

# Join Size Bounds using $\ell_p$ -Norms on Degree Sequences

Mahmoud Abo Khamis  
RelationalAI  
United States

Dan Olteanu  
University of Zurich  
Switzerland

Vasileios Nakos  
RelationalAI & University of Athens  
Greece

Dan Suciu  
University of Washington  
United States

## ABSTRACT

Estimating the output size of a query is a fundamental yet long-standing problem in database query processing. Traditional cardinality estimators used by database systems can routinely underestimate the true output size by orders of magnitude, which leads to significant system performance penalty. Recently, upper bounds have been proposed that are based on information inequalities and incorporate sizes and max-degrees from input relations, yet their main benefit is limited to cyclic queries, because they degenerate to rather trivial formulas on acyclic queries.

We introduce a significant extension of the upper bounds, by incorporating  $\ell_p$ -norms of the degree sequences of join attributes. Our bounds are significantly lower than previously known bounds, even when applied to acyclic queries. These bounds are also based on information theory, they come with a matching query evaluation algorithm, are computable in exponential time in the query size, and are provably tight when all degrees are “simple”.

## KEYWORDS

query output cardinality, degree sequence, worst-case optimal join

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Cardinality estimation is a central yet longstanding open problem in database systems. It allows query optimizers to select a query plan that minimizes the size of the intermediate results and therefore the necessary time and memory to compute the query. Yet traditional estimators present in virtually all database management systems routinely underestimate the true cardinality by orders of magnitude, which can lead to inefficient query plans [12, 18, 22].

The past two decades introduced *worst-case upper bounds* on the output size of a join query. The first such bound is the *AGM bound*, which is a function of the sizes of the input tables [1]. It was further refined in the presence of functional dependencies [11, 16]. A more general bound is the *PANDA bound*, which is a function of both the sizes of the input tables and the max degrees of attributes in these tables [17]. These are powerful methods as they can be applied to arbitrary joins and compute *provable* upper bounds on the query output size, unlike traditional cardinality estimators which often severely underestimate the query output size [21].

However, these theoretical bounds have not had practical impact. One reason is that most queries in practice are acyclic queries, where upper bounds become trivial: they simply multiply the size of one relation with the *maximum* degrees of the joining relations. This is not new for a practitioner: standard estimators do the same, but use the *average* degrees instead of the max degrees. A second, related reason, is that they use essentially the same statistics as

existing cardinality estimators: cardinalities and max or average degrees. There have been a few implementations under the name *pessimistic cardinality estimators* [3, 13], but their empirical evaluation showed that they remain less accurate than other estimators [5, 12].

In this paper we introduce new upper bounds on the query output size that use  $\ell_p$ -norms of degree sequences. The *degree sequence* of a graph is the sorted list of the degrees of the nodes,  $d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \dots$ , where  $d_1$  the largest degree,  $d_2$  the next largest, etc. The  $\ell_p$ -norm of a degree sequence is defined as  $(d_1^p + d_2^p + \dots)^{1/p}$ . Our method computes an upper bound in terms of  $\ell_p$ -norms of the degree sequences of the join columns; to the best of our knowledge, these are the first upper bounds that use arbitrary  $\ell_p$ -norms on the relations. They strictly generalize previous bounds based on cardinalities and max-degrees [17], because the  $\ell_1$ -norm of an attribute  $RA$  is the size  $\sum_i d_i$  of  $R$ , and the  $\ell_\infty$ -norm is the max degree  $d_1$  of  $A$ . However, our method can use any other norm, which leads to a much tighter upper bound. We follow the standard assumption in cardinality estimation, and assume that several  $\ell_p$ -norms are pre-computed, and available during cardinality estimation.

Like the AGM [1] and the PANDA [17] bounds, our method relies on information inequalities. The computed bound is the optimal solution of a linear program, and can be computed in time exponential in the size of the query. Our method applies to arbitrary join queries (cyclic or not), but, unlike AGM and PANDA, it leads to completely new bounds even for acyclic queries, and uses new kinds of statistics, which makes it more likely for these theoretical bounds to have impact in practical scenarios.

### 1.1 A Motivating Example

The standard illustration for size upper bounds is the triangle query:

$$Q(X, Y, Z) = R(X, Y) \wedge S(Y, Z) \wedge T(Z, X), \quad (1)$$

for which the AGM bound [1] (based on the  $\ell_1$ -norm) is:

$$|Q| \leq (|R| \cdot |S| \cdot |T|)^{1/2} \quad (2)$$

and the PANDA bound [17] (based on the  $\ell_1$  and  $\ell_\infty$  norms) is:

$$|Q| \leq |R| \cdot \|\text{deg}_S(Z|Y)\|_\infty \quad (3)$$

where  $\text{deg}_S(Z|Y) = (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_m)$  is the degree sequence of  $Y$  in  $S$ , more precisely  $d_i$  is the frequency of the  $i$ 'th most frequent value  $Y = y$ . If the  $\ell_2$ - and  $\ell_3$ -norms of the degree sequences are

also available, then we can derive new upper bounds, for example:

$$|Q| \leq \left( \|\text{deg}_R(Y|X)\|_2^2 \cdot \|\text{deg}_S(Z|Y)\|_2^2 \cdot \|\text{deg}_T(X|Z)\|_2^2 \right)^{1/3} \quad (4)$$

$$|Q| \leq \left( \|\text{deg}_R(Y|X)\|_3^3 \cdot \|\text{deg}_S(Y|Z)\|_3^3 \cdot |T|^5 \right)^{1/6} \quad (5)$$

Assuming the  $\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3, \ell_\infty$  norms are precomputed, then all formulas above give us upper bounds on the query output size, and we can take the minimal one; which one is the smallest depends on the actual data.

## 1.2 Problem Definition

Before we define the problem investigated in this paper, we introduce the class of queries and the statistics under consideration.

For a number  $n$ , let  $[n] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . We use upper case  $X$  for variable names, and lower case  $x$  for values of these variables. We use boldface for sets of variables, e.g.,  $\mathbf{X}$ , and of constants, e.g.,  $\mathbf{x}$ .

A full conjunctive (or join) query is defined by:

$$Q(\mathbf{X}) = \bigwedge_{j \in [m]} R_j(Y_j) \quad (6)$$

where  $Y_j$  is the tuple of variables in  $R_j$  and  $\mathbf{X} = \bigcup_{j \in [m]} Y_j$  is the set of  $n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\mathbf{X}|$  variables in the query  $Q$ .

For a relation  $S$  and subsets  $U, V$  of its attributes, let  $\text{deg}_S(V|U)$  be the degree sequence of  $U$  in the projection  $\Pi_{UV}S$ . Formally, let  $G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\Pi_U(S), \Pi_V(S), E)$  be the bipartite graph whose edges  $E$  are all pairs  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in \Pi_{UV}(S)$ . Then  $\text{deg}_S(V|U) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_m)$  is the degree sequence of the  $U$ -nodes of the graph.

Fix  $X$  a set of variables. An *abstract conditional*, or simply *conditional*, is an expression of the form  $\sigma = (V|U)$ . We say that  $\sigma$  is *guarded* by a relation  $R(Y)$  if  $U, V \subseteq Y$ ; then we write  $\text{deg}_R(\sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{deg}_R(V|U)$ . An *abstract statistics* is a pair  $\tau = (\sigma, p)$ , where  $p \in (0, \infty]$ . If  $B \geq 1$  is a real number, then we call the pair  $(\tau, B)$  a *concrete statistics*, and call  $(\tau, b)$ , where  $b \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \log B$ , a *concrete log-statistics*. If  $R$  is a relation guarding  $\sigma$ , then we say that  $R$  *satisfies*  $(\tau, B)$  if  $\|\text{deg}_R(\sigma)\|_p \leq B$ . When  $p = 1$  then the statistics is a cardinality assertion on  $|\Pi_{UV}(R)|$ , and when  $p = \infty$  then it is an assertion on the maximum degree. We write  $\Sigma = \{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_s\}$  for a set of abstract statistics, and  $\mathbf{B} = \{B_1, \dots, B_s\}$  for an associated set of real numbers; thus, every pair  $(\tau_i, B_i)$  is a concrete statistics. We will call the pair  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{B})$  a *set of (concrete) statistics*, and call  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{b})$ , where  $b_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \log B_i$ , a set of concrete *log-statistics*. We say that  $\Sigma$  is guarded by a relational schema  $\mathbf{R} = (R_1, \dots, R_m)$  if every  $\tau_i \in \Sigma$  has a guard  $R_{j_i}$ , and we say that a database instance  $\mathbf{D} = (R_1^D, \dots, R_m^D)$  satisfies the statistics  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{B})$ , denoted by  $\mathbf{D} \models (\Sigma, \mathbf{B})$ , if  $\|\text{deg}_{R_{j_i}^D}(\sigma)\|_{p_i} \leq B_{\tau_i}$  for all  $\tau_i = (\sigma_i, p_i) \in \Sigma$ , where  $R_{j_i}$  is the guard of  $\sigma_i$ . We can now state the problem investigated in this paper:

**PROBLEM 1.** *Given a join query  $Q$  and a set of statistics  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{B})$  guarded by the (schema of the) query  $Q$ , find a bound  $U \in \mathbb{R}$  such that for all database instances  $\mathbf{D}$ , if  $\mathbf{D} \models (\Sigma, \mathbf{B})$ , then  $|Q(\mathbf{D})| \leq U$ .*

The bound  $U$  is *tight*, if there exists a database instance  $\mathbf{D}$  such that  $\mathbf{D} \models (\Sigma, \mathbf{B})$  and  $U = O(|Q(\mathbf{D})|)$ .

## 1.3 Main Results

We solve Problem 1 for arbitrary join queries  $Q$ , databases  $\mathbf{D}$  with relations of arbitrary arities, and statistics  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{B})$  consisting of arbitrary  $\ell_p$ -norms of degree sequences. We make the following contributions.

*Contribution 1:  $\ell_p$  Bounds on Query Output Size.* Our key observation is that the concrete statistics  $\|\text{deg}(V|U)\|_p \leq B$  implies the following inequality in information theory:

$$\frac{1}{p} h(U) + h(V|U) \leq \log B \quad (7)$$

where  $h$  is the entropy of some probability distribution on  $R$  (reviewed in Sec. 3). Using (7) we prove the following general upper bound on the size of the query's output:

**THEOREM 1.1.** *Let  $Q$  be a full conjunctive query (6),  $U_i, V_i \subseteq X$  be sets of variables, for  $i \in [s]$ , and suppose that the following information inequality is valid for all entropic vectors  $\mathbf{h}$  with variables  $X$ :*

$$\sum_{i \in [s]} w_i \left( \frac{1}{p_i} h(U_i) + h(V_i|U_i) \right) \geq h(X) \quad (8)$$

where  $w_i \geq 0$ , and  $p_i \in (0, \infty]$ , for all  $i \in [s]$ . Assume that each conditional  $(V_i|U_i)$  in (8) is guarded by some relation  $R_{j_i}$  in  $Q$ . Then, for any database instance  $\mathbf{D} = (R_1^D, R_2^D, \dots)$ , the following upper bound holds on the query output size:

$$|Q(\mathbf{D})| \leq \prod_{i \in [s]} \|\text{deg}_{R_{j_i}^D}(V_i|U_i)\|_{p_i}^{w_i} \quad (9)$$

We prove the theorem in Sec. 4. Thus, one approach to find an upper bound on the query output is to find an inequality of the form (8), prove it using Shannon inequalities, then conclude that (9) holds. For example, the bounds (4)-(5) stated in our motivating example follow from the following inequalities:

$$(h(X) + 2h(Y|X)) + (h(Y) + 2h(Z|Y)) + (h(Z) + 2h(X|Z)) \geq 3h(XYZ) \quad (10)$$

$$(h(X) + 3h(Y|X)) + (h(Z) + 3h(Y|Z)) + 5h(XZ) \geq 6h(XYZ) \quad (11)$$

These can be proven by observing that they are sums of basic Shannon inequalities (reviewed in Sec. 3):

$$\text{Eq. (10) is sum of } \begin{cases} h(X) + h(Y|X) + h(Z|Y) \geq h(XYZ) \\ h(Y) + h(Z|Y) + h(X|Z) \geq h(XYZ) \\ h(Z) + h(X|Z) + h(Y|X) \geq h(XYZ) \end{cases}$$

$$\text{Eq. (11) is sum of } \begin{cases} 2h(XZ) + 2h(Y|X) \geq 2h(XYZ) \\ 2h(XZ) + 2h(Y|Z) \geq 2h(XYZ) \\ h(X) + h(Y|X) + h(Z) \geq h(XYZ) \\ h(Y|Z) + h(XZ) \geq h(XYZ) \end{cases}$$

*Contribution 2: Asymptotically Tighter Cardinality Upper Bounds.* The AGM and PANDA's bounds also rely on an information inequality, but use only  $\ell_1$  and  $\ell_\infty$ . Our novelty is the extension to  $\ell_p$  norms. We show in Sec. 2.1 that this leads to significantly better bounds. Quite suprisingly, we are able to improve significantly the bounds even for acyclic queries, and even for a single join.

Preliminary experiments (Appendix C) with cyclic queries on the SNAP graph datasets [23] and with acyclic queries on the JOB benchmark [21] show that the upper bounds based on  $\ell_p$ -norms can be orders of magnitude closer to the true cardinalities than the traditional cardinality estimators (e.g., used by DuckDB) and the theoretical upper bounds based on the  $\ell_1$  and  $\ell_\infty$  norms only. To achieve the best upper bound with our method, a variety of norms are used in the experiments.

*Contribution 3: New Algorithm Meeting the New Bounds.* The celebrated Worst Case Optimal Join algorithm runs in time bounded by the AGM bound [24, 25]. A more complex algorithm [17] runs in time bounded by the PANDA bound. In Sec. 2.2 we describe an algorithm that runs in time bounded by our new  $\ell_p$ -bounds. Any such algorithm must include PANDA’s as a special case, because our bounds strictly generalize PANDA’s. Our new algorithm in Sec. 2.2 consists of reducing the general case to PANDA. We do this by repeatedly partitioning each relation  $R$  such that a constraint on  $\|\text{deg}_R(V|U)\|_p$  can be replaced by two constraints, on  $\|\Pi_U(R)\|$  and  $\|\text{deg}_R(V|U)\|_\infty$ . The original query becomes a union of queries, one per combination of parts of different relations. The algorithm then evaluates each of these queries using PANDA’s algorithm.

*Contribution 4: Computing the bounds.* One way to describe the solution to Problem 1 is as follows. Consider a set of statistics  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{B})$ . Any valid information inequality (8) implies some bound on the query output size, namely  $|Q| \leq \prod_{i \in [s]} B_{j_i}^{w_i}$ . The best bound is their *minimum*, over all valid inequalities (8); we denote the log of this minimum by *Log-U-Bound*. This describes the solution to Problem 1 as a minimization problem. This approach is impractical, because the number of valid inequalities is infinite. In Sec. 5 we describe an alternative, dual characterization of the upper bound, as a maximization problem, by considering the following quantity:

$$\text{Log-L-Bound} = \sup_{\mathbf{h} \models (\Sigma, \mathbf{b})} h(X) \quad (12)$$

where  $X$  is the set of all variables in the query  $Q$ , and  $\mathbf{h}$  is required to “satisfy” the concrete log-statistics  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{b})$ , meaning that inequality (7) is satisfied for every statistics in  $\Sigma$ . Equation (12) defines a *maximization* problem. Our fourth contribution is:

**THEOREM 1.2 (INFORMAL).** *If  $\mathbf{h}$  ranges over the same closed, convex cone  $K$  in both (8) and (12), then  $\text{Log-U-Bound} = \text{Log-L-Bound}$ .*

We explain the theorem.  $K$  is used implicitly in (8) to define when the inequality is *valid*, namely when it holds  $\forall \mathbf{h} \in K$ , and also in (12), as the range of  $\mathbf{h}$ . The theorem says that, if  $K$  is topologically closed and convex, then the two quantities coincide. The special case of the theorem when  $K \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Gamma_n$  is the set of *polymatroids* and (8) are the Shannon inequalities appeared implicitly in [17]; the general statement is new, and it includes the non-trivial case when  $K \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Gamma_n^*$  is the closure of entropic vectors and (8) are all entropic inequalities. To indicate which cone was used, we will use the subscript  $K$  in (12). Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 and the fact that  $\Gamma_n^* \subseteq \Gamma_n$  imply:

$$\log |Q| \leq \text{Log-U-Bound}_{\Gamma_n^*} \leq \text{Log-U-Bound}_{\Gamma_n} \quad (13)$$

Theorem 1.2 has two important applications. First, it gives us an effective method for solving Problem 1, when (8) are restricted to Shannon inequalities, because in that case (12) is the optimal value of a linear program. Second, it allows us to study the tightness of the bound, by taking a deeper look at (13). We prove (Appendix D.2) that the *entropic bound*,  $\text{Log-U-Bound}_{\Gamma_n^*}$ , is asymptotically tight (which is a weaker notion than tightness), while, in general, the *polymatroid bound*,  $\text{Log-U-Bound}_{\Gamma_n}$ , is not even asymptotically tight.

*Contribution 5: Simple degree sequences.* The tightness analysis leaves us with a dilemma: the entropic bound is tight but not computable, while the polymatroid bound is computable but not tight. We reconcile them in Sec. 6: For *simple degree sequences*, the two bounds coincide, i.e., they become equal. A degree sequence  $\text{deg}_R(V|U)$  is *simple* if  $|U| \leq 1$ . Moreover, in this case the bound is tight, in our usual sense: there exists a database  $D$  such that the size of the query output is  $|Q(D)| \geq c \cdot 2^{\text{Log-U-Bound}_{\Gamma_n}}$ , where  $c$  is a constant that depends only on the query  $Q$ . The database  $D$  can be restricted to have a special form, called a *normal database*.

*Closely related work.* Jayaraman et al. [14] present a new algorithm for evaluating a query  $Q$  and prove a runtime in terms of  $\ell_p$ -norms on degree sequences. Their result is limited to binary relations (thus all degrees are simple), to a single value  $p$  for a given query, and to queries with girth  $\geq p + 1$ . (The girth is the length of the minimal cycle.) While their work concerns only the algorithm, not a bound on the output, one can derive a bound from the runtime of the algorithm, since the output size cannot exceed the runtime. In Appendix B we describe their bound explicitly, and show that it is a special case of our inequality (8). For example, for the triangle query (1) their runtime is (4), but they cannot derive (5), because the query graph has girth 3, hence they cannot use  $\ell_3$ . The authors also notice that the worst-case instance is not always a product database, as in the AGM bound, but don’t characterize it: our paper shows that this is always a *normal database*.

The Degree Sequence Bound (DSB) [6] is a tight upper bound of a query  $Q$  in terms of the degree sequences of its join attributes. The query  $Q$  is restricted to be Berge-acyclic, which also implies that all degree sequences are simple. There exists a 1-to-1 mapping between a degree sequence  $d_1 \geq \dots \geq d_m$  and its first  $m$  norms  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_m$  (see Appendix A), therefore the DSB and our new bound could have access to the same information. Somewhat surprisingly, the DSB bound can be asymptotically better: the reason is that the 1-to-1 mapping is monotone only in one direction. We describe this analysis in Appendix C.3. In practice, both methods have access to fewer statistics than  $m$ : the DSB bound uses lossy compression [7], while our bound will have access to only a few  $\ell_p$ -norms, making the two methods incomparable.

## 2 APPLICATIONS

Before we present the technical details of our results, we discuss two applications: cardinality estimation and query evaluation.

## 2.1 Cardinality Estimation

Our main intended application of Theorem 1.1 is for pessimistic cardinality estimation: given a query and statistics on the database, compute an upper bound on the query output size. A bound is good if it is as small as possible, i.e. as close as possible to the true output size. We follow the common assumption in cardinality estimation that the statistics are precomputed<sup>1</sup> and available at estimation time. For example the system may have precomputed the  $\ell_2, \ell_5, \ell_\infty$ -norms of  $\deg_R(Y|X)$  and the  $\ell_1, \ell_{10}$ -norms of  $\deg_S(Z|Y)$ . We give several examples of upper bounds of the form (9) that improve significantly previously known bounds. For presentation purposes we describe all bounds in this section using (9). A system would instead rely on (12), i.e. it will compute the numerical value of the upper bound by optimizing a linear program, as we explain in Sec. 5. To reduce clutter, in this section we abbreviate  $|Q(D)|$  with  $|Q|$ , and drop the superscript  $D$  from an instance  $R^D$  when no confusion arises.

EXAMPLE 2.1. *As a warmup we start with a single join:*

$$Q(X, Y, Z) = R(X, Y) \wedge S(Y, Z) \quad (14)$$

Traditional cardinality estimators (as found in textbooks [26], see also [21]) use the formula

$$|Q| \approx \frac{|R| \cdot |S|}{\max(|\Pi_Y(R)|, |\Pi_Y(S)|)} \quad (15)$$

Since  $\frac{|R|}{|\Pi_Y(R)|}$  is the average degree of  $R(X|Y)$ , (15) is equivalent to

$$|Q| \approx \min(|S| \cdot \text{avg}(\deg_R(X|Y)), |R| \cdot \text{avg}(\deg_S(Z|Y))) \quad (16)$$

Turning our attention to upper bounds, we note that the AGM bound is  $|R| \cdot |S|$ . A better bound is the PANDA bound, which replaces  $\text{avg}$  with  $\max$  in (16):

$$|Q| \leq \min(|S| \cdot \|\deg_R(X|Y)\|_\infty, |R| \cdot \|\deg_S(Z|Y)\|_\infty) \quad (17)$$

Our framework derives several new upper bounds, by using  $\ell_p$ -statistics other than  $\ell_1$  and  $\ell_\infty$ . We start with the simplest:

$$|Q| \leq \|\deg_R(X|Y)\|_2 \cdot \|\deg_S(Z|Y)\|_2 \quad (18)$$

The reader may notice that this inequality is Cauchy-Schwartz, but, in the framework of Th. 1.1, it follows from a Shannon inequality:

$$\frac{1}{2} (h(Y) + 2h(X|Y)) + \frac{1}{2} (h(Y) + 2h(Z|Y)) \geq h(XYZ)$$

The inequality can be simplified to  $h(Y) + h(X|Y) + h(Z|Y) \geq h(XYZ)$ , which holds because  $h(Y) + h(X|Y) = h(XY)$ ,  $h(Z|Y) \geq h(Z|XY)$ , and  $h(XY) + h(Z|XY) = h(XYZ)$ ; we review Shannon inequalities in Sec. 3. Depending on the data, (18) can be asymptotically better than (17). A simple example where this happens is when  $Q$  is a self-join, i.e.  $R(X, Y) \wedge R(Z, Y)$ . Then, the two degree sequences are equal,  $\deg_R(X|Y) = \deg_R(Z|Y)$ , and (18) becomes an equality, because  $|Q| = \|\deg_R(X|Y)\|_2^2$ . Thus, (18) is exactly  $|Q|$ , while (17) continues to be an over approximation of  $|Q|$ , and can be asymptotically worse (see Appendix C.3).

<sup>1</sup>It takes  $O(N \log N)$  time to compute the degree sequence of an attribute  $X$  of a relation  $R$  of size  $N$ : sort  $R$  by  $X$ , group-by  $X$ , count, then sort again by the count.

A more sophisticated inequality for the join query is the following, which holds for all  $p, q \geq 0$  s.t.  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} \leq 1$ :

$$|Q| \leq \|\deg_R(X|Y)\|_p \cdot \|\deg_S(Z|Y)\|_q^{\frac{q}{p(q-1)}} |S|^{1 - \frac{q}{p(q-1)}} \quad (19)$$

Depending on the concrete statistics on the data, this new bound can be much better than both (17) and (18). We prove this bound in Appendix C.3, where we also use this bound to study the connection between our  $\ell_p$ -bounds on the Degree Sequence Bound in [6].

The new bounds (18)-(19) are just two examples, and other inequalities exist. In Appendix C.1 we provide some empirical evidence showing that, even for a single join, these new formulas indeed give better bounds on real data.

EXAMPLE 2.2. *In real applications most queries are acyclic. In Appendix C.2 we conducted some preliminary empirical evaluation on the JOB benchmark consisting of 33 acyclic queries over the IMDB real dataset, and found that the new  $\ell_p$ -bounds are significantly better than both traditional estimators (e.g., used by DuckDB) and pessimistic estimators (AGM, PANDA). We give here a taste of how such a bound might look for a path query of length  $n \geq 3$ :*

$$Q(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \bigwedge_{i \in [n-1]} R_i(X_i, X_{i+1})$$

Traditional cardinality estimators apply (15) repeatedly; similarly PANDA relies on a straightforward extension of (17). Our new approach leads, for example, to:

$$|Q|^p \leq |R_1|^{p-2} \cdot \|\deg_{R_2}(X_1|X_2)\|_2^2 \cdot \prod_{i=2, n-2} \|\deg_{R_i}(X_{i+1}|X_i)\|_{p-1}^{p-1} \cdot \|\deg_{R_{n-1}}(X_n|X_{n-1})\|_p^p$$

This bound holds for any  $p \geq 2$ , because of the following Shannon inequality (proven in Appendix C.4):

$$(p-2)h(X_1X_2) + (h(X_2) + 2h(X_1|X_2)) + \sum_{i=2, n-2} (h(X_i) + (p-1)h(X_{i+1}|X_i)) + (h(X_{n-1}) + ph(X_n|X_{n-1})) \geq ph(X_1 \dots X_n) \quad (20)$$

We illustrate several other bounds for the path query in Appendix C.4. To our surprise, when we conducted our empirical evaluation in Appendix C.2, we found that the system used  $\ell_p$ -norms from a wide range,  $p \in \{1, 2, \dots, 29, \infty\}$ . This shows the utility of having a large variety of  $\ell_p$ -norm statistics for the purpose of cardinality estimation. It also raises a theoretical question: is it the case that, for every  $p$ , there exists a query/database, for which the optimal bound uses the  $\ell_p$ -norm? We answer this positively next.

EXAMPLE 2.3. *For every  $p$ , there exists a query and a database instance where the  $\ell_p$ -norm on degree sequences leads to the best upper bound. Consider the cycle query of length  $p+1$ :*

$$Q(X_0, \dots, X_p) = R_0(X_0, X_1) \wedge \dots \wedge R_{p-1}(X_{p-1}, X_p) \wedge R_p(X_p, X_0)$$

For every  $q \in [p]$ , the following is an upper bound (generalizing (4)):

$$|Q| \leq \prod_{i=0, p} \|\deg_{R_i}(X_{(i+1) \bmod (p+1)}|X_i)\|_q^{\frac{q}{q+1}} \quad (21)$$

The bound follows from a Shannon inequality, which we defer to Appendix C.5. In the same appendix we also prove that, for any  $p$ , there

exists a database instance where the bound (21) for  $q := p$  is the theoretically optimal bound that one can obtain by using the statistics on all  $\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_p, \ell_\infty$ -norms of all degree sequences.

## 2.2 Query Evaluation

The second application is to query evaluation: we show that, if inequality (8) holds for all polymatroids, then we can evaluate the query in time bounded by (9) times a polylogarithmic factor in the data and an exponential factor in the sum of the  $p$  values of the statistics. Our algorithm generalizes the PANDA's algorithm [17] from  $\ell_1$  and  $\ell_\infty$  norms to arbitrary norms. Recall that PANDA starts from an inequality of the form (8), where every  $p_i$  is either 1 or  $\infty$ , and computes  $Q(D)$  in time  $O\left(\prod_i B_i^{w_i}\right)$  if the database satisfies  $|\Pi_{U_i} V_i(R_{j_i})| \leq B_i$  when  $p_i = 1$  and  $\|\text{deg}_{R_{j_i}}(V_i|U_i)\|_\infty \leq B_i$  when  $p_i = \infty$ .

Our algorithm uses PANDA as a black box, as follows. It first partitions the relations on the join columns so that, within each partition, all degrees are within a factor of two, and each statistics defined by some  $\ell_p$ -norm on the degree sequence of the join column can be expressed alternatively using only  $\ell_1$  and  $\ell_\infty$ . The original query becomes a union of queries, one per combination of parts of different relations. The algorithm then evaluates each of these queries using PANDA. We describe next the details of data partitioning and the reduction to PANDA.

Consider a relation  $R$  with attributes  $X$ , and consider a concrete statistics  $(\tau, B)$ , where  $\tau = ((V|U), p)$ . We say that  $R$  strongly satisfies  $(\tau, B)$ , in notation  $R \models_s (\tau, B)$ , if there exists a number  $d > 0$  such that  $\|\text{deg}_R(V|U)\|_\infty \leq d$  and  $|\Pi_U(R)| \leq B^p/d^p$ . If  $R \models_s (\tau, B)$  then  $R \models (\tau, B)$  because:

$$\|\text{deg}_R(V|U)\|_p^p \leq |\Pi_U(R)| \cdot \|\text{deg}_R(V|U)\|_\infty^p \leq \frac{B^p}{d^p} d^p = B^p \quad (22)$$

In other words,  $R$  strongly satisfies the  $\ell_p$  statistics  $(\tau, B)$  if it satisfies an  $\ell_1$  and an  $\ell_\infty$  statistics that imply  $(\tau, B)$ . We prove:

**LEMMA 2.4.** *Fix a join query  $Q$ , and suppose that inequality (8) holds for all polymatroids. Let  $\Sigma = \{(V_i|U_i, p_i) \mid i \in [s]\}$  be the abstract statistics and  $w_i \geq 0$  be the coefficients in (8). If a database  $D$  strongly satisfies the concrete statistics  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{B})$ , then the query output  $Q(D)$  can be computed in time  $O\left(\prod_{i \in [s]} B_i^{w_i} \text{polylog } N\right)$ , where  $N$  is the size of the active domain of  $D$ .*

**PROOF.** Since  $D$  strongly satisfies the concrete statistics  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{B})$ , we can use (22) and replace each  $\ell_p$ -statistics with an  $\ell_1$  and an  $\ell_\infty$  statistics. We write  $B_i$  as  $B_i = B_{i,1}^{\frac{1}{p_i}} \cdot B_{i,\infty}$ , such that both  $|\Pi_{U_i}(R_{j_i}^D)| \leq B_{i,1}$  and  $\|\text{deg}_{R_{j_i}}(V|U)\|_\infty \leq B_{i,\infty}$  hold. Expand the inequality (8) to  $\sum_i \frac{w_i}{p_i} h(U_i) + \sum_i w_i h(V_i|U_i) \leq h(X)$ . This can be viewed as an inequality of the form (8) with  $2s$  terms, where half of the terms have  $p_i = 1$  and the others have  $p_i = \infty$ . Therefore, PANDA's algorithm can use this inequality and run in time: and

$$O\left(\prod_{i \in [s]} B_{i,1}^{\frac{w_i}{p_i}} \cdot \prod_{i \in [s]} B_{i,\infty}^{w_i} \cdot \text{polylog } N\right) = O\left(\prod_{i \in [s]} B_i^{w_i} \text{polylog } N\right) \quad \square$$

In order to use the lemma, we prove the following:

**LEMMA 2.5.** *Let  $R$  be a relation that satisfies an  $\ell_p$ -statistics,  $R \models ((V|U), p, B)$ . Then we can partition  $R$  into  $\lceil 2^p \rceil \log N$  disjoint relations,  $R = R_1 \cup R_2 \cup \dots$ , such that each  $R_i$  strongly satisfies the  $\ell_p$ -statistics,  $R_i \models_s (((V|U), p), B)$ .*

**PROOF.** By assumption,  $\|\text{deg}_R V|U\|_p^p \leq B^p$ . First, partition  $R$  into  $\log N$  buckets  $R_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, \lceil \log N \rceil$ , where  $R_i$  contains the tuples  $t$  whose  $U$ -component  $u$  satisfies:

$$2^{i-1} \leq \text{deg}_R(V|U = u) = \text{deg}_{R_i}(V|U = u) \leq 2^i$$

Then  $|\Pi_U(R_i)| \leq B^p/2^{p(i-1)}$ , because:

$$B^p \geq \|\text{deg}_R(V|U)\|_p^p \geq \|\text{deg}_{R_i}(V|U)\|_p^p \geq |\Pi_U(R_i)| \cdot 2^{p(i-1)}$$

Second, partition  $R_i$  into  $\lceil 2^p \rceil$  sets  $R_{i,1}, R_{i,2}, \dots$  such that  $|\Pi_U(R_i)| \leq B^p/2^{p^i}$ . Then, each  $R_{i,j}$  strongly satisfies the concrete statistics  $(((V|U), p), B)$ , and their union is  $R$ .  $\square$

Our discussion implies:

**THEOREM 2.6.** *There exists an algorithm that, given a join query  $Q$ , an inequality (8) that holds for all polymatroids, and a database  $D$  satisfying the concrete statistics  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{B})$ , computes the query output  $Q(D)$  in time  $O\left(c \cdot \prod_{i \in [s]} B_i^{w_i} \text{polylog } N\right)$ ; here  $c = \prod_{i \in [s]} \lceil 2^{p_i} \rceil$ , where  $p_1, \dots, p_s$  are the norms occurring in  $\Sigma$ .*

**PROOF.** Using Lemma 2.5, for each  $\ell_{p_i}$ -norm, we partition  $D$  into a union of  $2^{p_i}$  databases  $D_1 \cup D_2 \cup \dots$ , where each  $D_j$  strongly satisfies  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{B})$ . Resolving  $s$  such norms like this partitions  $D$  into  $c$  parts. We then apply Lemma 2.4 to each part.  $\square$

## 3 BACKGROUND ON INFORMATION THEORY

Consider a finite probability space  $(D, P)$ , where  $P : D \rightarrow [0, 1]$ ,  $\sum_{x \in D} P(x) = 1$ , and denote by  $X$  the random variable with outcomes in  $D$ . The entropy of  $X$  is:

$$H(X) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} - \sum_{x \in D} P(x) \log P(x) \quad (23)$$

If  $N \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |D|$ , then  $0 \leq H(X) \leq \log N$ , the equality  $H(X) = 0$  holds iff  $X$  is deterministic, and  $H(X) = \log N$  holds iff  $X$  is uniformly distributed. Given  $n$  jointly distributed random variables  $X = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ , we denote by  $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{2^{[n]}}$  the following vector:  $\mathbf{h}_\alpha \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} H(X_\alpha)$  for  $\alpha \subseteq [n]$ , where  $X_\alpha$  is the joint random variable  $(X_i)_{i \in \alpha}$ , and  $H(X_\alpha)$  is its entropy; such a vector  $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{2^{[n]}}$  is called *entropic*. We will blur the distinction between a vector in  $\mathbb{R}_+^{2^X}$ , a vector in  $\mathbb{R}_+^{2^X}$ , and a function  $2^X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ , and write interchangeably  $\mathbf{h}_\alpha$ ,  $\mathbf{h}_{X_\alpha}$ , or  $h(X_\alpha)$ . A *polymatroid* is a vector  $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{2^{[n]}}$  that satisfies the following *basic Shannon inequalities*:

$$h(\emptyset) = 0 \quad (24)$$

$$h(U \cup V) \geq h(U) \quad (25)$$

$$h(U) + h(V) \geq h(U \cup V) + h(U \cap V) \quad (26)$$

The last two inequalities are called *monotonicity* and *submodularity* respectively.

For any set  $V \subseteq \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ , the *step function*  $\mathbf{h}^V$  is:

$$h^V(U) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } V \cap U \neq \emptyset \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

There are  $2^n - 1$  non-zero step functions (since  $\mathbf{h}^\emptyset \equiv 0$ ). A *normal polymatroid* is a positive linear combination of step functions. When  $V$  is a singleton set,  $V = \{X_i\}$  for some  $i = 1, n$ , then we call  $\mathbf{h}^{X_i}$  a *basic modular function*. A *modular function* is a positive linear combination of  $\mathbf{h}^{X_1}, \dots, \mathbf{h}^{X_n}$ . The following notations are used in the literature:  $M_n$  is the set of modular functions,  $N_n$  is the set of normal polymatroids,  $\Gamma_n^*$  is the set of entropic vectors,  $\bar{\Gamma}_n^*$  is its topological closure, and  $\Gamma_n$  is the set of polymatroids. It is known that  $M_n \subset N_n \subset \Gamma_n^* \subset \bar{\Gamma}_n^* \subset \Gamma_n \subset \mathbb{R}_+^{2^{[n]}}$ , that  $M_n, N_n, \Gamma_n$  are polyhedral cones,  $\bar{\Gamma}_n^*$  is a closed, convex cone, and  $\Gamma_n^*$  is not a cone.<sup>2</sup>

The *conditional* of a vector  $\mathbf{h}$  is defined as:

$$h(V|U) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} h(UV) - h(U)$$

where  $U, V \subseteq X$ . If  $\mathbf{h}$  is a polymatroid, then  $h(V|U) \geq 0$ . If  $\mathbf{h}$  is entropic and realized by some probability distribution, then:

$$h(V|U) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}[h(V|U = \mathbf{u})] \quad (28)$$

where  $h(V|U = \mathbf{u})$  is the standard entropy of the random variable  $V$  conditioned on  $U = \mathbf{u}$ .

An *information inequality* is a linear inequality of the form:

$$\mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{h} \geq 0 \quad (29)$$

where  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^{2^{[n]}}$ . Give a set  $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^{2^{[n]}}$ , we say that the inequality is *valid for K* if it holds for all  $\mathbf{h} \in K$ ; in that case we write  $K \models \mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{h} \geq 0$ . *Entropic inequalities* are those valid for  $\Gamma_n^*$  or, equivalently, for  $\bar{\Gamma}_n^*$ ; it is an open problem whether they are decidable. *Shannon inequalities* are those valid for  $\Gamma_n$  and are decidable in exponential time.

## 4 PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1, by showing that the information inequality (8) implies an upper bound on the query output size. The crux of the proof is inequality (7), which we prove below in Lemma 4.1. It establishes a new connection between information measures and the  $\ell_p$ -norm, Eq. (32) below.

We briefly review connections that are known between database statistics and information measures. Let  $R$  be a relation instance with attributes  $X$  and with  $N$  tuples. Let  $P : R \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be any probability distribution whose outcome consists of the tuples in  $R$ , in particular  $\sum_{t \in R} P(t) = 1$ , and let  $h : 2^X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  be its entropic vector. The following two inequalities connect  $\mathbf{h}$  to statistics on  $R$ :

$$\forall V \subseteq X : \quad h(V) \leq \log |\Pi_V(R)| \quad (30)$$

$$\forall U, V \subseteq X : \quad h(V|U) \leq \log \|\text{deg}_R(V|U)\|_\infty \quad (31)$$

Eq. (31) follows from (30), from the fact that, for all  $\mathbf{u} \in \Pi_U(R)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} h(V|U = \mathbf{u}) &\leq \log \text{deg}_R(V|U = \mathbf{u}) \leq \log \max_{\mathbf{u}'} \text{deg}_R(V|U = \mathbf{u}') \\ &= \log \|\text{deg}_R(V|U)\|_\infty \end{aligned}$$

and from (28). In addition to these two connections, Lee [20] also proved a connection between conditional mutual information and

<sup>2</sup>We refer to [2] for the definitions.

multivalued dependencies, which is unrelated to our paper. We prove here a new connection:

LEMMA 4.1. *With the notations above, the following holds:*

$$\forall p \in (0, \infty] : \quad \frac{1}{p} h(U) + h(V|U) \leq \log \|\text{deg}_R(V|U)\|_p \quad (32)$$

PROOF. When  $p = \infty$ , then (32) becomes (31), so we can assume  $p < \infty$  and rewrite (32) to:

$$h(U) + ph(V|U) \leq \log \|\text{deg}_R(V|U)\|_p^p$$

Assume that  $\Pi_U(R)$  has  $N$  distinct values  $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_N$ , and that each  $\mathbf{u}_i$  occurs with  $d_i$  distinct values  $V = v$ . In particular,  $\text{deg}_R(V|U = \mathbf{u}_i) = d_i$ . Let  $P_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P(U = \mathbf{u}_i)$  be the marginal probability of  $\mathbf{u}_i$ . We use the definition of the entropy (23) and the formula for the conditional (28) and derive:

$$\begin{aligned} h(U) + ph(V|U) &= \sum_i P_i \log \frac{1}{P_i} + p \sum_i P_i h(V|U = \mathbf{u}_i) \\ &\leq \sum_i P_i \log \frac{1}{P_i} + p \sum_i P_i \log d_i = \sum_i P_i \log \frac{d_i^p}{P_i} \\ &\leq \log \left( \sum_i P_i \frac{d_i^p}{P_i} \right) = \log \sum_i d_i^p = \log \|\text{deg}_R(V|U)\|_p^p \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is Jensen's inequality.  $\square$

PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1. Assume that inequality (8) holds for all entropic vectors  $\mathbf{h}$ . Fix a database instance  $D = (R_1, \dots, R_m)$ .

Consider the uniform probability distribution over the output  $Q(D)$ , and let  $\mathbf{h}$  be its entropic vector. By uniformity,  $h(X) = \log |Q(D)|$ . By assumption, every conditional term  $h(V_i|U_i)$ ,  $i \in [s]$  that occurs in (8) has a witness  $R_{j_i}$ . From Lemma 4.1, we have

$$\frac{1}{p_i} h(U_i) + h(V_i|U_i) \leq \log \|\text{deg}_{R_{j_i}}(V_i|U_i)\|_{p_i}$$

Using inequality (8) we derive:

$$\begin{aligned} \log |Q(D)| = h(X) &\leq \sum_{i \in [s]} w_i \left( \frac{1}{p_i} h(U_i) + h(V_i|U_i) \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in [s]} w_i \log \|\text{deg}_{R_{j_i}}(V_i|U_i)\|_{p_i} \end{aligned}$$

This immediately implies the upper bound (9).  $\square$

## 5 COMPUTING THE BOUND

In this section we prove Theorem 1.2. Recall that the main problem in our paper, problem 1, asks for an upper bound to the query's output, given a set of concrete statistics on the database. So far we have proven Theorem 1.1, which says that, for any valid information inequality of the form (8), we can infer *some* bound. The best bound is its minimum, over all valid inequalities (8), and depends on the concrete statistics of the database. In this section we describe how to compute the best bound, by using the dual of information inequalities.

Given a vector  $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{2^{[n]}}$  an abstract conditional  $\sigma = (V|U)$ , and an abstract statistics  $\tau = (\sigma, p)$ , we denote by:

$$h(\sigma) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} h(V|U) \quad h(\tau) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{p} h(U) + h(V|U) \quad (33)$$

We say that a vector  $\mathbf{h}$  satisfies a concrete log-statistics  $(\tau, b)$  if  $h(\tau) \leq b$ . Similarly,  $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{2^{[n]}}$  satisfies a set of concrete log-statistics  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{b})$ , in notation  $\mathbf{h} \models (\Sigma, \mathbf{b})$ , if  $h(\tau_i) \leq b_i$  for all  $\tau_i \in \Sigma, b_i \in \mathbf{b}$ .

DEFINITION 5.1. If  $\Sigma = \{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_s\}$  is a set of abstract statistics, then a  $\Sigma$ -inequality is an information inequality of the form:

$$\sum_{i \in [s]} w_i h(\tau_i) \geq h(X) \quad (34)$$

where  $w_i \geq 0$ . Notice that (8) in Theorem 1.1 is a  $\Sigma$ -inequality.

For  $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^{2^{[n]}}$ , the log-upper bound and log-lower bound of a set of log-statistics  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{b})$  are:

$$\text{Log-U-Bound}_K(\Sigma, \mathbf{b}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf_{\mathbf{w}: K \models \text{Eq. (34)}} \sum_{i \in [s]} w_i b_i \quad (35)$$

$$\text{Log-L-Bound}_K(\Sigma, \mathbf{b}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\mathbf{h} \in K: \mathbf{h} \models (\Sigma, \mathbf{b})} h(X) \quad (36)$$

Fix a query  $Q(X) = \bigwedge_j R_j(Y_j)$  that guards  $\Sigma$ , and assume  $K = \bar{\Gamma}_n^*$ : by Theorem 1.1, if a database  $\mathbf{D}$  satisfies the statistics  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{B})$ , then  $\log |Q(\mathbf{D})| \leq \text{Log-U-Bound}_K$ , but it is an open problem whether this bound is computable. On the other hand,  $\text{Log-L-Bound}_K$  is not a bound, but it has two good properties. First, when  $K = \Gamma_n$ , then  $\text{Log-L-Bound}_K$  is computable, as the optimal value of a linear program: we show this in Example 5.3. Second, when the optimal vector  $\mathbf{h}^*$  of the maximization problem (36) is the entropy of some relation, then we can construct a “worst-case database instance”  $\mathbf{D}$ : we use this in Sec. 6. We prove that (35) and (36) are equal:

THEOREM 5.2. If  $K$  is any closed, convex cone, and  $N_n \subseteq K \subseteq \Gamma_n$  then  $\text{Log-U-Bound}_K = \text{Log-L-Bound}_K$ .

The special case of this theorem when  $K = \Gamma_n$  was already implicit in [17]. The proof of the general case is more difficult, and we defer it to Appendix D.1. Both  $\bar{\Gamma}_n^*$  and  $\Gamma_n$  are closed, convex cones, hence the theorem applies to both. We call the corresponding bounds the *almost-entropic bound* (when  $K = \bar{\Gamma}_n^*$ ) and the *polymatroid bound* (when  $K = \Gamma_n$ ) respectively.

There are two important applications of Theorem 5.2. First, it gives us an effective algorithm for computing the polymatroid bound, by computing the optimal value of a linear program: we used this method in all experiments in Appendix C. We illustrate here with a simple example.

EXAMPLE 5.3. Consider the triangle query  $Q$  in (1). Assume that we have the following statistics for the relations  $R, S, T$ : (a) their cardinalities, denoted by  $B_R, B_S, B_T$ , whose logarithms are  $b_R, b_S, b_T$ , (b) the  $\ell_2$ -norms of all degree sequences: (c) the  $\ell_3$  norms of all degree sequences. Then the polymatroid bound (36) can be computed by optimizing the following linear program, with 8 variables  $h(\emptyset), h(X), \dots$ ,

$h(XYZ)$ :

maximize  $h(XYZ)$ , subject to:

$$h(XY) \leq b_R, h(YZ) \leq b_S, h(XZ) \leq b_T \quad // \text{cardinality stats}$$

$$\frac{1}{2}h(X) + h(Y|X) \leq b_{((Y|X),2)} \quad \dots \quad // \ell_2\text{-norm stats}$$

$$\frac{1}{3}h(X) + h(Y|X) \leq b_{((Y|X),3)} \quad \dots \quad // \ell_3\text{-norms stats}$$

$$h(X) + h(XYZ) \leq h(XY) + h(XZ) \quad // \text{Shannon inequalities}$$

$$h(Y) + h(XYZ) \leq h(XY) + h(YZ) \quad // \text{i.e. (24)-(26)}$$

...

The second application of Theorem 5.2 is that it allows us to reason about the tightness of the bounds. If we can convert the optimal  $\mathbf{h}^*$  in the lower bound (36) into a database, then we have a worst-case instance witnessing the fact that the bound is tight. We show in Appendix D.2 that the almost-entropic bound is *asymptotically* tight (a weaker form of tightness), while the polymatroid bound is not tight. However, we show in the next section that the polymatroid bound is tight in the special case of simple degrees.

## 6 SIMPLE DEGREE SEQUENCES

Call a conditional  $\sigma = (V|U)$  *simple* if  $|U| \leq 1$ ; call a set of abstract statistics  $\Sigma$  *simple* if, for all  $(\sigma, p) \in \Sigma$ ,  $\sigma$  is simple. Simple conditionals were introduced in [15] to study query containment under bag semantics. We prove here that, when all statistics are simple, then the polymatroid bound is tight, meaning that there exists a worst case database  $\mathbf{D}$  such that the size  $|Q(\mathbf{D})|$  of the query output is within a query-dependent constant of the polymatroid bound. Recall (Sec. 3) that  $N_n$  is the set of normal polymatroids.

THEOREM 6.1. If  $\Sigma$  is simple, then

$$\text{Log-U-Bound}_{N_n}(\Sigma, \mathbf{b}) = \text{Log-U-Bound}_{\bar{\Gamma}_n^*}(\Sigma, \mathbf{b}) = \text{Log-U-Bound}_{\Gamma_n}(\Sigma, \mathbf{b})$$

The proof relies on a result in [15], see Appendix E. In the rest of the section we will use the theorem to prove that the polymatroid bound is tight. For that we prove a lemma. If  $T(X)$  is any relation instance with attributes  $X$ , then its entropy,  $\mathbf{h}_T$ , is the entropic vector defined by the uniform probability distribution on  $T$ . Call the relation  $T$  *totally uniform* if, for all  $V \subseteq X$ , the marginal distribution on  $\Pi_V(T)$  is also uniform. Equivalently, it is totally uniform if  $\log |\Pi_V(T)| = h_T(V)$  for all  $V \subseteq X$ . The lemma below proves that, if  $\mathbf{h}$  is normal, then it can be approximated by the entropy of a totally uniform  $T$ , which we will call a *normal* relation. Recall from Sec. 3 that  $\mathbf{h}$  is *normal* if it is a positive, linear combination of step functions:

$$\mathbf{h} = \sum_{V \subseteq X} \alpha_V \mathbf{h}^V \quad (37)$$

where  $\alpha_V \geq 0$ .

LEMMA 6.2. Let  $\mathbf{h}$  be the normal polymatroid in (37), and let  $c$  is the number of non-zero coefficients  $\alpha_V$ . Then there exist a totally uniform relation  $T(X)$  such that  $|T| \geq \frac{1}{2^c} 2^{h(X)}$ , whose entropy  $\mathbf{h}_T$  satisfies  $\forall U, V \subseteq X, h_T(V|U) \leq h(V|U)$ .

The lemma implies tightness of the polymatroid bound:

COROLLARY 6.3. If all statistics in  $\Sigma$  are simple, the polymatroid bound  $\text{U-Bound}_{\Gamma_n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2^{\text{Log-U-Bound}_{\Gamma_n}}$  is tight.

PROOF. Since  $N_n$  is polyhedral, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Log-U-Bound}_{\Gamma_n} &= \text{Log-U-Bound}_{N_n} && \text{by Th. 6.1} \\ &= \text{Log-L-Bound}_{N_n} && \text{by Th. 5.2} \\ &= \max_{\mathbf{h} \in N_n: (\Sigma, \mathbf{B}) = \mathbf{h}} h(\mathbf{X}) && \text{by (36)} \\ &= h^*(\mathbf{X}) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{h}^* \in N_n$  is optimal solution to the maximization problem. Let  $T(\mathbf{X})$  be the totally uniform relation given by Lemma 6.2. Define the database instance  $\mathbf{D} = (R_1^D, \dots, R_m^D)$  by setting  $R_j^D \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Pi_{Y_j}(T)$ , for  $j = 1, m$ . Then  $\mathbf{D}$  satisfies the constraints  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{B})$ , because, by total uniformity:

$$\begin{aligned} \log \|\text{deg}_{R_j}(\mathbf{V}_i | \mathbf{U}_i)\|_p^p &= \log \left( |\Pi_{U_i}(R_j)| \cdot \left( \text{avg}(\text{deg}_{R_j}(\mathbf{V}_i | \mathbf{U}_i)) \right)^p \right) \\ &= \log \left( |\Pi_{U_i}(T)| \cdot \left( \frac{|\Pi_{U_i} \mathbf{V}_i(T)|}{|\Pi_{U_i}(T)|} \right)^p \right) \\ &= h_T(\mathbf{U}_i) + p h_T(\mathbf{V}_i | \mathbf{U}_i) \leq h^*(\mathbf{U}_i) + p h^*(\mathbf{V}_i | \mathbf{U}_i) \leq b_i \end{aligned}$$

The corollary follows from  $|\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{D})| = |T| \geq \frac{1}{2^p} 2^{h^*(\mathbf{X})} = \frac{1}{2^p} \text{U-Bound}_{\Gamma_n}$ , proving that the bound is tight.  $\square$

In the rest of the section we prove Lemma 6.2. Given two  $X$ -tuples  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$  and  $\mathbf{x}' = (x'_1, \dots, x'_n)$  their *domain product* is  $\mathbf{x} \otimes \mathbf{x}' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} ((x_1, x'_1), \dots, (x_n, x'_n))$ : it has the same  $n$  attributes, and each attribute value is a pair consisting of a value from  $\mathbf{x}$  and a value from  $\mathbf{x}'$ . Given two relations  $T(\mathbf{X}), T'(\mathbf{X})$ , with the same attributes, their *domain product* is  $T \otimes T' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathbf{x} \otimes \mathbf{x}' \mid \mathbf{x} \in T, \mathbf{x}' \in T'\}$ . The following hold:

$$\begin{aligned} |T \otimes T'| &= |T| \cdot |T'| \\ \mathbf{h}_{T \otimes T'} &= \mathbf{h}_T + \mathbf{h}_{T'} \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Domain products were first introduced by Fagin [8] (under the name *direct product*), and appear under various names in [9, 15, 19].

DEFINITION 6.4. For  $V \subseteq X$ , the basic normal relation  $T_N^V$  is:

$$T_N^V \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \left( \underbrace{k, \dots, k}_V, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{X-V} \mid k = 0, N-1 \right) \right\} \quad (39)$$

*attributes in V    X-V*

A normal relation is a domain product of basic normal relations.

PROPOSITION 6.5. (1)  $T_N^V$  is totally uniform. (2) Its entropy is  $\mathbf{h}_{T_N^V} = (\log N) \cdot \mathbf{h}^V$ , where  $\mathbf{h}^V$  is the step function.

The proof is immediate and omitted. It follows that every normal relation is totally uniform, because  $|\Pi_V(T \otimes T')| = |\Pi_V(T)| \cdot |\Pi_V(T')| = 2^{h_T(V)} \cdot 2^{h_{T'}(V)} = 2^{h_{T \otimes T'}(V)}$ , and the entropy of a normal relation is a normal polymatroid, because it is the sum of some step functions. We illustrate normal relations with an example.

EXAMPLE 6.6. The following is a basic normal relation:

$$T_N^{X,Z} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline X & Y & Z \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 2 & 0 & 2 \\ & \dots & \\ N-1 & 0 & N-1 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

Its entropy is  $(\log N) \mathbf{h}^{X,Z}$ . The following are normal relations:

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 &= \{(i, j, k) \mid i, j, k \in [0 : N-1]\} && = T_N^X \otimes T_N^Y \otimes T_N^Z \\ T_2 &= \{(i, i, i) \mid i \in [0 : N-1]\} && = T_N^{XYZ} \\ T_3 &= \{(i, (i, j), j) \mid i, j \in [0 : N-1]\} && = T_N^{X,Y} \otimes T_N^{Y,Z} \end{aligned}$$

Their cardinalities are  $|T_1| = N^3$ ,  $|T_2| = N$ ,  $|T_3| = N^2$ .

PROOF. (of Lemma 6.2) Fix a normal polymatroid  $\mathbf{h}$  given by (37). For each  $V \subseteq X$ , define  $\beta_V \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lfloor \log \lfloor 2^{\alpha_V} \rfloor \rfloor$ . Then  $2^{\beta_V}$  is an integer, and satisfies the following: (a)  $\beta_V \leq \alpha_V$ , (b)  $2^{\beta_V} \geq \frac{1}{2} 2^{\alpha_V}$  when  $\alpha_V \neq 0$  and  $\beta_V = \alpha_V$  when  $\alpha_V = 0$ . Define the normal relation  $T \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigotimes_{V \subseteq X} T_{2^{\beta_V}}^V$ ; thus,  $T$  is uniform. We check that  $T$  satisfies the lemma. Its entropy is

$$\mathbf{h}_T = \sum_{V \subseteq X} \beta_V \mathbf{h}^V$$

Condition (1) follows from property (a). For all  $\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W} \subseteq X$ :

$$\mathbf{h}_T(\mathbf{W} | \mathbf{U}) = \sum_{V \subseteq X} \beta_V \mathbf{h}^V(\mathbf{W} | \mathbf{U}) \leq \sum_{V \subseteq X} \alpha_V \mathbf{h}^V(\mathbf{W} | \mathbf{U}) = \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{W} | \mathbf{U})$$

Condition (2) follows from property (b):

$$2^{h_T(\mathbf{X})} = |T| = \prod_{V \subseteq X} |T_{2^{\beta_V}}^V| = \prod_{V \subseteq X} 2^{\beta_V} \geq \frac{1}{2^c} \prod_{V \subseteq X} 2^{\alpha_V} = \frac{1}{2^c} 2^{h(\mathbf{X})} \quad \square$$

EXAMPLE 6.7. Recall that tightness of the AGM bound ( $\ell_1$ -bound) is achieved by a product database, where each relation is the cartesian product of its attributes. We show a query where no product database matches the  $\ell_p$ -upper bound, instead a normal database is needed:

$$\mathcal{Q}(X, Y, Z) = R_1(X, Y) \wedge R_2(Y, Z) \wedge R_3(Z, X) \wedge S_1(X) \wedge S_2(Y) \wedge S_3(Z)$$

Assume the statistics assert that each of  $\|\text{deg}_{R_1}(Y|X)\|_4^4$ ,  $\|\text{deg}_{R_2}(Z|Y)\|_4^4$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\text{deg}_{R_3}(X|Z)\|_4^4, |S_1|, |S_2|, |S_3| \leq B &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2^b. \text{ The log-statistics are:} \\ h(X) \leq b \quad h(Y) \leq b \quad h(Z) \leq b \\ h(X) + 4h(Y|X) \leq b \quad h(Y) + 4h(Z|Y) \leq b \quad h(Z) + 4h(X|Z) \leq b \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

The following Shannon inequality (see Appendix E):

$$\begin{aligned} h(X) + h(Y) + h(Z) + (h(X) + 4h(Y|X)) + \\ (h(Y) + 4h(Z|Y)) + (h(Z) + 4h(X|Z)) \geq 6h(XYZ) \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

implies  $|\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{D})| \leq B$ . To compute the worst-case instance  $\mathbf{D}$ , observe that  $\mathbf{h}^* = b \cdot \mathbf{h}^{\{X,Y,Z\}}$  is the optimal solution to (40), since it satisfies (40) and  $h^*(XYZ) = b$ , and define:

$$T \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(k, k, k) \mid k = 0, \lfloor 2^b \rfloor - 1\}$$

Then  $\mathbf{D}$  consists of projections of  $T$ , e.g.  $R_1^D = \Pi_{XY}(T)$ ,  $S_1^D = \Pi_X(T)$ , etc, and  $|\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{D})| = |T| = \lfloor 2^b \rfloor \geq \frac{1}{2} 2^b = \frac{1}{2} B$ . On the other hand, for any product database  $\mathbf{D}$ , the output  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{D})$  is asymptotically smaller than  $B$ . Such a database has  $R_1^D = [N_X] \times [N_Y]$  and  $\|\text{deg}_{R_1}(Y|X)\|_4^4 = N_X N_Y^4$ . The concrete  $\ell_4$ -statistics become:

$$N_X N_Y^4 \leq B \quad N_Y N_Z^4 \leq B \quad N_Z N_X^4 \leq B$$



By multiplying them we derive  $N_X N_Y N_Z \leq B^{3/5}$ . Since  $Q(D) = [N_X] \times [N_Y] \times [N_Z]$  we derive  $|Q(D)| \leq B^{3/5}$ , which is asymptotically smaller than the upper bound  $B$ .

## 7 CONCLUSIONS

We have described a new upper bound on the size of the output of a multi-join query, using  $\ell_p$ -norms of degree sequences. Our techniques are based on information inequalities, and extend prior results in [1, 11, 16, 17]. This is complemented by a query evaluation algorithm whose runtime matches the size bound. The bound can be computed by optimizing a linear program whose size is exponential in the size of the query. This bound is tight in the case when all degree sequences are simple.

Our new bounds significantly extend the previously known upper bounds, especially for acyclic queries. We have also conducted some very preliminary experiments on real datasets in Appendix C, which showed significantly better upper bounds for acyclic queries than the AGM and PANDA bounds from prior work.

In future work, we will incorporate our  $\ell_p$ -bounds into a cardinality estimation system.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to acknowledge Luis Torrejón Machado for their help with the preliminary experiments reported in Appendix C of this paper.

This work was partially supported by NSF-BSF 2109922, NSF-IIS 2314527 and NSF-SHF 2312195. Part of this work was conducted while some of the authors participated in the Simons Program on Logic and Algorithms in Databases and AI.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Albert Atserias, Martin Grohe, and Dániel Marx. 2013. Size Bounds and Query Plans for Relational Joins. *SIAM J. Comput.* 42, 4 (2013), 1737–1767. <https://doi.org/10.1137/110859440>
- [2] Stephen Boyd and Lieven Vandenberghe. 2004. *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511804441>
- [3] Walter Cai, Magdalena Balazinska, and Dan Suciu. 2019. Pessimistic Cardinality Estimation: Tighter Upper Bounds for Intermediate Join Cardinalities. In *Proceedings of the 2019 International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD Conference 2019, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, June 30 - July 5, 2019*, Peter A. Boncz, Stefan Manegold, Anastasia Ailamaki, Amol Deshpande, and Tim Kraska (Eds.). ACM, 18–35. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3299869.3319894>
- [4] Terence H. Chan and Raymond W. Yeung. 2002. On a relation between information inequalities and group theory. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 48, 7 (2002), 1992–1995.
- [5] Jeremy Chen, Yuqing Huang, Mushi Wang, Semih Salihoglu, and Kenneth Salem. 2022. Accurate Summary-based Cardinality Estimation Through the Lens of Cardinality Estimation Graphs. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 15, 8 (2022), 1533–1545. <https://www.vldb.org/pvldb/vol15/p1533-chen.pdf>
- [6] Kyle Deeds, Dan Suciu, Magda Balazinska, and Walter Cai. 2023. Degree Sequence Bound for Join Cardinality Estimation. In *26th International Conference on Database Theory, ICDT 2023, March 28–31, 2023, Ioannina, Greece (LIPIcs, Vol. 255)*, Floris Geerts and Brecht Vandevoort (Eds.). Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 8:1–8:18. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ICDT.2023.8>
- [7] Kyle B. Deeds, Dan Suciu, and Magdalena Balazinska. 2023. SafeBound: A Practical System for Generating Cardinality Bounds. *Proc. ACM Manag. Data* 1, 1 (2023), 53:1–53:26. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3588907>
- [8] Ronald Fagin. 1982. Horn clauses and database dependencies. *J. ACM* 29, 4 (1982), 952–985.
- [9] Dan Geiger and Judea Pearl. 1993. Logical and Algorithmic Properties of Conditional Independence and Graphical Models. *The Annals of Statistics* 21, 4 (1993), 2001–2021. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2242326>
- [10] Tomasz Gogacz and Szymon Torunczyk. 2017. Entropy Bounds for Conjunctive Queries with Functional Dependencies. In *20th International Conference on Database Theory, ICDT 2017, March 21–24, 2017, Venice, Italy (LIPIcs, Vol. 68)*, Michael

- Benedikt and Giorgio Orsi (Eds.). Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 15:1–15:17. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.ICDT.2017.15>
- [11] Georg Gottlob, Stephanie Tien Lee, Gregory Valiant, and Paul Valiant. 2012. Size and Treewidth Bounds for Conjunctive Queries. *J. ACM* 59, 3 (2012), 16:1–16:35. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2220357.2220363>
- [12] Yuxing Han, Ziniu Wu, Peizhi Wu, Rong Zhu, Jingyi Yang, Liang Wei Tan, Kai Zeng, Gao Cong, Yanzhao Qin, Andreas Pfadler, Zhengping Qian, Jingren Zhou, Jiangneng Li, and Bin Cui. 2021. Cardinality Estimation in DBMS: A Comprehensive Benchmark Evaluation. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 15, 4 (2021), 752–765. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3503585.3503586>
- [13] Axel Hertzschuch, Claudio Hartmann, Dirk Habich, and Wolfgang Lehner. 2021. Simplicity Done Right for Join Ordering. In *11th Conference on Innovative Data Systems Research, CIDR 2021, Virtual Event, January 11–15, 2021, Online Proceedings*. www.cidrdb.org. [http://cidrdb.org/cidr2021/papers/cidr2021\\_paper01.pdf](http://cidrdb.org/cidr2021/papers/cidr2021_paper01.pdf)
- [14] Sai Vikneshwar Mani Jayaraman, Corey Ropell, and Atri Rudra. 2021. Worst-case Optimal Binary Join Algorithms under General  $\ell_p$  Constraints. *CoRR* abs/2112.01003 (2021). arXiv:2112.01003 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.01003>
- [15] Mahmoud Abo Khamis, Phokion G. Kolaitis, Hung Q. Ngo, and Dan Suciu. 2021. Bag Query Containment and Information Theory. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.* 46, 3 (2021), 12:1–12:39. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3472391>
- [16] Mahmoud Abo Khamis, Hung Q. Ngo, and Dan Suciu. 2016. Computing Join Queries with Functional Dependencies. In *Proceedings of the 35th ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGAI Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS 2016, San Francisco, CA, USA, June 26 - July 01, 2016*, Tova Milo and Wang-Chiew Tan (Eds.). ACM, 327–342. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2902251.2902289>
- [17] Mahmoud Abo Khamis, Hung Q. Ngo, and Dan Suciu. 2017. What Do Shannon-type Inequalities, Submodular Width, and Disjunctive Datalog Have to Do with One Another?. In *Proceedings of the 36th ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGAI Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS 2017, Chicago, IL, USA, May 14–19, 2017*, Emanuel Sallinger, Jan Van den Bussche, and Floris Geerts (Eds.). ACM, 429–444. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3034786.3056105>
- [18] Kyoungmin Kim, Jisung Jung, In Seo, Wook-Shin Han, Kangwoo Choi, and Jaehyok Chong. 2022. Learned Cardinality Estimation: An In-depth Study. In *SIGMOD '22: International Conference on Management of Data, Philadelphia, PA, USA, June 12 - 17, 2022*, Zachary Ives, Angela Bonifati, and Amr El Abbadi (Eds.). ACM, 1214–1227. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3514221.3526154>
- [19] Swastik Kopparty and Benjamin Rossman. 2011. The homomorphism domination exponent. *Eur. J. Comb.* 32, 7 (2011), 1097–1114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejc.2011.03.009>
- [20] Tony T. Lee. 1987. An Information-Theoretic Analysis of Relational Databases - Part I: Data Dependencies and Information Metric. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.* 13, 10 (1987), 1049–1061. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.1987.232847>
- [21] Viktor Leis, Andrey Gubichev, Atanas Mirchev, Peter A. Boncz, Alfons Kemper, and Thomas Neumann. 2015. How Good Are Query Optimizers, Really? *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 9, 3 (2015), 204–215. <https://doi.org/10.14778/2850583.2850594>
- [22] Viktor Leis, Bernhard Radke, Andrey Gubichev, Atanas Mirchev, Peter A. Boncz, Alfons Kemper, and Thomas Neumann. 2018. Query optimization through the looking glass, and what we found running the Join Order Benchmark. *VLDB J.* 27, 5 (2018), 643–668. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00778-017-0480-7>
- [23] Jure Leskovec and Andrej Krevl. 2014. SNAP Datasets: Stanford Large Network Dataset Collection. <http://snap.stanford.edu/data>.
- [24] Hung Q. Ngo, Ely Porat, Christopher Ré, and Atri Rudra. 2018. Worst-case Optimal Join Algorithms. *J. ACM* 65, 3 (2018), 16:1–16:40. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3180143>
- [25] Hung Q. Ngo, Christopher Ré, and Atri Rudra. 2013. Skew strikes back: new developments in the theory of join algorithms. *SIGMOD Rec.* 42, 4 (2013), 5–16. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2590989.2590991>
- [26] Raghu Ramakrishnan and Johannes Gehrke. 2003. *Database management systems (3. ed.)*. McGraw-Hill.
- [27] Doron Zeilberger. 1984. A combinatorial proof of Newton’s identities. *Discrete mathematics* 49, 3 (1984).
- [28] Zhen Zhang and Raymond W. Yeung. 1998. On Characterization of Entropy Function via Information Inequalities. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* 44, 4 (1998), 1440–1452. <https://doi.org/10.1109/18.681320>

## A EQUIVALENCE OF $L_p$ -NORMS AND DEGREE SEQUENCES

The following is a standard result, establishing a 1-to-1 correspondence between a sequence of length  $m$  and its first  $m$  norms. We include it here for completeness.

LEMMA A.1. Denote by  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^m$  the set of sorted sequences  $d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \dots \geq d_m \geq 0$ . The mapping  $\varphi : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^m$  defined by  $\varphi(\mathbf{d}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\|\mathbf{d}\|_1, \|\mathbf{d}\|_2^2, \dots, \|\mathbf{d}\|_m^m)$  is injective.

In other words, having the full degree sequence  $d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \dots \geq d_m$  is equivalent to having the  $\ell_p$ -norms for  $p = 1, 2, \dots, m$ .

PROOF. We make use of the elementary symmetric polynomials

$$\begin{aligned} e_0(\mathbf{d}) &= 1 \\ e_1(\mathbf{d}) &= d_1 + d_2 + \dots + d_m \\ e_2(\mathbf{d}) &= \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} d_i d_j \\ &\dots \\ e_m(\mathbf{d}) &= d_1 \cdot d_2 \cdot \dots \cdot d_m \\ e_k(\mathbf{d}) &= 0, k > m. \end{aligned}$$

Using Newton's identities (see [27] for a simple proof) we can express the elementary symmetric polynomials using the  $L_p$ -norms as follows

$$k \cdot e_k(\mathbf{d}) = \sum_{p=1}^k (-1)^{p-1} e_{k-p}(\mathbf{d}) \cdot \|\mathbf{d}\|_p^p.$$

Thus, given the values of  $\|\mathbf{d}\|_p$  for  $p \in [m]$ , the first  $m$  values of the elementary symmetric polynomials inductively, by:

$$\begin{aligned} e_0(\mathbf{d}) &= 1 \\ 1 \cdot e_1(\mathbf{d}) &= e_0(\mathbf{d}) \|\mathbf{d}\|_1^1 \\ 2 \cdot e_2(\mathbf{d}) &= e_1(\mathbf{d}) \|\mathbf{d}\|_1^1 - e_0(\mathbf{d}) \|\mathbf{d}\|_2^2 \\ &\dots \\ m \cdot e_m(\mathbf{d}) &= e_{m-1}(\mathbf{d}) \|\mathbf{d}\|_1^1 - e_{m-2}(\mathbf{d}) \|\mathbf{d}\|_2^2 + \dots + (-1)^{m-1} e_0(\mathbf{d}) \|\mathbf{d}\|_m^m \end{aligned}$$

This uniquely determines the values:

$$e_1(\mathbf{d}), e_2(\mathbf{d}), \dots, e_m(\mathbf{d})$$

Using Vieta's formulas we have that the polynomial with roots  $d_1, d_2, \dots, d_m$  corresponds to the polynomial

$$\lambda^m - e_1(\mathbf{d})\lambda^{m-1} + e_2(\mathbf{d})\lambda^{m-2} + \dots + (-1)^m e_m(\mathbf{d}).$$

Thus, the first  $m$  symmetric polynomials uniquely determine the degree vector  $\mathbf{d}$ .  $\square$

## B RELATIONSHIP TO [14]

Jayaraman et al. [14] consider conjunctive queries where all relations are binary. Thus, the query can be described by a graph with nodes  $X$  and edges  $E$ ,  $Q(X) = \bigwedge_{(V,U) \in E} R_{V,U}(V,U)$ . They claim the following result. Fix a number  $p > 1$  and denote by  $L_{V,U} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|\text{deg}_{R_{V,U}}(U|V)\|_p$ . Consider the following linear optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{minimize} \quad \sum_{(V,U) \in E} x_{V,U} \log L_{V,U} \\ \forall U \in X : &\quad \sum_{(V,U) \in E} x_{V,U} + \sum_{(U,W) \in E} \frac{x_{U,W}}{p} \geq 1 \quad (42) \\ &\forall (V,U) \in E : x_{V,U} \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

The authors of [14] describe an algorithm that computes the query  $Q$  in time  $O(\prod_{(V,U) \in E} L_{V,U}^{x_{V,U}^*})$  (we ignore query-dependent constants), where  $\mathbf{x}^*$  is the optimal solution of the program above. When  $p > 2$ , then they require the girth of the query graph to be  $\geq p+1$ .<sup>3</sup> No additional condition is required in [14] when  $p \leq 2$ . However, the exception for  $p \leq 2$  appears to be an omission: the next example shows that, even for  $p = 2$ , it is necessary for the graph to have girth  $\geq 3$ .

EXAMPLE B.1. Consider the query  $Q(U,V) = R(U,V) \wedge S(V,U)$ , and  $p = 2$ . Then  $x_{U,V} = x_{V,U} = \frac{2}{3}$  is a feasible solution of the linear program (42), because:

$$\begin{aligned} U : x_{V,U} + \frac{1}{2}x_{U,V} &= \frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{3} = 1 \\ V : x_{U,V} + \frac{1}{2}x_{V,U} &= \frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{3} = 1 \end{aligned}$$

The algorithm in [14] claims to compute  $Q$  in time  $O((L_{V,U}L_{U,V})^{2/3})$ . However, when the relations are  $R = S = \{(i,i) \mid i = 1, N\}$ , then  $L_{V,U} = L_{U,V} = \sqrt{N}$ , and the runtime of the algorithm is  $O(N^{2/3})$ , yet the query's output has size  $N$ , meaning that any algorithm requires time  $\Omega(N)$ . It appears that, for correctness, the algorithm in [14] requires the girth to be  $\geq p+1$  even when  $p = 2$ .

Implicit in the result of [14] is the claim that the query output size is bounded by  $O(\prod_{(V,U) \in E} L_{V,U}^{x_{V,U}^*})$ . We discuss this upper bound through the lens of our results. Consider our upper bound on the same query, given by (8):

$$\sum_{(V,U) \in E} x_{V,U} \left( \frac{1}{p} h(V) + h(U|V) \right) \geq h(X) \quad (43)$$

We have proven in this paper (Th. 1.1) that, if the inequality above is valid, then indeed  $|Q(\mathbf{D})| \leq \prod_{(V,U) \in E} \|\text{deg}_{R_{V,U}}(V|U)\|_p^{x_{V,U}^*}$ . To check validity of (43) it suffices to check the inequality for all normal polymatroids, because inequality (43) is simple (Sec. 6). However, the linear constraints in (42) check validity only for modular functions; recall that the modular functions are a strict subset of the normal polymatroids. To see this, consider a *basic modular function*  $h^{U_0}$  (Sec. 3), where  $U_0 \in X$  is a variable. Let  $U, V \in X$  be any variables. Then  $h^{U_0}(V) = 1$  iff  $V = U_0$ , otherwise  $h^{U_0}(V) = 0$ . Similarly,  $h^{U_0}(U|V) = 1$  iff  $U = U_0$ ; otherwise  $h^{U_0}(U|V) = 0$ . Also,

<sup>3</sup>Meaning: the graph has no cycles of length  $\leq p$ .

$h^{U_0}(\mathbf{X}) = 1$ , because  $\mathbf{X}$  contains all variables, including  $U_0$ . Therefore the inequality (43) applied to  $h^{U_0}$  is:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(V,U) \in E} x_{V,U} \left( \frac{1}{p} h^{U_0}(V) + h^{U_0}(U|V) \right) &= \\ \sum_{(U_0,U) \in E} x_{U_0,U} \left( \frac{1}{p} h^{U_0}(U_0) + \underbrace{h^{U_0}(U|U_0)}_{=0} \right) &+ \\ \sum_{(V,U_0) \in E} x_{V,U_0} \left( \frac{1}{p} h^{U_0}(V) + \underbrace{h^{U_0}(U_0|V)}_{=0} \right) & \\ = \sum_{(U_0,U) \in E} \frac{x_{U_0,U}}{p} + \sum_{(V,U_0) \in E} x_{V,U_0} \geq h^{U_0}(\mathbf{X}) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

The first equality above is based on our observation above that  $h^{U_0}(VU)$  and  $h^{U_0}(U|V)$  are non-zero iff  $U_0$  is one of  $U$  or  $V$ . Thus, inequality (43) is precisely the constraint in (42) applied to a basic modular function. In other words, the result in [14] is based on checking the inequality *only on modular functions*. We have seen in Example 6.7 that this is insufficient in general. In fact, Example B.1 can be derived precisely in this way, by observing that the following inequality

$$\frac{2}{3} \left( \frac{1}{2} h(V) + h(U|V) \right) + \frac{2}{3} \left( \frac{1}{2} h(U) + h(V|U) \right) \geq h(UV)$$

is valid for both basic modular functions  $h^U$  and  $h^V$  (for example, for  $h^U$  the inequality becomes  $\frac{2}{3}(0+1) + \frac{2}{3}(\frac{1}{2}+0) = 1$ ), however it fails in general, for example it fails for the step function  $h^{U,V}$ :  $\frac{2}{3}(\frac{1}{2}+0) + \frac{2}{3}(\frac{1}{2}+0) \not\geq 1$ .

It turns out, however, that by requiring the girth to be  $\geq p+1$ , the implicit claim in [14] on the query's upper bound indeed holds. We state this here explicitly, and prove it:

**THEOREM B.2.** *Let  $\mathbf{X} = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ . Fix a natural number  $p \geq 1$  and consider the following inequality:*

$$\sum_{Y \subseteq \mathbf{X}} q_Y h(Y) + \sum_{i \neq j} r_{ij} (h(X_i) + p h(X_j|X_i)) \geq k h(\mathbf{X}) \quad (44)$$

where  $k, q_Y, r_{ij}$  are natural numbers. Let  $G$  be the graph defined by the conditional terms  $h(X_j|X_i)$ , more precisely,  $G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathbf{X}, E)$ , where  $E = \{(X_i, X_j) \mid r_{ij} > 0\}$ . If  $G$  has no cycles of length  $\leq p$ , then the following holds: inequality (44) holds for all modular functions, iff it holds for all polymatroids.

The theorem implies that if the query's girth is  $\geq p+1$  and if inequality (43) holds for all modular functions, or, equivalently,  $\mathbf{x}$  is a feasible solution to the linear program (42), then  $|Q(\mathbf{D})| \leq \prod_{(V,U) \in E} L_{V,U}^{\mathbf{x}_{V,U}}$ . In that case, by our results in Sec. 6 (see Lemma 6.2 and its proof) there exists a normal worst-case product database instance for which the bound is tight. The authors in [14] already remarked that the worst-case instance for their algorithm is not always a product database, see Section 1.2.2. in [14], however, no general characterization of the worst-case instance is given. In our paper, we have characterized these worst-case instances as being

the *normal databases*, which are a natural generalization of product databases, see Sec. 6.

For the proof of Theorem B.2, we need the following *modularization lemma*:

**LEMMA B.3.** *Let  $\mathbf{h}$  be any polymatroid. Fix an arbitrary order of the variables, say  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$ , and define the following modular function  $\mathbf{h}'$ :*

$$h'(X_i) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} h(X_i|X_1 X_2 \dots X_{i-1}), \quad \forall Y \subseteq \mathbf{X} : h'(Y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{X_i \in Y} h'(X_i)$$

Then the following hold:

$$h'(\mathbf{X}) = h(\mathbf{X}), \quad \forall Y \subseteq \mathbf{X} : h'(Y) \leq h(Y), \quad \forall i < j : h'(X_j|X_i) \leq h(X_j|X_i)$$

**PROOF.** The first two claims are well known and we omit their proof. We prove the third claim. Since  $\mathbf{h}'$  is modular, we have  $h'(X_j|X_i) = h'(X_j)$  and the claim follows from

$$h'(X_j) = h(X_j|X_1 \dots X_{j-1}) \leq h(X_j|X_i) \quad \square$$

We now prove Theorem B.2.

**PROOF.** (of Theorem B.2) Denote by  $E[\mathbf{h}]$  the expression on the LHS of (44):

$$E[\mathbf{h}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{Y \subseteq \mathbf{X}} q_Y h(Y) + \sum_{i \neq j} r_{ij} (h(X_i) + p h(X_j|X_i))$$

We prove by induction on the number of cycles in the graph  $G$  associated to  $E$  the following claim: if  $E[\mathbf{h}] \geq k h(\mathbf{X})$  holds for all modular functions  $\mathbf{h}$ , then it holds for all polymatroids  $\mathbf{h}$ .

Base case:  $G$  is acyclic. Let  $\mathbf{h}$  be any polymatroid. Consider any topological order induced by the graph  $G$ , and let  $\mathbf{h}'$  be the modularization of  $\mathbf{h}$  induced by this order. By the previous lemma, we have  $E[\mathbf{h}] \geq E[\mathbf{h}']$  and  $h'(\mathbf{X}) = h(\mathbf{X})$ . The inequality  $E[\mathbf{h}'] \geq k h'(\mathbf{X})$  holds by assumption, because  $\mathbf{h}'$  is modular, and this implies  $E[\mathbf{h}] \geq k h(\mathbf{X})$ .

Suppose now that  $G$  has a cycle:  $U_0, U_1, \dots, U_{m-1}$ , where  $m \geq p+1$ . Let  $\mathbf{h}$  be any polymatroid, and write  $E[\mathbf{h}] = E_0[\mathbf{h}] + E_1[\mathbf{h}]$  where  $E_1$  "is the cycle":

$$\begin{aligned} E_1[\mathbf{h}] &= \sum_{i=0, m-1} (h(U_i) + p h(U_{i+1 \bmod m} | U_i)) \\ &= \sum_{i=0, m-1} \left( h(U_i) + \sum_{j=0, p-1} h(U_{i+j+1 \bmod m} | U_{i+j \bmod m}) \right) \\ &\geq \sum_{i=0, m-1} h(U_i U_{i+1 \bmod m} \dots U_{i+p \bmod m}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E'_1[\mathbf{h}] \end{aligned}$$

In the second line we used the fact that  $m \geq p+1$ , while in the third line we applied a simple Shannon inequality. Thus, we have proven:

$$E[\mathbf{h}] = E_0[\mathbf{h}] + E_1[\mathbf{h}] \geq E_0[\mathbf{h}] + E'_1[\mathbf{h}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E'[\mathbf{h}] \quad (45)$$

We claim that the following holds: for every modular function  $\mathbf{h}$ ,  $E'[\mathbf{h}] \geq k h(\mathbf{X})$ . To prove the claim, we use the fact that, by assumption,  $E[\mathbf{h}] \geq k h(\mathbf{X})$  holds for all modular functions. In addition, if  $\mathbf{h}$  is modular, then the inequality (45) becomes an equality, because, for any basic modular function  $\mathbf{h}^X$ ,  $X \in \mathbf{X}$ , the equality

$E_1[\mathbf{h}^X] = E'_1[\mathbf{h}^X]$  holds: indeed if  $X$  is one of the variables on the cycle, i.e.  $X \in \{U_0, U_1, \dots, U_{m-1}\}$ , then  $E_1[\mathbf{h}^X] = E'_1[\mathbf{h}^X] = 1$ , otherwise, when  $X$  is not on the cycle, then both expressions are  $= 0$ . Thus, we have proven that  $E[\mathbf{h}] = E_0[\mathbf{h}] + E'_1[\mathbf{h}]$  for all modular functions  $\mathbf{h}$ . Since  $E[\mathbf{h}] \geq kh(X)$ , it follows that  $E'[\mathbf{h}] \geq kh(X)$ , proving the claim.

At this point we apply induction on  $E'$ . The graph associated to  $E'$  has one less cycle than  $E$ , hence by induction hypothesis, we have  $E'[\mathbf{h}] \geq kh(X)$  for all polymatroids  $\mathbf{h}$ . It follows:  $E[\mathbf{h}] \geq E'[\mathbf{h}] \geq kh(X)$ , which completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

## C APPLICATIONS TO PESSIMISTIC CARDINALITY ESTIMATION

*Pessimistic Cardinality Estimation* refers to a system that replaces the traditional cardinality estimation module of the query optimizer with an upper bound [3, 7, 13]. Existing implementations are based on one of two techniques: the AGM and the PANDA bounds, or a different technique called the *degree sequence bound*, which applies only to Berge-acyclic queries. In this section we extend our discussion in Sec. 2 and provide both empirical and theoretical evidence for the improvements provided by the  $\ell_p$ -bounds.

### C.1 Preliminary Experiments

We conducted a limited exploration of the usefulness of different  $\ell_p$ -bounds on (1) eight real datasets representing graphs from the SNAP repository [23] and (2) the 33 acyclic join queries from the JOB benchmark. We removed the duplicates in the twitter SNAP dataset before processing, the other datasets do not have duplicates.

The goal of an upper bound is to be as close as possible to the true output size of a query. We computed the upper bound to the true cardinality, for three different choices of the upper bound: the AGM bound [1], the polymatroid bound from PANDA [17], and our  $\ell_p$ -norm based bound. We denoted them by  $\{1\}$ -bound,  $\{1, \infty\}$ -bound, and  $\{1, 2, \dots, p, \infty\}$ -bound, indicating which  $\ell_p$ -norms they used. We also report the cardinality estimates of DuckDB, a modern publicly-available database management system.

In summary, we found that the bound computed using our approach can be significantly tighter than the  $\{1\}$ -bound and the  $\{1, \infty\}$ -bound in our experiment. We also found that DuckDB consistently underestimates the join output size in case of acyclic queries and consistently overestimates in case of the triangle cyclic join query. Apart from a very few exceptions, provides estimates that are farther away from the true cardinality than our bounds.

*Triangle query.* We start with the triangle join query  $Q(X, Y, Z) = R(X, Y) \wedge R(Y, Z) \wedge R(X, Z)$ , where  $R$  is the edge relation of the input graph. Our findings are in the table below:

Dataset	$\{1\}$	$\{1, \infty\}$	$\{2\}$	DuckDB
ca-GrQc	32.5	15.73	3.44	<b>2.99</b>
ca-HepTh	69.19	19.73	<b>3.80</b>	5.17
facebook	16.26	13.74	<b>3.34</b>	17.41
soc-Epinions	101.21	101.21	<b>15.27</b>	56.03
soc-LiveJournal	605.54	605.54	<b>7.71</b>	25.91
soc-pokec	1765.81	1765.81	<b>23.6</b>	127.05
twitter	73.07	66.22	<b>4.65</b>	36.59

The numbers represent the ratios between the corresponding upper bound and the true cardinality: a lower value is better, and 1 is perfect. Even though we provided all  $\ell_p$ -norms for  $p \in [15]$  and  $p = \infty$ , the smallest bound was obtained by only using the  $\ell_2$ -norm. If we were to remove the  $\ell_2$ -norm, then the next best bound would use the  $\ell_3$ -norm and be from 1.3 to 4.7 worse, thus still much better than the  $\{1\}$ -bound and the  $\{1, \infty\}$ -bound. DuckDB always overestimates in this case of a cyclic join query; it gives the best estimate in 1/7 datasets by 1.15x relative to our bound. Otherwise, our bound is the best in 6/7 datasets and outperforms DuckDB's estimate by a factor from 1.36x to 7.86x.

*One-join query.* We next consider a simple  $\alpha$ -acyclic query, which is a self-join of the edge relation  $R: Q(X, Y, Z) = R(X, Y) \wedge R(Y, Z)$ . The  $\{1\}$ -bound is  $|R|^2$ , the  $\{1, \infty\}$ -bound is  $|R| \cdot M$ , where  $M$  is the minimum of the max-degrees in the first and second column of  $R$ , while the  $\{2\}$ -bound is  $(\|\text{deg}_R(X|Y)\|_2 \cdot \|\text{deg}_R(Z|Y)\|_2)$ . The table below shows the ratio of each of these three upper bounds to the actual join size:

Dataset	$\{1\}$	$\{1, \infty\}$	$\{2\}$	DuckDB
ca-GrQc	2,349.44	9.80	2.15	<b>0.57</b>
ca-HepTh	4,145.99	5.19	<b>1.00</b>	0.33
facebook	2,894.12	8.23	2.45	<b>0.58</b>
soc-Epinions	6,485.18	22.95	<b>1.75</b>	0.25
soc-LiveJournal	804,671.28	162.19	<b>1.45</b>	0.22
soc-pokec	526,733.76	150.73	<b>1.27</b>	0.34
twitter	23,374.26	15.93	<b>1.61</b>	0.34

The  $\{2\}$ -bound is very close (1 - 2.5x larger) to the join output size. DuckDB always underestimates the true cardinality. It gives the best estimates for the ca-GrQc and facebook datasets (1.22x and 1.44x better than our bounds), otherwise it is worse than the  $\{2\}$ -bound (by 1.8x to 3.13x). The  $\{1, \infty\}$ -bound is up to two orders of magnitude higher than the join output size. Finally, the  $\{1\}$ -bound is from three to six orders of magnitude larger than the join output size. The ratio of 1, i.e., the calculated upper bound which is precisely the join size, is obtained for the edge relation that is symmetric and calibrated with respect to the path query  $Q$ : This means the degree sequence is the same for both first and second column, on which we join, and there are no dangling tuples that contribute to the  $\ell_2$ -norm and not to the join output.

### C.2 Acyclic join queries on the JOB benchmark

Figure 1 shows the ratios of various bounds and estimates to the true cardinality of the query output for each of the 33 join queries in the JOB benchmark<sup>4</sup>. These join queries are over four to 14 relations. Two join queries could not be computed by DuckDB so are excluded. For our approach, we consider statistics for the simple degree sequences on the join columns of each relation and  $\ell_p$  norms for  $p \in [30] \cup \{\infty\}$ .

Our bounds are always better than the AGM bound by 14 to 53 orders of magnitude and than the PANDA bound by up to three orders of magnitude. DuckDB uses a cardinality estimator that underestimates for all queries by up to five orders of magnitude. Our bounds are better for 24 out of 31 queries (77.41%), while DuckDB's

<sup>4</sup>All 113 JOB queries are variations of these 33 join queries with different selection conditions. Supporting selection conditions is beyond the scope of this paper and subject to on-going work.

underestimates are better for 7 out of 31 queries. Whenever DuckDB's estimates are better than ours, this is by a single digit factor (four times under 1.5x, one time 2.44x, one time 4.67x, and one time 6.08x). In contrast, our bounds can be better than DuckDB's estimates by up to four orders of magnitude.

Our bounds use a wide variety of norms and never just the  $\ell_1$  and  $\ell_\infty$  norms. The queries use from two to seven norms. The  $\ell_\infty$  norm is used for all queries. The reason is that they all have many key - foreign key joins that do not increase the size of the query output. The optimal solution of our method uses the  $\ell_\infty$  norm on the degree sequence of a primary key column, as each key occurs once so the max-degree is one.

### C.3 A Single Join (Example 2.1)

We discuss here in depth our new bounds applied to the single join query in Example 2.1. For convenience, we repeat here the query (14):

$$Q(X, Y, Z) = R(X, Y) \wedge S(Y, Z)$$

*Inequality (18).* We start by describing a simple example where the bound (18) is asymptotically better the PANDA bound (17). For this purpose we define a type of database instance that we will also use in the rest of the section.

**DEFINITION C.1.** An  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -sequence is a degree sequence of the form:

$$\underbrace{(M^\beta, \dots, M^\beta)}_{M^\alpha \text{ values}} \underbrace{(1, \dots, 1)}_{M-M^\alpha \text{ values}} \quad (46)$$

where  $\alpha, \beta > 0$  and  $\alpha + \beta \leq 1$ . An  $(\alpha, \beta)$  relation is a binary relation  $R(X, Y)$  where both  $\deg_R(Y|X)$  and  $\deg_R(X|Y)$  are a  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -sequence.<sup>5</sup>

In other words, there are  $M^\alpha$  nodes with degree  $M^\beta$ , and  $M-M^\alpha$  nodes with degree 1.

Let both  $R$  and  $S$  be  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -instances with  $\alpha = \beta = 1/3$ . Then the PANDA bound (17) is  $M^{4/3}$ , while our bound (18) is  $O(M)$ , which is asymptotically better.

The inequality (18) is a special case of a more general inequality, which is of independent interest and we show it here. This new inequality uses the number of distinct values in the columns  $R.Y$  and  $S.Y$ . Such statistics are often available in database systems, and they are captured by our framework because any cardinality statistics is a special case of an  $\ell_1$ -statistics, e.g.  $|\Pi_Y(R)|$  is the same as  $\|\deg_R(X|\emptyset)\|_1$ . PANDA also uses such cardinalities: for example, denoting  $M \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min(|\Pi_Y(R)|, |\Pi_Y(S)|)$ , PANDA also considers the following inequality:

$$|Q| \leq \|\deg_R(X|Y)\|_\infty \cdot \|\deg_S(Z|Y)\|_\infty \cdot M, \quad (47)$$

Yet the best PANDA bound remains (17), because it is always better than (47).

<sup>5</sup>Such a relation exists, either by Gale-Ryser theorem, or by direct construction: take  $R$  the disjoint union of  $\{(i, (i, j)) \mid i \in [M^\alpha], j \in [M^\beta]\}$ ,  $\{(i, j), i) \mid i \in [M^\alpha], j \in [M^\beta]\}$ , and  $\{(i, i) \mid i \in [M - 2M^{\alpha+\beta}]\}$ .

Our new inequality uses  $M$  in the following bound, which holds for all  $p, q > 0$  satisfying  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} \leq 1$ :

$$|Q| \leq \|\deg_R(X|Y)\|_p \cdot \|\deg_S(Z|Y)\|_q \cdot M^{1-\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}} \quad (48)$$

Inequality (18) is the special case of (48) for  $p = q = 2$ , while the PANDA bound (17) is the special case  $p = 1, q = \infty$  and  $p = \infty, q = 1$ .

We prove (48), by using the following Shannon inequality (which is of the form (8)):

$$\left(\frac{1}{p}h(Y) + h(X|Y)\right) + \left(\frac{1}{q}h(Y) + h(Z|Y)\right) + \left(1 - \frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}\right)h(Y) \geq h(XYZ)$$

The inequality simplifies to  $h(Y) + h(X|Y) + h(Z|Y) \geq h(XYZ)$ , which holds because:  $h(Z|Y) \geq h(Z|XY)$ ;  $h(Y) + h(X|Y) = h(XY)$ ; and  $h(XY) + h(Z|XY) = h(XYZ)$ .

Examining closer (48), we also prove that it can only be optimal when  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$ , because, whenever  $p \leq p_1$  and  $q \leq q_1$ , then the bound (48) using  $(p, q)$  is better than that using  $(p_1, q_1)$ . In particular, the only integral values of  $p, q$  for which (48) could be optimal are  $(\infty, 1)$ ,  $(1, \infty)$ , and  $(2, 2)$ : other potentially optimal pairs  $(p, q)$  exists, e.g.  $(6/5, 6)$ , but they require fractional  $p$  or  $q$ . To prove this claim, it suffices to prove the following: if  $p \leq p_1$  then

$$\frac{\|\deg_R(X|Y)\|_p}{M^{\frac{1}{p}}} \leq \frac{\|\deg_R(X|Y)\|_{p_1}}{M^{\frac{1}{p_1}}}$$

We rearrange the inequality as:

$$\|\deg_R(X|Y)\|_p \leq \|\deg_R(X|Y)\|_{p_1} \cdot M^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{p_1}}$$

Denoting  $\deg_R(X|Y) = (d_1, d_2, \dots)$  the inequality becomes:

$$\left(\sum_i d_i^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \left(\sum_i d_i^{p_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{p_1}} M^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{p_1}}$$

We raise both sides to the power  $p$ , and denote by  $a_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_i^p$  and  $q \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{p_1}{p}$ . Then the inequality becomes:

$$\sum_i a_i \leq \left(\sum_i a_i^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}} M^{1-\frac{1}{q}}$$

which is Hölder's inequality. This proves the claim.

*Inequality (19).* Next, we provide the proof of (19), by establishing the following Shannon inequality:

$$\left(\frac{1}{p}h(Y) + h(X|Y)\right) + \left(1 - \frac{q}{p(q-1)}\right)h(YZ) + \frac{q}{p(q-1)}\left(\frac{1}{q}h(Y) + h(Z|Y)\right) \geq h(XYZ)$$

The coefficient  $1 - \frac{q}{p(q-1)}$  is  $\geq 0$  because  $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} \leq 1$ . We expand the LHS of inequality and obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{p}h(Y) + h(X|Y) + h(YZ) - \frac{q}{p(q-1)}h(YZ) + \frac{1}{p(q-1)}h(Y) + \frac{q}{p(q-1)}h(Z|Y) \\ &= \frac{q}{p(q-1)}h(Y) + h(X|Y) + h(YZ) - \frac{q}{p(q-1)}h(YZ) + \frac{q}{p(q-1)}h(Z|Y) \\ &= h(X|Y) + h(YZ) \geq h(XYZ) \end{aligned}$$

Query #	# Relations	Ours	Norms	AGM: {1}	PANDA: {1, ∞}	DuckDB
1	5	<b>1.90E+00</b>	{2, ∞}	1.01E+15	2.56E+00	3.50E-01
2	5	<b>1.76E+00</b>	{2, ∞}	2.70E+22	1.22E+01	1.34E-01
3	4	<b>1.62E+00</b>	{2, ∞}	9.67E+16	3.40E+01	1.07E-01
4	5	<b>1.43E+00</b>	{1, 2, 23, ∞}	2.30E+19	1.74E+00	2.37E-01
5	5	<b>1.32E+00</b>	{2, ∞}	6.57E+14	2.07E+01	2.15E-01
6	5	<b>2.42E+00</b>	{1, 2, 3, ∞}	1.07E+24	3.65E+01	1.84E-01
7	8	2.66E+03	{3, 4, 5, 6, ∞}	7.80E+32	7.35E+04	<b>5.07E-04</b>
8	7	1.80E+01	{3, ∞}	2.90E+31	2.97E+03	<b>5.68E-02</b>
9	8	3.37E+01	{3, ∞}	8.27E+37	2.69E+03	<b>1.09E-01</b>
10	7	3.81E+00	{2, ∞}	1.12E+26	4.51E+01	<b>6.43E-01</b>
11	8	1.17E+02	{1, 2, 6, ∞}	4.91E+29	3.68E+02	<b>1.34E-02</b>
12	8	<b>1.67E+00</b>	{2, 3, 24, ∞}	9.14E+27	3.14E+01	4.34E-02
13	9	<b>1.67E+00</b>	{2, 3, 24, ∞}	6.40E+28	3.14E+01	4.34E-02
14	8	<b>1.93E+00</b>	{2, 3, 27, ∞}	4.03E+27	4.60E+01	1.92E-02
15	9	<b>7.63E+00</b>	{3, 6, ∞}	1.34E+35	3.17E+03	2.07E-04
16	8	<b>8.36E+01</b>	{3, 4, 5, ∞}	4.02E+40	1.77E+04	2.18E-03
17	7	<b>3.23E+00</b>	{3, ∞}	4.58E+34	2.39E+02	1.03E-02
18	7	<b>2.45E+00</b>	{2, 3, 21, ∞}	8.92E+28	9.23E+01	4.97E-02
19	10	1.49E+02	{3, 4, 6, ∞}	2.07E+45	5.90E+04	<b>7.47E-03</b>
20	10	<b>1.14E+01</b>	{2, 3, 6, ∞}	6.49E+37	1.92E+02	2.07E-02
21	9	<b>4.07E+02</b>	{2, 4, 8, ∞}	3.42E+34	5.07E+03	3.31E-04
22	11	<b>2.61E+00</b>	{2, 3, 4, 28, ∞}	4.56E+38	1.99E+02	8.89E-04
23	11	<b>3.92E+00</b>	{2, 3, 4, ∞}	4.32E+36	2.72E+02	2.38E-04
24	12	<b>4.53E+02</b>	{3, 4, 5, 8, ∞}	1.17E+55	2.96E+05	9.72E-05
25	9	<b>4.26E+00</b>	{3, 4, 29, ∞}	7.69E+38	7.08E+02	9.88E-04
26	12	<b>1.28E+01</b>	{2, 3, 7, 8, 25, ∞}	3.35E+45	2.54E+02	2.93E-03
27	12	<b>4.30E+03</b>	{2, 4, 8, ∞}	3.90E+41	5.36E+04	9.09E-05
28	14	<b>4.48E+00</b>	{2, 3, 4, 28, ∞}	8.46E+44	3.42E+02	3.97E-05
30	12	<b>7.82E+00</b>	{3, 4, 29, ∞}	1.53E+45	1.30E+03	4.30E-05
32	6	3.27E+01	{1, 2, 6, ∞}	7.27E+24	5.62E+01	<b>1.86E-01</b>
33	14	<b>9.62E+01</b>	{1, 2, 4, 6, 29, 30, ∞}	1.96E+53	5.37E+02	1.20E-03

Figure 1: Ratios of various bounds and estimates to the true cardinality of the query output for each of the 33 join queries in the JOB benchmark. Queries 29 and 31 were not computable by DuckDB due to their large output size.

which proves the claim. We will show below that (19) can be strictly better than (48).

*Comparison to the DSB.* A method for computing an upper bound on the query’s output using degree sequences was described in [6], which uses the full degree sequence  $d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \dots$  instead of its  $\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots$  norms. We compare it here to our method, on our single join query. It turns out that (19) play a key role in this comparison.

Suppose  $R, S$  have the following degree sequences:

$$\begin{aligned} \deg_R(X|Y) &= a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \dots \geq a_M \\ \deg_S(Z|Y) &= b_1 \geq b_2 \geq \dots \geq b_M \end{aligned}$$

If the system has full access to both degree sequences, then the Degree-Sequence Bound (DSB) defined in [6] is the following quantity:

$$DSB \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1, M} a_i b_i \quad (49)$$

In general the degree sequences are too large to store, and the DSB bound needs to use compression [7], but for the purpose of our

discussion we will assume that we know both degree sequences, and  $DSB$  is given by the formula above. It is easy to check that  $|Q| \leq DSB$ . Our bound (18) becomes:

$$|Q| \leq \|\deg_R(X|Y)\|_2 \cdot \|\deg_S(Z|Y)\|_2 = \sqrt{\left(\sum_i a_i^2\right)\left(\sum_i b_i^2\right)}$$

Thus, the  $DSB$  and the  $\ell_2$ -bound above are the two sides of the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality;  $DSB$  is obviously the better one.  $DSB$  is also better than the PANDA bound (17), which in our notation is  $\min(a_1 \sum_i b_i, b_1 \sum_i a_i)$  (assuming  $a_1$  and  $b_1$  are the largest degrees). Can we compute a better  $\ell_p$ -bound? We will show that (19) can improve over both (17), and (18), however, it remains strictly weaker than the  $DSB$  bound. This may be surprising, given the 1-1 correspondence between the statistics and the  $\ell_p$ -bounds that we described in Appendix A. The mapping between a degree sequence of length  $M$  and its  $\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_M$ -norms is 1-to-1, and, moreover, both bounds are tight: tightness of the  $DSB$  bound was proven in [6], while tightness of the polymatroid bound holds because both degrees are simple, and it follows from our discussion in Sec. 6.

So, one expects that some  $\ell_p$ -bounds will match the *DSB* expression (49). However, this is not the case, for a rather subtle reason: it is because the set of databases to which these two bounds apply, differ. The 1-to-1 mapping from degrees to  $\ell_p$ -norms is monotone in one direction, but not in the other. For example, consider the degree sequence  $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, d_2) = (a + \varepsilon, a - \varepsilon)$ , where  $\|\mathbf{d}\|_1 = 2a$ ,  $\|\mathbf{d}\|_2^2 = 2a^2 + 2\varepsilon^2$ . A database with degree sequence  $\mathbf{d}' = (d'_1, d'_2) = (a, a)$  satisfies the  $\ell_p$ -constraints, because  $\|\mathbf{d}'\|_1 = 2a$ ,  $\|\mathbf{d}'\|_2^2 = 2a^2$ , but it does not satisfy the degree sequence, because  $d'_2 > d_2$ . We show next that the polymatroid bound that we can obtain from the  $\ell_p$ -norms can be strictly worse than the *DSB*. However, we note that, for practical applications, the degree sequences in the *DSB* bound need to be compressed, leading to a different loss of precision, which makes it incomparable to the  $\ell_p$ -bound.

We describe now an instance where there exists a gap between the *DSP* bound and the polymatroid bound: the relation  $R$  is a  $(0, 1/3)$ -relation, while  $S$  is a  $(0, 2/3)$ -relation, see Def. C.1. More precisely, the two relations  $R(X, Y), S(Y, Z)$  will have the following degree sequences:

$$\begin{aligned} \deg_R(X|Y) &= \left(M^{\frac{1}{3}}, 1, 1, \dots, 1\right) && M \text{ values} \\ \deg_S(Z|Y) &= \left(M^{\frac{2}{3}}, 1, 1, \dots, 1\right) && M \text{ values} \end{aligned}$$

There are  $M$  degrees equal to 1 in both sequences. The value  $DSB = O(M)$  is asymptotically tight, because  $|Q| = O(M)$ . Assume that we access to all statistics  $\|\deg_R(X|Y)\|_p, \|\deg_S(Z|Y)\|_p$ , for  $p = 1, 2, \dots, M, \infty$ . We prove:

CLAIM 1. *The polymatroid bound is  $M^{\frac{10}{9}}$ .*

Normally, the polymatroid bound is computed as the optimal solution of a linear program, as described in Sec. 5. However, to prove the claim, we proceed differently. First, we describe an inequality proving that the polymatroid bound is  $O(M^{\frac{10}{9}})$ . Second, we describe a database instance that satisfies all the given  $\ell_p$ -statistics, for which the query output has size  $|Q| = \Omega(M^{\frac{10}{9}})$ . These two steps prove the claim.

We start by computing the  $\ell_p$ -norms for our instance:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\deg_R(X|Y)\|_p^p &= \begin{cases} O(M) & \text{when } p \leq 2 \\ O\left(M^{\frac{p}{3}}\right) & \text{when } p \geq 3 \end{cases} \\ \|\deg_S(Z|Y)\|_q^q &= \begin{cases} O(M) & \text{when } q = 1 \\ O\left(M^{\frac{2q}{3}}\right) & \text{when } q \geq 2 \end{cases} \\ |Q| = DSB &= M^{\frac{1}{3}} \cdot M^{\frac{2}{3}} + M = O(M) \end{aligned}$$

For the first step, we use the inequality (19) specialized for  $p = 3, q = 2$ , which we show here for convenience:<sup>6</sup>

$$|Q| \leq \|\deg_R(X|Y)\|_3 \cdot |S|^{\frac{1}{3}} \cdot \|\deg_S(Z|Y)\|_2^{\frac{2}{3}} \quad (50)$$

Since  $|S| = \|\deg_S(Z|X)\|_1 = O(M)$ , we obtain

$$|Q| \leq O\left(M^{\frac{1}{3}} \cdot M^{\frac{1}{3}} \cdot M^{\frac{2}{3} \cdot \frac{2}{3}}\right) = O\left(M^{\frac{10}{9}}\right)$$

<sup>6</sup>A direct proof follows from the following Shannon inequality:

$$\frac{1}{3}(h(Y) + 3h(X|Y)) + \frac{1}{3}h(YZ) + \frac{1}{3}(h(Y) + 2h(Z|Y)) \geq h(XYZ)$$

As a side note, we observe that the other upper bound (48) leads to strictly larger upper bounds, for any choice of  $p, q$ .

For the second step we construct a new database instance  $R', S'$  that satisfies all the  $\ell_p$ -statistics that we computed for  $R, S$ . We describe them using their degrees:

$$\begin{aligned} \deg_{R'}(X|Y) &= O\left(M^{\frac{1}{9}}, \dots, M^{\frac{1}{9}}\right) && M^{\frac{2}{3}} \text{ values} \\ \deg_{S'}(Z|Y) &= O\left(M^{\frac{1}{3}}, \dots, M^{\frac{1}{3}}\right) && M^{\frac{2}{3}} \text{ values} \end{aligned}$$

Then the following hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\deg_{R'}(X|Y)\|_p^p &= O\left(M^{\frac{p}{9} + \frac{2}{3}}\right) \\ \|\deg_{S'}(Z|Y)\|_q^q &= O\left(M^{\frac{q}{3} + \frac{2}{3}}\right) \\ |Q'| &= M^{\frac{1}{9}} \cdot M^{\frac{1}{3}} \cdot M^{\frac{2}{3}} = M^{\frac{10}{9}} \end{aligned}$$

We check that the  $\ell_p$ -norms of the degrees of  $R', S'$  are no larger than those of  $R, S$ :

$$\begin{aligned} p \leq 2 : \quad \|\deg_{R'}(X|Y)\|_p^p &= O\left(M^{\frac{p}{9} + \frac{2}{3}}\right) \leq O(M) = \|\deg_R(X|Y)\|_p^p \\ p \geq 3 : \quad \|\deg_{R'}(X|Y)\|_p^p &= O\left(M^{\frac{p}{9} + \frac{2}{3}}\right) \leq O\left(M^{\frac{p}{3}}\right) = \|\deg_R(X|Y)\|_p^p \end{aligned}$$

$$q = 1 : \quad \|\deg_{S'}(Z|Y)\|_1 = O\left(M^{\frac{1}{3} + \frac{2}{3}}\right) \leq O(M) = \|\deg_S(Z|Y)\|_1$$

$$q \geq 2 : \quad \|\deg_{S'}(Z|Y)\|_q^q = O\left(M^{\frac{q}{3} + \frac{2}{3}}\right) \leq O\left(M^{\frac{2q}{3}}\right) = \|\deg_S(Z|Y)\|_q^q$$

Similarly,  $|R'.Y| = |S'.Y| = M^{\frac{2}{3}} \leq M$ . It follows that the relations  $R', S'$  satisfy all constraints on the  $\ell_p$ -norms, including those on  $|R'.Y|, |S'.Y|$  (assuming the latter are available). Yet the size of the output of the query on  $R', S'$  is  $M^{\frac{10}{9}}$ .

As explained earlier, the issue stems from the fact that the *DSB* bound does not permit the instance  $R', S'$ , since its degree sequences are not dominated by those of  $R, S$ .

#### C.4 The Chain Query (Example 2.2)

We prove that inequality (20) is a Shannon inequality, by writing it as a sum of the following inequalities, each which can be verified immediately:

$$\begin{aligned} (p-2)h(X_1X_2) + \sum_{i=2, n-2} (p-2)h(X_{i+1}|X_i) + (p-2)h(X_n|X_{n-1}) &\geq \\ &\geq (p-2)h(X_1 \dots X_n) \\ h(X_2) + h(X_1|X_2) + \sum_{i=2, n-2} h(X_{i+1}|X_i) + h(X_n|X_{n-1}) &\geq \\ &\geq h(X_1 \dots X_n) \\ h(X_1|X_2) + \sum_{i=2, n-2} h(X_i) + h(X_{n-1}) + h(X_n|X_{n-1}) &\geq \\ &\geq h(X_1 \dots X_n) \end{aligned}$$

#### C.5 The Cycle Query (Example 2.3)

We prove here the output bound (21), then show that, for every  $p \geq 1$  there exists a database instance where this bound for  $q := p$  is the theoretically optimal bound that can be derived using all statistics on  $\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_p, \ell_\infty$  norms.

To prove (21), we show the following Shannon inequality, where the arithmetic on the indices is taken modulo  $p+1$ , i.e.  $i+1$  means  $(i+1) \bmod (p+1)$  etc:

$$\sum_{i=0,p} (h(X_i) + qh(X_{i+1}|X_i)) \geq (q+1)h(X_0 \dots X_p) \quad (51)$$

To prove the inequality, we proceed as follows. First, we observe that, for each  $i = 0, p$ , the following is a Shannon inequality:

$$h(X_i) + h(X_{i+1}|X_i) + \dots + h(X_{i+q}|X_{i+q-1}) \geq h(X_i X_{i+1} \dots X_{i+q})$$

As before, all indices are taken modulo  $p+1$ , for example  $i+q$  means  $(i+q) \bmod (p+1)$ . Each inequality above can be easily checked. Next, we add up these  $p+1$  inequalities, and make two observations. First, the sum of their LHS is precisely the LHS of (51). Second, after adding up their RHS, we use the following Shannon inequality  $\sum_{i=0,p} h(X_i \dots X_{i+q}) \geq (q+1)h(X_0 X_1 \dots X_p)$  (which holds because each variable  $X_k$  occurs exactly  $q+1$  times on the left, hence this is a Shearer-type inequality). Together, these observations prove (51).

We compare now the upper bound (21) to the AGM and PANDA bounds. To reduce the clutter we will assume that  $R_0 = R_1 = \dots = R_p$ . Then the AGM bound and the PANDA bounds are:

$$|Q| \leq |R|^{\frac{p+1}{2}} \quad |Q| \leq |R| \cdot \|\text{deg}_R(Y|X)\|_\infty^{p-1} \quad (52)$$

They follow from the following straightforward Shannon inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} h(X_0 X_1) + h(X_1 X_2) + \dots + h(X_p X_0) &\geq 2h(X_0 X_1 X_2 \dots X_p) \\ h(X_0 X_1) + h(X_2 | X_1) + \dots + h(X_p | X_{p-1}) &\geq h(X_0 X_1 X_2 \dots X_p) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we describe a database instance for which bound (21) for  $q := p$  is the best. The instance consists of the  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -relation  $R$  for  $\alpha = \beta = \frac{1}{p+1}$  (see Def. C.1); to simplify the notations here we will rename  $M$  to  $N$ . Thus, we have  $|R| = N$ ,  $\|\text{deg}_R(Y|X)\|_q^q = N$  for  $q \in [p]$ ,  $\|\text{deg}_R(Y|X)\|_\infty = N^{\frac{1}{p+1}}$ , and the bounds in (52) and (21) become  $N^{\frac{p+1}{2}}$ ,  $N^{\frac{2p}{p+1}}$ , and  $N^{\frac{p+1}{q+1}}$  respectively. The best bound among them is the latter, when  $q = p$ , which gives us  $|Q| \leq \|\text{deg}_R(Y|X)\|_p^p = (1 + o(N))N$ . All other bounds are asymptotically worse. Thus, among these three formulas, (21) is the best, namely for  $q := p$ . However, this does not yet prove that these formulas provide the best bounds if we have access to the given statistics.

We show now that these bounds are tight. In other words, we show that there exists relation instances  $R$  for which the bounds are tight, up to constant factors. We already know this for the  $\{1\}$ -bound (the AGM bound), since the AGM bound is  $N^{\rho^*}$ , where  $\rho^*$  is the optimal fractional edge covering number of the  $(p+1)$ -cycle, which is  $\rho^* = \frac{p+1}{2}$ .

Consider now the  $\{1, \infty\}$ -bound, in other words we have only the statistics for  $\|\text{deg}_R(Y|X)\|_1$  (which is  $|R|$ ) and  $\|\text{deg}_R(Y|X)\|_\infty$ . We prove that the PANDA bound in (52) is indeed optimal. In fact we prove a more general claim: the  $\{1, \infty\}$ -bound of the cycle query is  $|Q| \leq N \cdot D^{p-1}$ , whenever  $|R| \leq N$ ,  $\|\text{deg}_R Y|X\|_\infty \leq D$ , and  $N, D$  are numbers satisfying  $D^2 \leq N$ . In our case we have  $D = N^{\frac{1}{p+1}}$ , and the claim implies that the  $\{1, \infty\}$ -bound is  $N^{1+\frac{p-1}{p+1}} = N^{\frac{2p}{p+1}}$ . To prove this claim, we will refer to the polymatroid upper bound, and polymatroid lower bound in Def. 5.1. The Shannon inequality that we proved in Example 2.3 implies  $\text{Log-U-Bound}_{\Gamma_n}(Q) \leq \log N +$

$(p-1) \log D$ . We also have  $\text{Log-U-Bound}_{\Gamma_n}(Q) = \text{Log-U-Bound}_{N_n}(Q)$  (by Theorem 6.1), where  $N_n$  are the normal polymatroids, and  $\text{Log-U-Bound}_{N_n}(Q) = \text{Log-L-Bound}_{N_n}(Q)$  by Theorem 5.2. We claim that there exists a normal polymatroid that satisfies the  $\{1, \infty\}$ -statistics and where  $h(X_0 \dots X_p) = \log N + (p-1) \log D$ : the claim implies  $\log N + (p-1) \log D \leq \text{Log-L-Bound}_{\Gamma_n}(Q)$ , which proves that the  $\{1, \infty\}$ -bound is  $N \cdot D^{p-1}$ . To prove the claim, consider the following polymatroid:

$$h(\emptyset) = 0, \quad \forall W \neq \emptyset, h(W) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \log N + (|W| - 2) \log D$$

Then  $h$  satisfies the required statistics:

$$\forall i: h(X_i X_{i+1}) \leq \log N \quad h(X_{i+1}|X_i) \leq \log D$$

and  $h(X_0 X_1 \dots X_p) = \log N + (p-1) \log D$ . It remains to observe that  $h$  is a normal polymatroid, which follows by writing it as  $\mathbf{h} = (\log N - 2 \log D) \cdot h^X + \log D \cdot \sum_{i=0,p} h^{X_i}$ .

Finally, we prove that, if we have available all statistics  $\|\text{deg}_R(Y|X)\|_q$  for  $q = 1, 2, \dots, p, \infty$ , then the best query upper bound is (21). Fix a number  $q \in [p]$ , and let  $N, L, D$  be three positive numbers satisfying  $L \leq N$  and  $L \leq D^{q+1}$ . Then we claim that the  $\{1, 2, \dots, q, \infty\}$ -bound of the cyclic query in Example 2.3, when the input relation satisfies the statistics  $|R| \leq N$ ,  $\|\text{deg}_R(Y|X)\|_r^r \leq L$ , for all  $r \leq q$ , and  $\|\text{deg}_R(Y|X)\|_\infty \leq D$ , is  $|Q| \leq L^{\frac{(p+1)q}{q+1}}$ . The claim applies to our database instance  $(\alpha, \beta)$  for  $\alpha = \beta = \frac{1}{p+1}$ , because we have  $L = (1 + o(N))N$  and  $D = N^{\frac{1}{p+1}}$ , and implies that the  $\{1, 2, \dots, q\}$ -bound is  $L^{\frac{(p+1)q}{q+1}}$ . To prove the claim, we use the same reasoning as above: it suffices to describe a polymatroid satisfying the statistics

$$\begin{aligned} h(X_i X_{i+1}) &\leq \log N \\ \forall r = 2, q: h(X_i X_{i+1}) + (r-1)h(X_{i+1}|X_i) &\leq \log L \\ h(X_{i+1}|X_i) &\leq \log D \end{aligned}$$

The desired polymatroid is the following modular function:  $h(W) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{|W| \cdot \log L}{q+1}$ . In other words,  $\mathbf{h} = \frac{1}{q+1} \sum_{i=0,p} \mathbf{h}^{X_i}$ . Then, the first inequality above is  $\frac{2 \log L}{q+1} \leq \log N$ , and it holds because  $L \leq N$ . The second inequality is  $(r+1) \frac{\log L}{q+1} \leq \log L$ , which holds because  $r \leq q$ . And the third inequality is  $\frac{\log L}{q+1} \leq \log D$ , which holds by the assumption  $L \leq D^{q+1}$ .

## C.6 Loomis-Whitney Query

All examples so far used only binary relations. We illustrate here some examples with relations of higher arity. More precisely, we derive general upper bounds for the class of queries, called Loomis-Whitney, that have relational atoms with more than two join variables. A Loomis-Whitney query has  $n$  variables and  $n$  relational atoms, such that there is one atom for each set of  $n-1$  variables. The triangle query is the Loomis-Whitney query with  $n = 3$ .

The Loomis-Whitney query with  $n = 4$  is:

$$Q(X, Y, Z, W) = A(X, Y, Z) \wedge B(Y, Z, W) \wedge C(Z, W, X) \wedge D(W, X, Y)$$

One bound that can be obtained with our framework is the following:

$$|Q|^4 \leq \|\text{deg}_A(YZ|X)\|_2^2 \cdot |B| \cdot \|\text{deg}_C(WX|Z)\|_2^2 \cdot |D|$$



This bound follows from the following information inequality:

$$4h(XYZW) \leq (h(X) + 2h(YZ|X)) + h(YZW) \\ + (h(Z) + 2h(WX|Z)) + h(WXY)$$

The inequality holds because it is a sum of 4 Shannon inequalities:

$$h(XYZW) \leq h(X) + h(YZ|X) + h(W|YZ) \\ h(XYZW) \leq h(Z) + h(WX|Z) + h(Y|WX) \\ h(XYZW) \leq h(YZ|X) + h(WX) \\ h(XYZW) \leq h(WX|Z) + h(YZ)$$

## D PROOFS FROM SEC. 5

### D.1 Proof of Theorem 5.2

We restate Theorem 5.2 here in an extended form

**THEOREM D.1.** (1) If  $K$  is any closed, convex cone,<sup>7</sup> and  $N_n \subseteq K \subseteq \Gamma_n$  then  $\text{Log-U-Bound}_K = \text{Log-L-Bound}_K$ .

(2) If  $K$  is polyhedral (meaning: it has the form  $K = \{\mathbf{h} \mid \mathbf{M} \cdot \mathbf{h} \geq 0\}$  for some matrix  $\mathbf{M}$ ) then  $\text{Log-U-Bound}_K = \text{Log-L-Bound}_K$ , and the two bounds can be described by a pair of primal/dual linear optimization programs. In particular, inf/sup in (35)-(36) can be replaced by min/max, meaning that there exists optimal solutions  $\mathbf{w}^*$  and  $\mathbf{h}^*$  that achieve the upper and lower bounds, and these can be computed in time exponential in the number of variables of  $Q$ .

The weak duality property states the following:

$$\text{Log-L-Bound}_K(\Sigma, \mathbf{b}) \leq \text{Log-U-Bound}_K(\Sigma, \mathbf{b}) \quad (53)$$

Weak duality is easy to check: If  $\mathbf{h} \in K$  satisfies  $\mathbf{h} \models (\Sigma, \mathbf{b})$ , and  $\mathbf{w} = (w_\tau)_{\tau \in \Sigma}$  is such that  $K \models \text{Eq. (34)}$ , then  $h(\mathbf{X}) \leq \sum_{\tau \in \Sigma} w_\tau h(\tau) \leq \sum_{\tau \in \Sigma} w_\tau b_\tau$ , and weak duality follows from the fact that  $\text{Log-L-Bound}_K = \sup_{\mathbf{h}}(\dots)$  and  $\text{Log-U-Bound}_K = \inf_{\mathbf{w}}(\dots)$ .

We prove next that strong duality holds as well:

**PROOF.** We start by proving Theorem D.1 item (2) Let  $|\Sigma| = s$  and let  $\mathbf{A}$  be the  $s \times 2^n$  matrix that maps  $\mathbf{h}$  to the vector  $\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{h} = (h(\tau))_{\tau \in \Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^s$ . Let  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^{2^n}$  be the vector  $c_X = 1, c_U = 0$  for  $U \neq X$ . The two bounds are the optimal solutions to the following pair of primal/dual linear programs:

$\begin{array}{l} \text{Log-L-Bound}_K \\ \text{Maximize } \mathbf{c}^T \cdot \mathbf{h} \\ \text{where } \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{h} \leq \mathbf{b} \\ \quad \quad \quad -\mathbf{M} \cdot \mathbf{h} \leq 0 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{l} \text{Log-U-Bound}_K \\ \text{Minimize } \mathbf{w}^T \cdot \mathbf{b} \\ \text{where } \mathbf{w}^T \cdot \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{c}^T \geq \mathbf{u}^T \cdot \mathbf{M} \end{array}$
---	--

where the primal variables are  $\mathbf{h} \geq 0$ , and the dual variables are  $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{u} \geq 0$ ; the reader may check that the two programs above form indeed a primal/dual pair.  $\text{Log-L-Bound}_K$  is by definition the optimal value of the program above. We prove that  $\text{Log-U-Bound}_K$  is the value of the dual. First, observe that the  $\Sigma$ -inequality (34) is equivalent to  $(\mathbf{w}^T \cdot \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{c}^T) \cdot \mathbf{h} \geq 0$ . We claim that this inequality holds  $\forall \mathbf{h} \in K$  iff there exists  $\mathbf{u}$  s.t.  $(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{u})$  is a feasible solution to the dual. For that consider the following primal/dual programs with variables  $\mathbf{h} \geq 0$  and  $\mathbf{u} \geq 0$  respectively:

$\begin{array}{l} \text{Minimize } (\mathbf{w}^T \cdot \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{c}^T) \cdot \mathbf{h} \\ \text{where } \mathbf{M} \cdot \mathbf{h} \geq 0 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{l} \text{Maximize } 0 \\ \text{where } \mathbf{u}^T \cdot \mathbf{M} \leq \mathbf{w}^T \cdot \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{c}^T \end{array}$
---	--

<sup>7</sup>We refer to [2] for the definitions.

The primal (left) has optimal value 0 iff the inequality  $(\mathbf{w}^T \cdot \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{c}^T) \cdot \mathbf{h} \geq 0$  holds for all  $\mathbf{h} \in K$ ; otherwise its optimal is  $-\infty$ . The dual (right) has optimal value 0 iff there exists a feasible solution  $\mathbf{u}$ ; otherwise its optimal is  $-\infty$ . Strong duality proves our claim.  $\square$

**PROOF.** We prove Theorem D.1 (1). We will assume that all log-statistics are  $b_\tau > 0$ , and defer to the full paper the treatment of zero values of the log-statistics.

We will use the following definition from [2, Example 5.12]:

**DEFINITION D.2.** Let  $K$  be a proper cone (meaning: closed, convex, with a non-empty interior, and pointed i.e.  $\mathbf{x}, -\mathbf{x} \in K$  implies  $\mathbf{x} = 0$ ). A primal/dual cone program in standard form<sup>8</sup> is the following:

$\begin{array}{l} \text{Primal} \\ \text{Maximize } \mathbf{c}^T \cdot \mathbf{x} \\ \text{where } \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b} \\ \quad \quad \quad \mathbf{x} \in K \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{l} \text{Dual} \\ \text{Minimize } \mathbf{y}^T \cdot \mathbf{b} \\ \text{where } (\mathbf{y}^T \cdot \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{c}^T)^T \in K^* \end{array}$
--	--

Denote by  $P^*, D^*$  the optimal value of the primal and dual respectively. Weak duality states that  $P^* \leq D^*$ , and is easy to prove. When Slater's condition holds, which says that there exists  $\mathbf{x}$  in the interior of  $K$  such that  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$ , then strong duality holds too:  $P^* = D^*$ .

$\text{Log-L-Bound}_K(\Sigma, \mathbf{b})$  and  $\text{Log-U-Bound}_K(\Sigma, \mathbf{b})$  can be expressed as a cone program, by letting  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{c}$  be the matrix and vector defined in the proof of Theorem D.1 (2) (thus,  $\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{h} = (h(\sigma))_{\sigma \in \Sigma}$  and  $c_X = 1, c_U = 0$  for  $U \neq X$ ):

$\begin{array}{l} \text{Log-L-Bound}_K \\ \text{Maximize } \mathbf{c}^T \cdot \mathbf{h} \\ \text{where } \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{h} + \boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{b} \\ \quad \quad \quad (\mathbf{h}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \in K \times \mathbb{R}_+^s \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{l} \text{Log-U-Bound}_K \\ \text{Minimize } \mathbf{w}^T \cdot \mathbf{b} \\ \text{where } (\mathbf{w}^T \cdot \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{c}^T)^T \in K^* \\ \quad \quad \quad \mathbf{w} \geq 0 \end{array}$
--	--

Here  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  are slack variables that convert an inequality  $h(\sigma) \leq b_\sigma$  into an equality  $h(\sigma) + \beta_\sigma = b_\sigma$ . We leave it to the reader to check that these two programs are indeed primal/dual as in Def. D.2.

Every set  $K$  s.t.  $N_n \subseteq K \subseteq \Gamma_n$  has an empty interior, because  $h(\emptyset) =$ . To circumvent that, we remove the  $\emptyset$ -dimension. Define  $L_0 = 2^X - \{\emptyset\}$ , define the cone:

$$K_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Pi_{L_0}(K \cap F) \quad (55)$$

Thus,  $K_0$  removes the  $\emptyset$ -dimension. The cone program above can be rewritten with minor changes to remove any reference to the dimension  $\emptyset$ .

Thus, we represent both bounds,  $\text{Log-L-Bound}_{K_0}$  and  $\text{Log-U-Bound}_{K_0}$ , as the solutions to the primal/dual cone program (54) over the cone  $K_0$ .

It remains to check Slater's condition. Consider the  $2^n - 1$  step functions  $h^V$  in Eq. (27). One can check that they are linearly independent vectors in  $\mathbb{R}_+^{2^n - 1}$ . Choose  $2^n - 1$  numbers  $\varepsilon_V > 0$  small enough, such that, defining  $\mathbf{h} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_V \varepsilon_V h^V$ , it holds that  $h(\tau) < b_\tau$  for all  $\tau \in \Sigma$ : this is possible by choosing the coefficients  $\varepsilon_V$  small enough, since  $b_\tau > 0$ . Since  $\mathbf{h} \in N_n \subseteq K$ , it represents a feasible solution of the cone program, and it is in the interior of  $K$ , because changing the coefficients  $\varepsilon_V$  independently, by a small amount, continues to keep  $\mathbf{h}$  in  $N_n$  and, thus, in  $K$ .  $\square$

<sup>8</sup>We changed to the original formulation [2] by replacing  $\mathbf{c}$  with  $-\mathbf{c}$ , replacing  $\mathbf{y}$  with  $-\mathbf{y}$ .

## D.2 Tightness of the bounds

Fix a set of log-statistics  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{b})$ . If  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , then we call a  $k$ -amplification the set of log-statistics  $(\Sigma, k\mathbf{b})$ . Notice that these correspond to the set of statistics  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{B}^k)$ . We prove:

**THEOREM D.3.** (1) For any query  $Q$  and any set of log-statistics  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{b})$ , if  $Q$  guards  $\Sigma$  then the following holds:

$$\sup_k \frac{\sup_{D: D \models \mathbf{B}^k} \log |Q(D)|}{\text{Log-L-Bound}_{\Gamma_n^*}(\Sigma, k\mathbf{b})} = 1 \quad (56)$$

(2) There exists an  $\alpha$ -acyclic query  $Q$  with 4 variables and set of log-statistics  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{b})$  such that:

$$\forall k \geq 1 : \frac{\sup_{D: D \models \mathbf{B}^k} \log |Q(D)|}{\text{Log-L-Bound}_{\Gamma_n^*}(\Sigma, k\mathbf{b})} \leq \frac{35}{36} \quad (57)$$

The proof of the theorem makes essential use of the definition of the lower bound (36): this is one reason why we introduced it. Item (1) states that the almost-entropic bound is tight in an asymptotic sense. The proof is based on Chan and Yeung's Group-Characterization theorem [4], uses similar ideas to those in [10, 17]. Item (2) in Theorem D.3 states that the polymatroid bound is not tight in general: there exists a concrete query and concrete statistics where the polymatroid bound is strictly larger than the query cardinality. Notice that inequality (57) is stated in terms of logarithms: the gap between the actual query output size and the upper polymatroid bound is an exponent, not a constant factor.

The fraction in (56) is  $\leq 1$ , because of weak duality (53) and Theorem 1.1. We prove that it is  $\geq 1$ , following ideas from [10, 17]

Define  $L \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Log-L-Bound}_{\Gamma_n^*}(\Sigma, k\mathbf{b})$ , and let  $\mathbf{h}^* \in \bar{\Gamma}_n^*$  be an optimal solution to the bound above, i.e.  $\mathbf{h}^* \models (\Sigma, \mathbf{b})$  and  $h^*(\mathbf{X}) = L$ . We will assume that  $L < \infty$ , and in that case such a solution exists, because  $\mathbf{h}$  can be restricted to the compact set  $\bar{\Gamma}_n^* \cap \{\mathbf{h} \mid \|\mathbf{h}\|_\infty \leq L\}$ ; when  $L = \infty$  then one can choose  $\mathbf{h}^*$  s.t.  $h^*(\mathbf{X})$  arbitrarily large and make minor adjustments to the argument in the rest of the proof, which we omit.

Since  $\bar{\Gamma}_n^*$  is the topological closure of  $\Gamma_n^*$ , for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\mathbf{h} \in \Gamma_n^*$  s.t.  $\mathbf{h}$  and  $\mathbf{h}^*$  are  $\varepsilon$ -close, more precisely there exists  $\mathbf{h} \in \Gamma_n^*$  such that  $h(\mathbf{X}) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)h^*(\mathbf{X})$  and  $h(\tau) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)h^*(\tau)$  for all  $\tau \in \Sigma$ . Notice that  $\mathbf{h}$  may slightly violate the constraints  $\mathbf{b}$ , more precisely, the following hold:

$$\mathbf{h} \models (\Sigma, (1 + \varepsilon)\mathbf{b}) \quad h(\mathbf{X}) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)L$$

Define  $\mathbf{h}' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (k - 1)\mathbf{h}$ , where  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  is a large number to be defined shortly. We notice that  $\mathbf{h}'$  is still an entropic vector, because  $\Gamma_n^*$  is closed under addition. (It is not closed under multiplication with non-integer constants.) Write  $\mathbf{h}' = k(1 - \frac{1}{k})\mathbf{h} = k(1 - \delta)\mathbf{h}$  and observe that  $\mathbf{h}'$  is almost a  $k$  amplification of  $\mathbf{h}$ . We choose  $k$  such that  $\varepsilon \leq \delta \leq 2\varepsilon$ , and observe that, for  $\tau \in \Sigma$ ,  $h'(\tau) = k(1 - \delta)h(\tau) \leq k(1 - \varepsilon)h(\tau) \leq k(1 - \varepsilon^2)b_\tau$ . It follows that the following hold:

$$\mathbf{h}' \models (\Sigma, (1 - \varepsilon^2)k\mathbf{b}), \quad h'(\mathbf{X}) \geq (1 - 2\varepsilon)^2 kL$$

At this point we would like to convert the probability space associated to the entropic vector  $\mathbf{h}'$  into a database. However, we cannot simply take its support and view it as a database, because the probability distribution is non-uniform, hence  $\log Q(D)$  will not be equal to  $h'(\mathbf{X})$ . Instead, we use an elegant result by Chan

and Yeung [4]. (The same argument was used in prior work [10, 17], hence only sketch the main idea here.)

Given a finite group  $G$  and a subgroup  $G_1 \subseteq G$ , a *left coset* is a set of the form  $aG_1$ , for some  $a \in G$ . By Lagrange's theorem, the set of left cosets, denoted  $G/G_1$ , forms a partition of  $G$ , and  $|G/G_1| = |G|/|G_1|$ . Fix  $n$  subgroups  $G_1, \dots, G_n$ , and consider the relational instance:

$$R = \{(aG_1, \dots, aG_n) \mid a \in G\} \quad (58)$$

whose set of attributes we identify, as usual, with  $\mathbf{X} = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ . Notice that  $|R| = |G|/|\bigcap_{i=1,n} G_i|$ . The entropic vector  $\mathbf{h}$  associated to the relation  $R$  is called a *group realizable entropic vector*, and the set of group realizable entropic vectors is denoted by  $\Upsilon_n^* \subseteq \Gamma_n^*$ . One can check that, for any subset of variables  $\mathbf{U} \subseteq \mathbf{X}$ ,  $h(\mathbf{U}) = \log |G|/|\bigcap_{X_i \in \mathbf{U}} G_i|$ . The following was proven in [4]:

**THEOREM D.4.** For any  $\mathbf{h} \in \Gamma_n^*$  there exists a sequence  $\mathbf{h}^{(r)} \in \Upsilon_n^*$  such that  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r}\mathbf{h}^{(r)} = \mathbf{h}$ .

We complete the proof by approximating  $\mathbf{h}'$  by some group realizable entropic vector  $\frac{1}{r}\mathbf{h}^{(r)}$ . Since  $\mathbf{h}'$  satisfies all  $k$ -amplified constraints  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{b})$  with some slack, we can choose  $r$  large enough to ensure that  $\frac{1}{r}\mathbf{h}^{(r)}$  will still satisfy the  $k$ -amplified constraints  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{b})$ , and, similarly, that  $\frac{1}{r}h^{(r)}(\mathbf{X}) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)h'(\mathbf{X})$ . Thus, we have:

$$\mathbf{h}^{(r)} \models (\Sigma, kr\mathbf{b}), \quad h^{(r)}(\mathbf{X}) \geq (1 - 2\varepsilon)^3 krL$$

In other words,  $\mathbf{h}^{(r)}$  satisfies the  $kr$ -amplified statistics, and  $h^{(r)}$  is arbitrarily close to  $krL$ . Consider now the relation (58) that defines  $\mathbf{h}^{(r)}$ .  $R$  is totally uniform, in the sense that for any set of variables  $\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}$  and any two values  $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}'$  of  $\mathbf{U}$ ,  $\deg_R(\mathbf{V}|\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{u}) = \deg_R(\mathbf{V}|\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{u}')$ . This implies:

$$\begin{aligned} h(\mathbf{U}) &= \log |\Pi_{\mathbf{U}}(R)|, \\ h(\mathbf{V}|\mathbf{U}) &= \log \|\deg_R(\mathbf{V}|\mathbf{U})\|_\infty, \\ h(\mathbf{UV}) + (p - 1)h(\mathbf{V}|\mathbf{U}) &= \log \|\deg_R(\mathbf{V}|\mathbf{U})\|_p^p \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we define the database  $D = (R_1^D, \dots, R_m^D)$  by setting  $R_j^D \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Pi_{Y_j}(R)$ . We observe that  $D \models \mathbf{B}^{kr}$  and  $Q(D) = R$ , which implies  $\log |Q(D)| = h^{(r)}(\mathbf{X}) \geq (1 - 2\varepsilon)^3 krL$ . In other words,  $\log |Q(D)|$  is arbitrarily close to the  $kr$ -amplification of the bound  $L$ . Since  $\varepsilon > 0$  was arbitrary, it follows that the fraction in (56) is  $\geq 1$ , as required.

Next, we prove item (2) of Theorem D.3.

We first describe a non-Shannon inequality, which we later use to derive a query and statistics for which the polymatroid bound is not tight.

**PROPOSITION D.5.** The following is a non-Shannon inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} 9h(ABXY) &\leq [h(ABXY) + 4h(B|AXY)] + [h(ABXY) + h(A|BXY)] + \\ &\quad [h(ABXY) + h(XY|AB)] + h(BX) + h(BY) + \\ &\quad \frac{1}{2}[h(XY) + 2h(Y|X) + h(XY) + 2h(X|Y)] + \\ &\quad \frac{1}{2}[h(AY) + 2h(Y|A) + h(AY) + 2h(A|Y)] + \\ &\quad [h(AX) + h(A|X)] + h(AX). \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

PROOF. We prove Inequality (59) by a series of transformations from Zhang and Yeung's non-Shannon inequality [28]:

$$I(X; Y) \leq 2I(X; Y|A) + I(X; Y|B) + I(A; B) + I(A; Y|X) + I(A; X|Y) \quad (60)$$

Recall that  $I(X; Y|A)$  represents the mutual information of the variables  $X$  and  $Y$  given variable  $A$  and is defined using the entropy function  $h$  over these variables as follows:

$$I(X; Y|A) = h(AX) + h(AY) - h(AXY) - h(A)$$

We expand Equation (60) to use the entropy function only:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq - (h(X) + h(Y) - h(XY)) + 2h(AX) + \\ &\quad 2h(AY) - 2h(AXY) - 2h(A) + \\ &\quad h(BX) + h(BY) - h(BXY) - h(B) + h(A) + h(B) - h(AB) + \\ &\quad h(AX) + h(XY) - h(AXY) - h(X) + \\ &\quad h(AY) + h(XY) - h(AXY) - h(Y) \\ &\quad \Leftrightarrow \\ 0 &\leq 3h(XY) - 2h(X) - 2h(Y) - 4h(AXY) - h(BXY) + \\ &\quad 3h(AX) + 3h(AY) + h(BX) + h(BY) - h(AB) - h(A) \end{aligned}$$

We add  $9h(ABXY)$  to both sides of the inequality and use the following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} h(ABXY) - h(AXY) &= h(B|AXY) \\ h(ABXY) - h(BXY) &= h(A|BXY) \\ h(ABXY) - h(AB) &= h(XY|AB) \\ h(XY) - h(X) &= h(Y|X) \\ h(XY) - h(Y) &= h(X|Y) \\ h(AY) - h(A) &= h(Y|A) \\ h(AY) - h(Y) &= h(A|Y) \\ h(AX) - h(X) &= h(A|X) \end{aligned}$$

The inequality becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} 9h(ABXY) &\leq [h(ABXY) + 4h(B|AXY)] + [h(ABXY) + h(A|BXY)] + \\ &\quad [h(ABXY) + h(XY|AB)] + h(BX) + h(BY) + \\ &\quad [h(XY) + h(Y|X) + h(X|Y)] + \\ &\quad [h(AY) + h(Y|A) + h(A|Y)] + \\ &\quad [h(AX) + h(A|X)] + h(AX) \\ &\quad \Leftrightarrow \\ 9h(ABXY) &\leq [h(ABXY) + 4h(B|AXY)] + [h(ABXY) + h(A|BXY)] + \\ &\quad [h(ABXY) + h(XY|AB)] + h(BX) + h(BY) + \\ &\quad \frac{1}{2}[h(XY) + 2h(Y|X) + h(XY) + 2h(X|Y)] + \\ &\quad \frac{1}{2}[h(AY) + 2h(Y|A) + h(AY) + 2h(A|Y)] + \\ &\quad [h(AX) + h(A|X)] + h(AX). \end{aligned}$$




Figure 2: A lattice of closed sets and the polymatroid from [28] defined on the lattice.

Query and its upper bound derived from non-Shannon inequality. Consider the following join query, derived from Inequality (59):

$$\begin{aligned} Q(A, B, X, Y) &= R_1(A, B, X, Y) \wedge R_2(B, X) \wedge R_3(B, Y), \\ &\quad R_4(X, Y) \wedge R_5(A, Y) \wedge R_6(A, X) \end{aligned}$$

The hypergraph of  $Q$  has two triangles  $R_2 - R_3 - R_4$  and  $R_4 - R_5 - R_6$ , both included in the hyperedge  $R_1$ .  $Q$  is thus  $\alpha$ -acyclic.

In Inequality (59), some terms are grouped to show their correspondence to the  $\ell_p$ -norms on degree vectors.

We also use the equality  $h(VU) + (p-1)h(V|U) = ph(VU) - (p-1)h(U) = h(U) + p(h(VU) - h(U)) = h(U) + ph(V|U)$ , which gives a different reading of Inequality (7).

Using  $h(ABXY) = \log |Q|$  and Inequality (9) with  $w_i = 1$ , we obtain the following entropic bound on the query output size:

$$\begin{aligned} |Q(ABXY)|^9 &\leq \|\text{deg}_{R_1}(B|AXY)\|_5^5 \cdot \|\text{deg}_{R_1}(A|BXY)\|_2^2 \cdot \\ &\quad \|\text{deg}_{R_1}(XY|AB)\|_2^2 \cdot |R_2| \cdot |R_3| \cdot \\ &\quad \|\text{deg}_{R_4}(Y|X)\|_3^{3/2} \cdot \|\text{deg}_{R_4}(X|Y)\|_3^{3/2} \cdot \\ &\quad \|\text{deg}_{R_5}(Y|A)\|_3^{3/2} \cdot \|\text{deg}_{R_5}(A|Y)\|_3^{3/2} \cdot \\ &\quad \|\text{deg}_{R_6}(A|X)\|_2^2 \cdot |R_6| \end{aligned}$$

Statistics. Consider the following log-statistics:

$$\Sigma = \{(B|AXY), (A|BXY), (XY|AB), (B, X), (B, Y), (Y|X), (X|Y), (Y|A), (A|Y), (A|X), (A, X)\}$$

$$\mathbf{b} = \{b_1 = 4/5, b_2 = b_3 = b_{10} = 2, b_4 = b_5 = b_{11} = 3, b_6 = b_7 = b_8 = b_9 = 5/3\}, \text{ where}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \log \|\text{deg}_{R_1}(B|AXY)\|_5 &\leq b_1, \quad \log \|\text{deg}_{R_1}(A|BXY)\|_2 \leq b_2, \\ \log \|\text{deg}_{R_1}(XY|AB)\|_2 &\leq b_3, \\ \log \|\text{deg}_{R_2}(BX)\|_1 &\leq b_4, \quad \log \|\text{deg}_{R_3}(BY)\|_1 \leq b_5, \\ \log \|\text{deg}_{R_4}(Y|X)\|_3 &\leq b_6, \quad \log \|\text{deg}_{R_4}(X|Y)\|_3 \leq b_7, \\ \log \|\text{deg}_{R_5}(Y|A)\|_3 &\leq b_8, \quad \log \|\text{deg}_{R_5}(A|Y)\|_3 \leq b_9, \\ \log \|\text{deg}_{R_6}(A|X)\|_2 &\leq b_{10}, \quad \log \|\text{deg}_{R_6}(AX)\|_1 \leq b_{11}. \end{aligned}$$

These log-statistics  $(\Sigma, \mathbf{b})$  are valid for the polymatroid  $\mathbf{h}$  in Figure 2, i.e.,  $\mathbf{h} \models (\Sigma, \mathbf{b})$ . They are constructed as follows:

□

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma &= \{(B|AXY), (A|BXY), (XY|AB), (B, X), (B, Y), (Y|X), (X|Y), \\ &\quad (Y|A), (A|Y), (A|X), (A, X)\} \\ \mathbf{b} &= \{b_1 = 4/5, b_2 = b_3 = b_{10} = 2, b_4 = b_5 = b_{11} = 3, \\ &\quad b_6 = b_7 = b_8 = b_9 = 5/3\}, \text{ where} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \log \|\text{deg}_{R_1}(B|AXY)\|_5 &\leq b_1, & \log \|\text{deg}_{R_1}(A|BXY)\|_2 &\leq b_2, \\ \log \|\text{deg}_{R_1}(XY|AB)\|_2 &\leq b_3, \\ \log \|\text{deg}_{R_2}(BX)\|_1 &\leq b_4, & \log \|\text{deg}_{R_3}(BY)\|_1 &\leq b_5, \\ \log \|\text{deg}_{R_4}(Y|X)\|_3 &\leq b_6, & \log \|\text{deg}_{R_4}(X|Y)\|_3 &\leq b_7, \\ \log \|\text{deg}_{R_5}(Y|A)\|_3 &\leq b_8, & \log \|\text{deg}_{R_5}(A|Y)\|_3 &\leq b_9, \\ \log \|\text{deg}_{R_6}(A|X)\|_2 &\leq b_{10}, & \log \|\text{deg}_{R_6}(AX)\|_1 &\leq b_{11}. \end{aligned}$$

$\Sigma$  is constructed immediately from Inequality (59): There is one element of  $\Sigma$  for each entropic term in the information inequality. This is valid for  $\mathbf{h}$ , as all terms only use a subset of the variables  $A, B, X, Y$ .

The construction of the log-statistics  $\mathbf{b}$  is slightly more involved. Figure 2 depicts a lattice of closed sets. It does not show elements whose entropy is the same as for an element that includes them: For instance,  $AXY$  is not shown and its entropy is the same as of the element that contains  $AXY$  and is shown in the lattice, i.e.,  $h(AXY) = h(XYAB) = 4$ . Similarly,  $h(BXY) = h(AB) = h(XYAB) = 4$ .

The log-statistics can then be derived as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \log \|\text{deg}_{R_1}(B|AXY)\|_5^5 &= h(ABXY) + 4h(B|AXY) \\ &= 5h(ABXY) - 4h(AXY) = 5 \cdot 4 - 4 \cdot 4 = 4 \\ &\Rightarrow \log \|\text{deg}_{R_1}(B|AXY)\|_5 = 4/5 = b_1 \\ \log \|\text{deg}_{R_1}(A|BXY)\|_2^2 &= 2 \cdot h(ABXY) - h(BXY) = 4 \\ &\Rightarrow \log \|\text{deg}_{R_1}(A|BXY)\|_2 = 2 = b_2 \\ \log \|\text{deg}_{R_1}(XY|AB)\|_2^2 &= 2h(ABXY) - h(AB) = 4 \\ &\Rightarrow \log \|\text{deg}_{R_1}(XY|AB)\|_2 = 2 = b_3 \\ \log \|\text{deg}_{R_2}(BX)\|_1 &= h(BX) = 3 = b_4 \\ \log \|\text{deg}_{R_3}(BY)\|_1 &= h(BY) = 3 = b_5 \\ \log \|\text{deg}_{R_4}(Y|X)\|_3^3 &= h(XY) + 2h(Y|X) \\ &= 3h(XY) - 2h(X) = 3 \cdot 3 - 2 \cdot 2 = 5 \\ &\Rightarrow \log \|\text{deg}_{R_4}(Y|X)\|_3 = 5/3 = b_6 \\ \log \|\text{deg}_{R_4}(X|Y)\|_3^3 &= h(XY) + 2h(X|Y) \\ &= 3h(XY) - 2h(Y) = 3 \cdot 3 - 2 \cdot 2 = 5 \\ &\Rightarrow \log \|\text{deg}_{R_4}(X|Y)\|_3 = 5/3 = b_7 \\ \log \|\text{deg}_{R_5}(Y|A)\|_3^3 &= h(AY) + 2h(Y|A) \\ &= 3h(AY) - 2h(A) = 3 \cdot 3 - 2 \cdot 2 = 5 \\ &\Rightarrow \log \|\text{deg}_{R_5}(Y|A)\|_3 = 5/3 = b_8 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \log \|\text{deg}_{R_5}(A|Y)\|_3^3 &= h(AY) + 2h(A|Y) \\ &= 3h(AY) - 2h(Y) = 3 \cdot 3 - 2 \cdot 2 = 5 \\ &\Rightarrow \log \|\text{deg}_{R_5}(A|Y)\|_3 = 5/3 = b_9 \\ \log \|\text{deg}_{R_6}(A|X)\|_2^2 &= h(AX) + h(A|X) \\ &= 2h(AX) - h(X) = 2 \cdot 3 - 2 = 4 \\ &\Rightarrow \log \|\text{deg}_{R_6}(A|X)\|_2 = 2 = b_{10} \\ \log \|\text{deg}_{R_6}(AX)\|_1 &= h(AX) = 3 = b_{11}. \end{aligned}$$

Concluding the argument that the bound is not tight for the polymatroid. If we consider the scaled log-statistics  $k\mathbf{b}$  for any scale factor  $k > 0$ , Definition 35 yields:

$$\text{Log-U-Bound}_{\Gamma_n^*}(\Sigma, k\mathbf{b}) \leq k \cdot$$

$$\frac{5b_1 + 2(b_2 + b_3 + b_{10}) + b_4 + b_5 + b_{11} + \frac{3}{2}(b_6 + b_7 + b_8 + b_9)}{9} = \frac{35k}{9}$$

Therefore, for any database  $D$  for which  $D \models (\Sigma, \mathbf{B}^k)$  it holds that  $\log |Q(D)| \leq \frac{35k}{9}$ .

On the other hand, consider a polymatroid  $k\mathbf{h}$ , where  $\mathbf{h}$  is the polymatroid in Figure 2. Since  $h(ABXY) = 4$ , it follows that  $k \cdot h(ABXY) = 4k$ . Since  $\mathbf{h} \models (\Sigma, \mathbf{b})$ , it follows that  $k\mathbf{h} \models (\Sigma, k\mathbf{b})$ . Therefore,

$$\frac{\sup_{D: D \models \mathbf{B}^k} \log |Q(D)|}{\text{Log-L-Bound}_{\Gamma_n}(\Sigma, k\mathbf{b})} \leq \frac{35k}{9} \cdot \frac{1}{4k} = \frac{35}{36}.$$

This proves Inequality (57) in Item (2) of Theorem D.3.

## E PROOF FROM SEC. 6

We start by proving Theorem 6.1. The proof follows immediately from a result in [15]:

**THEOREM E.1.** *Let  $\Sigma$  be a simple set of LP-statistics. Consider the  $\Sigma$ -inequality (34). Then the following are equivalent:*

- Eq. (34) is valid for all  $\mathbf{h} \in \Gamma_n$ .
- Eq. (34) is valid for all  $\mathbf{h} \in \Gamma_n^*$ .
- Eq. (34) is valid for all  $\mathbf{h} \in N_n$ .

In other words, if the inequality (34) is simple, then it is valid for all polymatroids iff it is valid for all (almost-) entropic vectors, iff it is valid for all normal polymatroids. This immediately implies 6.1.

Finally, we prove that inequality (40) is a Shannon inequality. This follows by observing that it is the sum of the following basic Shannon inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} 2h(X) + 2h(Y|X) + 2h(Z|Y) &\geq 2h(XYZ) \\ 2h(Y) + 2h(Z|Y) + 2h(X|Z) &\geq 2h(XYZ) \\ 2h(Z) + 2h(X|Z) + 2h(Y|X) &\geq 2h(XYZ) \end{aligned}$$