

# Revisiting the Expressiveness Landscape of Data Graph Queries

Michael Benedikt and Anthony Widjaja Lin and Di-De Yen

## Abstract

The study of graph queries in database theory has spanned more than three decades, resulting in a multitude of proposals for graph query languages. These languages differ in the mechanisms. We can identify three main families of languages, with the canonical representatives being: (1) regular path queries, (2) walk logic, and (3) first-order logic with transitive closure operators. This paper provides a complete picture of the expressive power of these languages in the context of data graphs. Specifically, we consider a graph data model that supports querying over both data and topology. For example, “Does there exist a path between two different persons in a social network with the same last name?”. We also show that an extension of (1), augmented with transitive closure operators, can unify the expressivity of (1)–(3) without increasing the query evaluation complexity.

## 1 Introduction

Graph databases are data models with a multitude of natural applications including social networks, semantic web, biology, ecology, supply chain management, and business process modeling. With graphs as the main repository of data, *graph querying* has become a major component in data wrangling. Indeed, graph database systems — like Neo4j, Oracle, TigerGraph, among many others — have increasingly found usage in a plethora of application domains.

One important feature in graph query languages is the ability to query for paths over a given database. In fact, much of the effort in the study of graph query languages in database theory has been motivated by the need to support path queries. This has resulted in a plethora of query languages over graphs. Such languages can be classified into three categories: (1) extensions of regular path queries [26, 24, 3], (2) walk logic [18, 2], and (3) first-order logic with transitive closure operators [20, 24]. In addition, while the original query languages were studied within the basic graph database setting of edge-labelled graphs with finitely many labels, recent development suggests the importance of supporting *data* in the model, not just *topology*. For example, if a node represents a person (with data including `age`, `firstname`, `lastname`, etc.) in a social network and an edge represents a “friend-of” relation, then we might be interested

in a pair of friend-of-friends (i.e. transitive closure of friend relations) with the same data component `lastname`. To support such queries, an extended graph data model of *data graphs* [25, 24] was proposed, wherein additional binary relations  $\equiv_{\text{DATA},i} \subseteq V \times V$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$  over nodes in the graph check whether two nodes have the same  $i^{\text{th}}$  data component (e.g. `lastname`). The bulk of graph queries can be (and have been) extended to the setting of data graphs [25, 24, 2, 13]. This paper is a step towards a better understanding of the expressiveness landscape for these languages. While a more flexible data model called *property graphs*, which supports schemaless querying — together with the query languages over this data model — is under development, we focus on the more stable model of data graphs and their corresponding query languages in this work.

**Zoo of query languages over data graphs** We proceed by first surveying the categories (1)–(3) of graph query languages. The first category of query language originates from the idea of using regular languages to describe “path patterns”. This was featured in the seminal paper of Mendelzon and Wood [26], which introduces the so-called *Regular Path Queries (RPQ)*. For example, to describe the friend-of-friends relation, one may simply write the path pattern `(friend)*`, where `friend` is a name of a relation in the database describe the friend-of relation. Since the publication of [26] in 1995, RPQ has been extended to operate over data graphs [25, 24], and to support unions/conjunctions [6, 12, 15], which featured in the query language Conjunctive RPQ, i.e., CRPQ. It has also been extended to support path comparisons [3] featured in the language Extended CRPQ, (ECRPQ). In particular, register automata – or, equivalently, regular expressions with memory – are used to extend the notion of regular path patterns to *data paths*, an alternating sequence of data and edge labels. In register automata an unbounded register/memory is required to store data. For example, to enforce that the start node  $v$  and end node  $w$  correspond to persons with the same `lastname` attribute, an automaton can save the last name of the first person  $v$  in the register and then check if it is the same with the last name of the last person  $w$ . The idea of using register automata to express regular patterns over data paths, or tuples of data paths, can also be easily extended to CRPQ and ECRPQ, as well as their extensions with negations CRPQ<sub>-</sub>, and ECRPQ<sub>-</sub>. To emphasize the data model the query languages, on which they operate, we denote RPQ, CRPQ, etc. by RDPQ, CRDPQ, etc., as was suggested by [24].

The second paradigm is that of *Walk Logic (WL)* [18], which takes paths within graphs as the fundamental data item referenced within query variables. Paths are manipulated through first-order predicate logic operations: roughly the paradigm is “relational calculus for paths”. As explained in [2], WL can be construed as a query language over data graphs.

The third paradigm is inspired by first-order logic with transitive closure operators [20]. This logic was studied in the setting of data graphs in [24], where additional binary relations  $\equiv_{\text{DATA},i} \subseteq V \times V$  over nodes in the graph are




Figure 1: Prior query languages (extended with data). In the diagrams, for any pair of languages  $L$  and  $M$ , the arrow  $L \rightarrow M$  signifies that  $M$  is more expressive than  $L$ . Languages  $L$  and  $M$  are considered incomparable if there is no edge (after taking transitive closure) between them.




Figure 2: Expressiveness of languages.

introduced that check whether two nodes have the same  $i^{th}$  data component. This resulting logic (called  $FO^*(\equiv_{DATA})$ ) subsumes  $GXPath$  [24] and also regular (data) queries [27].

Finally, we mention another language that can be related to the first paradigm, the recently proposed *Graph Pattern Calculus* (GPC) [16], which arose during the ongoing standardization of efforts [11] of SQL/PGQ and GQL for the more expressive graph data model of property graphs<sup>1</sup>.

**Contributions:** We begin by studying the prior proposals for graph query languages in the framework of data graphs. We isolate the expressiveness of these languages, showing which containments hold: see Figure 1. We show that over data graphs the most expressive existing language  $ECRDPQ_-$  from the first paradigm strictly subsumes  $WL$ ,  $RDPQ$ , as well as  $GPC$ . Although we show that  $FO^*(\equiv_{DATA})$ , from Category (3), subsumes  $RDPQ$ , we prove that it is incomparable with  $ECRDPQ_-$ , as well as  $GPC$ . This leaves the question of whether there is a natural way to reconcile  $ECRDPQ_-$  and  $FO^*(\equiv_{DATA})$ . Towards resolving this, we propose a language that subsumes all the existing ones, while retaining the most important computational property common to them: decidable model checking. A summary of the revised landscape in terms of expressive power can be found in Figure 2.

At a high level, our proofs utilize the usual expressiveness toolbox in finite model theory – e.g. Ehrenfeucht-Fraïssé games, automata, complexity-theoretic arguments. But their application to some of the finer-grain comparisons we consider here requires some subtlety. For example, since  $ECRDPQ_-$  combines

<sup>1</sup>The schemaless nature of property graphs is currently not yet fully supported by GPC, as defined in [16], e.g., find all nodes with the key  $a$ . We are aware that there is an ongoing effort in extending GPC to support such queries.

regular expression power with some arithmetic, in separating  $\text{ECRDPQ}_\perp$  from MWL we require a combination of circuit complexity bounds and rewriting techniques; in showing RDPQ is not subsumed by GPC, we need to bound the expressiveness of GPC, and thus require a variation of the E-F game technique that is tailored towards fine points of the GPC syntax.

## 2 Preliminaries

**General Notation:** We use  $\mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  to denote the sets of non-negative integers and positive integers, respectively. For any two  $i$  and  $j$  in  $\mathbb{N}$  where  $i < j$ , the notation  $[i, j]$  represents the set  $\{i, i + 1, \dots, j\}$ . If  $i = 1$ , we simply write  $[j]$ . Let  $m$  be a mapping, and let  $d$  and  $i$  be elements in the domain and image of  $m$ , respectively. The notation  $m[d \mapsto i]$  represents the mapping equivalent to  $m$ , except that  $d$  is now mapped to  $i$ .




Figure 3: Data graph  $G$ , where  $p$  is for parent,  $s$  for spouse, and  $f$  is for friend.

**Data Model:** In this work, we are concerned with graphs that incorporate data. Specifically, each node corresponds to a unique id and is accompanied by additional attributes. For instance, as shown in Figure 3, nodes possess attributes such as Name (with the data type string) and Age (with the data type being a natural number). To denote the sets of ids and other pertinent attributes (“Properties”), we use  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ID}}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{PROP}}$ , respectively. Here,  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{PROP}}$  represents a  $k$ -ary relation, where  $k$  is the number of attributes that nodes have, excluding the id. For the example shown in Figure 3,  $k$  is 2. The data domain, denoted as  $\mathcal{D}$ , is the Cartesian product of  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ID}}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{PROP}}$  when  $k > 0$ ; otherwise, when  $k = 0$ ,  $\mathcal{D}$  is equivalent to  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ID}}$ . From now on we assume  $k = 1$  by default. All results hold for  $k > 1$  with the same proofs. The assumption  $k > 0$  will be important only in a few of our separation results: see property P.1 and P.2 in the proof of Theorem 3.

**Definition 1.** A data graph  $G$  over alphabet  $\Sigma$  and data domain  $\mathcal{D}$  is a quadruple  $(V, E, \text{ID}, \text{DATAOF})$ , where

- $V$  is a non-empty finite set of nodes;

- $E \subseteq V \times \Sigma \times V$  is a set of labeled edges;
- $\text{ID} : V \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{id}}$  is an injective function mapping a node to an id.
- $\text{DATAOF} : V \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{PROP}}$  is a function assigning an element in  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{PROP}}$  to each node in  $V$ .

When  $k > 0$ , for each  $i \in [k]$ , we define  $\text{DATAOF}_i$  as the function that maps each node  $v$  to the  $i^{\text{th}}$  component of  $\text{DATAOF}(v)$ . In other words, if  $\text{DATAOF}(v) = (d_1, \dots, d_i, \dots, d_k)$ , then  $\text{DATAOF}_i(v) = d_i$ . For example, consider Figure 3. We have  $\text{DATAOF}(n_9) = (\text{Paul}, 5) = \text{DATAOF}(n_{13})$ , and  $\text{DATAOF}_2(n_2) = 66$  for nodes  $n_2$ ,  $n_9$ , and  $n_{13}$  with  $\text{ID}(n_2) = 07$ ,  $\text{ID}(n_9) = 24$ , and  $\text{ID}(n_{13}) = 29$ . Since the function  $\text{ID}$  is injective, for any two nodes  $v$  and  $v'$  in  $V$ ,  $\text{ID}(v) = \text{ID}(v')$  if and only if  $v = v'$ . The tuple  $(\text{ID}(v), \text{DATAOF}(v)) \in \mathcal{D}$  represents the *data value* of node  $v$ . For simplicity, we often treat a node's id as synonymous with the node itself. A graph  $G$  is classified as a *chain* if it is connected and each node has at most one predecessor and one successor.

A *path*  $\rho$  in the data graph  $G$  is a non-empty alternating sequence

$$v_0 a_1 v_1 \dots v_{n-1} a_n v_n$$

where  $v_i \in V$ ,  $a_j \in \Sigma$ , and  $(v_{l-1}, a_l, v_l)$  forms an edge in  $E$  for all  $i, j$ , and  $l$ . The length of  $\rho$ , denoted as  $|\rho|$ , is  $n$ . The set of *positions* of  $\rho$  is  $[0, n]$ , with  $v_i$  being the node at position  $i$  for  $i \in [0, n]$ . The *data path* corresponding to  $\rho$  is the string  $d_0 a_1 d_1 \dots a_n d_n$ , where  $d_i$  represents the data value associated with  $v_i$  for each  $i \in [0, n]$ . This data path is denoted as  $\mathbf{dp}(\rho)$ . The *label* of  $\rho$  is  $\mathbf{lb}(\rho) = a_1 \dots a_n$ . A path  $\rho$  is considered a *simple path* if  $v_i \neq v_j$  for all  $i \neq j \in [0, n]$ . For example, consider the path in the graph from Figure 3:

$$\rho = n_4 s n_3 p n_{11} p n_9 f n_{13}$$

It is a simple path, with  $\mathbf{lb}(\rho) = \mathbf{sppf}$  and  $\mathbf{dp}(\rho) = (03, \text{Mary}, 56) \dots (29, \text{Paul}, 5)$ .

Our definition of data graphs extends the one provided in [25]. The primary distinction is that here, each node incorporates a unique id as part of its data value, as done in [2]. This slight modification allows us to model node identity in all of our query languages without cluttering them with additional syntax. We will comment on the few places where this decision makes a difference.

**Queries:** Informally, a *query* is a function that returns a Boolean value, taking as input a data graph over a given  $\Sigma, \mathcal{D}$ , along with a valuation that maps a predetermined set of free variables of different types (path, nodes, positions) to values of the appropriate kind. While these languages often vary in the types of free variables they accommodate, all our query languages support *Boolean graph queries*, where the input is solely a data graph over  $\Sigma, \mathcal{D}$ . Usually,  $\Sigma, \mathcal{D}$  will be evident from the context, so we'll omit them. A query language  $L$  defines a set of queries, and we say language  $L$  is *subsumed by* language  $L'$  if every Boolean graph query expressible in  $L$  is also expressible in  $L'$ . In previous discussions, we've addressed languages semantically as collections of queries, yet of course, languages of interest are usually defined using syntax for expressions. Often,

we identify the expressions with their corresponding queries. Therefore, given a (syntactically defined) query language, a related problem is to evaluate an expression in the language on a given data graph - this is the *model checking problem* for the language.

### 3 Existing query languages for graphs with data

#### 3.1 Graph querying based on path quantification

*Walk logic* (WL) is a first-order graph query language that quantifies over variables ranging paths and positions within paths [18]. With the capability to manipulate paths and positions, the query  $Q_H$ : “Is there a Hamiltonian path in the graph?” can be readily expressed using WL. Before providing an exact definition, it is instructive to understand how WL expresses that a graph is Hamiltonian. A graph is Hamiltonian if it possesses a path that (1) is simple (with no repeated nodes) and (2) visits all nodes. This can be expressed using a logic that quantifies over paths and positions within a given path. We employ variables  $\pi$  and  $\omega$  for paths, and  $\ell^\pi$  and  $m^\pi$  ranging over positions within the path referenced by variable  $\pi$ . Hence, the following WL formula captures that path  $\pi$  is simple:  $\phi_{\text{SIMPLE}}(\pi) := \forall \ell^\pi, m^\pi. \ell^\pi \neq m^\pi \rightarrow \neg(\ell^\pi \equiv_{\text{ID}} m^\pi)$ , where  $\ell^\pi \equiv_{\text{ID}} m^\pi$  indicates that positions referenced by  $\ell^\pi$  and  $m^\pi$  point to the same node. The quantification over nodes can be recaptured by viewing nodes as paths of length 0: a WL formula  $\text{NODE}(\pi)$  holds for such node-like paths. The subsequent WL formula verifies whether (2) is fulfilled:  $\phi_{\text{VISITALL}}(\pi) := \forall \omega. \text{NODE}(\omega) \wedge \exists \ell^\pi, \exists m^\omega. \ell^\pi \equiv_{\text{ID}} m^\omega$ . Hence, formula  $\exists \pi. \phi_{\text{SIMPLE}}(\pi) \wedge \phi_{\text{VISITALL}}(\pi)$  expresses Hamiltonicity.

The syntax of WL assumes a countably infinite set  $\Pi$  of path variables, coupled with a set  $\Lambda$  of position variables indexed by path variables. A position variable  $\ell$  is of sort  $\pi$ , denoted as  $\ell^\pi$ , when indexed by  $\pi$ . A variable of sort  $\pi$  takes values that are positions within  $\pi$ . The  $\pi$  superscript is omitted when the context is clear.

**Definition 2.** *Let  $\pi, \omega \in \Pi$ ,  $\ell^\pi, m^\pi, n^\omega \in \Lambda$ , and  $a \in \Sigma$ . The formulas of WL over  $\Sigma$  are defined inductively by the following rules:*

- $E_a(\ell^\pi, m^\pi)$ ,  $\ell^\pi < m^\pi$ ,  $\ell^\pi \equiv_{\text{ID}} n^\omega$ , and  $\ell^\pi \equiv_{\text{DATA}} n^\omega$  are atomic formulas.
- If  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  are formulas, so are  $\neg\phi$ ,  $\phi \vee \psi$ ,  $\exists \ell^\pi. \phi$ , and  $\exists \pi. \phi$ .

*Note: in WL we can say  $\ell^\pi < n^\omega$  only if  $\pi = \omega$ .*

Intuitively, every path variable  $\pi$  is interpreted as a path  $\rho$  within the data graph  $G$ , and each position variable  $\ell^\pi$  is interpreted as a position  $r \in [0, i]$  within  $\rho$ , where  $\rho = v_0 a_1 \dots a_i v_i$ .

Formally, let  $\phi$  be a WL formula and  $\alpha$  be a mapping that assigns paths in  $G$  to path variables and natural numbers to position variables. Assume  $\alpha(\pi) = v_0 a_1 \dots a_i v_i$ ,  $\alpha(\omega) = w_0 b_1 \dots b_j w_j$ ,  $\alpha(\ell^\pi) = r$ ,  $\alpha(m^\pi) = s \in [0, i]$ , and  $\alpha(n^\omega) = t \in [0, j]$ . We say  $G$  satisfies  $\phi$  under  $\alpha$ , denoted by  $(G, \alpha) \models \phi$ , if one of the following holds:

- $\phi := E_a(\ell, m)$ ,  $s = r + 1$ , and  $a = a_s$ .
- $\phi := \ell < m$  and  $r < s$ .
- $\phi := \ell \equiv_{\text{ID}} n$  and  $\text{ID}(v_r) = \text{ID}(w_t)$ .
- $\phi := \ell \equiv_{\text{DATA}} n$  and  $\text{DATAOF}(v_r) = \text{DATAOF}(w_t)$ .
- $\phi := \neg\psi$  and it is not the case that  $(G, \alpha) \models \psi$ .
- $\phi := \phi' \vee \phi''$  and we have  $(G, \alpha) \models \phi'$  or  $(G, \alpha) \models \phi''$ .
- $\phi := \exists \ell^\pi. \psi$  and there is a position  $r$  in  $\alpha(\pi)$  such that  $(G, \alpha[\mapsto r]) \models \psi$ .
- $\phi := \exists \pi. \psi$  and there is a path  $\rho$  in  $G$  such that  $(G, \alpha[\pi \mapsto \rho]) \models \psi$ .

### 3.2 Querying graphs based on regular languages

The languages discussed in the preceding section have limitations in expressing certain aspects of path label patterns. Consider the query  $Q_{\text{even}}$ : “Are nodes  $s$  and  $t$  connected by a path of even length in graph  $G$ ?”. This query cannot be expressed using  $WL$  [18]. However, the set of paths satisfying this property can be described using a *regular path query* (RPQ). An RPQ comprises three elements: a source node  $v_s$ , a target node  $v_t$ , and a regular expression  $e$  (or an NFA  $A$ ). A pair of nodes  $(v_s, v_t)$  satisfies such a query if there exists a path from  $v_s$  to  $v_t$  with the label of  $\rho$  is in the language defined by  $e$ , that is  $\text{Ib}(\rho) \in L(e)$ .

Various extensions of regular path query languages have been introduced in the literature, initially for labelled graphs and later for graphs with data. For instance, conjunctive regular path queries, as in [3], allow conjunction as well as automata operating over vectors of paths. In contrast, [25] and [2] permit automata capable of detecting patterns involving data values. We introduce a language that subsumes all languages in this paradigm, *extended conjunctive regular data path query language with negations* (ECRDPQ<sub>-</sub>). Regular languages are expanded to languages defined by *register data path automata* (RDPAs). These RDPAs are register automata designed to recognize languages of data paths. A *register automaton* (RA) is an extension of finite automata, utilizing registers to store data values. While processing input symbols from an infinite alphabet, register automata compare symbols with register values, updating both registers and automaton state. An RDPA  $A$  can be thought of as a fusion of an RA and an NFA. It has a finite set of registers, for keeping data values, where we identify a register with a number, along with two disjoint finite sets of states, *word states* and *data states*. While in a word state,  $A$  reads a symbol from  $\Sigma$  and transitions to a data state. In a data state, it reads an element from  $\mathcal{D}$ , updates its registers, and reverts to a word state. It also has a distinguish initial and final word state, and transitions that are either of the form  $p \xrightarrow{a} q$ , where  $p$  is a word state,  $q$  is a data state, and  $a \in \Sigma$ , or  $r \xrightarrow{\text{Pre, Upd}} s$ , where  $r$  is a data state and  $s$  is a word state, while **Pre**, the precondition, is a conjunction of equalities and inequalities among input data values, registers and constants.

The update function **Upd** is a conjunction of assignments of register values to other register values, input data values, or constants. The semantics of register automata is straightforward [21].

Two modifications of RDPAs are needed here: we can allow the input alphabet to be a product space, and thus in **Pre** and **Upd** we can refer to the  $i^{\text{th}}$  input value. We can also fix infinite domains for each input value and register, and require **Pre** and **Upd** to be well-typed. Checking well-typedness – e.g. we only compare registers with the same domain – is straightforward. Thus in particular we will have certain registers that will only store ids, and we will assume that their domain is disjoint from the domains of other data values.

A data path automaton is simply an RDPA where the input words will have components corresponding to  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ID}}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{PROP}}$ , where the data and id domains both contain a constant, denoted in each case by  $\sharp$  (“unset”). A data path automaton will enforce that the initial value of each register is  $\sharp$ . Assuming  $D_{\text{PROP}} = 1$  for simplicity, the data transitions will have a special shape, which we denote as  $r \xrightarrow{E, I, U} s$ , where  $r$  is a data state,  $s$  is a word state, while

- $E_{\text{ID}}$  (“ID equality check registers”),  $I_{\text{ID}}$  (“ID inequality check registers”),  $U_{\text{ID}}$  (“ID update registers”) are subsets of  $X_{\text{ID}}$ ,
- $E_{\text{DATA}}, I_{\text{DATA}}, U_{\text{DATA}}$  are subsets of  $X_{\text{DATA}}$ .

Assuming  $\ell$  registers and a single variable domain  $\mathcal{U}$ , a *configuration* of  $A$  is a pair  $(q, v)$  where  $q$  is a state, and  $v \in (\mathcal{U})^\ell$  is an  $\ell$ -tuple representing register content. A precondition corresponding to  $E$  and  $I$  above states that, when reading a symbol  $(d_{\text{ID}}, d_{\text{DATA}})$ , we have

- $v[i] = d_{\text{ID}}$  for each  $i$  in  $E_{\text{ID}}$ ,
- $v[i] = d_{\text{DATA}}$  for each  $i$  in  $E_{\text{DATA}}$ ,
- $v[i] \neq d_{\text{ID}}$  for each  $i$  in  $I_{\text{ID}}$
- $v[i] \neq d_{\text{DATA}}$  for each  $i$  in  $I_{\text{DATA}}$ ,

And the update corresponding to  $U$  above is:

- $w[i] = d_{\text{ID}}$  for each  $i$  in  $U_{\text{ID}}$ ,
- $w[i] = d_{\text{DATA}}$  for each  $i$  in  $U_{\text{DATA}}$ ,
- $w[i] = v[i]$  for each  $i \notin U_{\text{ID}} \cup U_{\text{DATA}}$ .

Given two configurations  $(p, v), (q, w)$  and a transition  $\delta$ , we write  $(p, v) \xrightarrow{a} \delta (q, w)$  if the precondition and update function are respected.  $(q, v)$  is designated as the *initial configuration* if  $q$  is the initial state and  $v = (\sharp, \dots, \sharp)$ . Similarly,  $(q, v)$  is a *final configuration* if  $q$  is a final state. For a sequence of configurations  $s = c_0 \dots c_n$  and a data path  $u = a_1 \dots a_n$ ,  $s$  is a *computation* on  $u$  if there exists a sequence of transitions  $\delta_1 \dots \delta_n$  such that  $c_{i-1} \xrightarrow{a_i} \delta_i c_i$  for each  $i \in [n]$ . If  $c_0$  is the initial configuration and  $c_n$  is a final configuration, then  $s$  is an

accepting computation, and  $u$  is accepted by  $A$ . The language of regular data path recognized by  $A$ , denoted as  $L(A)$ , comprises data paths  $u$  accepted by  $A$ . Along the computation  $s$ , we say register  $x_i$  is *written* at the  $j^{\text{th}}$  step where configuration  $c_j = (q_j, v_j)$  for  $1 \leq j \leq n$  if  $v_{j-1}[i] = \#$  and  $v_j[i] \neq \#$ . Note that we can use states to keep track of which registers were written at the previous states, and whether the current content is  $\#$ .

An  $n$ -ary RDPA  $A$  is an RDPA over  $n$ -ary product alphabets. Let  $u_1, \dots, u_n$  be  $n$  data paths, where  $u_i = (d_0^{\text{ID},(i)}, d_0^{\text{DATA},(i)}) a_1^{(i)} \dots (d_{j_i}^{\text{ID},(i)}, d_{j_i}^{\text{DATA},(i)})$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and some  $j_1, \dots, j_n \in \mathbb{N}$ . The *convolution* of  $u_1, \dots, u_n$  is an  $n$ -ary data path  $d_0 a_1 \dots d_m$ , where:

- $m = \max\{j_1, \dots, j_n\}$ ,
- $a_j = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$  where  $b_i = a_j^{(i)}$  if  $j \leq j_i$ ; otherwise,  $b_i = \#$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and  $1 \leq j \leq m$ ,
- $d_j = (e_1^{\text{ID}}, \dots, e_n^{\text{ID}}, e_1^{\text{DATA}}, \dots, e_n^{\text{DATA}})$  where  $e_i^{\text{ID}} = d_j^{\text{ID},(i)}$  and  $e_i^{\text{DATA}} = d_j^{\text{DATA},(i)}$  if  $j \leq j_i$ ; otherwise  $e_i^{\text{ID}} = e_i^{\text{DATA}} = \#$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and  $1 \leq j \leq m$ .

We say  $(u_1, \dots, u_n)$  is accepted by  $A$  if their convolution is accepted by  $A$ .

With this foundation, we proceed to define  $\text{ECRDPQ}_-$ .

**Definition 3.** *The formulas of the logic are defined inductively:*

- $\text{atom} ::= \pi = \omega \mid x = y \mid (x, \pi, y) \mid (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n) \in A$ ,
- $\phi ::= \text{atom} \mid \neg\phi \mid \phi \wedge \phi \mid \exists x.\phi \mid \exists\pi.\phi$ ,

Here,  $\pi$  and  $\omega$  are path variables,  $x$  and  $y$  are node variables, and  $A$  is an  $n$ -ary RDPA where  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ .

Let  $\phi$  be an  $\text{ECRDPQ}_-$  formula,  $G$  a data graph, and  $\alpha$  be a mapping that assigns paths in  $G$  to path variables and nodes to node variables. We say  $G$  satisfies  $\phi$  under  $\alpha$ , denoted by  $(G, \alpha) \models \phi$ , if one of the following holds:

- $\phi := \pi = \omega$  and  $\alpha(\pi) = \alpha(\omega)$ .
- $\phi := x = y$  and  $\alpha(x) = \alpha(y)$ .
- $\phi := (x, \pi, y)$  and  $\alpha(\pi)$  is a path from  $\alpha(x)$  to  $\alpha(y)$ .
- $\phi := (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n) \in A$  and  $(\mathbf{dp}(\alpha(\pi_1)), \dots, \mathbf{dp}(\alpha(\pi_n)))$  is in the  $n$ -ary relation of data paths defined by  $A$ .
- $\phi := \neg\psi$  and  $G$  does not satisfy  $\psi$  under  $\alpha$ .
- $\phi := \phi' \wedge \phi''$  and we have  $(G, \alpha) \models \phi'$  and  $(G, \alpha) \models \phi''$ .
- $\phi := \exists x.\psi$  and there is a node  $r$  in  $G$  s.t.  $(G, \alpha[x \mapsto r]) \models \psi$ .
- $\phi := \exists\pi.\psi$  and there is a path  $\rho$  in  $G$  s.t.  $(G, \alpha[\pi \mapsto \rho]) \models \psi$ .

A query in  $\text{ECRDPQ}_\neg$  is referred to as a *conjunctive regular data path query with negations* ( $\text{CRDPQ}_\neg$ ) if all RDPA in the query are unary. A  $\text{CRDPQ}_\neg$  query is called a *regular data path query* (RDPQ) if it is of the form  $\exists \pi.(x, \pi, y) \wedge \pi \in A$ . The semantics of  $\text{ECRDPQ}_\neg$  is standard.

Let  $\phi$  be an  $\text{ECRDPQ}_\neg$  formula,  $G$  a data graph, and  $\alpha$  be a mapping that assigns paths in  $G$  to path variables and nodes to node variables. We say  $G$  satisfies  $\phi$  under  $\alpha$ , denoted by  $(G, \alpha) \models \phi$ , if one of the following holds:

- $\phi := \pi = \omega$  and  $\alpha(\pi) = \alpha(\omega)$ .
- $\phi := x = y$  and  $\alpha(x) = \alpha(y)$ .
- $\phi := (x, \pi, y)$  and  $\alpha(\pi)$  is a path from  $\alpha(x)$  to  $\alpha(y)$ .
- $\phi := (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n) \in A$  and  $(\mathbf{dp}(\alpha(\pi_1)), \dots, \mathbf{dp}(\alpha(\pi_n)))$  is in the  $n$ -ary relation of data paths defined by  $A$ .
- $\phi := \neg\psi$  and  $G$  does not satisfy  $\psi$  under  $\alpha$ .
- $\phi := \phi' \wedge \phi''$  and we have  $(G, \alpha) \models \phi'$  and  $(G, \alpha) \models \phi''$ .
- $\phi := \exists x.\psi$  and there is a node  $r$  in  $G$  s.t.  $(G, \alpha[x \mapsto r]) \models \psi$ .
- $\phi := \exists \pi.\psi$  and there is a path  $\rho$  in  $G$  s.t.  $(G, \alpha[\pi \mapsto \rho]) \models \psi$ .

Obviously,  $Q_{\text{even}}$  is expressible in  $\text{ECRDPQ}_\neg$ . It corresponds to formula  $\phi_{\text{even}}(x, y) := \exists \pi.(x, \pi, y) \wedge \pi \in A_{\text{even}}$ , where  $A_{\text{even}}$  recognizes the set of data paths of even length. Moreover, since ids are included as a part of data values, Hamiltonicity is expressible in  $\text{ECRDPQ}_\neg$ .

**Example 1.** A path  $\rho = v_0 a_1 \dots v_n$  is simple if there are no  $0 \leq i < j \leq n$  s.t.  $v_i = v_j$ . Let  $A_{\text{repeat}}$  be the unary RDPA with one register which non-deterministically records a node id and accepts the input if the recorded id repeats. Consequently, a path  $\rho$  in a data graph satisfies  $\neg\pi \in A_{\text{repeat}}$  if and only if  $\rho$  is simple. A path  $\rho$  is said to visit all nodes if, for each node  $v$ , there exists an index  $i$  such that  $v_i = v$ . Now, let  $A_{\text{visit}}$  be a binary RDPA with one register, storing the first node id of the first data path and accepting if the stored id appears in the second path. Then, the  $\text{ECRDPQ}_\neg$  formula  $\phi_H(\pi) := \neg\pi \in A_{\text{repeat}} \wedge \forall \omega.(\omega, \pi) \in A_{\text{visit}}$  asserts that  $\pi$  represents a Hamiltonian path.

**Graph pattern calculus (GPC):** GPC is another query language based on regular expressions, designed for working with graphs containing data [16]. The most foundational GPC query takes the form  $\mathbf{t} \mathbf{p}$ , where  $\mathbf{t}$  is referred to as a *restrictor*, and  $\mathbf{p}$  is called a *pattern*. Informally, a pattern can describe the label pattern of a path, which can be represented equivalently as a regular expression. It can also perform equality tests on data values of two nodes. A restrictor can constrain a path to have non-repeating vertices, and can also enforce the path to be the shortest among the valid paths. The forms of a restrictor  $\mathbf{t}$  are:

- $\mathbf{t} ::= \text{SIMPLE} \mid \text{SHORTEST} \mid \text{SHORTESTSIMPLE}$ .<sup>2</sup>

Atomic GPC patterns are either node patterns:  $()$  and  $(x)$  or Edge patterns:  $\rightarrow$  and  $\xrightarrow{a}$ . Here,  $x$  represents a node variable, and  $a \in \Sigma$ .

We now give inductive rules for forming patterns, assuming two patterns  $\mathbf{p}$  and  $\mathbf{p}'$ . We close under *union* ( $\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{p}'$ ), *concatenation* ( $\mathbf{p}\mathbf{p}'$ ), *repetition* ( $\mathbf{p}^{n..m}$ ), and *conditioning* ( $\mathbf{p}_{(\theta)}$ ), where  $\theta$  is a condition. In these operations,  $n$  and  $m$  can take values in  $\mathbb{N} \cup \infty$ . Conditions are defined as  $\theta ::= x \equiv_{\text{DATA}} y \mid \neg\theta \mid \theta \wedge \theta$ , where  $x$  and  $y$  are node variables.

Finally we define *GPC* queries via the recursive rule:

$$Q ::= \mathbf{t} \mathbf{p} \mid z = \mathbf{t} \mathbf{p} \mid Q, Q$$

where  $\mathbf{p}$  is a pattern,  $\mathbf{t}$  a restrictor,  $z$  a path variable.

We quickly overview the semantics of GPC. The semantic function takes as input a graph, an expression, and a valuation  $\text{DATAOF}$  for the free variables, outputting a set of paths in the case the expression is a query, and a Boolean if the expression is a condition. In the presence of bound variables, the semantic function will also output an assignment. Note that GPC is accompanied by a type system [16] which imposes some restrictions. We highlight one restriction relevant to our discussion. Consider a scenario where  $\mathbf{p}$  is formed by concatenating patterns  $\mathbf{p}_1$ ,  $\mathbf{p}_2$ , and  $\mathbf{p}_3$ . It is important to note that if  $\mathbf{p}_2$  is a repetition pattern, then a node variable  $x$  employed within  $\mathbf{p}_2$  must not appear in either  $\mathbf{p}_1$  or  $\mathbf{p}_3$ . This constraint ensures the integrity of expressions.

The semantics of a basic condition  $x \equiv_{\text{DATA}} y$ , where  $x$  and  $y$  are variables, is given by  $\text{DATAOF}(x) = \text{DATAOF}(y)$ . The inductive rules for Boolean combinations of conditions are standard.

For two patterns  $\mathbf{p}_1$  and  $\mathbf{p}_2$ , let  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  represent the sets of paths associated with  $\mathbf{p}_1$  and  $\mathbf{p}_2$ , respectively. The set of paths resulting from concatenating  $\mathbf{p}_1$  and  $\mathbf{p}_2$  is the collection of concatenated paths from  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ . However, we restrict to those paths where the assignments of variables used in both  $\mathbf{p}_1$  and  $\mathbf{p}_2$  are consistent. Similarly, given a pattern  $\mathbf{p}$  and its corresponding set of paths  $P$ , the semantics of  $\mathbf{p}^{n..m}$  is the union of the concatenation of  $P$   $n$  times to the concatenation of  $P$   $m$  times.

Let us consider the semantics of a query consisting of a pattern  $\mathbf{p}$  paired with a restrictor  $\mathbf{t}$ . Let  $P$  be the set of paths corresponding to  $\mathbf{p}$ . The query  $\mathbf{t} \mathbf{p}$  yields a simple (or shortest, or shortest simple) path from  $P$ , depending on whether  $\mathbf{t}$  is *SIMPLE* (or *SHORTEST*, or *SHORTESTSIMPLE*).

Consider the semantics of  $Q_1, Q_2$ , called the *join* of  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$ . Each GPC query  $Q$  is the union of queries  $Q_1, \dots, Q_n$ , where  $Q_i$  is either of the form  $\mathbf{t}_i \mathbf{p}_i$  or of the form  $z_i = \mathbf{t}_i \mathbf{p}_i$ , where  $z_i$  is a path variable,  $\mathbf{t}_i$  is a restrictor, and  $\mathbf{p}_i$  is a pattern for  $1 \leq i \leq n$  for some  $n$ . Suppose the semantics associates set of paths  $V_i$  with  $\mathbf{t}_i \mathbf{p}_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and  $V$  is the cross product of  $V_1, \dots, V_n$ . Then, the

<sup>2</sup>In this article, we focus on data graphs instead of property graphs, so we do not utilize edge variables in patterns. Moreover, restrictors like trails or shortest trails, as in [16], are not applicable here.




Figure 4: Directed graph  $G$  translated to data graph  $G'$ .

semantics of  $Q$  is a subset  $V_Q$  of  $V$ , where  $(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_n) \in V_Q$  if  $\rho_i = \rho_j$  whenever a path variable  $z$  is used in both  $Q_i$  and  $Q_j$  for all  $i, j$ .

We adapt GPC to support graph queries in the obvious way, allowing a query with free path variables to also define a graph query where the paths are implicitly existentially quantified.

### 3.3 Graph querying based on FO\*

Another category of languages revolves around first-order logic with only node variables. Instead of relying on operations rooted in automata or regular languages, these languages utilize a transitive closure operator.

A data graph  $G = (V, E, \text{ID}, \text{DATAOF})$  over  $\Sigma$  can be viewed as an first-order logic structure  $\langle V, \{E_a\}_{a \in \Sigma}, \equiv_{\text{DATA}} \rangle$ , denoted as  $\text{FO}(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$ . In this structure, the set  $V$  of nodes forms the universe,  $E_a$  is interpreted as  $\{(v, v') \in V^2 \mid (v, a, v') \in E\}$ , and  $\equiv_{\text{DATA}}$  is interpreted as  $\{(v, v') \mid \text{DATAOF}(v) = \text{DATAOF}(v')\}$ .

We extend  $\text{FO}(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$  by introducing a transitive closure constructor. If  $\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is a formula, then  $\phi^*(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  becomes a formula, where  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$  represent two vectors of node variables of the same arity. The interpretation is such that  $G, \rho \models \phi^*(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  for a data graph  $G$  and a valuation  $\rho$ , if there exists a sequence of node vectors  $\mathbf{x}_1 = \rho(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n = \rho(\mathbf{y})$  satisfying the condition that for each  $1 \leq i < n$ ,  $G, \rho \models \phi(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_{i+1})$ . We denote the extension of  $\text{FO}(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$  with transitive closures as  $\text{FO}^*(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$ . In contrast to other languages that rely on transitive closure of edge relations,  $\text{FO}^*(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$  permits the transitive closure of any definable relationship, not just the closure of the edge relation.

**Example 2.** Figure 4 illustrates a directed graph  $G$  encoded as a data graph  $G'$ , featuring edge labels OUT (colored green) and IN (colored blue). We can formulate an FO formula  $\text{DATA LINK}(x, y)$  such that a pair of nodes  $v$  and  $w$  in  $G'$  satisfies  $\text{DATA LINK}$  if there exists a node  $s$  linked to  $v$  through an OUT edge and another node  $f$  linked to  $w$  through an IN edge, with the data value of  $s$  equating the data value of  $f$ . For instance,  $(v_1, v_4)$  satisfies  $\text{DATA LINK}$ , while  $(v_3, v_5)$  does not. Additionally, we can create an  $\text{FO}^*(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$  formula  $\text{DATA CONNECTION}(x, y)$ , representing the transitive closure of  $\text{DATA LINK}$ . Consequently, a pair of nodes  $(v, w)$  in  $G'$  satisfies  $\text{DATA CONNECTION}$  if  $v$  and  $w$  are connected in  $G$ .

Within this paradigm, one prominent language family is GXPath, originating from query languages for graph databases initially introduced in [24], inspired

by the XML query language XPath. Within this family,  $\text{XPath}_{\text{REG}}(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$  is the most powerful variant: [24] shows that it is equivalent to  $(\text{FO}_3^*)(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$ , a restriction of  $\text{FO}^*(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$  allowing only formulas in which every subformula has at most three free variables, and the closure  $\phi^*$  of  $\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is allowed only if both  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$  consist of unary variables.

## 4 Expressiveness of existing languages

The languages discussed in Section 3 are illustrated in Figure 1. This section will be devoted to proving the following theorem, which justifies Figure 1:

**Theorem 1.** *The subsumptions depicted in Figure 1 all hold.*

It is straightforward, just chasing the definitions, to observe that  $\text{RDPQ} \subseteq \text{CRDPQ}_{\neg} \subseteq \text{ECDPQ}_{\neg}$ . To complete the proof, we still have to show:

- (1)  $\text{ECDPQ}_{\neg}$  subsumes GPC.
- (2)  $\text{ECDPQ}_{\neg}$  subsumes WL.
- (3)  $\text{FO}^*(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$  subsumes RDPQ.

We will show the first and third item here. The proof of the middle item will be deferred to Section 6.

### 4.1 $\text{ECDPQ}_{\neg}$ subsumption of GPC

We define a fragment of  $\text{ECDPQ}_{\neg}$  with lower data complexity that still subsumes GPC. The motivation is that there exists a substantial complexity gap between GPC and  $\text{ECDPQ}_{\neg}$ . The data complexity of model checking for GPC is within PSPACE [16], whereas for  $\text{ECDPQ}_{\neg}$ , it is non-elementary [3]. Our objective is to bridge this gap by introducing the fragment  $\text{ECDPQ}_{\neg}^{\forall}$  of  $\text{ECDPQ}_{\neg}$ , in which only universal quantifiers are allowed. This fragment is illustrated in Figure 5.




Figure 5: Fragment between  $\text{ECDPQ}_{\neg}$  and GPC.

Formalizing the syntax, an  $\text{ECDPQ}_{\neg}^{\forall}$  formula takes the form:

$$\forall \bar{\omega}. \psi(\bar{\pi}, \bar{\omega}),$$

where  $\psi$  is a quantifier-free  $\text{ECDPQ}_{\neg}$  formula. We will demonstrate that this fragment contains GPC.

**Theorem 2.** *Every GPC query is expressible in ECRDPQ<sub>-</sub>.*

Recall that GPC queries are defined recursively:

$$Q ::= \mathbf{tp} \mid x = \mathbf{tp} \mid Q, Q$$

It follows that a GPC query  $Q$  is a join of  $n$  GPC queries  $Q_1, \dots, Q_n$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ , where  $Q_i$  is either of the form  $\mathbf{t}_s \mathbf{p}_s$  or of the form  $x_{i_s} = \mathbf{t}_s \mathbf{p}_s$  where  $x_{i_s}$  is a path variable,  $\mathbf{t}_s$  is a restrictor, and  $\mathbf{p}_s$  is a pattern for  $s \in [n]$  and  $i_1, \dots, i_n \in [n]$ .

We will first argue that it suffices to translate each component query  $Q_i$  into the target language. Consider  $n = 2$  for simplicity. The cases can be divided into the following categories:

- (i)  $Q_1 := \mathbf{t}_1 \mathbf{p}_1$  and  $Q_2 := \mathbf{t}_2 \mathbf{p}_2$ .
- (ii)  $Q_1 := x = \mathbf{t}_1 \mathbf{p}_1$  and  $Q_2 := \mathbf{t}_2 \mathbf{p}_2$ .
- (iii)  $Q_1 := x = \mathbf{t}_1 \mathbf{p}_1$  and  $Q_2 := y = \mathbf{t}_2 \mathbf{p}_2$ .
- (iv)  $Q_1 := x = \mathbf{t}_1 \mathbf{p}_1$  and  $Q_2 := x = \mathbf{t}_2 \mathbf{p}_2$ .

In cases (i) and (ii),  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$  are two independent queries, so they can be seen as two special cases of (iii).

Consider (iii). Let  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  be the sets of output paths corresponding to  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$ , respectively. Since  $x$  and  $y$  are two independent path variables, the set of outputs of the query  $Q_1, Q_2$  is simply the Cartesian product of  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ . Suppose that  $\phi_{Q_i}(\pi_i)$  is a ECRDPQ<sub>-</sub><sup>∀</sup> formula corresponding to  $Q_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . A ECRDPQ<sub>-</sub><sup>∀</sup> formula  $\phi_Q(\pi_1, \pi_2)$  related to  $Q$  then  $\phi_{Q_1}(\pi_1) \wedge \phi_{Q_2}(\pi_2)$ . Notice that we can assume variable  $\pi_2$  does not appear in  $\phi_{Q_1}$  and  $\pi_1$  does not appear in  $\phi_{Q_2}$ . Now, consider (iv). The join query  $Q_1, Q_2$  will return the paths that both satisfy  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$ . So the set of outputs is the intersection of  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ . The corresponding ECRDPQ<sub>-</sub><sup>∀</sup> formula  $\phi_Q(\pi)$ , now, becomes  $\phi_{Q_1}(\pi) \wedge \phi_{Q_2}(\pi)$ .

Thus we need only translate pattern queries, and Theorem 2 reduces to:

**Proposition 1.** *Given a GPC query  $Q := \mathbf{tp}$ , there is a unary ECRDPQ<sub>-</sub><sup>∀</sup>  $\phi_Q(\pi)$  equivalent to  $Q$ . That is, for every data graph  $G$  and path  $\rho$  in  $G$ ,  $G \models \phi_Q(\rho)$  if and only if  $\rho$  is in the semantics of  $Q$ .*

To prove Proposition 1, we show:

- (S1) There is a unary RDPA  $A_{\mathbf{p}}$  recognizing the data paths  $\mathbf{dp}(\rho)$  of the paths  $\rho$  of pattern  $\mathbf{p}$ .
- (S2) For every restrictor  $\mathbf{t}$ , there is a unary ECRDPQ<sub>-</sub><sup>∀</sup>  $\phi_{\mathbf{t}}(\pi)$  such that for every path  $\rho$ ,  $\phi_{\mathbf{t}}(\rho)$  if and only if  $\rho$  satisfies  $\mathbf{t}$ .

Suppose we have the RDPA  $A_{\mathbf{p}}$  in (S1) and the ECRDPQ<sub>-</sub><sup>∀</sup>  $\phi_{\mathbf{t}}$  in (S2). Then, the ECRDPQ<sub>-</sub><sup>∀</sup>  $\phi_Q(\pi)$  required is:

$$\phi_Q(\pi) := \phi_{\mathbf{t}}(\pi) \wedge \pi \in A_{\mathbf{p}}.$$

Recall that restrictor  $\mathfrak{t}$  is SIMPLE, SHORTEST, or SHORTESTSIMPLE. Consider  $\mathfrak{t} = \text{SIMPLE}$ . A path  $\rho$  is simple if for every two prefixes  $\tau, \nu$  of  $\rho$  with  $|\tau| \neq |\nu|$ , their last nodes have different ids. We can create a ternary RDPA  $A_{\text{SIMPLE}}$  with one register to recognize the set of triples  $(\mathbf{dp}(\rho), \mathbf{dp}(\tau), \mathbf{dp}(\nu))$  that satisfy this condition. Consequently, a path is simple if and only if it satisfies the following ECRDPQ $_{\mathfrak{t}}^{\forall}$  formula:

$$\phi_{\text{SIMPLE}}(\pi) := \forall \omega, \theta. (\pi, \omega, \theta) \in A_{\text{SIMPLE}}.$$

For the cases when  $\mathfrak{t} = \text{SHORTEST}$  and  $\mathfrak{t} = \text{SHORTESTSIMPLE}$ ,  $\phi_Q$  can be obtained in a similar manner. Thus (S2) is true. Lastly, we prove (S1):

*Proof.* Each pattern  $\mathfrak{p}$  is recursively constructed from atomic patterns. If there are no node patterns of the form  $(x)$  appearing in  $\mathfrak{p}$ , then  $\mathfrak{p}$  is simply a regular expression, and the construction process for  $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$  is identical to the process of transforming a regular expression into a corresponding finite automaton. A key distinction arises when node variables  $x$  are present within  $\mathfrak{p}$ . Each variable  $x$  corresponds to two registers:  $r_x^{\text{ID}}$  and  $r_x^{\text{DATA}}$ , which respectively store the node's id and the associated data value excluding the id. Recall that the registers of an RDPA are a set of numbers in  $\mathbf{Z}_{>0}$ , so are  $r_x^{\text{ID}}$  and  $r_x^{\text{DATA}}$ . We use these notations are for explicitly indicating their relations with  $x$ . Importantly, once they are written, these registers remain unaltered, except when  $x$  is involved in a repetition sub-pattern. Before proceeding, consider the following example:

Pattern  $\mathfrak{p}_{ex} := (x) \xrightarrow{a} (y) \xrightarrow{b} (x)_{(x \equiv_{\text{DATA}} y)}$ . A path  $\rho$  satisfies  $\mathfrak{p}_{ex}$  if  $\rho = v_1 a_1 v_2 a_2 v_3$  where  $a_1 = a, a_2 = b, \text{ID}(v_1) = \text{ID}(v_3)$  and  $\text{DATAOF}(v_1) = \text{DATAOF}(v_2)$ . Thus  $A_{\mathfrak{p}_{ex}}$  should use registers to keep the  $v_1$ 's id and the associated data value excluding the id, and examine if  $\text{ID}(v_1) = \text{ID}(v_3)$  and  $\text{DATAOF}(v_1) = \text{DATAOF}(v_2)$ . We first construct RDPAs for each atomic sub-pattern. There will be structurally identical RDPAs  $A_1, A_3$ , and  $A_5$  corresponding to the first occurrence of  $(x)$ ,  $(y)$  and the second occurrence of  $(x)$ , as well as  $A_2, A_4$  for edge patterns  $\xrightarrow{a}, \xrightarrow{b}$ . For  $i = 1, 3, 5$   $A_i$  will only differ in using registers  $r_i^{\text{ID}}$  and  $r_i^{\text{DATA}}$  to keep the data value of the input node for  $i = 1, 3, 5$ . Then, we have the concatenation  $A_c$  of  $A_1, \dots, A_5$  by concatenating  $A_1$  with  $A_2, \dots, A_5$  consecutively. Since  $A_1$  and  $A_5$  refer to the same node variable  $x$ , when concatenating  $A_{1, \dots, 4}$  and  $A_5$  (where  $A_{1, \dots, 4}$  is the concatenation of  $A_1$  through  $A_4$ ), we must ensure that the values of registers  $r_1^{\text{ID}}, r_1^{\text{DATA}}$  are identical to the values of registers  $r_5^{\text{ID}}, r_5^{\text{DATA}}$ . We call this process *unifying* the registers. Similarly, to obtain  $A_{\mathfrak{p}_{ex}}$  from  $A_c$ , we unify register  $r_3^{\text{DATA}}$  with  $r_1^{\text{DATA}}$ .

The construction of  $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$  follows a recursive procedure:

#### Node patterns:

- If  $\mathfrak{p} = ()$ , then  $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$  accepts all data paths of length zero.
- If  $\mathfrak{p} = (x)$ , then  $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$  accepts all data paths  $d$  of length zero, where  $d = (d_{\text{ID}}, d_{\text{DATA}}) \in \mathcal{D}$ , and the automaton indicates that registers  $r_x^{\text{ID}}$  and  $r_x^{\text{DATA}}$  are written with values  $d_{\text{ID}}$  and  $d_{\text{DATA}}$ , respectively.

**Edge patterns:**

- For  $\mathbf{p} = \rightarrow$ ,  $A_{\mathbf{p}}$  accepts all data paths of length one.
- For  $\mathbf{p} = \xrightarrow{a}$ ,  $A_{\mathbf{p}}$  accepts all data paths  $d_0 a_1 d_1$  of length one, where  $a_1 = a$ .

**Union:** Let's assume  $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{p}_1 + \mathbf{p}_2$ , and we have the corresponding register automata  $A_{\mathbf{p}_1}$  and  $A_{\mathbf{p}_2}$  for  $\mathbf{p}_1$  and  $\mathbf{p}_2$  respectively. The automaton  $A_{\mathbf{p}}$  results from the disjunction of  $A_{\mathbf{p}_1}$  and  $A_{\mathbf{p}_2}$ . Since register automata are closed under disjunction, the disjunction of  $A_{\mathbf{p}_1}$  and  $A_{\mathbf{p}_2}$  is well-defined.

**Concatenation:** Let's assume  $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{p}_1 \mathbf{p}_2$ , and we have the corresponding register automata  $A_{\mathbf{p}_1}$  and  $A_{\mathbf{p}_2}$  for  $\mathbf{p}_1$  and  $\mathbf{p}_2$  respectively. The automaton  $A_{\mathbf{p}}$  results from concatenating  $A_{\mathbf{p}_1}$  and  $A_{\mathbf{p}_2}$ . Due to the closure property of register automata under concatenation,  $A_{\mathbf{p}}$  is well-defined. Similar to finite automata, the concatenation automaton is derived by combining the final states of  $A_{\mathbf{p}_1}$  with the initial state of  $A_{\mathbf{p}_2}$ . Note that a node variable  $x$  could be present in both  $\mathbf{p}_1$  and  $\mathbf{p}_2$ . Therefore, during the construction of  $A_{\mathbf{p}}$ , it is essential to unify the usage of registers.

**Repetition:** Given a pattern  $\mathbf{q}$ ,  $\mathbf{q}^{n \dots m}$  is also a pattern, where  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ . This notation signifies that pattern  $\mathbf{q}$  is repeated between  $n$  and  $m$  times. When both  $n$  and  $m$  belong to  $\mathbb{N}$ , then  $\mathbf{q}^{n \dots m}$  is equivalent to  $\mathbf{q}^{n \dots n} + \dots + \mathbf{q}^{m \dots m}$ . Pattern  $\mathbf{q}^{n \dots \infty}$  is equivalent to the concatenation of  $\mathbf{q}^{n \dots n}$  and  $\mathbf{q}^{0 \dots \infty}$ . Therefore, we only need to consider the cases  $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{q}^{n \dots n}$  and  $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{q}^{0 \dots \infty}$ .

Let  $A_{\mathbf{q}}$  be the RDPA corresponding to  $\mathbf{q}$ . If  $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{q}^{n \dots n}$ , then  $A_{\mathbf{p}}$  results from concatenating  $A_{\mathbf{q}}$  with  $n - 1$  many of its duplicates. Note that, although, the semantics of concatenating  $\mathbf{q}$  with itself  $n$  times and the repetition  $\mathbf{q}^{n \dots n}$  may appear similar, they are different. For instance, if  $\mathbf{q}$  is a node pattern  $(x)$ , then the semantics of  $\mathbf{p}_c := \mathbf{q}\mathbf{q}$  is the set of paths  $v_0 a_1 v_1$  of length one where  $v_0 = v_1$ . However, the semantics of  $\mathbf{p}_r := \mathbf{q}^{2 \dots 2}$  is simply the set of paths of length one. Therefore when constructing  $A_{\mathbf{p}}$  for  $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{q}^{n \dots n}$  by concatenating  $A_{\mathbf{q}}$  with itself  $n$  times, we do not have to unify the registers

Suppose  $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{q}^{0 \dots \infty}$ . Without loss of generality, we assume that there are no outgoing transitions starting from final states of  $A_{\mathbf{q}}$ . In this case,  $A_{\mathbf{p}}$  is derived from  $A_{\mathbf{q}}$ , where: (1) for every transition  $\delta$  of  $A_{\mathbf{q}}$  from state  $s_1$  to state  $s_2$ , if state  $s_2$  is final, then replacing  $s_2$  with an initial state  $s_0$  gives rise to a new transition  $\delta'$ , which is also part of  $A_{\mathbf{p}}$ ; (2) all final states of  $A_{\mathbf{q}}$  are transformed into initial states of  $A_{\mathbf{p}}$ . Moreover, during the application of transition  $\delta'$ , all register values are set to  $\ddagger$ .

**Conditioning:** Suppose  $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{q}_{(\theta)}$ , where  $\theta = x \equiv_{\text{DATA}} y$  for some node variables  $x$  and  $y$ , and  $A_{\mathbf{q}}$  is the automaton for  $\mathbf{q}$ . Without loss of generality, we assume there are no outgoing transitions starting from final states of  $A_{\mathbf{q}}$ .

$A_p$  is identical to  $A_q$  except for those transitions ending in final state  $s_f$ . Suppose  $\delta = s \xrightarrow{\mathbf{Pre}, \mathbf{Upd}} s_f$  is a transition of  $A_q$ . We create a new transition  $\delta'$  which behaves as  $\delta$  except that the precondition  $\mathbf{Pre}$  is conjoined with the condition that the value of  $r_x^{\text{DATA}}$  is equal to the value of  $r_y^{\text{DATA}}$ . In the case of  $\theta = \theta_1 \wedge \theta_2$ ,  $\theta_1 \vee \theta_2$ , or  $\neg\theta_1$ , the construction of  $A_p$  follows a similar process.

This completes the proof of statement (S1), which proves Proposition 1 and thus Theorem 2.  $\square$

## 4.2 The data complexity of $\text{ECRDPQ}_{\neg}^{\forall}$

In the previous subsection, we introduced a fragment  $\text{ECRDPQ}_{\neg}^{\forall}$  of  $\text{ECRDPQ}_{\neg}$ , which has no elementary bound on the data complexity, and showed that GPC is subsumed by  $\text{ECRDPQ}_{\neg}^{\forall}$ . Additionally, we asserted that  $\text{ECRDPQ}_{\neg}^{\forall}$  has significantly lower data complexity than  $\text{ECRDPQ}_{\neg}$ , within PSPACE. From this, we could conclude that  $\text{ECRDPQ}_{\neg}^{\forall}$  is strictly less expressive than  $\text{ECRDPQ}_{\neg}$ . We will now substantiate this data complexity claim.

Each quantifier-free  $\text{ECRDPQ}_{\neg}$  formula  $\psi$  is a Boolean combination of atoms of the form  $\bar{\pi} \in A$  or  $\neg\bar{\pi} \in A$ . To check that a universally-quantified sentence does not hold on a given graph, we can negate it as an existentially-quantified Boolean combination, and then guess a conjunction of atoms of the above form that witness satisfiability.

Thus to show that  $\text{ECRDPQ}_{\neg}^{\forall}$  model-checking is PSPACE, it suffices to give a PSPACE algorithm for checking satisfiability of formulas:

$$\exists \bar{\omega}. \bigwedge_i \bar{\omega} \in A_i \wedge \bigwedge_j \neg \bar{\omega} \in B_j. \quad (\text{Eq. } \dagger)$$

Considering the context of data complexity, the  $A_i$  and  $B_j$  are treated as constants.

**Proposition 2.** *Fixing  $A_i, B_i, i \leq n$ ,  $m$ -ary RDPA's and let  $\phi := \exists \bar{\omega}. \bigwedge_i \bar{\omega} \in A_i \wedge \bigwedge_j \neg \bar{\omega} \in B_j$ . There is an algorithm that checks if  $G \models \phi$  running in PSPACE in the size of  $G$ .*

*Proof.* For simplicity, we will assume  $m = 1$ . Let  $\mathcal{D}_G$  be the set of data values appearing in  $G$  and  $\Sigma_G = \mathcal{D}_G \cup \Sigma$ , a set that is polynomial in  $G$  for fixed  $\Sigma$ . For any RDPA  $A$  there is a PTIME algorithm inputting  $G$  and producing an NFA over  $\Sigma_G$  that accepts exactly the data paths through  $G$  that are accepting in  $A$ . Applying this to each  $A_i$  and  $B_j$ , we have reduced to checking whether a Boolean Combination of NFA is non-empty. This can be checked in PSPACE in the size of the NFA.  $\square$

Combining the reduction to satisfiability of sentences of the form (Eq.  $\dagger$ ), we have shown that  $\text{ECRDPQ}_{\neg}^{\forall}$  has much lower complexity than  $\text{ECRDPQ}_{\neg}$ :

**Corollary 1.** *The data complexity of  $\text{ECRDPQ}_{\neg}^{\forall}$  model checking is in PSPACE.*

### 4.3 RDPQ to FO\*( $\equiv_{\text{data}}$ )

To show the inclusion of RDPQ in FO\*( $\equiv_{\text{DATA}}$ ), for every RDPA  $A$  we will construct an FO\*( $\equiv_{\text{DATA}}$ ) formula  $\phi_A$  simulating the computation of  $A$ . Without loss of generality, assume  $A$  is unary,  $\Sigma = \{a, b\}$ , and  $A$  has  $n = 2^t$  states for some positive integer  $t$ . First, let's explore a simplified scenario of using an FO\* formula to emulate the computation of an NFA.

Let  $G$  be a graph with only ids as data, containing at least two nodes  $v$  and  $w$ . Let  $A$  be an NFA. We can assume  $Q = \{\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_n\}$ , where each  $\mathbf{r}_i$  is an  $t$ -tuple over  $\{v, w\}$ . Since  $Q$  is finite, we can define first-order formulas  $\phi_a^{\text{tran}}$  and  $\phi_b^{\text{tran}}$  such that (i)  $\phi_a^{\text{tran}}(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j)$  holds if and only if  $(\mathbf{r}_i, a, \mathbf{r}_j)$  is a transition in  $A$  for  $i, j \in [n]$  and (ii)  $\phi_b^{\text{tran}}(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j)$  holds if and only if  $(\mathbf{r}_i, b, \mathbf{r}_j)$  is a transition in  $A$  for  $i, j \in [n]$ .

For any path  $\rho$  in  $G$ , with label  $\mathbf{lb}(\rho) = a_1 \dots a_m \in L(A)$ , there exist sequences of states  $p_0 \dots p_m$  and nodes  $v_0 \dots v_m$  in  $G$  such that  $p_0$  is the initial state,  $p_m$  is a final state,  $(p_{i-1}, a_i, p_i)$  is a transition in  $A$ , and  $(v_{i-1}, a_i, v_i)$  forms an edge in  $G$  for  $i \in [m]$ . We can define

$$\psi_*^{\text{tran}}(\mathbf{x}, y, \mathbf{x}', y') := \phi_*^{\text{tran}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') \wedge E_*(y, y'),$$

for  $* = a, b$  and

$$\psi_{\text{tran}} := \psi_a^{\text{tran}} \vee \psi_b^{\text{tran}}.$$

Thus  $\mathbf{lb}(\rho) \in L(A)$  if and only if  $\psi_{\text{tran}}^*(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j, r, s)$  where  $\mathbf{r}_i$  is the initial state,  $\mathbf{r}_j$  is a final state, and  $\rho$  goes from node  $r$  to node  $s$ .

Now, let's consider the general case where  $A$  is an RDPA and  $G$  is a data graph. Suppose that  $A$  has registers  $\{1, \dots, \ell\}$  and  $u = d_1 d_2 \dots d_m$  is a data path in  $G$ . The data path  $u$  is accepted by  $A$  if there exists a sequence of accepting configurations  $c_0 c_1 \dots c_m$  and a sequence of transitions  $\delta_1 \dots \delta_m$  such that  $c_{i-1} \xrightarrow{\delta_i} c_i$  for each  $i \in [m]$ . Assume  $X_{\text{ID}} = \{1, \dots, \eta - 1\}$  and  $X_{\text{DATA}} = \{\eta, \dots, \ell\}$  for some index  $\eta$ . A configuration of  $A$  takes the form  $(q, r_1, \dots, r_\ell)$ , where  $q$  is an  $A$ -state,  $r_i = \text{ID}(v_i)$  if  $i < \eta$ , and  $r_i = \text{DATAOF}(v_i)$  if  $i \geq \eta$  for some  $v_i$  in  $G$ . The value of  $r_i$  is uniquely determined once  $v_i$  is known. Thus  $u$  is accepted by  $A$  if and only if there exists a sequence  $\alpha_0 \dots \alpha_m$ , where  $\alpha_i = (q_i, v_1^{(i)}, \dots, v_\ell^{(i)})$  for some  $A$ -state  $q_i$  and  $G$ -nodes  $v_1^{(i)}, \dots, v_\ell^{(i)}$ . This sequence satisfies  $c_i = (q_i, \text{ID}(v_1^{(i)}), \dots, \text{ID}(v_{\eta-1}^{(i)}), \text{DATAOF}(v_\eta^{(i)}), \dots, \text{DATAOF}(v_\ell^{(i)}))$  for  $i \in [m]$ .

In the case of NFA emulation, we utilized tuples  $\mathbf{r}$  of nodes to carry the state information of the automaton. Likewise, for RDPAs, we can also employ tuples of nodes to carry  $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_m$  around. Recall that there are two kinds of transitions in  $A$ : word transitions of the form  $\delta_w := p \xrightarrow{a} q$  and data transitions of the form  $\delta_d := r \xrightarrow{E, I, U} s$ . When  $\delta_w$  is applied, the content of the registers is not modified. Therefore the RDPA-version formula  $\psi_w^{\text{tran}}(\mathbf{x}, y, z, \mathbf{x}', y', z')$

corresponding to  $\delta_w$  can be defined as:

$$\phi_a^{\text{tran}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') \wedge E_a(y, y') \wedge \left( \bigwedge_{1 \leq i < \eta} (z_i = z'_i) \right) \wedge \left( \bigwedge_{\eta \leq i \leq \ell} (z_i \equiv_{\text{ID}} z'_i) \right).$$

When  $\delta_d$  is applied, the values of the registers are compared with the data value of a node and updated. We can define the RDPa-version formula  $\psi_d^{\text{tran}}$  corresponding to  $\delta_d$  as follows:

$$\psi_d^{\text{tran}}(\mathbf{x}, y, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x}', y', \mathbf{z}', w) := \phi_a^{\text{tran}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') \wedge \phi_E(\mathbf{z}, w) \wedge \phi_I(\mathbf{z}, w) \wedge \phi_U(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}'),$$

where

$$\phi_E(\mathbf{z}, w) := \left( \bigwedge_{x_i \in E_{\text{ID}}} z_i = w \right) \wedge \left( \bigwedge_{x_i \in E_{\text{DATA}}} z_i \equiv_{\text{DATA}} w \right)$$

states that the id of node  $w$  is identical to the values of registers in  $E_{\text{ID}}$  and the data value excluding id of node  $w$  is identical to the values of registers in  $E_{\text{DATA}}$ ,

$$\phi_I(\mathbf{z}, w) := \left( \bigwedge_{x_i \in I_{\text{ID}}} \neg(z_i = w) \right) \wedge \left( \bigwedge_{x_i \in I_{\text{DATA}}} \neg(z_i \equiv_{\text{DATA}} w) \right)$$

states that the id of node  $w$  is different from the values of registers in  $I_{\text{ID}}$  and the data value excluding id of node  $w$  is different from the values of registers in  $I_{\text{DATA}}$ , and

$$\phi_U(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}') := \left( \bigwedge_{x_i \in U_{\text{ID}}} z'_i = z_i \right) \wedge \left( \bigwedge_{x_i \in U_{\text{DATA}}} z'_i = z_i \right)$$

states how the registers are updated. Thus, the proof is complete.

#### 4.4 Strictness of the inclusions in Figure 1

Since  $\text{GXPath}_{\text{REG}}(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$  and  $(\text{FO}_3^*)(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$  share the same expressive power [24],  $\text{GXPath}_{\text{REG}}(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$  is subsumed by full transitive closure logic, as shown in Figure 1. The following results implies that the subsumptions in the diagram are all strict.

**Theorem 3.** *Assuming  $\text{NL} \neq \text{NP}$ , no containment relations other than those depicted in the diagram are valid. Specifically, all the containment relations in the diagram are strict.*

Since the diagram includes numerous containments, for the sake of clarity, we will initially enumerate a set of properties that we intend to derive.

P.1 Every pair from the following set is incomparable:  $\text{GPC}$ ,  $\text{WL}$ ,  $\text{CRDPQ}_{\neg}$ ,  $\text{FO}^*(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$ .

P.2  $\text{GXPath}_{\text{REG}}(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$  is not subsumed by  $\text{ECRDPQ}_{\neg}$ .

P.3 RDPQ is not subsumed by  $\text{GXPath}_{\text{REG}}(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$ , GPC, or WL.

The assumption  $\text{NL} \neq \text{NP}$  will be used only in the first item, and there it will be used to derive that GPC and  $\text{CRDPQ}_{\neg}$  are not subsumed by  $\text{FO}^*(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$  and GPC is not subsumed by  $\text{CRDPQ}_{\neg}$ .

These properties are sufficient to obtain the following, which implies that no other containments are derivable:

R.1  $\text{FO}^*(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$  and  $\text{ECRDPQ}_{\neg}$  are incomparable.

R.2 GPC, WL,  $\text{CRDPQ}_{\neg}$  are strictly subsumed by  $\text{ECRDPQ}_{\neg}$ .

R.3 RDPQ is strictly subsumed by  $\text{CRDPQ}_{\neg}$  and  $\text{FO}^*(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$ .

R.4 GPC, WL, RDPQ, and  $\text{GXPath}_{\text{REG}}(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$  are incomparable.

R.5  $\text{GXPath}_{\text{REG}}(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$  is incomparable with  $\text{CRDPQ}_{\neg}$  and  $\text{ECRDPQ}_{\neg}$ .

R.6  $\text{GXPath}_{\text{REG}}(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$  is strictly subsumed by  $\text{FO}^*(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$ .

We start with P.1. Recall Example 2.  $\text{FO}^*(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$  enables us to define the formula  $\text{DATA\_CONNECTION}$  telling if  $v$  and  $w$  are connected in  $G$ . In contrast, languages like  $\text{ECRDPQ}_{\neg}$  that lack general transitive closure operators cannot express this. To see this, consider the family of graphs from Example 2, and note that path lengths are confined to 2. Therefore, fixing a vocabulary with three relations  $P_0, P_1, P_2$  over nodes - where  $P_0, P_1$ , and  $P_2$  are unary, binary, and ternary, respectively - we can convert any  $\text{ECRDPQ}_{\neg}$  formula  $f$  into a first-order logic formula by substituting path variables with node variables. But connectivity cannot be expressed using first-order logic [17]. Consequently,  $\text{ECRDPQ}_{\neg}$  does not subsume  $\text{FO}^*(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$ , and thus  $\text{FO}^*(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$  is not subsumed by any of the other three languages.

It is known that there is no elementary bound on the data complexity for WL, even for graphs with only ids as data [2]. But  $\text{FO}^*(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$ , GPC, and  $\text{CRDPQ}_{\neg}$  do have elementary bounds on data complexity, with  $\text{FO}^*(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$  having a NL bound [19]. Consequently, these languages cannot subsume WL.

What remains in P.1 is to show that GPC and  $\text{CRDPQ}_{\neg}$  cannot be subsumed by WL, by  $\text{FO}^*(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$ , or by each other. We argue that GPC and  $\text{CRDPQ}_{\neg}$  are both NP-hard in data complexity. Since  $\text{FO}^*(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$  is in NL, this will imply that  $\text{FO}^*(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$  cannot subsume either of these languages, assuming NP is not equal to NL. The NP-hardness of GPC stems from the restrictor SIMPLE [16], while the NP-hardness of  $\text{CRDPQ}_{\neg}$  can be demonstrated by reducing the Hamiltonian path problem to a  $\text{CRDPQ}_{\neg}$  query evaluation. The reduction of the Hamiltonian path problem to a  $\text{CRDPQ}_{\neg}$  query evaluation problem is done by creating  $n$  copies  $V_1, \dots, V_n$  of the graph's node set  $V$ , where each transition in the original graph  $G$  from node  $v$  to node  $w$  is replicated by adding a transition from  $v$  in  $V_i$  to  $w$  in  $V_{i+1}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n - 1$ . Thus,  $G$  contains a Hamiltonian path if and only if there exists a path  $\rho$  from a node in  $V_1$  to a node in  $V_n$ , with all nodes along the path corresponding to distinct nodes in  $V$ . This condition can be verified in  $\text{CRDPQ}_{\neg}$  due to the availability of data values and negation.

**Proposition 3.** *The data complexity for CRDPQ<sub>-</sub> is NP-hard.*

*Proof.* We reduce the Hamiltonian path problem to CRDPQ<sub>-</sub> query evaluation. Given a directed graph  $G = (V, E)$  where  $|V| = n_G$  and  $V = [n_G]$ , we let  $G' = (V', E', \text{ID}, \text{DATAOF})$  be the data graph where

- $\Sigma = \{a, b\}$ ,
- $V' = \bigcup_{i=1}^n V_i$  where  $V_i = \{v + i \cdot n_G \in \mathbb{N} \mid v \in V\}$ ,
- $E' = \bigcup_{i=2}^n E_i$  where  $E_i = \{(v + (i-1) \cdot n_G, a_i, w + i \cdot n_G) \in V_{i-1} \times \Sigma \times V_i \mid (v, w) \in E\}$  and  $a_i = b$  when  $i \notin \{2, n\}$ ,
- $\text{DATAOF}(v + i \cdot n_G) = v$  for each  $v \in V$  and  $1 \leq i \leq n_G$ .

According to the construction of  $G'$ , we have that  $G$  contains a Hamiltonian path if and only if there is a path  $\pi$  in  $G'$  such that the data path  $\mathbf{dp}(\pi) = d_1 a_2 d_2 \dots a_n d_n$ ,  $a_2 \dots a_n \in ab^*a$ , and  $d_1 \dots d_n \notin L = \{e_1 \dots e_m \in \mathbb{N}^* \mid e_i = e_j \text{ for some } 1 \leq i < j \leq m\}$ . Regular languages are closed under complement, so there is a finite automaton recognizing the complement of  $ab^*a$ . It is known that  $L$  is register automata recognizable. Consequently, we have that there is an RDPQ  $A$  such that the data path  $\mathbf{dp}(\pi) = d_1 a_2 d_2 \dots a_n d_n \notin L(A)$  if and only if  $a_2 \dots a_n \in ab^*a$  and  $d_1 \dots d_n \notin L$ .  $\square$

While the regular-based query languages GPC and CRDPQ<sub>-</sub> can express the query  $Q_{\text{even}}$ , we know from [18, Proposition 7] that  $Q_{\text{even}}$  is not expressible in WL for graphs with only ids as data. Thus neither of these languages is subsumed by WL.

To finish the derivation of Property P.1, we need to show that CRDPQ<sub>-</sub> and GPC are not subsumed by one another. For one non-containment, we use that GPC is NP-hard even without data, while CRDPQ<sub>-</sub> is in NL without data [3]. For the other, we show that even RDPQ is not subsumed by GPC: this is shown in the argument for Property P.3 below.

We turn to P.2. Previously, we derived that  $\text{FO}^*(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$  is not subsumed by ECRDPQ<sub>-</sub> by showing that  $\text{DATA CONNECTION}$ , from Example 2, cannot be expressed within ECRDPQ<sub>-</sub>. This example can be used to show non-containment of  $\text{GXPath}_{\text{REG}}(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$  within ECRDPQ<sub>-</sub>.  $\text{GXPath}_{\text{REG}}(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$  and  $(\text{FO}_3^*)(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$  are equivalent in expressiveness and  $(\text{FO}_3^*)(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$  allows us to express  $\text{DATA CONNECTION} = \text{DATA LINK}^*$ , where  $\text{DATA LINK}(x, y)$  is

$$\exists z. (\text{OUT}(z, x) \wedge (\exists x. (\text{IN}(x, y) \wedge x \equiv_{\text{DATA}} z)))$$

As a result, we have P.2.

Next, we argue for P.3. Given that RDPQ is also based on regular languages, it can express the query  $Q_{\text{even}}$ . Consequently, we deduce that WL does not subsume RDPQ. Let's define  $Q_{4\text{NODES}}$  as the query: "Is there a path from node  $s$  to node  $t$  containing four distinct nodes?". For any complete graph  $G$  with two nodes  $s$  and  $t$ , there exists a path from  $s$  to  $t$  containing four distinct nodes if and only if  $G$  has at least four nodes. It was established that

no  $\text{GXPath}_{\text{REG}}(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$  formula can differentiate between  $K_3$  and  $K_4$  [24], where  $K_n$  is the complete graph on  $n$  nodes for all  $n \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}$ . More specifically, there is no  $\text{GXPath}_{\text{REG}}(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$  sentence  $\phi$  such that  $K_4 \models \phi$ , but  $K_3 \not\models \phi$ . Therefore,  $Q_{4\text{NODES}}$  cannot be expressed using  $\text{GXPath}_{\text{REG}}(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$ . However, the query  $Q_{4\text{NODES}}$  is expressible using RDPQ. So we conclude that  $\text{GXPath}_{\text{REG}}(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$  does not subsume RDPQ.

Lastly, we demonstrate that RDPQ is not subsumed by GPC.

**Theorem 4.** *RDPQ is not subsumed by GPC.*

Consider query  $Q_{3\text{val}}(s, t) :=$  “Is there a path  $\rho$  from node  $s$  to node  $t$  where the number of distinct data values (excluding ids) along  $\rho$  is exactly 3?”. It is evident that  $Q_{3\text{val}}$  can be expressed in RDPQ. There exists a path containing exactly three distinct data values from  $s$  to  $t$  if and only if there exists such a path that is also simple. Since we define GPC graph queries via existentially quantifying over path variables, it suffices to show there is no GPC path query  $\mathbf{t} \mathbf{p}_{3\text{val}}$ , where  $\mathbf{t} = \text{SIMPLE}$ , and pattern  $\mathbf{p}_{3\text{val}}$  defines the set of paths containing exactly three distinct data values from  $s$  to  $t$ . This assertion will hold even restricting to chain data graphs over unary  $\Sigma$ .

Refer to Figure 6, where we use  $\rho_G$  to denote the longest path, i.e., the path from  $s$  to  $t$ , in graph  $G$ . We will prove that there does not exist a GPC pattern  $\mathbf{p}_{3\text{val}}$  such that, for each input graph  $G$ ,  $\rho_G$  matches pattern  $\mathbf{p}_{3\text{val}}$  if and only if  $\rho_G$  is an answer to query  $Q_{3\text{val}}$ .




Figure 6: Chain graph  $G$  and path  $\rho_G$  from  $s$  to  $t$ .

For simplicity, throughout the rest of this section, when comparing two chains  $G_1 = (V_1, E_1, \text{ID}_1, \text{DATAOF}_1)$  and  $G_2 = (V_2, E_2, \text{ID}_2, \text{DATAOF}_2)$ , if  $|V_1| \leq |V_2|$ , we assume  $V_1 \subseteq V_2$  and  $E_1 \subseteq E_2$ , and we will directly ignore the functions  $\text{ID}_1$  and  $\text{ID}_2$ , as well as the labels of edges, treating paths as sequences of nodes. Furthermore, given a chain  $G = (V, E, \text{DATAOF})$ , we assume that  $V = \{v_0, \dots, v_n\}$  for some  $n$ , and  $E = \{(v_0, v_1), \dots, (v_{n-1}, v_n)\}$ . When referring to a path  $\rho = v_i \dots v_j$  in  $G$  for some  $i \leq j$ , we use  $G_\rho$  to denote the subgraph  $(V_{i,j}, E_{i,j}, \text{DATAOF})$  from node  $v_i$  to  $v_j$ , where  $V_{i,j} = \{v_i, \dots, v_j\}$  and  $E_{i,j} = \{(v_i, v_{j-1}), \dots, (v_{i+1}, v_j)\}$ . Given a pattern  $\mathbf{p}$  and a graph  $G$ , we use  $\llbracket \mathbf{p} \rrbracket_G$  to denote the set of paths  $\rho$  in  $G$  that match the pattern  $\mathbf{p}$ . For any two patterns  $\mathbf{p}$  and  $\mathbf{q}$ , we write  $\mathbf{p} \approx \mathbf{q}$  if  $\llbracket \mathbf{p} \rrbracket_G = \llbracket \mathbf{q} \rrbracket_G$  for all  $G$ .

**Normal forms:** Each pattern can be expressed in one of the following forms: an atomic pattern,  $\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{q}$ ,  $\mathbf{pq}$ ,  $\mathbf{p}_{\langle \theta \rangle}$ , or  $\mathbf{p}^*$ .

The normalization above is achieved using two families of rules. One family pushes filters out of compositions:

**Proposition 4.**  $\mathbf{p}_{\langle \theta \rangle} \mathbf{q}_{\langle \eta \rangle} \approx \{\mathbf{pq}\}_{\langle \theta \wedge \eta \rangle}$  if the pattern  $\mathbf{p}_{\langle \theta \rangle} \mathbf{q}_{\langle \eta \rangle}$  is well-typed.

A second family eliminates filters from Kleene star patterns:

**Proposition 5.**  $\{\mathbf{p}^*\}_{\langle\theta\rangle} \approx \{\mathbf{p}^*\}_{\langle\top\rangle} \approx \mathbf{p}^*$  if  $\{\mathbf{p}^*\}_{\langle\theta\rangle}$  is well-typed.

Note also that  $\mathbf{p}^{n\dots m}$  can be eliminated, since it can be seen as  $\mathbf{p}^{n\dots n} + \dots + \mathbf{p}^{m\dots m}$ , and each  $\mathbf{p}^{i\dots i}$  is equivalent to the concatenation of  $\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_i$  for some  $\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_i$ . This allows us to consider only the case  $\mathbf{p}^{0\dots\infty}$ .)

We rely on the fact that patterns cannot distinguish between two graphs that are isomorphic:

**Proposition 6.** Let  $\mathbf{p}$  be a GPC pattern. For any two graphs  $G_1 = (V_1, E_1, \text{DATAOF}_1)$ ,  $G_2 = (V_2, E_2, \text{DATAOF}_2)$ , if  $V_1 = V_2$  and  $\text{DATAOF}_1(v_i) = \text{DATAOF}_1(v_j) \Leftrightarrow \text{DATAOF}_2(v_i) = \text{DATAOF}_2(v_j)$  for all  $i, j$ , then  $\rho_{G_1} \in \llbracket \mathbf{p} \rrbracket_{G_1} \Leftrightarrow \rho_{G_2} \in \llbracket \mathbf{p} \rrbracket_{G_2}$ .

We will demonstrate that for any pattern  $\mathbf{p}$ , we can construct two graphs,  $G$  and  $G'$ , such that both  $\rho_G$  and  $\rho_{G'}$  either agree or disagree with pattern  $\mathbf{p}$ . Additionally,  $G$  has exactly three values, while  $G'$  does not.

Let's fix a pattern  $\mathbf{p}$ . Using the normalization rules described above, we can assume that  $\mathbf{p}$  is equivalent to a disjunction  $\mathbf{p}^1 + \dots + \mathbf{p}^n$  for some patterns  $\mathbf{p}^1, \dots, \mathbf{p}^n$ . Furthermore, we can assume that each pattern  $\mathbf{p}^i$  in the disjunction has the form  $\mathbf{q}_{\langle\theta\rangle}$ , where  $\theta$  is a condition, and  $\mathbf{q}$  is the concatenation of patterns  $\mathbf{q}_1, \dots, \mathbf{q}_m$ . Finally, we can assume that each of the patterns  $\mathbf{q}_j$  is a union of two patterns or has the form  $\mathbf{r}_{\langle\phi\rangle}$  for some pattern  $\mathbf{r}$  and condition  $\phi$ . Let's fix such a  $\mathbf{p}^i$ .

Now, consider any chain graph  $G$  with three alternating values that is sufficiently long, denoted as  $G = (V, E, \text{DATAOF})$ , where  $|V| = 3^\ell > 3 \cdot |\mathbf{p}| + 7$  for some positive integer  $\ell$ . Here,  $\text{DATAOF}(\rho_G) = (d_1 d_2 d_3)^\ell$ , and  $|\{d_1, d_2, d_3\}| = 3$ . Assuming that  $\mathbf{p}$  correctly implements  $Q_{3\text{val}}$ , we have  $\rho_G \in \llbracket \mathbf{p} \rrbracket_G$ . Moreover, there is an index  $i$  such that  $\rho_G \in \llbracket \mathbf{p}^i \rrbracket_G$ .

Recall that using the normal form assumption, we could assume that  $\mathbf{p}^i$  is equivalent to  $\{\mathbf{q}_1 \dots \mathbf{q}_m\}_{\langle\theta\rangle}$  for some condition  $\theta$  and patterns  $\mathbf{q}_1, \dots, \mathbf{q}_m$ , where each  $\mathbf{q}_j$  is either an atomic pattern or has the form  $\mathbf{r}^*$  for some pattern  $\mathbf{r}$ . Since  $\frac{|V|-7}{3} > |\mathbf{p}| \geq |\mathbf{p}^i|$ , there is an index  $j$  and a pattern  $\mathbf{r}$  such that  $\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{r}^*$ : in other words, there is some segment of the graph matched by a wildcard sub-pattern.

Consider  $\theta = \top$ . There are two possibilities:  $m = 1$  and  $m > 1$ . The case  $m = 1$  can be easily transformed into case  $m > 1$  because for every pattern  $\mathbf{r}$ ,  $\mathbf{r}^*$  is equivalent to  $\mathbf{r}^* \mathbf{r}^*$ . Therefore, we will assume  $m > 1$ : the composition has more than one component.

Up to this point, we have been reasoning about the pattern  $\mathbf{p}$  on the chain graph  $G$ . Now we define several additional isomorphic copies of  $G$ . Let  $e \notin \{d_1, d_2, d_3\}$ , and define  $H_s = (V, E, \text{DATAOF}_s)$  for  $s = 1, 2, 3$ , where  $\text{DATAOF}_1(\rho_{H_1}) = (e d_2 d_3)^\ell$ ,  $\text{DATAOF}_2(\rho_{H_2}) = (d_1 e d_3)^\ell$ , and  $\text{DATAOF}_3(\rho_{H_3}) = (d_1 d_2 e)^\ell$ . For instance, let  $d_1 = 1, d_2 = 2, d_3 = 3$ , and  $e = 4$ . Then,  $G, H_1, H_2, H_3$  are illustrated in Figure 7a.

Since all four graphs are isomorphic, by Proposition 6 we have  $\rho_{H_s} \in \llbracket \mathbf{p}^i \rrbracket_{H_s}$  for  $s = 1, 2, 3$ . By our assumption,  $\mathbf{p}^i = \{\mathbf{q}_1 \dots \mathbf{q}_m\}_{\langle\theta\rangle}$ , the path  $\rho_G$  (and  $\rho_{H_s}$

for  $s = 1, 2, 3$ ) can be divided into segments  $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_m$  (and  $\tau_1^s, \dots, \tau_m^s$  for  $s = 1, 2, 3$ ), where  $\rho_j \in \llbracket \mathbf{q}_j \rrbracket_G$  (and  $\tau_j^s \in \llbracket \mathbf{q}_j \rrbracket_{H_s}$  for  $s = 1, 2, 3$ ) for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ . Additionally, we can assume that  $|\rho_j| = |\tau_j^s|$  for  $s = 1, 2, 3$  for all  $j$ .

Since  $|\rho_G| = |\rho_{H_1}| = |\rho_{H_2}| = |\rho_{H_3}| = |V| > 3 \cdot |\mathbf{p}^i| + 7$ , there is an index  $1 \leq \iota \leq m$  such that  $3 \leq |\rho_\iota| = |\tau_\iota^s|$  for  $s = 1, 2, 3$  and  $\mathbf{q}_\iota = \mathbf{r}^*$  for some  $\mathbf{r}$ . Since  $\mathbf{r}^* \mathbf{r}^*$  is equivalent to  $\mathbf{r}^*$ , we can also demand that  $|\rho_\iota| < |\rho_G| - 3$ . In other words, there is a “non-trivial” segment matched by a Kleene star pattern component within  $G$ , and likewise within each of the  $H_i$ . This is a segment where we will perform our merging.

Let  $3 < s < t < 3^\ell - 3$  be the indices marking the beginning and end of the crucial segment, corresponding to nodes  $v_s$  and  $v_t$  in graph  $G$ , such that  $\rho_\iota = \rho_G[v_s, v_t]$ . Note that within each  $H_i$ , the positions that contain the value 4 are congruent modulo 3. As we consider  $H_1, H_2, H_3$ , the positions of the value 4 cover every possible residue class modulo 3. Therefore, in one of the  $H_i$ , which we will call  $H_r$ , the positions of nodes with value 4 do not align with  $s$  or  $t$  modulo 3. For this particular  $r$ , we have agreement between  $G$  and  $H_r$  at the endpoints of the crucial segment:  $\text{DATAOF}(v_s) = \text{DATAOF}_r(v_s)$  and  $\text{DATAOF}(v_t) = \text{DATAOF}_r(v_t)$ . For example, if  $\text{DATAOF}(v_s) = 3$  and  $\text{DATAOF}(v_t) = 1$ , then we have  $r = 2$ .

Let  $G' = (V, E, \text{DATAOF}')$  where:

- $\text{DATAOF}'(v_r) = \text{DATAOF}(v_r)$  if  $r < s$  or  $t < r$ ;
- $\text{DATAOF}'(v_r) = \text{DATAOF}_r(v_u)$  if  $s \leq u \leq t$ .

Figure 7b illustrates the process of merging  $G$  with  $H_r$  to obtain  $G'$ .

We now claim that  $\rho_{G'} \in \llbracket \mathbf{p} \rrbracket_{G'}$ . As a witness, we will use the same disjunct  $\mathbf{p}^i$ , and for  $\mathbf{p}^i$ , we will use the “obvious” partition corresponding to the merged structures. Formally, we divide  $\rho_{G'}$  into  $\rho'_1, \dots, \rho'_m$  such that  $|\rho'_p| = |\rho_p|$  for all  $p = 1, \dots, m$ . Then we have  $\rho'_\iota = \tau_\iota^r$ ,  $\text{DATAOF}'(\rho'_\iota) = \text{DATAOF}_r(\tau_\iota^r)$ ,  $\rho'_p = \rho_p$ , and  $\text{DATAOF}'(\rho'_{p'}) = \text{DATAOF}(\rho_{p'})$  for each  $p \in \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus \{\iota\}$ . Thus  $\rho'_p \in \llbracket \mathbf{q}_p \rrbracket_{G'}$  for  $p = 1, \dots, m$ , and  $\rho_{G'} \in \llbracket \mathbf{q}_1 \dots \mathbf{q}_m \rrbracket_{G'} = \llbracket \mathbf{p}_i \rrbracket_{G'} \subseteq \llbracket \mathbf{p}_{3\text{val}} \rrbracket_{G'}$ . Since  $3 < |\rho'_\iota| < |V| - 3$ , we have  $\text{DATAOF}'(\rho_{G'}) = 4 > 3$ . This leads to a contradiction.

The analysis for the case  $\theta \neq \top$  is similar. Note that the variables that appear in  $\mathbf{q}_j = \mathbf{r}^*$  cannot be mentioned in  $\theta$ , otherwise,  $\mathbf{p}^i$  is not well-typed. Hence, Theorem 4 is proved.

## 5 Unifying the Languages

A natural way to find a language subsuming all the languages in Figure 1 is to extend  $\text{ECDPQ}_-$  or  $\text{FO}^*(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$ , which are shown to be the maximally expressive query languages within the diagram in the preceding section. Essentially,  $\text{ECDPQ}_-$  is a first-order logic. The extension of  $\text{ECDPQ}_-$  augmented with transitive closures then intuitively subsumes  $\text{FO}^*(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$ . However, there are two issues we need to address. First, in  $\text{ECDPQ}_-$ , there are two types of variables: node variables and path variables. Given a formula  $\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ , where




Figure 7: A data graph  $G$  with exactly 3 distinct data values (excluding ids).

$\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$  have the same arity, we cannot form  $\phi^*(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  without considering the types of variables in  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$ . For instance, it does not make sense to allow a formula  $\psi^*(x, \pi)$  from a formula  $\psi(x, \pi)$  where  $x$  is a node variable and  $\pi$  is a path variable. We address this by imposing the restriction that all the variables in vectors  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$  of formula  $\phi$  are node variables. Second, we want the language to remain well-behaved, i.e., the query evaluation should be decidable. We will define a query language  $\text{ECRDPQ}_\neg^*$  augmenting  $\text{ECRDPQ}_\neg$  with transitive closure in such a way that it addresses the second issue mentioned in the last paragraph.

**Definition 4.** *The formulas of  $\text{ECRDPQ}_\neg^*$  are defined inductively by the following rules:*

- *$\text{ECRDPQ}_\neg$  formulas are  $\text{ECRDPQ}_\neg^*$  formulas.*
- *If  $\phi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\pi})$  is an  $\text{ECRDPQ}_\neg^*$  formula where  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$  are vectors of node variables with the same arity and  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  is a vector of path variables, then  $\phi^*(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\pi})$  is an  $\text{ECRDPQ}_\neg^*$  formula.*
- *If  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  are  $\text{ECRDPQ}_\neg^*$  formulas, then  $\neg\phi$ ,  $\phi \vee \psi$ ,  $\exists x.\phi$ , and  $\exists \pi.\psi$  are also  $\text{ECRDPQ}_\neg^*$  formulas, where  $x$  and  $\pi$  are node and path variables appearing free in  $\phi$  and  $\psi$ , respectively.*

Since  $\text{ECRDPQ}_\neg^*$  is an extension of  $\text{ECRDPQ}_\neg$ , to define the semantics, we simply have to illustrate the meaning of  $\phi^*(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ . Given a data graph  $G$ , an  $\text{ECRDPQ}_\neg^*$  formula  $\phi^*(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ , where  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$  are vectors of node variables with the same arity and  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  is a vector of path variables, holds if there exists a sequence of vectors of nodes  $\mathbf{v}_1 = \mathbf{v}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n = \mathbf{v}'$  and a vector of paths  $\boldsymbol{\rho}$  s.t.  $G \models \phi(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_{i+1}, \boldsymbol{\rho})$  for  $1 \leq i < n$ , then  $G \models \phi^*(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}', \boldsymbol{\rho})$ .

By the definition of  $\text{ECRDPQ}_\neg^*$ , we have the following theorem:

**Theorem 5.**  *$\text{ECRDPQ}_\neg^*$  subsumes all languages from Figure 1.*

Next, we show that  $\text{ECRDPQ}_\neg^*$  is well-behaved.

**Proposition 7.** *The  $\text{ECRDPQ}_\neg^*$  query evaluation problem is decidable.*

*Proof.* Let  $\phi(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\pi})$  be an ECRDPQ $_{\neg}^*$  formula and  $G$  be a data graph. Without loss of generality, we assume that both  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{ID}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{PROP}} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ . Therefore, all data paths in  $G$  are in the set  $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{N}^2 \times (\Sigma \times \mathbb{N}^2)^*$ . The ECRDPQ $_{\neg}^*$  query evaluation is decidable if and only if the emptiness problem for the set  $L_{\phi, G} = \{(\mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\rho}) \mid G \models \phi(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\pi})\}$  is decidable for arbitrary  $\phi$  and  $G$ . We can decide emptiness using the following:

**Claim 1.**  $L_{\phi, G}$  is regular and the finite automaton  $A_{\phi, G}$  recognizing  $L_{\phi, G}$  can be effectively derived from  $\phi$  and  $G$ .

In [3], it is shown that the statement holds when  $\phi$  is an ECRDPQ $_{\neg}$  formula and  $G$  is a graph without data; thus, all automata  $A$  appearing in  $\phi$  are finite automata. We explain how to adapt the proof for data graphs. In [3], the authors give an inductive construction of  $A_{\phi, G}$ . The main inductive step relies on closure of finite automata under complement. Although we consider data graphs, the automata  $A$  appearing in  $\phi$  are RDPAs, and RDPAs are not closed under complementation. However, once a data graph  $G$  is fixed, we can transform all RDPAs  $A$  into finite automata  $A'$  and derive an ECRDPQ $_{\neg}$  formula  $\phi'$  from  $\phi$  by replacing  $A$  with  $A'$  such that  $G \models \phi(\mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\rho})$  if and only if  $G \models \phi'(\mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\rho})$ .

For instance, consider Example 1. There is no RDPA recognizing the complement of  $L(A_{\text{repeat}})$  in  $\mathbb{P}$ . However, once  $G$  is fixed, there are two finite subsets  $D_{\text{ID}}^G, D_{\text{PROP}}^G$  of  $\mathbb{N}$  s.t. all data paths in  $G$  are over the union of  $D_{\text{ID}}^G, D_{\text{PROP}}^G$ , and  $\Sigma$ . Thus there is a finite automaton  $A_{\text{repeat}}^G$  s.t. for every data path  $\rho$  in  $G$ ,  $\rho \in L(A_{\text{repeat}})$  if and only if  $\rho \in L(A_{\text{repeat}}^G)$ . Hence, we have that the claim is true when  $\phi$  is an ECRDPQ $_{\neg}$  formula, even when  $G$  is with data.

From Claim 1 Proposition 7 follows. □

Figure 2 summarizes the results of this section.

## 6 Multi-Path Walk Logic, an extension of WL

In the previous section, we extended ECRDPQ $_{\neg}$  to unify the prior languages. Based on Theorem 3, we have that ECRDPQ $_{\neg}$  subsumes CRDPQ $_{\neg}$ , RDPQ, GPC, and WL. The query languages RDPQ for data graphs and ECRDPQ $_{\neg}$  for graphs without data are well-studied [24, 3]. In this section, we examine WL and derive an extension of WL, still subsumed by ECRDPQ $_{\neg}$ .

In WL, comparative analysis across different paths is precluded. That is, we can say  $l^{\pi} < n^{\omega}$  only if  $\pi = \omega$ . We call the extension of WL obtained by lifting this limitation *multi-path walk logic* (MWL). In this section, we study the properties of MWL. We relate it to the languages investigated in the preceding sections and derive the decidability of query evaluation. Additionally, we also show that both *HyperLTL*, an extension of LTL with explicit qualification over multi-paths [9], and *ILTL* [7], another extension of LTL allowing the manipulation of multi-paths, are subsumed by MWL. See Figure 8.




Figure 8: Expressive power of languages relevant to MWL.

## 6.1 Properties of MWL

Recall from Section 4 that to complete the proof of Theorem 1, we need to show that WL is contained in  $\text{ECRDPQ}_{\neg}$ . We will show something stronger: that MWL, an extension of WL, is contained in  $\text{ECRDPQ}_{\neg}$ .

**Proposition 8.** *MWL is strictly stronger than WL in expressive power.*

*Proof.* Let  $G$  be a graph and  $n_{\mathbf{red}}, n_{\mathbf{black}}$  be two nodes in  $G$  where  $n_{\mathbf{red}}$  and  $n_{\mathbf{black}}$  have no outgoing edges. Assume that for every node  $n$  in  $G$ , if  $n \neq n_c$  for  $c = \mathbf{red}, \mathbf{black}$ , then there is exactly one edge from  $n$  either to  $n_{\mathbf{red}}$  or to  $n_{\mathbf{black}}$ . We say  $n$  is red if there is an edge from  $n$  to  $n_{\mathbf{red}}$  and black if there is an edge from  $n$  to  $n_{\mathbf{black}}$ . Without loss of generality, assume all the labels of the edges to  $n_{\mathbf{red}}$  or  $n_{\mathbf{black}}$  are  $a$ .

Let  $Q_{\text{LEN}}^{\text{DIFF}}$  be: “Are there two paths of different lengths from a red node to a black node?” It is shown that  $Q_{\text{LEN}}^{\text{DIFF}}$  is not expressible in WL [18]. However, it is expressible in MWL as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \exists \pi, \omega, \ell^\pi, m^\pi, s^\omega, t^\omega. (\mathbf{first}(\ell) \wedge \mathbf{first}(s) \wedge \mathbf{last}(m) \wedge \mathbf{last}(t)) \wedge \ell < \omega \\ & \wedge \phi_{\mathbf{red}}(\ell) \wedge \phi_{\mathbf{red}}(s) \wedge \phi_{\mathbf{black}}(m) \wedge \phi_{\mathbf{black}}(t), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\phi_{\mathbf{red}}(x) := \exists \pi, \ell^\pi, m^\pi. E_a(\ell, m) \wedge \ell \equiv_{\text{ID}} x$$

and it indicates that  $x$  is red. The formula  $\phi_{\mathbf{black}}$  is defined similarly.  $\square$

In Theorem 1, we also claimed that WL is subsumed by  $\text{ECRDPQ}_{\neg}$ , and we note that this is a bit subtle. In fact, we have something stronger:

**Proposition 9.** *MWL is subsumed by  $\text{ECRDPQ}_{\neg}$ .*

*Proof.* We show that MWL formulas can be inductively translated into  $\text{ECRDPQ}_{\neg}$  formulas. First, consider MWL atoms: 1.  $E_a(x, y)$ . 2.  $x < y$ . 3.  $x \equiv_{\text{ID}} y$ . 4.  $x \equiv_{\text{DATA}} y$ . Consider two paths  $\rho$  and  $\tau$  and two node positions  $i^\rho$  and  $j^\tau$ . Each of (1) to (4) corresponds to a property of prefixes  $\rho'$  of  $\rho$  (for  $x$ ) with length  $i^\rho$  and  $\tau'$  of  $\tau$  (for  $y$ ) with length  $j^\tau$ , as follows:

- (1')  $|\tau'| = |\rho'| + 1$  and the last symbol from  $\Sigma$  along  $\tau'$  is  $a$ .
- (2') The length of  $\rho'$  is shorter than the length of  $\tau'$ .

- (3') The last node along  $\rho'$  is the same as the last node along  $\tau'$ .
- (4') The last node data value (excluding the id) along  $\rho'$  is equivalent to the last node data value (excluding the id) along  $\tau'$ .

Each of these relations (1') through (4') can be defined by RDPA expressions. Note that in the case of (1), variables  $x$  and  $y$  should belong to the same sort.

Note that in  $\text{ECRDPQ}_{\neg}$ , there are no position variables. So above, when we translate an MWL formula into an  $\text{ECRDPQ}_{\neg}$  one, we map a position variable  $x$  sorted by the path variable  $\pi$  to a path variable that is constrained to be a prefix of  $\pi$ . The property that path  $x$  is a prefix of  $\pi$  can be expressed by the atomic  $\text{ECRDPQ}_{\neg}$  formula  $(x, \pi) \in A_{\text{PREFIX}}$ , where  $A_{\text{PREFIX}}$  is the RDPA recognizing the pair  $(\rho, \tau)$  of data paths where  $\rho$  is a prefix of  $\tau$ . By using the RDPAs defined by (1')-(4'), we can then recursively translate MWL formulas into their corresponding  $\text{ECRDPQ}_{\neg}$  forms.  $\square$

On the other hand, MWL remains fundamentally a first-order language, unable to count the parity of a set. More specifically, we show that on  $\Sigma$ -words, MWL is subsumed by  $\text{FO}[\langle, +, \{a\}_{a \in \Sigma}]$ , a first-order logic where variables range over positions of words and the interpretations of  $\langle, +, \{a\}_{a \in \Sigma}$  are standard. Since checking whether the number of positions with a particular symbol  $a$  is even is not definable in  $\text{FO}[\langle, +, \{a\}_{a \in \Sigma}]$  [23], it is also not definable in MWL.

**Proposition 10.** *Over words (i.e. chain graphs) MWL is subsumed by  $\text{FO}[\langle, +, \{a\}_{a \in \Sigma}]$ .*

*Proof.* Given a chain data graph  $G$ , we use  $w_G$  to denote the label of the chain.

**Claim 2.** *For each MWL sentence  $\phi$ , there is an  $\text{FO}[\langle, +, \{a\}_{a \in \Sigma}]$  sentence  $\psi$  such that for every chain graph  $G$  with only ids as data,  $G \models \phi$  if and only if  $w_G \models \psi$ .*

Each path variable  $\pi$  in  $\phi$  is translated to two position variables  $\pi^{\text{begin}}$  and  $\pi^{\text{end}}$  in  $\psi$ , representing the endpoints. Each position variable  $\ell$  in  $\phi$  is translated to a position variable  $x_\ell$  in  $\psi$ . Additionally, we enforce the following conditions:

- $\pi^{\text{begin}} \leq \pi^{\text{end}}$ , and the equality holds if and only if  $\pi$  is empty.
- $0 \leq x_\ell < \pi^{\text{end}} - \pi^{\text{begin}}$  if  $\ell$  is of sort  $\pi$ , and  $\pi$  is not empty.

Then, we can translate MWL atomic formulas as follows:

- $E_a(\ell^\pi, m^\pi)$  is translated to  $a(x_\ell + \pi^{\text{begin}}) \wedge (x_m = x_\ell + 1)$ .
- $\ell < m$  is translated to  $x_\ell < x_m$ .
- $\ell^\pi \equiv_{\text{ID}} m^\omega$  is translated to  $\ell + \pi^{\text{begin}} = m + \omega^{\text{begin}}$ .

$\text{FO}[\langle, +, \{a\}_{a \in \Sigma}]$  is a first-order logic that incorporates existential quantification, disjunction, and negation, so the induction step for the corresponding MWL operators is straightforward. This completes the proof of Claim 2.  $\square$

Parity is a regular language, so is in RDPQ and GPC. Thus:

**Proposition 11.** *MWL does not subsume GPC or RDPQ.*

As a result, we have:

**Proposition 12.** *MWL is strictly subsumed by ECRDPQ<sub>¬</sub>.*

## 6.2 Hyperproperties

While reasoning about a system, a property can be seen as a set of traces. A *hyperproperty* is a set of properties [10]. In other words, a hyperproperty is a set of sets of traces. More generally, given a universe  $\mathcal{U}$ , each set  $S \subseteq \mathcal{U}$  represents a property, and each class  $C \subseteq 2^{\mathcal{U}}$  represents a hyperproperty. For instance, let  $\mathcal{U} = \Sigma^*$  for a fixed alphabet  $\Sigma$ . Then, each linear temporal logic (LTL) formula over  $\Sigma$  defines a set of  $\Sigma$ -strings, and [9] defines a language HyperLTL whose formulas define a set of sets of  $\Sigma$ -strings. If the universe is the set of paths, then any formula of the query languages discussed in this paper can be seen as a hyperproperty. More precisely, each graph  $G$  uniquely defines a set of paths  $P$ , making a set of graphs a hyperproperty. For example, a WL sentence  $\phi$  defines the set  $\{G \mid G \models \phi\}$ , which can be considered a set of sets of paths. We can thus compare the logics studied in this paper with other hyperproperty logics.

We will not need the formal definition of HyperLTL here. Let  $\Sigma$  be a fixed finite set of symbols. In [14], the authors introduce  $\text{FO}(\prec, \mathbf{peql})$ , a first-order logic over sets of  $\Sigma$ -strings, and show that HyperLTL is strictly subsumed by  $\text{FO}(\prec, \mathbf{peql})$ . In  $\text{FO}(\prec, \mathbf{peql})$ , variables are string position variables. Given two strings  $s = a_1a_2\dots$  and  $t = b_1b_2\dots$ , the pair  $((s, i), (t, j))$  satisfies the atomic formula  $\mathbf{peql}(x, y)$  if  $i = j$  for  $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ . In other words, it states that  $a_i$  of  $s$  and  $b_j$  of  $t$  are at the same positions. The pair  $((s, i), (t, j))$  satisfies the atomic formula  $x \prec y$  if  $s$  is  $t$  and  $i < j$ . In other words, the predicate  $\prec$  indicates the order of positions on a single string. Additionally, in  $\text{FO}(\prec, \mathbf{peql})$ , for each  $a \in \Sigma$ ,  $P_a(x)$  is an atomic formula. Element  $(s, i) \in \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  witnesses  $P_a(x)$  if  $a_i = a$ .

Given an  $\text{FO}(\prec, \mathbf{peql})$  sentence and a graph  $G$ , we say  $G \models \phi$  if the set  $\{\mathbf{lb}(\rho) \mid \rho \in P_G\}$  satisfies  $\phi$ , where  $P_G$  is the set of paths in  $G$ . We are now ready to state a simple result relating this language to MWL, and hence also relating HyperLTL to MWL:

**Proposition 13.** *Given an  $\text{FO}(\prec, \mathbf{peql})$  sentence  $\phi$ , there exists an MWL sentence  $\psi$  such that for every graph  $G$ ,  $G \models \phi$  if and only if  $G \models \psi$ .*

The use of  $\prec$  in  $\text{FO}(\prec, \mathbf{peql})$  is similar to the use of “ $<$ ” in WL. In WL,  $l < l'$  is a formula only if  $l$  and  $l'$  are of the same sort  $\pi$  for some  $\pi$ . Furthermore, the meaning of  $\mathbf{peql}$  is akin to equality in MWL. So the translation from an  $\text{FO}(\prec, \mathbf{peql})$  sentence  $\phi$  to an equivalent MWL sentence  $\psi$  is straightforward.

### 6.3 Indexed Linear Temporal Logic (ILTL)

*Indexed linear temporal logic* (ILTL), an extension of Linear Temporal Logic (LTL) on sets  $T$  of traces, is a specification language for parameterized concurrent and multi-agent systems [4, 7, 22, 5], where each agent is assigned a specific ID. In ILTL, we can intuitively employ LTL formulas to specify trace patterns and quantifiers over trace ids. In this section we connect ILTL to MWL.

Let  $\Sigma_{\text{GLOBAL}}$  and  $\Sigma_{\text{LOCAL}}$  be two disjoint alphabets. The intention of  $\Sigma_{\text{GLOBAL}}$  is to specify global properties of the system we are modeling, whereas  $\Sigma_{\text{LOCAL}}$  is used for specific processes. A *computation trace* over  $\Sigma_{\text{GLOBAL}}$  and  $\Sigma_{\text{LOCAL}}$  is a triple  $(u, I, \{v_i\}_{i \in I})$ , where  $u$  is a *global trace* in  $\Sigma_{\text{GLOBAL}}^*$ ,  $v_i \in \Sigma_{\text{LOCAL}}^*$  a *local trace* with id  $i$  for each  $i \in I$ , and  $I$  is a finite set of local trace ids.

**Definition 5.** *Let  $x$  be an index variable taking values in  $I$ ,  $a \in \Sigma_{\text{GLOBAL}}$ , and  $a' \in \Sigma_{\text{LOCAL}}$ . ILTL formulas  $\phi$  over  $\Sigma_{\text{GLOBAL}}$  and  $\Sigma_{\text{LOCAL}}$  are defined inductively as follows:*

$$\phi := a \mid \neg a \mid a'(x) \mid \neg a'(x) \mid \phi' \vee \phi'' \mid \phi' \wedge \phi'' \mid X\phi' \mid \phi' U \phi'' \mid \exists x.\phi' \mid \forall x.\phi'.$$

$\phi$  is an LTL formula if there are no index variables.

For each string  $u$  and  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ , we use  $u[n]$  to denote the  $n^{\text{th}}$  component of  $u$ . Let  $\phi$  be an ILTL formula,  $V$  be the set of variables used in  $\phi$ ,  $a \in \Sigma_{\text{GLOBAL}}$ , and  $a' \in \Sigma_{\text{LOCAL}}$ . Given a computation trace  $c = (u, I, \{v_i\}_{i \in I})$ , a mapping  $\alpha$  from  $V$  to  $I$ , and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we say the triple  $(c, \alpha, n)$  satisfies  $\phi$ , denoted by  $(c, \alpha, n) \models \phi$ , if one of the following holds:

- $\phi := a$  and  $u[n] = a$ .
- $\phi := \neg a$  and  $u[n] \neq a$ .
- $\phi := a'(x)$ ,  $\alpha(x) = i$ , and  $v_i[n] = a'$ .
- $\phi := \neg a'(x)$ ,  $\alpha(x) = i$ , and  $v_i[n] \neq a'$ .
- $\phi := \phi' \vee \phi''$  and  $(c, \alpha, n) \models \phi'$  or  $(c, \alpha, n) \models \phi''$ .
- $\phi := \phi' \wedge \phi''$ ,  $(c, \alpha, n) \models \phi'$ , and  $(c, \alpha, n) \models \phi''$ .
- $\phi := X\phi'$  and  $(c, \alpha, n+1) \models \phi'$ .
- $\phi := \phi' U \phi''$  and there is  $k \geq n$  such that  $(c, \alpha, k) \models \phi''$  and  $(c, \alpha, j) \models \phi'$  for  $n \leq j < k$ .
- $\phi := \exists x.\phi'$  and there exists  $i \in I$  such that  $(c, \alpha[x \mapsto i], n) \models \phi'$ .
- $\phi := \forall x.\phi'$  and for each  $i \in I$ ,  $(c, \alpha[x \mapsto i], n) \models \phi'$ .

We say a trace computation  $c$  satisfies  $\phi$  under  $\alpha$  if  $(c, \alpha, 1) \models \phi$ .

We now explain how we can compare the expressiveness of ILTL to our data graph queries. Given a computation trace  $c = (u, I, \{v_i\}_{i \in I})$ , we can regard

the trace  $u$  as a chain data graph  $G_u$  over  $\Sigma_{\text{GLOBAL}}$ , with the label of  $G_u$  being  $u$ . Similarly, for each  $i \in I$ ,  $v_i$  can be treated as a chain data graph  $G_{v_i}$  over  $\Sigma_{\text{LOCAL}}$ , where the label of  $G_{v_i}$  is  $v_i$ , and the data values (excluding node ids) in  $G_{v_i}$  are all  $i$ . Therefore, a computation trace is essentially a data graph  $G_c$  consisting of  $|I| + 1$  chains. As a convenient way to distinguish  $u$  from  $v_i$  for all  $i \in I$  in the graph representation  $G_c$ , we represent  $u$  as a path where each node has the data value trace id set to the constant 0.

We are now ready to present a result relating ILTL to MWL.

**Proposition 14.** *For each ILTL sentence  $\phi$ , there exists a MWL sentence  $\phi'$  such that for every computation trace  $c$ ,  $c$  satisfies  $\phi$  if and only if  $G_c \models \phi'$ .*

*Proof.* The translation of  $\phi$  will be of the form  $\phi' = \exists \pi, \ell^\pi. \psi_{\text{GLOBAL}}(\pi) \wedge \ell = 0 \wedge \psi_\phi(\ell)$ . Here

$$\psi_{\text{GLOBAL}}(\pi) := \forall \omega, \ell^\omega. \ell \equiv_{\text{DATA}} 0 \rightarrow \exists m^\pi. m \equiv_{\text{ID}} \ell$$

saying that  $\pi$  is the longest path in  $G_c$  with trace id = 0. So a path  $\rho$  satisfies  $\psi_{\text{GLOBAL}}$  if  $\text{lb}(\rho) = u$ , the global trace, and thus  $\phi$  states that the initial element  $\ell$  of the global trace satisfies  $\psi_\phi(\ell)$ . The formula  $\psi_\phi(\ell)$  will be a translation of  $\phi$  in terms of the global trace:

- $\psi_\phi = E_a(\ell, \ell + 1)$  if  $\phi = a$  for  $a \in \Sigma_{\text{GLOBAL}}$ ;
- $\psi_\phi = \bigvee_{b \in \Sigma_{\text{GLOBAL}} \setminus \{a\}} E_b(\ell, \ell + 1)$  if  $\phi = \neg a$  for  $a \in \Sigma_{\text{GLOBAL}}$ ;
- $\psi_\phi = \exists m^x. E_{a'}(m, m + 1) \wedge m = \ell$  if  $\phi = a'(x)$  for  $a' \in \Sigma_{\text{LOCAL}}$
- $\psi_\phi = \exists m^x. \bigvee_{b \in \Sigma_{\text{GLOBAL}} \setminus \{a'\}} E_b(m, m + 1) \wedge m = \ell$  if  $\phi = \neg a'(x)$  for  $a' \in \Sigma_{\text{LOCAL}}$ ;
- $\psi_\phi = \psi_{\phi_1} \wedge \psi_{\phi_2}$  if  $\phi = \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2$ ;
- $\psi_\phi = \psi_{\phi_1} \vee \psi_{\phi_2}$  if  $\phi = \phi_1 \vee \phi_2$ ;
- $\psi_\phi = \psi_{\phi'}(\ell + 1)$  if  $\phi = X\phi'$ ;
- $\psi_\phi = \exists m. \ell \leq m \wedge \psi_{\phi_2}(m) \wedge \forall n. \ell \leq n < m. \psi_{\phi_1}(n)$  if  $\phi = \phi_1 U \phi_2$ ;
- $\psi_\phi = \exists x. \psi_{\phi'}$  if  $\phi = \exists x \phi'$ ;
- $\psi_\phi = \forall x. \psi_{\phi'}$  if  $\phi = \forall x \phi'$ ;

where  $x$  in  $\psi_\phi$  is a path variable.

Let's recap what we have derived. Formula  $\phi'$  consists of two existentially quantified subformulas:  $\psi_{\text{GLOBAL}}(\pi) \wedge \ell = 0$  and  $\psi_\phi(\ell)$ . The subformula  $\psi_{\text{GLOBAL}}(\pi) \wedge \ell = 0$  states that  $\ell$  corresponds to the first node in  $G_u$ , while  $\psi_\phi(\ell)$  states that  $\ell$  satisfies  $\phi$ , a variation of the standard translation of LTL into first-order logic with order.  $\square$

## 7 Conclusion

In this work, we have provided what we believe is a fairly complete picture of the landscape of expressiveness among query languages for data graphs. See Figure 2. We showed that the landscape of prior query languages lacked a single maximally expressive language. Instead,  $\text{FO}^*(\equiv_{\text{DATA}})$ , a first-order language augmented with transitive closure, and  $\text{ECRDPQ}_\neg$  were maximally expressive query languages. To remedy this, we introduce  $\text{ECRDPQ}_\neg^*$ , which is  $\text{ECRDPQ}_\neg$  extended with transitive closures. We show that it subsumes the prior languages. Additionally, we prove that query evaluation of  $\text{ECRDPQ}_\neg^*$  is still decidable.

Beyond exploring the landscape of query languages for data graphs, we examine the potential of WL, which only allows comparisons along a single path. We show that MWL, the extension of WL allowing multi-path comparisons, is more powerful than WL and subsumes the verification specification languages HyperLTL and ILTL. We believe that the connection of graph data queries to recent specification languages arising in verification is a promising avenue for future work.

Although query evaluation of  $\text{ECRDPQ}_\neg^*$  is decidable, we acknowledge that it is, in an important sense, too expressive, as the worst-case complexity of evaluation is extremely high, with no elementary bound in the size of the data. Identifying fragments with better evaluation complexity, as well as developing algorithmic techniques for implementing them, is a key piece of ongoing work.

Since RDPQ and its extensions, including  $\text{ECRDPQ}_\neg^*$ , manipulate data along the paths through register automata, we can easily extend these languages to include aggregates by replacing register automata with other automata such as register automata with linear arithmetic [8] and cost register automata [1]. This is another component of future work.

## References

- [1] R. Alur, L. D’Antoni, J. Deshmukh, M. Raghothaman, and Y. Yuan. Regular functions and cost register automata. In *LICS*, 2013.
- [2] P. Barceló, G. Fontaine, and A. W. Lin. Expressive path queries on graphs with data. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, 11(4), 2015.
- [3] P. Barceló, L. Libkin, A. W. Lin, and P. T. Wood. Expressive languages for path queries over graph-structured data. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.*, 37(4), 2012.
- [4] R. Bloem, S. Jacobs, A. Khalimov, I. Konnov, S. Rubin, H. Veith, and J. Widder. *Decidability of Parameterized Verification*. Morgan & Claypool Publishers, 2015.
- [5] M. C. Browne, E. M. Clarke, and O. Grumberg. Reasoning about networks with many identical finite state processes. *Inf. Comput.*, 81(1):13–31, 1989.

- [6] D. Calvanese, G. D. Giacomo, M. Lenzerini, and M. Y. Vardi. Containment of conjunctive regular path queries with inverse. In *KR*, 2000.
- [7] T. Chen, F. Song, and Z. Wu. On the satisfiability of indexed linear temporal logics. In *CONCUR*, 2015.
- [8] Y.-F. Chen, O. Lengál, T. Tan, and Z. Wu. Register automata with linear arithmetic. In *LICS*, 2017.
- [9] M. R. Clarkson, B. Finkbeiner, M. Koleini, K. K. Micinski, M. N. Rabe, and C. Sánchez. Temporal logics for hyperproperties. In *POST*, 2014.
- [10] M. R. Clarkson and F. B. Schneider. Hyperproperties. In *Computer Security Foundations Symposium*, 2008.
- [11] A. Deutsch, N. Francis, A. Green, K. Hare, B. Li, L. Libkin, T. Lindaaker, V. Marsault, W. Martens, J. Michels, F. Murlak, S. Plantikow, P. Selmer, O. van Rest, H. Voigt, D. Vrgoc, M. Wu, and F. Zemke. Graph pattern matching in GQL and SQL/PGQ. In *SIGMOD*, 2022.
- [12] A. Deutsch and V. Tannen. Optimization properties for classes of conjunctive regular path queries. In *Database Programming Languages*, 2001.
- [13] D. Figueira, A. Jez, and A. W. Lin. Data path queries over embedded graph databases. In *PODS*, 2022.
- [14] B. Finkbeiner and M. Zimmermann. The first-order logic of hyperproperties. In *STACS*, 2017.
- [15] D. Florescu, A. Y. Levy, and D. Suciu. Query containment for conjunctive queries with regular expressions. In *PODS*, 1998.
- [16] N. Francis, A. Gheerbrant, P. Guagliardo, L. Libkin, V. Marsault, W. Martens, F. Murlak, L. Peterfreund, A. Rogova, and D. Vrgoc. GPC: A pattern calculus for property graphs. In *PODS*, 2023.
- [17] E. Grädel. On transitive closure logic. In *CSL*, 1992.
- [18] J. Hellings, B. Kuijpers, J. Van den Bussche, and X. Zhang. Walk logic as a framework for path query languages on graph databases. In *ICDT*, 2013.
- [19] N. Immerman. Nondeterministic space is closed under complementation. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 17(5):935–938, 1988.
- [20] N. Immerman. *Descriptive complexity*. Springer, 1999.
- [21] M. Kaminski and N. Francez. Finite-memory automata. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 134(2):329–363, 1994.
- [22] P. Kouvaros and A. Lomuscio. Parameterised verification for multi-agent systems. *Artif. Intell.*, 234:152–189, 2016.

- [23] L. Libkin. *Elements of Finite Model Theory*. Springer, 2004.
- [24] L. Libkin, W. Martens, and D. Vrgoc. Querying graphs with data. *J. ACM*, 63(2):14:1–14:53, 2016.
- [25] L. Libkin and D. Vrgoc. Regular path queries on graphs with data. In *ICDT*, 2012.
- [26] A. O. Mendelzon and P. T. Wood. Finding regular simple paths in graph databases. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 24(6):1235–1258, 1995.
- [27] J. L. Reutter, M. Romero, and M. Y. Vardi. Regular queries on graph databases. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 61(1):31–83, 2017.