

Proving correctness for SQL implementations of OCL constraints

Hoang Nguyen
hoang.nguyen@imdea.org
IMDEA Software Institute
Madrid, Spain

Manuel Clavel
manuel.clavel@eiu.edu.vn
Eastern International University
Binh Duong, Vietnam

ABSTRACT

In the context of the model-driven development of data-centric applications, OCL constraints play a major role in adding precision to the source models (e.g., data models and security models). Several code-generators have been proposed to bridge the gap between source models with OCL constraints and their corresponding database implementations. However, the database queries produced by these code-generators are significantly less efficient—from the point of view of execution-time performance—than the implementations manually written by database experts. In this paper, we propose a different approach to bridge the gap between models with OCL constraints and their corresponding database implementations. In particular, we introduce a model-based methodology for proving the correctness of manually written SQL implementations of OCL constraints. This methodology is based on a novel mapping from a significant subset of the SQL language into many-sorted first-order logic. Moreover, by leveraging on an already existing mapping from the OCL language into many-sorted first-order logic, we can use SMT solvers to automatically prove the correctness of SQL implementations of OCL constraints. To illustrate and show the applicability of our approach, we include in the paper a number of non-trivial examples. Finally, we report on the status of a suite of tools supporting our approach.

KEYWORDS

Object Constraint Language, SQL, Correctness

ACM Reference Format:

Hoang Nguyen and Manuel Clavel. 2024. Proving correctness for SQL implementations of OCL constraints. In *Proceedings of ACM Conference (Conference'17)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 11 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

1 INTRODUCTION

In the context of software development, model-driven engineering (MDE) [6] aspires to develop software systems by using models as the driving-force. Models are artefacts defining the different aspects and views of the intended software system. Ideally, the gap between the source models and the real software systems is covered by appropriate code-generators.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

Conference'17, July 2017, Washington, DC, USA

© 2024 Association for Computing Machinery.

ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM...\$15.00

<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

The Unified Modelling Language (UML) [28] is the facto standard modeling language for MDE. Originally, it was conceived as a graphical language: models were defined using diagrammatic notation. However, it soon became clear that UML diagrams were not expressive enough to define certain aspects of the intended software systems, and the Object Constraint Language (OCL) [25] was added to the UML standard.

OCL is a textual language, with a formal semantics. It can be used to specify in a precise, unambiguous way complex constraints and queries over models. In the context of model-driven development of data-centric applications, OCL has been used to specify both data models' invariants and security models' authorisation constraints [10].

A number of mappings from OCL to other languages (e.g., [3, 4]) have been proposed in the past, each with its own goals and limitations. In the context of the model-driven development of data-centric applications, in order to bridge the gap between models with OCL constraints and their corresponding database implementations, [12–14, 18, 19] introduce different mappings from OCL to SQL. Unfortunately, as reported in [8, 19], the SQL queries produced by these mappings are significantly less efficient—from the point of view of execution-time performance—than the corresponding implementations written by SQL experts.

In this paper, we follow a different approach for bridging the gap between models with OCL constraints and their corresponding database implementations. We assume that, in practice, OCL constraints are implemented by SQL experts. Then, to bridge the aforementioned gap, we propose a model-based methodology for proving the correctness of these implementations. However, proving correctness for SQL implementations of OCL constraints poses a number of non-trivial challenges. In particular, although both languages can be considered as query languages, the “resources” that they provide for specifying queries are of different nature. Suffice to say that there is really nothing like OCL iterators in the standard SQL language.¹ Moreover, while the Boolean type in OCL has four values—namely, true, false, null, and invalid—, in SQL it has only three values—namely, TRUE, FALSE and NULL. Furthermore, the null-value behaves differently in OCL and in SQL. As an example, the expression `null = null` in OCL evaluates to true (much as in object-oriented programming languages, like Java), while executing in SQL the statement `SELECT NULL = NULL` returns NULL.

Our methodology is based on a novel mapping, called SQL2-MSFOL, from a significant subset of the SQL language into many-sorted first-order logic (MSFOL), which takes into account the aforementioned challenges. Then, by leveraging on an existing mapping

¹Interestingly, for the case of mapping OCL iterator expressions, [13, 14] propose using cursors and loops within stored procedures. But this is certainly not the natural way of implementing queries in SQL and, not-surprisingly, it comes with a significant penalty in terms of execution-time efficiency.

from OCL into MSFOL [9], we can use Satisfiability Modulo Theories (SMT) solvers [2, 11] to automatically prove the correctness of the SQL implementations of OCL constraints.

Organisation. In Section 2 we provide a bird's-eye-view of our methodology, indicating the mappings that we use and the roles that they play. Then, in Section 3 we recall the mappings that we borrow from the literature and use in our methodology. Next, in Section 4 we introduce the key component of our methodology: namely, a novel mapping from SQL to many-sorted first-order logic (MSFOL). Afterwards, in Section 5 we discuss a number of non-trivial examples of correctness proofs that illustrate our methodology, and in Section 6 we report on the status of a suite of tools supporting our methodology. Finally, in Sections 7 and 8 we discuss related work and future work. For the sake of readability, we have moved to the appendices the detailed definitions of the different mappings.

2 A BIRD'S-EYE VIEW

In Figure 1 we depict schematically our methodology for proving the correctness of SQL implementations of OCL constraints. We briefly indicate in this section the mappings that we use and the roles that they play in our methodology. A detailed account of each mapping is given in the following sections.

First, our methodology leverages on a previous mapping, called OCL2MSFOL [9], from OCL to many-sorted first-order logic. We denote the mapping OCL2MSFOL as $o2f()$. Let \mathcal{D} be a data model and let $expr$ be an OCL Boolean expression in the context of \mathcal{D} . In a nutshell, the mapping $o2f()$ generates

- a MSFOL theory $o2f(\mathcal{D})$ such that there is a correspondence between the instances of the data model \mathcal{D} and the models of the theory $o2f(\mathcal{D})$;
- a MSFOL formula $o2f(expr)$ such that, for any instance O of \mathcal{D} , the expression $expr$ evaluates to true in the instance O if and only if the formula $o2f(expr)$ holds in the model of the theory $o2f(\mathcal{D})$ that corresponds to the instance O .

Secondly, our methodology uses the mapping OCL2PSQL from OCL to SQL [19]. We denote the part of the mapping OCL2PSQL related to data models as $o2s()$. Let \mathcal{D} be a data model. In a nutshell, the mapping $o2s()$ generates

- a SQL schema $o2s(\mathcal{D})$ such that there is a correspondence between the instances of the data model \mathcal{D} and the database instances of the schema $o2s(\mathcal{D})$.

Finally, our methodology introduces a new mapping, called SQL2MSFOL, from SQL to many-sorted first-order logic. We denote SQL2MSFOL as $s2f()$. Let \mathcal{D} be a data model. Let $o2s(\mathcal{D})$ be the SQL schema corresponding to \mathcal{D} and let sel be a SQL select-statement in the context of $o2s(\mathcal{D})$. In a nutshell, the mapping $s2f()$ generates

- a MSFOL theory $s2f(o2s(\mathcal{D}))$ such that there is a correspondence between the database instances of the schema $o2s(\mathcal{D})$ and the models of the theory $o2f(\mathcal{D}) \cup s2f(o2s(\mathcal{D}))$;
- a MSFOL formula $s2f(sel)$ such that, for any database instance \mathcal{Y} of $o2s(\mathcal{D})$, the result of executing the statement sel in \mathcal{Y} is TRUE if and only if the formula $s2f(sel)$ holds in the model of the theory $o2f(\mathcal{D}) \cup s2f(o2s(\mathcal{D}))$ that corresponds to the database instance \mathcal{Y} .




Figure 1: A schematic depiction of our proposal

Let \mathcal{D} be a data model and let $expr$ be an OCL Boolean expression in the context of \mathcal{D} . Let sel be a SQL select-statement in the context of $o2s(\mathcal{D})$. In our methodology, we consider that sel correctly implements the Boolean expression $expr$ if and only if the following holds:

$$o2f(\mathcal{D}) \cup s2f(o2s(\mathcal{D})) \models o2f(expr) \iff s2f(sel).$$

3 MAPPING OCL TO MSFOL

The Object Constraint Language (OCL) [25] is a language for specifying constraints and queries using a textual notation. Every OCL expression is written in the context of a model (called the contextual model). OCL is strongly typed. Expressions either have a primitive type, a class type, a tuple type, or a collection type. OCL provides standard operators on primitive types, tuples, and collections. OCL also provides a dot-operator to access the value of an attribute of an object, or the objects linked with an object at the end of an association. OCL provides operators to iterate over collections, such as forAll, exists, select, reject, and collect. Collections can be sets, bags, ordered sets and sequences, and can be parametrised by any type, including other collection types. Finally, to represent *undefinedness*, OCL provides two constants, namely, null and invalid. Intuitively, null represents an unknown or an undefined value, whereas invalid represents an error or an exception.

Data models and object models. We assume that the contextual models of OCL expressions are basic data models consisting of classes, with attributes, and associations. The interested reader can find our formal definitions of data models and object models (or instances of data models) in Appendix A.

OCL expressions are evaluated in object models. Let \mathcal{D} be a data model. We denote by $\text{Inst}(\mathcal{D})$ the set of instances of \mathcal{D} . Now, let $O \in \text{Inst}(\mathcal{D})$ be an instance of \mathcal{D} . Let $expr$ be an OCL expression. Then, we denote by $\text{Eval}(O, expr)$ the evaluation of $expr$ in O according to the semantics of OCL.

Assignments. The standard semantics of OCL can be naturally extended to take into account *assignments* as follows.

A variable x in an OCL expression $expr$ is *free* if it is not bound by any iterator in $expr$. We denote by $\text{Free}(expr)$ the set of free variables occurring in $expr$.

Let \mathcal{D} be a data model. Let $O \in \text{Inst}(\mathcal{D})$ be an instance of \mathcal{D} . Let x be an OCL variable. Let v be an OCL value. Then, $x \mapsto v$ is a

valid assignment if and only if x and v are of the same OCL type. Let \vec{X} be a set of OCL variables. We denote by $\text{Asg}(\vec{X}, \mathcal{O})$ the set of valid *assignments* of values in \mathcal{O} to variables in \vec{X} .

Let \mathcal{D} be a data model. Let $\mathcal{O} \in \text{Inst}(\mathcal{D})$ be an instance of \mathcal{D} . Let $expr$ be an OCL expression, with free variables \vec{X} . Let $\sigma \in \text{Asg}(\vec{X}, \mathcal{O})$ be a valid assignment for \vec{X} . Then, we denote by $\text{Eval}(\mathcal{O}, \sigma, expr)$ the evaluation of $expr$ in \mathcal{O} according to the semantics of OCL, where variables in \vec{X} are evaluated following the assignment σ .

Mapping OCL to MSFOL. [9] defines a mapping, called OCL2MSFOL, from OCL Boolean expressions to many-sorted first-order (MSFOL) formulas. More precisely, OCL2MSFOL consists of a mapping $\text{o2f}_{\text{data}}()$ from data models to MSFOL theories, and four mappings, namely, $\text{o2f}_{\text{true}}()$, $\text{o2f}_{\text{false}}()$, $\text{o2f}_{\text{null}}()$, and $\text{o2f}_{\text{invalid}}()$, formalising, respectively, when an OCL Boolean expression evaluates to true, false, null, or invalid.

The interested reader can find a description of these mappings in Appendix B. Nevertheless, there are two properties of the aforementioned mappings that we should remark here.

First, let \mathcal{D} be a data model. Then, there is a one-to-one correspondence between the instances of the data model \mathcal{D} and the models of the corresponding MSFOL theory $\text{o2f}_{\text{data}}(\mathcal{D})$.

Secondly, the four mappings $\text{o2f}_{\text{true}}()$, $\text{o2f}_{\text{false}}()$, $\text{o2f}_{\text{null}}()$, and $\text{o2f}_{\text{invalid}}()$ are defined recursively over the structure of OCL expressions. When the subexpression is a non-Boolean type, an auxiliary mapping $\text{o2f}_{\text{eval}}()$ is called. As expected, the mapping $\text{o2f}_{\text{eval}}()$ builds upon the mapping $\text{o2f}_{\text{data}}()$. However, there are three classes of non-Boolean expressions that $\text{o2f}_{\text{eval}}()$ treats especially. First, the class of expressions that define sets (e.g., `allInstances`-expressions, and `select`, `reject`, and `collect`-expressions). Each expression $expr$ in this class is mapped by $\text{o2f}_{\text{eval}}()$ to a new predicate. This predicate formalises the set defined by the expression $expr$ and its definition is generated as part of the mapping $\text{o2f}_{\text{eval}}()$. Second, the class of expressions that distinguish an element from a set (e.g., `any`, `max`, and `min`-expressions). Each expression $expr$ in this class is mapped by $\text{o2f}_{\text{eval}}()$ to a new function. This function represents the element referred to by $expr$ and its definition is generated as part of the mapping $\text{o2f}_{\text{eval}}()$. Finally, the class of literal expressions. For each literal in $expr$, the mapping $\text{o2f}_{\text{eval}}()$ generates the axioms stating that this literal is different from `null` and `invalid`.²

We denote by $\text{o2f}_{\text{def}}(expr)$ the union of the set of axioms generated by $\text{o2f}_{\text{eval}}()$, when considering each non-Boolean (sub)expression of $expr$.

Finally, let \mathcal{D} be a data model. Let \mathcal{O} be an object model of \mathcal{D} and let $\text{intr}(\mathcal{O})$ be the corresponding model in $\text{o2f}_{\text{data}}(\mathcal{D})$. Let $expr$ be a ground (i.e., no free variables) OCL Boolean expression. Then, [9] claims that the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Eval}(\mathcal{O}, expr) = \text{true} \\ \iff \text{intr}(\mathcal{O}) \models (\text{o2f}_{\text{def}}(expr) \Rightarrow \text{o2f}_{\text{true}}(expr)) \end{aligned}$$

This result can be naturally extended to take into account assignments. Let \mathcal{D} be a data model and let \mathcal{O} be an object model of \mathcal{D} . Let $expr$ be a OCL Boolean expression, with free variables \vec{X} .

Then, for any assignment $\sigma \in \text{Asg}(\vec{X}, \mathcal{O})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Eval}(\mathcal{O}, \sigma, expr) = \text{true} \\ \iff \text{intr}(\mathcal{O}, \sigma) \models (\text{o2f}_{\text{def}}(expr) \Rightarrow \text{o2f}_{\text{true}}(expr)) \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{intr}(\mathcal{O}, \sigma)$ denotes the interpretation $\text{intr}(\mathcal{O})$ extended with the assignment σ .

The key limitations of the mapping OCL2MSFOL come from the fact that expressions defining collections are mapped to predicates. Although these new predicates are defined so as to capture the property that distinguishes the elements belonging to the given collection, this is not sufficient for reasoning about this collection's cardinality, or about the multiplicity or the ordering of its elements. As a consequence, the mapping OCL2MSFOL cannot support, in general, size-expressions or expressions of collection types different from set types.

4 MAPPING SQL TO MSFOL

The Structure Query Language (SQL) is a special-purpose programming language designed for managing data in relational database management systems (RDBMS). Its scope includes data insert, query, update and delete, and schema creation and modification.

Our mapping's context. Our methodology for proving the correctness of SQL implementations of OCL constraints is based on the mapping SQL2MSFOL explained below. Notice that, in particular, our mapping assumes that the SQL implementations of the OCL constraints are select-statements in the context of the SQL schema generated from the contextual model of the OCL constraints.

More specifically, we borrow from [19] the mapping from data models to SQL schemata, which we denote as $\text{o2s}()$, and the corresponding mapping from instance of data models to instances of SQL databases, which we denote as $\text{o2s}_{\text{inst}}()$. In a nutshell, the mapping $\text{o2s}()$ maps classes to tables, attributes to columns, and many-to-many associations to tables with appropriate foreign-keys. The mapping $\text{o2s}_{\text{inst}}()$ maps objects and links accordingly. In what follows, let \mathcal{D} be a data model. Then, for any class c in \mathcal{D} we denote by $\ulcorner c \urcorner$ the table in $\text{o2s}(\mathcal{D})$ corresponding to the class c . Similarly, for any association as in \mathcal{D} we denote by $\ulcorner as \urcorner$ the table in $\text{o2s}(\mathcal{D})$ corresponding to the association as . The interested reader can find the description of the mappings $\text{o2s}()$ and $\text{o2s}_{\text{inst}}()$ in Appendix C. Nevertheless, there is a property of these mappings that we should remark here. Let \mathcal{D} be a data model. Then, there is a one-to-one correspondence between the instances of the data model \mathcal{D} and the database instances of the schema $\text{o2s}(\mathcal{D})$.

Assignments. Let \mathcal{S} be a database schema. We denote by $\text{Inst}(\mathcal{S})$ the set of database instances of \mathcal{S} . Let $\mathcal{Y} \in \text{Inst}(\mathcal{S})$ be a database instance of \mathcal{S} . Let x be a SQL variable. Let v be a SQL value (in the context of \mathcal{Y}). Then, $x \mapsto v$ is a *valid assignment* if and only if x and v are of the same SQL type. Let \vec{X} be a set of SQL variables. We denote by $\text{Asg}(\vec{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ the set of valid *assignments* of values in \mathcal{Y} to variables in \vec{X} .

SQL statements are executed on database instances. Let \mathcal{S} be a database schema. Let $\mathcal{Y} \in \text{Inst}(\mathcal{S})$ be a database instance of \mathcal{S} . Let sel be a SQL select-statement Let $\varsigma \in \text{Asg}(\vec{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ be a valid assignment for \vec{X} . Then, we denote by $\text{Exec}(\mathcal{Y}, \varsigma, sel)$ the result of

²This is needed because OCL2MSFOL maps the `null` and `invalid` for each predefined type to distinguished constants of the corresponding predefined types in MSFOL.

executing sel in \mathcal{D} according to the semantics of SQL, where the variables in \vec{X} are substituted according to the assignment ς .

Let \mathcal{D} be a data model. Let $\mathcal{O} \in \text{Inst}(\mathcal{D})$. Let \vec{X} be a set of variables, and let $\sigma \in \text{Asg}(\vec{X}, \mathcal{O})$ be a valid assignment for \vec{X} (in the context of \mathcal{O}). Then, we denote by $\text{o2s}_{\text{inst}}(\sigma) \in \text{Asg}(\vec{X}, \text{o2s}_{\text{inst}}(\mathcal{O}))$ the assignment of values in $\text{o2s}_{\text{inst}}(\mathcal{O})$ to the variables in \vec{X} that correspond, according to the mapping $\text{o2s}_{\text{inst}}()$, to the values assigned by σ to the variables in \vec{X} .

Our notion of correctness. We are interested in proving the correctness of SQL implementations of OCL constraints, i.e., of OCL expressions of type Boolean. As mentioned before, the type Boolean in OCL has four values: true, false, null, and invalid. Our notion of correctness for SQL implementations of OCL constraints is only concerned with the case when the OCL constraints evaluate to true. This is arguably the most interesting case, in practice, when using OCL constraints.

More specifically, let \mathcal{D} be a data model. Let $expr$ be an OCL Boolean expression, with free variables \vec{X} . Let sel be a SQL select-statement containing exactly one expression $selitem$ in its list of selected items. We consider that sel correctly implements $expr$ if and only if, for every instance $\mathcal{O} \in \text{Inst}(\mathcal{D})$ and every assignment $\sigma \in \text{Asg}(\vec{X}, \mathcal{O})$, the following holds: $\text{Eval}(\mathcal{O}, \sigma, expr)$ evaluates to true if and only if $\text{Exec}(\text{o2s}_{\text{inst}}(\mathcal{O}), \text{o2s}_{\text{inst}}(\sigma), sel)$ returns TRUE.

Our mapping in a nutshell. Let \mathcal{D} be a data model. Let $\mathcal{O} \in \text{Inst}(\mathcal{D})$ be an instance of \mathcal{D} . Let sel be a SQL select-statement containing exactly one expression $selitem$ in its list of selected items. In a nutshell, the mapping SQL2MSFOL defines the following:

- For each class c in \mathcal{D} , our mapping defines a predicate $\text{index}_{c^\neg}()$ that specifies the *indices* (of the rows) of the table $\ulcorner c \urcorner$ in \mathcal{O} . Then, for each attribute att of c our mapping defines a function $\text{val}_{c^\neg}(att, x)$ that specifies the *value* of the column att in the row indexed by x in the table $\ulcorner c \urcorner$.
- For each association as in \mathcal{D} , our mapping defines a predicate $\text{index}_{as^\neg}()$ that specifies the *indices* (of the rows) of the table $\ulcorner as \urcorner$ in \mathcal{O} . Then, for each association-end ase of as our mapping defines a function $\text{val}_{as^\neg}(ase, x)$ that specifies the *value* of the column ase in the row indexed by x in the table $\ulcorner as \urcorner$.
- For each (sub)select sel' in sel , our mapping defines a predicate $\text{index}_{sel'}()$ that specifies the *indices* (of the rows) of the table $\text{Exec}(\text{o2s}_{\text{inst}}(\mathcal{O}), sel')$.
- For each (sub)expression $expr$ in each (sub)select sel' in sel , our mapping defines a function $\text{val}_{sel'}(expr, x)$ that specifies the *value* of the expression $expr$ in the row indexed by x in the table $\text{Exec}(\text{o2s}_{\text{inst}}(\mathcal{O}), sel')$. Notice that the value of the expression $expr$ can be a Boolean value, which in SQL is either TRUE, FALSE, or NULL. To represent the SQL Boolean values, our mapping generates an enumerated type with the literals TRUE, FALSE, and NULL.

We denote by $\text{index}_{\text{def}}(\mathcal{D})$ the union of the set of axioms specifying the predicates $\text{index}_{c^\neg}()$ and $\text{index}_{as^\neg}()$, as well as the functions $\text{val}_{c^\neg}(att)$ and $\text{val}_{as^\neg}(ase)$ for every class c , attribute att , association as , and association-end ase in \mathcal{D} .

We denote by $\text{index}_{\text{def}}(sel)$ the union of the set of axioms specifying the predicate $\text{index}_{sel'}()$, for every (sub)select-statement sel' in

sel . Similarly, we denote by $\text{val}_{\text{def}}(sel)$ the union of the set of axioms specifying the function $\text{val}_{sel'}(expr)$, for every (sub)expression $expr$ of every (sub)select-statement sel' in sel .

The interested reader can find the formal definition of our mapping in Appendix D. The task of formally proving that SQL2MSFOL is correct, i.e., that it correctly captures the semantics of SQL, is beyond the scope of this paper.

Re-formalising our notion of correctness using our mapping. We can now use our mapping SQL2MSFOL, along with the mapping OCL2MSFOL [9], to re-formalise our notion of correctness for SQL implementations of OCL constraints as follows.

Let \mathcal{D} be a data model. Let $expr$ be an OCL Boolean expression, with free variables \vec{X} . Let sel be a SQL select-statement containing exactly one expression $selitem$ in its list of selected items. We consider that sel is a correct implementation of $expr$ if and only if the MSFOL theories C1, C2 and C3 below, with the variables \vec{X} added as (uninterpreted) constants of the appropriate type, are *unsatisfiable*. We precede each theory by its intended meaning.

MSFOL Theory C1. There exists at least one instance \mathcal{O} of \mathcal{D} such that: the query sel returns zero or more than one row when executed in $\text{o2s}_{\text{inst}}(\mathcal{O})$. Formally,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{o2f}_{\text{data}}(\mathcal{D}) \\ \cup \text{index}_{\text{def}}(\mathcal{D}) \cup \text{index}_{\text{def}}(sel) \cup \text{val}_{\text{def}}(sel) \\ \cup \{ \neg(\exists(x).(\text{index}_{sel}(x) \wedge \forall(y).(y \neq x \Rightarrow \neg(\text{index}_{sel}(y)))))) \}. \end{aligned}$$

MSFOL Theory C2. There exists at least one instance of \mathcal{D} such that: (i) the expression $expr$ evaluates to true in \mathcal{O} , and (ii) there exists at least one row in the table obtained when executing sel in $\text{o2s}(\mathcal{O})$ for which $selitem$ does not contain the value TRUE.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{o2f}_{\text{data}}(\mathcal{D}) \cup \text{o2f}_{\text{def}}(expr) \\ \cup \text{index}_{\text{def}}(\mathcal{D}) \cup \text{index}_{\text{def}}(sel) \cup \text{val}_{\text{def}}(sel) \\ \cup \{ \text{o2f}_{\text{true}}(expr) \} \\ \cup \{ \neg(\forall(x).(\text{index}_{sel}(x) \Rightarrow \text{val}_{sel}(selitem, x) = \text{TRUE})) \}. \end{aligned}$$

MSFOL Theory C3. There exists at least one instance of \mathcal{D} such that: (i) $selitem$ contains the value TRUE in all the rows of the table obtained when executing sel in $\text{o2s}(\mathcal{O})$, and (ii) the expression $expr$ does not evaluate to true in \mathcal{O} .

$$\begin{aligned} \text{o2f}_{\text{data}}(\mathcal{D}) \cup \text{o2f}_{\text{def}}(expr) \\ \cup \text{index}_{\text{def}}(\mathcal{D}) \cup \text{index}_{\text{def}}(sel) \cup \text{val}_{\text{def}}(sel) \\ \cup \{ \forall(x).(\text{index}_{sel}(x) \Rightarrow \text{val}_{sel}(selitem, x) = \text{TRUE}) \} \\ \cup \{ \neg(\text{o2f}_{\text{true}}(expr)) \}. \end{aligned}$$

5 EXAMPLES

To illustrate and show the applicability of our approach, we include in this section a number of non-trivial examples of proving correctness of SQL implementations of OCL constraints.

Consider the data model *University* in Figure 2. It contains two classes, Student and Lecturer, and an association, Enrolment. Student and Lecturer represent, respectively, the students and




Figure 2: The data model University.

the lecturers of the university. Student and Lecturer have attributes name and age. Enrolment represents the relationship between a student (at the association-end students) and a lecturer (at the association-end lecturers) when the student is enrolled in a course taught by the lecturer.

The interested reader can find the correctness proofs for the examples below at [20]. Notice that the file names in this examples repository follow the pattern *exmi-Cj*, where the integer *i* denotes the number of the example (from 1 to 7) under consideration, and the integer *j* denotes the number of the theory (from 1 to 3) in Definition C1, C2 and C3 whose satisfiability is checked. In other words, for each example below, and for each theory in Definition C1, C2, C3, the interested reader can find at [20] a file specifying, using SMT-LIB2 syntax [1], the corresponding satisfiability problem, and can check whether this problem is satisfiable or not by inputting the file into any SMT solver that supports the SMT-LIB2 language, like CVC4 [2] or Z3 [11].

Example #1

Consider the OCL expression:

```
> true.
```

Using our methodology we can prove that the SQL statement below correctly implements the above OCL expression:

```
> SELECT TRUE;
```

In particular, for the corresponding correctness proof, we use the files *exm1-C1*, *exm1-C2*, and *exm1-C3* at [20].

Example #2

Consider the OCL expression:

```
> caller.students->isEmpty().
```

where *caller* is a variable of type Lecturer.

Using our methodology we can prove that the SQL statement below correctly implements the above OCL expression:

```
> SELECT NOT EXISTS
>   (SELECT students FROM Enrolment
>   WHERE lecturers = caller);
```

In particular, for the corresponding correctness proof, we use the files *exm2-C1*, *exm2-C2*, and *exm2-C3* at [20].

Example #3

Consider the OCL expression:

```
> self.age ≥ 18.
```

where *self* is a variable of type Student.

Using our methodology we can prove that the SQL statement below correctly implements the above OCL expression:

```
> SELECT age ≥ 18 FROM Student
>   WHERE Student_id = self;
```

In particular, for the corresponding correctness proof, we use the files *exm3-C1*, *exm3-C2*, and *exm3-C3* at [20].

Example #4

Consider the OCL expression:

```
> Student.allInstances()->
>   forAll(s|s.lecturers->forAll(l|s.age < l.age)).
```

Using our methodology we can prove that the SQL statement below correctly implements the above OCL expression:

```
> SELECT NOT EXISTS
>   (SELECT 1 FROM
>     (SELECT s.age, e.lecturers
>      FROM Student s JOIN Enrolment e
>      ON e.students = s.Student_id) AS TEMP
>   JOIN Lecturer l
>   WHERE TEMP.age ≥ l.age
>   AND l.Lecturer_id = TEMP.lecturers);
```

In particular, for the corresponding correctness proof, we use the files *exm4-C1*, *exm4-C2*, and *exm4-C3* at [20].

Example #5

Consider the OCL expression:

```
> self.name = user.
```

where *self* is a variable of type Student, and *user* is a variable of type String.

Suppose that the variable *user* is always assigned a String value different from null. Then, using our methodology we can prove that the SQL statement below correctly implements the above OCL expression:

```
> SELECT (SELECT name FROM Student
>   WHERE Student_id = self) = user;
```

In particular, for the corresponding correctness proof, we use the files *exm5-C1*, *exm5-C2*, and *exm5-C3* at [20]. Notice that we have added the assumption about the variable *user* being assigned a String value different from null to each of the satisfiability problems in *exm5-C1*, *exm5-C2*, and *exm5-C3*. Otherwise, given the SQL semantics for null-equality, we can not prove that this SQL statement correctly implements the OCL expression above, since there are scenarios where the OCL expression will evaluate to true but the SQL statement will not return TRUE. For example, suppose that the variable *user* is assigned null. Then, for an scenario in which the name of the lecturer *self* is also null, the OCL expression will evaluate to true while the SQL statement will return NULL.

Example #6

Consider the same OCL expression as in Example #5.

```
> self.name = user.
```

where *self* is a variable of type Student, and *user* is a variable of type String.

Suppose, as in Example #5, that the variable *user* is always assigned a String value different from null. Consider now the SQL statement:

```
> SELECT name = user FROM Student
> WHERE Student_id = self;
```

Notice that this statement is different (but equivalent) to the statement in Example #5. As expected, using our methodology we can prove that this SQL statement correctly implements the above OCL expression. In particular, for the corresponding correctness proof, we use the files `exm6-C1`, `exm6-C2`, and `exm6-C3` at [20]. Notice that, as in Example #5 and for the same reasons, we have added the assumption about the variable `user` being assigned a `String` value different from `null` to each of the satisfiability problems in `exm6-C1`, `exm6-C2`, and `exm6-C3`.

Example #7

Consider again the same OCL expression as in Example #5 and Example #6.

```
> self.name = user.
```

where `self` is a variable of type `Student`, and `user` is a variable of type `String`.

However, in this example, we do not assume that the variable `user` is always assigned a `String` value different from `null`. Consider now the SQL statement:

```
> SELECT CASE WHEN name IS NULL
> THEN user IS NULL
> ELSE CASE WHEN user IS NULL
> THEN FALSE
> ELSE name = user END
> END
> FROM Student WHERE Student_id = self;
```

Notice that in this statement the case-expressions take care of the “problematic” scenarios. As expected, using our methodology we can prove that this SQL statement correctly implements the above OCL expression. In particular, for the corresponding correctness proof, we use the files `exm7-C1`, `exm7-C2`, and `exm7-C3` at [20].

6 TOOL SUPPORT

We have implemented the following tools to automate the transformation process (i.e., text-to-model, model-to-text) supporting our methodology.

OCL2MSFOL. [21] is a Java application that implements the mapping OCL2MSFOL from OCL to many-sorted first-order logic (MSFOL) [9]. Given a data model \mathcal{D} (in JSON-format) and an OCL constraint *expr* (in textual format), OCL2MSFOL generates the MSFOL theory $\text{o2f}(\mathcal{D})$ and the MSFOL formula $\text{o2f}(\text{expr})$ (in SMT-LIB2 syntax).

SQL2MSFOL. [23] is a Java implementation of our mapping SQL2MSFOL from SQL statements to many-sorted first-order logic (MSFOL). Given a data model \mathcal{D} (in JSON-format) and an SQL select-statement *sel* (in textual format), SQL2MSFOL automatically generates the MSFOL theory $\text{s2f}(\mathcal{D})$ and the MSFOL formula $\text{s2f}(\text{sel})$ (in SMT-LIB2 syntax).

OCLSQLProver. [22] is a Python application that integrates the tools OCL2MSFOL and SQL2MSFOL. In a nutshell, OCLSQLProver takes a data model \mathcal{D} , an OCL constraint *expr*, a set (possibly empty)

of OCL assumptions, and a SQL select-statement *sel*, and it automatically generates the satisfiability problems that, according to our methodology, need to be checked for proving that the SQL select-statement *sel* correctly implements the OCL constraint *expr*. Then, OCLSQLProver will call an SMT solver of choice (i.e., CVC4 [2], Z3 [11]) to check the generated satisfiability problems. If, for every generated satisfiability problem, the result is UNSAT, we can conclude the SQL select-statement *sel* correctly implements the OCL constraint *expr*. If, for some of the generated satisfiability problems, the result is SAT, we can conclude that the SQL select-statement *sel* does not correctly implements the OCL constraint *expr*. Finally, if, for some of the generated satisfiability problems, the result is UNKNOWN, then we cannot conclude whether the SQL select-statement *sel* correctly implements or not the OCL constraint *expr*.

7 RELATED WORK

To the best of our knowledge, there have been no previous proposals for proving correctness of SQL implementations of OCL constraints. On the other hand, a number of different mappings have been proposed in the past to generate SQL implementations from OCL expressions [12–14, 18, 19]. The interested reader can find in [8, 19] a detailed discussion about the goals and limitations of each of these mappings. No formal proof of the correctness of the aforementioned mappings have been published yet.

Our methodology for proving correctness of SQL implementations of OCL constraints crucially leverages on the mapping OCL2MSFOL [9] from OCL to many-sorted first-order logic. The interested reader can find in [9] a summary of previously proposed mappings from OCL to other formalisms. Among these mappings, USE [15, 16] and HOL-OCL [7] are the ones more closely related to OCL2MSFOL. For reasoning about UML/OCL models, USE uses SAT-based constraint solvers and HOL-OCL uses the interactive theorem prover Isabelle [24, 27], while OCL2MSFOL uses SMT solvers. On the other hand, HOL-OCL supports the full OCL language, while OCL2MSFOL only supports a significant subset of the language.

Finally, the key component of our methodology is our mapping SQL2MSFOL from SQL to many-sorted first-order logic. Although designed for different purposes, it would be interesting to compare the mapping SQL2MSFOL with the formal semantics (for a basic fragment) of SQL introduced in [17]. The interested reader can find in [17] a detailed discussion about previous attempts of providing formal semantics to SQL.

8 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

In the context of model-driven development of data-centric applications, OCL constraints can play a major role in adding precision to the source models. In particular, OCL has been successfully used to specify both data models’ invariants and security models’ authorization constraints [10].

A number of code-generators have been proposed in the past to bridge the gap between source models with OCL constraints and their corresponding SQL implementations [12–14, 18, 19]. Unfortunately, the database queries produced by these code-generators are significantly less efficient—from the point of view of execution-time

performance— than the corresponding implementations written by SQL experts [8, 19].

To bridge the gap between source models with OCL constraints and their corresponding SQL implementations, we have proposed in this paper a different approach. Namely, instead of generating the SQL implementations from the OCL constraints using code-generators—and relying for their correctness on the correctness of the code-generators themselves—, we propose a methodology for proving the correctness of the SQL implementations themselves—letting the SQL experts to decide the most efficient way of implementing the OCL constraints.

Our methodology is based on a novel mapping, called SQL2MSFOL, from a significant subset of the SQL language into many-sorted first-order logic. Moreover, by leveraging on the mapping OCL2MSFOL [9] from the OCL language into many-sorted first-order logic, we can use SMT solvers (e.g., CVC4 [2] or Z3 [11]) to automatically prove the correctness of SQL implementations of OCL constraints. Moreover, we have included in this paper a number of non-trivial examples that show the applicability of our methodology, and we have briefly reported on the status of a suite of tools supporting it.

As for future work, the first natural direction is to extend our mapping SQL2MSFOL to include more features of the SQL language, especially aggregation and grouping. Nevertheless, our main future work will consist in formally proving the correctness of our mapping SQL2MSFOL, at least for the basic fragment of SQL covered by [17]. For the proof of correctness of SQL2MSFOL, we intend to use interactive theorem provers like Isabelle [24, 27] or Coq [5, 26].

REFERENCES

- [1] Clark Barrett, Aaron Stump, and Cesare Tinelli. 2010. The SMT-LIB Standard: Version 2.0. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Workshop on Satisfiability Modulo Theories (Edinburgh, UK)*, A. Gupta and D. Kroening (Eds.).
- [2] Clark W. Barrett, Christopher L. Conway, Morgan Deters, Liana Hadarean, Dejan Jovanovic, Tim King, Andrew Reynolds, and Cesare Tinelli. 2011. CVC4. In *Computer Aided Verification - 23rd International Conference, CAV 2011, Snowbird, UT, USA, July 14-20, 2011. Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 6806)*, Ganesh Gopalakrishnan and Shaz Qadeer (Eds.). Springer, 171–177.
- [3] Miloud Bennaïma and Thouraya Bouabana-Tebibel. 2014. Mapping OCL Constraints into CTL-like Logic and SML for UML Validation. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Workshop on Verification and Evaluation of Computer and Communication Systems, VECoS 2014, Bejaïa, Algeria, September 29-30, 2014 (CEUR Workshop Proceedings, Vol. 1256)*, Hassane Alla and Louiza Bouallouche-Medjkoune (Eds.). CEUR-WS.org, 102–112. <http://ceur-ws.org/Vol-1256/paper11.pdf>
- [4] Gábor Bergmann. 2014. Translating OCL to Graph Patterns. In *Model-Driven Engineering Languages and Systems - 17th International Conference, MODELS 2014, Valencia, Spain, September 28 - October 3, 2014. Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 8767)*, Jürgen Dingel, Wolfram Schulte, Isidro Ramos, Sílvia Abrahão, and Emilio Insfrán (Eds.). Springer, 670–686.
- [5] Yves Bertot and Pierre Castéran. 2004. *Interactive Theorem Proving and Program Development - Coq'Art: The Calculus of Inductive Constructions*. Springer.
- [6] Marco Brambilla, Jordi Cabot, and Manuel Wimmer. 2017. *Model-Driven Software Engineering in Practice, Second Edition*. Morgan & Claypool Publishers.
- [7] Achim D. Brucker and Burkhard Wolff. 2008. HOL-OCL: A Formal Proof Environment for UML/OCL. In *Fundamental Approaches to Software Engineering, 11th International Conference, FASE 2008, Held as Part of the Joint European Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2008, Budapest, Hungary, March 29-April 6, 2008. Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 4961)*, José Luiz Fiadeiro and Paola Inverardi (Eds.). Springer, 97–100.
- [8] Manuel Clavel and Hoang Nguyen. 2019. Mapping OCL into SQL: Challenges and Opportunities Ahead. In *19th International Workshop in OCL and Textual Modeling (OCL 2019) co-located with IEEE/ACM 22nd International Conference on Model Driven Engineering Languages and Systems (MODELS 2019), Munich, Germany, September 16, 2019 (CEUR Workshop Proceedings, Vol. 2513)*, Achim D. Brucker, Gwendal Daniel, and Frédéric Jouault (Eds.). CEUR-WS.org, 3–16. <http://ceur-ws.org/Vol-2513/paper1.pdf>
- [9] Carolina Dania and Manuel Clavel. 2016. OCL2MSFOL: a mapping to many-sorted first-order logic for efficiently checking the satisfiability of OCL constraints. In *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 19th International Conference on Model Driven Engineering Languages and Systems, Saint-Malo, France, October 2-7, 2016*, Benoit Baudry and Benoit Combemale (Eds.). ACM, 65–75. <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=2976774>
- [10] Miguel Angel García de Dios, Carolina Dania, David A. Basin, and Manuel Clavel. 2014. Model-Driven Development of a Secure eHealth Application. In *Engineering Secure Future Internet Services and Systems - Current Research*, Maritta Heisel, Wouter Joosen, Javier López, and Fabio Martinelli (Eds.). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 8431. Springer, 97–118.
- [11] Leonardo Mendonça de Moura and Nikolaj S. Bjørner. 2008. Z3: An Efficient SMT Solver. In *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems, 14th International Conference, TACAS 2008, Held as Part of the Joint European Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2008, Budapest, Hungary, March 29-April 6, 2008. Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 4963)*, C. R. Ramakrishnan and Jakob Rehof (Eds.). Springer, 337–340.
- [12] Birgit Demuth and Heinrich Hußmann. 1999. Using UML/OCL Constraints for Relational Database Design. In *«UML»'99: The Unified Modeling Language - Beyond the Standard, Second International Conference, Fort Collins, CO, USA, October 28-30, 1999, Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 1723)*, Robert B. France and Bernhard Rumpe (Eds.). Springer, 598–613.
- [13] Marina Egea and Carolina Dania. 2019. SQL-PL4OCL: an automatic code generator from OCL to SQL procedural language. *Softw. Syst. Model.* 18, 1 (2019), 769–791.
- [14] Marina Egea, Carolina Dania, and Manuel Clavel. 2010. MySQL4OCL: A Stored Procedure-Based MySQL Code Generator for OCL. *Electron. Commun. Eur. Assoc. Softw. Sci. Technol.* 36 (2010).
- [15] Martin Gogolla, Fabian Büttner, and Jordi Cabot. 2013. Initiating a Benchmark for UML and OCL Analysis Tools. In *Tests and Proofs - 7th International Conference, TAP@STAF 2013, Budapest, Hungary, June 16-20, 2013. Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 7942)*, Margus Veanes and Luca Viganò (Eds.). Springer, 115–132.
- [16] Martin Gogolla, Fabian Büttner, and Mark Richters. 2007. USE: A UML-based specification environment for validating UML and OCL. *Sci. Comput. Program.* 69, 1-3 (2007), 27–34.
- [17] Paolo Guagliardo and Leonid Libkin. 2017. A Formal Semantics of SQL Queries, Its Validation, and Applications. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 11, 1 (2017), 27–39.
- [18] Florian Heidenreich, Christian Wende, and Birgit Demuth. 2008. A Framework for Generating Query Language Code from OCL Invariants. *Electron. Commun. Eur. Assoc. Softw. Sci. Technol.* 9 (2008).
- [19] Hoang Nguyen and Manuel Clavel. 2019. OCL2PSQL: An OCL-to-SQL Code-Generator for Model-Driven Engineering. In *Future Data and Security Engineering - 6th International Conference, FDSE 2019, Nha Trang City, Vietnam, November 27-29, 2019, Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 11814)*, Tran Khanh Dang, Josef Küng, Makoto Takizawa, and Son Ha Bui (Eds.). Springer, 185–203.
- [20] Hoang Nguyen and Manuel Clavel. 2024. Manuscript's artifacts. <https://github.com/ModelSVGU/ocsql-artifacts>.
- [21] Hoang Nguyen and Manuel Clavel. 2024. The OCL2MSFOL Tool. <https://github.com/ModelSVGU/OCL2MSFOL>.
- [22] Hoang Nguyen and Manuel Clavel. 2024. The OCLSQLProver Tool. <https://github.com/ModelSVGU/OCLSQLProver>.
- [23] Hoang Nguyen and Manuel Clavel. 2024. The SQL2MSFOL tool. <https://github.com/ModelSVGU/SQL2MSFOL>.
- [24] Tobias Nipkow, Lawrence C. Paulson, and Markus Wenzel. 2002. *Isabelle/HOL - A Proof Assistant for Higher-Order Logic*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 2283. Springer.
- [25] OCL 2014. *Object Constraint Language specification Version 2.4*. Technical Report. Object Management Group. <https://www.omg.org/spec/OCL/>.
- [26] The Coq Proof Assistant Homepage 2022. *The Coq Proof Assistant Homepage*. Technical Report. INRIA. <https://coq.inria.fr/>.
- [27] The Isabelle Proof Assistant Homepage 2021. *The Isabelle Proof Assistant Homepage*. Technical Report. University of Cambridge and Technische Universität München. <https://isabelle.in.tum.de/>.
- [28] UML 2017. *Unified Modeling Language version 2.5.1*. Technical Report. Object Management Group. <https://www.omg.org/spec/UML/>.

A DATA MODELS AND OBJECT MODELS

We define data models as follows:

Definition A.1. Let $\mathcal{T} = \{\text{Integer}, \text{String}\}$ be the set of predefined types. A *data model* \mathcal{D} is a tuple $\langle C, AT, AS \rangle$, where:

- C is a set of *classes* c .
- AT is a set of *attributes* att , $att = \langle ati, c, t \rangle$, where ati is the attribute's identifier, c is the class of the attribute, and t is the type of the values of the attribute, with $t \in \mathcal{T}$ or $t \in C$.
- AS is a set of *associations* as , $as = \langle asi, ase_l, c_l, ase_r, c_r \rangle$, where asi is the association's identifier, ase_l and ase_r are the association's ends, and c_l and c_r are the classes of the objects at the corresponding association's ends.

Then, we define instances of data models as follows:

Definition A.2. Let $\mathcal{D} = \langle C, AT, AS \rangle$ be a data model. An *object model* \mathcal{O} of \mathcal{D} (also called an *instance* of \mathcal{D}) is a tuple $\langle OC, OAT, OAS \rangle$ where:

- OC is set of objects o , $o = \langle oi, c \rangle$, where oi is the object's identifier and c is the class of the object, where $c \in C$.
- OAT is a set of *attribute values* atv , $atv = \langle \langle ati, c, t \rangle, \langle oi, c \rangle, vl \rangle$, where $\langle ati, c, t \rangle \in AT$, $\langle oi, c \rangle \in OC$, and vl is a value of the type t . The attribute value atv denotes the value vl of the attribute $\langle ati, c, t \rangle$ of the object $\langle oi, c \rangle$.
- OAS is a set of *association links* asl , $asl = \langle \langle asi, ase_l, c_l, ase_r, c_r \rangle, \langle oi_l, c_l \rangle, \langle oi_r, c_r \rangle \rangle$, where $\langle asi, ase_l, c_l, ase_r, c_r \rangle \in AS$, $\langle oi_l, c_l \rangle \in OC$, and $\langle oi_r, c_r \rangle \in OC$. The association link asl denotes that there is a link of the association $\langle asi, ase_l, c_l, ase_r, c_r \rangle$ between the objects $\langle oi_l, c_l \rangle$ and $\langle oi_r, c_r \rangle$, where the latter stands at the end ase_r and the former stands at the end ase_l .

Let o be an object. We denote by $\text{id}(o)$ the identifier of the object o . We assume that every object is identified by a unique integer number. Let \mathcal{D} be a data model. We denote by $\text{Inst}(\mathcal{D})$ the set of instances of \mathcal{D} .

B THE MAPPING OCL2MSFOL

Mapping data models to MSFOL theories. [9] defines a mapping $\text{o2f}_{\text{data}}()$ from data models to MSFOL theories. Let \mathcal{D} be a data model. In a nutshell, $\text{o2f}_{\text{data}}(\mathcal{D})$ contains:

- The sorts `Int` and `String`, whose intended meaning is to represent the integer numbers and the strings.
- The constants `nullInt`, `nullString`, `invalInt`, and `invalString`, whose intended meaning is to represent `null` and `invalid` for integers and strings.
- The sort `Classifier`, whose intended meaning is to represent all the objects in an instance of \mathcal{D} , as well as `null` and `invalid` for objects.
- For each class c in \mathcal{D} , a unary predicate c , whose intended meaning is to define the objects of the class c in an instance of \mathcal{D} .
- For each attribute att in \mathcal{D} , a function att , whose intended meaning is to define the values of the attribute att in the objects in an instance of \mathcal{D} .
- For each binary association as in \mathcal{D} with association-ends ase_l and ase_r , a binary predicate as , whose intended meaning

is to define the links via the association as between objects in an instance of \mathcal{D} .

- The axioms that constrain the meaning of the aforementioned sorts, constants, predicates, and functions.

Based on the definition of $\text{o2f}_{\text{data}}()$, we define the following mapping $\text{intr}()$ from object models to MSFOL interpretations. Let \mathcal{D} be a data model and let \mathcal{O} be an instance of \mathcal{D} . Then, $\text{intr}(\mathcal{O})$ is the following interpretation of $\text{o2f}_{\text{data}}(\mathcal{D})$:

- The sort `Int` contains the integer numbers and the strings. The constants `nullInt` and `invalInt` are assigned two arbitrary (but different) integer numbers.
- The sort `String` contains the strings. The constants `nullString` and `invalString` are assigned two arbitrary (but different) strings.
- The sort `Classifier` contains the set of objects in \mathcal{O} plus two distinguished elements, which are the interpretations of the constants `nullClassifier` and `invalClassifier`.
- For each class c in \mathcal{D} , the predicate c is assigned the set of objects in \mathcal{O} of class c .
- For each attribute att in \mathcal{D} , the function att assigns to each object in \mathcal{O} the value of its attribute att .
- For each binary association as in \mathcal{D} with association-ends ase_l and ase_r , the binary predicate as is assigned all the pairs of objects linked through the association as in \mathcal{O} .

Mapping OCL to MSFOL formulas. Based on the definition of the mapping $\text{o2f}_{\text{data}}()$, [9] defines a mapping from OCL Boolean expressions to MSFOL formulas. More precisely, it defines four mappings, namely, $\text{o2f}_{\text{true}}()$, $\text{o2f}_{\text{false}}()$, $\text{o2f}_{\text{null}}()$, and $\text{o2f}_{\text{inval}}()$, formalising, respectively, when an OCL Boolean expression evaluates to `true`, `false`, `null`, or `invalid`. These mappings are defined recursively over the structure of OCL expressions. The following example shows the recursive definition of these mappings.

Example 1. Consider the Boolean expression:

`Student.allInstances() → notEmpty()`.

Then, according to the definition of the mapping $\text{o2f}_{\text{true}}()$ in [9]:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{o2f}_{\text{true}}(\text{Student.allInstances() → notEmpty()}) \\ &= \exists(x).(\text{o2f}_{\text{eval}}(\text{Student.allInstances()})(x) \\ &\quad \wedge \neg(\text{o2f}_{\text{inval}}(\text{Student.allInstances()}))) \\ &= \exists(x).(\text{o2f}_{\text{eval}}(\text{Student.allInstances()})(x)) \end{aligned}$$

where x is a variable of type `Classifier`.

Notice that, in the recursive case, when the subexpression is a non-Boolean type, an auxiliary mapping $\text{o2f}_{\text{eval}}()$ is called. The mapping $\text{o2f}_{\text{eval}}()$ builds upon the mapping $\text{o2f}_{\text{data}}()$ from data models to MSFOL theories. [9] distinguishes three classes of non-Boolean expressions. The first class is formed by variables and by expressions that denote primitive values and objects. Expressions denoting primitive values and objects are basically the literals (integers or strings), the arithmetic expressions, the expressions denoting operations on strings, and the dot-expressions for attributes. Variables are mapped to MSFOL variables of the appropriate sort. Expressions denoting primitive values and objects are mapped by $\text{o2f}_{\text{eval}}()$ following the definition of the mapping $\text{o2f}_{\text{data}}()$. The output of the mapping $\text{o2f}_{\text{eval}}()$ for this first class of non-Boolean expressions is always an MSFOL term.

Example 2. Consider the non-Boolean expression: $p.age$, where p is a variable of type `Student`. Then, according to the definition of the mapping $o2f_{eval}()$ in [9]:

$$o2f_{eval}(p.age) = age(o2f_{eval}(p)) = age(p)$$

where p is a variable of sort `Classifier`.

The second class of non-Boolean expressions is formed by the expressions that define sets. These expressions are basically the `allInstances`-expressions, the `select` and `reject`-expressions, the `including` and `excluding`-expressions, the `intersection` and `union`-expressions, and the `collect`-expressions. Each expression $expr$ in this class is mapped by $o2f_{eval}()$ to a new predicate, denoted as $\ulcorner expr \urcorner$. This predicate formalises the set defined by the expression $expr$ and its definition is generated by calling a mapping $o2f_{def_c}()$, which is also defined in [9].

Example 3. Consider the non-Boolean expression:

`Student.allInstances()` \rightarrow `select(s|s.age.oclIsUndefined())`.

Then, according to the definition of the mapping $o2f_{eval}()$ in [9]:

$$\begin{aligned} o2f_{eval}(\text{Student.allInstances}) &\rightarrow \text{select}(p|p.age.oclIsUndefined()) \\ = \ulcorner \text{Student.allInstances} \urcorner &\rightarrow \text{select}(p|p.age.oclIsUndefined()) \end{aligned}$$

where the new predicate

$$\ulcorner \text{Student.allInstances} \urcorner \rightarrow \text{select}(p | p.age.oclIsUndefined())$$

is defined by $o2f_{def_c}()$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall(s).(\ulcorner \text{Student.allInstances} \urcorner &\rightarrow \text{select}(p|p.age.oclIsUndefined()) \urcorner(s) \\ \Leftrightarrow (o2f_{eval}(\text{Student.allInstances}()) &(s) \\ \wedge o2f_{true}(s.age.oclIsUndefined())) & \\ = & \\ \forall(s).(\ulcorner \text{Student.allInstances} \urcorner &\rightarrow \text{select}(p|p.age.oclIsUndefined()) \urcorner(s) \\ \Leftrightarrow (\ulcorner \text{Student.allInstances} \urcorner \urcorner(s) & \\ \wedge o2f_{eval}(s.age) = \text{nullInt} & \\ \vee (s = \text{nullClassifier} \vee s = \text{invalClassifier})) & \\ = & \\ \forall(s).(\ulcorner \text{Student.allInstances} \urcorner &\rightarrow \text{select}(p|p.age.oclIsUndefined()) \urcorner(s) \\ \Leftrightarrow (\ulcorner \text{Student.allInstances} \urcorner \urcorner(s) & \\ \wedge \text{age}(s) = \text{nullInt} & \\ \vee (s = \text{nullClassifier} \vee s = \text{invalClassifier})) & \end{aligned}$$

where the new predicate $\ulcorner \text{Student.allInstances} \urcorner$ is defined by $o2f_{def_c}()$ as follows:

$$\forall(s).(\ulcorner \text{Student.allInstances} \urcorner \Leftrightarrow \text{Student}(s))$$

where s is a variable of type `Classifier`.

The third class of non-Boolean expressions is formed by the expressions that distinguish an element from a set. These expressions are, basically, the `any`, `max`, and `min`-expressions. Each expression $expr$ in this class is mapped by $o2f_{eval}()$ to a new function, denoted as $\ulcorner expr \urcorner$, which represents the element referred to by $expr$. The axioms defining $\ulcorner expr \urcorner$ are generated by calling a mapping $o2f_{def_o}()$, which is also defined in [9].

[9] denotes by $o2f_{def}(expr)$ the set of axioms that result from applying $o2f_{def_c}()$ and $o2f_{def_o}()$ to the corresponding non-Boolean subexpression in $expr$. In particular, for each literal integer i and literal string st in $expr$, $o2f_{def_o}()$ generates the following axioms:

$$o2f_{def_o}(i) = \neg(i = \text{nullInt}) \wedge \neg(i = \text{invalInt}).$$

$$o2f_{def_o}(st) = \neg(st = \text{nullString}) \wedge \neg(st = \text{invalString})$$

C THE MAPPING OCL2PSQL

Mapping data models to SQL schemata. [19] introduces a mapping, called OCL2PSQL, from OCL to SQL. It contains two parts: first, a mapping from data models to SQL schemata, and then a mapping from OCL expressions to pure SQL select statements. The mapping from data models to SQL schemata, which we denoted as $o2s()$, is the usual OR mapping (classes are mapped to tables, attributes to columns, and many-to-many associations to tables with appropriate foreign-keys). Let $\mathcal{D} = \langle C, AT, AS \rangle$ be a data model. In a nutshell, $o2s(\mathcal{D})$ contains the following statements:

- For each class $c \in C$,
 \gt CREATE TABLE $\ulcorner c \urcorner$ (c_id int PRIMARY KEY)
- For each attribute $att = \langle ati, c, t \rangle$ in AT ,
 \gt ALTER TABLE $\ulcorner c \urcorner$ ADD COLUMN att SqlType(t)
 where:
 $\text{-- if } t = \text{Integer, then SqlType}(t) = \text{int};$
 $\text{-- if } t = \text{String, then SqlType}(t) = \text{varchar};$
 $\text{-- if } t \in C, \text{ then SqlType}(t) = \text{int}.$
 Moreover, if $t \in C$, then
 \gt ALTER TABLE $\ulcorner c \urcorner$ ADD FOREIGN KEY $fk_c_ati(att)$
 \gt REFERENCES $\ulcorner t \urcorner(t_id);$
- For each association $as = \langle asi, ase_l, c_l, ase_r, c_r \rangle$ in AS ,
 \gt CREATE TABLE $\ulcorner as \urcorner$ (ase_l int, ase_r int,
 \gt FOREIGN KEY $fk_c_l_ase_l(ase_l)$ REFERENCES $\ulcorner c_l \urcorner(c_l_id),$
 \gt FOREIGN KEY $fk_c_r_ase_r(ase_r)$ REFERENCES $\ulcorner c_r \urcorner(c_r_id)).$

[19] also defines a mapping $o2s_{inst}()$ from instances of data models to instances of SQL databases. Let $\mathcal{D} = \langle OC, OAT, OAS \rangle$ be a data model. Let $\mathcal{O} = \langle OC, OAT, OAS \rangle$ be an instance of \mathcal{D} . Then $o2s_{inst}(\mathcal{O})$ is defined as follows:

- For each $o = \langle oi, c \rangle \in OC$,
 \gt INSERT INTO $\ulcorner c \urcorner$ (c_id) VALUES ($id(o)$)
- For each $\langle att, (o, c), v \rangle \in OAT$,
 \gt UPDATE $\ulcorner c \urcorner$ SET $att = v$ WHERE $c_id = id(o)$
- For each $\langle \langle as, ase_l, c_l, ase_r, c_r \rangle, o_l, o_r \rangle \in OAS$,
 \gt INSERT INTO $\ulcorner as \urcorner$ (ase_l, ase_r) VALUES ($id(o_l), id(o_r)$)

D THE MAPPING SQL2MSFOL

Mapping SQL schemata to MSFOL theories. Let \mathcal{D} be a data model. We recall that our mapping SQL2MSFOL assumes that the SQL implementations of the OCL constraints in the context of the data model \mathcal{D} are select-statements in the context of the SQL schema $o2s(\mathcal{D})$ generated by the mapping OCL2PSQL [19] in Appendix C.

Notation. In what follows, for any class c in the contextual model, we use $\text{index}_{c \urcorner}(_)$ to denote the name of a new unary predicate. Similarly, for any association as in the contextual model, we use $\text{index}_{as \urcorner}(_)$ to denote the name of a new unary predicate. In what

follows, the variable c, c' are of sort Classifier, and the variable x, y, z are of sort Int. Also, $\text{id}()$ is an uninterpreted function from the sort Int to the sort Classifier, and left , and right are uninterpreted functions from the sort Int to the sort Int.

For each class C in the contextual model, the mapping $\text{s2f}()$ generates the following axioms:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall(x)(\text{index}_{C^{-1}}(x) &\Rightarrow \exists(c)(C(c) \wedge c = \text{id}(x))). \\ \forall(c)(C(c) &\Rightarrow \exists(x)(\text{index}_{C^{-1}}(x) \wedge c = \text{id}(x))). \\ \forall(x, y)((\text{index}_{C^{-1}}(x) &\wedge \text{index}_{C^{-1}}(y) \wedge x \neq y) \Rightarrow (\text{id}(x) \neq \text{id}(y))). \\ \forall(x)(\text{index}_{C^{-1}}(x) &\Rightarrow \text{val}_{C^{-1}}(\ulcorner C^{-1}_id, x) = \text{id}(x)). \end{aligned}$$

and for each attribute att in C ,

$$\forall(x)(\text{index}_{C^{-1}}(x) \Rightarrow \text{val}_{C^{-1}}(\text{att}, x) = \text{att}(\text{id}(x))).$$

Moreover, for each association as , with association-ends ase_1 and ase_2 in the contextual model, $\text{s2f}()$ generates the following axioms:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall(x, y)(\text{index}_{\text{as}^{-1}}(x) &\wedge \text{index}_{\text{as}^{-1}}(y) \wedge x \neq y \\ &\Rightarrow \neg(\text{left}(x) = \text{left}(y) \wedge \text{right}(x) = \text{right}(y))). \\ \forall(c, c')(as(c, c') & \\ &\Rightarrow \exists(x)(\text{index}_{\text{as}^{-1}}(x) \wedge \text{id}(\text{left}(x)) = c \wedge \text{id}(\text{right}(x)) = c'). \\ \forall(x)(\text{index}_{\text{as}^{-1}}(x) & \\ &\Rightarrow \exists(c, c')(\text{as}(c, c') \wedge \text{id}(\text{left}(x)) = c \wedge \text{id}(\text{right}(x)) = c'). \\ \forall(x)(\text{index}_{\text{as}^{-1}}(x) &\Rightarrow \text{val}_{\text{as}^{-1}}(\text{ase}_1, x) = \text{id}(\text{left}(x))). \\ \forall(x)(\text{index}_{\text{as}^{-1}}(x) &\Rightarrow \text{val}_{\text{as}^{-1}}(\text{ase}_2, x) = \text{id}(\text{right}(x))). \end{aligned}$$

Mapping select-statements. Currently, our mapping $\text{s2f}()$ covers the SQL patterns below, where fromitem is either a *table* of a *subselect*. We do not consider correlated subqueries.

- SELECT *selectitems*.
- SELECT *selectitems* FROM *fromitem*.
- SELECT *selectitems* FROM *fromitem* WHERE *bexpr*.
- SELECT *selectitems* FROM *fromitem* JOIN *fromitem'*.
- SELECT *selectitems* FROM *fromitem* JOIN *fromitem'* ON *bexpr*.
- SELECT *selectitems* FROM *fromitem* JOIN *fromitem'* ON *bexpr* WHERE *bexpr'*.

Notation. In what follows, for any select-statement sel we use $\text{index}_{\text{sel}}()$ to denote the name of a new unary predicate. Also, for any from-expression fromitem we use $\text{index}_{\text{fromitem}}()$ to denote the name of a new unary predicate. And, similarly, for any select-statement sel , and any expression expr , we use $\text{val}_{\text{sel}}(\text{expr}, _)$ to denote the name of a new unary function.

For each (sub)select statement, $\text{s2f}()$ generates the following axioms:

Case: $\text{sel} := \text{SELECT } \text{selectitems}$.

$$\exists(x)(\text{index}_{\text{sel}}(x) \wedge \forall(y)(y \neq x \Rightarrow \neg(\text{index}_{\text{sel}}(y)))).$$

Case: $\text{sel} := \text{SELECT } \text{selectitems}$ FROM *fromitem*.

$$\forall(x)(\text{index}_{\text{sel}}(x) \iff \text{index}_{\text{fromitem}}(x)).$$

Moreover, for each column fromitem.col in *selectitems*,

$$\forall(x)(\text{index}_{\text{sel}}(x) \Rightarrow \text{val}_{\text{sel}}(\text{fromitem.col}, x) = \text{val}_{\text{fromitem}}(\text{col}, x)).$$

Case: $\text{sel} := \text{SELECT } \text{selectitems}$ FROM *fromitem* WHERE *expr*.

$$\begin{aligned} \forall(x)(\text{index}_{\text{sel}}(x) & \\ \iff \text{index}_{\text{fromitem}}(x) \wedge \text{val}_{\text{fromitem}}(\text{expr}, x) &= \text{TRUE}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for each column fromitem.col in *selectitems*,

$$\forall(x)(\text{index}_{\text{sel}}(x) \Rightarrow \text{val}_{\text{sel}}(\text{fromitem.col}, x) = \text{val}_{\text{fromitem}}(\text{col}, x)).$$

Case: $\text{sel} := \text{SELECT } \text{selectitems}$ FROM *fromitem* JOIN *fromitem'*. The predicate $\text{index}_{\text{join}}()$ specifies the indices of the intermediate table resulting from joining *fromitem* with *fromitem'*.

$$\forall(x)(\text{index}_{\text{sel}}(x) \iff \text{index}_{\text{join}}(x)).$$

$$\begin{aligned} \forall(x, y)(\text{index}_{\text{join}}(x) \wedge \text{index}_{\text{join}}(y) \wedge x \neq y & \\ \Rightarrow \neg(\text{left}(x) = \text{left}(y) \wedge \text{right}(x) = \text{right}(y))). & \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \forall(x)(\text{index}_{\text{join}}(x) \Rightarrow \exists(y, z)(\text{index}_{\text{fromitem}}(y) & \\ \wedge \text{index}_{\text{fromitem}'}(z) \wedge y = \text{left}(x) \wedge z = \text{right}(x))). & \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \forall(y, z)(\text{index}_{\text{fromitem}}(y) \wedge \text{index}_{\text{fromitem}'}(z) & \\ \Rightarrow \exists(x)(\text{index}_{\text{join}}(x) \wedge y = \text{left}(x) \wedge z = \text{right}(x))). & \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for each column fromitem.col in *selectitems*,

$$\begin{aligned} \forall(x)(\text{index}_{\text{sel}}(x) & \\ \Rightarrow \text{val}_{\text{sel}}(\text{fromitem.col}, x) = \text{val}_{\text{fromitem}}(\text{col}, \text{left}(x))). & \end{aligned}$$

Finally for each column fromitem'.col in *selectitems*,

$$\begin{aligned} \forall(x)(\text{index}_{\text{sel}}(x) & \\ \Rightarrow \text{val}_{\text{sel}}(\text{fromitem'.col}, x) = \text{val}_{\text{fromitem}'}(\text{col}, \text{right}(x))). & \end{aligned}$$

Case: $\text{sel} := \text{SELECT } \text{selectitems}$ FROM *fromitem* JOIN *fromitem'* ON *bexpr*. The predicate $\text{index}_{\text{join}}()$ specifies the indices of the intermediate table resulting from joining *fromitem* with *fromitem'* taking into account the on-clause *bexpr*.

$$\begin{aligned} \forall(x)(\text{index}_{\text{sel}}(x) \iff \text{index}_{\text{join}}(x) & \\ \wedge \text{val}_{\text{join}}(\text{bexpr}, x) = \text{TRUE}). & \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \forall(x, y)(\text{index}_{\text{join}}(x) \wedge \text{index}_{\text{join}}(y) \wedge x \neq y & \\ \Rightarrow \neg(\text{left}(x) = \text{left}(y) \wedge \text{right}(x) = \text{right}(y))). & \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \forall(x)(\text{index}_{\text{join}}(x) \Rightarrow \exists(y, z)(\text{index}_{\text{fromitem}}(y) & \\ \wedge \text{index}_{\text{fromitem}'}(z) \wedge y = \text{left}(x) \wedge z = \text{right}(x))). & \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \forall(y, z)(\text{index}_{\text{fromitem}}(y) \wedge \text{index}_{\text{fromitem}'}(z) & \\ \Rightarrow \exists(x)(\text{index}_{\text{join}}(x) \wedge y = \text{left}(x) \wedge z = \text{right}(x))). & \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for each column fromitem.col in *selectitems*,

$$\forall(x)(\text{index}_{\text{sel}}(x) \Rightarrow \text{val}_{\text{sel}}(\text{fromitem.col}, x) = \text{val}_{\text{fromitem}}(\text{col}, \text{left}(x))).$$

Finally for each column fromitem'.col in *selectitems*,

$$\begin{aligned} \forall(x)(\text{index}_{\text{sel}}(x) & \\ \Rightarrow \text{val}_{\text{sel}}(\text{fromitem'.col}, x) = \text{val}_{\text{fromitem}'}(\text{col}, \text{right}(x))). & \end{aligned}$$

Case: $\text{sel} := \text{SELECT } \text{selectitems}$ FROM *fromitem* JOIN *fromitem'* ON *bexpr* WHERE *bexpr'*. The predicate $\text{index}_{\text{join}}()$ specifies the indices of the intermediate table resulting from joining *fromitem* with *fromitem'* taking into account the on-clause *bexpr* and the where-clause *bexpr'*

$$\begin{aligned} \forall(x)(\text{index}_{\text{sel}}(x) \iff \text{index}_{\text{join}}(x) & \\ \wedge \text{val}_{\text{join}}(\text{bexpr}, x) = \text{TRUE} \wedge \text{val}_{\text{join}}(\text{bexpr'}, x) = \text{TRUE}). & \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \forall(x, y)(\text{index}_{\text{join}}(x) \wedge \text{index}_{\text{join}}(y) \wedge x \neq y & \\ \Rightarrow \neg(\text{left}(x) = \text{left}(y) \wedge \text{right}(x) = \text{right}(y))). & \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \forall(x)(\text{index}_{\text{join}}(x) \Rightarrow \exists(y, z)(\text{index}_{\text{fromitem}}(y) & \\ \wedge \text{index}_{\text{fromitem}'}(z) \wedge y = \text{left}(x) \wedge z = \text{right}(x))). & \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \forall(y, z)(\text{index}_{\text{fromitem}}(y) \wedge \text{index}_{\text{fromitem}'}(z) & \\ \Rightarrow \exists(x)(\text{index}_{\text{join}}(x) \wedge y = \text{left}(x) \wedge z = \text{right}(x))). & \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for each column fromitem.col in *selectitems*,

$$\begin{aligned} \forall(x)(\text{index}_{\text{sel}}(x) & \\ \Rightarrow \text{val}_{\text{sel}}(\text{fromitem.col}, x) = \text{val}_{\text{fromitem}}(\text{col}, \text{left}(x))). & \end{aligned}$$

Finally for each column fromitem'.col in *selectitems*,

$\forall(x)(\text{index}_{sel}(x) \Rightarrow \text{val}_{sel}(\text{fromitem}'.col, x) = \text{val}_{\text{fromitem}'}(col, \text{right}(x)))$.

Mapping expressions. Currently, our mapping $s2f()$ covers the following SQL expressions:

$expr$	$:=$	TRUE FALSE NULL	(Boolean literals)
		NULL \dots 0 1 \dots	(integer literals)
		var	(variables)
		c_id $attribute$	(class ids and attributes)
		$association_end$	(association-end)
		$\ominus expr$	(unary logical ops)
		$expr_1 \oplus expr_2$	(binary logical ops)
		$expr_1 \otimes expr_2$	(binary comparison ops)
		CASE WHEN $expr$ THEN $expr_1$ ELSE $expr_2$ END	(CASE-expression)
		$expr$ IS NULL	(IS NULL-expression)
		EXISTS $subselect$	(EXISTS-expression)
		$subselect$	(single-valued subselect)

Let sel be a (sub)select statement. Then, for each (sub) expression $expr$ in sel , $s2f()$ generates the following axioms.

Case: $expr := \text{TRUE} \mid \text{FALSE} \mid \text{NULL}$.

$\forall(x)(\text{index}_{sel}(x) \Rightarrow \text{val}_{sel}(\text{TRUE}, x) = \text{TRUE})$.
 $\forall(x)(\text{index}_{sel}(x) \Rightarrow \text{val}_{sel}(\text{FALSE}, x) = \text{FALSE})$.
 $\forall(x)(\text{index}_{sel}(x) \Rightarrow \text{val}_{sel}(\text{NULL}, x) = \text{NULL})$.

Case: $expr := \dots \mid -1 \mid 0 \mid \text{NULL} \mid 1 \mid \dots$

$\forall(x)(\text{index}_{sel}(x) \Rightarrow \text{val}_{sel}(\text{NULL}, x) = \text{nullInt})$.

For every integer number i ,

$\forall(x)(\text{index}_{sel}(x) \Rightarrow \text{val}_{sel}(i, x) = i)$.

Case: $expr := var$.

$\forall(x)(\text{index}_{sel}(x) \Rightarrow (\text{val}_{sel}(var, x) = var))$.

Case: $expr := c_id \mid attribute \mid association_end$. The corresponding axioms are introduced in *Mapping SQL schemata to MS-FOL theories* above.

Case: $expr := \text{NOT } expr'$.

$\forall(x)(\text{index}_{sel}(x) \Rightarrow (\text{val}_{sel}(expr, x) = \text{TRUE} \Leftrightarrow \text{val}_{sel}(expr', x) = \text{FALSE}))$.
 $\forall(x)(\text{index}_{sel}(x) \Rightarrow (\text{val}_{sel}(expr, x) = \text{FALSE} \Leftrightarrow \text{val}_{sel}(expr', x) = \text{TRUE}))$.
 $\forall(x)(\text{index}_{sel}(x) \Rightarrow (\text{val}_{sel}(expr, x) = \text{NULL} \Leftrightarrow \text{val}_{sel}(expr', x) = \text{NULL}))$.

Case: $expr := expr_1 \text{ AND } expr_2$.

$\forall(x)(\text{index}_{sel}(x) \Rightarrow \text{val}_{sel}(expr, x) = \text{TRUE} \Leftrightarrow \text{val}_{sel}(expr_1, x) = \text{TRUE} \wedge \text{val}_{sel}(expr_2, x) = \text{TRUE})$.
 $\forall(x)(\text{index}_{sel}(x) \Rightarrow \text{val}_{sel}(expr, x) = \text{FALSE} \Leftrightarrow \text{val}_{sel}(expr_1, x) = \text{FALSE} \vee \text{val}_{sel}(expr_2, x) = \text{FALSE})$.
 $\forall(x)(\text{index}_{sel}(x) \Rightarrow (\text{val}_{sel}(expr, x) = \text{NULL} \Leftrightarrow (\text{val}_{sel}(expr_1, x) = \text{NULL} \wedge \text{val}_{sel}(expr_2, x) = \text{NULL} \vee (\text{val}_{sel}(expr_1, x) = \text{NULL} \wedge \text{val}_{sel}(expr_2, x) = \text{TRUE}) \vee (\text{val}_{sel}(expr_1, x) = \text{TRUE} \wedge \text{val}_{sel}(expr_2, x) = \text{NULL})))$.

Case: $expr := expr_1 \text{ OR } expr_2$.

$\forall(x)(\text{index}_{sel}(x) \Rightarrow \text{val}_{sel}(expr, x) = \text{TRUE} \Leftrightarrow \text{val}_{sel}(expr_1, x) = \text{TRUE} \vee \text{val}_{sel}(expr_2, x) = \text{TRUE})$.
 $\forall(x)(\text{index}_{sel}(x) \Rightarrow \text{val}_{sel}(expr, x) = \text{FALSE} \Leftrightarrow \text{val}_{sel}(expr_1, x) = \text{FALSE} \wedge \text{val}_{sel}(expr_2, x) = \text{FALSE})$.
 $\forall(x)(\text{index}_{sel}(x) \Rightarrow (\text{val}_{sel}(expr, x) = \text{NULL} \Leftrightarrow (\text{val}_{sel}(expr_1, x) = \text{NULL} \wedge \text{val}_{sel}(expr_2, x) = \text{NULL}) \vee (\text{val}_{sel}(expr_1, x) = \text{NULL} \wedge \text{val}_{sel}(expr_2, x) = \text{FALSE}) \vee (\text{val}_{sel}(expr_1, x) = \text{FALSE} \wedge \text{val}_{sel}(expr_2, x) = \text{NULL})))$.

Case: $expr := expr' \text{ IS NULL}$. Let t be the type of $expr'$. Then,

$\forall(x)(\text{index}_{sel}(x) \Rightarrow (\text{val}_{sel}(expr, x) = \text{TRUE} \Leftrightarrow \text{val}_{sel}(expr', x) = \text{nullOf}(t)))$.
 $\forall(x)(\text{index}_{sel}(x) \Rightarrow (\text{val}_{sel}(expr, x) = \text{FALSE} \Leftrightarrow \text{val}_{sel}(expr', x) \neq \text{nullOf}(t)))$.

where $\text{nullOf}(\text{Bool}) = \text{NULL}$, $\text{nullOf}(\text{Integer}) = \text{nullInt}$, and $\text{nullOf}(\text{String}) = \text{nullString}$;

Case: $expr := expr_1 \otimes expr_2$.

$\forall(x)(\text{index}_{sel}(x) \Rightarrow (\text{val}_{sel}(expr, x) = \text{TRUE} \Leftrightarrow \neg(\text{val}_{sel}(expr_1, x) = \text{nullOf}(t)) \wedge \neg(\text{val}_{sel}(expr_2, x) = \text{nullOf}(t)) \wedge \text{val}_{sel}(expr_1, x) \otimes \text{val}(expr_2, x)))$.
 $\forall(x)(\text{index}_{sel}(x) \Rightarrow (\text{val}_{sel}(expr, x) = \text{FALSE} \Leftrightarrow \neg(\text{val}_{sel}(expr_1, x) = \text{nullOf}(t)) \wedge \neg(\text{val}_{sel}(expr_2, x) = \text{nullOf}(t)) \wedge \neg(\text{val}_{sel}(expr_1, x) \otimes \text{val}(expr_2, x))))$.
 $\forall(x)(\text{index}_{sel}(x) \Rightarrow (\text{val}_{sel}(expr, x) = \text{NULL} \Leftrightarrow \text{val}_{sel}(expr_1, x) = \text{nullOf}(t) \vee \text{val}_{sel}(expr_2, x) = \text{nullOf}(t)))$.

Case: $expr := \text{CASE WHEN } expr' \text{ THEN } expr_1 \text{ ELSE } expr_2 \text{ END}$.

$\forall(x)(\text{index}_{sel}(x) \Rightarrow (\text{val}_{sel}(expr, x) = \text{val}_{sel}(expr_1, x) \Leftrightarrow \text{val}_{sel}(expr', x) = \text{TRUE}))$.
 $\forall(x)(\text{index}_{sel}(x) \Rightarrow (\text{val}_{sel}(expr, x) = \text{val}_{sel}(expr_2, x) \Leftrightarrow (\text{val}_{sel}(expr', x) = \text{FALSE} \vee \text{val}_{sel}(expr', x) = \text{NULL})))$.

Case: $expr := \text{EXISTS } subselect$.

$\forall(x)(\text{index}_{sel}(x) \Rightarrow (\text{val}_{sel}(expr, x) = \text{TRUE} \Leftrightarrow \exists(y)(\text{index}_{subselect}(y))))$.
 $\forall(x)(\text{index}_{sel}(x) \Rightarrow (\text{val}_{sel}(expr, x) = \text{FALSE} \Leftrightarrow \neg\exists(y)(\text{index}_{subselect}(y))))$.

Case: $expr := subselect$. Notice that a *subselect* can only be used as an expression when it projects one single item and returns one single row. Then, in our methodology, we first add the following *proof goal* to our correctness proofs:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{o2f}_{\text{data}}(\mathcal{D}) \\ & \cup \text{index}_{\text{def}}(\mathcal{D}) \cup \text{index}_{\text{def}}(subselect) \\ & \cup \{ \neg(\exists(x)(\text{index}_{subselect}(x) \wedge \forall(y)(y \neq x \Rightarrow \neg(\text{index}_{subselect}(y)))))) \}. \end{aligned}$$

Under the assumption that this proof goal holds, the mapping $s2f()$ generates the following axioms: let $expr'$ be the item projected by *subselect*, and let w a new constant of the type of $expr'$. Then,

$\forall(x)(\text{index}_{sel}(x) \Rightarrow \text{val}_{sel}(expr, x) = w)$.
 $\exists(x)(\text{index}_{subselect}(x) \wedge \text{val}_{subselect}(expr', x) = w)$.