

On the feasibility of semantic query metrics

George Fletcher¹, Peter Wood², Nikolay Yakovets¹

¹Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands

²Birkbeck, University of London

{g.h.l.fletcher, n.yakovets}@tue.nl, p.wood@bbk.ac.uk

Abstract

We consider the problem of defining semantic metrics for relational database queries. Informally, a semantic query metric for a query language L is a metric function $\delta : L \times L \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ where $\delta(Q_1, Q_2)$ represents the length of a shortest path between queries Q_1 and Q_2 in a graph. In this graph, nodes are queries from L , and edges connect semantically distinct queries where one query is maximally semantically contained in the other. Since query containment is undecidable for first-order queries, we focus on the simpler language of conjunctive queries. We establish that defining a semantic query metric is impossible even for conjunctive queries. Given this impossibility result, we identify a significant subclass of conjunctive queries where such a metric is feasible, and we establish the computational complexity of calculating distances within this language.

1 Introduction

Defining distances between queries plays an important role in the study of data management systems. Example applications giving rise to notions of query distance include workload compression and clustering [26, 27, 40]; view selection, index selection and, in general, physical design [1, 13, 15, 18, 19, 32]; statistical synopsis construction (e.g., histogram tuning) [13], approximate aggregate query answering [13]; workload forecasting and monitoring [25, 30, 31]; query recommendation [25, 26]; benchmark design [25, 26]; query debugging [24, 25, 26]; workload error classification [25, 26]; database forensics [25, 26, 31]; and data systems education [24, 28, 35, 41].

The majority of studies have defined distance in terms of the syntax of queries, either using the query-strings themselves or some derivative thereof, such as physical query execution plans. Syntactic and instance distance measures have also been studied in the database and logics communities, e.g., [3, 29, 33, 34]. Alternatively, some studies have taken into consideration operational behaviour such as query frequency and workload co-occurrence in the definition of distance, e.g., [30]. Furthermore, heuristic machine learning approaches have been studied, e.g., [38].

Distance functions studied in the literature often contain some indirect proxy of the semantics of queries, e.g., queries with shared physical access paths will potentially have some semantic similarity. To our knowledge, the semantic behaviour of queries have not been directly taken into consideration in the study of query distance (where “behaviour” means input/output behaviour). This is surprising, as many workload analytics tasks rely on grouping queries with similar behaviors.

Contributions. Given these practical observations, in this work we consider the problem of defining semantic metrics for relational database queries. Informally, a semantic query metric with respect to query language L is a metric function $\delta : L \times L \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $\delta(Q_1, Q_2)$ is the number of queries on a shortest path between Q_1 and Q_2 in the graph having node set L and edge set $\{\{Q, Q'\} \mid Q \text{ and } Q' \text{ are semantically distinct and } Q \text{ is maximally semantically contained in } Q'\}$. As containment is undecidable for first order queries, we consider the language of conjunctive queries for which containment is decidable [12]. We establish that it is also not possible to define a semantic query metric for this language. Given this impossibility result, we identify a non-trivial class of conjunctive queries for which this is possible and establish the complexity of computing distances within this language.

2 Preliminary definitions

We fix our attention on the language of conjunctive queries.

Data A *relational schema* is a finite set of *relation names* $\sigma = \{R_1, \dots, R_k\}$, where each $R \in \sigma$ is of some fixed *arity* $\text{arity}(R) \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$.

Let \mathcal{C} be a domain of constants. A σ -*fact* is a tuple $R(c_1, \dots, c_a)$ where $R \in \sigma$, $a = \text{arity}(R)$, and $c_i \in \mathcal{C}$ for each $1 \leq i \leq a$. An *instance* of σ is a finite set I of σ -facts.

Queries Let σ be a relational schema, \mathcal{V} be a set of variables, and $n > 0$. A *conjunctive query* (CQ) over σ is a rule of the form

$$(\bar{z}) \leftarrow S_1(\bar{x}_1), \dots, S_n(\bar{x}_n)$$

where

- $S_j \in \sigma$ and $\bar{x}_j \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ is a list of variables of length $\text{arity}(S_j)$, for $1 \leq j \leq n$; and,
- $\bar{z} \subseteq \bigcup \bar{x}_j$ is a list of variables.

We call (\bar{z}) the *head* and $S_1(\bar{x}_1), \dots, S_n(\bar{x}_n)$ the *body* of the query; we call the variables that appear in the head *distinguished* variables, and those that appear only in the body *non-distinguished* variables; and, we call the elements $S_j(\bar{x}_j)$ the *atoms* of the body. Further, we say the query is of *arity* $|\bar{z}| \geq 0$.

Given query $Q = (z_1, \dots, z_m) \leftarrow S_1(x_1^1, \dots, x_{i_1}^1), \dots, S_n(x_1^n, \dots, x_{i_n}^n)$ and instance I of σ , a function $h : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$, is an *embedding of Q in I* if, for each atom $S_j(x_1^j, \dots, x_{i_j}^j)$ in the body of Q , it holds that $S_j(h(x_1^j), \dots, h(x_{i_j}^j)) \in I$. The semantics of Q on I is the set

$$\llbracket Q \rrbracket_I = \{(h(z_1), \dots, h(z_m)) \mid h \text{ is an embedding of } Q \text{ in } I\}.$$

Example 2.1. Assume we have the relational schema $\sigma = \{R, L\}$, where $\text{arity}(R) = 2$ and $\text{arity}(L) = 1$. Let I be the following instance of σ :

$$\begin{aligned} &R(a, b), R(a, c), R(b, a), R(c, c) \\ &L(a), L(b), L(c) \end{aligned}$$

Consider the following CQ Q over σ :

$$(x, y) \leftarrow R(x, y), R(y, x), L(x), L(y).$$

One embedding of Q in I is given by the function h_1 which maps x to a and maps y to b , while another is given by h_2 which maps both x and y to c . Since there are no other embeddings, we have $\llbracket Q \rrbracket_I = \{(a, b), (c, c)\}$.

2.1 Maximal query containment

The classic notions of relative semantic behaviour are query containment and equivalence. Our semantic distance function is based on the notion of maximal query containment which we define below.

Definition 2.2. Let $Q_1, Q_2 \in CQ$.

- Q_1 is contained in Q_2 , denoted $Q_1 \sqsubseteq Q_2$, if and only if for every instance I it holds that $\llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket_I \subseteq \llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket_I$.
- Q_1 and Q_2 are equivalent, denoted $Q_1 \equiv Q_2$, if and only if $Q_1 \sqsubseteq Q_2$ and $Q_2 \sqsubseteq Q_1$.
- The core of a query Q is the equivalent query Q^c having the smallest body, i.e., Q^c has the fewest atoms in its body of all queries equivalent to Q .¹ We also say that Q is minimal if $Q = Q^c$ (up to variable renaming).

¹We say “the” core, as cores are computable and unique up to renaming of variables [22].

Definition 2.3. A homomorphism from query Q_2 to query Q_1 is a function $h : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ such that, (1) for each atom $S_j(x_1^j, \dots, x_{i_j}^j)$ in the body of Q_2 , it is the case that $S_j(h(x_1^j), \dots, h(x_{i_j}^j))$ is an atom in the body of Q_1 ; and, (2) given the head (z_1, \dots, z_m) of Q_2 , $(h(z_1), \dots, h(z_m))$ is the head of Q_1 . We denote that such a homomorphism exists by $Q_2 \rightarrow Q_1$.

Note that the above definition allows a homomorphism to map one distinguished variable to another. As is common practice, we will also apply homomorphisms to tuples of variables, with the obvious meaning: i.e., if $\bar{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_m)$, then $h(\bar{z}) = (h(z_1), \dots, h(z_m))$.

We have the following useful characterisation of containment.

Proposition 2.4 ([12]). $Q_1 \sqsubseteq Q_2$ if and only if $Q_2 \rightarrow Q_1$.

Example 2.5. Let Q_1 be the CQ Q from Example 2.1:

$$(x, y) \leftarrow R(x, y), R(y, x), L(x), L(y)$$

and Q_2 be the CQ

$$(x, y) \leftarrow R(x, z), L(y), L(z)$$

With the instance I from Example 2.1, we see that $\llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket_I = \{(a, a), (a, b), (a, c), (b, a), (b, b), (b, c), (c, a), (c, b), (c, c)\}$, i.e., $\llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket_I \sqsubseteq \llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket_I$. In fact, $Q_1 \sqsubseteq Q_2$ since there is a homomorphism h from Q_2 to Q_1 which maps x and y to themselves and maps z to y .

If we add the atom $R(y, z)$ to Q_1 to give Q_3 :

$$(x, y) \leftarrow R(x, y), R(y, x), R(y, z), L(x), L(y)$$

we see that Q_3 is not minimal since it is equivalent to Q_1 . We could add any number of atoms of the form $R(y, w_i)$ to Q_3 , where in each case w_i is a new variable, showing that the same query can be represented syntactically in infinitely many ways.

It is well-known that:

Proposition 2.6 ([12, 22]). Containment (and therefore equivalence) is NP-complete. Furthermore, constructing the core of a query is an NP-complete problem.

In our study, we are interested in inequivalent queries which are semantically as “close” as possible. This is captured by the notion of *maximal containment*.

Definition 2.7. Let $Q_1, Q_2 \in CQ$. Q_1 is maximally contained in Q_2 (written $Q_1 \sqsubseteq_m Q_2$) if and only if (1) $Q_1 \sqsubseteq Q_2$, (2) $Q_2 \not\sqsubseteq Q_1$, and (3) for every $Q \in CQ$, it is the case that if $Q_1 \sqsubseteq Q \sqsubseteq Q_2$ then $Q_1 \equiv Q$ or $Q \equiv Q_2$.

In the next section, we show that, for a certain very restricted subclass of conjunctive queries, given a query Q in the class, there is no (finite) query that is maximally contained in Q .

3 Non-existence results

We now assume that our database consists of a single binary relation E , which can be viewed as the edge relation of some graph.

Definition 3.1. A Boolean path query (PQ) of length n , denoted P_n , checks for the existence of a (directed) path of length n in relation E , i.e.:

$$() \leftarrow E(z_1, z_2), E(z_2, z_3), \dots, E(z_n, z_{n+1}).$$

We refer to the atom $E(z_i, z_{i+1})$ as the i 'th atom in P_n . An oriented path query (OPQ) of length n generalises a path query by allowing the i 'th atom to be either $E(z_i, z_{i+1})$ (called a forward atom) or $E(z_{i+1}, z_i)$ (called a backwards atom).

Query	Reversal	Minimal
1	0	
11	00	
10	01	1
111	000	
110	100	11
001	011	11
101	010	1
1111	0000	
1110	1000	111
0111	0001	111
1101	0100	11
1011	0010	11
1001	0110	11
1100		11
0011		11
1010		1
0101		1

Figure 1: Equivalences among oriented path queries.




Figure 2: Oriented path queries O_{111} , O_{11011} and O_{11} .

If we denote a forwards atom by 1 and a backwards atom by 0, then we can represent any OPQ of length n by O_k , where k is a binary sequence of length n . So, e.g., the OPQ O_{11111} is the same as P_4 , the PQ of length four².

Many oriented path queries are equivalent to one another, as shown by each row in the table in Figure 1 (where queries are represented simply by their binary sequences). Some of these equivalences arise through “reading” the atoms in a query from right to left rather than left to right (the “Reversal” column in the table, where a blank entry means the reversal is the same as the original query). Others arise as a result of some atoms being redundant (the “Minimal” column in the table, where a blank entry means the original query is minimal). In fact, each oriented path query of length up to 4 is equivalent to a path query of the same or shorter length, as shown in the table.

Only at length 5 does one encounter an oriented path query that is not equivalent to a path query, namely P_{11011} , shown in Figure 2. Note that, although there is a homomorphism from O_{11} to O_{11011} and from O_{11011} to O_{111} , there is no homomorphism from O_{11011} to O_{11} or from O_{111} to O_{11011} . So O_{11011} is “between” a path query of length 2 and one of length 3. How many oriented path queries can appear between two “consecutive” path queries? Unfortunately, it seems that there can be an unbounded number of oriented path queries between two consecutive path queries,

Theorem 3.2. *There exist (oriented) path queries P_i and P_{i+1} for which there is no oriented path query O such that $P_i \sqsubseteq O \sqsubseteq_m P_{i+1}$.*

Proof. Consider path queries $P_3 = O_{111}$ and $P_2 = O_{11}$, as well as the oriented path query O_{11011} shown in Figure 2. We can produce any number of OPQs by “iterating” a sub-pattern in O_{11011} . Let $Q_0 = O_{111}$ and let $Q_i = O_{11(01)^i 1}$, $i \geq 1$, as shown in Figure 3. A homomorphism from Q_{i+1} to Q_i is given by mapping w_{2i+1} and $w_{2(i+1)}$ in Q_{i+1} to

²Oriented path queries and the binary notation for them have been inspired by [23].




Figure 3: Oriented path query $Q_i = O_{11(01)^i1}$.

w_{2j-1} and w_{2j} in Q_i , respectively (or w_1 and w_2 to z_2 and z_3 , respectively, for Q_1 to Q_0). There is a homomorphism from O_{11} to each Q_i , since each Q_i contains O_{11} as a sub-path. So we have the following:

$$O_{111} \sqsubseteq Q_1 \sqsubseteq \cdots \sqsubseteq Q_i \sqsubseteq \cdots \sqsubseteq O_{11}$$

We claim that none of the reverse containments to those above hold.

There can be no homomorphism from O_{111} to Q_1 because the longest directed path in Q_1 is of length only 2. Similarly, there can be no homomorphism from Q_i to O_{11} because one of the O_{11} components of Q_i (from z_1 to z_3 , or from w_{2i-1} to w_{2i}) must map to the directed path of length 2 in O_{11} , but then either z_1 or z_4 cannot be mapped to any variable in O_{11} .

Now consider a possible homomorphism from Q_i to Q_{i+1} . Variables z_1, z_2 and z_3 in Q_i could map to variables $w_{2i+1}, w_{2(i+1)}$ and z_4 in Q_{i+1} , respectively, but, once again, z_4 in Q_i cannot be mapped anywhere. So z_1, z_2 and z_3 in Q_i must map to z_1, z_2 and z_3 , respectively, in Q_{i+1} . Now, whether the w variables in Q_i map to distinct w variables in Q_{i+1} or not, z_4 in Q_i cannot be mapped to Q_{i+1} because Q_{i+1} has one more 01 pattern than Q_i .

Perhaps there is some other query R that is contained in O_{11} and contains each Q_i . Because R is of finite size, no homomorphism from R can map one variable to one of z_1 to z_3 and another variable to z_4 (since Q_i can be “pumped” to Q_j , $j > i$). Hence, variables in R must map to some subset of $\{z_1, z_2, z_3, w_1, \dots, w_k\}$, or to some subset of $\{w_{2i-k}, \dots, w_{2i}, z_4\}$, for some fixed k . But the queries induced by these subsets of variables are all equivalent to O_{11} . Hence, R (which is always assumed to be minimal) must have fewer variables than O_{11} . The only queries contained in O_{11} having fewer variables than O_{11} are C_1 and C_2 , the cycles with one and two variables, respectively. But neither of these is an oriented path query (nor contains any Q_i). We conclude that there is no query “between” O_{111} and O_{11} (including O_{111} itself) that is maximally contained in O_{11} . \square

The above theorem shows that the partial order $(\mathcal{S}, \sqsubseteq)$, where \mathcal{S} is the set of oriented path queries, does not satisfy the ascending chain condition. A partial order $(\mathcal{S}, \sqsubseteq)$ satisfies the *ascending chain condition* if no infinite strictly ascending sequence

$$q_1 \sqsubset q_2 \sqsubset q_3 \sqsubset \cdots$$

of elements of \mathcal{S} exists.

Note that, because of the equivalences shown in Figure 1, we can reduce the problem of determining maximal containment for oriented path queries to that of path queries if we limit the number of occurrences of the same relation name in an oriented path query to four.

4 Maximal containment of 2CQs

We next consider the problem of deciding maximal containment, i.e., given CQs Q_1 and Q_2 , is $Q_1 \sqsubseteq_m Q_2$? If we do not restrict the numbers of occurrences of relation names in the CQs, we will fall foul of the result established in the previous section. Hence, we restrict our attention to CQs in which each relation name can appear at most twice in the body. Another reason for limiting the number of occurrences to *two* is that Saraiya [37] shows that $Q_1 \sqsubseteq Q_2$ can

be tested in PTIME if each atom in Q_2 can be mapped to at most *two* atoms in Q_1 . Increasing that number to three results in NP-completeness.

In addition, many queries in practice refer to the same relation at most twice. For example, as an important practical class of queries, every *star* query is (semantically) a 2CQ. Here a star query is such that (1) all body atoms are binary and (2) there exists exactly one variable x which appears exactly once in each atom. Note that relation names can appear any number of times in the body; it is easy to establish that the core of every star query is a 2CQ. It has been observed in recent large-scale query log analyses that typically over 90% of queries in practice are star queries [7, 8].

4.1 2CQs and their restrictions

A conjunctive query in which each relation name appears at most twice (2CQ) is a rule of the form

$$(z_1, \dots, z_m) \leftarrow S_1(\bar{x}_1), \dots, S_n(\bar{x}_n)$$

where $S_i = S_j$ for at most two indexes i and j .

For the class of 2CQs we have a characterisation of maximal containment based on the notion of a *restriction* of a query.

Definition 4.1. Let $Q = (\bar{z}) \leftarrow S_1(\bar{x}_1), \dots, S_n(\bar{x}_n)$ be a 2CQ query, and $\text{vars}(Q)$ denote the set of variables appearing in Q . A restriction of Q takes one of the following four forms:

1. $h(\bar{z}) \leftarrow S_1(h(\bar{x}_1)), \dots, S_n(h(\bar{x}_n))$, where h is a function from $\text{vars}(Q)$ to $\text{vars}(Q)$ which is the identity on all variables in $\text{vars}(Q)$ except for one variable y , such that $h(y)$ is distinguished if y is.
2. $(\bar{z}) \leftarrow S_1(\bar{x}_1), \dots, S_n(\bar{x}_n), T(\bar{y})$, where T is a relation name in σ distinct from those in Q , and \bar{y} consists of distinct new variables not appearing in $\text{vars}(Q)$.
3. $(\bar{z}) \leftarrow S_1(\bar{x}_1), \dots, S_n(\bar{x}_n), T(h(\bar{y}))$, where
 - $T = S_j$ for exactly one $j \in [1..n]$,
 - \bar{y} consists of distinct new variables not appearing in $\text{vars}(Q)$,
 - h is a function from Y to $\text{vars}(Q) \cup Y$ (where Y is the set of variables appearing in \bar{y}) which is the identity on all variables in Y except for exactly one variable.
4. $(\bar{z}) \leftarrow S_1(\bar{x}_1), \dots, S_n(\bar{x}_n), T_1(h(\bar{y}_1)), T_2(\bar{y}_2)$, where
 - $T_1 = S_j$ and $T_2 = S_k$ ($S_j \neq S_k$) for exactly one $j \in [1..n]$ and exactly one $k \in [1..n]$,
 - \bar{y}_1 and \bar{y}_2 are tuples of distinct variables not in $\text{vars}(Q)$, and
 - h is a function from Y_1 to $Y_1 \cup Y_2$ (where Y_1 and Y_2 are the sets of variables appearing in \bar{y}_1 and \bar{y}_2 , respectively) which is the identity on all variables in Y_1 except for exactly one variable which h maps to a variable in Y_2 .

We refer to a restriction corresponding to case (i) above as a type- i restriction.

The following proposition clearly holds by virtue of the above definition.

Proposition 4.2. Each restriction of a 2CQ is a 2CQ.

However, a restriction of a minimal 2CQ does not necessarily result in a minimal 2CQ, except for restrictions of type 2 which are always minimal. Also, there can be containment relationships among the various restrictions of a query, as shown in the following example.

Example 4.3. Consider the following queries:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1 &: () \leftarrow R(x, y) \\ Q_2 &: () \leftarrow R(x, y), R(y, z) \\ Q_3 &: () \leftarrow R(x, y), R(y, x) \\ Q_4 &: () \leftarrow R(x, x) \end{aligned}$$

We have $Q_4 \sqsubseteq Q_3 \sqsubseteq Q_2 \sqsubseteq Q_1$. A type-1 restriction can map y to x , producing Q_4 directly from Q_1 , while there is a type-3 restriction of Q_1 , namely Q_2 , which contains Q_4 . Considering Q_2 , the type-1 restriction mapping z to x produces Q_3 , which is maximally contained in Q_2 . However, mapping z to y , y to z , y to x or x to y would each produce Q_4 directly, which is obviously not maximally contained in Q_2 .

The above examples show that there can be containment relationships among the queries generated by type-1, 3 and 4 restrictions; hence, we need to perform a containment check when generating them. This check is not necessary for type-2 restrictions as will be shown below.

Let Q be a minimal 2CQ and QR be the set of type 1, 3 or 4 restrictions applied to Q . The *reduced set of type 1, 3 or 4 restrictions* of Q is given by

$$\{Q' \mid Q' \text{ is the core of a query in } QR, Q \not\sqsubseteq Q', \text{ and } \nexists Q'' \in QR (Q'' \neq Q') \text{ such that } Q' \sqsubseteq Q''\}.$$

We say that queries Q_1 and Q_2 are *incomparable* if $Q_1 \not\sqsubseteq Q_2$ and $Q_2 \not\sqsubseteq Q_1$.

Lemma 4.4. Let Q be a minimal 2CQ, Q' be a type-2 restriction of Q , and Q'' be either of type-2 (in which case it is assumed to be non-isomorphic to Q') or in the reduced set of type 1, 3 or 4 restrictions of Q . Then (1) Q' is minimal, (2) there is no homomorphism from Q' to Q , and (3) Q' and Q'' are incomparable.

Proof. (1) Let A be the atom added to Q to form Q' , and R be its relation name. Since Q is minimal and R does not appear in Q , there can be no homomorphism from Q' to Q in which one atom maps to another. This shows both that Q' is minimal and that there is no homomorphism from Q' to Q .

Next we show that Q' and Q'' are incomparable. Assume first that Q'' is a type-2 restriction. There can be no homomorphism between Q' and Q'' since they each contain an atom with a relation name not appearing in the other.

Now assume that Q'' is of type 1, 3 or 4. There can be no homomorphism from Q' to Q'' because Q' contains an atom with a relation name not appearing in Q'' . There can be no homomorphism g from Q'' to Q' because, in each case, g would have to map the atoms of Q'' to $S_1(\bar{x}_1), \dots, S_n(\bar{x}_n)$, and therefore $Q'' \equiv Q$ which contradicts the fact that Q'' is in the reduced set of type 1, 3 or 4 restrictions of Q . \square

The *reduced set of restrictions* of Q , denoted $RR(Q)$, is the union of the set of type-2 restrictions of Q and the reduced set of type 1, 3 or 4 restrictions of Q .

Proposition 4.5. If R and Q are minimal 2CQs, then $R \sqsubseteq_m Q$ if and only if $R \in RR(Q)$.

Proof. Let $M(Q)$ be the set of cores of queries maximally contained in 2CQ Q . An alternative definition of $M(Q)$ is as the set of incomparable cores of queries properly contained in Q such that for each 2CQ $P \sqsubset Q$, there exists an $R \in M(Q)$ such that $P \sqsubseteq R$. Below we show that $RR(Q)$ is equal to $M(Q)$ in three steps: (1) if $R \in RR(Q)$, then $R \sqsubset Q$, (2) if $R \in M(Q)$, then $R \in RR(Q)$, and (3) if $R \in RR(Q)$, then there is no $R' \in RR(Q)$ ($R' \neq R$) such that $R \sqsubset R'$.

Steps (1) and (3) are straightforward, so we deal with them first. For (1), let Q be a 2CQ and $R \in RR(Q)$. If R is a type-1 restriction, then the function h in the definition of a type-1 restriction provides a homomorphism from Q to R . If R is a type-2, type-3 or type-4 restriction, then the identity function on $vars(Q)$ provides a homomorphism from Q to R . Thus, $R \sqsubseteq Q$. Proper containment follows from the definition of $RR(Q)$ and Lemma 4.4.

For step (3), the definition of $RR(Q)$, along with Lemma 4.4, ensures that if $R \in RR(Q)$, then there does not exist another restriction R' of Q ($R' \neq R$) such that $R \sqsubseteq R'$.

We now consider step (2), namely showing that every query maximally contained in 2CQ Q is in the reduced set of restrictions of Q . Let Q be the 2CQ query $(\bar{z}) \leftarrow S_1(\bar{x}_1), \dots, S_n(\bar{x}_n)$. We use the fact that $M(Q)$ is the set of

incomparable cores of queries properly contained in Q such that for each 2CQ $P \sqsubset Q$, there exists an $R \in M(Q)$ such that $P \sqsubseteq R$. We show that, for each 2CQ P such that $P \sqsubset Q$, there is an $R \in RR(Q)$ such that $P \sqsubseteq R$, and hence that $R \in M(Q)$.

Choose some 2CQ $P \sqsubset Q$. Since $P \sqsubset Q$, there is some homomorphism g from Q to P . Let us call the atoms in P to which the atoms of Q are mapped by g the *target* atoms, and any additional atoms in P the *non-target* atoms. We will also call two atoms with the same relation name *counterparts*.

For the homomorphism g to exist, P must include at least one atom for each relation name S_i in Q , as well as possibly atoms with other relation names. Also, the head of P must be $g(\bar{z})$.

Assume first that P contains an atom $T(\bar{w})$ where T is different from each of S_1, \dots, S_n . Let R be the type-2 restriction of Q that includes $T(\bar{y})$ as its additional atom. Since R is identical to Q on its S_i atoms, g maps the S_i atoms of R to atoms in P as well. Then g can be extended to homomorphism g' which also maps $T(\bar{y})$ in R to $T(\bar{w})$ in P , since the variables in \bar{y} are distinct and disjoint from those in the rest of R . We conclude that $P \sqsubseteq R$.

Now assume that P includes only atoms using relation names S_1 to S_n . There are two cases to consider: (a) no relation name appears more often in P than it does in Q , and (b) some relation name appears more often in P than it does in Q .

Consider case (a). It cannot be the case that each variable in Q is mapped by g to a distinct variable in P , for otherwise g would be a bijection, i.e., simply a renaming of variables, every atom of P would be a target, and $P \equiv Q$. So let u and v be two distinct variables in Q that are mapped by g to the same variable w in P . Without loss of generality, assume that, if one of u or v is distinguished, then it is v which is distinguished. Let R be the type-1 restriction of Q in which u is the variable on which function h is not the identity, and such that h maps u to v . Let g' be the homomorphism g excluding the mapping for u . We claim that $g = g' \circ h$ and hence that g' is a homomorphism from R to P . Let y be a variable in Q . If $y \neq u$, then h is the identity on y and, by definition, $g'(y) = g(y)$. If $y = u$, then $h(y) = v$, and, once again, $g'(y) = g(y)$ since $g'(v) = g(v)$. We conclude that g' is a homomorphism from R to P , and hence that $P \sqsubseteq R$.

Now consider case (b), i.e. P contains only atoms using relation names S_1 to S_n and at least one relation name appears more often (i.e., twice) in P than it does in Q (i.e, once). So there is at least one non-target atom in P .

We first show that (at least) one of the following three conditions must be true in P :

- (i) There is a non-target atom which shares a variable with a target atom.
- (ii) There is a non-target atom in which the same variable appears in two different positions.
- (iii) There is a pair of non-target atoms which share a variable.

Assume to the contrary that none of the above three conditions is true. We know there is at least one non-target atom $T(\bar{z})$. By assuming (i), (ii) and (iii) above to be false, the z_i must be distinct and appear nowhere else in P . Furthermore, no z_i can be distinguished, since that would require z_i also to appear in a target atom. Hence, there is a homomorphism which maps $T(\bar{z})$ to its target counterpart, meaning P is not minimal, a contradiction. We conclude that P must satisfy at least one of the conditions (i), (ii) or (iii) above. We consider each in turn below.

Assume that P satisfies condition (i), and let $T(\bar{z})$ be the non-target atom which satisfies the condition. Assume that $T(\bar{z})$ shares variable z_j with target atom $S_k(\bar{w}_k)$ in P . Let $S_i(\bar{x}_i)$ be the atom in Q mapped to $S_k(\bar{w}_k)$ in P by homomorphism g , with x_{ij} being the variable mapped to z_j . Now let R be the type-3 restriction of Q which adds $T(\bar{y})$ to Q and maps y_j to x_{ij} . Clearly g can be extended to a homomorphism g' from R to P by including mappings for each of the distinct variables in $T(\bar{y})$ not shared with any atom to their corresponding variables in $T(\bar{z})$ in P , while the shared variable x_{ij} in $T(\bar{y})$ in R is mapped to the correct shared variable z_j in P .

Now assume that P satisfies condition (ii) and let $T(\bar{z})$ be the non-target atom such that $z_j = z_k$. Let R be the type-3 restriction of Q which adds $T(\bar{y})$ to Q and h maps y_j to y_k . Since $T(\bar{y})$ in R shares no variables with other atoms in R , the homomorphism g from Q to P can be extended to a homomorphism g' from R to P by mapping the variables in $T(\bar{y})$, including the shared variable, to those in $T(\bar{z})$.

Finally assume that P satisfies condition (iii) and let $T_1(\bar{u})$ and $T_2(\bar{v})$ be the two non-target atoms such that $u_i = v_j$. Let R be the type-4 restriction of Q which adds $T_1(h(\bar{y}_1))$ and $T_2(\bar{y}_2)$ to Q and maps y_{1i} to y_{2j} . Since the T_i atoms in R share no variables with other atoms in R , the homomorphism g from Q to P can be extended to a homomorphism g' from R to P which maps $T_1(\bar{y}_1)$ to $T_1(\bar{u})$ and $T_2(\bar{y}_2)$ to $T_2(\bar{v})$.

We conclude that, for each minimal 2CQ P such that $P \sqsubset Q$, there is a restriction $R \in RR(Q)$ such that $P \sqsubseteq R$, and hence that $R \in M(Q)$. \square

4.2 Complexity of maximal containment

Based on Saraiya's result [37], we next show that maximal containment can be decided in polynomial time. Let σ be a relational schema and let $2CQ_{\sigma,\alpha}$ denote the set of all 2CQs of arity α defined on σ . Given a query $Q \in 2CQ_{\sigma,\alpha}$

$$(z_1, \dots, z_\alpha) \leftarrow S_1(\bar{x}_1), \dots, S_n(\bar{x}_n)$$

its size is given by $\alpha + n + \sum_{i=1}^n |\bar{x}_i|$.

Proposition 4.6. *Given relational schema σ and queries $Q_1, Q_2 \in 2CQ_{\sigma,\alpha}$, deciding $Q_1 \sqsubseteq_m Q_2$ can be done in time polynomial in the sizes of Q_1 and Q_2 .*

Proof. From [37] we have that $Q_1 \sqsubseteq Q_2$ and $Q_1 \equiv Q_2$ can be decided in polynomial time. Minimising a 2CQ Q can also be achieved in polynomial time by simply removing each atom from the body of Q in turn and checking for containment. After minimising both Q_1 and Q_2 , we can use Proposition 4.5 to decide maximal containment by generating all minimal 2CQ restrictions of Q_2 , testing each for equivalence to Q_1 . We need to show that there are only a polynomial number of such restrictions.

Assume Q_2 contains α head variables and n body atoms whose total arity is s . Assume Q_1 uses k relation names in its body atoms. For type-1 restrictions, Q_2 has at most s variables, so there are at most $s(s-1)/2$ type-1 restrictions. Query Q_2 has at most k type-2 restrictions that could possibly be equivalent to Q_1 . Each type-3 restriction introduces an atom whose relation name appears in Q_2 , with either one variable shared with an atom in Q_2 or two variables the same. The former case generates at most s^2 restrictions, while the latter generates at most $s(s-1)/2$ restrictions. Type-4 restrictions equate pairs of variables in two atoms whose relation names appear in Q_2 , so there can be at most $s(s-1)/2$ type-4 restrictions. Thus, the total number of restrictions of Q_2 which have to be checked for equivalence to Q_1 is polynomial in the sizes of Q_1 and Q_2 . \square

5 A semantic metric for 2CQs

5.1 Well-defined and well-behaved containment-based distance

We are ready to define our distance function on 2CQs of arity α over schema σ .

Definition 5.1. *For $Q_1, Q_2 \in 2CQ_{\sigma,\alpha}$, let $\delta_{\sqsubseteq} : 2CQ_{\sigma,\alpha} \times 2CQ_{\sigma,\alpha} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be defined as follows.*

- $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q_2) = 0$ if and only if $Q_1 \equiv Q_2$.
- $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q_2) = 1$ if and only if $Q_1 \sqsubseteq_m Q_2$ or $Q_2 \sqsubseteq_m Q_1$.
- $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q_2) = i > 1$ if and only if (a) there exists $Q \in 2CQ_{\sigma,\alpha}$ such that $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q) = i - 1$ and $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_2, Q) = 1$; and (b) there does not exist $Q' \in 2CQ_{\sigma,\alpha}$ such that $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q') = i'$, $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_2, Q') = 1$, and $i' < i - 1$.

Example 5.2. *Consider again the 2CQs Q_1 :*

$$(x, y) \leftarrow R(x, y), R(y, x), L(x), L(y)$$

and Q_2 :

$$(x, y) \leftarrow R(x, z), L(y), L(z)$$

from Example 2.5. There are 2CQs Q_3

$$(x, y) \leftarrow R(x, x), L(x), L(y)$$

and Q_4 :

$$(x, x) \leftarrow R(x, x), L(x)$$

such that $Q_4 \sqsubseteq_m Q_3 \sqsubseteq_m Q_2$ and $Q_4 \sqsubseteq_m Q_1$. Hence, $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q_4) = 1$, $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_2, Q_3) = 1$ and $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_3, Q_4) = 1$. So we have that $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_2, Q_4) = 2$, and since it turns out that there is no query Q' such that $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q') = 1$ and $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_2, Q') = 1$, we have that $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q_2) = 3$.

We establish next that δ_{\sqsubseteq} is well-defined.

Theorem 5.3. *For every $Q_1, Q_2 \in 2CQ_{\sigma, \alpha}$, there exists a unique $i \in [0, \infty)$ such that $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q_2) = i$.*

Proof. If $Q_1 \equiv_{\pi} Q_2$, then by the first case of Definition 5.1, we have that $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q_2) = i = 0$. As the second and third cases of the Definition require $Q_1 \not\equiv_{\pi} Q_2$, it also cannot be that there exists $j > 0$ such that $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q_2) = j$. Hence, i is unique.

Now assume that $Q_1 \not\equiv_{\pi} Q_2$ so $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q_2) > 0$. Also assume by way of contradiction that $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q_2)$ is not unique, i.e., $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q_2) = i$ and $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q_2) = j$, for some i and j , $i \neq j$. Without loss of generality, assume that $i < j$. If $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q_2)$ is j (i), then by condition (a) in the third case of the definition, there is a query Q (Q') such that $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_2, Q) = 1$ ($\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_2, Q') = 1$) and $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q) = j - 1$ ($\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q') = i - 1$). But then Q' violates condition (b) in the definition for distance j since $(\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_2, Q') = 1)$ and $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q') = i - 1 < j - 1$. We conclude that $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q_2)$ is unique. \square

We also establish that δ_{\sqsubseteq} is well-behaved. In particular, we show that δ_{\sqsubseteq} is a *metric*, i.e., is positive and symmetric, preserves the identity of indiscernibles, and satisfies the triangle inequality.

Definition 5.4. *A binary function $f : S^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a metric on S if and only if for all $x, y, z \in S$ it holds that*

1. $f(x, y) \geq 0$;
2. $f(x, y) = f(y, x)$;
3. $f(x, x) = 0$; and
4. $f(x, y) \leq f(x, z) + f(z, y)$.

Being a metric is a crucial property for applications of distance functions [14, 42].

Theorem 5.5. *δ_{\sqsubseteq} is a metric on $2CQ_{\sigma, \alpha}$.*

Proof. Properties (1), (2) and (3) follow straightforwardly from Definition 5.1. The proof of property (4) proceeds by induction on the distance between two 2CQs. The base case when the distance is zero is obvious. Our inductive hypothesis is that, for all 2CQs Q_1, Q_2 and Q_3 such that $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q_3) \leq k$, it is the case that $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q_3) \leq \delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q_2) + \delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_2, Q_3)$.

Now let Q_1 and Q_3 be 2CQs such that $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q_3) = k + 1$. From Definition 5.1, we know that there exists a 2CQ Q_2 such that $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q_2) = k$ and $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_3, Q_2) = 1$, and no other query at distance one from Q_3 which has distance less than k from Q_1 . Consider an arbitrary 2CQ Q' . By the inductive hypothesis, $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q_2) \leq \delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q') + \delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q', Q_2)$. Since $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_3, Q_2) = 1$, we have $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q_3) = k + 1 \leq \delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q') + \delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q', Q_2) + 1$. In other words, $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q_3) \leq \delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q') + \delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q', Q_3)$, as required. \square

5.2 Complexity of computing semantic distance

In order to compute the distance between a pair of 2CQs of the same arity over the same schema, we can construct a graph based on the maximal containment relationship between queries. Given schema σ and arity α , the *maximal containment graph* (*MC-graph* for short) $G_{\sigma, \alpha} = (V, E)$ for σ and α is constructed as follows: the set of nodes V comprises the set of minimal 2CQs of arity α that can be constructed for σ ; there is a directed edge $e = (u, v)$ in E if and only if u maximally contains v .

We view $G_{\sigma,\alpha}$ being orientated such that edges are directed vertically downwards. Then a *top* node (query) in $G_{\sigma,\alpha}$ is a node v such that there is no node u with $(u, v) \in E$. A *bottom* node (query) in $G_{\sigma,\alpha}$ is a node u such that there is no node v with $(u, v) \in E$.

It is not hard to see that there is a unique bottom node (up to renaming of variables) in $G_{\sigma,\alpha}$, corresponding to the 2CQ

$$(\bar{y}) \leftarrow S_1(\bar{x}_1), \dots, S_n(\bar{x}_n)$$

where $\sigma = \{S_1, \dots, S_n\}$ and there is a variable x such that \bar{y} is a tuple of α copies of x and each \bar{x}_i is a tuple of $\text{arity}(S_i)$ copies of x . There are, however, an exponential number of top nodes (queries) in $G_{\sigma,\alpha}$. Each top query has a distinct variable in each position of each atom. Given a set of relation names ρ , we define the set of *top queries associated with ρ* , denoted $tq(\rho)$, to be the cores of those top queries whose body comprises two atoms for each relation name in ρ , and whose head consists of a permutation of α variables from the body. If there are fewer than α variables in the body, then some variables in the head are repeated in order to extend it to α variables. In $G_{\sigma,\alpha}$, there is a set of top queries $tq(\sigma')$ for each non-empty $\sigma' \subseteq \sigma$.

Theorem 5.6. *Given schema σ and $Q_1, Q_2 \in 2CQ_{\sigma,\alpha}$, $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q_2)$ can be computed in exponential time.*

Proof. We can construct $G_{\sigma,\alpha} = (V, E)$ as follows. Initially V is given by $tq(\sigma')$ for each non-empty $\sigma' \subseteq \sigma$. Next, we successively add new nodes to V by finding the reduced set of restrictions of each node in V , until no new (i.e., non-equivalent) nodes can be found. Although we start from a number of nodes which is exponential in the size of σ and α , the size of $G_{\sigma,\alpha}$ remains exponential, although in α plus the total arity of all relation names in σ .

Now given $Q_1, Q_2 \in 2CQ_{\sigma,\alpha}$, we can search $G_{\sigma,\alpha}$ to find a 2CQ equivalent to Q_1 , say, in exponential time, and then use a shortest-path algorithm (viewing the edges in $G_{\sigma,\alpha}$ as undirected) to find $\delta_{\sqsubseteq}(Q_1, Q_2)$, once again in exponential time. \square

6 Related Work

Refinement operators have been used in inductive logic programming for concept learning (model inference) [39]. A refinement operator computes a specialisation or generalisation of a clause, based on the notion of subsumption between clauses. The downward refinement operator defined in [39] is analogous to our restriction operator, although it includes only rules corresponding to some of our types of restriction (as well as one for introducing function symbols). In order to ensure completeness (i.e., that their operator returns all specialised clauses), the authors of [39] need to include all non-reduced clauses (cf. non-minimal CQs) equivalent to a given clause in their search space. We avoid this by including other types of restriction which ensure completeness when restricted to 2CQs.

More recently, refinement operators have been applied to CQs in description logic (DL) in order to measure the similarity between individuals [36]. The downward operator of [36], defined using several rewriting rules, produces from a DL CQ Q all queries which are properly contained in Q . However, a rule is not guaranteed to produce a query which is *maximally* contained in Q , unlike in our approach.

In work studying which classes of conjunctive queries are uniquely characterised by polynomially many positive and negative examples [9], ten Cate and Dalmau define the *frontier* of a finite structure (and conjunctive query) in the homomorphism lattice of such structures (queries). In our setting, the frontier of a conjunctive query Q is essentially the set of queries each of which maximally contains Q . Based on earlier results [2, 17], ten Cate and Dalmau show that the frontier of Q exists (i.e., is finite) if and only if the core of Q is c -acyclic (a condition based on the incidence graph of Q stating that each cycle must contain at least one distinguished variable). However, the queries making up the frontier of a c -acyclic query may not themselves be c -acyclic, which means that we cannot use c -acyclicity of queries to build a finite structure based on maximal containment.

In more recent work, ten Cate and colleagues have studied containment-based CQ fitting, generalization, specialization, and repair problems based on labeled examples [10, 11].

Barceló et al. consider the problem of, given a CQ Q , find an approximation Q' of Q (i.e. Q' is maximally contained in Q) such that Q' is in a class of CQs whose evaluation can be performed efficiently in terms of combined complexity (e.g., acyclic CQs) [5]. In a sense, each query Q' in our set of maximal restrictions of a query Q (which comprises all

queries maximally contained in Q) is an approximation of Q . However, for us, Q and Q' are always in the same class of CQs, namely 2CQs. Some bound on the number of repeated occurrences of a relation symbol in a CQ is required, because otherwise there may be no (finite) CQ maximally contained in Q , even if Q is a 2CQ, as we show in Section 3.

Finally, efficient solutions for proving query (in)equivalence have been the focus of recent investigations, e.g., [16, 20, 21].

7 Discussion and next steps

We have developed the first semantic metric for relational database queries and established the complexity of computing this metric. This study was motivated by the diversity of practical applications of semantic query distance in data management. Two natural next steps are (1) the algorithmic and empirical study of computing δ_{\sqsubseteq} ; and (2) investigating what happens in the presence of integrity constraints [4, 6].

References

- [1] Foto Afrati and Rada Chirkova. *Answering queries using views*. Morgan & Claypool, 2017.
- [2] Bogdan Alexe, Balder ten Cate, Phokion G. Kolaitis, and Wang-Chiew Tan. Characterizing schema mappings via data examples. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.*, 36(4), December 2011.
- [3] Ofer Arieli, Marc Denecker, and Maurice Bruynooghe. Distance semantics for database repair. *Ann. Math. Artif. Intell.*, 50(3-4):389–415, 2007.
- [4] Pablo Barceló, Diego Figueira, Georg Gottlob, and Andreas Pieris. Semantic optimization of conjunctive queries. *J. ACM*, 67(6):34:1–34:60, 2020.
- [5] Pablo Barceló, Leonid Libkin, and Miguel Romero. Efficient approximations of conjunctive queries. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 43(3):1085–1130, 2014.
- [6] Pablo Barceló, Andreas Pieris, and Miguel Romero. Semantic optimization in tractable classes of conjunctive queries. *SIGMOD Record*, 46(2):5–17, 2017.
- [7] Angela Bonifati, Wim Martens, and Thomas Timm. Navigating the maze of Wikidata query logs. In *The World Wide Web Conference, WWW 2019, San Francisco, CA, USA, May 13-17, 2019*, pages 127–138. ACM, 2019.
- [8] Angela Bonifati, Wim Martens, and Thomas Timm. An analytical study of large SPARQL query logs. *VLDB J.*, 29(2-3):655–679, 2020.
- [9] Balder ten Cate and Victor Dalmau. Conjunctive queries: Unique characterizations and exact learnability. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.*, 47(4), Nov 2022.
- [10] Balder ten Cate, Victor Dalmau, Maurice Funk, and Carsten Lutz. Extremal fitting problems for conjunctive queries. In *Proc. ACM Symp. on Principles of Database Systems*, pages 89–98, 2023.
- [11] Balder ten Cate, Phokion Kolaitis, and Carsten Lutz. Query repairs. In *ICDT*, 2025.
- [12] Ashok K. Chandra and Philip M. Merlin. Optimal implementation of conjunctive queries in relational data bases. In *Proceedings of the 9th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, May 4-6, 1977, Boulder, Colorado, USA*, pages 77–90, 1977.
- [13] Surajit Chaudhuri, Ashish Kumar Gupta, and Vivek R. Narasayya. Compressing SQL workloads. In *Proceedings of the 2002 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data, Madison, Wisconsin, USA, June 3-6, 2002*, pages 488–499, 2002.

- [14] Lu Chen, Yunjun Gao, Baihua Zheng, Christian S. Jensen, Hanyu Yang, and Keyu Yang. Pivot-based metric indexing. *PVLDB*, 10(10):1058–1069, 2017.
- [15] Rada Chirkova and Jun Yang. Materialized views. *Foundations and Trends in Databases*, 4(4):295–405, 2012.
- [16] Shumo Chu, Brendan Murphy, Jared Roesch, Alvin Cheung, and Dan Suciu. Axiomatic foundations and algorithms for deciding semantic equivalences of SQL queries. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 11(11):1482–1495, 2018.
- [17] Jan Foniok, Jaroslav Nešetřil, and Claude Tardif. Generalised dualities and maximal finite antichains in the homomorphism order of relational structures. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 29(4):881–899, 2008.
- [18] Kareem El Gebaly and Ashraf Aboulnaga. Robustness in automatic physical database design. In *EDBT 2008, 11th International Conference on Extending Database Technology, Nantes, France, March 25-29, 2008, Proceedings*, pages 145–156, 2008.
- [19] Goetz Graefe, Wey Guy, Harumi Anne Kuno, and Glenn Paullley. Robust Query Processing (Dagstuhl Seminar 12321). *Dagstuhl Reports*, 2(8):1–15, 2012.
- [20] Brandon Haynes, Rana Alotaibi, Anna Pavlenko, Jyoti Leeka, Alekh Jindal, and Yuanyuan Tian. GEqO: ML-accelerated semantic equivalence detection. *Proc. ACM Manag. Data*, 1(4), 2023.
- [21] Yang He, Pinhan Zhao, Xinyu Wang, and Yuepeng Wang. VeriEQL: Bounded equivalence verification for complex SQL queries with integrity constraints. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 8(OOPSLA1), 2024.
- [22] Pavol Hell and Jaroslav Nešetřil. The core of a graph. *Discrete Mathematics*, 109(1-3):117–126, 1992.
- [23] Pavol Hell, Jaroslav Nešetřil, and X Zhu. Complexity of tree homomorphisms. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 70(1):23–36, 1996.
- [24] Yihao Hu, Amir Gilad, Kristin Stephens-Martinez, Sudeepa Roy, and Jun Yang. Qr-hint: Actionable hints towards correcting wrong SQL queries. *Proc. ACM Manag. Data*, 2(3):164, 2024.
- [25] Shrainik Jain, Bill Howe, Jiaqi Yan, and Thierry Cruane. Query2Vec: An evaluation of NLP techniques for generalized workload analytics. *ArXiv e-prints*, abs/1801.05613, 2018.
- [26] Shrainik Jain, Jiaqi Yan, Thierry Cruanes, and Bill Howe. Database-agnostic workload management. In *9th Biennial Conference on Innovative Data Systems Research, CIDR*, 2019.
- [27] Gökhan Kul, Duc Thanh Anh Luong, Ting Xie, Varun Chandola, Oliver Kennedy, and Shambhu J. Upadhyaya. Similarity metrics for SQL query clustering. *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, 30(12):2408–2420, 2018.
- [28] Leo Köberlein, Dominik Probst, and Richard Lenz. Quantifying semantic query similarity for automated linear SQL grading: A graph-based approach. *ArXiv e-prints*, 2403.14441, 2024.
- [29] Leonid Libkin. *Elements of finite model theory*. Springer, 2004.
- [30] Lin Ma, Dana Van Aken, Ahmed Hefny, Gustavo Mezerhane, Andrew Pavlo, and Geoffrey J. Gordon. Query-based workload forecasting for self-driving database management systems. In *Proceedings of the 2018 International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD Conference 2018, Houston, TX, USA, June 10-15, 2018*, pages 631–645, 2018.
- [31] Clement Moreau, Clement Legroux, Veronika Peralta, and Mohamed Ali Hamrouni. Mining SQL workloads for learning analysis behavior. *Information Systems*, 108:102004, 2022.
- [32] Barzan Mozafari, Eugene Zhen Ye Goh, and Dong Young Yoon. Cliffguard: A principled framework for finding robust database designs. In *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia, May 31 - June 4, 2015*, pages 1167–1182, 2015.

- [33] Jan Ramon and Maurice Bruynooghe. A framework for defining distances between first-order logic objects. In *Inductive Logic Programming, 8th International Workshop, ILP-98, Madison, Wisconsin, USA, July 22-24, 1998, Proceedings*, pages 271–280, 1998.
- [34] Jan Ramon and Maurice Bruynooghe. A polynomial time computable metric between point sets. *Acta Inf.*, 37(10):765–780, 2001.
- [35] Sudeepa Roy, Amir Gilad, Yihao Hu, Hanze Meng, Zhengjie Miao, Kristin Stephens-Martinez, and Jun Yang. How database theory helps teach relational queries in database education. In *27th International Conference on Database Theory, ICDT*, pages 2:1–2:9, 2024.
- [36] Antonio A. Sánchez-Ruiz, Santiago Ontañón, Pedro A. González-Calero, and Enric Plaza. Measuring similarity of individuals in description logics over the refinement space of conjunctive queries. *Journal of Intelligent Information Systems*, 47(3):447–467, 2016.
- [37] Yatin P. Saraiya. Polynomial-time program transformations in deductive databases. In *Proceedings of the Ninth ACM SIGACT-SIGMOD-SIGART Symposium on Principles of Database Systems*, pages 132–144, 1990.
- [38] Xiu Tang, Sai Wu, Mingli Song, Shanshan Ying, Feifei Li, and Gang Chen. PreQR: Pre-training representation for SQL understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD*, page 204–216, 2022.
- [39] Patrick R.J. van der Laag and Shan-Hwei Nienhuys-Cheng. Completeness and properness of refinement operators in inductive logic programming. *The Journal of Logic Programming*, 34(3):201–225, 1998.
- [40] Ting Xie, Varun Chandola, and Oliver Kennedy. Query log compression for workload analytics. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 12(3):183–196, 2018.
- [41] Jun Yang, Amir Gilad, Yihao Hu, Hanze Meng, Zhengjie Miao, Sudeepa Roy, and Kristin Stephens-Martinez. What teaching databases taught us about researching databases: Extended talk abstract. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International SIGMOD Workshop on Data Systems Education: Bridging education practice with education research, DataEd*. ACM, 2024.
- [42] Pavel Zezula, Giuseppe Amato, Vlastislav Dohnal, and Michal Batko. *Similarity search - The metric space approach*. Kluwer, 2006.