

# A Single Approach to Decide Chase Termination on Linear Existential Rules

Michel Leclère<sup>1</sup>, Marie-Laure Mugnier<sup>1</sup>, Michaël Thomazo<sup>2</sup>, Federico Ulliana<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Univ. Montpellier, LIRMM, Inria, CNRS

leclere@lirmm.fr, mugnier@lirmm.fr, ulliana@lirmm.fr

<sup>2</sup> Inria, DI ENS, ENS, CNRS, PSL University

michael.thomazo@inria.fr

The chase procedure is a fundamental tool for solving many issues involving tuple-generating dependencies, such as data integration, data-exchange, query answering using views or query answering on probabilistic databases. In the last decade, tuple-generating dependencies raised a renewed interest under the name of *existential rules* for the ontology-mediated query answering (OMQA) problem. In this context, the aim is to query a knowledge base  $(I, \mathcal{R})$ , where  $I$  is an instance (or factbase) and  $\mathcal{R}$  is a set of existential rules (see e.g. the survey chapters [5,16]). A fundamental property of the chase is that it allows one to compute a (possibly infinite) *universal model* of  $(I, \mathcal{R})$ , i.e., a model that can be homomorphically mapped to any other model of  $(I, \mathcal{R})$ . Hence, the answers to a conjunctive query (and more generally to any kind of query closed by homomorphism) over  $(I, \mathcal{R})$  can be defined by considering solely this universal model.

The chase starts from an instance and exhaustively performs a sequence of rule applications with respect to a redundancy criterion, which differs according to the considered chase variant. We focus in this paper on the main variants, namely: *semi-oblivious* [15] (aka skolem [15]), *restricted* [3,10] (aka standard [17]) and *core* [8]. All these produce homomorphically equivalent results but terminate for increasingly larger subclasses of existential rules. The question of whether a chase variant terminates on *all instances* for a given set of existential rules is known to be undecidable when there is no restriction on the kind of rules [1,11]. A number of *sufficient* syntactic conditions for termination have been proposed in the literature for the semi-oblivious chase (see e.g. [17,12,18] for syntheses), as well as for the restricted chase [7] (note that the latter paper also defines a sufficient condition for non-termination). However, only few positive results exist regarding the termination of the chase on specific classes of rules. Decidability was shown for the semi-oblivious chase on guarded-based rules (linear rules, and their extension to (weakly-)guarded rules) [4]. Decidability of the core chase termination on guarded rules for a fixed instance was shown in [13].

In this work, we provide new insights on the chase termination problem for *linear* existential rules, which are precisely of the form  $\forall \mathbf{x} \forall \mathbf{y}. [\alpha_1(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \rightarrow \exists \mathbf{z}. \alpha_2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})]$ , where  $\alpha_i$  is an atom and  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$  and  $\mathbf{z}$  are pairwise disjoint tuples of variables. Linear rules form a simple yet important subclass of guarded existential rules, which generalizes inclusion dependencies [9] and positive inclusions in DL-Lite $\mathcal{R}$  [6] (which can be seen as inclusion dependencies restricted to unary and binary predicates). Concerning the ontology-mediated query answering problem, we note that linear rules are first-order rewritable, hence OMQA on conjunctive queries can be solved by query rewriting. However, it is well known that the size and the unusual form of the rewritten query may

give rise to practical efficiency issues. The materialization of ontological inferences in the data is often a good alternative to query rewriting, provided that some chase algorithm terminates. Finally, having the choice of how to process a set of linear rules may extend the applicability of query answering techniques that combine query rewriting and materialization [1].

The question of whether a chase variant terminates on all instances for a set of linear existential rules can be asked under two forms: Does *every* (fair) chase sequence terminate? Does *some* (fair) chase sequence terminate? It is well-known that these two questions have the same answer for the semi-oblivious and the core chase variants, but not for the restricted chase. Indeed, this last one may admit both terminating and non-terminating sequences over the same knowledge base. We show that the termination problem is decidable for linear existential rules, whether we consider *any version* of the problem and *any chase variant*.

We study chase termination by exploiting in a novel way a graph structure, namely the *derivation tree*, which was originally introduced to solve the ontology-mediated (conjunctive) query answering problem for the family of greedy-bounded treewidth sets of existential rules [2,19], a class of rules that generalizes guarded-based rules and in particular linear rules. We first use derivation trees to show the decidability of the termination problem for the semi-oblivious and restricted chase variants, and then generalize them to *entailment trees* to show the decidability of termination for the core chase. For any chase variant we consider, we adopt the same high-level procedure: starting from a finite set of canonical instances (representative of all possible instances), we build a (set of) tree structures for each canonical instance, while forbidding the occurrence of a specific pattern, we call *unbounded-path witness*. The built structures are finite thanks to this forbidden pattern, and this allows us to decide if the chase terminates on the associated canonical instance. By doing so, we obtain a uniform approach to study the termination of several chase variants, which we believe to be of theoretical interest per se. The derivation tree is moreover a simple structure and the algorithms built on this notion are likely to lead to an effective implementation.

Besides providing new theoretical tools to study chase termination, we obtain the following results for linear existential rules:

- a new proof of the decidability of the semi-oblivious chase termination, building on different objects than the previous proof provided in [4]; we show that our algorithm provides the same complexity upper-bound;
- the decidability of the restricted chase termination, for both versions of the problem, i.e., termination of all (fair) chase sequences and termination of some (fair) chase sequence; to the best of our knowledge, these are the first positive results on the decidability of the restricted chase termination;
- a new proof of the decidability of the core chase termination, with different objects than previous work on the core chase termination reported in [13].

The full paper is available as a technical report [14].

## References

1. Baget, J., Leclère, M., Mugnier, M., Salvat, E.: On rules with existential variables: Walking the decidability line. *Artif. Intell.* **175**(9-10), 1620–1654 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artint.2011.03.002>
2. Baget, J., Mugnier, M., Rudolph, S., Thomazo, M.: Walking the complexity lines for generalized guarded existential rules. In: Walsh, T. (ed.) *IJCAI 2011, Proceedings of the 22nd International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain, July 16-22, 2011*. pp. 712–717. *IJCAI/AAAI* (2011). <https://doi.org/10.5591/978-1-57735-516-8/IJCAI11-126>
3. Beeri, C., Vardi, M.Y.: The implication problem for data dependencies. In: Even, S., Kariv, O. (eds.) *Automata, Languages and Programming, 8th Colloquium, Acre (Akko), Israel, July 13-17, 1981, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 115, pp. 73–85. Springer (1981). [https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-10843-2\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-10843-2_7)
4. Calautti, M., Gottlob, G., Pieris, A.: Chase termination for guarded existential rules. In: Milo, T., Calvanese, D. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 34th ACM Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS 2015, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia, May 31 - June 4, 2015*. pp. 91–103. ACM (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2745754.2745773>
5. Cali, A., Gottlob, G., Lukasiewicz, T.: Datalog extensions for tractable query answering over ontologies. In: Virgilio, R.D., Giunchiglia, F., Tanca, L. (eds.) *Semantic Web Information Management - A Model-Based Perspective*, pp. 249–279. Springer (2009). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-04329-1\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-04329-1_12)
6. Calvanese, D., De Giacomo, G., Lembo, D., Lenzerini, M., Rosati, R.: Tractable reasoning and efficient query answering in description logics: The *DL-Lite* family. *J. Autom. Reasoning* **39**(3), 385–429 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10817-007-9078-x>
7. Carral, D., Dragoste, I., Krötzsch, M.: Detecting chase (non)termination for existential rules with disjunctions. In: Sierra, C. (ed.) *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2017, Melbourne, Australia, August 19-25, 2017*. pp. 922–928. *ijcai.org* (2017). <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2017/128>
8. Deutsch, A., Nash, A., Rimmel, J.B.: The chase revisited. In: Lenzerini, M., Lembo, D. (eds.) *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS 2008, June 9-11, 2008, Vancouver, BC, Canada*. pp. 149–158. ACM (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1145/1376916.1376938>
9. Fagin, R.: A normal form for relational databases that is based on domains and keys. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.* **6**(3), 387–415 (1981). <https://doi.org/10.1145/319587.319592>
10. Fagin, R., Kolaitis, P.G., Miller, R.J., Popa, L.: Data exchange: semantics and query answering. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **336**(1), 89–124 (2005). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2004.10.033>
11. Gogacz, T., Marcinkowski, J.: All-instances termination of chase is undecidable. In: Esparza, J., Fraigniaud, P., Husfeldt, T., Koutsoupias, E. (eds.) *Automata, Languages, and Programming - 41st International Colloquium, ICALP 2014, Copenhagen, Denmark, July 8-11, 2014, Proceedings, Part II. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 8573, pp. 293–304. Springer (2014). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-43951-7\\_25](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-43951-7_25)
12. Grau, B.C., Horrocks, I., Krötzsch, M., Kupke, C., Magka, D., Motik, B., Wang, Z.: Acyclicity notions for existential rules and their application to query answering in ontologies. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.* **47**, 741–808 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.3949>
13. Hernich, A.: Computing universal models under guarded tgds. In: Deutsch, A. (ed.) *15th International Conference on Database Theory, ICDT '12, Berlin, Germany, March 26-29, 2012*. pp. 222–235. ACM (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2274576.2274600>
14. Leclère, M., Mugnier, M.L., Thomazo, M., Ulliana, F.: A single approach to decide chase termination on linear existential rules. *CoRR* **abs/1602.05828** (2018), <https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.02132>

15. Marnette, B.: Generalized schema-mappings: from termination to tractability. In: Paredaens, J., Su, J. (eds.) Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS 2009, June 19 - July 1, 2009, Providence, Rhode Island, USA. pp. 13–22. ACM (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1145/1559795.1559799>
16. Mugnier, M., Thomazo, M.: An introduction to ontology-based query answering with existential rules. In: Reasoning Web. Reasoning on the Web in the Big Data Era - 10th International Summer School 2014, Athens, Greece, September 8-13, 2014. Proceedings. pp. 245–278 (2014). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-10587-1\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-10587-1_6)
17. Onet, A.: The chase procedure and its applications. Ph.D. thesis, Concordia University, Canada (2012), <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/6b1b/327a989d3d8e2488f645488063f391391b89.pdf>
18. Rocher, S.: Querying Existential Rule Knowledge Bases: Decidability and Complexity. (Interrogation de Bases de Connaissances avec Règles Existentielles : Décidabilité et Complexité). Ph.D. thesis, University of Montpellier, France (2016), <https://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-01483770>
19. Thomazo, M.: Conjunctive Query Answering Under Existential Rules - Decidability, Complexity, and Algorithms. Ph.D. thesis, Montpellier 2 University, France (2013), <https://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-00925722>