# **XML Data Exchange**

Marcelo Arenas P. Universidad Católica de Chile

Joint work with Leonid Libkin (U. of Toronto)

## Data Exchange in Relational Databases

- Data exchange has been extensively studied in the relational world.
  - It has also been implemented: Clio.
- Relational data exchange settings:
  - Source and target schemas: Relational schemas.
  - Relationship between source and target schemas: Source-to-target dependencies.
- Semantics of data exchange has been precisely defined.
  - Algorithms for materializing target instances and for answering queries over the target have been developed.

## Outline

- XML data exchange settings.
  - XML source-to-target dependencies.
- Query answering in XML data exchange.
- Final remarks.

## Outline

- XML data exchange settings.
  - XML source-to-target dependencies.
- Query answering in XML data exchange.
- Final remarks.

### **XML Documents**



### XML Documents



 $\begin{array}{cccc} db & \rightarrow & book^+ \\ \text{DTD}: & book & \rightarrow & author^+ \\ & author & \rightarrow & \varepsilon \end{array}$ 

4

### **XML Documents**



# XML Data Exchange Settings

• Source and target schemas are given by DTDs.

• To specify the relationship between the source and the target schemas we use source-to-target dependencies.

To define these dependencies, we use tree patterns ...









Collect tuples (x, y): (Algebra, Hungerford), (Real Analysis, Royden)

### **Tree Patterns**

• Tree patterns: XPath-like language.

- Example: book(@title = x)[author(@name = y)]

 Language also includes wildcard \_ (matching more than one symbol) and descendant operator //.

## XML Source-to-target Dependencies

Source-to-target dependency (STD):

 $\psi_{\mathbf{T}}(\bar{x},\bar{z}) \coloneqq \varphi_{\mathbf{S}}(\bar{x},\bar{y}),$ 

where  $\varphi_{\mathbf{S}}(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  and  $\psi_{\mathbf{T}}(\bar{x}, \bar{z})$  are tree-pattern formulas over the source and target DTDs, resp.

### XML Data Exchange Settings



9

## **Example: Finding Solutions**

Let T be our original tree:



# **Example: Finding Solutions**

#### A solution for *T*:



## Outline

- XML data exchange settings.
  - XML source-to-target dependencies.
- Query answering in XML data exchange.
- Final remarks.

# Query Answering in XML Data Exchange

• Decision to make: What is our query language?

• We start by considering a query language that produces tuples of values.

# **Conjunctive Tree Queries**

• Query language  $CTQ^{//}$  is defined by

$$Q \quad := \quad \varphi \quad | \quad Q \wedge Q \quad | \quad \exists x \, Q,$$

where  $\varphi$  ranges over tree-pattern formulas.

• By disallowing descendant // we obtain restriction CTQ.

### **Example: Conjunctive Tree Query**

List all pairs of authors that have written articles with the same title.



- Given: A source tree T and a conjunctive tree query Q over the target.
- Answer to Q should represent the answer to this query in the space of solutions for T.
- Certain answers semantics:

$$\underline{certain}(Q,T) = \bigcap_{T' \text{ is a solution for } T} Q(T').$$

# **Computing Certain Answers**

We study the following problem.

Given data exchange setting  $(D_{\mathbf{S}}, D_{\mathbf{T}}, \Sigma_{\mathbf{ST}})$  and query Q:

PROBLEM:	CERTAIN-ANSWERS $(Q)$ .
INPUT:	Tree $T$ conforming to $D_{\mathbf{S}}$ and tuple $\overline{a}$ .
QUESTION:	Is $\bar{a} \in \underline{certain}(Q,T)$ ?

## **Computing Certain Answers: General Picture**

**Theorem** For every XML data exchange setting and  $CTQ^{//}$ -query Q, CERTAIN-ANSWERS(Q) is in coNP.

Remark: In terms of the size of the document (data complexity).

**Theorem** There exist an XML data exchange setting and a  $CTQ^{//}$ -query Q such that CERTAIN-ANSWERS(Q) is coNP-hard.

We want to find tractable cases ...

### Computing Certain Answers: Finding Tractable Cases

• To find tractable cases, we have to concentrate on fully-specified STDs:

We impose restrictions on tree patterns over target DTDs:

- no descendant relation //; and
- no wildcard \_; and
- all patterns start at the root.

No restrictions imposed on tree patterns over source DTDs.

• Subsume non-relational data exchange handled by Clio.

From now on, all STDs are fully-specified.

### **Computing Certain Answers: Towards a Classification**

Given a class C of regular expressions and a class Q of queries:

C is tractable for Q if for every data exchange setting in which target DTDs only use regular expressions from C and every Q-query Q, CERTAIN-ANSWERS(Q) is in PTIME.

C is coNP-complete for Q if there is a data exchange setting in which target DTDs only use regular expressions from C and a Q-query Q such that CERTAIN-ANSWERS(Q) is coNP-complete.

Remark (Ladner): If PTIME  $\neq$  NP, there are problems in coNP which are neither tractable nor coNP-complete.

## **Computing Certain Answers: Towards a Classification**

- Our classification is based on classes of regular expressions used in target DTDs.
- They must contain the simplest type of regular expressions:  $(a + b + c)^*$
- Such classes will be called admissible.

# **Computing Certain Answers: Dichotomy**

#### Theorem

- 1) Every admissible class C of regular expressions is either tractable or coNP-complete for  $CTQ^{//}$ .
- 2) For every tractable class: Given a source tree T, one can compute in PTIME a solution  $T^*$  for T such that

<u>certain</u>(Q, T) = remove\_null\_tuples $(Q(T^{\star}))$ .

3) It is decidable whether the regular expressions used in a target DTD belong to a tractable class.

## Outline

- XML data exchange settings.
  - XML source-to-target dependencies.
- Query answering in XML data exchange.
- Final remarks.

### **Final Remarks**

- Dichotomy also holds for unions of conjunctive queries.
- Future work:
  - We would like to consider XML query languages that produce XML trees.

How do we define certain answers?

- The notion of reasonable solutions needs to be investigated further.