Data integration – general setting

- A source schema S:
  - relational schema XML Schema (DTD), etc.
- A global schema G:
  - could be of many different types too
- A mapping M between S and G:
  - many ways to specify it, e.g. by queries that mention S and T
- A general condition: the source and our view of the global schema should satisfy the conditions imposed by the mapping M.

Data integration – general setting cont'd

- Assume we have a source database D.
- We are interested in databases D' over the global schema such that

$$(D, D') \text{ satisfies the conditions of the mapping } M$$

- There are many possible ways to specify the mapping.
- The set of such databases D' is denoted by

$$[\![D]\!]_M$$

- If we have a query Q, we want certain answers that are true in all possible databases D':

$$\text{certain}_M(Q, D) \quad = \quad \bigcap_{D' \in [\![D]\!]_M} Q(D').$$

Data integration – general setting cont'd

- Depending on a type of mapping M, the set $[\![D]\!]_M$ could be very large — or even infinite.
- That makes $\text{certain}_M(Q, D)$ prohibitively expensive or even impossible to compute.
- Hence we need a rewriting Q' so that

$$\text{certain}_M(Q, D) \;=\; Q'(D)$$

or even

$$\text{certain}_M(Q, D) \;=\; Q'(V)$$

if V is the set of views that the database D makes available.

Types of mappings: Two major parameters

- Source-central vs global schema-central:
  - Source is defined in terms of the global schema
    - Known as local-as-view (LAV)
  - The global schema is defined in terms of the source
    - Known as global-as-view (GAV)
  - Combinations are possible (GLAV, P2P, to be seen later)
- Exact vs sound definitions
  - Exact definition specify precise relationships that must hold between the source and the global schema database
  - Sound definitions leave that description potentially incomplete: we know some relationships but not all of them.
    - potentially many more instances in $[\![D]\!]_M$

Example

- Source schema:
  - EM50(title,year,director)
    - meaning: European movies made since 1950
  - RV10(movie,review)
    - reviews for the past 10 years
- Global schema:
  - Movie(title,director,year)
  - ED(name,country,dob) (European directors)
  - RV(movie,review) (reviews)

Example – LAV setting

- We define the source (local) in terms of the global schema – hence local is a view.
- Two possibilities for $D' \in [\![D]\!]_M$:
  - ◦ Exact: $D = Q(D')$, where Q is a query over the global schema.
  - ◦ Sound: $D \subseteq Q(D')$.
  - ◦ In other words, if a fact is present in D, it must be derivable from the global schema by means of Q.
- More generally, for each n-ary relation R in the source schema, there is a query Q_R over the global schema such that
  - – $R = Q_R(D')$ (exact)
  - – $R \subseteq Q_R(D')$ (sound)

Sound LAV setting

$$\text{EM50(T,Y,D)} \subseteq \left\{ (t, y, d) \;\middle|\; \exists n, dob \left(\begin{array}{ll} & \text{Movie}(t, y, d) \\ \wedge & \text{ED}(d, n, dob) \\ \wedge & y \geq 1950 \end{array} \right) \right\}$$

$$\text{RV10}(t, r) \subseteq \left\{ (t, r) \;\middle|\; \exists y, d \left(\begin{array}{ll} & \text{Movie}(t, y, d) \\ \wedge & \text{RV}(t, r) \\ \wedge & y \geq 1998 \end{array} \right) \right\}$$

Right-hand sides are simple SQL queries involving joins and simple selection predicates:

```
SELECT M.title, RV.review
FROM Movie M, RV
WHERE M.title=RV.title AND M.year >= 1998
```

Exact LAV setting

$$\mathsf{EM50(T,Y,D)} = \left\{ (t,y,d) \;\middle|\; \exists n, dob \left(\begin{array}{rl} & \mathsf{Movie}(t,y,d) \\ \wedge & \mathsf{ED}(d,n,dob) \\ \wedge & y \geq 1950 \end{array} \right) \right\}$$

$$\mathsf{RV10}(t,r) = \left\{ (t,r) \;\middle|\; \exists y, d \left(\begin{array}{rl} & \mathsf{Movie}(t,y,d) \\ \wedge & \mathsf{RV}(t,r) \\ \wedge & y \geq 1998 \end{array} \right) \right\}$$

All the data from the global database must be reflected in the source.

LAV setting – queries

Consider a global schema query

```
SELECT M.title, R.review
FROM Movie M, RV R
WHERE M.title=R.title AND M.year = 2000
```

(Movies from 2000 and their reviews)

This is rewritten as a relational calculus query:

$$\{t, r \mid \exists d, y \ \mathsf{Movie}(t, d, y) \wedge \mathsf{RV}(t, r) \wedge y = 2000\}$$

LAV setting:

$\{t, r \ \mid \ \exists d, y \ \textsf{Movie}(t, d, y) \wedge \textsf{RV}(t, r) \wedge y = 2000\}$

Idea: re-express in terms of predicates of the source schema. The following seems to be the best possible way:

$$\{t, r \mid \exists d, y \textsf{EM50}(t, y, d) \wedge \textsf{RV10}(t, r) \wedge y = 2000\}$$

and back to SQL:

```
SELECT EM50.title, RV10.review
FROM EM50, RV10
WHERE EM50.title=RV10.title AND EM50.year = 2000
```

- Is this always possible?
- In what sense is this the best way?

GAV settings

- Global schema is defined in terms of sources.
- Sound GAV:
  - $D' \supseteq Q(D)$
  - the global database contains the result of a query over the source
- Exact GAV:
  - $D' = Q(D)$
  - the global database is obtained as the result of a query over the source
- Note: in exact GAV, $[\![D]\!]_M$ contains a unique database!

GAV example

- Change the schema slightly: ED'(name) (i.e. we only keep names of European directors)
- A sound GAV setting:
  - Movie $\supseteq$ EM50
  - ED' $\supseteq \{d \mid \exists t, y$ EM50$(t, d, y)\}$
  - RV $\supseteq$ RV10

Look at a SQL query:

```
SELECT M.title, RV.review
FROM Movie M, RV
WHERE M.title=RV.title AND M.year = 2000
```

(Movies from 2000 and their reviews)

GAV example

- Query: $\{t, r \mid \exists d, y\ \mathsf{M}(t, d, y) \land \mathsf{RV}(t, r) \land y = 2000\}$
- Substitute the definitions from the mapping and get:
- $\{t, r \mid \exists d, y\ \mathsf{EM50}(t, d, y) \land \mathsf{RV10}(t, r) \land y = 2000\}$
- This is called unfolding.
- Does this always work? Can queries become too large?

Integration with views

- We have assumed that all source databases are available.
- But often we only get views that they publish.
- If only views are available, can queries be:
  - answered?
  - approximated?
- Assume that in EM50 directors are omitted. Then nothing is affected.
- But if titles are omitted in EM50, we cannot answer the query.

Towards view-based query answering

- Suppose only a view of the source is available. Can queries be answered?
- It depends on the query language.
- Start with relational algebra/calculus.
- Suppose we have either a LAV or a GAV setting, and we want to answer queries over the global schema using the view over the source.
- Problem: given the setting, and a query, can it be answered?
- This is undecidable!
- Two undecidable relational algebra problems:
  - If e is a relational algebra expression, does it always produce $\emptyset$ (i.e., on every database)?
  - Closely related: if e_1 and e_2 are two relational algebra expressions, is it true that $e_1(D) = e_2(D)$ for every database?

Equivalence of relational algebra expressions

- A side note – this is the basis of query optimisation.
- But it can only be sound, never complete.
- Equivalence is undecidable for the full relational algebra
  - $\pi, \sigma, \bowtie, \cup, -$
- The good news: it is decidable for $\pi, \sigma, \bowtie, \cup$
- And quite efficiently for $\pi, \sigma, \bowtie$
- And the latter form a very important class of queries, to be seen soon.

View-based query answering – relational algebra

- A very simple setting: exact LAV (and GAV)
  - the source schema and the target schema are identical (say, for each $R(A, B, C, \ldots)$ in the source there is $R'(A', B', C', \ldots)$ in the target)
  - The constraints in M state that they are the same.
  - The source does not publish any views: i.e. $V = \emptyset$.
- If we can answer queries in this setting, it means they have to be answered *independently* of the data in the source.
- The only way it happens: $Q(D_1) = Q(D_2)$ for all databases D_1, D_2; we output this answer without even looking at the view $\emptyset$.
- But this ($Q(D_1) = Q(D_2)$ for all databases D_1, D_2) is undecidable.

A better class of queries

- Conjunctive queries
- They are the building blocks for SQL queries:

```
SELECT ....
FROM R1, ..., Rn
WHERE <conjunction of equalities>
```

- For example:

```
SELECT M.title, RV.review
FROM Movie M, RV
WHERE M.title=RV.title AND M.year = 2000
```

- In relational calculus:

$$\{t, r \mid \exists d, y \ \mathsf{Movie}(t, d, y) \land \mathsf{RV}(t, r) \land y = 2000\}$$

Conjunctive queries

- $\{t, r \mid \exists d, y \; \mathsf{Movie}(t, d, y) \wedge \mathsf{RV}(t, r) \wedge y = 2000\}$
- Written using only conjunction and existential quantification – hence the name.
- In relational algebra:

$$\pi_{t,r}\Big(\sigma_{y=2000}\big(\mathsf{Movie} \bowtie_{\mathsf{Movie}.t=\mathsf{RV}.t} \mathsf{RV}\big)\Big)$$

- Also called SPJ-queries (Select-Project-Join)
- These are all equivalent (exercise – why?)

Conjunctive queries: good properties

- QUERY CONTAINMENT:

Input:	two queries Q_1 and Q_2
Output:	true if $Q_1(D) \subseteq Q_2(D)$ for all databases D

- QUERY EQUIVALENCE:

Input:	two queries Q_1 and Q_2
Output:	true if $Q_1(D) = Q_2(D)$ for all databases D

- For relational algebra queries, both are undecidable.
- For conjunctive queries, both are decidable.
- Complexity: NP. This gives an $O(2^n)$ algorithm.
- Can often be reasonable in practice – queries are small.

Conjunctive queries: good properties

- For each conjunctive query, one can find an equivalent query with the minimum number of joins.
- ```
  SELECT R2.A
  FROM R R1, R R2
  WHERE R1.A=R2.A AND R1.B=2 AND R1.C=1
  ```
- In relational algebra: $\pi_{\ldots}(\sigma_{\ldots}(R \times R))$
- $\{x \mid \exists y, z\ R(x, 2, 1) \wedge R(x, y, z)\}$
- Looking at it carefully, this is equivalent to $\{x \mid R(x, 2, 1)\}$, or $\pi_A(\sigma_{B=2 \wedge C=1}(R))$
- The join is saved:

  ```
  SELECT R.A
  FROM R WHERE R.B=2 AND R.C=1
  ```
  ```

Conjunctive queries: complexity

- Can one find a polynomial algorithm? Unlikely.
- Reminder: NP-completeness.
- Take a graph $G = (V, E)$:
  - $V = \{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}$ the set of vertices;
  - E is the set of edges (a_i, a_j)
- and define a conjunctive query

$$Q_G \;=\; \exists x_1, \ldots x_n \bigwedge_{(a_i, a_j) \in E} E(x_i, x_j)$$

- Then G' satisfies Q_G iff there is a homomorphism from $GtoG'$.
- A homomorphism from G to $\{(r,b),(r,g),(g,b),(g,r),(b,r),(b,g)\}$ $\Leftrightarrow$ the graph is 3-colourable.

Conjunctive queries: summary

- A nicely-behaved class
- Basic building blocks of SQL queries
- Easy to reason about
  - Another important property: monotonicity:
  - if $D_1 \subseteq D_2$ then $Q(D_1) \subseteq Q(D_2)$
- Heavily used in data integration/exchange

GAV-exact with conjunctive queries

- Source: $R_1(A,B)$, $R_2(B,C)$
- Global schema: $T_1(A,B,C)$, $T_2(B,C)$
- Exact GAV mapping:
  - $T_1 = \{x,y,z \mid R_1(x,y) \wedge R_2(y,z)\}$ (or $R_1 \bowtie_B R_2$)
  - $T_2 = \{x,y \mid R_2(x,y)\}$
- Query Q:

```
SELECT T1.A, T1.B. T2.C
FROM T1, T2
WHERE T1.B=T2.B AND T1.C=T2.C
```

- As conjunctive query: $\{x,y,z \mid T_1(x,y,z) \wedge T_2(y,z)\}$

GAV-exact with conjunctive queries cont'd

- Take $\{x, y, z \mid T_1(x, y, z) \wedge T_2(y, z)\}$ and unfold:
- $\{x, y, z \mid R_1(x, y) \wedge R_2(y, z) \wedge R_2(y, z)\}$
- or $R_1 \bowtie R_2 \bowtie R_2$
- This is of course $R_1 \bowtie R_2$.
- Bottom line: optimise after unfolding – save joins.

GAV-sound with conjunctive queries

- Source and global schema as before:
  - source $R_1(A, B), R_2(B, C)$
  - Global schema: $T_1(A, B, C)$, $T_2(B, C)$
- GAV mappings become sound:
  - $T_1 \supseteq \{x, y, z | R_1(x, y) \wedge R_2(y, z)\}$
  - $T_2 \supseteq R_2$
- Let D_{exact} be the unique database that arises from the *exact* setting (with $\supseteq$ replaced by $=$)
- Then every database D_{sound} that satisfies the sound setting also satisfies

$$D_{exact} \quad \subseteq \quad D_{sound}$$

GAV-sound with conjunctive queries cont'd

- Conjunctive queries are monotone:

$$D_1 \subseteq D_2 \quad \Rightarrow \quad Q(D_1) \subseteq Q(D_2)$$

- Exact solution is a sound solution too, and is contained in every sound solution.
- Hence certain answers for each conjunctive query

$$\text{certain}(D, Q) \;=\; \bigcap_{D_{sound}} Q(D_{sound}) \;=\; Q(D_{exact})$$

- The solution for GAV-exact gives us certain asnwers for GAV-sound, for conjunctive (and more generally, monotone) queries.