

Minimizing Conjunctive Regular Path Queries

DIEGO FIGUEIRA, Univ. Bordeaux, CNRS, Bordeaux INP, LaBRI, UMR 5800, France

RÉMI MORVAN, Univ. Bordeaux, CNRS, Bordeaux INP, LaBRI, UMR 5800, France

MIGUEL ROMERO, Dept. of Computer Science, Universidad Católica de Chile & CENIA, Chile

We study the *minimization problem* for Conjunctive Regular Path Queries (CRPQs) and unions of CRPQs (UCRPQs). This is the problem of checking, given a query and a number k , whether the query is equivalent to one of size at most k . For CRPQs we consider the size to be the number of atoms, and for UCRPQs the maximum number of atoms in a CRPQ therein, motivated by the fact that the number of atoms has a leading influence on the cost of query evaluation.

We show that the minimization problem is decidable, both for CRPQs and UCRPQs. We provide a 2ExpSpace upper-bound for CRPQ minimization, based on a brute-force enumeration algorithm, and an ExpSpace lower-bound. For UCRPQs, we show that the problem is ExpSpace-complete, having thus the same complexity as the classical containment problem. The upper bound is obtained by defining and computing a notion of maximal under-approximation. Moreover, we show that for UCRPQs using the so-called *simple regular expressions* consisting of concatenations of expressions of the form a^+ or $a_1 + \dots + a_k$, the minimization problem becomes Π_2^P -complete, again matching the complexity of containment.

CCS Concepts: • **Information systems** → **Query languages; Query reformulation.**

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Regular Path Queries, Minimization, CRPQ, UCRPQ, graph databases, simple regular expressions

🔗 This pdf contains internal links: clicking on a [notion](#) leads to its *definition*.

🔗 This article is based on a PODS'25 paper [13].

1 Introduction

Conjunctive Regular Path Queries (CRPQs) and unions of CRPQs (UCRPQs) form the backbone of graph database query languages, including the new ISO standard Graph Query Language (GQL) [21] and the SQL extension for querying graph-structured data SQL/PGQ [22] (see also [17, 18]). These extend the well-known classes of Conjunctive Queries (CQs) and unions of CQs (UCQs), with the ability to reason about paths in a graph. Optimizing and understanding the fundamental properties of such queries has then become a major topic in graph database theory.

Static optimization for CRPQs has received considerable attention. The basic study of containment and equivalence problems for CRPQs, possibly with unions and inverses, was initiated over 25 years ago [3, 16], where they were shown to be ExpSpace-complete. These problems have also been investigated under different scenarios: restrictions on the shape of queries [8], restrictions on their regular languages [9], alternative semantics [14], or under schema information [19, 20]. This has enabled the study of more advanced static analysis problems motivated by the following general question: *Can a given query be equivalently rewritten as one from a target fragment (which enjoys desirable properties)?* In the literature the problem has been studied where the target fragment are queries which either (i) avoid having infinite languages, or (ii) have a tree-like structure. This gives rise to the so-called (i) *boundedness problem* for CRPQs (*i.e.*, whether a CRPQ is equivalent to a UCQ) [1, 10], and (ii) *semantic treewidth problem* for CRPQs (*i.e.*, whether a CRPQ is equivalent to one of a given treewidth) [2, 7, 12].

Minimization of queries. Minimization – that is, the problem of transforming a query into a strictly smaller equivalent query – is perhaps the most fundamental query optimization question. This problem corresponds to the question posed above, where the target fragment are queries of bounded sizes. For CQs (and UCQs), minimization is well understood, and there exists a canonical unique minimal query, called the *core*. The mechanism for obtaining such minimal query is simple: eliminate any atom from the query that results in an equivalent query (*i.e.*, any atom which is ‘redundant’ in the sense of equivalence). In contrast, minimization of CRPQs is poorly understood from a theoretical perspective. In this case, the situation is more challenging: there is no natural notion of ‘core’, and it is not clear whether a notion of ‘canonical’ smallest query may even be possible. In particular, eliminating redundant atoms of a CRPQ as done for CQs, in general results in a query which is neither minimal nor canonical.

In this paper we study the [minimization problem](#) for CRPQs and UCRPQs. In the case of CRPQs, we aim at minimizing the number of atoms of a CRPQ, and hence we formulate the problem as follows (\equiv denotes query equivalence, *i.e.*, the fact that the queries output the same answer for all databases):¹

Minimization problem for CRPQs:

Input: A finite alphabet \mathbb{A} , a CRPQ γ over \mathbb{A} and $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Question: Is there a CRPQ δ over \mathbb{A} with at most k atoms such that $\gamma \equiv \delta$?

On the other hand, in the case of UCRPQs, we minimize the maximum number of atoms of the CRPQs participating in a UCRPQ:

Minimization problem for UCRPQs:

Input: A finite alphabet \mathbb{A} , a UCRPQ Γ over \mathbb{A} and $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Question: Is there a UCRPQ Δ over \mathbb{A} whose every CRPQ has at most k atoms *s.t.* $\Gamma \equiv \Delta$?

Observe that the minimization problem for CRPQs and UCRPQs are two different problems: an algorithm for the minimization problem for UCRPQs (where the equivalent query may have unions) in principle does not imply any bound on the minimization for CRPQs (where we insist in being only one CRPQ).

Contributions. We investigate the minimization problem for CRPQs and UCRPQs, and present several fundamental results. More concretely:

- We show that the minimization problem for CRPQs and UCRPQs are both decidable. As explained before, these are different problems and we give two very different algorithms. Contrary as what happens for CQs, minimizing a CRPQ by unions of CRPQs may result in smaller queries, hence in a sense UCRPQ minimization may be seen as a strictly more powerful approach (Proposition 5.1).
- For the [minimization of CRPQs](#), the algorithm is essentially by brute-force. By carefully bounding the sizes of the automata involved, we show that the algorithm can be implemented in 2ExpSpace in Theorem 4.1. We also show an ExpSpace -hard lower bound in Theorem 6.2, leaving an exponential gap.
- For the minimization of UCRPQs we can apply a more elegant solution, and in fact we show how to compute ‘maximal under-approximations’ of a query by UCRPQs of a given size (Lemma 5.3). The minimization then follows by testing whether the given query is

¹Note that we can always assume k to be smaller than the number of atoms of the input query, since otherwise the instance of the minimization problem is trivially solvable by answering ‘yes’. So, whether k is given in unary or binary does not affect the size of the input.

equivalent to its approximation of size k , yielding an ExpSpace upper bound (Corollary 5.4), which is tight with the lower bound (Corollary 6.4).

- We consider subclasses of UCRPQs restricted to some commonly used regular expressions as observed in practice, namely, the so-called *simple regular expressions* (or *SRE*). These are concatenations of expressions of the form (i) a^+ for some letter over the alphabet $a \in \mathbb{A}$, or (ii) $a_1 + \dots + a_m$ for some $a_1, \dots, a_m \in \mathbb{A}$.² We show that minimization of UCRPQs having such simple regular expressions is Π_2^P -complete (Theorem 5.5).
- We explore some necessary and sufficient conditions for minimality. In particular, we show that non-redundancy (*i.e.*, the fact that removing any atom results in a non-equivalent query) is necessary but not sufficient for minimality (also known to be the case for tree patterns [6]). We also investigate a notion of ‘strong minimality’ which implies minimality (Corollary 3.8), and can be used as a theoretical tool to prove minimality of queries. This result is based on Theorem 3.7, which may be of independent interest, providing a tool to extract lower bounds on the number of atoms (and more generally properties on the underlying structure of queries, such as tree-width, path-width, etc.) that is necessary to express a UCRPQ.
- We also discuss an alternative definition of size, where instead of the number of atoms we count the number of variables: we obtain upper bounds for the *variable-minimization problem* of CRPQs and UCRPQs in Section 7.

On the chosen size measure. A naïve algorithm for the *evaluation* of a union of t CRPQs with k atoms on a graph database G gives a rough bound of $O(tk(|V(G)||E(G)|r) + t|V(G)|^{2k})$, where r is the maximum size of the regular expressions it contains, and $E(G)$, $V(G)$ are the set of edges and vertices of G , respectively.³ As we see, the most costly dependence is on k , since G is the largest object (*i.e.*, the database, several orders of magnitude larger than the remaining parameters in practice). The size of regular expressions and the number of unions have a less predominant multiplicative influence on the cost. Further, unions can be executed in parallel, which justifies the choice of taking the maximum size of the number of atoms of the CRPQs therein. However, other measures may also be reasonable. For example, taking the size to be the number of variables instead of the number of atoms is explored in Section 7. More complex measures including the size of regular expressions and the number of unions would need to take into account the drastically different roles of the parameters in the evaluation in view of the previous discussion (*e.g.*, a simple sum of the parameters would not be a reasonable choice).

Our size measure of number of atoms is also natural from a practical perspective. In practice, systems typically evaluate CRPQs by combining on-the-fly “materialization” of CRPQ atoms with relational database techniques, in particular using join algorithms (see *e.g.* [5, 23, 25]). The number of atoms (or joins) plays an important role in these algorithms.

Related work. Minimization is well-understood for CQs and corresponds to the *core* in the Chandra-Merlin theory [4], that is, the smallest homomorphically-equivalent query, which is unique up to renaming of variables. The *minimization problem* is then NP-complete. For UCQs, the canonical minimal query consists of minimizing each CQ and removing redundant queries (*i.e.*, removing a CQ disjunct q if there is another disjunct q' such that $q \subseteq q'$), which remains NP.

²Note that *e.g.* [12, §6] uses a^* instead of a^+ . This restriction is needed in Lemma E.17.

³This is obtained by first materializing a table with the answers to each RPQ atom $x \xrightarrow{L} y$ of the query. For each vertex $u \in V(G)$, we can compute the answers to $u \xrightarrow{L} y$, by a BFS traversal on the product of G and the NFA \mathcal{A}_L for the regular language L , taking roughly $O(|E(G)|r)$. Then we can evaluate each CRPQ as if it were a conjunctive query on the computed tables (each table having size at most $|V(G)|^2$), in $O((|V(G)|^2)^k) = O(|V(G)|^{2k})$.

However, for unbounded homomorphism-closed queries, such as CRPQs, the existence of such unique minimal queries (even seen as infinitary unions of CQs) remains rather elusive. In particular, what breaks is the “redundancy removal”, because there could be infinite chains of ever growing queries, as for instance in the Boolean CRPQ $q() = x \xrightarrow{a^+} x$.

Minimization has also been studied for the class of *tree patterns* [6, 15, 24]. Tree patterns are simple yet widely used tree-like queries for tree-like databases such as XML. These queries allow mild recursion in the form of descendent edges, that is, atoms of the form $x \xrightarrow{a^+} y$, where x is the parent of y . Minimization of tree patterns is now well-understood [6]: it is known that non-redundancy is not the same as minimality, and that the *minimization problem* is Σ_2^P -complete, the lower bound being highly non-trivial.

Due to space constraints, some proofs and details are deferred to the Appendix.

2 Preliminaries

Graph databases. *Graph databases* are abstracted as edge-labelled directed graphs $G = \langle V(G), E(G) \rangle$, where nodes of $V(G)$ represent entities and labelled edges $E(G) \subseteq V(G) \times \mathbb{A} \times V(G)$ represent relations between these entities, with \mathbb{A} being a fixed finite alphabet.

Conjunctive regular path queries (CRPQs) and unions of CRPQs (UCRPQs). A *CRPQ* γ is defined as a tuple $\bar{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ of *output variables*⁴, together with a conjunction of *atoms* of the form $\bigwedge_{j=1}^m x_j \xrightarrow{L_j} y_j$, where each L_j is a regular language and where $m \geq 0$. The set of all variables occurring in γ , namely⁵ $\{z_1, \dots, z_n\} \cup \{x_1, y_1, \dots, x_m, y_m\}$, is denoted by $\text{vars}(\gamma)$. Variables in $\text{vars}(\gamma) \setminus \{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$ are existentially quantified. We denote by $\text{atoms}(\gamma)$ the set of *atoms* of γ . Given a database G , we say that a tuple of nodes $\bar{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$ *satisfies* γ on G if there is a mapping $f: \text{vars}(\gamma) \rightarrow V(G)$ such that $u_i = f(z_i)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, and for each $1 \leq j \leq m$, there exists a (directed) path from $f(x_j)$ to $f(y_j)$ in G , labelled by a word from L_j (if the path is empty, the label is ε). The *evaluation* of γ on G is then the set of all tuples that *satisfy* γ on G .

A *union of CRPQs (UCRPQs)* is defined as a finite set of CRPQs, called *disjuncts*, whose tuples of output variables have all the same arity. The *evaluation* of a union is defined as the union of its evaluations. If a query has no output variables we call it *Boolean*, and its *evaluation* can either be the set $\{\}$, in which case we say that G *satisfies* the query, or the empty set $\{\}$.

Given two UCRPQs Γ and Γ' whose output variables have the same arity, we say that Γ is *contained* in Γ' , denoted by $\Gamma \subseteq \Gamma'$, if for every graph database G , for every tuple \bar{u} of $V(G)$, if \bar{u} *satisfies* Γ on G , then so does Γ' . We will hence reserve the symbol ‘ \subseteq ’ for set inclusion. The *containment problem* for UCRPQs is the problem of, given two UCRPQs Γ and Γ' , to decide if $\Gamma \subseteq \Gamma'$. When $\Gamma \subseteq \Gamma'$ and $\Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma$ we say that Γ and Γ' are *equivalent*, denoted by $\Gamma \equiv \Gamma'$.

A *conjunctive query (CQ)* is in this context a CRPQ whose every atom is of the form $x \xrightarrow{a} y$ for $a \in \mathbb{A}$ (i.e., every language is a singleton $\{a\}$). A *union of CQs (UCQs)* is defined as a UCRPQ with the same property.

Homomorphisms. A *homomorphism* f from a CRPQ $\gamma(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ to a CRPQ $\gamma'(y_1, \dots, y_m)$ is a mapping from $\text{vars}(\gamma)$ to $\text{vars}(\gamma')$ such that $f(x) \xrightarrow{L} f(y)$ is an atom of γ' for every atom $x \xrightarrow{L} y$ of γ , and further $f(x_i) = y_i$ for every i . Such a homomorphism f is *strong onto* if for every atom $x' \xrightarrow{L} y'$ of γ' there is an atom $x \xrightarrow{L} y$ of γ such that $f(x) = x'$ and $f(y) = y'$. We write $\gamma \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \gamma'$ if there is a homomorphism from γ to γ' , and $\gamma \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \gamma'$ if there is a strong onto homomorphism. In the latter case, we say that γ' is a *homomorphic image* of γ . A *homomorphism* f from a graph

⁴For technical reasons (see the definition of equality atoms) we allow for a variable to appear multiple times.

⁵We neither assume disjointness nor inclusion between $\{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$ and $\{x_1, y_1, \dots, x_m, y_m\}$.

database G to a graph database G' is a mapping from $V(G)$ to $V(G')$ such that for every edge $u \xrightarrow{a} v$ of G , it holds that $f(u) \xrightarrow{a} f(v)$ is an edge in G' . A homomorphism from a CQ to a graph database is defined analogously.

It is easy to see that if $\gamma \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \delta$ then $\delta \subseteq \gamma$, and in the case where γ, δ are CQs this is an “if and only if” [4, Lemma 13]. Two CQs γ, δ are *hom-equivalent* if there are homomorphisms $\gamma \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \delta$ and $\delta \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \gamma$. Hence, for any two CQs γ, δ , we have $\gamma \equiv \delta$ if, and only if, they are hom-equivalent. The *core* of a CQ γ , denoted by $\text{core}(\gamma)$ is the result of repeatedly removing any atom which results in an equivalent query. It is unique up to isomorphism (see, e.g., [4]). We say that a CQ is ‘a core’ if it is isomorphic to its core. If γ and δ are hom-equivalent then they have the same core. Moreover, there is always an *embedding*—i.e., a homomorphism which is injective both on variables and atoms—of $\text{core}(\gamma)$ into γ .

Refinements and expansions of (U)CRPQs. For an NFA \mathcal{A} and two states q, q' thereof, we denote by $\mathcal{A}[q, q']$ the *sublanguage* of \mathcal{A} recognized when considering $\{q\}$ as the set of initial states and $\{q'\}$ as the set of final states. An *atom m -refinement* of a CRPQ atom $\gamma(x, y) = x \xrightarrow{L} y$ where $m \geq 1$ and L is given by the NFA \mathcal{A}_L is any CRPQ of the form

$$\rho(x, y) = x \xrightarrow{L_1} t_1 \xrightarrow{L_2} \dots \xrightarrow{L_{n-1}} t_{n-1} \xrightarrow{L_n} y \quad (1)$$

where $1 \leq n \leq m$, t_1, \dots, t_{n-1} are fresh (existentially quantified) variables, and L_1, \dots, L_n are such that there exists a sequence (q_0, \dots, q_n) of states of \mathcal{A}_L such that q_0 is initial, q_n is final, and for each i , L_i is either of the form

- (i) $\mathcal{A}_L[q_{i-1}, q_i]$, or
- (ii) $\{a\}$ if the letter $a \in \mathbb{A}$ belongs to $\mathcal{A}_L[q_{i-1}, q_i]$.

Additionally, if $\varepsilon \in L$, the *equality atom* “ $x = y$ ” is also an *atom m -refinement*. Thus, an *atom m -refinement* can be either of the form (1) or “ $x = y$ ”. By definition, note that the concatenation $L_1 \cdots L_n$ is a subset of L and hence $\rho \subseteq \gamma$ for any atom m -refinement ρ of γ . An *atom refinement* is an atom m -refinement for some m .


Given a natural number m , an *m -refinement* of a CRPQ $\gamma(\bar{x}) = \bigwedge_i x_i \xrightarrow{L_i} y_i$ is any query resulting from: 1) replacing every atom by one of its m -refinements, and 2) should some m -refinements have equality atoms, collapsing the variables (and removing the identity atoms ‘ $x = x$ ’). A *refinement* is an m -refinement for some m . Note that in a refinement of a CRPQ the atom refinements need not have the same length. For instance, both $\rho(x, x) = x \xrightarrow{c} x$ and $\rho'(x, y) = x \xrightarrow{a} t_1 \xrightarrow{a} y \xrightarrow{c} y$ are refinements of $\gamma(x, y) = x \xrightarrow{a} y \xrightarrow{c} x$. We write $\text{Ref}(\gamma(\bar{x}))$ to denote the set of all refinements of $\gamma(\bar{x})$ and $\text{Ref}^{\leq m}(\gamma(\bar{x}))$ to the m -refinements.

The set of *expansions* of a CRPQ γ is the set $\text{Exp}(\gamma)$ of all CQs which are refinements of γ . In other words, an *expansion* of γ is any CQ obtained from γ by replacing each atom $x \xrightarrow{L} y$ by a path $x \xrightarrow{w} y$ for some word $w \in L$. The *expansions* (resp. *refinements*) of a UCRPQ are the *expansions* (resp. *refinements*) of the CRPQs it contains. We define *atom expansions* analogously to atom refinements. For UCRPQs we use $\text{Exp}(\Gamma)$, $\text{Ref}(\Gamma)$ and $\text{Ref}^{\leq m}(\Gamma)$ as for CRPQs.

Any UCRPQ is equivalent to the infinitary union of its expansions. In light of this, the semantics for UCRPQs can be rephrased as follows. Given a UCRPQ $\Gamma(\bar{x})$ and a graph database G , the evaluation of $\Gamma(\bar{x})$ on G , denoted by $\Gamma(G)$, is the set of tuples \bar{v} of nodes for which there is $\xi \in \text{Exp}(\Gamma)$ such that there is a homomorphism $\xi \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} G$ that sends \bar{x} onto \bar{v} .

Containment of UCRPQs can also be characterized in terms of expansions.

PROPOSITION 2.1 (FOLKLORE, SEE E.G. [16, PROPOSITION 3.2] OR [3, THEOREM 2]). Let Γ_1 and Γ_2 be UCRPQs. Then the following are equivalent: (i) $\Gamma_1 \subseteq \Gamma_2$; (ii) for every $\xi_1 \in \text{Exp}(\Gamma_1)$, $\xi_1 \subseteq \Gamma_2$; (iii) for every $\xi_1 \in \text{Exp}(\Gamma_1)$ there is $\xi_2 \in \text{Exp}(\Gamma_2)$ such that $\xi_2 \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \xi_1$.



(a) The segments of γ —labels are omitted. Each segment has a different color. Internal variables are the smaller circles.

(b) The segment graph of γ .

Fig. 1. Segments and segment graph of a CRPQ γ .

General assumptions. To simplify proofs, we often assume that the regular languages are described via non-deterministic finite automata (NFA) instead of regular expressions, which does not affect any of our complexity bounds. However, for readability all our examples will be given in terms of regular expressions. We denote by $\|\gamma\|_{\text{at}}$ the number of atoms of a CRPQ γ and by $\|\gamma\|_{\text{var}}$ the number of variables. We extend these notations to a UCRPQ Γ by letting $\|\Gamma\|_{\text{at}} = \max_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \|\gamma\|_{\text{at}}$ and $\|\Gamma\|_{\text{var}} = \max_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \|\gamma\|_{\text{var}}$. We denote by $\|\Gamma\|$ the size (of a reasonable encoding) of a UCRPQ. For a CRPQ γ , we define its *underlying graph* G_γ of γ as the directed multigraph obtained from γ by ignoring the regular languages labelling the atoms of γ .

We assume familiarity with basic concepts of directed multigraphs. For simplicity, thorough the paper, by ‘graph’ we mean a directed multigraph. We also adapt implicitly in the natural way, concepts defined for CRPQs to (directed multi)graphs (such a homomorphisms, embeddings, etc.). A *minor* of a graph is any graph that can be obtained by removing edges, removing vertices—and their adjacent edges—, and *contracting edges*—meaning that we identify the two endpoints of the edge and remove the edge from the graph.⁶

3 Necessary & Sufficient Conditions for Minimality

This section explores some necessary and sufficient conditions for a query to be *minimal*. We start with some necessary definitions. An *internal variable* of a CRPQ γ is any non-output variable with both in-degree and out-degree 1. A non-internal variable is called *external*. A *one-way internal path*⁷, or *internal path* for short, from x_0 to x_n of a CRPQ γ is a *simple*⁸ path

$$x_0 \xrightarrow{L_1} x_1 \xrightarrow{L_2} \dots \xrightarrow{L_n} x_n \quad (2)$$

in γ where $n > 0$ and every x_i is internal with $i \in \llbracket 1, n - 1 \rrbracket$. A *segment* of a CRPQ γ is a maximal *internal path* in γ , where “maximal” means that it cannot be extended on the left or on the right. We say that a *segment* is *cyclic* if $x_0 = x_n$. We identify two cyclic segments if they are equal up to circular permutation. We say that a *segment* as in (2) is *incident* to a variable y if $y = x_i$ for some i .

Fact 3.1. The segments—seen as sets of atoms—of γ form a partition on its set of atoms.

See Figure 1a for an example of a decomposition into segments. Note that each segment is incident to either zero external variable (isolated cycles), to one (non-isolated cycles) or to two

⁶This definition is a trivial generalization of the notion of minors for undirected graphs.

⁷This definition comes from [12, §7], under the name ‘one-way internal path’; there is also an equivalent notion for C2RPQs.

⁸Meaning that all nodes are pairwise disjoint, except that potentially $x_0 = x_n$.

(non-cycles). We denote by $\|\gamma\|_{\text{seg}}$ the number of segments of a CRPQ γ , and we extend this notation to UCRPQs by letting $\|\Gamma\|_{\text{seg}} \hat{=} \max_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \|\gamma\|_{\text{seg}}$. By Fact 3.1, $\|\Gamma\|_{\text{seg}} \leq \|\Gamma\|_{\text{at}}$ always holds.

3.1 Necessary Conditions: Contractions and Redundancy

Contractions. One simple (and tractable) way to make a query smaller is to ‘contract’ any two consecutive atoms in a path with just one atom having the concatenation of the languages. Formally, a *contraction* of an internal variable y in a CRPQ γ is the result of replacing any pair of distinct atoms $x \xrightarrow{L} y$ and $y \xrightarrow{L'} z$ with $x \xrightarrow{L \cdot L'} z$ for $L \cdot L' \hat{=} \{w \cdot w' : w \in L, w' \in L'\}$.⁹ Observe that this results in an equivalent query. A *contraction* of γ is any CRPQ obtained by repeatedly contracting internal variables. A CRPQ γ is *fully contracted* if it cannot be contracted. In other words, γ is fully contracted iff $\|\gamma\|_{\text{seg}} = \|\gamma\|_{\text{at}}$. A contraction of a UCRPQ is a contraction of a CRPQ therein (obtaining the UCRPQ where one CRPQ γ was replaced by a contraction of γ). A UCRPQ is then *fully contracted* if each CRPQ therein is fully contracted.

Fact 3.2. Contractions preserve semantic equivalence. Further, from a UCRPQ Γ one can produce, in polynomial time, an equivalent one that is fully contracted with $\|\Gamma\|_{\text{seg}}$ atoms.

In particular, if a UCRPQ Γ is minimal then Γ is fully contracted and $\|\Gamma\|_{\text{seg}} = \|\Gamma\|_{\text{at}}$; in other words, $\|\Gamma\|_{\text{seg}}$ is an upper bound on the number of atoms of the minimal equivalent query.

Redundancy. Another way to reduce the number of atoms of a query is to remove any *redundant atom*, that is, any atom whose removal results in an equivalent query. When there are no such redundant atoms, we say that the query is *non-redundant*. However, this is a more difficult problem, since it involves testing for query equivalence, an ExpSpace-complete problem.

PROPOSITION 3.3. Testing whether a (U)CRPQ is non-redundant is ExpSpace-complete.

PROOF. The upper bound is trivial: for every atom we remove it and check equivalence.

For the lower bound, we use the construction of Proposition 6.1 for containment. Let $\delta() \hat{=} x' \xrightarrow{K} y' \wedge \bigwedge_i x \xrightarrow{L_i} y$ be the disjoint conjunction of $\gamma_1()$ and $\gamma_2()$ as defined in Proposition 6.1. We first strengthen the construction to ensure the following two properties:

- (1) **K cannot be mapped inside any L_i :** There is no word of K which appears as factor of a word from some L_i . For this, it suffices to add a special letter at the beginning and the end of every word of K which is not in any of the L_i 's. That is, we can define a new $K^{\text{new}} \hat{=} \# \cdot K^{\text{old}} \cdot \#$ for a new symbol $\#$.
- (2) **For every j there is $w_j \in L_j$ such that $w_j \notin L_i$ for every $i \neq j$:** it suffices to add a special word (e.g. using a new alphabet letter) to each L_i . For example, we can define $L_i^{\text{new}} \hat{=} L_i^{\text{old}} \cup \{ @_i \}$, where $@_i$ is a fresh alphabet letter.

It is easy to see that these modifications preserve all the properties needed for the containment problem to still be ExpSpace-hard.

We show that $\delta()$ is non-redundant iff $x' \xrightarrow{K} y' \subseteq \bigwedge_i x \xrightarrow{L_i} y$.

☞ *K cannot be removed.* We first show that removing the atom $x' \xrightarrow{K} y'$ from $\delta()$ results in a non-equivalent query $\delta'()$. Indeed, if it is removed then for any expansion of $\delta'()$ there will not be any word from K that can be used to map into the expansion due to the first point above.

☞ *If some L_j is redundant, then containment holds.* Consider the result $\delta'()$ of removing an atom $x \xrightarrow{L_j} y$ from $\delta()$. Consider all the expansions of $\delta'()$ that choose w_i —defined in the second point above—as the atom expansion for L_i for every $i \neq j$. It follows that for any such expansion there must be an expansion of $\delta()$ that maps necessarily $x \xrightarrow{L_j} y$ to the atom expansion of $x' \xrightarrow{K} y'$ in $\delta'()$.

⁹Note that contraction of internal variable is a particular case of edge contraction.




Fig. 2. Equivalent CRPQs. The leftmost query is fully contracted, non-redundant and not minimal, since it is equivalent to the rightmost query.

Otherwise, we would be mapping some word of L_j to some w_i with $i \neq j$, which we know it is not possible due to the second point above. This means that $x' \xrightarrow{K} y' \subseteq \bigwedge_i x \xrightarrow{L_i} y$.

• If containment holds, then all L_i 's redundant. Finally, observe that if $x' \xrightarrow{K} y' \subseteq \bigwedge_i x \xrightarrow{L_i} y$ then the query is equivalent to $x' \xrightarrow{K} y'$.

Overall, we obtained that the following are equivalent:

- (a) $\delta()$ is redundant,
- (b) an atom $x \xrightarrow{L_i} y$ of $\delta()$ is redundant,
- (c) the containment $x' \xrightarrow{K} y' \subseteq \bigwedge_i x \xrightarrow{L_i} y$ holds,
- (d) all atoms $x \xrightarrow{L_i} y$ of $\delta()$ are redundant. □

While in the case of conjunctive queries non-redundancy is the same as minimality, for CRPQs and UCRPQs this is not the case, even if the query is fully contracted.

PROPOSITION 3.4. There are fully contracted non-redundant CRPQs which are not minimal.

PROOF. Figure 2 contains a simple witnessing example. It is trivial to see that the CRPQs in the figure are all equivalent and that the leftmost query is non-redundant and fully contracted. However, it is not minimal since it is equivalent to the rightmost CRPQ. □

3.2 A Sufficient Condition: Strong Minimality

We have seen some sound ways to reduce the size of queries. But how can we ensure that a query is actually minimal? Here we give a theoretical tool which can ensure this by means of finding some expansion which is a witness for the query to have “many atoms”. We call this strong minimality.

Say that an expansion ξ of a UCRPQ Γ is *hom-minimal* when, for every expansion ξ' of Γ , if $\xi' \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \xi$ then ξ' and ξ are hom-equivalent.

A UCRPQ Γ is *strongly minimal* if it has a hom-minimal expansion $\xi \in \text{Exp}(\Gamma)$ s.t. $\|\text{core}(\xi)\|_{\text{seg}} = \|\Gamma\|_{\text{at}}$. We will next show that this is a sufficient condition for minimality.

The *segment graph* $\mathcal{SG}(\gamma)$ of a CRPQ γ is the directed multigraph obtained by replacing segments of γ with edges in its underlying graph, as illustrated in Figure 1b (a formal definition can be found in Definition B.1).

Fact 3.5. The segment graph of γ can always be obtained from its underlying graph by contracting internal variables.

PROPOSITION 3.6. Let γ be a CRPQ and ξ be an expansion of γ . Then $\mathcal{SG}(\xi)$ is a minor of the underlying graph of γ .

In particular, $\|\xi\|_{\text{seg}} \leq \|\gamma\|_{\text{at}}$. See Figure 3 for an example. The next proposition provides a helpful tool to prove lower bounds on the number of atoms—but also on the structure—required to express a query.




Fig. 3. Illustration of Proposition 3.6: Figure 3c can be obtained as a minor of Figure 3a.

THEOREM 3.7 (SEMANTICAL STRUCTURE). *Let Γ be a UCRPQ. Let ξ be a hom-minimal expansion of Γ , and Δ be any UCRPQ equivalent to Γ . Then there exists some $\delta \in \Delta$ s.t. the segment graph $\mathcal{SG}(\text{core}(\xi))$ of the core of ξ is a minor of the underlying graph of δ .*

PROOF. Let Γ be a fixed UCRPQ, and let Δ be an equivalent UCRPQ. Let ξ_Γ be a hom-minimal expansion of Γ . Since $\Gamma \subseteq \Delta$, there exists an expansion ξ_Δ of Δ s.t. $\xi_\Delta \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \xi_\Gamma$. Likewise, since $\Delta \subseteq \Gamma$, there exists an expansion $\xi'_\Gamma \in \text{Exp}(\Gamma)$ s.t. $\xi'_\Gamma \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \xi_\Delta$. Overall, we have $\xi'_\Gamma \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \xi_\Gamma$ and so, by hom-minimality of ξ_Γ , it is hom-equivalent to ξ'_Γ . In turn, this implies that ξ_Δ is hom-equivalent to ξ_Γ , and thus there exists an embedding of $\text{core}(\xi_\Gamma)$ into ξ_Δ . Note moreover that such an embedding must send variables of in-degree 0 (resp. out-degree 0) to nodes of in-degree 0 (resp. out-degree 0) and so by Corollary B.4, there is an embedding from $\mathcal{SG}(\text{core}(\xi_\Gamma))$ into $\mathcal{SG}(\xi_\Delta)$. Letting δ be the disjunct of Δ of which ξ_Δ is an expansion, Proposition 3.6 implies that $\mathcal{SG}(\xi_\Delta)$ is a minor of the underlying graph of δ . Hence, $\mathcal{SG}(\text{core}(\xi_\Gamma))$ is a subgraph of a minor, and hence a minor, of the underlying graph of δ . \square

COROLLARY 3.8 (OF THEOREM 3.7). Every strongly minimal UCRPQ is minimal.

In fact, it can be seen that the assumption that ξ is hom-minimal in Theorem 3.7 is necessary as otherwise the statement would be false (see Remark B.6 for details). Also, note in particular that Theorem 3.7 implies $\|\text{core}(\xi)\|_{\text{seg}} \leq \|\Delta\|_{\text{at}}$. But it can also be used to obtain lower bounds on, for instance, the tree-width of Δ , and hence the one-way semantic tree-width¹⁰ of Γ , or more generally to prove that Γ cannot be equivalent to a UCRPQ whose underlying graphs all belong to a minor-closed class of graphs.

However, this is a sound but unsurprisingly not a complete characterization of minimality.

PROPOSITION 3.9. There are minimal (U)CRPQs which are not strongly minimal.

PROOF. The Boolean CRPQ $\gamma() = x \xrightarrow{a^+} x$. Since it has one atom, it must be minimal, but it has no hom-minimal expansions. \square

Finally, we show that checking strong minimality is at least as hard as checking containment.

PROPOSITION 3.10. Testing whether a (U)CRPQ is strongly minimal is ExpSpace-hard.

¹⁰Defined in [12, §1, p. 7].

4 An Upper Bound for Minimization of CRPQs

In this section we show that the **minimization problem** for CRPQs is decidable, in particular, it belongs to the class 2ExpSpace .

THEOREM 4.1. *The minimization problem for CRPQs is in 2ExpSpace .*

The proof of Theorem 4.1 is based on a key lemma stated below. Intuitively, this lemma tells us that if a CRPQ γ is **equivalent** to another CRPQ α , then γ is also equivalent to a CRPQ β , where β has the same “shape” than α but the sizes of the NFAs appearing in β are bounded by the size of γ . In particular, if γ is equivalent to a CRPQ with at most k atoms, then it is equivalent to a CRPQ with at most k atoms and NFAs of bounded sizes, and hence the search space in the minimization problem becomes finite. A careful analysis of this idea yields our 2ExpSpace upper bound.

LEMMA 4.2. Let γ and α be two CRPQs such that $\alpha \subseteq \gamma$. Then there exists a CRPQ β satisfying $\alpha \subseteq \beta \subseteq \gamma$ such that:

- (1) The **underlying graphs** of α and β coincide.
- (2) The size of each NFA appearing in β is bounded by $f(\|\gamma\|)$, where f is a double-exponential function.

PROOF SKETCH. The idea is to define the CRPQ β as the CRPQ obtained from α by replacing each regular language L by a suitable regular language \tilde{L} , which depends also on γ . Consider the following equivalence relation on \mathbb{A}^* , where \mathbb{A} is the underlying alphabet. Given $u, v \in \mathbb{A}^*$, we write $u \sim_\gamma v$ if for every NFA \mathcal{A} appearing on γ , and pair of states p, q of \mathcal{A} :

$$u \text{ is accepted by } \mathcal{A}[p, q] \iff v \text{ is accepted by } \mathcal{A}[p, q].$$

Recall that $\mathcal{A}[p, q]$ denote the sublanguage of \mathcal{A} recognized when considering $\{p\}$ as the set of initial states and $\{q\}$ as the set of final states. For $u \in \mathbb{A}^*$, we define its γ -**type** to be:

$$\text{type}_\gamma(u) \triangleq \{([u_1]_{\sim_\gamma}, \dots, [u_\ell]_{\sim_\gamma}) \mid \ell \leq (\|\gamma\|_{\text{var}} + 1), \text{ and } u_1, \dots, u_\ell \in \mathbb{A}^* \text{ satisfy that } u = u_1 \cdots u_\ell\}.$$

The idea is that $\text{type}_\gamma(u)$ encodes all the possible ways u can be broken into $\ell \leq (\|\gamma\|_{\text{var}} + 1)$ subwords: we are not interested in the particular subwords u_i , but in their equivalence classes $[u_i]_{\sim_\gamma}$ with respect to \sim_γ .

We define the sought CRPQ β to be the CRPQ obtained from α by replacing each regular language L by \tilde{L} , where:

$$\tilde{L} \triangleq \bigcup_{u \in L} \{z \in \mathbb{A}^* \mid \text{type}_\gamma(u) \subseteq \text{type}_\gamma(z)\}.$$

By definition, the **underlying graphs** of α and β are the same, and hence condition (1) holds. It remains to verify $\alpha \subseteq \beta \subseteq \gamma$ and condition (2). Note that $u \in \{z \in \mathbb{A}^* \mid \text{type}_\gamma(u) \subseteq \text{type}_\gamma(z)\}$ always holds, and hence $L \subseteq \tilde{L}$. It follows that $\alpha \subseteq \beta$.

Showing $\beta \subseteq \gamma$ is more involved. By Proposition 2.1, we need to prove that for every expansion $\xi_\beta \in \text{Exp}(\beta)$, there exists an expansion $\eta_\beta \in \text{Exp}(\gamma)$, such that $\eta_\beta \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \xi_\beta$. Assume that β and γ are of the form $\bigwedge_{j=1}^m x_j \xrightarrow{L_j} y_j$ and $\bigwedge_{i=1}^r t_i \xrightarrow{M_i} s_i$, respectively. In particular, α must be of the form $\bigwedge_{j=1}^m x_j \xrightarrow{L_j} y_j$. Suppose ξ_β is of the form $\bigwedge_{j=1}^m x_j \xrightarrow{\tilde{L}_j} y_j$, where $z_j \in \tilde{L}_j$. By construction, ξ_β has a corresponding expansion ξ_α of α : since each $z_j \in \tilde{L}_j$, there must be a $u_j \in L_j$ such that $\text{type}_\gamma(u_j) \subseteq \text{type}_\gamma(z_j)$, and then we can take ξ_α as $\bigwedge_{j=1}^m x_j \xrightarrow{u_j} y_j$. In turn, since $\alpha \subseteq \gamma$, there exists an expansion $\eta_\alpha \in \text{Exp}(\gamma)$ such that $\eta_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \xi_\alpha$ via a homomorphism f .

The idea is to modify η_α into another expansion η_β with $\eta_\beta \rightarrow \xi_\beta$, as desired. Note that f maps the external variables of η_α to external or internal variables in ξ_α . This determines a subdivision for each path $x_j \xrightarrow{u_j} y_j$ of ξ_α into smaller or ‘basic paths’, whose endpoints correspond to external

variables of ξ_α or images of the external variables of η_α via f . The number of these paths is hence bounded by $\|\gamma\|_{\text{var}} + 1$. Since $\text{type}_\gamma(u_j) \subseteq \text{type}_\gamma(z_j)$, then each path $x_j \xrightarrow{z_j} y_j$ in ξ_β can also be subdivided in an equivalent way than $x_j \xrightarrow{u_j} y_j$. Overall, the decomposition of ξ_α into basic paths can be ‘simulated’ in ξ_β . This gives us a homomorphism from η_β to ξ_β , where η_β is obtained from η_α in the following way: for each path $t_i \xrightarrow{w_i} s_i$ in η_α , where $w_i \in M_i$, the image of the path via f induces a subdivision of $t_i \xrightarrow{w_i} s_i$ into basic paths of ξ_α . We can replace each of these basic paths by its equivalent basic path in ξ_β . As the label of these paths are equivalent w.r.t to the relation \sim_γ , membership in M_i is maintained after this transformation. Hence η_β is indeed an expansion of γ .

For condition (2), it is easy to see that every equivalence class C of the relation \sim_γ can be accepted by an NFA \mathcal{A}_C of single-exponential size on $\|\gamma\|$. Also, for each word $u \in \mathbb{A}^*$, and each tuple $\bar{c} = (C_1, \dots, C_\ell) \in \text{type}_\gamma(u)$, there is a single-exponential size NFA $\mathcal{A}_{\bar{c}}$ accepting the language $\{z \in \mathbb{A}^* \mid \bar{c} \in \text{type}_\gamma(z)\}$. By intersecting these NFAs, we obtain an NFA \mathcal{A}_u accepting the language $\{z \in \mathbb{A}^* \mid \text{type}_\gamma(u) \subseteq \text{type}_\gamma(z)\}$. It is easy to see that the number of tuples of the form (C_1, \dots, C_ℓ) is at most single-exponential, and then the size of \mathcal{A}_u is at most double-exponential. It follows that the number of possible $\text{type}_\gamma(u)$ is at most double-exponential, and hence the languages \tilde{L} in β can be described by a union of double-exponential many NFAs, each of size at most double-exponential. Overall, each \tilde{L} can be described by an NFA of at most double-exponential size on $\|\gamma\|$. \square

PROOF OF THEOREM 4.1. The 2ExpSpace algorithm proceeds as follows. Let γ be a CRPQ over \mathbb{A} and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Let f be the double-exponential function from Lemma 4.2. We enumerate all possible directed multigraphs with at most k edges. For each of these graphs, we enumerate all the possible CRPQs β obtained by labelling each edge with an NFA of size bounded by $f(\|\gamma\|)$. If for some of these β , we have that $\beta \equiv \gamma$ then we accept the instance, otherwise we reject it. Lemma 4.2 ensures that this algorithm is correct.

It remains to show that $\beta \equiv \gamma$ can be carried out in 2ExpSpace. We use a proposition from [12, Proposition 3.11, p. 17] stating that containment $\Gamma \subseteq \Delta$, for UCRPQs Γ and Δ , can be solved in non-deterministic space $O(\|\Gamma\| + \|\Delta\|^{c \cdot \|\Delta\|_{\text{at}}})$, where c is a constant. This implies that $\beta \subseteq \gamma$ can be checked in space $O(\|\beta\| + \|\gamma\|^{c \cdot \|\gamma\|_{\text{at}}})$, and then within 2ExpSpace. The containment $\gamma \subseteq \beta$ can be solved in space $O(\|\gamma\| + \|\beta\|^{c \cdot k})$, and hence also in 2ExpSpace. \square

5 Minimization of UCRPQs via Approximations


We now focus on minimizations by *finite unions* of CRPQs. This is a different problem than the one seen in the previous section, *i.e.*, there is no obvious reduction in either direction between the *minimization problem* for CRPQs and the *minimization problem* for UCRPQs, and indeed we will solve this problem using an altogether different approach.

5.1 Unions Allow Further Minimization

As it turns out, having unions may help in minimizing the (maximum) number of atoms of a query as the next proposition shows.

PROPOSITION 5.1. There exist CRPQs which are minimal among CRPQs but not among UCRPQs.

PROOF SKETCH. The following example is inspired from [11, Example 1.2]. Consider these CRPQs:



It can be seen that $\gamma \equiv \delta_0 \vee \delta_1$ by doing a case analysis on the parity of the path between y and z —the even case is handled by δ_0 , the odd case by δ_1 . Hence, γ is not **minimal** among **UCRPQs**.

The hard part is to argue that γ is **minimal** among **CRPQs**: we consider a **CRPQ** ζ that is equivalent to γ and, by contradiction we assume that it has at most four **atoms**. Using the **Semantical Structure** theorem, we deduce that the following graph must be **minor** of the **underlying graph** of ζ . Since ζ has at most four **atoms**, we conclude that ζ must exactly be of the following shape



We then use the equivalence with δ to reach a contradiction. □

5.2 Maximal Under-Approximations

Our approach exploits having unions at our disposal, enabling the possibility of defining and computing **maximal under-approximations** for **UCRPQs** having some given underlying shape. This will lead to an **ExpSpace** upper bound for **UCRPQ** minimization.

For a graph class \mathcal{C} (remember that these are directed multigraphs) we denote by $\mathbf{CQ}(\mathcal{C})$, $\mathbf{CRPQ}(\mathcal{C})$, $\mathbf{UCRPQ}(\mathcal{C})$, $\mathbf{UCRPQ}^\infty(\mathcal{C})$, the class of **CQs**, of **CRPQs**, of finite unions of **CRPQs** and of infinite unions of **CRPQs** γ such that $G_\gamma \in \mathcal{C}$. Given a graph class \mathcal{C} and a **UCRPQ** Γ , we define $\mathbf{App}_\mathcal{C}^\infty(\Gamma)$ to be the (infinite) set of all $\mathbf{CRPQ}(\mathcal{C})$ queries which are **contractions** of **CQs** contained in Γ . More formally:¹¹

$$\mathbf{App}_\mathcal{C}^\infty(\Gamma) \hat{=} \{\alpha \in \mathbf{CRPQ}(\mathcal{C}) \mid \exists \xi \in \mathbf{Exp}(\Gamma), \exists \eta \in \mathbf{CQ} \text{ s.t. } \xi \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \eta \text{ and } \alpha \text{ is a contraction of } \eta\}.$$

PROPOSITION 5.2. If \mathcal{C} is a graph class closed under taking **minors**, then $\mathbf{App}_\mathcal{C}^\infty(\Gamma)$ is a **maximal under-approximation** of Γ by $\mathbf{UCRPQ}^\infty(\mathcal{C})$ queries, in the sense that:

- (1) $\mathbf{App}_\mathcal{C}^\infty(\Gamma) \in \mathbf{UCRPQ}^\infty(\mathcal{C})$,
- (2) $\mathbf{App}_\mathcal{C}^\infty(\Gamma) \subseteq \Gamma$, and
- (3) for any $\Delta \in \mathbf{UCRPQ}^\infty(\mathcal{C})$, if $\Delta \subseteq \Gamma$, then $\Delta \subseteq \mathbf{App}_\mathcal{C}^\infty(\Gamma)$.

PROOF. The first point is trivial. For the second one, observe that if $\alpha \in \mathbf{CRPQ}(\mathcal{C})$ is *s.t.* there exist $\xi \in \mathbf{Exp}(\Gamma)$ and $\eta \in \mathbf{CQ}$ *s.t.* $\xi \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \eta$ and α is a contraction of η , then $\eta \subseteq \xi$ and η is **semantically equivalent** to α by Fact 3.2, and hence $\alpha \subseteq \xi$, from which it follows that $\mathbf{App}_\mathcal{C}^\infty(\Gamma) \subseteq \Gamma$.

For the third point, let $\Delta \in \mathbf{UCRPQ}^\infty(\mathcal{C})$ *s.t.* $\Delta \subseteq \Gamma$. Let $\delta \in \Delta$ and ξ_δ be an **expansion** of δ . Since $\Delta \subseteq \Gamma$, there exist $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and $\xi_\gamma \in \mathbf{Exp}(\gamma)$ *s.t.* $\xi_\gamma \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \xi_\delta$. From the fact that $G_\delta \in \mathcal{C}$ and that $\xi_\delta \in \mathbf{Exp}(\delta)$, it follows that there exists a **contraction** α_δ of ξ_δ *s.t.* G_{α_δ} is a **minor** of G_δ , and thus belongs to \mathcal{C} . Hence, it follows that $\alpha_\delta \in \mathbf{App}_\mathcal{C}^\infty(\Gamma)$. So $\xi_\delta \subseteq \mathbf{App}_\mathcal{C}^\infty(\Gamma)$ and thus $\Delta \subseteq \mathbf{App}_\mathcal{C}^\infty(\Gamma)$. □

Our **ExpSpace** upper bound relies on the following technical lemma:

¹¹Note that the **contraction** of a **CQ** is a **CRPQ**: this is why $\mathbf{App}_\mathcal{C}^\infty(\Gamma)$ is an infinite union of **CRPQs** and not of **CQs**.

LEMMA 5.3. If C is finite and closed under taking minors, then $\text{App}_C^\infty(\Gamma)$ is equivalent to a query $\Delta \in \text{UCRPQ}(C)$ with exponentially many CRPQs, each CRPQ of Δ being of size polynomial in $\|\Gamma\| + \max\{\|G\|_{\text{at}} \mid G \in C\}$. Further, the membership $\delta \in^? \Delta$ can be tested NP. In particular, this UCRPQ Δ can be computed in exponential time from Γ .

PROOF. We start by observing that $\text{App}_C^\infty(\Gamma)$ admits an equivalent and more flexible definition in terms of refinements. This definition will allow us to effectively compute our desired equivalent query Δ , by considering refinements of bounded lengths.

For each $m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{+\infty\}$, we define the $\text{UCRPQ}^\infty(C)$

$$\text{App}_C^{\leq m}(\Gamma) \hat{=} \{\alpha \in \text{CRPQ}(C) \mid \exists \rho \in \text{Ref}^{\leq m}(\Gamma), \exists \eta \in \text{CRPQ} \text{ s.t. } \rho \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \eta \text{ and } \alpha \text{ is a contraction of } \eta\}.$$

We have that $\text{App}_C^\infty(\Gamma) \equiv \text{App}_C^{\leq +\infty}(\Gamma)$. Indeed, $\text{App}_C^\infty(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{App}_C^{\leq +\infty}(\Gamma)$ as the former is a subset of the latter. On the other hand, $\text{App}_C^{\leq +\infty}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{App}_C^\infty(\Gamma)$ follows from Proposition 5.2 and the fact that $\text{App}_C^{\leq +\infty}(\Gamma) \subseteq \Gamma$ by construction.

Let $\|C\|_{\text{at}} \hat{=} \max\{\|G\|_{\text{at}} \mid G \in C\}$ and r_Γ be the maximum number of states over the NFAs describing the languages appearing in Γ . We claim that $\text{App}_C^{\leq +\infty}(\Gamma) \equiv \text{App}_C^{\leq O(\|\Gamma\|_{\text{at}} \cdot r_\Gamma \cdot \|C\|_{\text{at}})}(\Gamma)$. The right-to-left containment is trivial, so it suffices to show $\text{App}_C^{\leq +\infty}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{App}_C^{\leq O(\|\Gamma\|_{\text{at}} \cdot r_\Gamma \cdot \|C\|_{\text{at}})}(\Gamma)$.

We define an *explicit approximation* of Γ over C as a tuple $\vec{\alpha} = \langle \rho, \eta, \alpha, h, \text{orig}, \text{contr} \rangle$ consisting of the following:

- queries $\rho \in \text{Ref}(\Gamma)$, $\eta \in \text{CRPQ}$ and $\alpha \in \text{CRPQ}(C)$,
- a homomorphism $h: \rho \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \eta$,
- witnesses that α is a contraction of η , in the form of a function $\text{orig}: \text{vars}(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{vars}(\eta)$, saying from which variable of η a variable of α originates, and a function $\text{contr}: \text{atoms}(\eta) \rightarrow \text{atoms}(\alpha)$ saying onto which atom of α an atom of η is contracted (i.e., the functions $\text{orig}, \text{contr}$ must meet the expected properties).

We say that an explicit approximation $\vec{\alpha}_1$ is *contained* in an explicit approximation $\vec{\alpha}_2$ if $\alpha_1 \subseteq \alpha_2$. For any m , to prove that $\text{App}_C^{\leq +\infty}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{App}_C^{\leq m}(\Gamma)$, it suffices to prove that any explicit approximation $\vec{\alpha}_1 = \langle \rho_1, \eta_1, \alpha_1, h_1, \text{orig}_1, \text{contr}_1 \rangle$ is contained in an explicit approximation $\vec{\alpha}_2 = \langle \rho_2, \eta_2, \alpha_2, h_2, \text{orig}_2, \text{contr}_2 \rangle$ such that $\rho_2 \in \text{Ref}^{\leq m}(\Gamma)$.

• *1st step: Bounding the size of η .* We define the *contraction length* of an explicit approximation $\vec{\alpha}$ as the size of the longest path in η whose atoms are all sent on the same atom of α via contr . In symbols, this is $\max\{|\text{contr}^{-1}(\mu)| : \mu \in \text{atoms}(\alpha)\}$. We show that any explicit approximation $\vec{\alpha}_1$ is contained in an explicit approximation $\vec{\alpha}_2$ of bounded contraction length.

Consider a path $x_0 \rightarrow x_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow x_k$ of η_1 whose atoms are all sent on the same atom of α_1 via contr_1 . If this path is very long, in particular greater than $\|\Gamma\|_{\text{var}}$, it must contain an internal variable x_i such that all of its h_1 -preimages are internal variables of ρ_1 . Then we will be able to contract x_i as well as the internal variables of the preimage, obtaining an explicit approximation which contains $\vec{\alpha}_1$ (details in Appendix D.1). Overall, this shows that any explicit approximation is contained in an explicit approximation of contraction length at most $O(\|\Gamma\|_{\text{var}}) \leq O(\|\Gamma\|_{\text{at}})$.

• *2nd step: bounding the size of ρ .* We now show that we can bound the *refinement length* of an explicit approximation, namely the maximal length of an atom refinement in ρ . Let $\vec{\alpha}_1$ be an explicit approximation of contraction length at most $O(\|\Gamma\|_{\text{at}})$. Then η_1 has at most $O(\|\Gamma\|_{\text{at}} \cdot \|C\|_{\text{at}})$ atoms. It follows then, by the pigeonhole principle, that we can bound the refinement length of ρ_1 by $O(\|\Gamma\|_{\text{at}} \cdot r_\Gamma \cdot \|\alpha\|_{\text{at}})$. Indeed, if the length of an atom refinement of ρ_1 is greater than this bound, there are two atoms in the refinement $x \xrightarrow{L_i} y$ and $x' \xrightarrow{L_j} y'$, with $i < j$, mapped to the same atom via h_1 and whose corresponding NFA states q_i and q_j in the definition of refinements are the same. We can then remove the path between y and y' . In conclusion, this shows that $\text{App}_C^{\leq +\infty}(\Gamma) \subseteq \text{App}_C^{\leq O(\|\Gamma\|_{\text{at}} \cdot r_\Gamma \cdot \|C\|_{\text{at}})}(\Gamma)$.

🔗 *Conclusion: Expressing & computing $\text{App}_C^{\leq O(\|\Gamma\|_{\text{at}} \cdot r_\Gamma \cdot \|C\|_{\text{at}})}(\Gamma)$ as a UCRPQ.* In order to compute $\text{App}_C^{\leq O(\|\Gamma\|_{\text{at}} \cdot r_\Gamma \cdot \|C\|_{\text{at}})}(\Gamma)$ we can enumerate the finitely many m -refinements ρ of Γ , where $m = O(\|\Gamma\|_{\text{at}} \cdot r_\Gamma \cdot \|C\|_{\text{at}})$, and the finitely many CRPQs η with at most $O(\|\Gamma\|_{\text{at}} \cdot \|C\|_{\text{at}})$ atoms such that $\rho \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \eta$. The only issue here is that we have infinitely many possibilities to choose languages labelling the atoms that are not in the homomorphic image of $\rho \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \eta$. However, we can choose the most general language \mathbb{A}^* obtaining a query equivalent to $\text{App}_C^{\leq m}(\Gamma)$. Note that each CRPQ has at most $O(\|\Gamma\|_{\text{at}} \cdot \|C\|_{\text{at}})$ atoms and its languages are concatenations of $O(\|\Gamma\|_{\text{at}} \cdot \|C\|_{\text{at}})$ sublanguages of Γ or \mathbb{A}^* , and so they can be described by NFAs of polynomial size on $\|\Gamma\|$ and $\|C\|_{\text{at}}$. \square

COROLLARY 5.4. Testing whether a UCRPQ is equivalent to a UCRPQ of at most k atoms is ExpSpace-complete.

PROOF. It suffices to test if the UCRPQ Γ is equivalent to $\text{App}_C^{\leq m}(\Gamma)$ where C is the class of all graphs with at most k edges and $m = O(\|\Gamma\|_{\text{at}} \cdot r_\Gamma \cdot \|C\|_{\text{at}})$ as in the proof of Lemma 5.3. The correctness follows from Proposition 5.2 since C is trivially closed under minors. Each $\alpha \in \text{App}_C^{\leq m}(\Gamma)$ has at most k edges, and $\text{App}_C^{\leq m}(\Gamma)$ contains exponentially many queries, so by [12, Proposition 3.11] (see also proof of Theorem 4.1), it can be solved in ExpSpace. Finally, ExpSpace-hardness will follow from Theorem 6.2 (§6). \square

5.3 CRPQs over Simple Regular Expressions

Let *UCRPQ(SRE)* (resp. *CRPQ(SRE)*) be the set of all UCRPQs (resp. CRPQs) whose languages are expressed via SREs (as defined in Section 1). We show that if we restrict the regular expressions we obtain a much better complexity for the minimization problem for UCRPQs.

THEOREM 5.5. *The minimization problem for UCRPQ(SRE) is Π_2^P -complete.*¹²

PROOF. We first begin with an easy small counterexample property.

Claim 5.6. Let $\Gamma, \Delta \in \text{UCRPQ}$ containing only atoms with expressions of the form (i) a^+ , or (ii) $a_1 + \dots + a_k$. Additionally, Δ may also have expressions of the form (iii) \mathbb{A}^* . If $\Gamma \not\subseteq \Delta$, then there exists $\xi \in \text{Exp}(\Gamma)$ such that (a) $\xi \not\subseteq \Delta$ and (b) $\|\xi\|_{\text{at}} \leq O(\max_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \|\gamma\|_{\text{at}} \cdot \max_{\delta \in \Delta} \|\delta\|_{\text{at}})$.

The intuition is that if a counterexample includes an atom expansion $x \xrightarrow{a^n} y$ of some atom $x \xrightarrow{a^+} y$, where n is greater than the maximum number of atoms in Δ (plus one), then the expansion obtained by replacing $x \xrightarrow{a^n} y$ with $x \xrightarrow{a^{n-1}} y$ must also be a counterexample. Hence, a minimal counterexample must have all atom expansions bounded by the maximum number of atoms in Δ .

PROOF. This fact follows from a standard technique as used in, e.g., [9]. Take any counterexample $\xi \in \text{Exp}(\Gamma)$ as in the statement, and suppose it is of minimal size. By means of contradiction, assume $\|\xi\|_{\text{at}} > \max_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \|\gamma\|_{\text{at}} \cdot (\max_{\delta \in \Delta} \|\delta\|_{\text{at}} + 1)$. Then, it contains an atom expansion $x \xrightarrow{a^m} y$ of size $m > \max_{\delta \in \Delta} \|\delta\|_{\text{at}} + 1$. Consider removing one atom from such expansion (i.e., replacing $x \xrightarrow{a^m} y$ with $x \xrightarrow{a^{m-1}} y$), obtaining some expansion $\xi' \in \text{Exp}(\Gamma)$ of smaller size. By minimality ξ' is not a counterexample: in other words there is $\xi'' \in \text{Exp}(\delta)$ such that $h : \xi'' \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \xi'$ for some $\delta \in \Delta$ and h . Since $x \xrightarrow{a^{m-1}} y$ contains more than $\|\delta\|_{\text{at}}$ atoms, there must be some a -atom of $x \xrightarrow{a^{m-1}} y$ which either (1) has no h -preimage or (2) every h -preimage is in an atom expansion of a \mathbb{A}^* -atom or a a^+ -atom of δ . We can then replace the a -atom with two a -atoms in ξ' and do similarly in the atom expansions of ξ'' in the h -preimage, obtaining that $\xi'' \subseteq \delta$. But this is in contradiction with our hypothesis, hence any minimal counterexample is of size smaller or equal to $\max_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \|\gamma\|_{\text{at}} \cdot (\max_{\delta \in \Delta} \|\delta\|_{\text{at}} + 1)$. \square

¹²By this we mean the minimization problem for UCRPQs whose input instances are UCRPQ(SRE).

Given a **UCRPQ(SRE)** Γ , the construction of Lemma 5.3 yields its **maximal under-approximation** by **UCRPQs** of at most k atoms as a **UCRPQ** Δ_{App} whose every regular expression is a concatenation of expressions of the form (i), (ii) and (iii) above. It suffices then to test $\gamma \subseteq \Delta_{\text{App}}$ for every **CRPQ(SRE)** γ in Γ . Due to Claim 5.6 (and observing that equivalent queries without concatenations can be obtained in polynomial time) its negation $\gamma \not\subseteq \Delta_{\text{App}}$ can be tested by guessing a polynomial sized **expansion** ξ of γ and then testing $\xi \not\subseteq \Delta_{\text{App}}$. In turn, $\xi \subseteq \Delta_{\text{App}}$ can be tested in NP by [9, Theorem 4.2].¹³ This yields a Π_2^P algorithm for testing $\gamma \subseteq \Delta_{\text{App}}$, and thus also for $\Gamma \subseteq \Delta_{\text{App}}$. Π_2^P -hardness follows from Corollary 6.4. \square

6 Lower Bounds

In this section we give some underlying ideas for showing lower bounds for the **minimization problems**. All the proofs can be found in the Appendix.

6.1 Equivalence with a Single Atom

Containment of CRPQs is ExpSpace-complete [3, 16]. Somewhat surprisingly, Figueira [8, Lemma 8] showed that there exists a finite alphabet \mathbb{A} s.t. the problem remained ExpSpace-hard even if restricted to instances with a simple shape. We start by strengthening this result to fit our needs.

PROPOSITION 6.1 (VARIATION ON [8, LEMMA 8]). There is a fixed alphabet over which the **containment problem for Boolean CRPQs** is ExpSpace-hard restricted to instances of the form


$$\gamma_1() = x \xrightarrow{K} y \quad \stackrel{?}{\subseteq} \quad \bigwedge_{j \in \llbracket 1, p \rrbracket} x \xrightarrow{L_j} y = \gamma_2(), \text{ where:}$$

- (1) no language among K or the L_i 's is empty or contains the empty word ε , and
- (2) there is no i such that $\mathbb{A}^* L_i \mathbb{A}^* = \mathbb{A}^* (\bigcap_j L_j) \mathbb{A}^*$.

We shall use these hard instances to show that the **minimization problem for CRPQs** is hard.

THEOREM 6.2. The **minimization problem for CRPQs** is ExpSpace-hard. Further, there is a fixed alphabet s.t. the problem of, given a **Boolean CRPQ** on this alphabet with only four variables is equivalent to a **Boolean CRPQ** with a single atom is ExpSpace-hard.

PROOF SKETCH. We reduce an instance of the problem of Proposition 6.1 to the instance δ , where



First, it is easy to see that if $\gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2$ then $\delta \equiv \gamma_1$. Conversely, if δ is equivalent to a **Boolean CRPQ** with at most one atom, then $\gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2$. The conditions imposed by Proposition 6.1 are necessary to discard one-atom queries which are self-loops and that whenever $\gamma_1 \not\subseteq \gamma_2$ there is an **expansion** of δ to which any δ -equivalent single-atom query **expansion** cannot be mapped. \square

¹³Simply by (1) guessing a polynomial size **CRPQ** δ , (2) testing $\delta \in \Delta_{\text{App}}$ in NP by Lemma 5.3, and (3) guessing a (small) expansion ξ' of δ and testing $\xi' \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \xi$.

6.2 Minimization is Harder than Containment

We show that, under some technical conditions, the containment problem can be reduced to the **minimization problem**. This allows to transfer known lower bounds from the **containment problem** of CRPQ classes. Due to space constraints we only state the key definitions and lemmas. We first introduce an intermediary technical property called “**canonization**”, which ensures the feasibility of the reduction.

Canonization. We say that an **expansion** ξ of a CRPQ γ is *non-degenerate* if no **atom refinement** in ξ was obtained using the empty word. A *class of (Boolean) CRPQs* is a function Q mapping an alphabet \mathbb{A} to a set $Q_{\mathbb{A}}$ of Boolean CRPQs, which is closed under variable renaming and alphabetic renaming of the languages. Given a class of CRPQs Q , the *Q -canonization problem* is the functional problem taking an alphabet \mathbb{A} and two Boolean CRPQs $\langle \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \rangle$ in $Q_{\mathbb{A}}$, and outputting an alphabet \mathbb{M} , two other Boolean CRPQs $\langle \delta_1, \delta_2 \rangle$, in $Q_{\mathbb{A} \cup \mathbb{M}}$, such that:

- (Cnz)_{monotonic}: $\gamma_1 \sqsubseteq \gamma_2$ iff $\delta_1 \sqsubseteq \delta_2$,
- (Cnz)_{str-onto}: there exists a non-degenerate $D_1 \in \text{Exp}(\delta_1)$ s.t., for every $D'_1 \in \text{Exp}(\delta_1)$ and $f : D'_1 \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} D_1$ we have (i) D'_1 is non-degenerate, (ii) f is strong onto, and (iii) $f(x) = x$ for every $x \in \text{vars}(\delta_1)$,
- (Cnz)_{non-red}: for each $D_1 \in \text{Exp}(\delta_1)$, for each $x, y \in \text{vars}(\delta_1)$, there cannot be an **atom refinement** in D_1 from x to y and another path from x to y in D_1 , disjoint from the **atom refinement** that share the same label,
- (Cnz)_{contracted}: δ_1 is fully contracted,
- (Cnz)_{containment}: $\gamma_2 \sqsubseteq \delta_2$, and
- (Cnz)_{marking}: each connected component of δ_1 must contain at least one **atom** labelled by a language L s.t. every word of L must contain at least one letter from \mathbb{M} .

The *Q -strong canonization problem* is defined similarly, except that we replace ‘there exists’ with ‘for all’ in (Cnz)_{str-onto}—see (SCnz)_{str-onto} for a formal definition.

We show that assuming we can solve the Q -canonization problem (resp. Q -strong canonization problem) this problem, then the CRPQ (resp. UCRPQ) minimization problem restricted to CRPQs of Q (resp. to UCRPQs whose disjuncts are all in Q) is harder than the containment problem over Q .

LEMMA 6.3. For any class Q of CRPQs closed under disjoint conjunction, there is a polynomial-time algorithm using a Q -canonization oracle (resp. Q -strong canonization oracle) from the containment problem for Boolean queries of Q to the CRPQ (resp. UCRPQ) minimization problem restricted to CRPQs in Q (resp. UCRPQs whose disjuncts are all in Q). The reduction also applies under the restriction that the target query must also be in Q .

PROOF SKETCH. The construction reduces some restriction of the **containment problem** to some variant of the **minimization problem**. The main idea is, given an instance $\gamma_1 \sqsubseteq^? \gamma_2$, to build CRPQs δ_1 and δ_2 with some desirable properties s.t. the following are equivalent: (i) $\gamma_1 \sqsubseteq \gamma_2$, (ii) $\delta_1 \sqsubseteq \delta_2$, (iii) $\delta_1 \oslash \delta_2 \equiv \delta_1$, where \oslash denotes the *disjoint conjunction* (i.e., the conjunction of **atoms** of both queries making sure that variables are disjoint), and (iv) $\delta_1 \oslash \delta_2$ is equivalent to a CRPQ whose size is at most the size of δ_1 . Of course, (ii) \Leftrightarrow (iii) always holds, as well as (iii) \Rightarrow (iv).

All the difficulty lies in guaranteeing the converse property: (iv) \Rightarrow (iii). We will use the constructions $\gamma_i \mapsto \delta_i$, given by the canonization problem, to enforce it while respecting (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii). The main idea of this approach is to add some ‘marking’ (with fresh alphabet symbols) of either the variables or the atoms of γ_1 in δ_1 , ensuring that δ_1 has some strong structure implying that—loosely speaking—any query equivalent to $\delta_1 \oslash \delta_2$ must contain δ_1 as a subquery. Using the assumption that $\delta_1 \oslash \delta_2$ is equivalent to a CRPQ whose size is at most the size of δ_1 , we conclude that in fact $\delta_1 \oslash \delta_2 \equiv \delta_1$, i.e. $\delta_1 \sqsubseteq \delta_2$ and so $\gamma_1 \sqsubseteq \gamma_2$. \square

Motivated by Lemma 6.3 we show in the appendix that several reasonable classes admit a polynomial-time algorithm for the strong canonization problem—see Lemmas E.14 and E.17.

COROLLARY 6.4. The CRPQ and UCRPQ minimization problems are:

- (1) ExpSpace-hard, even if restricted to queries of path-width at most 1,
- (2) PSpace-hard when restricted to forest-shaped CRPQs,¹⁴
- (3) Π_2^P -hard when restricted to CRPQs over simple regular expressions.

All hardness results are under polynomial-time reductions.

7 Discussion

Several open problems are left by our work, more prominently, the complexity gap for minimization of CRPQs. Below we discuss further avenues for future research.

Variable minimization. Another approach for an algorithm for query answering of a (U)CRPQs γ on a graph database G is by first guessing a variable assignment $f : \text{vars}(\gamma) \rightarrow V(G)$ and then checking, for each atom $x \xrightarrow{L} y$ of γ , that there is a path in G from $f(x)$ to $f(y)$ with label in L . This implementation approach privileges minimizing the number of variables as opposed to the number of atoms of a (U)CRPQ, and gives rise to the corresponding *variable-minimization problem(s)*. From a practical perspective, as already mentioned in the Introduction, systems commonly evaluate CRPQs via join algorithms. Recent *worst-case optimal* joins algorithms work by ordering the variables and assigning potential values to these, and hence the number of variables may also be a relevant parameter in these cases [5, 25].

Variable-minimization problem for CRPQs (resp. for UCRPQ):

Input: A finite alphabet \mathbb{A} , a CRPQ (resp. UCRPQ) γ over \mathbb{A} and $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Question: Does there exists a CRPQ (resp. UCRPQ) δ over \mathbb{A} with at most k variables (resp. whose every CRPQ has at most k variables) s.t. $\gamma \equiv \delta$?

As before, a (U)CRPQ is *variable minimal* if there is no equivalent (U)CRPQ smaller in the number of variables. It is worth observing that for conjunctive queries (and for tree patterns) minimizing the number of variables or minimizing the number of atoms is equivalent: a query is minimal in the number of variables *iff* it is minimal in the number of atoms. However, for CRPQs and UCRPQs it is not: $\gamma(x, y) = x \xrightarrow{a} y \wedge x \xrightarrow{a+b} y$ is *variable minimal*, but it is not (atom) *minimal* since it is equivalent to $\gamma'(x, y) = x \xrightarrow{a} y$. We further conjecture that there are (atom) *minimal* CRPQs which are not *variable minimal*.

CONJECTURE 7.1. *There exist (atom) minimal CRPQs which are not variable minimal.*

By adaptations of the algorithms of Sections 4 and 5 we can derive some upper bounds, which are likely to be sub-optimal.

THEOREM 7.2. *The variable-minimization problem for CRPQs is in 4ExpSpace and for UCRPQs in 2ExpSpace. Both problems are ExpSpace-hard.*

PROOF. For the case of CRPQ variable-minimization problem, it suffices to observe, in the proof of Lemma 4.2, that since each NFA of the proof has size double-exponential, there there cannot be more than a triply-exponential number of distinct NFA, and hence that the underlying multigraph of queries to be considered has a triply-exponential number of edges. Thus, there are ‘only’ a quadruply-exponential number of such triply-exponential queries. For each such query we test if it is equivalent to the original query in 4ExpSpace.

¹⁴By *forest-shaped CRPQs* we mean queries whose underlying graph has no undirected cycle.

For the case of UCRPQ variable-minimization problem, let C_k be the (infinite) set of multigraphs having at most k vertices. Via the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 5.3, we obtain that each $\text{CRPQ}(C_k)$ in the union of CRPQs expressing $\text{App}_{C_k}^\infty(\Gamma) = \text{App}_{C_k}^{\leq O(\|\Gamma\|_{\text{at}} \cdot r_\Gamma \cdot \|C\|_{\text{at}})}(\Gamma)$ has atoms consisting in a concatenation of at most $O(\|\Gamma\|_{\text{at}} \cdot \|C\|_{\text{at}})$ sublanguages of Γ . Hence, there cannot be more than $2^{O(\|\Gamma\|_{\text{at}} \cdot \|C\|_{\text{at}})}$ distinct atoms between two variables, and $\text{App}_{C_k}^{\leq O(\|\Gamma\|_{\text{at}} \cdot r_\Gamma \cdot \|C\|_{\text{at}})}(\Gamma) \equiv \text{App}_{C'_k}^{\leq O(\|\Gamma\|_{\text{at}} \cdot r_\Gamma \cdot \|C\|_{\text{at}})}(\Gamma)$ for C'_k being the finite subclass of C_k having graphs with no more than $2^{O(\|\Gamma\|_{\text{at}} \cdot \|C\|_{\text{at}})}$ parallel edges. Hence, there is a double-exponential number of exponential queries to test for equivalence with Γ , which yields a 2ExpSpace upper bound.

The lower bounds follows by a similar idea as Theorem 6.2 and can be found in Theorem E.3 of the Appendix. \square

Tree patterns. We believe that the techniques of Section 5 should also yield a method to compute maximal under-approximations for unions of tree patterns, as well as a Π_2^P upper bound for the minimization problem of unions of tree patterns, contrasting with the Σ_2^P -completeness of minimization of tree patterns proven by Czerwiński, Martens, Niewerth & Parys [6, Theorem 3.1]. We leave the details for a future long version of this article.

We do not fully understand the relation between tree pattern minimization and CRPQ minimization, we conjecture that if a tree pattern is minimal among tree patterns, then its encoding as a CRPQ—see Appendix F.1 for a definition—should also be minimal, up to contracting internal variables, among CRPQs but we have failed so far to prove this.

Acknowledgments

Diego Figueira is partially supported by ANR AI Chair INTENDED, grant ANR-19-CHIA-0014. Miguel Romero is funded by the National Center for Artificial Intelligence CENIA FB210017, Basal ANID.

References

- [1] Pablo Barceló, Diego Figueira, and Miguel Romero. 2019. Boundedness of Conjunctive Regular Path Queries. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP) (LIPIcs, Vol. 132)*. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 104:1–104:15.
- [2] Pablo Barceló, Miguel Romero, and Moshe Y. Vardi. 2016. Semantic Acyclicity on Graph Databases. *SIAM Journal on computing* 45, 4 (2016), 1339–1376. <https://doi.org/10.1137/15M1034714>
- [3] Diego Calvanese, Giuseppe De Giacomo, Maurizio Lenzerini, and Moshe Y. Vardi. 2000. Containment of Conjunctive Regular Path Queries with Inverse. In *Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning (KR)*. Morgan Kaufmann, 176–185.
- [4] Ashok K. Chandra and Philip M. Merlin. 1977. Optimal Implementation of Conjunctive Queries in Relational Data Bases. In *Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*. ACM, 77–90. <https://doi.org/10.1145/800105.803397>
- [5] Tamara Cucumides, Juan Reutter, and Domagoj Vrgoč. 2023. Size Bounds and Algorithms for Conjunctive Regular Path Queries. In *International Conference on Database Theory (ICDT) (Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs))*. Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 13:1–13:17.
- [6] Wojciech Czerwiński, Wim Martens, Matthias Niewerth, and Paweł Parys. 2018. Minimization of Tree Patterns. *J. ACM* 65, 4, Article 26 (2018), 46 pages.
- [7] Cristina Feier, Tomasz Gogacz, and Filip Murlak. 2024. Evaluating Graph Queries Using Semantic Treewidth. In *International Conference on Database Theory (ICDT) (LIPIcs, Vol. 290)*. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 22:1–22:20.
- [8] Diego Figueira. 2020. Containment of UC2RPQ: The Hard and Easy Cases. In *International Conference on Database Theory (ICDT) (Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs), Vol. 155)*. Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 9:1–9:18. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICS.ICDT.2020.9>
- [9] Diego Figueira, Adwait Godbole, S. Krishna, Wim Martens, Matthias Niewerth, and Tina Trautner. 2020. Containment of Simple Conjunctive Regular Path Queries. In *Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning (KR)*. 371–380.

- [10] Diego Figueira, S. Krishna, Om Swostik Mishra, and Anantha Padmanabha. 2024. Boundedness for Unions of Conjunctive Regular Path Queries over Simple Regular Expressions. In *Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning (KR)*.
- [11] Diego Figueira and Rémi Morvan. 2023. Approximation and Semantic Tree-Width of Conjunctive Regular Path Queries. In *International Conference on Database Theory (ICDT) (LIPICs, Vol. 255)*. Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 15:1–15:19.
- [12] Diego Figueira and Rémi Morvan. 2025. Semantic Tree-Width and Path-Width of Conjunctive Regular Path Queries. *Logical Methods in Computer Science (LMCS)* 21, 1 (March 2025). [https://doi.org/10.46298/lmcs-21\(1:21\)2025](https://doi.org/10.46298/lmcs-21(1:21)2025)
- [13] Diego Figueira, Rémi Morvan, and Miguel Romero. 2025. Minimizing Conjunctive Regular Path Queries. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data (PACMOD)* 3, 2 (PODS) (2025).
- [14] Diego Figueira and Miguel Romero. 2023. Conjunctive Regular Path Queries under Injective Semantics. In *ACM Symposium on Principles of Database Systems (PODS)*. ACM Press, 231–240.
- [15] S. Flesca, F. Furfaro, and E. Masciari. 2008. On the minimization of XPath queries. *J. ACM* 55, 1 (2008).
- [16] Daniela Florescu, Alon Levy, and Dan Suciu. 1998. Query Containment for Conjunctive Queries with Regular Expressions. In *ACM Symposium on Principles of Database Systems (PODS)*. ACM Press, 139–148. <https://doi.org/10.1145/275487.275503>
- [17] Nadime Francis, Amélie Gheerbrant, Paolo Guagliardo, Leonid Libkin, Victor Marsault, Wim Martens, Filip Murlak, Liat Peterfreund, Alexandra Rogova, and Domagoj Vrgoč. 2023. GPC: A Pattern Calculus for Property Graphs. In *ACM Symposium on Principles of Database Systems (PODS)*. ACM Press, 241–250. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3584372.3588662>
- [18] Nadime Francis, Amélie Gheerbrant, Paolo Guagliardo, Leonid Libkin, Victor Marsault, Wim Martens, Filip Murlak, Liat Peterfreund, Alexandra Rogova, and Domagoj Vrgoč. 2023. A Researcher’s Digest of GQL (Invited Talk). In *International Conference on Database Theory (ICDT) (Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPICs), Vol. 255)*. Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 1:1–1:22. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.ICDT.2023.1>
- [19] Víctor Gutiérrez-Basulto, Albert Gutowski, Yazmín Ibáñez-García, and Filip Murlak. 2022. Finite Entailment of UCRPQs over ALC Ontologies. In *Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning (KR)*. 184–194.
- [20] Víctor Gutiérrez-Basulto, Albert Gutowski, Yazmín Ibáñez-García, and Filip Murlak. 2024. Containment of Graph Queries Modulo Schema. In *ACM Symposium on Principles of Database Systems (PODS)*. ACM Press, 1–26.
- [21] International Organization for Standardization (ISO). 2024. ISO/IEC 39075:2024 GQL. <https://www.iso.org/standard/76120.html>. Released in April 2024 by ISO/IEC.
- [22] International Organization for Standardization (ISO). 2024. ISO/IEC 9075-16:2023 Part 16: Property Graph Queries (SQL/PGQ). <https://www.iso.org/standard/79473.html>. Released in June 2023 by ISO/IEC.
- [23] Nikolaos Karalis, Alexander Bigerl, Liss Heidrich, Mohamed Ahmed Sherif, and Axel-Cyrille Ngonga Ngomo. 2024. Efficient Evaluation of Conjunctive Regular Path Queries Using Multi-way Joins. Springer, 218–235.
- [24] Benny Kimelfeld and Yehoshua Sagiv. 2008. Revisiting redundancy and minimization in an XPath fragment. In *International Conference on Extending Database Technology (EDBT)*. ACM Press, 61–72.
- [25] Domagoj Vrgoč, Carlos Rojas, Renzo Angles, Marcelo Arenas, Vicente Calisto, Benjamín Fariás, Sebastián Ferrada, Tristan Heuer, Aidan Hogan, Gonzalo Navarro, Alexander Pinto, Juan Reutter, Henry Rosales, and Etienne Toussiant. 2024. MillenniumDB: A Multi-modal, Multi-model Graph Database. In *ACM Symposium on Principles of Database Systems (PODS)*. ACM Press, 496–499.

A Appendix to Section 2 “Preliminaries”

A *canonical database* G of a CRPQ γ is any canonical database associated to an expansion of γ , see [16, Definition 3.1] for a formal definition. We denote it by $G \models^* \gamma$. A *canonical database* of a UCRPQ is a canonical database of one of its disjuncts.

An *evaluation map* from a CRPQ γ to a graph database G is a function f from variables of γ to G s.t. for any atom $x \xrightarrow{L} y$ in γ , there is path from $f(x)$ to $f(y)$ in G labelled by a word of L .

The *containment* between UCRPQs $\Gamma_1 \subseteq \Gamma_2$ is exactly characterized by the fact that for all canonical database $G_1 \models^* \Gamma_1$, there exists a disjunct γ_2 of Γ_2 s.t. there is an evaluation map from γ_2 to G_1 .

B Appendix to Section 3 “Necessary & Sufficient Conditions for Minimality”

Definition B.1. Given a CRPQ γ , we define its *segment graph* $\mathcal{SG}(\gamma)$ to be the directed multigraph defined by:

- every external variable of γ is a vertex of $\mathcal{SG}(\gamma)$, and moreover, for every cyclic segment σ that is not incident to any external variable, we create a new variable x_σ ;
- for every cyclic segment σ , we have a self-loop around x_σ , and for any external variable x and y of γ , we have an edge from x to y in $\mathcal{SG}(\gamma)$ for any segment starting at x and ending at y .

The notion is illustrated in Figure 1b. The motivation behind segments is that they are essentially the dual to atom refinements.

PROPOSITION 3.6. Let γ be a CRPQ and ξ be an expansion of γ . Then $\mathcal{SG}(\xi)$ is a minor of the underlying graph of γ .

PROOF. The underlying graph of ξ is obtained from the underlying graph of γ by:

- (1) contracting some edges—corresponding to atom refinements for the word ε ,
- (2) potentially removing isolated vertices,¹⁵ and
- (3) refining some edges—corresponding to atom refinements for words of length at least 2.

Let G' be the underlying graph of γ to which we applied all operation of type (1) and (2). By construction, G' is a minor of G_γ . Notice then that if H is a graph obtained by refining one edge of G' , then $\mathcal{SG}(H)$ and $\mathcal{SG}(G')$ are isomorphic. By trivial induction, it follows that $\mathcal{SG}(\xi)$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{SG}(G')$. In turn, by Fact 3.5, $\mathcal{SG}(G')$ is an edge contraction of G' , which concludes the proof since the latter is a minor of G_γ . \square

COROLLARY 3.8 (OF THEOREM 3.7). Every strongly minimal UCRPQ is minimal.

PROOF. The number of edges of $\mathcal{SG}(\text{core}(\xi))$ equals $\|\text{core}(\xi)\|_{\text{seg}}$, and a minor can only decrease the number of edges. \square

PROPOSITION B.2. Let γ be a CRPQ. The set of atoms of any path $x_0 \xrightarrow{a_1} \dots \xrightarrow{a_n} x_n$ of γ where either $x_0 = x_n$ or where both x_0 and x_n are external is a finite union of segments of γ .

PROOF. The statement deals with the set of atoms of the path—and not the path itself—, so *w.l.o.g.*, up to a circular permutation of the path, we assume that (1) if $x_0 = x_n$ then either x_0 and x_n are external, or all x_i 's ($i \in \llbracket 1, n-1 \rrbracket$) are internal.

We prove the statement by induction on the length of the path. We identify three cases:

- (1) each x_i ($i \in \llbracket 1, n-1 \rrbracket$) is both internal and distinct from all x_j 's ($j \in \llbracket 0, n \rrbracket$);
- (2) x_0 and x_n are external and there exists $i \in \llbracket 1, n-1 \rrbracket$ s.t. x_i is external;

¹⁵This can happen e.g. in the atom refinement of $x \xrightarrow{a^*} x$ when dealing with the empty word.

(3) $x_0 = x_n$ and there exists $k \in \llbracket 1, n-1 \rrbracket$ s.t. $x_k = x_0 (= x_n)$.

Next, we show that this covers all possible cases.

If we are not in the first case, then either some x_i ($i \in \llbracket 1, n-1 \rrbracket$) is **external** or is equal to some x_j ($j \in \llbracket 0, n \rrbracket$). For the former, by (G) we get that x_0 and x_n are necessarily **external**, and we fall in case 2.

For the former, we know that all x_i 's ($i \in \llbracket 1, n-1 \rrbracket$) are **internal**, and there exists $i \in \llbracket 1, n-1 \rrbracket$ and $j \in \llbracket 0, n \rrbracket$ s.t. $x_i = x_j$. Up to renaming the variables, we get that $i < j$ and $(i, j) \neq (0, n)$. Recall that all x_k 's ($k \in \llbracket 1, n-1 \rrbracket$) are **internal**, and so from $x_i = x_j$ we get by trivial induction that $x_0 = x_{j-i}$. In particular, x_0 must be **internal** and so $x_0 = x_n$. Letting $k \hat{=} j - i$ we have $k \in \llbracket 1, n-1 \rrbracket$ s.t. $x_k = x_0 = x_n$, and so we are in case 3.

We can now proceed with the induction.

- (1) For the base case, we have a path where each x_i ($i \in \llbracket 1, n-1 \rrbracket$) is both **internal** and distinct from all x_j 's ($j \in \llbracket 0, n \rrbracket$). By definition this path is a **segment**.
- (2) In the second case, x_0 and x_n are **external**, and there exists some $i \in \llbracket 1, n-1 \rrbracket$ s.t. x_i is **external**. We use the induction hypothesis on the paths $x_0 \xrightarrow{a_1} \dots \xrightarrow{a_i} x_i$ and $x_i \xrightarrow{a_{i+1}} \dots \xrightarrow{a_n} x_n$ and the conclusion follows.
- (3) In the last case, there exists $k \in \llbracket 1, n-1 \rrbracket$ s.t. $x_0 = x_k = x_n$, and the conclusion follows from applying the induction on $x_0 \xrightarrow{a_1} \dots \xrightarrow{a_k} x_k$ and $x_k \xrightarrow{a_{k+1}} \dots \xrightarrow{a_n} x_n$.

This concludes the induction and the proof. \square

LEMMA B.3. Let γ, δ be **CRPQs**. If $f: \delta \rightarrow \gamma$ is a **homomorphism** that sends external variables of δ on external variables of γ , then there is a function from nodes of $\mathcal{SG}(\delta)$ to nodes of $\mathcal{SG}(\gamma)$ that sends an edge of $\mathcal{SG}(\delta)$ to a path of $\mathcal{SG}(\gamma)$.

PROOF. By Proposition B.2, the image $f[\sigma]$ by f of any **segment** σ of δ is a union of **segments** of γ . \square

COROLLARY B.4. Let γ, δ be two **CRPQs** such that there is an **embedding** from δ to γ s.t. every node of in-degree 0 (resp. out-degree 0) is sent on a node of in-degree 0 (resp. out-degree 0). Then $\mathcal{SG}(\delta)$ is a **minor** of $\mathcal{SG}(\gamma)$.

PROOF. Let $f: \delta \rightarrow \gamma$ be such an **embedding**.

Claim B.5. If $x \in \delta$ is **external**, then $f(x)$ is **external**.

Indeed, if x has in-degree at least 2, or out-degree at least 2, so does $f(x)$ since f is an **embedding**. Otherwise, either x has either in-degree 0 or out-degree 0, and so does $f(x)$ using the assumption we made on f .

We then use Lemma B.3. Note that since f is an **embedding**, the segments of γ occurring in $f[\sigma]$ must be distinct from the segments occurring in $f[\sigma']$ for any **segment** $\sigma' \neq \sigma$. Overall, we have an injective map from nodes of $\mathcal{SG}(\delta)$ to nodes of $\mathcal{SG}(\gamma)$, which sends an edge to a path, and moreover these paths are pairwise disjoint. This shows that $\mathcal{SG}(\delta)$ is a **minor** of $\mathcal{SG}(\gamma)$. \square

Remark B.6. Note that the assumption that ξ is **hom-minimal** in Theorem 3.7 is necessary: consider the **CRPQ** $\gamma(x, y) \hat{=} x \xrightarrow{a^+} y \wedge x \xrightarrow{(aa)^+} y$. For $n, m \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$, let $\xi_{n,m}(x, y) \hat{=} x \xrightarrow{a^n} y \wedge x \xrightarrow{a^{2m}} y$. There are two cases:

- (1) If $n \neq 2m$, then $\|\text{core}(\xi_{n,m})\|_{\text{seg}} = 2$ but $\xi_{n,m}$ is not **hom-minimal** since $\xi_{2m,m} \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \xi_{n,m}$ but $\xi_{n,m} \not\xrightarrow{\text{hopn}} \xi_{2m,m}$.
- (2) If $n = 2m$, then $\|\text{core}(\xi_{n,m})\|_{\text{seg}} = 1$ and $\xi_{n,m}$ is **hom-minimal**.

Hence, using Theorem 3.7, we can only get a lower bound of one atom (and not two) on the size of any UCRPQ equivalent to $\gamma(x, y)$, which is consistent with the fact that $\gamma(x, y) \equiv \gamma'(x, y)$ where $\gamma'(x, y) \hat{=} x \xrightarrow{(aa)^+} y$. If Theorem 3.7 would allow for non hom-minimal queries we would obtain, by Item 1 a lower bound of 2 atoms, which is false.

PROPOSITION 3.10. Testing whether a (U)CRPQ is strongly minimal is ExpSpace-hard.

PROOF. We use the same reduction as in Proposition 3.3. If δ is strongly minimal, then it is minimal, and so it is non-redundant, and hence by the proof of Proposition 3.3, $x' \xrightarrow{K} y' \not\subseteq \bigwedge_i x \xrightarrow{L_i} y$.

We prove the converse implication: assume that $x' \xrightarrow{K} y' \not\subseteq \bigwedge_i x \xrightarrow{L_i} y$. Then there exists $\#u\# \in K$ s.t. $x' \xrightarrow{\#u\#} y'$ does not satisfy $\bigwedge_i x \xrightarrow{L_i} y$. Consider the expansion ξ obtained by replacing K with $\#u\#$, and replacing L_i with $@_i$ for each i . Then ξ is a core because of the fresh letters $\#$ and $@_i$. Moreover, we claim that it has to be hom-minimal. Indeed, assume that some other expansion ξ' is s.t. $\xi' \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \xi$. Then because of $\#$, the atom expansion of $x' \xrightarrow{K} y'$ in ξ' must be mapped on $x' \xrightarrow{\#u\#} y'$ in ξ . Then, by definition of u , the atom expansions of $\bigwedge_i x \xrightarrow{L_i} y$ cannot be mapped on $x' \xrightarrow{\#u\#} y'$, and so they must be mapped on $\bigwedge_i x \xrightarrow{@_i} y$, and hence $\xi' = \xi$. Hence, this shows that δ is strongly minimal. Overall, we showed that $x' \xrightarrow{K} y' \not\subseteq \bigwedge_i x \xrightarrow{L_i} y$ iff δ is strongly minimal, which concludes our reduction. \square

C Appendix to Section 4 “An Upper Bound for Minimization of CRPQs”

LEMMA 4.2. Let γ and α be two CRPQs such that $\alpha \subseteq \gamma$. Then there exists a CRPQ β satisfying $\alpha \subseteq \beta \subseteq \gamma$ such that:

- (1) The underlying graphs of α and β coincide.
- (2) The size of each NFA appearing in β is bounded by $f(\|\gamma\|)$, where f is a double-exponential function.

PROOF. \heartsuit *Construction of β .* The idea is to define the CRPQ β as the CRPQ obtained from α by replacing each regular language L by a suitable regular language \tilde{L} , which depends also on γ . Consider the following equivalence relation on \mathbb{A}^* , where \mathbb{A} is the underlying alphabet. Given $u, v \in \mathbb{A}^*$, we write $u \sim_\gamma v$ if for every NFA \mathcal{A} appearing on γ , and pair of states p, q of \mathcal{A} :

$$u \text{ is accepted by } \mathcal{A}[p, q] \iff v \text{ is accepted by } \mathcal{A}[p, q].$$

Recall that $\mathcal{A}[p, q]$ denote the *sublanguage* of \mathcal{A} recognized when considering $\{p\}$ as the set of initial states and $\{q\}$ as the set of final states. For $u \in \mathbb{A}^*$, we define its γ -*type* to be:

$$\text{type}_\gamma(u) \hat{=} \{([u_1]_{\sim_\gamma}, \dots, [u_\ell]_{\sim_\gamma}) \mid \ell \leq (\|\gamma\|_{\text{var}} + 1), \text{ and } u_1, \dots, u_\ell \in \mathbb{A}^* \text{ satisfy that } u = u_1 \cdots u_\ell\}.$$

The idea is that $\text{type}_\gamma(u)$ encodes all the possible ways u can be broken into $\ell \leq (\|\gamma\|_{\text{var}} + 1)$ subwords: we are not interested in the particular subwords u_i , but in their equivalence classes $[u_i]_{\sim_\gamma}$ with respect to \sim_γ .

We define the sought CRPQ β to be the CRPQ obtained from α by replacing each regular language L by \tilde{L} , where:

$$\tilde{L} \hat{=} \bigcup_{u \in L} \{z \in \mathbb{A}^* \mid \text{type}_\gamma(u) \subseteq \text{type}_\gamma(z)\}.$$

\heartsuit *Correctness of the construction.* By definition, the underlying graphs of α and β are the same, and hence condition (1) holds. It remains to verify $\alpha \subseteq \beta \subseteq \gamma$ and condition (2).

$\heartsuit\heartsuit$ $\alpha \subseteq \beta \subseteq \gamma$. Note that $u \in \{z \in \mathbb{A}^* \mid \text{type}_\gamma(u) \subseteq \text{type}_\gamma(z)\}$ always holds, and hence $L \subseteq \tilde{L}$. It follows that $\alpha \subseteq \beta$.

We check $\beta \sqsubseteq \gamma$ using Proposition 2.1. Assume β is of the form $\bigwedge_{j=1}^m x_j \xrightarrow{\tilde{L}_j} y_j$. Consider an expansion $\xi_\beta \in \text{Exp}(\beta)$ defined by replacing each atom $x_j \xrightarrow{\tilde{L}_j} y_j$ by the path $x_j \xrightarrow{z_j} y_j$, for $z_j \in \tilde{L}_j$. There must exist $u_j \in L_j$ such that $\text{type}_\gamma(u_j) \subseteq \text{type}_\gamma(z_j)$. Let $\xi_\alpha \in \text{Exp}(\alpha)$ be the expansion of $\alpha = \bigwedge_{j=1}^m x_j \xrightarrow{L_j} y_j$ obtained from replacing each atom $x_j \xrightarrow{L_j} y_j$ by the path $x_j \xrightarrow{u_j} y_j$. As $\alpha \sqsubseteq \gamma$, then there exists an expansion $\eta_\alpha \in \text{Exp}(\gamma)$ such that $\eta_\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \xi_\alpha$. Assume γ is of the form $\bigwedge_{i=1}^r t_i \xrightarrow{M_i} s_i$ and η_α is of the form $\bigwedge_{i=1}^r t_i \xrightarrow{w_i} s_i$, where $w_i \in M_i$. Let f be a homomorphism from η_α to ξ_α . We can decompose each path $x_j \xrightarrow{u_j} y_j$ in ξ_α into

$$x_j \xrightarrow{u_{j,1}} h_{j,1} \xrightarrow{u_{j,2}} \dots \xrightarrow{u_{j,\ell-1}} h_{j,\ell-1} \xrightarrow{u_{j,\ell}} y_j$$

where each $h_{j,p}$ is the image via f of some variable in $\text{vars}(\gamma) = \{s_1, t_1, \dots, s_r, t_r\}$ and each path $x \xrightarrow{u_{j,p}} x'$ satisfies that all of its internal variables are not images via f of variables in $\text{vars}(\gamma)$. Note that $\ell \leq (\|\gamma\|_{\text{var}} + 1)$. We say that the paths of the form $x \xrightarrow{u_{j,p}} x'$ are the *basic paths* of ξ_α with respect to f . Since $\text{type}_\gamma(u_j) \subseteq \text{type}_\gamma(z_j)$, each path $x_j \xrightarrow{z_j} y_j$ in ξ_β can be decomposed into

$$x_j \xrightarrow{z_{j,1}} g_{j,1} \xrightarrow{z_{j,2}} \dots \xrightarrow{z_{j,\ell-1}} g_{j,\ell-1} \xrightarrow{z_{j,\ell}} y_j$$

where $z_{j,p} \sim_\gamma u_{j,p}$. Again, we say that the paths $x \xrightarrow{z_{j,p}} x'$ are the *basic paths* of ξ_β with respect to f . We conclude by showing that there is $\eta_\beta \in \text{Exp}(\gamma)$ such that $\eta_\beta \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \xi_\beta$. Intuitively, ξ_α and ξ_β have “equivalent” decompositions in terms of *basic paths*. Hence, it is possible to turn η_α into another expansion $\eta_\beta \in \text{Exp}(\gamma)$ by replacing *basic paths* of ξ_α by their corresponding *basic paths* in ξ_β . By doing so, we indeed obtain an expansion η_β of γ such that $\eta_\beta \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \xi_\beta$.


Formally, observe that each path $t_i \xrightarrow{w_i} s_i$ of expansion η_α is mapped via f to path in ξ_α that can be decomposed into

$$k_0 \xrightarrow{w_{i,1}} k_1 \xrightarrow{w_{i,2}} \dots \xrightarrow{w_{i,n-1}} k_{n-1} \xrightarrow{w_{i,n}} k_n$$

where $w_i = w_{i,1} \dots w_{i,n}$, $k_0 = f(t_i)$, $k_n = f(s_i)$ and each path $k_{q-1} \xrightarrow{w_{i,q}} k_q$ is a *basic path* of ξ_α w.r.t. f . Each path $k_{q-1} \xrightarrow{w_{i,q}} k_q$ has a corresponding *basic path* $k'_{q-1} \xrightarrow{w'_{i,q}} k'_q$ of ξ_β w.r.t. f defined in the natural way: if $k_o \in \text{vars}(\alpha) = \{x_1, y_1, \dots, x_m, y_m\}$, then $k'_o = k_o$; if $k_o = h_{j,p}$, then $k'_o = g_{j,p}$; and if $w_{i,q} = u_{j,p}$, then $w'_{i,q} = z_{j,p}$. In particular, we have that $w_{i,q} \sim_\gamma w'_{i,q}$ and that the following path belongs to ξ_β :

$$k'_0 \xrightarrow{w'_{i,1}} k'_1 \xrightarrow{w'_{i,2}} \dots \xrightarrow{w'_{i,n-1}} k'_{n-1} \xrightarrow{w'_{i,n}} k'_n$$

It follows that the CQ η_β obtained from γ by replacing each atom $t_i \xrightarrow{M_i} s_i$ by the path $t_i \xrightarrow{w'_i} s_i$, where $w'_i = w'_{i,1} \dots w'_{i,n}$ satisfies that $\eta_\beta \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \xi_\beta$. It remains to show that η_β is actually an expansion of γ , that is, each $w'_i \in M_i$. Suppose M_i is represented by the NFA \mathcal{A}_i . Since $w_i \in M_i$ and $w_i = w_{i,1} \dots w_{i,n}$, there is a sequence e_0, \dots, e_n of states of \mathcal{A}_i such that e_0 is initial, e_n is final, and $w_{i,q}$ is accepted by $\mathcal{A}_i[e_{q-1}, e_q]$. As $w'_{i,q} \sim_\gamma w_{i,q}$, we have that $w'_{i,q}$ is also accepted by $\mathcal{A}_i[e_{q-1}, e_q]$, and hence $w'_i = w'_{i,1} \dots w'_{i,n}$ is accepted by \mathcal{A}_i .

 *Bounding the size of NFAs in β .* First note that for any equivalence class C of \sim_γ the language $\{z \in \mathbb{A}^* \mid [z]_{\sim_\gamma} = C\}$ is accepted by an NFA \mathcal{A}_C of single-exponential size. Indeed, the class C can be described by a set of triples

$$\mathcal{T}_C \subseteq \mathcal{T} = \{(\mathcal{A}, p, q) \mid \mathcal{A} \text{ is an NFA in } \gamma, \text{ and } p, q \text{ are states of } \mathcal{A}\}$$

in such a way that $v \in C$ iff v is accepted by $\mathcal{A}[p, q]$, for every $(\mathcal{A}, p, q) \in \mathcal{T}_C$, and v is accepted by $\mathcal{A}[p, q]^C$, for every $(\mathcal{A}, p, q) \notin \mathcal{T}_C$, where \mathcal{A}^C denotes the complement NFA of \mathcal{A} . Hence \mathcal{A}_C can be written as the following intersection of NFAs:

$$\mathcal{A}_C = \bigcap_{(\mathcal{A}, p, q) \in \mathcal{T}_C} \mathcal{A}[p, q] \cap \bigcap_{(\mathcal{A}, p, q) \notin \mathcal{T}_C} \mathcal{A}[p, q]^C$$

The number of states in $\mathcal{A}[p, q]^{\mathbb{C}}$ is at most 2^r and $|\mathcal{T}| \leq r^2 \|\gamma\|_{\text{at}}$, where r is the maximum number of states in an NFA of γ . Hence the number of states of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{C}}$ is at most $2^{r^3 \|\gamma\|_{\text{at}}}$, that is, single-exponential on γ .

Fix $u \in \mathbb{A}^*$. We claim that $\{z \in \mathbb{A}^* \mid \text{type}_{\gamma}(u) \subseteq \text{type}_{\gamma}(z)\}$ can be accepted by an NFA \mathcal{A}_u of at most double-exponential size on γ . It is easy to see that for every tuple $\bar{c} = (C_1, \dots, C_{\ell}) \in \text{type}_{\gamma}(u)$, the language $\{z \in \mathbb{A}^* \mid \bar{c} \subseteq \text{type}_{\gamma}(z)\}$ can be described by an NFA $\mathcal{A}_{\bar{c}}$ of single-exponential size: we guess a decomposition $z = z_1 \cdots z_{\ell}$ of the input word z and check that each z_i is accepted by \mathcal{A}_{C_i} . The number of states of $\mathcal{A}_{\bar{c}}$ is $O(\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} s_i)$, where s_i is the number of states of \mathcal{A}_{C_i} . Since $\ell \leq (\|\gamma\|_{\text{var}} + 1)$, this is $O(\|\gamma\|_{\text{var}} 2^{r^3 \|\gamma\|_{\text{at}}})$. Now, the NFA \mathcal{A}_u is simply the intersection of all the NFAs in $\{\mathcal{A}_{\bar{c}} \mid \bar{c} \in \text{type}_{\gamma}(u)\}$. The number of possible equivalence classes of \sim_{γ} is at most $2^{|\mathcal{T}|} \leq 2^{r^2 \|\gamma\|_{\text{at}}}$, and then the number of possible tuples of the form $\bar{c} = (C_1, \dots, C_{\ell})$ is $N = O(2^{r^2 \|\gamma\|_{\text{at}}} (\|\gamma\|_{\text{var}} + 1))$. It follows that the number of states of \mathcal{A}_u is at most $O(\|\gamma\|_{\text{var}} 2^{r^3 \|\gamma\|_{\text{at}} N})$, i.e., double-exponential on γ .

Finally, note that the number of possible $\text{type}_{\gamma}(u)$ is at most double-exponential on γ , more precisely, 2^N . We conclude that every language \tilde{L} in β can be represented by an NFA $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{L}}$ which is the union of at most double-exponential many NFAs of the form \mathcal{A}_u , each of these having at most double-exponential many states. We conclude that the size of $\mathcal{A}_{\tilde{L}}$ can be bounded by a double-exponential function $f(\|\gamma\|)$. \square

D Appendix to Section 5 “Minimization of UCRPQs via Approximations”

PROPOSITION 5.1. There exist CRPQs which are minimal among CRPQs but not among UCRPQs.

PROOF. The following example is inspired from [11, Example 1.2]. Consider the following CRPQs:

$$\gamma() \hat{=} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} x \\ \downarrow a \\ y \\ \downarrow b^+ \\ z \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \left(\begin{array}{c} \nabla \\ \circlearrowright \end{array} \right) \\ \begin{array}{c} a(bb)^+ \\ \left(\begin{array}{c} \nabla \\ \circlearrowright \end{array} \right) \\ ab(bb)^* \end{array} \end{array} \end{array}, \quad \delta_0() \hat{=} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} x \\ \downarrow a \\ y \\ \downarrow (bb)^+ \\ z \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \left(\begin{array}{c} \nabla \\ \circlearrowright \end{array} \right) \\ \begin{array}{c} (bb)^+ \\ \left(\begin{array}{c} \nabla \\ \circlearrowright \end{array} \right) \\ ab(bb)^* \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_1() \hat{=} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} x \\ \downarrow a \\ y \\ \downarrow b(bb)^* \\ z \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \left(\begin{array}{c} \nabla \\ \circlearrowright \end{array} \right) \\ \begin{array}{c} a(bb)^+ \\ \left(\begin{array}{c} \nabla \\ \circlearrowright \end{array} \right) \\ ab(bb)^* \end{array} \end{array} \end{array}$$

It is easy to see that $\gamma \equiv \delta_0 \vee \delta_1$ by doing a case disjunction on the parity of the path between y and z —the even case is handled by δ_0 , the odd case by δ_1 . Hence, γ is not minimal among UCRPQs.

We want to show that γ is minimal among CRPQs. Let $\zeta()$ be a CRPQ that is equivalent to γ , and assume by contradiction that it has at most four atoms. Given natural numbers $l, m, r \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ where l is even and r is odd, consider the expansion

$$\xi_{l,m,r}() \hat{=} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} x \\ \downarrow a \\ y \\ \downarrow b^m \\ z \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \left(\begin{array}{c} \nabla \\ \circlearrowright \end{array} \right) \\ \begin{array}{c} ab^l \\ \left(\begin{array}{c} \nabla \\ \circlearrowright \end{array} \right) \\ ab^r \end{array} \end{array} \end{array}$$


where squiggly arrows represent paths of atoms.

Claim D.1. The expansion $\xi_{l,m,r}$ is hom-minimal iff $l = m$ or $m = r$.


Indeed, if $l \neq m$ and $m \neq r$, then if m is even then $\xi_{m,m,r} \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \xi_{l,m,r}$ but $\xi_{l,m,r} \not\xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \xi_{m,m,r}$ (since $l \neq m$) and dually if m is odd then $\xi_{l,m,m} \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \xi_{l,m,r}$ but $\xi_{l,m,r} \not\xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \xi_{l,m,m}$ (since $m \neq r$). In both cases, $\xi_{l,m,r}$ is not **hom-minimal**.

Conversely, if $l = m$ or $m = r$, assume *w.l.o.g.*, by symmetry, that $l = m$. Let $l', m', r' \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ s.t. l' is even and r' is odd, and assume that there is a **homomorphism** $f: \xi_{l',m',r'} \rightarrow \xi_{l,m,r}$. Because of the ∇ -self-loop, $f(y) = y$ and hence $f(x) = x$. It then follows that $f(z) = z$ because we must have both an $a(bb)^+$ - and an $ab(bb)^*$ -path from $f(x)$ and $f(z)$. Moreover, we must have $m = m'$, and since l' is even, we must have $l' = l = m$, and dually, since r' is odd, we must have $r' = r$. It follows that $\langle l', m', r' \rangle = \langle l, m, r \rangle$, and hence $\xi_{l,m,r}$ is **hom-minimal**.

Claim D.2. If $m = r$, then $\text{core}(\xi_{l,m,r})$ equals



Putting Claims D.1 and D.2 and Theorem 3.7 together, we get that $\mathcal{SG}(\text{core}(\xi_{2,1,1}))$ is a minor of ζ . Since ζ was assumed to have at most four atoms, it follows that $\zeta()$ must be exactly of the form




Using the containment $\zeta \subseteq \gamma$, since the only directed simple cycle in an **expansion** of γ is labelled by ∇ , we get $S = \{\nabla\}$. Similarly, using again that $\zeta \subseteq \gamma$ and that any **expansion** of γ must have both an $a(bb)^+$ - and an $ab(bb)^*$ -path, it can be shown that $U = \{a\}$.

Now let $l, m, r \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ with l even and r odd. From $\gamma \subseteq \zeta$, we get that each $\xi_{l,m,r}$ satisfies ζ and so there is an **evaluation map** $f: \zeta \rightarrow \xi_{l,m,r}$. Clearly $f(y) = y$ and then using the $a(bb)^+$ - and $ab(bb)^*$ -paths, we get that $f(x) = x$ and $f(z) = z$. It then follows that

- $b^m \in D$, and
- either $ab^l \in L$, or $ab^r \in L$, or $a\nabla^k b^m$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$

From the first point we get $b^+ \subseteq D$, and in fact using $\zeta \subseteq \gamma$, $D = b^+$.

Now let $w \in L$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and consider the **expansion**



of ζ . Since $\zeta \subseteq \gamma$, there is an evaluation map $f: \gamma \rightarrow \xi_\zeta$. Taking m to be any even value, we get that w must be in $ab(bb)^*$, say $w = ab^r$ for some odd $r \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. Taking m to be any odd value, we get dually that w must be in $a(bb)^+$, say $w = ab^l$ for some even $l \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. Hence, we get $\{ab^l, ab^r\} \subseteq L$.

We can now pick m to be even and $w = ab^l$, and then ξ_ζ should be a model of γ . But ξ_ζ does not satisfy the atom $x \xrightarrow{ab(bb)^*} z$. Contradiction. Hence, γ cannot be equivalent to a single CRPQ with at most four atoms. \square

Remark D.3. If C is closed under taking subgraphs and subdivisions, then

$$\text{App}_C^\infty(\gamma) \equiv \{\alpha \in \text{CQ}(C) \mid \exists \xi \in \text{Exp}(\gamma), \xi \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} \alpha\}.$$

D.1 Missing details to the proof of Lemma 5.3

Let $\vec{\alpha}_1$ be an explicit approximation. Consider a path $x_0 \rightarrow x_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow x_k$ of η_1 whose atoms are all sent on the same atom of α_1 via contr_1 .

Assume that for some x_i , with $i \in \llbracket 1, k-1 \rrbracket$, all variables in $h_1^{-1}(x_i)$ are internal in ρ_1 . If $x_{i-1} \xrightarrow{L} x_i$ and $x_i \xrightarrow{L'} x_{i+1}$ are the only atoms containing x_i in η_1 , then for a variable $z \in h_1^{-1}(x_i)$, the only atoms in containing z in ρ_1 must have the form $w \xrightarrow{L} z$ and $z \xrightarrow{L'} w'$. Let η_2 be the query resulting from η_1 by contracting the internal variable x_i and replacing $L \cdot L'$ by K , where K is defined as follows. Since L and L' appear consecutively in internal paths of the refinement ρ_1 , there must be an NFA \mathcal{A} in γ and three states p, q, r such that $L = \mathcal{A}[p, q]$ or $L = \{a\}$ with $a \in \mathcal{A}[p, q]$, and $L' = \mathcal{A}[q, r]$ or $L' = \{a\}$ with $a \in \mathcal{A}[q, r]$. We define $K = \mathcal{A}[p, r]$. Note that in any case, $L \cdot L' \subseteq K$. Similarly, define ρ_2 to be the query resulting from ρ_1 by contracting each internal variable $z \in h_1^{-1}(x_i)$ and replacing $L \cdot L'$ by K . Note that ρ_2 is still a refinement of γ and that the homomorphism $h_1: \rho_1 \rightarrow \eta_1$ induces a homomorphism $f_2: \rho_2 \rightarrow \eta_2$. Define α_2 be the contraction of η_2 obtained by contracting all the remaining internal variables as the contraction α_1 is obtained from ρ_1 . Since $\alpha_1 \subseteq \alpha_2$ as $L \cdot L' \subseteq K$, this defines an explicit approximation $\vec{\alpha}_2$ that contains $\vec{\alpha}_1$. Note that in the case $h_1^{-1}(x_i) = \emptyset$, we can take $K = L \cdot L'$, and $\alpha_1 \equiv \alpha_2$.

If $k-1 > \|\Gamma\|_{\text{var}}$, then path $x_0 \rightarrow x_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow x_k$ contains a variable satisfying the condition above, and hence we can apply the simplification. Overall, this shows that any explicit approximation is contained in an explicit approximation of contraction length at most $O(\|\Gamma\|_{\text{var}}) \leq O(\|\Gamma\|_{\text{at}})$.

E Appendix to Section 6 “Lower Bounds”

E.1 Equivalence with a Single Atom

PROPOSITION 6.1 (VARIATION ON [8, LEMMA 8]). There is a fixed alphabet over which the containment problem for Boolean CRPQs is ExpSpace-hard restricted to instances of the form

$$\gamma_1() = x \xrightarrow{K} y \quad \stackrel{?}{\subseteq} \quad \bigwedge_{j \in \llbracket 1, p \rrbracket} x \xrightarrow{L_j} y = \gamma_2(), \text{ where:}$$

- (1) no language among K or the L_i 's is empty or contains the empty word ε , and
- (2) there is no i such that $\mathbb{A}^* L_i \mathbb{A}^* = \mathbb{A}^* (\bigcap_j L_j) \mathbb{A}^*$.

PROOF. By inspecting [8, Proof of Lemma 8, pp. 15–17], it can be noticed that actually the first condition is satisfied by Figueira’s reduction—using his notation, neither E nor $G_i \cup F_C \cup F_H$ with $i \in \llbracket 0, n \rrbracket$ are empty.

Moreover, we claim that the reduction can be made so that the second condition also holds. Notice first that the 2^n -tiling problem is still ExpSpace-complete if we restrict it to instances with $n > 1$ and such that all instances admit one tiling which is “locally valid” but not valid—namely a tiling which satisfies all vertical and horizontal constraints, but not the initial and final tiles conditions. This can be achieved *e.g.* by adding a new tile t *s.t.* (t, t) is both a valid horizontal

and vertical configuration, but t cannot be adjacent to any other tile. Then, the second condition amounts to showing that there is no i s.t.

$$\mathbb{A}^*(G_i \cup F_C \cup F_H)\mathbb{A}^* = \mathbb{A}^*\left(\bigcap_{0 \leq j \leq n} (G_j \cup F_C \cup F_H)\right)\mathbb{A}^*$$


which is equivalent, by elementary manipulations, to saying that for all $i \in \llbracket 0, n \rrbracket$

$$\mathbb{A}^*G_i\mathbb{A}^* \not\subseteq \mathbb{A}^*\left(\bigcap_{0 \leq j \leq n} G_j\right)\mathbb{A}^* \cup \mathbb{A}^*(F_C \cup F_H)\mathbb{A}^*.$$

For $i = 0$, this holds because we can consider a valid encoding of a tiling which respects all constraints except that one vertical constraint is violated. For $i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$, we consider the encoding of a tiling which is locally valid. Then, it has no vertical error, no horizontal error, and no encoding error, so it does not belong to the right-hand side. However, it belongs to $\mathbb{A}^*G_i\mathbb{A}^*$ for any $i \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ since it contains a subword encoding two cells separated by exactly one row. Hence, the second condition also holds. \square

THEOREM 6.2. The minimization problem for CRPQs is ExpSpace-hard. Further, there is a fixed alphabet s.t. the problem of, given a Boolean CRPQ on this alphabet with only four variables is equivalent to a Boolean CRPQ with a single atom is ExpSpace-hard.

PROOF OF THEOREM 6.2. We reduce an instance of the problem of Proposition 6.1 to the instance δ , where



Claim E.1. If $\gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2$ then $\delta \equiv \gamma_1$.

Note first that $\delta \subseteq \gamma_1$. Then, if $\gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2$, then every word of K contains a factor which belongs to each L_i for $i \in \llbracket 1, p \rrbracket$, and hence $\gamma_1 \subseteq \delta$ i.e. $\delta \equiv \gamma_1$, and so δ is equivalent to a CRPQ with a single atom.

Claim E.2. Conversely, if δ is equivalent to a Boolean CRPQ with at most one atom, then $\gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2$.


Let ζ be the Boolean CRPQ with at most one atom which is equivalent to δ . Assume first, by contradiction, that it is a self-loop, i.e. $\zeta() = x \xrightarrow{M} x$ for some language M . Then by assumption on K , there exists a word $u \in K$ of size at least one. Since none of the L_i are empty, there exists a canonical database G_δ^u where the atom $\bullet \xrightarrow{K} \bullet$ yielded a u -labelled path. Since $\delta \subseteq \zeta$, the database G_δ^u must satisfy $\zeta() = x \xrightarrow{M} x$. Since every strongly connected component of G_δ^u is trivial—we assumed that none of the languages of δ contained ε —, it must be that $\varepsilon \in M$, and hence ζ is the query which is always satisfied, which contradicts the equivalence $\delta \equiv \zeta$.

Similarly, it can be shown that ζ cannot have zero atoms since δ is non-trivial. Hence, ζ is exactly of the form $\zeta() = x \xrightarrow{M} y$ for some language M . First, note that from $\zeta \subseteq \delta$, it follows that

$$M \subseteq \mathbb{A}^*\left(\bigcap_j L_j\right)\mathbb{A}^*. \quad (3)$$

Assume then, by contradiction, that there exists an i s.t. every word of L_i has a factor in M , i.e. $L_i \subseteq \mathbb{A}^*M\mathbb{A}^*$. Then (3) implies $\mathbb{A}^*L_i\mathbb{A}^* = \mathbb{A}^*(\bigcap_j L_j)\mathbb{A}^*$ which contradicts the second assumption of Proposition 6.1. Therefore, for every i , there is a word $v_i \in L_i$ which contains no factor in M .

We are now ready to show that $\gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2$, by first observing that it boils down to showing $K \subseteq \mathbb{A}^*(\bigcap_j L_j)\mathbb{A}^*$. Let $u \in K$. Consider the following canonical database of δ , where the v_i 's are words defined as in the paragraph above:



Since $\delta \subseteq \zeta$, it must contain a path labelled by a word of M . But no v_i contains a factor in M , hence it has to be u that does. Hence, $K \subseteq \mathbb{A}^*M\mathbb{A}^*$. Together with Equation (3), we get $K \subseteq \mathbb{A}^*(\bigcap_j L_j)\mathbb{A}^*$, which concludes the proof of Claim E.2.

Overall, we showed that $\gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2$ iff δ is equivalent to a CRPQ with at most one atom, which concludes the proof. \square

Note that the assumption of $\mathbb{A}^*L_i\mathbb{A}^* = \mathbb{A}^*(\bigcap_j L_j)\mathbb{A}^*$ in Proposition 6.1 is necessary for the reduction to be correct, otherwise $\delta()$ would be equivalent to


$$\delta'() \hat{=} x \xrightarrow{K} y \wedge x \xrightarrow{\mathbb{A}^*L_i\mathbb{A}^*} y,$$

and so we could have $\mathbb{A}^*L_i\mathbb{A}^* \subseteq K$, implying that (1) $K \not\subseteq \mathbb{A}^*L_i\mathbb{A}^*$ and hence $\gamma_1 \not\subseteq \gamma_2$ but (2) δ would be equivalent to a CRPQ with a single atom, namely $\delta''() \hat{=} x \xrightarrow{\mathbb{A}^*L_i\mathbb{A}^*} y$.

E.2 Equivalence with a Single Variable

THEOREM E.3. *There is a fixed alphabet s.t. the problem of, given a Boolean CRPQ on this alphabet with only five variables is equivalent to a Boolean CRPQ with a single variable is ExpSpace-hard.*

PROOF. We use same idea as in Theorem 6.2. We reduce the problem of Proposition 6.1 to the instance δ , where



where \triangleright , ∇ and \triangleleft are new symbols. Note that despite being named, variable x is also existentially quantified.

Claim E.4. If $\gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2$ then $\delta \equiv \gamma'_1$ where $\gamma'_1() \hat{=} x \xrightarrow{\triangleright K \triangleleft} x \wedge x \xrightarrow{\nabla} x$.

If $\gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2$ then any word of K contains a factor which belongs to $\bigcap_j L_j$ and so $\gamma'_1 \subseteq \delta$. The converse $\delta \subseteq \gamma'_1$ always holds.

Claim E.5. Conversely, if δ is equivalent to a Boolean CRPQ with a single variable, then $\gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2$.

Let $\zeta() = \bigwedge_{i=0}^n x \xrightarrow{M_i} x$ be a single-variable Boolean CRPQ that is equivalent to δ .

We first claim that there is some $i \in \llbracket 0, n \rrbracket$ s.t. $M_i = \{\nabla\}$. Every canonical database of δ contains a ∇ -self loop and so from $\zeta \subseteq \delta$ it follows that any canonical database of ζ contains a ∇ -self loop, which in turns implies that $M_i = \{\nabla\}$ for some i . *W.l.o.g.*, assume that $M_0 = \{\nabla\}$.

Observe that any evaluation map from ζ to a canonical database of δ must send $x \in \zeta$ to $x \in \delta$ because of the ∇ -self loop, and conversely, any evaluation map from δ to a canonical database of ζ must send $x \in \delta$ to $x \in \zeta$.

We remove from ζ all atoms $x \xrightarrow{M_i} x$ s.t. $i \neq 0$ and $M_i \cap \nabla^* \neq \emptyset$. Thanks to the ∇ -self loop, this transformation preserve the semantics of ζ . More generally, if M_i contains a word in which the letter ' ∇ ' occurs, we get remove the atom associated to M_i altogether. The query obtained ζ' is clearly s.t. $\zeta \subseteq \zeta'$, but dually for any canonical database $G_{\zeta'}$ of ζ' , extend it to a canonical database G_{ζ} of ζ by picking, for any atom that was removed, any word containing the letter ' ∇ '. Since $\zeta \subseteq \delta$, there is an evaluation map from δ to G_{ζ} . Now the atoms of δ except the ∇ -self loop do not use the letter ∇ , and so it follows that the evaluation map from δ to G_{ζ} actually yields an evaluation map from δ to $G_{\zeta'}$. Hence, $\zeta' \subseteq \delta$ and thus $\zeta' \equiv \delta$.

The same argument works for atoms containing a word that does not start with \triangleleft , or that does not end \triangleright , or that contain strictly more than one occurrence of these symbols. Overall, it implies that *w.l.o.g.* ζ is equivalent to

$$x \xrightarrow{\nabla} x \wedge \bigwedge_{j=1}^m x \xrightarrow{N_j \triangleleft} x$$

where $m \geq 0$ and the N_j 's are languages over \mathbb{A} .

Assume now, by contradiction, that for all $j \in \llbracket 1, m \rrbracket$ s.t. $N_j \not\subseteq K \cap \mathbb{A}^*(\bigwedge_i L_i)\mathbb{A}^*$. Pick for each j a word u_j witnessing this. The canonical database of ζ induced by these words $\langle n_1, \dots, n_m \rangle$, namely

$$x \xrightarrow{\nabla} x \wedge \bigwedge_{j=1}^m x \xrightarrow{N_j \triangleleft} x$$

must satisfy δ . But this implies that at least one n_j must belong to $K \cap \mathbb{A}^*(\bigcap_i L_i)\mathbb{A}^*$. Contradiction.

In fact, an argument similar to what we claimed before shows that we can remove all atoms s.t. $N_j \not\subseteq K \cap \mathbb{A}^*(\bigcap_i L_i)\mathbb{A}^*$ without changing the semantics. Hence, *w.l.o.g.*, for each j , we have $N_j \subseteq K \cap \mathbb{A}^*(\bigcap_i L_i)\mathbb{A}^*$.

We then claim that each word of K must belong to all N_j . Indeed, let u be a word of K . Let v_i be a word in $L_i \setminus \mathbb{A}^*(\bigcap_k L_k)\mathbb{A}^*$ —recall that such words exist by an assumption of Proposition 6.1—and consider the canonical database of δ obtained by expanding K into u and L_i into v_i . Now $\delta \subseteq \zeta$ so this database must satisfy ζ . Hence, for each j , N_j must contain one word among u, v_1, \dots, v_m . It cannot be any v_i since otherwise we would have $v_i \in N_j \subseteq K \cap \mathbb{A}^*(\bigcap_k L_k)\mathbb{A}^* \subseteq \mathbb{A}^*(\bigcap_k L_k)\mathbb{A}^*$, which is a contradiction. And so $u \in N_j$. Therefore, we have

$$K \subseteq \bigcap_j N_j \subseteq K \cap \mathbb{A}^*(\bigcap_i L_i)\mathbb{A}^*$$

from which it follows that $K \subseteq (\bigcap_k L_k)$ and hence $\gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2$.

Overall, Claims E.4 and E.5 imply that $\gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2$ iff it is equivalent to a CRPQ with a single variable, in which case it is actually equivalent to

$$\gamma_1() \triangleq x \xrightarrow{\triangleright K \triangleleft} x \wedge x \xrightarrow{\nabla} x,$$

which concludes the correctness of the reduction. \square

E.3 Variable Minimization is Harder than Containment

A *class of (Boolean) CRPQs* is a function \mathcal{Q} mapping an alphabet \mathbb{A} to a set $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{A}}$ of Boolean CRPQs, which is closed under variable renaming and alphabetic renaming of the languages.

The *disjoint conjunction* \otimes of two CRPQs consists of the conjunction of the queries, up to renaming so that their variable sets are disjoint—of two queries is the class still belong to the class. We say that the class is *closed under disjoint conjunction* if $\gamma \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{A}}$ and $\delta \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{B}}$ imply $\gamma \otimes \delta \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{A} \cup \mathbb{B}}$.

Lastly, we say that the class is *closed under variable marking* if one of the three following properties holds:

- (VM)_{loop} for any $\gamma \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{A}}$, if y is a variable of γ , if $a \notin \mathbb{A}$, then $\gamma' \hat{=} \gamma \wedge y \xrightarrow{a} y$ is in $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{A} \sqcup \{a\}}$, or
- (VM)_{out} for any $\gamma \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{A}}$, if y is a variable of γ , if $a \notin \mathbb{A}$, then $\gamma' \hat{=} \gamma \wedge y \xrightarrow{a} y'$ is in $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{A} \sqcup \{a\}}$, where y' is a new variable not occurring in γ , or
- (VM)_{in} for any $\gamma \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{A}}$, if y is a variable of γ , if $a \notin \mathbb{A}$, then $\gamma' \hat{=} \gamma \wedge y' \xrightarrow{a} y$ is in $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{A} \sqcup \{a\}}$, where y' is a new variable not occurring in γ .

We will sometimes write $\gamma \in \mathcal{Q}$ to mean that $\gamma \in \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{A}}$ for some alphabet \mathbb{A} .

Fact E.6. Any class defined by restricting the class of languages allowed to label the atoms is both closed under disjoint conjunction and closed under variable marking, assuming that languages of the form $\{a\}$ are allowed, where a is a single letter.

THEOREM E.7. *For any class of CRPQs closed under disjoint conjunction and closed under variable marking \mathcal{Q} , there is a polynomial-time reduction from the containment problem for Boolean queries of \mathcal{Q} to the CRPQ minimization problem restricted to queries of \mathcal{Q} . The same bound applies if we add the constraint that the target CRPQ must also belong to \mathcal{Q} .*

Say that a CRPQ is *degenerate* if it contains an atom labelled the language $\{\varepsilon\}$. Equivalently, it is *non-degenerate* if it has at least one canonical database which is non-degenerate.

Fact E.8. One can turn a degenerate CRPQ into a non-degenerate one by iteratively identifying variables adjacent to an atom $\xrightarrow{\{\varepsilon\}}$. This can be implemented in polynomial time.

PROOF OF THEOREM E.7. We assume for now that \mathcal{Q} satisfies the axiom (VM)_{loop}. Given an instance $\gamma_1() \subseteq \gamma_2()$ of the containment problem for Boolean queries of \mathcal{Q} , we assume w.l.o.g. that γ_1 is non-degenerate using Fact E.8, and we reduce it to the instance $\langle \delta_1 \otimes \gamma_2, \|\delta_1\|_{\text{var}} \rangle$, where δ_1 is defined as:

$$\delta_1() \hat{=} \gamma_1 \wedge \bigwedge_{x \in V(\gamma_1)} x \xrightarrow{\nabla_x} x$$

where ∇_x is a fresh letter for each $x \in V(\gamma_1)$. The reduction works clearly in logarithmic-space, and clearly $\delta_1 \otimes \gamma_2 \in \mathcal{Q}$ since \mathcal{Q} is closed under disjoint conjunction and (VM)_{loop}. Moreover, for it to be correct we need to show that $\gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2$ iff $\delta_1 \otimes \gamma_2$ is equivalent to a CRPQ with at most $\|\delta_1\|_{\text{var}}$ variables.

Claim E.9. If $\gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2$ then $\delta_1 \otimes \gamma_2 \equiv \delta_1$.

PROOF. Indeed, $\gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2$ implies $\delta_1 \subseteq \gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2$ and so $\delta_1 \otimes \gamma_2 \equiv \delta_1$. □

Actually this property is an “if and only if”. For the converse, we will prove a stronger statement.

Claim E.10. If $\delta_1 \otimes \gamma_2$ is equivalent to a CRPQ with at most $\|\delta_1\|_{\text{var}}$ variables, then $\gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2$.

PROOF. Let ζ be a CRPQ with at most $\|\delta_1\|_{\text{var}}$ variables that is equivalent to $\delta_1 \otimes \gamma_2$.

We claim first that for each $x \in V(\zeta)$ there is a unique variable in ζ with a ∇_x -self-loop. Indeed, consider any canonical database Z of ζ : since $\zeta \subseteq \delta_1 \otimes \gamma_2$, there exists a canonical database D_1 of

δ_1 and G_2 of γ_2 s.t. $D_1 \oplus G_2 \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} Z$ where \oplus denotes the disjoint union. Since D_1 contains a ∇_x -self loop for each $x \in V(\gamma_1)$, so does Z . Since this property holds for every Z , it follows that ζ must have a self-loop atom labelled by the singleton language $\{\nabla_x\}$ for each $x \in V(\gamma_1)$.

Now observe that no variable of ζ can be labelled by two ∇_x -self-loops with $x \in V(\gamma_1)$. Indeed, γ_1 is non-degenerate, and so δ_1 is also non-degenerate, and so there exists a canonical database D_1 of δ_1 which is non-degenerate. Then, pick any canonical database G_2 of γ_2 . $D_1 \oplus G_2$ is a canonical database of $\delta_1 \otimes \gamma_2$, which is equivalent to ζ , so there is an evaluation map from ζ to $D_1 \oplus G_2$. If a variable of ζ had both a ∇_x - and a ∇_y -self-loop for $x \neq y \in V(\gamma_1)$, then so would either D_1 or G_2 . G_2 contains no such letters, and so it would have to be D_1 . This contradicts the definition of D_1 . Hence, no variable of ζ can be labelled by two ∇_x -self-loops. Together with the previous paragraph and the fact that ζ has at most $\|\delta_1\|_{\text{var}} = \|\gamma_1\|_{\text{var}}$ variables, it follows that we can assume w.l.o.g.—up to renaming the variables of ζ —that $V(\zeta) = V(\gamma_1)$ and for each $x \in V(\gamma_1)$, $x \xrightarrow{\nabla_x} x$ is an atom of ζ . Moreover, this is the only self-loop in ζ labelled by $\{\nabla_x\}$, and for any self-loop atom $x \xrightarrow{L} x$ we cannot have $\nabla_y \in L$ for any $y \neq x \in V(\gamma_1)$.

We are now ready to prove that $\gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2$. Let G_1 be a canonical database of γ_1 , and let D_1 be the associated canonical database of δ_1 —it is obtained by adding an ∇_x -self-loop on every $x \in V(\gamma_1)$. Pick any canonical database G_2 of γ_2 . Since $\delta_1 \otimes \gamma_2 \subseteq \zeta$, there exists a canonical database Z of ζ s.t. $Z \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} D_1 \oplus G_2$. But then, since $\zeta \subseteq \delta_1 \otimes \gamma_2$, there exists D'_1 and G'_2 , which are canonical databases of δ_1 and γ_2 , respectively, s.t.

$$D'_1 \oplus G'_2 \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} Z \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} D_1 \oplus G_2.$$

Restrict this homomorphism to G'_2 : we obtain

$$G'_2 \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} Z \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} D_1 \oplus G_2.$$

Now note that, because of the previous paragraph, the homomorphism $Z \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} D_1 \oplus G_2$ must map $x \in V(Z)$ to $x \in V(D_1)$ —because of the ∇_x -self-loop. Since $D_1 \oplus G_2$ is a disjoint union, it follows that image of this homomorphism is actually included in D_1 , and so obtain a homomorphism

$$G'_2 \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} Z \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} D_1.$$

Now of course ∇_x -self-loop will occur in the image of any homomorphism $Z \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} D_1$. However, in the composition $G'_2 \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} Z \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} D_1$, since G'_2 does not use any letter of the form ∇_x , $x \in V(\gamma_1)$, we conclude we actually get a homomorphism

$$G'_2 \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} G_1,$$

which concludes the proof that $\gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2$. \square

Claims E.9 and E.10 imply that $\gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2$ iff $\delta_1 \otimes \gamma_2$ is equivalent to a CRPQ with at most $\|\delta_1\|_{\text{var}}$ variables, which concludes the reduction under the assumption that Q satisfies $(\text{VM})_{\text{loop}}$.

To conclude, note that if Q satisfies either $(\text{VM})_{\text{out}}$ or $(\text{VM})_{\text{in}}$ then exactly the same proof works, except that the definition of δ_1 should be changed: variables will be marked using outgoing and incoming edges, respectively. Lastly, since $\delta_1 \in Q$, then we have as a by-product of our proof that $\delta_1 \otimes \gamma_2$ is equivalent to a CRPQ with at most k atoms iff it is equivalent to a CRPQ of Q with at most k atoms. It follows that this reduction also works if we add the constraint that δ must be in Q . \square

E.4 Minimization is Harder than Containment

Fact E.11. If ξ is a non-degenerate expansion of γ and γ is fully contracted, then $\|\xi\|_{\text{seg}} = \|\gamma\|_{\text{at}}$.

The Q -strong canonization problem is defined similarly to the Q -canonization problem, except that $(\text{Cnz})_{\text{str-onto}}$ is replaced by the axiom

(SCnz)_{str-onto}: for every non-degenerate $D_1 \in \text{Exp}(\delta_1)$, every $D'_1 \in \text{Exp}(\delta_1)$, and $f : D'_1 \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} D_1$ we have (i) D'_1 is non-degenerate, (ii) f is strong onto, and (iii) $f(x) = x$ for every $x \in \text{vars}(\delta_1)$,

In the following statement, a *Q*-*canonization oracle* (resp. *Q*-*strong canonization oracle*) is an oracle to any algorithm solving the *Q*-canonization problem (resp. *Q*-strong canonization problem).

LEMMA 6.3. For any class *Q* of CRPQs closed under disjoint conjunction, there is a polynomial-time algorithm using a *Q*-canonization oracle (resp. *Q*-strong canonization oracle) from the containment problem for Boolean queries of *Q* to the CRPQ (resp. UCRPQ) minimization problem restricted to CRPQs in *Q* (resp. UCRPQs whose disjuncts are all in *Q*). The reduction also applies under the restriction that the target query must also be in *Q*.

PROOF. \heartsuit *Minimization in the class of CRPQs.* Let $\gamma_1 \sqsubseteq^? \gamma_2$ be an instance of the containment problem for Boolean queries of *Q*. We apply the *Q*-canonization oracle to obtain a pair $\langle \delta_1, \delta_2 \rangle$ as in the axioms (Cnz)_{*}. We then map the instance $\gamma_1 \sqsubseteq^? \gamma_2$ to $\langle \delta_1 \triangleleft \delta_2, \|\delta_1\|_{\text{at}} \rangle$.

The reduction works in logarithmic space with a *Q*-canonization oracle, and clearly $\delta_1 \triangleleft \delta_2 \in \mathcal{Q}$ since both δ_1 and δ_2 are in *Q* and *Q* is closed under disjoint conjunction. We need to show that $\gamma_1 \sqsubseteq \gamma_2$ iff $\delta_1 \triangleleft \delta_2$ is equivalent to a CRPQ with at most $\|\delta_1\|_{\text{at}}$ atoms.

Claim E.12. If $\gamma_1 \sqsubseteq \gamma_2$, then $\delta_1 \triangleleft \delta_2 \equiv \delta_1$ and so $\delta_1 \triangleleft \delta_2$ is equivalent to a CRPQ with at most $\|\delta_1\|_{\text{at}}$ atoms.

This follows from (Cnz)_{monotonic}. The converse hold for the same reason, but we actually need a stronger property.

Claim E.13. If $\delta_1 \triangleleft \delta_2$ is equivalent to a CRPQ with at most $\|\delta_1\|_{\text{at}}$ atoms, then $\gamma_1 \sqsubseteq \gamma_2$.

We write ζ as $\zeta_+ \triangleleft \zeta_-$ where ζ_+ is the disjoint conjunction of all connected components of ζ containing an atom whose language contains a word containing a ' \mathbb{M} '-letter, and ζ_- is the disjoint conjunction of all other components. We want to show that ζ_- is actually empty.

Let D_1 be a canonical database of δ_1 as in (Cnz)_{str-onto}. Then pick any canonical database G_2 of γ_2 . By (Cnz)_{containment}, there exists $D_2 \vDash^* \delta_2$ s.t. $D_2 \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} G_2$. Then $D_1 \oplus D_2 \vDash^* \delta_1 \triangleleft \delta_2$, so from $\delta_1 \triangleleft \delta_2 \equiv \zeta$ it follows that there exists $Z_+ \vDash^* \zeta_+$, $Z_- \vDash^* \zeta_-$, $D'_1 \vDash^* \delta_1$ and $D'_2 \vDash^* \delta_2$ such that we have homomorphisms

$$D'_1 \oplus D'_2 \xrightarrow{f} Z_+ \oplus Z_- \xrightarrow{g} D_1 \oplus D_2 \xrightarrow{h} D_1 \oplus G_2.$$

By (Cnz)_{marking}, every connected component of D'_1 must contain at least one edge labelled by a letter of \mathbb{M} , and so the homomorphism $f|_{D'_1} : D'_1 \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} Z_+ \oplus Z_-$ is actually a homomorphism from D'_1 to Z_+ . Note then that $(h \circ g)|_{Z_+}$ maps Z_+ onto $D_1 \oplus G_2$ but since G_2 contains no letter \mathbb{M} , the image of this homomorphism is included in D_1 . Overall, we have homomorphisms

$$D'_1 \xrightarrow{i} Z_+ \xrightarrow{j} D_1.$$

By (Cnz)_{str-onto}, $j \circ i$ be strong onto and for every $x \in \text{vars}(\delta_1)$, $j(i(x)) = x$.

We claim that for each x external in D'_1 , then $i(x)$ is external. First, since $x \in \text{vars}(\delta_1)$ is external, then $x \in \text{vars}(\delta_1)$ and so $j(i(x)) = x$. Then $j \circ i$ is strong onto and so j be also be strong onto. It follows that the in-degree (resp. out-degree) of $i(x)$ is lower bounded by the in-degree (resp. out-degree) $j(i(x)) = x$. So, if x has in-degree or out-degree at least 2, so does $i(x)$. Moreover, if x has in-degree (resp. out-degree 0), then so must $i(x)$ because otherwise, $j(i(x)) = x$ should also have an incoming edge. Overall, by letting $i[D'_1]$ be the image of D'_1 by i , we get that the natural embedding $i[D'_1] \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} Z_+$ satisfies the assumption of Corollary B.4 and so $\|i[D'_1]\|_{\text{seg}} \leq \|Z_+\|_{\text{seg}}$.

Now observe that $i: D'_1 \rightarrow i[D'_1]$ is injective on $\text{vars}(\delta_1)$ because $j(i(x))$ for any $x \in \text{vars}(\delta_1)$. Moreover, by $(\text{Cnz})_{\text{non-red}}$, i cannot identify an atom with another path of atoms and so D'_1 is actually isomorphic to $i[D'_1]$, from which we get $\|i[D'_1]\|_{\text{seg}} = \|\delta_1\|_{\text{at}}$ and so $\|Z_+\|_{\text{seg}} \geq \|\delta_1\|_{\text{at}}$. By Proposition 3.6 $\|\zeta_+\|_{\text{at}} \geq \|Z_+\|_{\text{seg}}$, and so ζ_+ has at least $\|\delta_1\|_{\text{at}}$ atoms, but since we assumed that ζ has at most $\|\delta_1\|_{\text{at}}$ atoms, it follows that ζ_- is trivial and $\zeta \equiv \zeta_+$.

We are now ready to prove that $\delta_1 \subseteq \delta_2$. Let $D_1 \vDash^* \delta_1$. Pick any $G_2 \vDash^* \gamma_2$. By $(\text{Cnz})_{\text{containment}}$, there exists $D_2 \vDash^* \delta_2$ s.t. $D_2 \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} G_2$. Then since $\delta_1 \otimes \delta_2 \equiv \zeta_+$, there exists $Z_+ \vDash^* \zeta_+$, $D'_1 \vDash^* \delta_1$ and $D'_2 \vDash^* \delta_2$ s.t.

$$D'_1 \oplus D'_2 \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} Z_+ \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} D_1 \oplus D_2 \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} D_1 \oplus G_2.$$

Because of \mathbb{M} , the homomorphism $Z_+ \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} D_1 \oplus G_2$ must in fact be a homomorphism $Z_+ \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} D_1$, and so by composition we obtain a homomorphism $D'_1 \oplus D'_2 \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} D_1$, which can be restricted to D'_2 , yielding $D'_2 \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} D_1$. Hence, $\delta_1 \subseteq \delta_2$, and so by $(\text{Cnz})_{\text{monotonic}}$, $\gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2$.

Putting Claims E.12 and E.13 together shows that the reduction is correct. We now prove that this reduction also works for the other variations of the problem.

• *Minimization in the class of UCRPQs.* If we allow ζ to be a UCRPQ, then Claim E.12 still holds, and we need to adapt Claim E.13. Assume that this “small” UCRPQ is of the form $\zeta_1 \vee \zeta_2 \vee \dots \vee \zeta_k$ where each ζ_i has at most $\|\delta_1\|_{\text{at}}$ atoms. We say that a disjunct ζ_i is *relevant* when it has at least one canonical database Z_i appearing in a pattern of the form

$$D'_1 \oplus D'_2 \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} Z_i \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} D_1 \oplus D_2 \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} D_1 \oplus G_2.$$

for some $D_1, D'_1 \vDash^* \delta_1$, $D_2, D'_2 \vDash^* \delta_2$ and $G_2 \vDash^* \gamma_2$. Using $(\text{SCnz})_{\text{str-onto}}$ on D_1 , the same proof as in the case of CRPQs apply. We can then conclude that w.l.o.g. $\zeta_i \equiv (\zeta_i)_+$ for all relevant disjunct. The proof of $\delta_1 \subseteq \delta_2$ —and hence $\gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2$ —then goes through as before, which concludes the proof.

• *If ζ is restricted to be in Q .* Then Claim E.13 still holds. To adapt Claim E.12, it suffices to remark that $\delta_1 \in Q$. \square

LEMMA E.14. The strong canonization problem can be solved in non-deterministic logarithmic space for the class of all CRPQs, or more generally for all classes of CRPQs defined by restricting the underlying multigraph class, provided that this class is closed under disjoint union.

PROOF. Given a pair $\langle \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \rangle$ of Boolean queries we assume w.l.o.g. that γ_1 is fully contracted using Fact 3.2—which works in non-deterministic logarithmic space—, and we reduce it to the pair $\langle \delta_1, \delta_2 \rangle$, where δ_1 is defined as

$$\delta_1() \hat{=} \bigwedge_{\alpha=x \xrightarrow{L} y \in \gamma_1} x \triangleright_{\alpha} L \triangleleft_{\alpha} y$$

where \triangleright_{α} and \triangleleft_{α} are fresh letters for each atom α of γ_1 , and

$$\delta_2() \hat{=} \bigwedge_{x \xrightarrow{L} y \in \gamma_2} x \xrightarrow{\varphi_{-\mathbb{M}}^{-1}[L]} y,$$

where $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ are all the atoms of γ_1 , $\mathbb{M} \hat{=} \{\triangleright_{\alpha_1}, \triangleleft_{\alpha_1}, \dots, \triangleright_{\alpha_k}, \triangleleft_{\alpha_k}\}$ and $\varphi_{-\mathbb{M}}: (\mathbb{A} \cup \mathbb{M})^* \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^*$ is the monoid morphism that maps letters of \mathbb{A} to themselves and letters of \mathbb{M} to the empty word.

In other words, δ_1 is similar to γ_1 except that it must read the special symbol \triangleright_{α} before satisfying atom $\alpha \in \gamma_1$, and read symbol \triangleleft_{α} after. On other hand, δ_2 is obtained from γ_2 by relaxing the constraints: instead of having to read a path labelled by some language L , we now must read a path such that, when we ignore these new symbols \triangleright_{α} and \triangleleft_{α} , then it belongs to L .

We now need to prove that properties $(\text{Cnz})_*$ and $(\text{SCnz})_{\text{str-onto}}$ hold.

Claim E.15. If $\gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2$ then $\delta_1 \otimes \delta_2 \equiv \delta_1$.

Showing that $\delta_1 \otimes \delta_2 \equiv \delta_1$ amounts to showing $\delta_1 \subseteq \delta_2$. Let D_1 be a canonical database of δ_1 . Consider the canonical database of γ_1 obtained by removing every edge of the form $x \xrightarrow{\triangleright\alpha} y$ or $x \xrightarrow{\triangleleft\alpha} y$, and merging variables x and y . Since $\gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2$, there exists a canonical database G_2 of γ_2 and a homomorphism $f: G_2 \rightarrow G_1$. We then define a canonical database D_2 of δ_2 together with a homomorphism $g: D_2 \rightarrow D_1$ as follows: given an atom refinement

$$x_0 \xrightarrow{b_1} x_1 \xrightarrow{b_2} \dots \xrightarrow{b_n} x_n \text{ in } G_2.$$

we look at its image

$$f(x_0) \xrightarrow{b_1} f(x_1) \xrightarrow{b_2} \dots \xrightarrow{b_n} f(x_n) \text{ in } G_1.$$

Now some $f(x_i)$'s might be variables of γ_1 and hence this might not a path in G_1 . We let $i_1 < \dots < i_k$ denote the indices i s.t. $x_i \in V(\gamma_1)$, so that we can split the path in G_1 into multiples atom refinements of atoms of γ_1 :

$$\underbrace{f(x_0) \xrightarrow{b_1} f(x_1) \xrightarrow{b_2} \dots \xrightarrow{b_{i_1}} f(x_{i_1})}_{\text{end of an atom refinement of } \alpha_0} \underbrace{\xrightarrow{b_{i_1+1}} f(x_{i_1+1}) \xrightarrow{b_{i_1+2}} \dots \xrightarrow{b_{i_2}} f(x_{i_2})}_{\text{atom refinement of } \alpha_1} \xrightarrow{b_{i_2+1}} f(x_{i_2+1}) \xrightarrow{b_{i_2+2}} \dots \dots \xrightarrow{b_{i_k}} f(x_{i_k}) \underbrace{\xrightarrow{b_{i_k+1}} f(x_{i_k+1}) \xrightarrow{b_{i_k+2}} \dots \xrightarrow{b_n} f(x_n)}_{\text{beginning of an atom refinement of } \alpha_k}$$

in G_1 . For $i \in \llbracket 1, k \rrbracket$, we let $f(x_{i_j})^r$ (resp. $f(x_{i_j})^l$) denote the unique variable of D_1 s.t. there is an edge from $f(x_{i_j})$ to $f(x_{i_j})^r$ labelled by $\triangleright\alpha_i$ (resp. from $f(x_{i_j})^l$ to $f(x_{i_j})$ labelled by $\triangleleft\alpha_{i-1}$), we obtain a path

$$\underbrace{f(x_0) \xrightarrow{b_1} f(x_1) \xrightarrow{b_2} \dots \xrightarrow{b_{i_1}} f(x_{i_1})^l}_{\text{end of an atom refinement of } \alpha_0} \xrightarrow{\triangleleft\alpha_0} f(x_{i_1}) \xrightarrow{\triangleright\alpha_1} f(x_{i_1})^r \underbrace{\xrightarrow{b_{i_1+1}} f(x_{i_1+1}) \xrightarrow{b_{i_1+2}} \dots \xrightarrow{b_{i_2}} f(x_{i_2})^l}_{\text{atom refinement of } \alpha_1} \xrightarrow{\triangleleft\alpha_1} f(x_{i_2}) \xrightarrow{\triangleright\alpha_1} f(x_{i_2})^r \xrightarrow{b_{i_2+1}} f(x_{i_2+1}) \xrightarrow{b_{i_2+2}} \dots \dots \xrightarrow{b_{i_k}} f(x_{i_k})^l \xrightarrow{\triangleleft\alpha_{k-1}} f(x_{i_k}) \xrightarrow{\triangleright\alpha_k} f(x_{i_k})^r \underbrace{\xrightarrow{b_{i_k+1}} f(x_{i_k+1}) \xrightarrow{b_{i_k+2}} \dots \xrightarrow{b_n} f(x_n)}_{\text{beginning of an atom refinement of } \alpha_k}$$

in D_1 . Hence, we build D_2 by replacing each atom refinement $x_0 \xrightarrow{b_1} x_1 \xrightarrow{b_2} \dots \xrightarrow{b_n} x_n$ in G_2 by

$$x_0 \xrightarrow{b_1} x_1 \xrightarrow{b_2} \dots \xrightarrow{b_{i_1}} x_{i_1}^l \xrightarrow{\triangleleft\alpha_0} x_{i_1} \xrightarrow{\triangleright\alpha_1} x_{i_1}^r \xrightarrow{b_{i_1+1}} x_{i_1+1} \xrightarrow{b_{i_1+2}} \dots \xrightarrow{b_{i_2}} x_{i_2}^l \xrightarrow{\triangleleft\alpha_1} x_{i_2} \xrightarrow{\triangleright\alpha_2} x_{i_2}^r \xrightarrow{b_{i_2+1}} x_{i_2+1} \xrightarrow{b_{i_2+2}} \dots \xrightarrow{b_{i_k}} x_{i_k}^l \xrightarrow{\triangleleft\alpha_{k-1}} x_{i_k} \xrightarrow{\triangleright\alpha_k} x_{i_k}^r \xrightarrow{b_{i_k+1}} x_{i_k+1} \xrightarrow{b_{i_k+2}} \dots \xrightarrow{b_n} x_n,$$

where $x_{i_1}^l, x_{i_1}^r, \dots, x_{i_k}^l, x_{i_k}^r$ are new fresh variables. By construction, D_2 comes equipped with a homomorphism $g: D_2 \rightarrow D_1$ which sends x_i to $f(x_i)$, $x_{i_j}^l$ to $f(x_{i_j})^l$ and $x_{i_j}^r$ to $f(x_{i_j})^r$. Since D_2 is—by construction—a canonical database of δ_2 , this concludes the proof that $\delta_1 \subseteq \delta_2$.

Claim E.16. If $\delta_1 \subseteq \delta_2$ then $\gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2$.

The construction is dual to Claim E.15 and left to the reader. Both claims yield $(\text{Cnz})_{\text{monotonic}}$.

We now show that $(\text{SCnz})_{\text{str-onto}}$ holds: pick a canonical database $D_1 \models^* \delta_1$. For any $D'_1 \models^* \delta_1$, if $D'_1 \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} D_1$, then because of the letters in \mathbb{M} , it follows that for each atom α_i of γ_1 , the atom refinement of α_i in D'_1 must be sent bijectively on the atom refinement of α_i in D_1 , and so they are equal. It follows that the homomorphism $D'_1 \rightarrow D_1$ must actually be the identity, and hence D_1 is

maximal. The same argument applied to $D'_1 \hat{=} D_1$ shows that the only homomorphism from D_1 itself is the identity, and so in particular D'_1 is a core. Lastly, because of the letters of \mathbb{M} , no atom of δ_1 contains the empty word, and so in particular D_1 must be non-degenerate. Hence, $(\text{SCnz})_{\text{str-onto}}$ holds.

Since γ_1 is fully contracted, so is δ_1 , which proves $(\text{Cnz})_{\text{contracted}}$. For any language L , we have $L \subseteq \varphi_{-\mathbb{M}}^{-1}[L]$, and so we have $(\text{Cnz})_{\text{containment}}$. Finally, $(\text{Cnz})_{\text{non-red}}$ and $(\text{Cnz})_{\text{marking}}$ trivially hold.

Together with that fact that $\langle \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \rangle \mapsto \langle \delta_1, \delta_2 \rangle$ preserves the underlying multigraphs, this shows that this is a solution to strong canonization problem for any class of CRPQs defined by restricting the underlying class of multigraphs. Note also that an NFA for $\varphi_{-\mathbb{M}}^{-1}[L]$ can be obtained from an NFA for L by adding on every state a self-loop labelled by every possible letter of \mathbb{M} and hence, this algorithm can be implemented in logarithmic space. \square

Note however that if L is a simple regular expression, then $\varphi_{-\mathbb{M}}^{-1}[L]$ does not need to be. Hence, the construction above does not work for CRPQs over simple regular expressions.

LEMMA E.17. The strong canonization problem can be solved in polynomial time for the class of CRPQs over simple regular expressions.

Given a CRPQ γ , we say that an atom $x \xrightarrow{L} y$ is *locally redundant* if there exists a path of atoms $z_0 \xrightarrow{L_1} z_1 \xrightarrow{L_2} \dots \xrightarrow{L_n} z_n$ in which $x \xrightarrow{L} y$ does not occur, and with $z_0 = x$ and $z_n = x$ where $L_1 L_2 \dots L_n \subseteq L$.

PROOF OF LEMMA E.17. Fix a pair $\langle \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \rangle$ of CRPQs. From γ_1 , we start by picking a locally redundant atom (if any), and remove it. We iterate this process, until we get a CRPQ with no locally redundant atom γ'_1 . By construction, it is equivalent to γ_1 .¹⁶ Moreover, γ'_1 can be computed in polynomial time. We then refine in γ'_1 each atom so that each atom is either labelled by a or a^+ for some $a \in \mathbb{A}$.

We then define $\langle \delta_1, \delta_2 \rangle$, where $\delta_2 \hat{=} \gamma_2$ and

$$\delta_1 = \left(\bigwedge_{x \xrightarrow{L} y \in \gamma'_1} x \xrightarrow{L} y \right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{x \in V(\gamma'_1)} x \xrightarrow{\nabla_x} x \right),$$


and we let $\mathbb{M} \hat{=} \{\nabla_x \mid x \in V(\gamma'_1)\}$.

Next, we show that $(\text{Cnz})_{\text{monotonic}}$ holds: if $\gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2$ then $\delta_1 \subseteq \gamma'_1 \equiv \gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2 = \delta_2$, and dually if $\delta_1 \subseteq \delta_2$ then let $G_1 \models^* \gamma'_1$, and let D_1 be the associated canonical database. Since $\delta_1 \subseteq \delta_2$, there exists $D_2 \models^* \delta_2$ s.t. $D_2 \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} D_1$ but since D_2 contains no letter from \mathbb{M} , we actually get a homomorphism $D_2 \xrightarrow{\text{hom}} G_1$, and so $\gamma'_1 \subseteq \delta_2$ i.e. $\gamma_1 \subseteq \gamma_2$.

For $(\text{SCnz})_{\text{str-onto}}$, by definition of simple regular expressions, no language labelling an atom of δ_1 contains the empty word, and hence every canonical database of δ_1 is non-degenerate. Then, let $f: D'_1 \rightarrow D_1$ be a homomorphism between canonical databases of δ_1 . Because of the letters of \mathbb{M} , f must send $x \in V(\delta_1) \subseteq V(D_1)$ onto $x \in V(D'_1)$. We then claim that f is strong onto. Let $\alpha \hat{=} x \xrightarrow{L} y$ be an atom of δ_1 . We consider its atom refinement in D_1 , and we want to show that it is included in the image of the atom refinement of α in D'_1 :

- if $L = \{\nabla_x\}$, this is trivial;
- if $L = \{a\}$ for some letter a , then since α is not locally redundant in γ'_1 , there are no other a -edge from x to y in D_1 (or D'_1), and so the unique a -edge from x to y in D'_1 must be sent on the unique a -edge from x to y in D_1 ;

¹⁶Note however that in general γ'_1 cannot be obtained by only keeping all atoms of γ_1 which are not locally redundant: for instance, if $\gamma_1() = x \xrightarrow{L} y \wedge x \xrightarrow{L} y$, then all atoms are locally redundant. Instead, we need to remove such atoms one after the other.



(a) A tree pattern τ . Double arrows represent transitive edges.

(b) Its encoding $\text{Enc}(\tau)$ as a CRPQ.

Fig. 4. Encoding a tree pattern into a CRPQ.

- if $L = a^+$ for some letter a , then the atom refinement of α in D'_1 , say $x \xrightarrow{a^k} y$ ($k \geq 1$) is sent via f on a path from x to y in D_1 . If the atom refinement of α in D_1 is included in this path, we are done; otherwise, when lifting this path to δ_1 , we would obtain a path of atoms $x \xrightarrow{L_1} \dots \xrightarrow{L_n} y$ s.t. $a^k \in L_1 \dots L_n$. By definition of simple regular expressions, all L_i 's must be either a or a^+ , and hence in all cases $L_1 \dots L_n \subseteq a^+$, contradicting that α is not locally redundant in γ'_1 .

Thus, we have $(\text{SCnz})_{\text{str-onto}}$.

Similarly, $(\text{Cnz})_{\text{non-red}}$ holds because all atoms of γ'_1 are labelled by a or a^+ and we removed locally redundant atoms. Thanks to the self-loops, δ_1 is fully contracted and so $(\text{Cnz})_{\text{contracted}}$ holds. Moreover, $(\text{Cnz})_{\text{containment}}$ holds trivially since $\gamma_2 = \delta_2$, and so does $(\text{Cnz})_{\text{marking}}$ by definition of δ_1 . \square

COROLLARY 6.4. The CRPQ and UCRPQ minimization problems are:

- (1) ExpSpace-hard, even if restricted to queries of path-width at most 1,
- (2) PSpace-hard when restricted to forest-shaped CRPQs,¹⁷
- (3) Π_2^P -hard when restricted to CRPQs over simple regular expressions.

All hardness results are under polynomial-time reductions.

PROOF. From Lemmas 6.3, E.14 and E.17 we can derive the stated hardness results when combined with known hardness results for the containment problem: Item 1 follows from the ExpSpace lower bound of [8, Lemma 8] (or its strengthening Proposition 6.1). Item 2 follows from the trivial PSpace lower bound from regular language containment which is also the lower bound for one-atom CRPQs. Item 3 follows from the known Π_2^P -lower bound for CRPQ(SRE) queries implied by [9, Theorem 4.2]. \square

F Appendix to Section 7 “Discussion”

F.1 Tree patterns

A *tree pattern*—see e.g. [6, §2.2]—over node variables \mathbb{A} is a directed tree, whose nodes have a label from $\mathbb{A} \sqcup \{*\}$, and whose edges are partition into simple edges and transitive edges.

We *encode* a tree pattern τ into a CRPQ over $\mathbb{A} \sqcup \{\nabla\}$, denoted by $\text{Enc}(\tau)$, obtained as follows:

- we start from the underlying tree of the tree pattern, and replace simple edges by an atom $\bullet \xrightarrow{\nabla} \bullet$, and transitive edges by an atom $\bullet \xrightarrow{\nabla^+} \bullet$;
- for any node x with a node label $a \in \mathbb{A}$, we add an atom $x \xrightarrow{a} x$;
- for any node with a wildcard label $*$, we do not add any atom.

¹⁷By *forest-shaped CRPQs* we mean queries whose underlying graph has no undirected cycle.

See Figure 4 for an example. Note that this encoding is injective.

PROPOSITION F.1. Given two tree patterns τ_1, τ_2 over \mathbb{A} , the following are equivalent:

- $\tau_1 \subseteq \tau_2$ as tree patterns—in the sense of [6, Definition 2.2], and
- $\text{Enc}(\tau_1) \subseteq \text{Enc}(\tau_2)$ as CRPQs.

PROOF SKETCH. This follows from the characterization of containment for tree patterns using “canonical tree models”—see [6, §4.2]¹⁸—and the characterization of containment for CRPQs via canonical databases (*a.k.a.* expansions)—see Proposition 2.1. \square

¹⁸Note however that the authors assume the set of labels to be infinite, and label ‘*’-nodes by z -nodes where z is a new label: this assumption can be removed by allowed unlabelled nodes in the model.