need the matching walks in full, as indicated by the semantics of most aforementioned languages. Since there are sometimes infinitely many matching walks, real query languages choose an *RPQ semantics*, that is, a filter that selects a finite number of “good” matching walks to output to the user. It turns out that none of the RPQ semantics currently used are ideal (see [DFM23, Intro.] or [MM24]), which gives some room to look for new candidate RPQ semantics. For instance, [DFM23] introduces and studies a new kind of *Run-based* RPQ semantics. In another paper, we describe a framework to compare RPQ semantics [MM24]. We also define quite a few candidate semantics there. Two of them are studied in [Khi24] and the present note is about another one.

Namely, we study the computational property of Minimal-Multiset (MM) semantics. It is defined as follows: MM keeps a matching walk w in the output if there is no other matching walk w' such that the edges of w are strictly included in the edges of w' (here *inclusion* stands for *bag inclusion*, hence multiplicity matters). We show that the problem of enumerating all matching walks kept by MM is not **PolyDelay** unless $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{NP}$ (Theorem 5). Moreover, deciding whether MM keeps a given walk is **coNP**-complete (Theorem 18). Both result are in data complexity (see Remark 7 or [AHV95]).

It is also noteworthy that the aforementioned enumeration problem exhibits some unusual features. Usually, proving that an enumeration problem is not in **PolyDelay** unless $\mathbf{P} \neq \mathbf{NP}$ amounts to showing that one must solve an **NP**-hard problem before outputting the *first* solution. Typically, for every instance I of some **NP**-hard problem, one builds an instance for the enumeration problem for which the outputs are certificates for I . We refer to these as *hard* outputs in the following. In our case, this approach cannot work. Indeed, we will see that every instance of our problem always has *easy* solutions, in the sense that they may be found in polynomial time. These easy solutions must remain in polynomial numbers. Moreover, the condition for a candidate hard solution to be actually output highly depends on the easy solutions. See Remark 6 for details. In some sense, the usual approaches shows that problems are **NP**-hard in preprocessing time, while our problem seems to be of lesser complexity.

Our proof is built upon a folklore reduction used to show that the problem **k-EDGE-DISJOINT-PATHS** is **NP**-hard. This reduction can be adapted to show that evaluation of RPQs under trail semantics evaluation is **NP**-hard. We even reshow that latter result as a first step of our proof: it corresponds roughly to the *red* part of the graph and statements up to Proposition 12. Note that it is also classical that the problem **TWO-EDGE-DISJOINT-PATH** is **NP**-hard (see for instance [BJG09, Sec. 10.2]); however, the proof being more involved, it is harder to adapt to our setting.

Outline After Preliminaries, Section 3 precisely defines the Minimal-Multiset semantics and the problem we study. Then, we state and prove our main result in Section 4. Finally, Section 5 shows a few side results, such as the **coNP**-hardness of membership under MM and an analog of our main result for a Shortest-Minimal-Set (SMS) semantics, a variant of MM also proposed in [MM24].

2 Preliminaries

Labels, words and regular expressions Given a set of symbols Σ , **words** over Σ are the finite sequences of letters $a_1 \cdots a_n$, and we denote the **empty word** by ε . A **language** over Σ is a subset of Σ^* . A **regular expression** R over a set Σ is a formula obtained inductively from the set of letters, one unary postfix function $*$, and two binary functions $+$ and \cdot , according to the following grammar.

$$R := \varepsilon \mid a \mid R^* \mid R \cdot R \mid R + R \quad \text{where } a \in \Sigma \quad (1)$$

We may omit the \cdot operator, and use it mostly to help readability. A regular expression R over Σ **denotes** a language $L(R) \subseteq \Sigma^*$ inductively defined as usual:

$$\begin{aligned} L(\varepsilon) &= \{\varepsilon\} & L(R \cdot R') &= L(R) \cdot L(R') & L(R^*) &= L(R)^* \\ \forall a \in \Sigma \quad L(a) &= \{a\} & L(R + R') &= L(R) \cup L(R') \end{aligned}$$

Graphs, walks and matches In this document, we consider (directed labeled) graph. Formally, a graph is a triplet $\mathcal{G} = (V, L, E)$ where V is a finite set of **vertices**, L is a finite set of **labels** and $E \subseteq V \times L \times V$ is a finite set of **edges**. An element of E will be denoted by $s \xrightarrow{a} t$ in order to help readability.

A walk in \mathcal{G} is an alternating sequence of vertices and labels consistent with the edges of \mathcal{G} . More precisely, a **walk** w is a sequence $(v_0, a_1, v_1, \dots, a_k, v_k)$ where each v_i belongs to V , each a_i belongs to L , and (v_{i-1}, a_i, v_i) belongs to E for every $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. Moreover, k is called the **length** of w , written $\text{Len}(w)$; v_0 is called the **source** of w , written $\text{Src}(w)$; and v_k is called the **target** of w , written $\text{Tgt}(w)$. As we do for edges, we generally use arrows to denote walks, as in $v_0 \xrightarrow{a_1} v_1 \rightarrow \dots \xrightarrow{a_k} v_k$. The set of all walks in \mathcal{G} is denoted by $\text{Walks}(\mathcal{G})$; note that vertices are walks of length 0 and edges are walks of length 1. A **trail** is a walk with no repeated edge.

Two walks $w = (v_0 \xrightarrow{a_1} \dots \xrightarrow{a_k} v_k)$ and $w' = (v'_0 \xrightarrow{a'_1} \dots \xrightarrow{a'_n} v'_n)$ **concatenate** if $v_k = v'_0$ and their **concatenation** is the walk $w \cdot w' = (v_0 \xrightarrow{a_1} v_1 \rightarrow \dots \xrightarrow{a_k} v_k \xrightarrow{a'_1} v'_1 \rightarrow \dots \xrightarrow{a'_n} v'_n)$.

Given two walks w, w' , we say that w is a **factor** of w' if there exists two walks w_p and w_s such that $w' = w_p \cdot w \cdot w_s$. In particular, a walk is a factor of itself since w_p and w_s can have length 0.

Enumeration complexity We generally use the enumeration complexity framework, which we sketch below. See for instance [Str21] for more formal definitions. An enumeration problem E takes inputs I and outputs a finite set $E(I)$ of **solutions**. An enumeration algorithm A solves E if it outputs each element in $E(I)$, in an order at the discretion of the algorithm. We denote by $T_A(I, k)$ the number of steps taken by A with input I before outputting the k -th solution and, writting ℓ for the cardinal of $E(I)$, we denote by $T_A(I, \ell + 1)$ the number of steps taken by A to stop. The **preprocessing time** of A is the function mapping an instance I of E to $T_A(I, 1)$ and its **delay** is the function mapping each instance I of E to $\max_{i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}} (T_A(I, i+1) - T_A(I, i))$, where ℓ is the cardinal of $E(I)$. The algorithm A is called **poly-delay** if its preprocessing time and its delay are bounded by polynomials in the size of I .

3 Considered problem

Definition 1. Given a regular expression R and a graph \mathcal{G} , a **match** to R in \mathcal{G} is a walk w such that $\text{Lbl}(w) \in L(R)$. We denote by $\text{Matches}(\mathcal{G}, R)$ the set of all matches, and given moreover two vertices $s, t \in V^2$, we denote by $\text{Matches}(\mathcal{G}, R, s, t)$ the set of all matches with source s and target t .

Due to cycles in the graph and Kleene stars in the expression, $\text{Matches}(\mathcal{G}, R)$ and $\text{Matches}(\mathcal{G}, R, s, t)$ is infinite in some cases. Languages use *RPQ semantics* (such as *trail semantics* or *shortest semantics*) to select finitely many matches to output to the user (see [DFM23; MM24]). In this document, we consider a finite subset of matches defined by the function MM below.

Definition 2 (Minimal-Multiset Semantics). (a) For every walk w , we let $\text{EdgeBag}(w)$ denote the **multiset** of the edges appearing in w .
 (b) We define the strict partial order relation \prec on walks as follows: $w \prec w'$ if and only if $\text{EdgeBag}(w) \subsetneq \text{EdgeBag}(w')$. As usual, we let \preceq denote the reflexive extension of \prec .
 (c) We call **minimal multiset semantics** the function $\text{MM} : \mathcal{G} \times R \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\text{Walks}(\mathcal{G}))$ defined as follows.

$$\text{MM}(\mathcal{G}, R) = \bigcup_{(s,t) \in V_{\mathcal{G}}^2} \text{MM}(\mathcal{G}, R, s, t) \quad \text{where} \quad \text{MM}(\mathcal{G}, R, s, t) = \min_{\prec} \text{Matches}(\mathcal{G}, R, s, t) \quad (2)$$

Note that there is no infinite descending chain $w_0 \succ w_1 \succ \dots \succ w_k \succ \dots$, meaning that \min_{\prec} is well-defined in Equation (2). In fact, one may verify that \preceq is a well-quasi-order over $\text{Walks}(\mathcal{G})$, from which the next statement follows.

Lemma 3. For every graph \mathcal{G} and regular expression R , then $\text{MM}(\mathcal{G}, R)$ is finite.

Checking nonemptiness of $\text{Matches}(\mathcal{G}, R, s, t)$ amounts to checking accessibility in some kind of product graph of $\mathcal{G} \times R$, a problem known to be **NL**-complete [AB09]. Since $\text{MM}(\mathcal{G}, R, s, t)$ is empty if and only if $\text{Matches}(\mathcal{G}, R, s, t)$ is, the next statement follows.

Lemma 4. The following problem is **NL**-complete: given a graph \mathcal{G} , a regular expression R and two vertices, is $\text{MM}(\mathcal{G}, R, s, t)$ nonempty?

4 Main result

The purpose of this document is to show that it is not possible to enumerate $\text{MM}(\mathcal{G}, R, s, t)$ with a polynomial delay algorithm, as formally stated below.

WALK ENUM UNDER MM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Input: A regular expression R, a graph \mathcal{G} and two vertices s, t. • Output: All walks in $\text{MM}(R, \mathcal{G}, s, t)$.

Theorem 5. *Unless $P = NP$, there exists no polynomial delay algorithm to solve WALK ENUM UNDER MM. It is already true for a fixed regular expression R with star-height 1.*

The remainder of Section 4 is dedicated to proving Theorem 5. We give a scheme of the proof in Section 4.1, together with the notation about the 3-SAT instance I we reduce from. Afterwards, the fixed regular expression R is then given in Section 4.2. We then present in section 4.3 the graph \mathcal{G}_I , built from the instance I . Finally, Section 4.4 states and shows the claims leading to Theorem 5.

Remark 6. *The idea underlying Lemma 4 also show that finding **some** walks in $MM(\mathcal{G}, R, s, t)$ is easy. Indeed, the shortest walk in $Matches(\mathcal{G}, R, s, t)$ is minimal w.r.t. \prec , hence also belongs to $MM(\mathcal{G}, R, s, t)$. Several other short walks are also likely to belong to $MM(\mathcal{G}, R, s, t)$. These walks may be computed in polynomial time with a breadth-first search of $\mathcal{G} \times R$.*

The tension in the proof of Theorem 5 comes from the existence of these easy solutions. We need to keep their number small (in polynomial number) otherwise one may solve the 3-SAT instance I by executing one step of the computation before outputting each of the easy solutions. On the other hand, as explained later in Section 4.1, there will be exponentially many walks in $Matches(\mathcal{G}, R, s, t)$, one for each valuation of the SAT variables. Hence each of the exponentially many valuations that are not a witness to I must be greater w.r.t. \prec than one of the polynomially many easy solutions.

Remark 7. *In database theory, it is usual to consider data complexity, that is the complexity when the query is considered to be constant (see for instance [AHV95]). In our case, the graph \mathcal{G} is the abstraction of the database and R is the abstraction of the query. Hence, Theorem 7 implies that WALK ENUM UNDER MM is not poly-delay in data complexity (unless $P = NP$).*

4.1 Proof outline

Although the term is not proper, our proof consists in a many-one reduction from 3-SAT. In the following, we fix a 3-SAT instance I with ℓ clauses C_1, \dots, C_j and k variables x_1, \dots, x_k . We denote negated literal with a bar, as in \bar{x}_i . From I , we will build a graph \mathcal{G}_I with two vertices Source and Target; we will also partition the edge into three color (red, green and blue) to help readability.

The last input of WALK ENUM UNDER MM is a fixed expression R that will be of the shape $R = R_1 \cdot R_3 + R_2$. First, R_1 is such that it matches a trail in \mathcal{G}_I if and only I is satisfiable. Moreover matches to R_1 contain only red edges. Then, R_2 matches walks that are almost trails, in the sense that exactly one edge is used twice. The property we want is: (*) for every match w_1 to R_1 that is not a trail, there exists a match w_2 to R_2 such that $w_2 \prec w_1$ (that is, $EdgeBag(w_2) \subsetneq EdgeBag(w_1)$), in which case w_1 is not returned. Indeed, since a nontrail must use some edge twice, there is a match to R_2 that uses that edge twice. However the property (*) does not precisely hold because matches to R_2 use extra (blue) edges. The expression R_3 solves this problem by matching exactly one walk which uses every extra edge in the graph (in fact every blue or green edge).

As explained in Remark 6, WALK ENUM. UNDER MM always has easy solutions. In our case, the matches to R_2 are the easy solutions and we will see that there is a polynomial number of them. After they are output, the next solution must be a match to $R_1 \cdot R_3$ that

is a trail, if it exists. This provides an algorithm solving I: An hard solution is output if and only if I is satisfiable.

4.2 The regular expression R

The expression R, defined below, is over the alphabet $\Sigma = \{0, \dots, 9, X\}$, has three part R_1 , R_2 and R_3 that will be used later on in the proof.

$$R = R_1 R_3 + R_2 \quad \text{where} \quad \begin{cases} R_1 = 0 \cdot (1 + 2 + 313)^* \cdot 0 \\ R_2 = 0 \cdot 2^* \cdot 55 \cdot 1^* \cdot 4 \cdot 1^* \cdot 55 \cdot 2^* \cdot 0 \\ R_3 = 9 \cdot (8 + 755 + 646 + 557)^* \cdot X \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Remark 8. Note that R is of star-height 1 and is independent of the SAT instance I.

We also split Σ into three: $\Sigma = \Sigma_R \uplus \Sigma_B \uplus \Sigma_G$ where

- $\Sigma_R = \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ contains the *red* letters;
- $\Sigma_B = \{4, 5\}$ contains the *blue* letters;
- $\Sigma_G = \{6, 7, 8, 9, X\}$ contains the *green* letters.

Remark 9. Expression R_1 is red, that is R_1 is over Σ_R . Expression R_2 is red and blue, that is R_2 is over $\Sigma_R \cup \Sigma_B$. Expression R_3 is blue and green, that is R_3 is over $\Sigma_B \cup \Sigma_G$.

4.3 Presentation of the gadgets and the graph \mathcal{G}_I

Figures 1 to 5 show the different gadgets used in \mathcal{G}_I . They collectively define G_I entirely. We use the following drawing convention.

- The color of an edge corresponds to the color of the label held by the edge.
- Vertices drawn with a plain line are inside the gadget and vertices drawn with a dashed line are outside the gadget.
- Edges drawn with a plain line have both endpoints in the gadget.
- Edges drawn with a dotted or a dashed line have one of their endpoints outside of the gadget.
- Dashed edges are unconditional, while dotted edges (in Fig 2 only) might or might not exist depending on the instance I.

Aside from the glu gadget, described last, they are given roughly in the order a (red) walk matching R_1 will traverse them.

Figure 1 gives the **start gadget**. Aside from the vertex Source, it contains 2 vertex for each variable x_i , that connects to the beginning of the positive and negative side of gadget x_i , respectively. Each walk matched by R_1 , R_2 or R will start in vertex Source in this gadget.

For each variable x_i , \mathcal{G}_I contains one **variable** gadget defined in Figure 2. It is formed of a **positive side** (top part: $\triangleright Sx_i \rightarrow x_i^0 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow x_i^\ell$), of a **negative side** (bottom part: $\triangleright S\bar{x}_i \rightarrow \bar{x}_i^0 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \bar{x}_i^\ell$), and of two vertices $\triangleright x_i$ and $x_i \triangleright$. It is linked to the prior variable gadget (left) and the next variable gadget (right). Finally, two edges connecting C_j to the positive (resp. negative) side of this gadget if x_i (resp. $\neg x_i$) is a literal in C_j .




Figure 1: Start gadget




Figure 2: Gadget for variable x_i , $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$

For each clause C_j , there is one **clause gadget** defined in Figure 3. It contains two vertices, is linked to the prior and following clause gadget. As said before, it is connected by two edges to a variable gadget x_i if x_i appears in C_j . It is connected to the positive (resp. negative) side if it appears positively (resp. negatively) in C_j .




Figure 3: Gadget for the clause C_j , $j \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$, decomposed as $C_j = \beta \vee \gamma \vee \delta$ with $\beta, \gamma, \delta \in \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \cup \{\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n\}$. For instance, if $\beta = x_2$ (resp. \bar{x}_5), then β^j refers to the vertex x_2^j (resp. \bar{x}_5^j) in gadget x_2 (resp. in gadget x_5).

Figure 4 defines the **end gadget**. Aside from the vertex Target, which will be the target of all matched walks, it contains 2 vertex for each variable x_i . They are connected to the end of the positive and negative side of gadget x_i , respectively.




Figure 4: End gadget

Finally, Figure 5 defines a few missing vertices that connect some gadgets to each other. First, it links with red edges the start gadget to the first variable gadget, then the last variable gadget to the first clause gadget, and the last clause gadget to the end gadget. Second, it helps create with green edges a cycle from Target to Target that traverse the positive sides and the negative sides of all variable gadget.




Figure 5: Glu gadget

4.4 Proof of Theorem 5

First, let us consider the walks matching R_1 . Recall that $R_1 = 0 \cdot (1 + 2 + 313)^* \cdot 0$. A simple verification yields the following lemma.

Lemma 10. *Any walk w matching R_1 meets the following properties.*

- (a) All edges in w are red, that is labelled over $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$.
- (b) The source of w is Source.
- (c) The walk w traverse once each gadget x_i and exactly one of the following walks is a factor of w .

$$\begin{aligned} \triangleright x_i &\rightarrow x_i^0 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow x_i^\ell \rightarrow x_i \triangleright \\ \triangleright x_i &\rightarrow \bar{x}_i^0 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \bar{x}_i^\ell \rightarrow x_i \triangleright \end{aligned}$$

If the former is a factor of w , we say that w **traverses the positive side of gadget x_i** , and or that it **traverses the negative side of gadget x_i** otherwise.

- (d) The walk w traverse once each gadget C_j .
- (e) The target of w is Target.
- (f) The length¹ of w is equal to $k\ell + 7k + 4\ell + 3$.

Definition 11. With any walk w matching R_1 is associated a **valuation** f_w , the one that maps each variable x_i to \top if it traverses the negative side of the gadget x_i , and to \perp if it traverses its

¹The precise length of w is unimportant. In the following we use only that all walks matching R_1 have the same length, and that this length is polynomial in I .

positive side.

Be aware that sign of x_i in the valuation f_w is the opposite of the sign of the side traversed in gadget x_i .

Proposition 12. *There exists a trail in \mathcal{G}_1 matching R_1 if and only if the 3-SAT instance I is satisfiable.*

Proof. \Rightarrow Let w be a trail matching R_1 . Let us show that the valuation f_w associated with w makes I true. Let $C_j = \beta \vee \gamma \vee \delta$ be a clause in I . Then the walk w must contain the factor $\triangleright C_j \xrightarrow{3} \alpha^{j-1} \xrightarrow{1} \alpha^j \xrightarrow{3} C_j \triangleright$ for some $\alpha \in \{\beta, \gamma, \delta\}$. Let us assume that α is a positive literal x_i , which means that w contains $C_j \xrightarrow{3} x_i^{j-1} \xrightarrow{1} x_i^j \xrightarrow{3} C_{j+1}$ as a factor. Since w is a trail, it means that w necessarily traverses the negative side of gadget x_i , hence that $f_w(x_i) = \top$. Hence f_w indeeds makes clause C_j true. The case where α is a negative literal is symmetric. We just showed that f_w makes true every clause of I , hence I is satisfiable.

The \Leftarrow direction is similar. The valuation making I true gives the side used in each variable gadget and since it must make I true, it also provides implicitly which variable(s) makes each clause true. \square

Recall that $R_2 = 0 \cdot 2^* \cdot 55 \cdot 1^* \cdot 4 \cdot 1^* \cdot 55 \cdot 2^* \cdot 0$. Let us now precisely characterises the walks matching R_2 .

Lemma 13. *The set of walks in \mathcal{G}_1 matching R_2 is exactly*

$$\{w_{\alpha,j} \mid \alpha \in \{x_1, \dots, x_k\} \cup \{\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_k\}, j \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}\}$$

where $w_{\alpha,j}$ is the following walk.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Source} &\xrightarrow{0} \text{Start}_{x_1} \xrightarrow{2} \dots \xrightarrow{2} \text{Start}_{\alpha} \xrightarrow{5} \\ &\triangleright S\alpha \xrightarrow{5} \alpha^0 \xrightarrow{1} \dots \xrightarrow{1} \alpha^{j-1} \xrightarrow{1} \alpha^j \xrightarrow{4} \alpha^{j-1} \xrightarrow{1} \alpha^j \xrightarrow{5} S\alpha \triangleright \xrightarrow{5} \\ &\text{End}_{\alpha} \xrightarrow{2} \dots \xrightarrow{2} \text{End}_{\bar{x}_1} \xrightarrow{0} \text{Target} \end{aligned}$$

Sketch of proof. The fact that all such walks are matching R_2 requires a simple verification. Conversely, each walk matching R_2 is necessarily of this form because of the mandatory 4 and 55 in R_2 . Indeed, 55 forces the walk to choose a variable gadget and the positive or negative side of that gadget. Then the mandatory letter 4 forces the matching walk to repeat an edge within that gadget, the repeated edge fixes j . \square

Note that the walks $w_{\alpha,j}$ is almost a trail: it repeats the edge $\alpha^{j-1} \xrightarrow{1} \alpha^j$ twice but every other edge appears once. Moreover, it follows from Lemma 13 that they satisfy the following properties.

Corollary 14. *There are $2 \times \ell \times k$ walks in \mathcal{G}_1 matching R_2 . They all belong to $\text{MM}(\mathcal{G}_1, R_2)$. They all have a length smaller than $4k + \ell + 6$.*

Proposition 15. *For every walk w_1 matching R_1 , the following are equivalent.*

- (a) w_1 is not a trail;

- (b) *there exists a walk w_2 matching R_2 such that $\text{RedEdgeBag}(w_2) \subseteq \text{RedEdgeBag}(w_1)$, where RedEdgeBag maps a walk w to the multiset of the red edges in w , that is the edges labeled by 0, 1, 2 or 3.*

Proof. (a) \implies (b) If w_1 is not a trail, w_1 uses twice some red edge $\alpha^{j-1} \xrightarrow{1} \alpha^j$ with $\alpha \in \{x_i, \bar{x}_i\}$ for some variable x_i . Then the walk $w_2 = w_{\alpha,j}$ (see Lemma 13) uses that red edge twice. Note that the walk w_1 contains each red edges from the start and end gadgets. Since $w_{\alpha,j}$ traverses only three gadgets, it remains to show that all red edges used by $w_{\alpha,j}$ in the gadget x_i are also in w_1 . The only way for w to use $\alpha^{j-1} \xrightarrow{1} \alpha^j$ twice is that w_1 contains the factor $\alpha^0 \xrightarrow{1} \dots \xrightarrow{1} \alpha^j$ (while traversing gadget x_i , see item 10(c)).

(b) \implies (a) Every match to R_2 repeats a red edge, the hypothesis $\text{RedEdgeBag}(w_2) \subseteq \text{RedEdgeBag}(w_1)$ implies that w_1 repeats that same red edge, hence is not a trail. \square

We now consider the expression $R_3 = 9 \cdot (8 + 755 + 646 + 557)^* \cdot X$. A simple verification yields the following characterization of the walks (in fact the unique walk) that matches R_3 .

Lemma 16. *There is exactly one walk w_3 matching R_3 , and it satisfies the following properties*

- (a) w_3 starts and ends in Target.
- (b) w_3 contains one or two copies of each blue or green edge, that is of each edge labeled over $\{4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, X\}$.

In particular, note that for every match w_1 to R_1 , the walk $w_1 \cdot w_3$ matches $R_1 R_3$, where w_3 is the match to R_3 .

Proposition 17. *Let w_1 be a match to R_1 and w_3 be the match to R_3 . The following are equivalent.*

- (a) w_1 is not a trail;
- (b) *There exists a walk w_2 matching R_2 such that $\text{EdgeBag}(w_2) \subsetneq \text{EdgeBag}(w_1 \cdot w_3)$;*
- (c) $w_1 \cdot w_3 \notin \text{MM}(D, R_1 \cdot R_3 + R_2)$;

Proof. It follows from Lemma 16(b) and Proposition 15 that (a) and (b) are equivalent. Definition of MM implies that (b) \implies (c).

Finally, let us show (c) \implies (b). By definition of MM, $w_1 \cdot w_3 \notin \text{MM}(D, R_1 \cdot R_3 + R_2)$ means that there exists a walk w_2 matching $R_1 R_3 + R_2$ such that $\text{EdgeBag}(w_2) \subsetneq \text{EdgeBag}(w_1 \cdot w_3)$. We assume, for the sake of contradiction that w_2 matches $R_1 \cdot R_3$. Recall that all matches to R_1 (resp. R_3) have the same length from Lemma 10(f) (resp. from Lemma 16). Hence, the length of w_2 is equal to the length of $w_1 w_3$, a contradiction to the condition $\text{EdgeBag}(w_2) \subsetneq \text{EdgeBag}(w_1 \cdot w_3)$. Since w_2 matches $R_1 R_3 + R_2$ but not $R_1 R_3$, then it must match R_2 , hence (b) holds. \square

We may now finalise the proof of Theorem 5. From Corollary 14, there are $2\ell k$ walks in $\text{MM}(\mathcal{G}_I, R_2)$. They must all belong to $\text{MM}(\mathcal{G}_I, R)$ since it is impossible that $\text{EdgeBag}(w) \subsetneq \text{EdgeBag}(w')$ with w matching $R_1 R_3$ and w' matching R_2 (w contains green edges, w' does not). Now, let us assume there is a polynomial-delay algorithm A to enumerate $\text{MM}(\mathcal{G}_I, R)$. Note that the following are equivalent.

The algorithm A outputs at least $(2\ell k + 1)$ -th walks.

- \iff There exists a walk $w \in \text{MM}(\mathcal{G}_I, R)$ that matches $R_1 \cdot R_3$.
- \iff There is a trail w matching R_1 . (Proposition 17)
- \iff I is satisfiable. (Proposition 12)

On the other hand, it follows from Lemma 10(f), Corollary 14 and Lemma 16 that all matches to $R = R_1 R_3 + R_2$ have a length that is polynomial in k and ℓ . Hence, A takes a polynomial time to output $2\ell k + 1$ walks or to stop after outputting $2\ell k$. This provides a polynomial time algorithm for 3-SAT: build \mathcal{G}_I and run A until it outputs $2\ell k + 1$ walks or stops at $2\ell k$; in the first case accept I , in the second reject I .

5 Side results

5.1 Walk membership is co-NP hard

WALK MEMBERSHIP UNDER MM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Input: A regular expression R, a graph \mathcal{G}_I and a walk w. • Question: Does w belong to $\text{MM}(R, D)$?

Theorem 18. *WALK MEMBERSHIP under MM semantics is coNP-complete. It is already true for a fixed regular expression R .*

Sketch of proof. $\text{WALK MEMBERSHIP}(\mathcal{G}, R, w)$ under MM belongs to coNP since a certificate for rejection is any walk w' in $\text{Walks}(\mathcal{G}, R)$ such that $\text{MM}(w') \subsetneq \text{MM}(w)$.

The proof of coNP-hardness is similar, but simpler than the one of Theorem 5. We use same red part of the graph and the same expression $R_1 = 0 \cdot (1 + 2 + 313)^* \cdot 0$. Hence, Proposition 12 still holds: each walk matching R_1 is a trail if and only if the 3-SAT instance is satisfiable. Then we add green edges to the graph. This time, we need to devise an expression R_2 that matches a walk w_2 such that every red edge occurs exactly once in w_2 (green edges may occur any number of times). This may for instance be done as follows.

- We add a single green letter G to the alphabet.
- We add an edge $x_i \triangleright \xrightarrow{G} \triangleright x_i$ for every $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$.
- We add an edge $C_j \triangleright \xrightarrow{G} \triangleright C_j$ for every $j \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$.
- An edge $\alpha^{j-1} \triangleright \xrightarrow{G} \triangleright \alpha^j$ for every $j \in \{1, \ell\}$ and every literal α in clause C_j .
- Using the expression $R_2 = 0 \cdot (11^* G 11^* + 2 + (3G)^5 3)^* \cdot 0$.

The pattern $11^* G 11^*$ inside the star of R_2 allows some walks matching R_2 to have as factors both the positive and the negative 1-walk of each variable gadget (see item 10(c)). Similarly, the pattern $(3G)^5 3$ allows some walks matching R_2 to pass through every 3-edge in each clause gadget. In particular, there is a match w_2 to R_2 that contains every red edge. Note also that all walks matching R_2 have the same length, hence it is impossible that a walk w'_2 matching R_2 satisfies $\text{EdgeBag}(w_2) \subsetneq \text{EdgeBag}(w'_2)$. Then w belongs to $\text{MM}(\mathcal{G}, R_1 + R_2)$ if and only if I is not satisfiable. \square

5.2 Minimal-Set Semantics

As mentioned in the introduction, the problem studied in this note were introduced in [MM24]. Other variants were also mentioned, and we show how the proof can easily be adapted for some of them.

Definition 19. (a) For every walk w , we let $\text{EdgeSet}(w)$ denote the set of the edges appearing in w .

(b) We define the strict partial order relation \sqsubset on walks as follows: $w \sqsubset w'$ if and only if: either $\text{EdgeSet}(w) \subsetneq \text{EdgeSet}(w')$; or $\text{EdgeSet}(w) = \text{EdgeSet}(w')$ and $\text{Len}(w) < \text{Len}(w')$. We let \sqsubseteq denote the reflexive extension of \sqsubset .

(c) We let SMS denote the function that maps a graph \mathcal{G} , a regular expression R , and two vertices vertex s, t to:

$$\text{SMS}(\mathcal{G}, R, s, t) = \min_{\sqsubseteq} \text{Matches}(\mathcal{G}, R, s, t) . \quad (4)$$

In Item (b) above, we use length as a tie-breaker when two walks have equal edge sets. Indeed, recall that without such a tie breaker, SMS would not always return a finite set of walks. It may be verified that with the current definition, $\text{SMS}(\mathcal{G}, R, s, t)$ is indeed always finite.

WALK ENUM UNDER SMS

- **Input:** A regular expression R , a graph \mathcal{G} and two vertices s, t .
- **Output:** All walks in $\text{SMS}(R, \mathcal{G}, s, t)$.

Theorem 20. *Unless $P = NP$, there exists no polynomial delay algorithm to solve WALK ENUM UNDER SMS. It is already true for a fixed regular expression R with star-height 1.*

The proof of Theorem 20 is very similar to the one of theorem 5 and we only sketch the difference below. First, we need to modify the graph and expression as follows.

- Add a new blue letter $4'$.
- Replace each edge $x_i^j \xrightarrow{4} x_i^{j-1}$ by two edges $x_i^j \xrightarrow{4} \bar{x}_i^{j-1}$ and $\bar{x}_i^j \xrightarrow{4'} x_i^j$.
- Symmetrically replace each edge $\bar{x}_i^j \xrightarrow{4} \bar{x}_i^{j-1}$ by two edges $\bar{x}_i^j \xrightarrow{4} x_i^{j-1}$ and $x_i^j \xrightarrow{4'} \bar{x}_i^j$.
- R_2 becomes $0 \cdot 2^* 55 \cdot 1^* \cdot 414' \cdot 1^* \cdot 55 \cdot 2^*$
- R_3 becomes $9 \cdot (8 + 755 + 6464' + 557)^* \cdot X$

Second, a proof much similar to the one of Proposition 12 shows that I is satisfiable if and only if there is a walk matching R_1 that does not contain both the edges $x_i^j \xrightarrow{1} x_i^{j-1}$ and $x_i^j \xrightarrow{1} \bar{x}_i^{j-1}$. The matches to R_2 are exactly the walks using one side (positive or negative) from a variable gadget, and one edge from the other side of this gadget. The remainder of the proof is similar to the one of Theorem 5.

Remark 21. *The proof of Theorem 20 does not actually use the fact that \sqsubseteq uses length a tiebreak. Hence Theorem 20 would also hold for semantics based on any order \ll satisfying $\text{EdgeSet}(w) \subsetneq \text{EdgeSet}(w') \implies w \ll w'$.*

Finally, consider the problem `MEMBERSHIP UNDER SMS`, defined similarly to `MEMBERSHIP UNDER MM`. Although `MEMBERSHIP UNDER SMS` is clearly in `coNP`, the constructions presented in this note does not seem adapted to show that it is `coNP-hard`. However, we conjecture that it is.

Conjecture 22. *MEMBERSHIP UNDER SMS is coNP-complete, for a fixed regular expression R.*

6 References

- [AHV95] S. Abiteboul, Richard Hull, and Victor Vianu. *Foundations of databases*. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1995. ISBN: 978-0-201-53771-0.
- [AB09] Sanjeev Arora and Boaz Barak. *Computational Complexity: A Modern Approach*. Cambridge University Press, 2009. ISBN: 978-0-521-42426-4.
- [BJG09] Jørgen Bang-Jensen and Gregory Z. Gutin. *Digraphs : Theory, Algorithms and Applications*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. London: Springer London, 2009. ISBN: 978-0-85729-041-0. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-84800-998-1.
- [CM90] Mariano P. Consens and Alberto O. Mendelzon. “GraphLog: a visual formalism for real life recursion”. In: *Proceedings of the Ninth ACM SIGACT-SIGMOD-SIGART Symposium on Principles of Database Systems*. PODS ’90. Nashville, Tennessee, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 1990, 404–416. ISBN: 0897913523. DOI: 10.1145/298514.298591. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/298514.298591>.
- [CMW87] Isabel F. Cruz, Alberto O. Mendelzon, and Peter T. Wood. “A graphical query language supporting recursion”. In: *SIGMOD Rec.* 16.3 (1987), 323–330. ISSN: 0163-5808. DOI: 10.1145/38714.38749.
- [DFM23] Claire David, Nadime Francis, and Victor Marsault. “Run-Based Semantics for RPQs”. In: *Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning (KR’23)*. Aug. 2023, pp. 178–187.
- [DF⁺22] Alin Deutsch, Nadime Francis, Alastair Green, Keith Hare, Bei Li, Leonid Libkin, Tobias Lindaaker, Victor Marsault, Wim Martens, Jan Michels, Filip Murlak, Stefan Plantikow, Petra Selmer, Hannes Voigt, Oskar van Rest, Domagoj Vrgoč, Mingxi Wu, and Fred Zemke. “Graph Pattern Matching in GQL and SQL/PGQ”. In: *SIGMOD’22*. ACM, 2022.
- [DX⁺19] Alin Deutsch, Yu Xu, Mingxi Wu, and Victor E. Lee. *TigerGraph: A Native MPP Graph Database*. Preprint arXiv:1901.08248. 2019. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1901.08248>.
- [FG⁺18a] Nadime Francis, Alastair Green, Paolo Guagliardo, Leonid Libkin, Tobias Lindaaker, Victor Marsault, Stefan Plantikow, Mats Rydberg, Martin Schuster, Petra Selmer, and Andrés Taylor. *Formal Semantics of the Language Cypher*. Arxiv Preprint. 2018. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1802.09984>.

-
- [FG⁺18b] Nadime Francis, Alastair Green, Paolo Guagliardo, Leonid Libkin, Tobias Lindaaker, Victor Marsault, Stefan Plantikow, Mats Rydberg, Petra Selmer, and Andrés Taylor. “Cypher: An Evolving Query Language for Property Graphs”. In: *SIGMOD’18*. ACM, 2018.
- [PGQ] International Organization for Standardization. *SQL — Part 16: SQL Property Graph Queries (SQL/PGQ)*. <https://www.iso.org/standard/79473.html>. Standard ISO/IEC 9075-16:2023. 2023.
- [GQL] International Organization for Standardization. *GQL*. <https://www.iso.org/standard/76120.html>. Standard under development ISO/IEC CD 39075. 2024.
- [Khi24] Sara Khichane. “Study of New Semantics for Regular Path Queries”. MA thesis. Université Paris-Cité, 2024.
- [PGQL] Property Graph Query Language. *PGQL 1.4 Specification*. 2021. URL: <https://pgql-lang.org/spec/1.4/>.
- [MM24] Victor Marsault and Antoine Meyer. *Framework for comparing walk-outputting RPQs semantics*. In preparation. 2024.
- [Str21] Yann Strozecki. *Enumeration Complexity: Incremental Time, Delay and Space*. Habilitation thesis. Université de Versailles – Saint-Quentin-en-Yvelines. 2021.
- [SPARQLPP] World Wide Web Consortium. *SPARQL 1.1 Query Language, Section 9: Property paths*. <https://www.w3.org/TR/sparql11-query/#propertypaths>. 2013.