

# Relational Perspective on Graph Query Languages

DIEGO FIGUEIRA, Bordeaux University, CNRS, Bordeaux INP, LaBRI, UMR 5800, Talence, France

ANTHONY W. LIN, University of Kaiserslautern-Landau & Max-Planck Institute, Kaiserslautern, Germany

LIAT PETERFREUND, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel

We study a relational perspective of graph database querying. Such a perspective underlies various graph database systems but very few theoretical investigations have been conducted on it. This perspective offers a powerful and unified framework to study graph database querying, by which algorithms and complexity follow from classical results. We provide two concrete applications.

The first is querying property graphs. The property graph data model supersedes previously proposed graph models and underlies the new standard GQL for graph query languages. We show that this standard can be, by and large, expressed by extensions of relational calculus with transitive closure operators (FO[TC]) and existential second-order quantifiers (ESO). With this, we obtain optimal data complexity bounds, along with extensions including schema validation.

The second application is incorporating data from concrete domains (e.g., numbers) in graph database querying. We use embedded finite model theory and, by exploiting a generic Restricted Quantifier Collapse (RQC) result for FO[TC] and ESO, we obtain optimal data complexity bounds for GQL with arithmetics and comparisons. Moreover, we show that Regular Data Path Querying with operations on data (i.e. using register automata formalisms) can be captured in FO[TC] over embedded finite graphs while preserving nondeterministic logspace data complexity.

## ACM Reference Format:

Diego Figueira, Anthony W. Lin, and Liat Peterfreund. 2024. Relational Perspective on Graph Query Languages. 1, 1 (July 2024), 29 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Graph databases have gained an increasing amount of popularity in the last decades, with numerous application domains, including social networks, semantic web, biological and ecological databases, and more. On the practical side, there has been rapid growth in the development of commercial graph database systems, including systems like Neo4j, Oracle, IBM, TigerGraph, and JanusGraph, among others.

*Heterogeneity of graph data models in database theory.* The study of graph databases in database theory can be traced back to the work of Mendelzon and Wood [25] in 1995 on Regular Path Queries (RPQ), where they popularized the data model of *edge-labeled graphs*. This has been the standard graph data model for a long time in database theory [5, 9, 12, 16, 17, 25]). Since then the area has undergone several paradigm shifts on the notion of a “graph data model”, including *data graphs* [22] and *property graphs* [1, 10, 13, 14]. Data graphs were introduced in [22, 23] owing to the lack of a treatment of “data” (attributes associated with nodes and edges, like “id”, “name” and “age”

---

Authors' addresses: Diego Figueira, [diego.figueira@cnrs.fr](mailto:diego.figueira@cnrs.fr), Bordeaux University, CNRS, Bordeaux INP, LaBRI, UMR 5800, Talence, France, F-33400; Anthony W. Lin, [awlin@mpi-sws.org](mailto:awlin@mpi-sws.org), University of Kaiserslautern-Landau & Max-Planck Institute, Kaiserslautern, Germany; Liat Peterfreund, [liat.peterfreund@mail.huji.ac.il](mailto:liat.peterfreund@mail.huji.ac.il), Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel.

---

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

© 2024 Association for Computing Machinery.

XXXX-XXXX/2024/7-ART \$15.00

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




Fig. 1. Part of a **property graph**  $G_{\text{bike}}$  of bike connections between towns.

of a person) in the data model of edge-labeled graphs. Many classical query languages (like RPO) have been extended to also incorporate such data [1, 4, 11, 22], e.g., in the query language RDPQ (Regular Data Path Queries). Data graphs unfortunately still do not capture the graph model that has been adopted by practitioners, e.g., the “schemaless” nature of a graph. The property graph data model [1, 10] has been proposed to address such deficiencies, and is today still undergoing an active development.

A *property graph* [1] is a graph whose node and edges are attached with labels, often representing their type, and properties kept in a key-value store. Figure 1 depicts a property graph  $G_{\text{bike}}$  of bike lanes and roads between towns and crossroads. It has two node types (indicated by their labels—Town and Crossroad), and two edge types (Bike-lane and Road). Towns have properties like name, and coordinates, Bike-lanes have length, and Roads may have tolls. Notice that Bike-lanes are undirected whereas Roads are.

The property graph data model was adopted by the newly suggested standard for graph query languages, namely GQL. The standard is highly influenced by real-world query languages and consists of two parts. The first, SQL/PGQ, is an extension of SQL for graph databases. The second, GQL, is a standalone language for graph databases. It is intended that GQL will serve a similar role for graph databases as SQL for relational databases. In two very recent papers [13, 14] a digest of this standard was presented to the research community. This formalization opens up a wide range of research questions for database theorists as summarized in [10]:

“Given the novelty of the language, and its goal as the future standard of querying property graphs, it is important to fully understand the expressiveness and complexity of its various fragments, in the spirit of many decades of research tradition in database query languages [...].”

These paradigm shifts in graph data models lead to the question, of whether results on prior graph data models still hold and, if so, whether they should be reproven. As argued in [1], many algorithmic results from older data models can be adapted in property graphs. This claim must, however, be taken with a grain of salt for two reasons. Firstly, this claim was only backed up

by examples without enumerating all results that exist for prior models. Secondly, the notion of “queries” on property graphs is continually being revised to reflect real world graph database systems.

*Relational perspective on graphs.* The development of data models and query evaluation algorithms for graph databases in database theory seems to have taken place separately from relational databases. That said, it is undeniable that relational database theory possesses a much more mature theory that is rooted in mathematical logic and finite model theory. For this reason, it is natural to wonder whether “relational perspectives” on graph databases can be beneficial. Such perspectives amount to, loosely speaking, encoding the semantics of a graph query (e.g. on property graphs) as a query over relational structures, and applying complexity results that are available for relational databases. As we will show below, relational perspectives of graph databases yield a powerful method for obtaining algorithmic results for graph querying, particularly the complexity of query evaluation.

*Contributions.* Under the obvious encoding of property graphs as relational databases, we show that prominent query languages over graphs, in particular, GQL [13, 14] can be embedded into first-order logic with transitive closure, and second-order logic. Using this, we show that the *data complexity* (i.e. the complexity of query evaluation measured only in the size of the database) of various query languages over graphs are corollaries of existing results over relational databases. Moreover, via translations on logic over embedded finite models (i.e., finite models with access to concrete infinite domains such as numerical theories), we also obtain data complexity bounds for extensions of query languages over graphs with data types, e.g., where property values are numbers and arithmetics is allowed in the queries.

More precisely, we establish a close connection between GQL and two logics on relational databases: (i) the transitive closure logic  $\text{FO}[\text{TC}]$ , and (ii) Second-Order logic ( $\text{SO}$ ). Our first result is that basic GQL without restrictions on the shapes of matched paths can be captured by  $\text{FO}[\text{TC}]$ . Loosely speaking, restrictors allow the user to restrict paths to simple paths (i.e. no repeating nodes), trails (no repeating edges), and shortest paths. This immediately yields an NL upper bound since this is the data complexity of  $\text{FO}[\text{TC}]$  over relational structures. Since the graph reachability problem is in NL-complete [28] this upper bound is the best we can hope for. Next, we show that basic GQL with restrictors on paths can be captured by  $\text{SO}$ . With this, we infer an upper bound of polynomial hierarchy PH (i.e. the complexity of  $\text{SO}$  on relational structures) on the data complexity of GQL. We leave the precise data complexity of GQL with restrictors open, but we mention that the data complexity of GQL is both NP-hard and co-NP-hard since it can express the existence (and non-existence) of simple paths of even lengths, which is NP-hard (resp. co-NP-hard) [20].

Next, we show how our embedding to logics on relational databases yields the possibility of extending GQL, while preserving the complexity, with the ability to (1) meta-querying and schema validation (e.g. checking the existence of a path containing only nodes with at least one common attribute), and (2) query data types (in particular, numeric data types and arithmetic operations on them). The second extension was raised as an open problem in the report [10] on the standardization of SQL/PGQ and GQL by the working groups. To extend GQL with data types, we exploit classical results [6] in constraint databases and embedded finite model theory on the data complexity of  $\text{FO}[\text{TC}]$  and  $\text{SO}$ , when extended with data types, which does not increase the data complexity for evaluation.

As a final result, we show how the recent result [11, 22] on the NL data complexity of RDPQ (RPQ extended with testing of data values along the path) can be obtained by embedding RDPQ to  $\text{FO}[\text{TC}]$  over relational databases with NL data complexity. The same data complexity NL can be obtained even with data types, which follows from a result in embedded finite model theory [6].

*Organization.* After recalling the the basics of property graphs and logics on relational structures in Section 2, we illustrate in Section 3 some applications of relational embedding of property graphs through examples. In Section 4, we provide an encoding of GQL to the transitive closure logic and second-order logic, through which we obtain the data complexity of GQL. In Section 5, we show how classical embedded finite model theory over relational structures can be used to extend query languages like GQL and RDPQ with data types, and obtain data complexity for them. Due to space limits, full definitions and proofs can be found in the Appendix.

## 2 PRELIMINARIES: LOGIC AND PROPERTY GRAPHS

We present the definition of property graphs, and the standard definitions of relational structure and logic, along with their classical complexity bounds.

### 2.1 Property Graphs as Relational Structures

- *Relational structures.* We set **Rel** and **Const** to be disjoint countably infinite sets of *relation names* and *constant names*, respectively, and assume the existence of an “arity” function  $ar : \text{Rel} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ . We sometimes write  $R^{(k)}$  to denote that  $ar(R) = k$ . A *relational vocabulary* is a finite set  $\sigma \subseteq \text{Rel}$  of relation names. A (finite)  $\sigma$ -*structure* is a function  $S$  which maps each relation  $R \in \sigma$  to a (finite) set  $\llbracket R \rrbracket^S \subseteq \text{Const}^{ar(R)}$ . When  $\sigma$  is clear from the context, we call  $S$  a *relational structure*. The *active domain* of  $S$ , namely  $adom(S)$ , is the set  $\{c \in \text{Const} : c \text{ appears in } \llbracket Z \rrbracket^S, Z \in \sigma\}$ . We say that a structure is *ordered* if it is equipped with a designated binary relation that defines a total order on its active domain.

*Property Graphs.* We assume pairwise disjoint infinite sets of nodes  $\mathcal{N}$ , directed edges  $\mathcal{E}_d$ , undirected edges  $\mathcal{E}_u$ , labels  $\mathcal{L}$ , properties  $\mathcal{P}$  and keys  $\mathcal{K}$ . A *property graph*  $G$  is a tuple

$$(N^G, E_d^G, E_u^G, \text{src}^G, \text{tgt}^G, \text{property}^G, \text{label}^G) \quad (1)$$

where  $N^G \subset \mathcal{N}$ ,  $E_d^G \subset \mathcal{E}_d$ ,  $E_u^G \subset \mathcal{E}_u$  are finite sets and  $\text{src}^G, \text{tgt}^G \subset (E_d^G \cup E_u^G) \times N^G$  indicate which are the source and target endpoints, respectively, of an edge<sup>1</sup>,  $\text{property}^G \subset (E_d^G \cup N^G) \times \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{P}$  indicate what are the properties of an edge or a node attached to a key, and  $\text{label}^G \subset E_d^G \cup N^G \times \mathcal{L}$  indicates which labels are attached to a node or an edge, where  $E^G = E_d^G \cup E_u^G$ . A *graph database*  $\mathcal{G}$  is a tuple  $\langle G_1, \dots, G_m \rangle$  of *property graphs*  $G_i$ .

We view a graph database as a relational structure by viewing each of its *property graphs* as *structures* interpreting the *vocabulary* specified in Equation (1).

### 2.2 First and Second-Order Logic

- *First-order logic.* We set **Vars** to be a countably infinite set of *variables*. Given a  $k$ -tuple of variables  $\bar{x}$ , a  $\bar{x}$ -*valuation* is a function  $\nu$  mapping *variables* of  $\bar{x}$  to elements of the *active domain* of a *relational structure*  $S$ , usually simply denoted by a  $k$ -tuple from  $adom(S)^k$  (whose  $i$ -th element is  $\nu(\bar{x}[i])$ ). We define first-order logic **FO** over *relational vocabularies*:

- $t = t'$  is a *formula* for every  $t, t' \in \text{Const} \dot{\cup} \text{Vars}$
- $R^{(k)}(t_1, \dots, t_k)$  is a *formula* for every  $t_1, \dots, t_k \in \text{Const} \dot{\cup} \text{Vars}$
- $\neg\varphi, \exists x \varphi, \varphi \wedge \psi$  are *formulas* if  $\varphi, \psi$  are *formulas*.

For any  $\bar{x}$ -*valuation*  $\nu$  and  $\sigma$ -*structure*  $S$ , we define the semantics  $\llbracket \varphi(\bar{x}) \rrbracket_\nu^S \in \{\top, \perp\}$  and  $\llbracket t \rrbracket_\nu^S \in \text{Const}$  for any *formula* or *term* whose free variables are in  $\bar{x}$ . The semantics of  $\llbracket \varphi(\bar{x}) \rrbracket_\nu^S$  and  $\llbracket t(\bar{x}) \rrbracket_\nu^S$  are as expected (they can be found in Appendix A.1).

<sup>1</sup>If the edge is undirected we choose, according to a predefined order on  $\mathcal{N}$  (e.g., alphabetical order) which of its endpoints is the source and which is the target.

*Transitive closure.* We extend FO with transitive closure to obtain FO[TC] by allowing a new type of formula  $[\text{TC}_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}(\varphi(\bar{u}\bar{v}\bar{p}))](\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  where  $\varphi$  is a formula, and  $\bar{u}, \bar{v}, \bar{x}, \bar{y}$  are of the same dimension  $k$ . We refer to  $\bar{p}$  as “parameters”. The semantics is such that  $\llbracket [\text{TC}_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}(\varphi(\bar{u}\bar{v}\bar{p}))](\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \rrbracket_{\nu}^{\mathbb{S}} = \top$  if there exists a sequence of  $k$ -tuples of active domain elements  $\bar{d}_0, \dots, \bar{d}_n$  such that

- $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket_{\bar{u}\bar{v}\bar{p} \rightarrow \bar{d}_i \bar{d}_{i+1} \nu(\bar{p})}^{\mathbb{S}} = \top$  for every  $i$ ,
- $\bar{d}_0 = \nu(\bar{x})$ , and
- $\bar{d}_n = \nu(\bar{y})$ .

We define  $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket_{\nu}^{\mathbb{S}}$  as the set of all assignments  $\nu$  such that  $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket_{\nu}^{\mathbb{S}} = \top$ . We refer to the fragment of FO[TC] in which every TC subformula appears under an even number of negations by FO[TC<sup>+</sup>].

PROPOSITION 2.1. [21, Propositions 10.22 & 10.23] *In terms of expressive power, on ordered structures, FO[TC] is equivalent to FO[TC<sup>+</sup>], and it captures all NL properties.*

□ *Second-order Logic.* *Second-order Logic* (SO) is another extension of FO, this time with second-order quantifiers over the active domain. Concretely, we have now another disjoint set  $\text{Var}^{\text{rel}}$  of relation variables with arity. We abuse notation and use  $R^{(k)}$  and  $\text{ar}(R)$  also for relation variables  $R$ . We add two new kinds of formulas. The first one of the form  $R(t_1, \dots, t_{\text{ar}(R)})$  where  $R$  is a relation variable and every  $t_i$  is a term. The second one of the form  $\exists R \varphi(R, \bar{S}, \bar{x})$ , where  $\varphi$  is a formula,  $R$  is a relation variable, and  $\bar{S}$  and  $\bar{x}$  are tuples of relation variables and variables, respectively. For the semantics, we now have that relation variables assignments are functions from  $\text{Var}^{\text{rel}}$  to sets of elements of the active domain of  $\mathbb{S}$ . We extend the semantics  $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket_{\nu, \rho}^{\mathbb{S}}$ , where  $\nu$  is a variable assignment and  $\rho$  is a relation variable assignment in the expected way. In particular,  $\llbracket \exists R \varphi(R, \bar{S}, \bar{x}) \rrbracket_{\nu, \rho}^{\mathbb{S}} = \top$  if for some set  $A \subseteq (\text{adom}(\mathbb{S}))^{\text{ar}(R)}$  we have  $\llbracket \varphi(R, \bar{S}, \bar{x}) \rrbracket_{\nu, \rho[R \rightarrow A]}^{\mathbb{S}} = \top$ . We have  $\llbracket R(t_1, \dots, t_{\text{ar}(R)}) \rrbracket_{\nu, \rho}^{\mathbb{S}} = \top$  for  $R \in \text{Var}^{\text{rel}}$  if  $(\llbracket t_1 \rrbracket_{\nu, \rho}^{\mathbb{S}}, \dots, \llbracket t_k \rrbracket_{\nu, \rho}^{\mathbb{S}}) \in \rho(R)$ .  $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket_{\nu}^{\mathbb{S}}$  is defined analogously.

□ The *Existential Second-order* fragment ESO of SO is the set of formulas built up from first-order formulas via the positive Boolean operators, existential (first-order) quantification, and quantifiers of the form  $\exists R_1, \dots, R_n \varphi$ . The following connection can be easily shown.

PROPOSITION 2.2. *In terms of expressive power, FO[TC<sup>+</sup>] is subsumed in ESO.*

This, along with Proposition 2.1, enables us to conclude that on ordered structures, FO[TC] is subsumed in ESO.

### 2.3 Evaluation of first and second-order logic

We are interested in the complexity of evaluation. The *evaluation problem* for a logic  $\mathcal{L}$  is the problem of determining, given a formula  $\varphi(\bar{x})$  in  $\mathcal{L}$ , a structure  $\mathbb{S}$  and a valuation  $\nu$ , whether  $\llbracket \varphi(\bar{x}) \rrbracket_{\nu}^{\mathbb{S}} = \top$ . The following proposition is well-known (e.g. see [21]).

PROPOSITION 2.3.

- (1) *The evaluation problem for FO[TC] is NL-complete in data complexity.*
- (2) *The evaluation problem for ESO is NP-complete in data complexity.*
- (3) *The evaluation problem for SO is PH-complete in data complexity.*

□ In general, we shall say that a logic  $\mathcal{L}$  captures a query language  $\mathcal{Q}$  (resp. a set of properties  $\mathcal{P}$ ), if for every query  $q \in \mathcal{Q}$  (resp. property  $p \in \mathcal{P}$ ) there is a sentence  $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$  (i.e., a formula with no free variables) which is equivalent, in the sense that for every relational structure  $\mathbb{S}$ , we have  $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket_{\nu}^{\mathbb{S}} \neq \emptyset$  iff  $q$  yields a non-empty answer on  $\mathbb{S}$  (resp.  $\mathbb{S}$  verifies property  $p$ ).




Fig. 2. Part of a **property graph**  $G_{\text{social}}$  of a social network.

### 3 APPLICATIONS OF RELATIONAL EMBEDDINGS: A TEASER

In this section, we give a flavor of the kind of queries that can be expressed by embedding graph queries to logic over relational structures. As we will see later in the paper, this can be done without sacrificing data complexity. Our examples focus on the following features: meta-querying (schema querying and validation) and data types. We note that, to the best of our knowledge, there are not any formal results on expressiveness limits for **GQL**. So while some of the following queries are easily expressible in logic over relational structures, they seem impossible to express in **GQL**.

*Meta-querying.* We first start with a pure first-order query (without paths) that epitomizes meta-querying. Suppose we want to do “coreference resolution”, that is, identify nodes and edges that may refer to the same entity. To this end, we can write a query of the form: Return all pairs of node and edge id’s having the same labels, and the same properties and values. This can be expressed with a first-order logic formula such as

$$\varphi_{eq}(x, x') = \forall z_{key}, z_{val} \text{ property}(x, z_{key}, z_{val}) \leftrightarrow \text{property}(x', z_{key}, z_{val})$$

that seems to be not expressible in most graph query languages including **GQL**, due to limited meta-querying capability (e.g. cannot quantify over properties).

We now proceed to path queries. We start with a simple query that can be expressed in **GQL**, and show how to express this in **FO[TC]**. The query returns pairs of towns having a bike lane path between them. In **GQL** we can express this query as

```

match (x : Town)-[:Bike-lane]-{1..∞}(y : Town)
return x, y
  
```

where  $\{1..∞\}$  stands for unbounded repetition. It can also be expressed in **FO[TC]** by

$$[\text{TC}_{u,v}(\varphi_{\text{bike-lane}}(u, v))](x, y)$$

with **FO[TC]**, where  $\varphi_{\text{bike-lane}}(u, v) = \exists x_{edge} (\text{label}(x_{edge}, \text{'Bike-lane'}) \wedge \text{src}(x_{edge}, u) \wedge \text{tgt}(x_{edge}, v))$ .

We now proceed to examples that can be expressed in the transitive closure logic and second-order logic, but it is not clear how (and whether it is possible) to express them in **GQL**. The first example quantifies over an attribute (i.e. meta-querying) that is then referred to inside the path query. As we will see, the data complexity for this query is still in **NL**. The following query tests if all nodes along a path share the same attribute by

$$\exists x_{key} [\text{TC}_{u,v}(\varphi_{\text{bike-lane}}(u, v) \wedge \exists x_{val} \text{ property}(u, x_{key}, x_{val}))](x, y).$$

In the second example, we may use second-order quantification to express that each pair of nodes in the path either do not have the same values or the same attributes:

$$\varphi(x, y) = \exists X [\text{TC}_{u,v}(\varphi_{\text{bike-lane}}(u, v) \wedge u \in X \wedge v \in X)](x, y) \wedge \left( \forall w, w', x_{val}, y_{att} (w, w' \in X \wedge w \neq w' \wedge \text{property}(w, y_{att}, x_{val}) \rightarrow \neg \text{property}(w', y_{att}, x_{val})) \right).$$

Note that we used **TC** in the previous formula but this is just a syntactic sugar because it can be simulated by a second-order quantification that refers to all possible transitive relations of a first-order order formula.

*Numeric data types.* We now discuss queries with numeric data types, which are currently not supported by GQL. Suppose now that we have a relation `FLOODED(x-coord, y-coord, radius)` with reports of flooded areas due to recent storms. Is there a way to go from Meerkerk to Asperen by Bike lanes avoiding flooded areas? We can express such a property by using the the extension of **FO[TC]** with constraints over Real Ordered Field (ROF) [6], which is expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \exists z, z' \text{ TC}_{u,v} & \left( \exists e E_u(e) \wedge \text{src}(e, u) \wedge \text{tgt}(e, v) \wedge \text{label}(e, \text{Bike-lane}) \wedge \right. \\ & \left( \exists x, y \text{ property}(u, \text{'x-coord'}, x) \wedge \text{property}(u, \text{'y-coord'}, y) \wedge \right. \\ & \left. \left. (\forall x', y', r \text{ Flooded}(x', y', r) \rightarrow (x - x')^2 + (y - y')^2 > r^2) \right) \right) [z, z'] \wedge \\ & \text{property}(z, \text{'name'}, \text{'Meerkerk'}) \wedge \text{property}(z', \text{'name'}, \text{'Asperen'}) \end{aligned}$$

Other spatial features can also be added into the query, as is common in constraint databases. For example, we can write that all the nodes in the path from Meerkerk to Asperen lie on a line (see Chapter 13 of [21]). Here, we may easily modify the above query by existentially quantifying  $r$  and  $s$  such that  $y = rx + s$  for any coordinate  $(x, y)$  in the path between Meerkerk and Asperen. Such a quantification is an example of non-active-domain quantifiers (since  $r$  and  $s$  might not be in the database). Despite this, the data complexity for the extended logic is still NL, as was proven in [6]. This will be discussed in more detail in Section 5.

## 4 FROM GRAPH QUERY LANGUAGES TO LOGIC

In this section, we show how the logics just mentioned capture large fragments of GQL and schema query languages, resulting in upper bounds for data complexity. Different fragments of GQL can be subsumed in **FO[TC]** and **SO** and **ESO**. We will follow the definitions of [13, 14], and briefly present GQL's full syntax, and its semantics by examples. Full definitions can be found in Appendix B.1.

### 4.1 GQL

Before giving the syntax of GQL which we need to phrase our main complexity result, we give some intuition of the language. We start with an illustrative example.

*Example 4.1.* Consider the bike lanes graph depicted in Figure 1, and the social network graph in Figure 2. The following GQL query answers the question: Does Yan have a friend in a town accessible from his by bike lanes?

```

use      Gsocial
{match  (x)-[:Friends]-(y : Person)
filter  x.name = Yan
return  x, y
then
use      Gbike
match   (x' : Town)-[:Bike-lane]-{1..∞}(y' : Town)
filter  x.location = x'.name and y.location = y'.name
return}

```

The query is computed as follows: we start with a relation that consists of the empty mapping which is the default input. Then, we evaluate the clauses sequentially. The first clause indicates



that we should use the social graph. Then, in the match, we join the default input with pairs  $(x, y)$  such that  $x$  is a node id and  $y$  is his friend. We filter the result so that  $x$  is Yan's node, and in the return clause project on  $x, y$ . We get a relation  $R$  with two attributes  $x, y$ . (This projection does not affect the relation and it is there due to GQL's syntax.) We then continue to the use clause which indicates that the graph we are considering now changes. We join  $R$  with the result of the match, that is, pairs  $x', y'$  that represent town ids connected by bike lanes. We obtain a relation with  $x, y, x', y'$  as attributes. We then filter it by checking whether the persons in  $x, y$  actually live in  $x', y'$ , respectively. We then use the return clause to project on the empty set since we are interested in a Boolean query.

As the example illustrates, GQL is built upon path patterns used to extract relations from the graph. GQL manipulates these extracted relation with a sequential form of relational algebra.

▮ *The Language.* Path patterns  $\pi$  are defined in a mutual recursion along with their *schema*  $sch(\pi)$  which consists of the output variables. The definition uses *descriptors*  $\delta$  of the form ' $x : \ell$  where  $\theta$ ' where each component ' $x$ ', ' $\ell$ ' and 'where  $\theta$ ' is optional.

▮ *Path patterns* are defined as follows:

$$\pi := (\delta) \mid -[\delta]- \mid < -[\delta]- \mid -[\delta]- \mid \pi\pi \mid \pi \cup \pi \mid \pi\{n..m\} \mid \pi \text{ where } \theta$$

▮ where  $\delta$  is optional, and  $0 \leq n \leq m \leq \infty$ , and

$$\theta := \chi = \chi \mid x : \ell \mid \theta \text{ or } \theta \mid \theta \text{ and } \theta \mid \text{not } \theta \mid \text{exists } \mathcal{Q}$$

is a *condition*<sup>2</sup> where  $\chi := x.a \mid c$  is a *term*,  $x, y \in \text{Vars}$ ,  $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ ,  $a, b \in \mathcal{K}$  and  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ .

▮ Intuitively, patterns are defined recursively such that  $(\delta)$  matches a node,  $-[\delta]- \mid < -[\delta]-$  directed edges,  $-[\delta]-$  undirected edge,  $\pi\pi$  concatenation of patterns,  $\pi \cup \pi$  union,  $\pi\{n..m\}$  repetition and  $\pi$  where  $\theta$  filtering according to the condition  $\theta$ . *Atomic conditions* can check for a label  $x : \ell$  or check the equivalence among property values and constants. *Composite conditions* are the closure of *atomic conditions* under union, conjunction and negation.

*Example 4.2.* The path pattern  $\pi_1 := (x : \text{Town})-[:\text{Bike-lane}]-\{1..\infty\}(y : \text{Town})$  matches pairs  $(x, y)$  of towns such that there is an arbitrary path of bike lanes from  $x$  to  $y$ . On the graph from Figure 1, the semantics will contain, e.g.,  $\mu_1$  defined by  $\mu_1(x) := n_1, \mu_1(y) := n_2$ . If we change the pattern by adding a variable to the repeating edge hence obtaining  $\pi_2 := (x : \text{Town})-[z : \text{Bike-lane}]-\{1..\infty\}(y : \text{Town})$  then the semantics on  $G_{\text{bike}}$  contains, e.g.,  $\mu_2$  with  $\text{dom}(\mu_2) = \{x, y, z\}$  and  $\mu_2(x) := n_1, \mu_2(y) := n_3$  and  $\mu_2(z) := \text{list}(e_1, e_5)$ , and  $\mu_3$  defined by  $\mu_3(x) := n_1, \mu_3(y) := n_3, \mu_3(z) := \text{list}(e_1, e_5, e_7, e_7)$ . That is, the variable  $z$  binds to the list of edges of the path matching the repetition.

▮ *Graph patterns*  $\Pi$  are defined recursively as follows:

$$\Pi := \rho [X =] \pi \mid \Pi, \Pi$$

where  $X \in \text{Var}^{\text{rel}}$  is a *path-binding*, and  $\rho := [\text{shortest}][\text{trail} \mid \text{acyclic}]$  is a *restrictor* (parts within squared brackets are optional).

▮ Intuitively, graph patterns can be *path patterns* preceded by every possible combination of (a) *restrictor*  $\rho$  of paths that can be matched to the pattern and (b) variable assignment in which the full matched path is stored. Graph patterns are also 'joins' of other graph patterns.

<sup>2</sup>We omit from the original definition the condition  $\chi < \chi$ ; We will refer to it in Section 5. In addition, we avoid nulls and hence omit also the condition  $\chi$  is null.



$C :=$ match $\Pi$   let $x = \chi$   for $x$ in $y$   filter $\theta$	$L :=$ use $GL$   $CL$   return $\chi_1$ as $x_1,$ $\dots, \chi_n$ as $x_n$	$\mathcal{Q} :=$ $L$   use $G \{ \mathcal{Q}_1 \text{ then } \mathcal{Q}_2 \dots \text{ then } \mathcal{Q}_\ell \}$   $\mathcal{Q}$ intersect $\mathcal{Q}$   $\mathcal{Q}$ union $\mathcal{Q}$   $\mathcal{Q}$ except $\mathcal{Q}$
---	--	--

where  $x, y, x_1, \dots, x_n \in \text{Vars}$ ,  $\chi, \chi_1, \dots, \chi_n, n \geq 0$  are terms,  $\theta$  is a condition,  $\ell \geq 1$ , and  $G \in \mathcal{G}$ .

Fig. 3. Syntax of clauses  $C$ , linear queries  $L$ , and GQL queries  $\mathcal{Q}$ .

*Example 4.3.* We can further extend  $\pi_2$  from Example 4.2 with to obtain the graph pattern  $\Pi_1 := \text{shortest}(x : \text{Town}) - [z : \text{Bike-lane}] - \{1.. \infty\}(y : \text{Town})$ . The semantics, in this case, contains, e.g., the mapping  $\mu_2$  but does not contain  $\mu_3$  since it corresponds with a path that is not the shortest among those connecting  $n_1$  and  $n_3$ . If we further add ‘ $X =$ ’ right after the restrict  $\text{shortest}$  then the domain of the mappings of the semantics is extended to include  $X$  which is mapped to the full path matched to the pattern.

- GQL queries  $\mathcal{Q}$  are defined in a mutual recursion with clauses  $C$ , and linear queries  $L$  in Figure 3.
- We first give the semantics of clauses, which consist of functions from relations to relations. The semantics of ‘match  $\Pi$ ’ is obtained by joining the input relation with the mappings in the semantics of  $\Pi$ . The ‘let  $x = \chi$ ’ joins the input table with a relation consisting of mapping from  $x$  to values of  $\chi$ . The ‘for  $x$  in  $y$ ’ joins the input with the unbinding of  $y$  into  $x$  (for instance if  $y$  is a path then  $x$  consists of tuples, each of which is an element in  $y$ ). Finally, ‘filter  $\theta$ ’ selects only tuples that satisfy  $\theta$ . Notice that Example 4.1 contains different GQL clauses.
- Linear queries are defined recursively. Firstly, ‘use  $GL$ ’ joins the input relation with the semantics of  $L$  evaluated on  $G$ ; and ‘ $CL$ ’ joins the input with  $L$  and then with  $C$ . Finally, ‘return  $\chi_1$  as  $x_1, \dots, \chi_n$  as  $x_n$ ’ joins the input with the relation whose attributes are  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  and values are given by  $\chi_1, \dots, \chi_n$ . Finally, the semantics of GQL queries are then either a linear query or a construct of the form ‘use  $G \{ \mathcal{Q}_1 \text{ then } \mathcal{Q}_2 \dots \text{ then } \mathcal{Q}_\ell \}$ ’ whose semantics is obtained by sequentially applying the queries  $\mathcal{Q}_1, \dots, \mathcal{Q}_\ell$  on  $G$ . Then, there are also the standard set operations –intersection, union and difference.

It is important to emphasize that the binding of the semantics can bind to variables either nodes and edges ids, or constants, or composite elements such as lists and paths. That is, the entries of the output relation are either atomic or composite.

## 4.2 Translation and Complexity Bounds for GQL

We can now show how to translate GQL queries into logical formulas.

The (Boolean) *evaluation problem* for GQL is that of deciding, given a GQL query  $\mathcal{Q}$  and a graph database  $\mathcal{G}$ , whether  $\llbracket \mathcal{Q} \rrbracket^{\mathcal{G}}$  is non-empty. The *data complexity of the evaluation problem* is the complexity of answering the evaluation problem while regarding  $\mathcal{Q}$  as being fixed.

- *Fragments in FO[TC]*. We shall henceforth focus on the *basic fragment of GQL*, that is, the fragment excluding variables that are assigned with paths and lists.

*Example 4.4.* The variable  $z$  in  $\pi_2$  of Example 4.2 is mapped to a list of edges since it appears under repetition. The variable  $X$  from the second part of Example 4.3 is a path binding and hence it is mapped to a path. The basic fragment disallows this kind of assignments by restrictions on the syntax.

We can describe this fragment syntactically as follows:

- no path-bindings in graph patterns
- for every path pattern of the form  $\pi_1\pi_2$  it holds that  $sch(\pi_1) \cap sch(\pi_2) = \emptyset$  and
- for every path pattern of the form  $\pi^{n..m}$  it holds that  $sch(\pi) = \emptyset$ .

The syntactic restriction indeed leads us to have the desired conditions on the output:

PROPOSITION 4.1. *The output of the basic fragment of GQL queries is a relation whose entries are not lists nor paths.*

We define *restrictor-free GQL queries* as those queries in which *restrictors* are omitted. That is, queries in which *graph patterns*  $\Pi$  are restricted to  $\Pi := [X =] \pi \mid \Pi, \Pi$ . Over these queries can be translated into FO[TC], as specified in the following statement (whose proof can be found in Appendix B.2).

THEOREM 4.5. *For every basic restrictor-free GQL query  $\mathcal{Q}$  there is an FO[TC] formula  $\varphi_{\mathcal{Q}}(\bar{x})$  where  $\bar{x} = sch(\mathcal{Q})$  such that for every graph database  $\mathcal{G}$ ,*

$$\llbracket \mathcal{Q} \rrbracket^{\mathcal{G}} = \llbracket \varphi_{\mathcal{Q}}(\bar{x}) \rrbracket^{\mathcal{G}}.$$

The intuition behind the proof is that whenever we have an unbounded repetition we use the TC operator. All other operations can be quite easily embedded in FO.

This, along with Proposition 2.3 (1), enable us to conclude the following upper-bound:

COROLLARY 4.6. *The data complexity of the evaluation problem for basic restrictor-free GQL queries is in NL.*

Does the use of *restrictors* necessitate a logic that is more expressive than FO[TC]? The following lower bound, along with the assumption  $NP \neq NL$ , provide a positive answer to this question.

PROPOSITION 4.2. *There exists a basic GQL query that uses either of the restrictors acyclic, trail whose evaluation problem is NP-complete.*

*Queries and Second-order logic.* As it turns out, GQL queries with *restrictors* can be encoded in SO.

□ If we want to focus on ESO we need further limitations. We define the *positive fragment* of GQL as that consists of positive queries  $\mathcal{Q}$  without negations  $\neg$  in conditions  $\theta$ , and without except.

THEOREM 4.7. *For every basic GQL query  $\mathcal{Q}$  there is an SO formula  $\varphi_{\mathcal{Q}}(\bar{x})$  where  $\bar{x} = sch(\mathcal{Q})$  such that for every graph database  $\mathcal{G}$ ,*

$$\llbracket \mathcal{Q} \rrbracket^{\mathcal{G}} = \llbracket \varphi_{\mathcal{Q}}(\bar{x}) \rrbracket^{\mathcal{G}}.$$

Further, if  $\mathcal{Q}$  is *positive* and does not use the *restrictor* shortest then  $\varphi_{\mathcal{Q}}$  is in ESO.

The intuition behind the proof of the second part of the theorem is as follows: Assume we have a basic positive query  $\mathcal{Q}$  that does not include restrictors, along with its corresponding FO[TC] formula  $\varphi$  that exists due to Theorem 4.5. We can existentially quantify over the matched path  $p$  using an SO variable  $X$ , verify that it conforms to the restrictor by an SO formula, and parametrize  $\varphi$  with  $X$  such that the parametrized version also verifies that  $p$  is the same path as that represented by  $X$ .

□ Theorem 4.7, along with Proposition 2.3, enables us to conclude the following upper-bound:

□ COROLLARY 4.8. *The data complexity of the evaluation problem for basic GQL queries is in PH, if further the query is positive and does not use the restrictor shortest then complexity is in NP.*

### 4.3 Schema Languages for Property Graphs

The relational perspective enables checking whether our graph database conforms to a schema. We adopt the PG-Schema formalism [2] for specifying property graph schemas and showing that we can express it naturally without increasing the upper bounds.

To add the ability to check typing, we need to extend the property graph relational encoding by adding Unary predicates for types, e.g.,  $\text{Integer}(\cdot)$ ,  $\text{Real}(\cdot)$ .

*Example 4.9.* To check whether a node labeled Person conforms to typing conditions, we can require, e.g., that their name is a string. This can be expressed by the FO formula:

$$\forall \text{id}, n : \text{property}(\text{id}, \text{name}, n) \rightarrow \text{String}(n)$$

Graph databases allow flexibility in modeling the data, e.g., two nodes with the same label need not have the same properties. A recent survey [27] shows that checking for schema compliance is a highly desirable feature in graph systems. Formalization of a language to check such compliance was presented recently in [2]. The formalism is called PG-schema and we present it shortly in the following example.

*Example 4.10.* The following is a formal graph type in the PG-schema formalism:

```
CREATE GRAPH TYPE transportGraphType LOOSE {
  (townType :Town {name STRING, x-coord INT, y-coord INT}),
  (crossroadType :Crossroad {x-coord INT, y-coord INT}),
  (:townType)-[bikeLaneType :Bike-lane]-(:townType)
}
```

It defines `transportGraphType` with two node types `townType` and `crossroadType`, and an edge type `bikeLaneType`. Within the curly braces, there is a list of expected properties with their types. This formal graph type can be translated into a Boolean FO formula that evaluates to  $\top$  on the input graph  $G$  from Figure 1.

Formally, PG-schema allows us to define a formal graph type  $S$  whose semantics  $\llbracket S \rrbracket_G$  on a graph  $G$  evaluates to true iff  $G$  satisfies the requirements of  $S$ . (Full details in Appendix B.4.)

**THEOREM 4.11.** *Let  $S$  be a formal graph type. There is a Boolean FO formula  $\varphi_S()$  such that  $G$  conforms to  $S$  if and only if  $\llbracket \varphi_S() \rrbracket^G = \top$*

The proof can be found in Appendix B.5. This allows us to conclude that FO is sufficiently expressive to capture schema conformance which is, hence, in NL.

### 4.4 Graph Path Query Languages on Edge-Labeled Graphs and Data Graphs

□ We briefly discuss other data models of graph databases.

*Edge-labeled graphs.* Firstly, we deal with edge-labeled graphs, which can be interpreted as a **relational structures** on finite vocabularies consisting of only binary relations representing labeled edges of the graphs.

□ Queries over edge-labeled graphs are based on *Regular Path Queries (RPQs)* of Mendelzon and Wood [25], which can test the existence of paths adhering to some regular expression. Its closure under conjunction, projection, is known as *Conjunctive Regular Path Queries (CRPQs)* [9]. Its closure under two-way navigation and transitive closure of binary queries is known as *Regular queries* [26] or *Nested Positive 2RPQ* [8]. These languages are subsumed by a simple extension of *GPC queries* [13, Theorem 11] which can be trivially expressed in **FO[TC]**. As a result, these languages (and their closure under finite unions) are all in **FO[TC]**.

**LEMMA 4.12.** *RPQs, CRPQs and Regular Queries are expressible in FO[TC].*

*Data Graphs.* A *data graph* is an edge-labelled finite graph whose nodes carry values from an infinite domain, known as “data values”. Here we can model *data graphs* as *relational structures* over ternary relations: a tuple  $(u, d, v)$  in some ternary relation  $R$  is interpreted as the existence of an edge from  $u$  to  $v$  carrying a label  $(R, d)$  (where  $d$  is the data value). In particular, the paper [22] advances the proposal of regular expressions “with memory” (*REM*), as a way to extend the power regular expressions of *RPQs* with the ability of testing for (in)equality of data values seen along the path. In a similar vein, a register automata version was also proposed. These query languages are captured by *FO[TC]* by using  $k$ -ary transitive closure to encode paths in the product between the *data graph* and the transition function of the register automata.

LEMMA 4.13. *The RDPQs, RQMs and GXPath as defined in [22] are in FO[TC].*

## 5 INCORPORATING DOMAIN-SPECIFIC OPERATORS

The query languages and logics we have seen so far are capable of checking for properties that combine the topology of the graph structure with the data contained in attributes. Nevertheless, the tests for data properties is limited to equality testing, thus completely ignoring its *structure*. Practical database query languages typically allow for concrete data domains (e.g. numbers, strings) equipped with a variety of data operations or comparisons (e.g. arithmetics, substrings, order, etc.), which go well beyond equality.

Investigations into relational database queries that incorporate concrete data domains, along with operations on them, were undertaken in the field of *constraint databases* [19] and *embedded finite model theory* [15]. Although these fields have been mostly inactive for the past two decades, we show that classical results in these areas (in particular, [6]) can be exploited to extend graph query languages with these data domains, without increasing their data complexity. Concretely, the new results in this section regard: (1) the data complexity for *GQL* extended with ‘data types’, and (2) a simpler proof of the NL data complexity of an extension [11] of *RDPQ* with concrete data domains.

- ⌈ The underlying idea behind constraint databases and embedded finite model theory is to ‘embed’ a finite database inside an infinite data structure  $S$  with a decidable first-order theory. In that way, by incorporating formulas over  $S$  into the database queries, one can have access to domain operations within the database. Many such structures can be found in the embedded finite model theory (see, e.g. [15, Chapter 5]), but among the most prominent ones we can find:
  - ⌈ • The *Linear Integer Arithmetic (LIA)* structure  $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{N},+,<} = \langle \mathbb{N}, 0, 1, +, \leq \rangle$ , that is, where we have  $\mathbb{N}$  as “domain”, the constants 0 and 1 (interpreted as 0 and 1), the binary function  $+$ , and the binary relation  $\leq$ , interpreted accordingly.
  - ⌈ • The *Linear Real Arithmetic (LRA)* structure  $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{R},+,\leq} = \langle \mathbb{R}, 0, 1, +, \leq \rangle$ .
  - ⌈ • The *Real Ordered Field (ROF)* structure  $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{R},+,\times,\leq} = \langle \mathbb{R}, 0, 1, +, \cdot, \leq \rangle$ , also known as Tarski’s real closed field.

For simplicity we will focus on these three numerical structures, but we mention that other interesting structures exist including reducts of the universal automatic structure [7], which allow us to reason about strings.

### 5.1 Embedded Finite Models: The Setting

We briefly introduce here the setting of embedded finite models [15, Chapter 5].

- ⌈ *The model.* Consider an *infinite structure*  $\mathfrak{M}$  with universe  $D$ , over a *vocabulary*  $\sigma_{\mathfrak{M}}$  containing both *function names*  $f_1, \dots, f_n$  and *relation names*  $R_1, \dots, R_m$ . We shall henceforth blur the distinction between function/relation names and their interpretation in  $\mathfrak{M}$ .

Fix a **relational vocabulary**  $\sigma$ , disjoint from the **vocabulary** of  $\mathfrak{M}$ . A  **$\mathfrak{M}$ -embedded finite relational structure** over  $\sigma$  is a finite **relational  $\sigma$ -structure**  $S$  such that **Const** is taken to be the set of first-order **definable**<sup>3</sup> elements over  $\mathfrak{M}$ . That is, each **relation name** of  $\sigma$  is interpreted in  $S$  as a finite relation over  **$\mathfrak{M}$ -definable** elements.

*The logic.* We define progressively more expressive logic over  **$\mathfrak{M}$ -embedded structures**: (1) first-order logic  $\text{FO}[\mathfrak{M}]$ , (2) hybrid transitive closure logic  $\text{FO}[\text{HTC}][\mathfrak{M}]$ , (3) hybrid second-order logic  $\text{HSO}[\mathfrak{M}]$ .

- A formula  $\varphi$  in  $\text{FO}[\mathfrak{M}]$  over the **relational vocabulary**  $\sigma$  is simply a first-order formula over the **vocabulary**  $\sigma' := \sigma \cup \sigma_{\mathfrak{M}}$ , where we additionally allow the **active-domain quantifier**  $\exists^{\text{adom}}x$ . Here, the quantifier  $\exists^{\text{adom}}x$  asserts the existence of an element in the **active domain** of a given **relational structure**  $S$ , whereas the standard quantifier  $\exists x$  asserts the existence of an element in the **domain**  $D$  of  $\mathfrak{M}$  (i.e., not necessarily in the **active domain**). The meaning of the formula is immediate from first-order logic, i.e., we interpret this over the structure  $\mathfrak{M}'$  over the vocabulary  $\sigma'$  with domain  $D$  and relations/functions from  $\mathfrak{M}$  and  $S$ . Such a formula  $\varphi$  is said to be an **active-domain formula**, if every quantifier therein is an **active-domain quantifier**. The following is a classical result from □ embedded finite model theory (see, e.g., [6, 15]), which is often called **Restricted Quantifier Collapse (RQC)**.

**PROPOSITION 5.1** ([6]). *Let  $\mathfrak{M}$  be either LRA, LIA, or ROF. Each  $\text{FO}[\mathfrak{M}]$ -formula is equivalent to an active-domain  $\text{FO}[\mathfrak{M}]$ -formula. Therefore, the data complexity for  $\text{FO}[\mathfrak{M}]$  is in  $\text{TC}^0$ .*

The transformation into  $\text{FO}[\mathfrak{M}]$ -formulas in the above proposition yields the complexity  $\text{TC}^0$  because an **active-domain formula** can be evaluated virtually in the same way as a normal **FO** formula without data types, except that each atomic formula from  $\mathfrak{M}$  will be evaluated using the decision procedures from  $\mathfrak{M}$ . This is also why we obtain  $\text{TC}^0$  instead of  $\text{AC}^0$  (the data complexity of **FO**), since each fixed<sup>4</sup>  $\mathfrak{M}$ -formula (which can be assumed to be quantifier-free for **LRA**, **LIA**, and **ROF**, since they admit quantifier elimination) can be evaluated in  $\text{TC}^0$ .

- Interestingly, as shown by Benedikt and Libkin [6], the above proposition has been extended to more powerful logics including **FO[TC]** and **SO**. The trick is to interpret the “higher-order features” □ with an **active-domain interpretation**. The resulting logics are called **Hybrid Transitive Closure Logic (FO[HTC])** and **Hybrid Second-Order Logic (HSO)**, respectively. More precisely, syntactically, we define  $\text{FO}[\text{HTC}][\mathfrak{M}]$  as an extension of  $\text{FO}[\mathfrak{M}]$  with the **TC**-operators as defined for  $\text{FO}[\text{TC}]$  in Section 2. Semantically, for any interpretation  $\nu$  in a  **$\mathfrak{M}$ -embedded structure**  $S$ , the meaning of

$$[\text{TC}_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}(\varphi(\bar{u}\bar{v}\bar{p}))](\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \quad (2)$$

is that there exists a sequence of  $k$ -tuples of **active domain** elements  $\bar{d}_0, \dots, \bar{d}_n \in \text{adom}(S)^k$  such that (i)  $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket_{\bar{u}\bar{v}\bar{p} \mapsto \bar{d}_i \bar{d}_{i+1} \nu(\bar{p})}^S = \top$  for every  $i$ , (ii)  $\bar{d}_0 = \nu(\bar{x})$ , and (iii)  $\bar{d}_n = \nu(\bar{y})$ . The definition of an **active-domain formula** from  $\text{FO}[\mathfrak{M}]$  extends to  $\text{FO}[\text{HTC}][\mathfrak{M}]$ , i.e., each quantifier must be an **active-domain quantifier**.

**PROPOSITION 5.2** ([6]). *Let  $\mathfrak{M}$  be either LRA, LIA, or ROF. Each  $\text{FO}[\text{HTC}][\mathfrak{M}]$ -formula is equivalent to an active-domain  $\text{FO}[\text{HTC}][\mathfrak{M}]$ -formula. Thus, the data complexity for  $\text{FO}[\text{HTC}][\mathfrak{M}]$  is in  $\text{NL}$ .*

The reasoning for the data complexity in this proposition is the same as for Proposition 5.1. Here, we obtain  $\text{NL}$  because the data complexity for  $\text{FO}[\text{TC}]$  is in  $\text{NL}$  and that  $\text{TC}^0 \subseteq \text{NL}$ .

□<sup>3</sup>An element  $u \in D$  is **definable** over  $\mathfrak{M}$  if there exists a  $\mathfrak{M}$ -formula  $\varphi(x)$  such that, for each  $v \in D$ ,  $\llbracket \varphi(v) \rrbracket^{\mathfrak{M}} = \top$  iff  $u = v$ . For example, the set of **definable** elements over  $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{R}, +, <}$  is precisely the set of rational numbers.

<sup>4</sup>This means that, for a fixed  $\mathfrak{M}$ -formula  $\varphi(\bar{x})$ , the problem of deciding whether  $\llbracket \varphi(\bar{x}) \rrbracket_{\mu}^{\mathfrak{M}}$  given a mapping  $\mu$  whose domain is  $\bar{x}$ , is in  $\text{TC}^0$ .

Finally, we define  $\text{HSO}[\mathfrak{M}]$  (*Hybrid Second-Order Logic*) syntactically as an extension of  $\text{FO}[\mathfrak{M}]$  with second-order quantifiers as defined for  $\text{SO}$  in Section 2. For the second-order quantifiers, we will write  $\exists^{adom}R$  instead of  $\exists R$ . This is because we will interpret  $\exists R\varphi$  as there exists a relation over  $\text{adom}(\mathfrak{S})$  such that  $\varphi$  holds. We define  $\text{HESO}[\mathfrak{M}]$  as a restriction of  $\text{HSO}[\mathfrak{M}]$  to formulas of the form

$$\exists^{adom}R_1, \dots, R_n \varphi$$

where  $\varphi$  is an  $\text{FO}[\mathfrak{M}]$ -formula over  $\sigma_{\mathfrak{M}} \cup \sigma \cup \{R_1, \dots, R_n\}$ .

**PROPOSITION 5.3** ([6]). *Let  $\mathfrak{M}$  be either LRA, LIA, or ROF. Each  $\text{HSO}[\mathfrak{M}]$ -formula (resp.  $\text{HESO}[\mathfrak{M}]$ -formula) is equivalent to an active-domain  $\text{HSO}[\mathfrak{M}]$ -formula (resp. active-domain  $\text{HESO}[\mathfrak{M}]$ -formula). Therefore, the data complexity for  $\text{HSO}[\mathfrak{M}]$  (resp.  $\text{HESO}[\mathfrak{M}]$ ) is in PH (resp. NP).*

The reasoning for the data complexity in this proposition is the same as for Proposition 5.1. Here, we obtain PH (resp. NP) because the data complexity for  $\text{SO}$  (resp.  $\text{ESO}$ ) is in PH (resp. NP) and that  $\text{TC}^0 \subseteq \text{NP} \subseteq \text{PH}$ .

## 5.2 Extending GQL with Data Types

We will immediately state our main result, before going through the classical results from embedded finite model theory. Fix an infinite structure  $\mathfrak{M}$ . We define now GQL queries with an  $\mathfrak{M}$ -data type. To this end, we first extend the definition of **terms** to  $\mathfrak{M}$ -terms defined as follows:

$$\chi := x.a \mid c \mid y \mid f^m(\chi_1, \dots, \chi_m)$$

where  $c$  is an  $\mathfrak{M}$ -definable constant,  $y$  is a variable ranging over the domain of  $\mathfrak{M}$ ,  $f^m$  is an  $m$ -ary function name in the vocabulary of  $\mathfrak{M}$ ,  $x \in \text{Vars}$ ,  $a \in \mathcal{K}$ , and every  $\chi_i$  is an  $\mathfrak{M}$ -term. We also extend the definition of **conditions** to  $\mathfrak{M}$ -conditions by adding

$$\theta := R^m(\chi_1, \dots, \chi_m)$$

where  $R^m$  is an  $m$ -ary relation name in the vocabulary of  $\mathfrak{M}$ , and every  $\chi_i$  is an  $\mathfrak{M}$ -term. The semantics of  $\theta$  extends by interpreting  $\chi$  and  $\theta$  “inside”  $\mathfrak{M}$ .

*Example 5.1.* Suppose that in Example 4.1 we want to require not only that the town is accessible by bake lanes but also that the Manhattan distance between the two towns is less than a constant  $c$ . To this end, we can add the following filter clause before the final return that will impose this condition:

$$\text{filter } (|x'.x\text{-coord} - y'.x\text{-coord}| + |x'.y\text{-coord} - y'.y\text{-coord}|) < c$$

This condition necessitates access to relations such as absolute value, addition, subtraction, and comparison  $<$ .

By exploiting Propositions 5.2 and 5.3, our upper bounds extend to GQL queries with data types.

**THEOREM 5.2.** *For every  $\mathfrak{M} \in \{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{N},+,<}, \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{R},+,\leq}, \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{R},+,x,\leq}\}$ , the data complexity of the evaluation problem of a Boolean GQL query  $\mathcal{Q}$  with an  $\mathfrak{M}$ -data type is*

- in NL if  $\mathcal{Q}$  is basic restrictor-free;
- in NP if  $\mathcal{Q}$  is basic, positive and uses only the restrictors *acyclic*, *trail*;
- in PH otherwise.

**REMARK 5.3.** *It is easy to extend GQL to multiple data types (e.g. strings and numbers) by employing multiple infinite structures having Restricted Quantifier Collapse and typed variables, while preserving the same data complexity. The required condition here is that variables of different types are not allowed to “communicate” with each other (i.e. each theory has disjoint function and relation symbols).*



### 5.3 Regular Path Queries with Data

Regular data path queries over  $\mathfrak{M}$  (RDPQ[ $\mathfrak{M}$ ]) have been recently introduced [11] as a powerful formalism to extend the “data structure blind” RDPQ of [22] (as mentioned in 4.13), which is based upon a version of the model of register automata [18] running over *embedded structures*. In a RDPQ[ $\mathfrak{M}$ ]-query, guards and register updates will use general FO[ $\mathfrak{M}$ ]-formulas. In addition, two types of registers are permitted: (1) active-domain registers, which may be modified throughout the automata runs, and (2) general registers, which may *not* be modified as soon as values have been assigned to them. One main result of [11] is the following:

PROPOSITION 5.4. *Let  $\mathfrak{M}$  be either LRA, LIA, or ROF. The data complexity for RDPQ[ $\mathfrak{M}$ ] is NL.*

This was proven by adapting the proof of RQC for FO[ $\mathfrak{M}$ ] (see, e.g., [15, Chapter 5]) to RDPQ[ $\mathfrak{M}$ ]. Our main result is that RDPQ[ $\mathfrak{M}$ ] can be captured by FO[HTC][ $\mathfrak{M}$ ], and so the data complexity follows already from the classical result of Proposition 5.2 in embedded finite model theory, without needing to prove new RQC results.

THEOREM 5.4. *FO[HTC][ $\mathfrak{M}$ ] captures RDPQ[ $\mathfrak{M}$ ].*

*Example 5.5.* Consider  $\mathfrak{M}$  to be LIA, and  $\sigma$  a relational vocabulary having relations  $\{value^{(2)}, a^{(2)}, b^{(2)}\}$ . Consider the query  $q$  returning pairs of active domain elements linked via an  $(ab)^*$ -path such that every element in the path has a *value* within 10 units. Let  $\varphi(curr, p) = \exists x value(curr, x) \wedge (p - 10 \leq x \leq p + 10)$ , and consider the ERA  $\mathcal{A}$  with one initial state  $q_0$ , one final state  $q_F$ , one extra state  $q_1$ , and one read-only register  $p$ . It has transitions  $(q_0, (\#, \varphi), q_F)$ ,  $(q_F, (a, \varphi), q_1)$  and  $(q_1, (b, \varphi), q_F)$ . It follows that the RDPQ  $x \xrightarrow{\mathcal{A}} y$  expresses the query  $q$ . Observe that the read-only register  $p$  is used to ‘guess’ an element that is not far from every other value. Another strategy to implement  $q$  would be by using two (normal) registers  $r_{\min}$  and  $r_{\max}$ , while keeping the minimum and maximum *value* seen so far, and checking that their difference never surpasses 10.

## 6 CONCLUSIONS

Although the study of graph databases in database theory has evolved separately from relational databases, we have shown — through relational embedding — that many results in graph databases (especially, on the complexity of query evaluation) are in fact corollaries of results on query evaluation on relational databases. To this end, one has to go beyond relational calculus, in particular to extensions with transitive closure and second-order quantification, which have been thoroughly studied in finite model theory [21]. Through the embedding, we have shown that new results on the complexity of query evaluation can be obtained, in particular of GQL and extensions thereof with meta-querying (i.e. querying and validating schemas) and data types (e.g. numbers). In doing so, we have also contributed to the open problem stated in the recent report [10] on the standardization of GQL on extending the current language with data types.

We believe that relational perspectives of graph databases could further benefit the study of graph databases. To this end, we leave a few concrete problems for future work. We have shown through a relational embedding that GQL with restrictors is in SO and therefore its data complexity is in the polynomial hierarchy. Since the current lower bound is only NP-hard and coNP-hard, we leave the precise data complexity for future work. Another interesting problem concerns aggregating over paths (e.g. by summing, counting, averaging, etc. over a given path). Although results on aggregation are available over relational databases (e.g. in embedded finite model theory), most positive results (e.g. see Chapter 5 of [15]) do not admit paths (i.e. not go beyond first-order logic). We propose to extend the results of [6] on FO[HTC] and SO to also admit aggregation.



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are extremely grateful to Michael Benedikt and Leonid Libkin for the fruitful discussions and useful feedback on the work.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Renzo Angles, Marcelo Arenas, Pablo Barceló, Aidan Hogan, Juan L. Reutter, and Domagoj Vrgoc. 2017. Foundations of Modern Query Languages for Graph Databases. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 50, 5 (2017), 68:1–68:40. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3104031>
- [2] Renzo Angles, Angela Bonifati, Stefania Dumbrava, George Fletcher, Alastair Green, Jan Hidders, Bei Li, Leonid Libkin, Victor Marsault, Wim Martens, Filip Murlak, Stefan Plantikow, Ognjen Savkovic, Michael Schmidt, Juan Sequeda, Slawek Staworko, Dominik Tomaszuk, Hannes Voigt, Domagoj Vrgoc, Mingxi Wu, and Dusan Zivkovic. 2023. PG-Schema: Schemas for Property Graphs. *Proc. ACM Manag. Data* 1, 2 (2023), 198:1–198:25.
- [3] Guillaume Bagan, Angela Bonifati, and Benoit Groz. 2020. A trichotomy for regular simple path queries on graphs. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* 108 (2020), 29–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JCSS.2019.08.006>
- [4] Pablo Barceló, Gaëlle Fontaine, and Anthony Widjaja Lin. 2015. Expressive Path Queries on Graph with Data. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.* 11, 4 (2015). [https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-11\(4:1\)2015](https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-11(4:1)2015)
- [5] Pablo Barceló, Leonid Libkin, Anthony Widjaja Lin, and Peter T. Wood. 2012. Expressive Languages for Path Queries over Graph-Structured Data. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.* 37, 4 (2012), 31:1–31:46. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2389241.2389250>
- [6] Michael Benedikt and Leonid Libkin. 2000. Relational Queries over Interpreted Structures. *J. ACM* 47, 4 (2000), 644–680. <https://doi.org/10.1145/347476.347477>
- [7] Michael Benedikt, Leonid Libkin, Thomas Schwentick, and Luc Segoufin. 2003. Definable relations and first-order query languages over strings. *J. ACM* 50, 5 (2003), 694–751. <https://doi.org/10.1145/876638.876642>
- [8] Pierre Bourhis, Markus Krötzsch, and Sebastian Rudolph. 2014. How to Best Nest Regular Path Queries. In *Informal Proceedings of the 27th International Workshop on Description Logics, Vienna, Austria, July 17-20, 2014 (CEUR Workshop Proceedings, Vol. 1193)*. CEUR-WS.org, 404–415. [http://ceur-ws.org/Vol-1193/paper\\_80.pdf](http://ceur-ws.org/Vol-1193/paper_80.pdf)
- [9] Diego Calvanese, Giuseppe De Giacomo, Maurizio Lenzerini, and Moshe Y. Vardi. 2000. Containment of Conjunctive Regular Path Queries with Inverse. In *KR*.
- [10] Alin Deutsch, Nadime Francis, Alastair Green, Keith Hare, Bei Li, Leonid Libkin, Tobias Lindaaker, Victor Marsault, Wim Martens, Jan Michels, Filip Murlak, Stefan Plantikow, Petra Selmer, Oskar van Rest, Hannes Voigt, Domagoj Vrgoc, Mingxi Wu, and Fred Zemke. 2022. Graph Pattern Matching in GQL and SQL/PGQ. In *SIGMOD*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3514221.3526057>
- [11] Diego Figueira, Artur Jež, and Anthony W. Lin. 2022. Data Path Queries over Embedded Graph Databases. In *PODS*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3517804.3524159>
- [12] Daniela Florescu, Alon Y. Levy, and Dan Suciu. 1998. Query Containment for Conjunctive Queries with Regular Expressions. In *PODS*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/275487.275503>
- [13] Nadime Francis, Amélie Gheerbrant, Paolo Guagliardo, Leonid Libkin, Victor Marsault, Wim Martens, Filip Murlak, Liat Peterfreund, Alexandra Rogova, and Domagoj Vrgoc. 2023. GPC: A Pattern Calculus for Property Graphs. In *PODS*.
- [14] Nadime Francis, Amélie Gheerbrant, Paolo Guagliardo, Leonid Libkin, Victor Marsault, Wim Martens, Filip Murlak, Liat Peterfreund, Alexandra Rogova, and Domagoj Vrgoc. 2023. A Researcher’s Digest of GQL (Invited Talk). In *ICDT (LIPIcs, Vol. 255)*. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 1:1–1:22.
- [15] E. Grädel, P. G. Kolaitis, L. Libkin, M. Marx, J. Spencer, M. Y. Vardi, Y. Venema, and S. Weinstein. 2007. *Finite Model Theory and Its Applications*. Springer.
- [16] Jelle Hellings, Bart Kuijpers, Jan Van den Bussche, and Xiaowang Zhang. 2013. Walk logic as a framework for path query languages on graph databases. In *ICDT*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2448496.2448512>
- [17] H. V. Jagadish, Angela Bonifati, George Fletcher, Hannes Voigt, and Nikolay Yakovets. 2018. *Querying Graphs*. Morgan and Claypool Publishers.
- [18] Michael Kaminski and Nissim Francez. 1994. Finite-Memory Automata. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 134, 2 (1994), 329–363. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975\(94\)90242-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(94)90242-9)
- [19] Gabriel Kuper, Leonid Libkin, and Jan Paredaens. 2000. *Constraint Databases*. Springer.
- [20] Andrea S. LaPaugh and Christos H. Papadimitriou. 1984. The even-path problem for graphs and digraphs. *Networks* 14, 4 (1984), 507–513. <https://doi.org/10.1002/NET.3230140403>
- [21] Leonid Libkin. 2004. *Elements of finite model theory*. Vol. 41. Springer.
- [22] Leonid Libkin, Wim Martens, and Domagoj Vrgoc. 2016. Querying Graphs with Data. *J. ACM* 63, 2 (2016), 14:1–14:53. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2850413>

- [23] Leonid Libkin and Domagoj Vrgoc. 2012. Regular path queries on graphs with data. In *15th International Conference on Database Theory, ICDT '12, Berlin, Germany, March 26-29, 2012*, Alin Deutsch (Ed.). ACM, 74–85. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2274576.2274585>
- [24] Wim Martens, Matthias Niewerth, and Tina Popp. 2023. A Trichotomy for Regular Trail Queries. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.* 19, 4 (2023). [https://doi.org/10.46298/LMCS-19\(4:20\)2023](https://doi.org/10.46298/LMCS-19(4:20)2023)
- [25] Alberto O. Mendelzon and Peter T. Wood. 1995. Finding Regular Simple Paths in Graph Databases. *SIAM J. Comput.* 24, 6 (1995), 1235–1258. <https://doi.org/10.1137/S009753979122370X>
- [26] Juan L. Reutter, Miguel Romero, and Moshe Y. Vardi. 2017. Regular Queries on Graph Databases. *Theoretical Computer Science* 61, 1 (2017), 31–83. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00224-016-9676-2>
- [27] Siddhartha Sahu, Amine Mhedhbi, Semih Salihoglu, Jimmy Lin, and M. Tamer Özsu. 2017. The Ubiquity of Large Graphs and Surprising Challenges of Graph Processing: A User Survey. *CoRR* abs/1709.03188 (2017). arXiv:1709.03188 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1709.03188>
- [28] M. Sipser. 1997. *Introduction to the Theory of Computation*. PWS Publishing Company.

## A APPENDIX TO SECTION 2 “PRELIMINARIES: LOGIC AND PROPERTY GRAPHS”

PROPOSITION 2.2. *In terms of expressive power, FO[TC<sup>+</sup>] is subsumed in ESO.*

PROOF. it suffices to replace each occurrence of

$$[\text{TC}_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}(\varphi(\bar{u}\bar{v}\bar{p}))](\bar{x}, \bar{y})$$

with

$$\exists R^{(2k)} R(\bar{x}\bar{y}) \wedge \text{lin}(R) \wedge \forall \bar{u}\bar{v} (\text{succ}(R, \bar{u}, \bar{v}) \rightarrow \varphi(\bar{u}\bar{v}\bar{p}))$$

where  $\text{lin}(R)$  expresses that  $R$  is a strict linear order,<sup>5</sup> and  $\text{succ}(R, \bar{u}, \bar{v})$  expresses that  $\bar{v}$  is the successor of  $\bar{u}$  in the linear order.  $\square$

### A.1 First-order Logic Semantics

The full semantics of first-order logic is defined as follows:

- $\llbracket \exists x \varphi(x, \bar{y}) \rrbracket_{\bar{y} \mapsto \bar{b}}^S = \top$  if for some  $a \in \text{adom}(S)$  we have  $\llbracket \varphi(x, \bar{y}) \rrbracket_{(\bar{y} \mapsto \bar{b}) \cup (x \mapsto a)}^S = \top$ ,
- $\llbracket t = t' \rrbracket_v^S = \top$  if  $\llbracket t \rrbracket_v^S = \llbracket t' \rrbracket_v^S$ ,
- $\llbracket R^{(k)}(t_1, \dots, t_k) \rrbracket_v^S = \top$  if  $(\llbracket t_1 \rrbracket_v^S, \dots, \llbracket t_k \rrbracket_v^S) \in \llbracket R \rrbracket^S$ ,
- $\llbracket c \rrbracket_v^S = c$  for every  $c \in \text{Const}$ ,
- $\llbracket x \rrbracket_v^S = v(x)$  for every  $x \in \text{Vars}$ ,
- $\llbracket \varphi \wedge \psi \rrbracket_v^S = \top$  if  $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket_v^S = \top$  and  $\llbracket \psi \rrbracket_v^S = \top$
- $\llbracket \neg \varphi \rrbracket_v^S = \top$  if  $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket_v^S \neq \top$

## B APPENDIX TO SECTION 4 “FROM GRAPH QUERY LANGUAGES TO LOGIC”

### B.1 Semantics of GQL

The semantics of GQL patterns and queries on a property graph  $G$  is defined as sets of pairs  $(p, \mu)$  where  $p$  is a path in  $G$ , as will be shortly defined, and  $\mu : \text{Vars} \rightarrow N \cup E$  is a partial assignment. A path  $p$  in  $G$  is an alternating sequence of nodes and edges that starts and ends with a node, i.e., an element of the form

$$n_0 e_0 \cdots n_{k-1} e_{k-1} n_k$$

where  $n_0, \dots, n_k \in N$  and  $e_0, \dots, e_{k-1} \in E$ . If  $k = n$  then the path consist of a single node. We define  $\text{src}(p)$ ,  $\text{tgt}(p)$  as  $n_0, n_k$ , respectively, and  $\text{len}(p)$  as then number of edges it contains, that is  $k$ . We say that a path  $p_2$  concatenates to a path  $p_1$  if  $\text{tgt}(p_1) = \text{src}(p_2)$ . In this case,  $p_1 p_2$  is the concatenation of the paths. To emphasize, we write  $\text{path}(p)$ . For partial mappings  $\mu_1, \mu_2 : \text{Vars} \rightarrow N \cup E$ , we use  $\mu_1 \sim \mu_2$  to denote that for every  $x \in \text{dom}(\mu_1) \cap \text{dom}(\mu_2)$ , it holds that  $\mu_1(x) = \mu_2(x)$  where  $\text{dom}(\mu)$  denotes the domain of  $\mu$ .

The semantic  $\llbracket \pi \rrbracket^G$  of path patterns on a graph  $G$  is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket () \rrbracket^G &:= \{(\text{path}(n), \emptyset) \mid n \in N\} \\ \llbracket (x) \rrbracket^G &:= \{(\text{path}(n), \{x \mapsto n\}) \mid n \in N\} \\ \llbracket -[x] \rightarrow \rrbracket^G &:= \left\{ \text{path}(n_1, e, n_2), \{x \mapsto e\} \mid \begin{array}{l} e \in E_d \\ \text{src}(e) = n_1 \\ \text{tgt}(e) = n_2 \end{array} \right\} \\ \llbracket \langle -[x] \rangle \rrbracket^G &:= \left\{ \text{path}(n_1, e, n_2), \{x \mapsto e\} \mid \begin{array}{l} e \in E \\ \text{src}(e) = n_2 \\ \text{tgt}(e) = n_1 \end{array} \right\} \\ \llbracket -[\ ] \rrbracket^G &:= \{(\text{path}(n_1, e, n_2), \emptyset) \mid e \in E_u\} \end{aligned}$$

<sup>5</sup>That is, it defines a linear order  $<$  on the domain  $(\text{adom}(S))^k$ , where  $\bar{a} < \bar{b}$  if  $\bar{a}\bar{b} \in R$ .

Notice that we ignored the parts  $: \ell$  and where  $\theta$  since the pattern can be rewritten by adding a condition. For instance, the pattern  $(x : \ell \text{ where } \theta)$  is syntactic sugar to the **path pattern**  $(x \text{ where } \theta')$  where  $\theta' = x : \ell$  and  $\theta$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket \pi_1 \pi_2 \rrbracket^G &:= \left\{ (p_1 \cdot p_2, \mu_1 \bowtie \mu_2) \mid \begin{array}{l} (p_i, \mu_i) \in \llbracket \pi_i \rrbracket^G, i = 1, 2 \\ p_1 \text{ and } p_2 \text{ concatenate} \\ \mu_1 \sim \mu_2 \end{array} \right\} \\
 \llbracket \pi_1 + \pi_2 \rrbracket^G &:= \llbracket \pi_1 \rrbracket^G \cup \llbracket \pi_2 \rrbracket^G \text{ whenever } \text{sch}(\pi_1) = \text{sch}(\pi_2)^6 \\
 \llbracket \pi \text{ where } \theta \rrbracket_G &:= \left\{ (p, \mu) \mid (p, \mu) \in \llbracket \pi \rrbracket^G, \llbracket \theta \rrbracket_\mu^G = \top \right\} \\
 \llbracket \pi^{n..m} \rrbracket_G &:= \bigcup_{i=n}^m \llbracket \pi \rrbracket_i^G \\
 \llbracket \pi \rrbracket_0^G &:= \{ (\text{path}(n), \mu) \mid \text{dom}(\mu) = \emptyset, n \in \mathbb{N} \}, \text{ and for } k > 0: \\
 \llbracket \pi \rrbracket_k^G &:= \left\{ (p_1 \cdots p_k, \mu) \mid \begin{array}{l} (p_1, \mu_1), \dots, (p_k, \mu_k) \in \llbracket \pi \rrbracket^G \\ \text{dom}(\mu) = \text{sch}(\pi), \\ \forall x \in \text{sch}(\pi) : \mu(x) := \text{list}(\mu_1(x), \dots, \mu_k(x)) \end{array} \right\}
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $\llbracket \theta \rrbracket_\mu^G$  is defined inductively as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket x : \ell \rrbracket_\mu^G &:= \top \text{ if } \text{label}(\mu(x)) := \ell \\
 \llbracket x.a = c \rrbracket_\mu^G &:= \top \text{ if } \text{property}(\mu(x), a) = c \\
 \llbracket x.a = y.b \rrbracket_\mu^G &:= \top \text{ if } \text{property}(\mu(x), a) = \text{property}(\mu(y), b) \\
 \llbracket \theta_1 \vee \theta_2 \rrbracket_\mu^G &:= \llbracket \theta_1 \rrbracket_\mu^G \vee \llbracket \theta_2 \rrbracket_\mu^G \\
 \llbracket \theta_1 \wedge \theta_2 \rrbracket_\mu^G &:= \llbracket \theta_1 \rrbracket_\mu^G \wedge \llbracket \theta_2 \rrbracket_\mu^G \\
 \llbracket \neg \theta \rrbracket_\mu^G &:= \neg \llbracket \theta \rrbracket_\mu^G \\
 \llbracket \text{exists}\{\mathcal{Q}\} \rrbracket_G^\mu &= \begin{cases} \top & \text{if } \llbracket \mathcal{Q} \rrbracket^G(\{\mu\}) \neq \emptyset \\ \perp & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
 \end{aligned}$$

and the schema is defined by:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{sch}(\cdot) &= \text{sch}(\rightarrow) = \text{sch}(\leftarrow) := \emptyset \\
 \text{sch}(x) &= \text{sch}(\overset{x}{\rightarrow}) = \text{sch}(\overset{x}{\leftarrow}) := \{x\} \\
 \text{sch}(\pi \text{ where } \theta) &:= \text{sch}(\pi) \\
 \text{sch}(\pi_1 \pi_2) &:= \text{sch}(\pi_1) \cup \text{sch}(\pi_2) \\
 \text{sch}(\pi_1 + \pi_2) &:= \text{sch}(\pi_1) \\
 \text{sch}(\pi^{n..m}) &:= \text{sch}(\pi) \\
 \text{sch}(\pi) &:= \text{sch}(\pi) \\
 \text{sch}(\rho \pi) &:= \text{sch}(\pi) \\
 \text{sch}(\Pi_1, \Pi_2) &:= \text{sch}(\Pi_1) \cup \text{sch}(\Pi_2)
 \end{aligned}$$

The semantics  $\llbracket \Pi \rrbracket^G$  of graph patterns  $\Pi$  on graph  $G$  is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket X = \pi \rrbracket^G &:= \left\{ (p, \mu \cup \{X \mapsto p\}) \mid (p, \mu) \in \llbracket \pi \rrbracket^G \right\} \\ \llbracket \text{trail } \pi \rrbracket^G &:= \left\{ (p, \mu) \in \llbracket \pi \rrbracket^G \mid p \text{ contains no repeating edges} \right\} \\ \llbracket \text{acyclic } \pi \rrbracket^G &:= \left\{ (p, \mu) \in \llbracket \pi \rrbracket^G \mid p \text{ contains no repeating nodes} \right\} \\ \llbracket \text{shortest } \bar{\pi} \rrbracket^G &:= \left\{ (p, \mu) \in \llbracket \pi \rrbracket^G \mid \text{len}(p) = \min \left\{ \text{len}(p') \mid \begin{array}{l} (p', \mu) \in \llbracket \pi \rrbracket^G \\ \text{src}(p') = \text{src}(p) \\ \text{tgt}(p') = \text{tgt}(p) \end{array} \right\} \right\} \\ \llbracket \text{all } \bar{\pi} \rrbracket_G &:= \llbracket \bar{\pi} \rrbracket^G \\ \llbracket \Pi_1, \Pi_2 \rrbracket^G &:= \left\{ (p_1 \times p_2, \mu_1 \bowtie \mu_2) \mid \begin{array}{l} (p_1, \mu_1) \in \llbracket \Pi_1 \rrbracket^G \\ (p_2, \mu_2) \in \llbracket \Pi_2 \rrbracket^G \end{array} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where  $\bar{\pi}$  stands for graph patterns that do not use the ‘,’ operator.

The semantics  $\llbracket C \rrbracket^G$  of clauses on graph  $G$  is a function that gets a table as input and returns a table, and is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \text{match } \Pi \rrbracket^G (T) &:= \bigcup_{\mu \in T} \{ \mu \bowtie \mu' \mid (p, \mu') \in \llbracket \Pi \rrbracket^G, \mu \sim \mu' \} \\ \llbracket \text{let } x = \chi \rrbracket_G (T) &:= \bigcup_{\mu \in T} \{ \mu \bowtie (x \mapsto \llbracket \chi \rrbracket_\mu^G) \} \text{ whenever } x \notin \text{dom}(T) \\ \llbracket \text{filter } \theta \rrbracket_G (T) &:= \bigcup_{\mu \in T} \{ \mu \mid \llbracket \theta \rrbracket_\mu^G = \top \} \text{ whenever } x \notin \text{dom}(T) \\ \llbracket \text{for } x \text{ in } y \rrbracket^G (T) &:= \bigcup_{\mu \in T} \{ \mu \bowtie (x \mapsto v) \mid v \in \mu(y) \} \text{ whenever } x \notin \text{dom}(T) \text{ and } \forall \mu \in T \mu(y) \text{ is a list} \end{aligned}$$

The semantics  $\llbracket L \rrbracket^G$  of linear queries on a property graph  $G$  is a function that gets a table as input and returns a table, and is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \text{use } G' L \rrbracket_G (T) &:= \llbracket L \rrbracket^{G'} (T) \\ \llbracket C L \rrbracket^G (T) &:= \llbracket L \rrbracket^G (\llbracket C \rrbracket^G (T)) \\ \llbracket \text{return } \chi_1 \text{ as } x_1, \dots, \chi_n \text{ as } x_n \rrbracket_G (T) &:= \bigcup_{\mu \in T} \{ (x_1 \mapsto \llbracket \chi_1 \rrbracket_\mu^G, \dots, x_n \mapsto \llbracket \chi_n \rrbracket_\mu^G) \} \end{aligned}$$

The output of queries is defined as

$$\text{Output}(\mathcal{Q}) = \llbracket \mathcal{Q} \rrbracket^G (\{()\})$$

where  $\{()\}$  is the unit table that consists of the empty binding, and  $G$  is the default graph. We define the semantics of queries recursively as follows:

$$\llbracket \text{use } G' \{Q_1 \text{ then } Q_2 \text{ then } \dots \text{ then } Q_k\} \rrbracket^G := \llbracket Q_k \rrbracket^{G'} \circ \dots \circ \llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket^{G'} (T)$$

Whenever  $\text{dom}(\llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket^G (T)) = \text{dom}(\llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket^G (T))$  we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket Q_1 \text{ intersect } Q_2 \rrbracket_G (T) &:= \llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket^G (T) \cap \llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket^G (T) \\ \llbracket Q_1 \text{ union } Q_2 \rrbracket_G (T) &:= \llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket^G (T) \cup \llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket^G (T) \\ \llbracket Q_1 \text{ except } Q_2 \rrbracket_G (T) &:= \llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket^G (T) \setminus \llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket^G (T) \end{aligned}$$

which completes the semantics definition.

*Discrepancies.* Our language is different in two aspects:

- (i) The semantics  $\llbracket \pi_1 + \pi_2 \rrbracket$  is defined only if  $\text{sch}(\pi_1) = \text{sch}(\pi_2)$  since we avoid nulls
- (ii) The restrictor **any** is excluded since we avoid non-determinism

The purpose of (i) is to consider only those GQL queries whose output consists of complete instances. In the original definition, optional variables can arise as a result of writing a **path pattern**  $\pi_1 + \pi_2$  with  $\text{sch}(\pi_1) \neq \text{sch}(\pi_2)$ . In this case, a variable  $x$  in the symmetric difference

$(sch(\pi_1) \setminus sch(\pi_2)) \cup (sch(\pi_2) \setminus sch(\pi_1))$  can be assigned to a null. We do not allow this by imposing  $sch(\pi_1) = sch(\pi_2)$  whenever we consider the disjunction  $\pi_1 + \pi_2$ . That is, the semantics is not defined otherwise.

The purpose of (ii) is to avoid non-determinism. Recall that in the original definition we have

$$\llbracket \text{any } \bar{\pi} \rrbracket^G := \cup_{(s,t) \in X} \{ \text{any} \left( \{ (p, \mu) \mid (p, \mu) \in \llbracket \bar{\pi} \rrbracket^G, \text{endpoints}(p) = (s, t) \} \right) \}$$

and any is a procedure that arbitrarily returns one element from a set; any need not be deterministic.

Assumption (iii) is for the sake of presentation but all results apply also when extending the data model and the query language (in particular, **path patterns**) to support it.

## B.2 Proof of Theorem 4.5

**THEOREM 4.5.** *For every basic restrictor-free GQL query  $\mathcal{Q}$  there is an FO[TC] formula  $\varphi_{\mathcal{Q}}(\bar{x})$  where  $\bar{x} = sch(\mathcal{Q})$  such that for every graph database  $\mathcal{G}$ ,*

$$\llbracket \mathcal{Q} \rrbracket^{\mathcal{G}} = \llbracket \varphi_{\mathcal{Q}}(\bar{x}) \rrbracket^{\mathcal{G}}.$$

We defined **basic GQL queries**. First-order GPC **path patterns** are those **path patterns** of **basic GQL queries**. This theorem follows from the following lemmas:

**LEMMA B.1.** *For every basic GPC path pattern  $\pi$  there is an FO[TC] formula  $\varphi_{\pi}(s, t, \bar{x})$  such that  $\bar{x} = sch(\pi)$ ,  $s, t \notin \bar{x}$ , and for every property graph  $G$  the following are equivalent:*

- $\exists p, \mu : (p, \mu) \in \llbracket \pi \rrbracket^G$  with  $\text{src}(p) = y_1, \text{tgt}(p) = y_2, \mu(\bar{x}) = \bar{z}$
- $\llbracket \varphi_{\pi}(s, t, \bar{x}) \rrbracket_{st\bar{x} \mapsto y_1 y_2 \bar{z}}^G = \top$

**PROOF.** The proof of this lemma is based on the following recursive translation of  $\pi$  to formulas  $\varphi_{\pi}$ .

*Base cases.* If  $\pi := (x : \ell)$  then

$$\varphi_{\pi}(s, t, x) := \text{Node}(x) \wedge \text{label}(x, c^{\ell}) \wedge s = x \wedge t = x$$

If  $\pi := (x)$  then

$$\varphi_{\pi}(s, t, x) := \text{Node}(x) \wedge s = x \wedge t = x$$

If  $\pi := (: \ell)$  then

$$\varphi_{\pi}(s, t) := \text{Node}(s) \wedge \text{label}(s, c^{\ell}) \wedge s = t$$

If  $\pi := ()$  then

$$\varphi_{\pi}(s, t) := \text{Node}(s) \wedge s = t$$

If  $\pi := -[x : \ell]->$  then

$$\varphi_{\pi}(s, t, x) := \text{Edge}(x) \wedge \text{Node}(s) \wedge \text{Node}(t) \wedge \text{src}(x, s) \wedge \text{tgt}(x, t) \wedge \text{label}(x, c^{\ell})$$

If  $\pi := -[x]->$  then

$$\varphi_{\pi}(s, t, x) := \text{Edge}(x) \wedge \text{Node}(s) \wedge \text{Node}(t) \wedge \text{src}(x, s) \wedge \text{tgt}(x, t)$$

If  $\pi := -[ : \ell]->$  then

$$\varphi_{\pi}(s, t) := \exists x : (\text{Edge}(x) \wedge \text{Node}(s) \wedge \text{Node}(t) \wedge \text{src}(x, s) \wedge \text{tgt}(x, t) \wedge \text{label}(x, c^{\ell}))$$

If  $\pi := -[]->$  then

$$\varphi_{\pi}(s, t) := \exists x : (\text{Edge}(x) \wedge \text{Node}(s) \wedge \text{Node}(t) \wedge \text{src}(x, s) \wedge \text{tgt}(x, t))$$

The translation is symmetric for patterns  $\pi := <-[]-$  (by replacing  $\text{src}$  and  $\text{tgt}$ ).

If  $\pi := -[x]$ - then

$$\varphi_\pi(s, x, t) := \text{Edge}(x) \wedge \text{Node}(s) \wedge \text{Node}(t) \wedge ((\text{src}(x, s) \wedge \text{tgt}(x, t)) \vee (\text{src}(x, t) \wedge \text{tgt}(x, s)))$$

If  $\pi := -[\ ]$ - then

$$\varphi_\pi(s, t) := \exists x : \left( \text{Edge}(x) \wedge \text{Node}(s) \wedge \text{Node}(t) \wedge ((\text{src}(x, s) \wedge \text{tgt}(x, t)) \vee (\text{src}(x, t) \wedge \text{tgt}(x, s))) \right)$$

If  $\pi := -[x : \ell]$ - then

$$\varphi_\pi(s, x, t) := \text{Edge}(x) \wedge \text{Node}(s) \wedge \text{Node}(t) \wedge ((\text{src}(x, s) \wedge \text{tgt}(x, t)) \vee (\text{src}(x, t) \wedge \text{tgt}(x, s)) \wedge \text{label}(x, c^\ell))$$

If  $\pi := -[\ : \ell]$ - then

$$\varphi_\pi(s, x, t) := \exists x \left( \text{Edge}(x) \wedge \text{Node}(s) \wedge \text{Node}(t) \wedge ((\text{src}(x, s) \wedge \text{tgt}(x, t)) \vee (\text{src}(x, t) \wedge \text{tgt}(x, s)) \wedge \text{label}(x, c^\ell)) \right)$$

*Induction step.* If  $\pi = \pi_1 + \pi_2$  then since  $\text{sch}(\pi_1) = \text{sch}(\pi_2)$  we set

$$\varphi_{\pi_1 + \pi_2}(s, t, \bar{x}) := \varphi_{\pi_1}(s, t, \bar{x}) \vee \varphi_{\pi_2}(s, t, \bar{x})$$

If  $\pi = \pi_1 \pi_2$  then

$$\varphi_\pi(s, t, \bar{z}, \bar{x}, \bar{y}) := \exists n : (\text{Node}(n) \wedge \varphi_{\pi_1}(s, n, \bar{z}, \bar{x}) \wedge \varphi_{\pi_2}(n, t, \bar{z}, \bar{y}))$$

where  $\bar{z} = \text{sch}(\pi_1) \cap \text{sch}(\pi_2)$  are assumed w.l.o.g. to appear in their stated positions (if it is not the case they can be modified appropriately).

Before translating  $\pi = \pi'_{\langle \theta \rangle}$ , we discuss the condition  $\theta$ . We define  $\text{sch}(\theta)$  recursively as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sch}(x.a = y.b) &:= \{x, y\} \\ \text{sch}(x.a = c) &:= \{x\} \\ \text{sch}(\theta_1 \vee \theta_2) &:= \text{sch}(\theta_1) \cup \text{sch}(\theta_2) \\ \text{sch}(\theta_1 \wedge \theta_2) &:= \text{sch}(\theta_1) \cup \text{sch}(\theta_2) \\ \text{sch}(\neg\theta) &:= \text{sch}(\theta) \\ \text{sch}(\text{exists } \{\mathcal{Q}\}) &:= \emptyset \end{aligned}$$

If  $\pi = \pi'_{\langle \theta \rangle}$  then

$$\varphi_\pi(s, t, \bar{x}) := \varphi_{\pi'}(s, t, \bar{x}) \wedge \varphi_\theta$$

where  $\varphi_\theta$  is defined as follows: If  $\theta := x.a = p$  then  $\varphi_\theta(x) := \text{property}(x, c^a, c^p)$ . If  $\theta := x.a = y.b$  then  $\varphi_\theta(x, y) := \exists p : \text{property}(x, c^a, p) = \text{property}(y, c^b, p)$ . If  $\theta := \theta_1 \circ \theta_2$ ,  $\circ \in \{\vee, \wedge\}$  then  $\varphi_\theta(\bar{z}, \bar{x}, \bar{y}) := \varphi_{\theta_1}(\bar{z}, \bar{x}) \circ \varphi_{\theta_2}(\bar{z}, \bar{y})$  where  $\bar{z}$  are the joint free variables of  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$ . If  $\theta := \neg\theta'$  then  $\varphi_\theta(\bar{x}) := \neg\varphi_{\theta'}(\bar{x})$ . If  $\theta := \text{exists}\{\mathcal{Q}\}$  then  $\varphi_\theta() := \exists \bar{x} : \varphi_{\mathcal{Q}}(\bar{x})$  where  $\bar{x} = \text{sch}(\mathcal{Q})$  and  $\varphi_{\mathcal{Q}}(\bar{x})$  is that from Theorem 4.5.<sup>7</sup> Notice that the semantics of  $\pi'_{\langle \theta \rangle}$  is only defined when  $\text{sch}(\theta) \subseteq \text{sch}(\pi')$ . Therefore, the free variables of  $\varphi_\theta$  are a subset of the free variables of  $\varphi_{\pi'}$ ; hence, the above translation is well-defined.

<sup>7</sup>In fact, the construction is done in mutual recursion with  $\varphi_{\mathcal{Q}}$  but for the sake of presentation we present it sequentially. The proof of correctness is of both claims simultaneously.



If  $\pi = \pi'^{k..k}$  with  $k < \infty$  is translated to

$$\varphi_\pi(s, t) = \exists s_1, \dots, s_k : \bigwedge_{i=1}^{k-1} \varphi'(s_i, s_{i+1}) \wedge \varphi'(s_k, t) \wedge s = s_1$$

The pattern  $\pi = \pi'^{k..m}$  with  $0 \leq k \leq m < \infty$  can be viewed as syntactic sugar to  $\pi'^k + \dots + \pi'^m$  which is translated according to the previous item and the + translation.

The pattern  $\pi = \pi'^{0..∞}$  is translated to

$$\varphi_\pi(s, t) := [\text{TC}_{u,v}(\varphi_{\pi'}(u, v))](s, t)$$

(Notice that since we are dealing with the **basic** fragment of GQL, it holds that  $\text{sch}(\pi') = \emptyset$ , hence,  $\text{sch}(\varphi_{\pi'}) = \{s, t\}$ .)

The pattern  $\pi = \pi'^{k..∞}$  can be viewed as syntactic sugar to  $\pi'^k \pi'^{0..∞}$  which is translated according to the translation of previous items and concatenation.

The equivalence can be shown straightforwardly by induction on the **path pattern**'s structure.  $\square$

We now move to graph patterns. We define **basic restrictor-free** graph patterns as those graph patterns of **basic restrictor-free GQL** queries.

LEMMA B.2. *For every **basic restrictor-free** graph patterns  $\Pi$  there is an FO[TC] formula  $\varphi_\Pi(\bar{x})$  such that  $\bar{x} = \text{sch}(\Pi)$  and for every property graph  $G$  and partial mapping  $\mu$  the following are equivalent:*

- $\exists \bar{p} : (\bar{p}, \mu) \in \llbracket \Pi \rrbracket^G$
- $\llbracket \varphi_\Pi(\bar{x}) \rrbracket_{\mu(\bar{x})}^G = \top$

PROOF. We prove the claim by induction on the structure of  $\pi$  but first describe the translation. Since we only consider **basic restrictor-free** graph patterns, we only need to take care of the case  $\Pi = \Pi_1, \Pi_2$ . The base case is when  $\Pi_1$  and  $\Pi_2$  are path patterns. In this case, Lemma B.1 ensures that there are  $\varphi_{\Pi_1}(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  and  $\varphi_{\Pi_2}(\bar{x}, \bar{z})$  for which the equivalence stated in the lemma holds. (Notice that we can assume wlog that the variables are ordered like stated - first joint free variables of  $\varphi_{\Pi_1}$  and  $\varphi_{\Pi_2}$  and then the rest.) We define  $\varphi_\Pi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}) := \varphi_{\Pi_1}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \wedge \varphi_{\Pi_2}(\bar{x}, \bar{z})$ . The equivalence then holds directly from the equivalence stated in Lemma B.1. The induction step is defined similarly, and correctness holds directly.  $\square$

We now move to clauses. We define **basic restrictor-free** clauses as those clauses of **basic restrictor-free GQL** queries.

LEMMA B.3. *For every **basic restrictor-free GQL clause**  $C$  and table  $T$  expressible by an FO[TC] formula  $\varphi_T(\bar{y})$ , there is an FO[TC] formula  $\varphi_{C,T}(\bar{z})$  for every graph database  $\mathcal{G}$*

$$\llbracket C \rrbracket^{\mathcal{G}}(T) = \llbracket \varphi_{C,T}(\bar{z}) \rrbracket^{\mathcal{G}}$$

PROOF. We denote  $\bar{x} = \text{sch}(C)$ . Notice that  $\bar{y} = \text{dom}(T)$ . We prove the claim by considering all possible options of a clause  $C$ .

- For **match**  $\Pi$  we can use the formula  $\varphi_\Pi$  from the previous lemma, and define  $\varphi_{C,T}(\bar{z}) := \varphi_\Pi(\bar{x}) \wedge \varphi_T(\bar{y})$  where  $\bar{z} = \bar{x} \cup \bar{y}$ .
- For **let**  $x = \chi$ , we distinguish between cases: if  $x \in \text{dom}(T)$  then  $\varphi_{C,T}(\bar{y}) := \varphi_T(\bar{y})$ ; otherwise (if  $x \notin \text{dom}(T)$ ) then  $\varphi_{C,T}(\bar{y}, x) := \varphi_T(\bar{y}) \wedge x = \chi$ . Notice that in this case  $\bar{z} = \bar{y}$ .
- For **filter**  $\theta$ , we set  $\varphi_{C,T}(\bar{z}) := \varphi_T(\bar{y}) \wedge \varphi_\theta(\bar{x})$  where  $\bar{z} = \bar{z} \cup \bar{y}$ .
- Since we are dealing with the **basic** fragment of GQL, in case  $C$  is for  $x$  in  $y$  then  $\varphi_{C,T}(\bar{z}) := \varphi_T(\bar{y})$  where  $\bar{z} = \bar{y}$ .

The proof follows straightforwardly from the definition of the semantics of  $C$ .  $\square$

LEMMA B.4. For every basic restrictor-free GQL linear query  $L$  and table  $T$  expressible by an FO[TC] formula  $\varphi_T(\bar{y})$  where  $\bar{y} = \text{dom}(T)$ , there is an FO[TC] formula  $\varphi_{L,T}(\bar{z})$  such that for every graph database  $\mathcal{G}$

$$\llbracket L \rrbracket^{\mathcal{G}}(T) = \llbracket \varphi_{L,T}(\bar{z}) \rrbracket^{\mathcal{G}}$$

PROOF. We denote  $\bar{x} = \text{sch}(L)$ . Similarly to before, we distinguish between cases for  $L$  and prove the claim inductively (since the definition of linear query is recursive).

- If  $L$  is of the form `return  $\chi_1$  as  $x_1, \dots, \chi_n$  as  $x_n$`  then  $\varphi_{L,T}(x_1, \dots, x_n) := \exists \bar{u} : \varphi_T(\bar{y}) \wedge x_1 = \chi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge x_n = \chi_n$  where  $\bar{u} = \bar{y} \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ . Notice that in this case  $\bar{z} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ .
- If  $L = CL'$  then  $\varphi_{L,T}(\bar{z}) := \varphi_{L',T'}(\bar{u})$  where  $T'$  is defined by  $\varphi_{C,T}(\bar{v})$ .
- If  $L := \text{use } GL'$  then we define  $\varphi_{L,T}(\bar{v}) := \varphi_{L',T}(\bar{u})$ .

The proof of correctness is via induction and is based on the semantics definition of  $L$ .  $\square$

LEMMA B.5. For every basic restrictor-free GQL query  $\mathcal{Q}$  and table  $T$  expressible by an FO[TC] formula  $\varphi_T(\bar{y})$  where  $\bar{y} = \text{dom}(T)$ , there is an FO[TC] formula  $\varphi_{\mathcal{Q},T}(\bar{z})$  such that for every graph database  $\mathcal{G}$

$$\llbracket \mathcal{Q} \rrbracket^{\mathcal{G}}(T) = \llbracket \varphi_{\mathcal{Q},T}(\bar{z}) \rrbracket^{\mathcal{G}}$$

PROOF. Similarly to previous proofs, we distinguish between cases.

- If  $\mathcal{Q} := \text{use } G' \{ \mathcal{Q}_1 \text{ then } \mathcal{Q}_2 \}$  then  $\varphi_{\mathcal{Q},T}(\bar{z}) := \varphi_{\mathcal{Q}_2,T'}$  where  $T'$  is described by the formula  $\varphi_{\mathcal{Q}_1,t}(\bar{u})$ . We generalize this similarly for every  $k$ .
- If  $\mathcal{Q} := \mathcal{Q}_1 \text{ intersect } \mathcal{Q}_2$  then  $\varphi_{\mathcal{Q},T}(\bar{z}) = \varphi_{\mathcal{Q}_1,T}(\bar{z}) \wedge \varphi_{\mathcal{Q}_2,T}(\bar{z})$ .
- If  $\mathcal{Q} := \mathcal{Q}_1 \text{ union } \mathcal{Q}_2$  then  $\varphi_{\mathcal{Q},T}(\bar{z}) = \varphi_{\mathcal{Q}_1,T}(\bar{z}) \vee \varphi_{\mathcal{Q}_2,T}(\bar{z})$ .
- If  $\mathcal{Q} := \mathcal{Q}_1 \text{ except } \mathcal{Q}_2$  then  $\varphi_{\mathcal{Q},T}(\bar{z}) = \varphi_{\mathcal{Q}_1,T}(\bar{z}) \wedge \neg \varphi_{\mathcal{Q}_2,T}(\bar{z})$ .

The proof then follows from the definition.  $\square$

This allows us to conclude Theorem 4.5.

PROPOSITION 4.2. There exists a basic GQL query that uses either of the restrictors *acyclic*, *trail* whose evaluation problem is NP-complete.

PROOF. The proof follows straight from the fact that

- basic Boolean GQL queries with the *acyclic* restrictor capture Boolean RPQs under *simple path semantics*,<sup>8</sup>
- basic Boolean GQL queries with the *trail* restrictor capture Boolean RPQs under *trail semantics*,<sup>9</sup>

and that there RPQs whose evaluation is NP-hard in data complexity both under the *simple path* and *trail semantics* (see, e.g., [3, 24]).  $\square$

### B.3 Proof of Theorem 4.7

THEOREM 4.7. For every basic GQL query  $\mathcal{Q}$  there is an SO formula  $\varphi_{\mathcal{Q}}(\bar{x})$  where  $\bar{x} = \text{sch}(\mathcal{Q})$  such that for every graph database  $\mathcal{G}$ ,

$$\llbracket \mathcal{Q} \rrbracket^{\mathcal{G}} = \llbracket \varphi_{\mathcal{Q}}(\bar{x}) \rrbracket^{\mathcal{G}}.$$

Further, if  $\mathcal{Q}$  is *positive* and does not use the restrictor *shortest* then  $\varphi_{\mathcal{Q}}$  is in ESO.

First, using ESO we can existentially quantify a linear order on the active domain and with that we use the fact that FO[TC] is subsumed in ESO for order structures and obtain the following corollary (contrast with Theorem 4.5):

<sup>8</sup>That is, for an RPQ  $L$ , whether there is a path with no repeated vertices reading a word from  $L$ .

<sup>9</sup>That is, for an RPQ  $L$ , whether there is a path with no repeated edges reading a word from  $L$ .

**COROLLARY B.6.** *For every basic restrictor-free GQL query  $\mathcal{Q}$  there is an ESO formula  $\varphi_{\mathcal{Q}}(\bar{x})$  where  $\bar{x} = \text{sch}(\mathcal{Q})$  and for every graph database  $\mathcal{G}$  the following equivalence holds:*

$$\llbracket \mathcal{Q} \rrbracket^{\mathcal{G}} = \llbracket \varphi_{\mathcal{Q}}(\bar{x}) \rrbracket^{\mathcal{G}}$$

**PROOF.** We can take the FO[TC] formula  $\varphi'(\bar{x})$  that exists due to Theorem 4.5, and define  $\varphi(x) := \exists M \psi^{\text{lin}}(M) \wedge \psi^{\text{adom}}(M) \wedge \varphi'(\bar{x})$  where  $M$  is a second order variable,  $\psi^{\text{lin}}(M)$  is an FO formula that verifies that  $M$  is a linear order, and  $\psi^{\text{adom}}(M)$  is an FO formula that verifies that  $M$  consists of all and only the elements in the active domain. Then, by Proposition 2.2, there is a rewriting  $\varphi''_M(\bar{x})$  of  $\varphi'(\bar{x})$  (which is in FO[TC]) into an equivalent ESO formula. Therefore, the target formula is  $\varphi(x) := \exists M \psi^{\text{lin}}(M) \wedge \psi^{\text{adom}}(M) \wedge \varphi''_M(\bar{x})$ .  $\square$

To incorporate the restrictors, we need to parameterize the translation of  $\pi$  with a ternary relation  $R$  which is existentially quantified and describes the restricted nature of the path matched to the pattern. Recall that acyclic paths (trails) are those in which there are no repeating nodes (edges).

Recall that by Lemma B.2 we know that for every basic restrictor-free graph pattern  $\Pi$  there is an FO[TC] formula  $\varphi_{\Pi}(\bar{x})$  such that  $\bar{x} = \text{sch}(\Pi)$  and for every property graph  $G$  and partial mapping  $\mu$  the following are equivalent:

- $\exists \bar{p} : (\bar{p}, \mu) \in \llbracket \Pi \rrbracket^G$
- $\llbracket \varphi_{\Pi}(\bar{x}) \rrbracket_{\mu(\bar{x})}^G = \top$

We now obtain a parametrized version of this

We can encode acyclic paths  $(n_1, e_1, \dots, n_k, e_k, n_{k+1})$  with a ternary relation  $R^{(3)}$  by instantiating it with  $R^{(3)}(n_j, e_j, n_{j+1})$  for every  $1 \leq j \leq k$ . Given a ternary  $R$  we can write an FO formula  $\psi^{\text{acyclic}}(R)$  that returns  $\top$  if and only if  $R$  is an instantiation of an acyclic path. We are now ready to show the following:

**LEMMA B.7.** *for every basic graph pattern  $\Pi$  of the form acyclic  $\pi$  there is an ESO formula  $\varphi_{\Pi}^R(\bar{x})$  such that  $\bar{x} = \text{sch}(\Pi)$  and for every property graph  $G$  and partial mapping  $\mu$  the following are equivalent:*

- $\exists \bar{p} : (\bar{p}, \mu) \in \llbracket \Pi \rrbracket^G$
- $\llbracket \varphi_{\Pi}(\bar{x}) \rrbracket_{\mu(\bar{x})}^G = \top$

**PROOF.** We write the following formula:

$$\exists R : \psi^{\text{acyclic}}(R) \wedge \varphi_{\Pi}^R(\bar{x})$$

where  $R$  is a second-order variable, and  $\varphi_{\Pi}^R(\bar{x})$  is defined similarly as  $\varphi_{\Pi}(\bar{x})$  from the proof of Lemma B.1 except for edge patterns  $\pi$  (on which, intuitively, it also verifies the edge is indeed in  $R$ ) is defined as follows:

- If  $\pi \in \{-[x : \ell] \rightarrow, -[x] \rightarrow, <-[x : \ell] \rightarrow, <-[x] \rightarrow, -[x : \ell] \rightarrow, -[x] \rightarrow, \}$  then

$$\varphi_{\pi}^R(s, t, x) := \varphi_{\pi}(s, t, x) \wedge R(s, x, t)$$

- If  $\pi \in \{-[ : \ell] \rightarrow, -[ ] \rightarrow, <-[ : \ell] \rightarrow, <-[ ] \rightarrow, -[ : \ell] \rightarrow, -[ ] \rightarrow, \}$  then we add  $\wedge R(s, x, t)$  in the scope of the existential quantification, that is, as a suffix within the scope of  $\exists x$ .

It can be shown directly that the conditions of the lemma hold.  $\square$

We can use a similar strategy for trail by changing  $\psi^{\text{acyclic}}(R)$  to  $\psi^{\text{trail}}(R)$  which can be expressed in FO. Formally, we have:

**LEMMA B.8.** *for every basic graph pattern  $\Pi$  of the form trail  $\pi$  there is an ESO formula  $\varphi_{\Pi}^R(\bar{x})$  such that  $\bar{x} = \text{sch}(\Pi)$  and for every property graph  $G$  and partial mapping  $\mu$  the following are equivalent:*

- $\exists \bar{p} : (\bar{p}, \mu) \in \llbracket \Pi \rrbracket^G$
- $\llbracket \varphi_\pi(\bar{x}) \rrbracket_{\mu(\bar{x})}^G = \top$

These two lemmas allow us to conclude the second part of Theorem 4.7.

For the first part of the theorem, let us consider the restrictor `shortest`. The strategy we take here is somewhat similar but we need quantifier alternation. The intuition is that we can again existentially quantify over that path and make sure it conforms to the restrictor. How can we do so? we know that if a path is the shortest then it contains no repeating nodes and no repeating edges, and there is a bijection from its elements to the elements of any other path. Therefore, we can write similarly to before:

$$\exists R : \left( \varphi_\pi^R(\bar{x}) \wedge \forall S : \varphi_\pi^R(\bar{x}) \rightarrow \text{bijection}_{R,S}() \right)$$

where  $R, S$  are second-order variables and  $\text{bijection}_{R,S}()$  is an FO formula that returns  $\top$  iff there is a bijection from  $R$  to  $S$ . This allows us to conclude the following:

LEMMA B.9. *For every basic graph pattern  $\Pi$  of the form `shortest  $\pi$`  there is an SO formula  $\varphi_\Pi^R(\bar{x})$  such that  $\bar{x} = \text{sch}(\Pi)$  and for every property graph  $G$  and partial mapping  $\mu$  the following are equivalent:*

- $\exists \bar{p} : (\bar{p}, \mu) \in \llbracket \Pi \rrbracket^G$
- $\llbracket \varphi_\Pi(\bar{x}) \rrbracket_{\mu(\bar{x})}^G = \top$

Combining this with the above, concludes the proof of the theorem.

## B.4 PGSchema

What are the capabilities of PG-Schema? In Figure 4, we present the grammar of PG-Schema, the full semantics is given in the original paper. We next show how we can translate it into an FO formula.

## B.5 Proof of Theorem 4.11

THEOREM 4.11. *Let  $S$  be a formal graph type. There is a Boolean FO formula  $\varphi_S()$  such that  $\mathcal{G}$  conforms to  $S$  if and only if  $\llbracket \varphi_S() \rrbracket^{\mathcal{G}} = \top$*

The idea is building an FO formula  $\varphi$  for each grammar component. The free variable of each such formula would depend on what the part of the grammar restricts. The formula is obtained by applying a sequence of rewriting rules as described:

- For `property`, if it is of the form
  - $\text{tr}(\text{key propertyType})(x) := \exists p : (\text{property}(x, \text{key}) = p \wedge \text{propertyType}(p))$
  - $\text{tr}(\text{OPTIONAL key propertyType})(x) := (\exists p : \text{property}(x, \text{key}) = p) \rightarrow \text{propertyType}(p)$
- $\text{tr}(\text{property}_1, \dots, \text{property}_k)(x) := \bigwedge_{i=1}^k \text{tr}(\text{property}_i)(x)$
- For `propertySpec` we distinguish between cases:
  - $\text{tr}(\text{"{" "}"}) (x) := x = x$
  - $\text{tr}(\text{"{" properties "}"}) (x) := \text{tr}(\text{properties})(x)$
- For `labelSpec` we distinguish between cases
  - $\text{tr}(\text{label})(x) := \text{label}(x, c^{\text{label}})$
  - $\text{tr}(\text{"(" labelSpec ")"}) (x) := \text{tr}(\text{labelSpec})(x) \wedge N(x)$
  - $\text{tr}(\text{"[" labelSpec "]"}) (x) := \text{tr}(\text{labelSpec})(x) \wedge E(x)$
- For `labelPropertySpec` we distinguish between cases:
  - $\text{tr}(\text{"." labelSpec})(x) := \text{tr}(\text{labelSpec})(x)$
  - $\text{tr}(\text{"." labelSpec propertySpec})(x) := \text{tr}(\text{labelSpec})(x) \wedge \text{tr}(\text{propertySpec})(x)$
- $\text{tr}(\text{endpointType})(x) := \text{tr}(\text{labelPropertySpec})(x) \wedge N(x)$

pgschema	:= (createType “;”?) <sup>+</sup>
createType	:= createNodeType   createEdgeType   createGraphType
createNodeType	:= CREATE NODE TYPE (ABSTRACT)? nodeType
createEdgeType	:= CREATE EDGE TYPE (ABSTRACT)? edgeType
createGraphType	:= CREATE GRAPH TYPE graphType
graphType	:= typeName graphTypeMode graphTypeImports? graphTypeElements
graphTypeMode	:= STRICT   LOOSE
graphTypeElements	:= “{” elementTypes? “}”
elementTypes	:= elementType (“,” elementType)*
elementType	:= typeName   nodeType   edgeType
nodeType	:= (“” typeName labelPropertySpec “”)
edgeType	:= endpointType “-” middleType “->” endpointType
middleType	:= (“” typeName labelPropertySpec “”)
endpointType	:= (“” labelPropertySpec “”)
labelPropertySpec	:= (“:” labelSpec)? OPEN? propertySpec?
labelSpec	:= (“” labelSpec “”   “[” labelSpec “]”   labelSpec (“ ” “&”) labelSpec (“?”)   label   typeName
propertySpec	:= (“{” (properties (“,” OPEN)?   OPEN)? “}”)
properties	:= property (“,” property)*
property	:= (OPTIONAL)? key propertyType
typeName	:= stringLiteral
label	:= $l$ for $l \in \mathcal{L}$
key	:= $k$ for $k \in \mathcal{K}$
propertyType	:= $b$ for $b \in \mathcal{B}$

Fig. 4. PG-Schema Grammar

- $\text{tr}(\text{middleType})(x) := \text{tr}(\text{typeName})(x) \wedge \text{tr}(\text{labelPropertySpec})(x) \wedge E(x)$
- $\text{tr}(\text{endpointType}_1 \text{ “-” middleType “->” endpointType}_2)(x) :=$   
 $\forall y, z : (\text{tr}(\text{endpointType}_1)(y) \wedge \text{tr}(\text{endpointType}_2)(z) \wedge E(x) \wedge \text{src}(x, y) \wedge \text{tgt}(x, z))$
- $\text{tr}(\text{“” typeName labelPropertySpec “”})(x) := \text{tr}(\text{typeName})(x) \wedge$   
 $\text{tr}(\text{labelPropertySpec})(x) \wedge N(x)$
- $\text{tr}(\text{elementType}_1 \text{ “,” } \dots \text{ “,” elementType}_k)(x) := \text{tr}(\text{elementType}_1)(x) \wedge \dots \wedge$   
 $\text{tr}(\text{elementType}_k)(x)$
- For graphElementTypes we distinguish between cases  
 $\text{tr}(\text{“{” “}”})(x) := x = x$   
 $\text{tr}(\text{“{” elementType “}”})(x) := \text{tr}(\text{elementType})(x)$

## C APPENDIX TO SECTION 5 “INCORPORATING DOMAIN-SPECIFIC OPERATORS”

THEOREM 5.4.  $\text{FO}[\text{HTC}][\mathfrak{M}]$  captures  $\text{RDPQ}[\mathfrak{M}]$ .

PROOF. We first give an idea for the proof (below) by showing how to capture Example 5.5 above. Let  $\psi(x, x', p)$  be the formula expressing that there is a path “ $x \xrightarrow{a} z \xrightarrow{x'}$ ” for some  $z$  such that

$\varphi(x_{curr}, p)$  (as defined in Example 5.5) holds for all  $x_{curr} \in \{x, z, x'\}$ . It follows that

$$\xi(x_s, x_t) = \exists p \text{TC}_{u,v}(\psi(x, x', p)[x/u, x'/v])(x_s, x_t)$$

expresses the existence of a path from  $x_s$  to  $x_t$  with the desired property.

We now continue with the proof of the above theorem. Let  $x \xrightarrow{\mathcal{A}} y$  be an  $\text{RDPQ}(\text{FO}, \sigma, \mathfrak{M})$  over the  $\langle \sigma, \mathfrak{M} \rangle$ -ERA  $\mathcal{A} = (R, P, Q, Q_0, F, \Delta)$ . To avoid unnecessary technical details, let us assume that  $\mathcal{A}$  is so that every sequence of transitions

$$(p_0, \alpha_0, \varphi_1, p_1), (p_1, \alpha_1, \varphi_2, p_2), \dots, (p_{m-1}, \alpha_m, \varphi_m, p_m) \in \Delta,$$

where  $q_0 \in Q_0$  verifies that  $\alpha_0 = \#$  and  $\alpha_i \neq \#$ , for every  $i > 0$ . It is easy to see that this is without any loss of generality.

Let  $Q = \{q_1, \dots, q_n\}$ . For simplicity, we will first assume that the structure has at least  $n$  distinct elements from the **active domain**, which we will use to encode the states of the automaton. That is, the formula we will produce will be of the form

$$\exists x_{q_1}, \dots, x_{q_n} \bigwedge_{i \neq j} x_{q_i} \neq x_{q_j} \wedge \dots,$$

where the rest of the formula will use the  $x_{q_i}$  variables to encode the automata states. We will later discuss how to adapt the formula should the **embedded structure** have less than  $n$  **active domain** elements

Suppose  $R = \{r_1, \dots, r_\ell\}$  and  $P = \{p_1, \dots, p_s\}$ .

Consider any transition  $tr = (q, a, \varphi(x_{curr}, \bar{x}_R, \bar{x}'_R, \bar{x}_P), q')$  of  $\Delta$ , where  $\bar{x}_R = x_{r_1}, \dots, x_{r_\ell}$ ,  $\bar{x}'_R = x'_{r_1}, \dots, x'_{r_\ell}$ ,  $\bar{x}_P = x_{p_1}, \dots, x_{p_s}$ . We define the formula  $\rho_{tr}(x_{curr}, x'_{curr}, x_{state}, x'_{state}, \bar{x}_R, \bar{x}'_R, \bar{x}_P)$  associated to this transition to be

$$a(x_{curr}, x'_{curr}) \wedge (x_{state} = x_q) \wedge (x'_{state} = x_{q'}) \wedge \varphi(x_{curr}, \bar{x}_R, \bar{x}'_R, \bar{x}_P).$$

That is  $x_{curr}, x'_{curr}$  bind to the constants that  $\mathcal{A}$  is currently traversing;  $x_{state}, x'_{state}$  to the constants representing the traversed state; and  $\bar{x}_R, \bar{x}'_R$  represent as usual the pre- and post-conditions for **registers**; and  $\bar{x}_P$  the parameters. If instead of a relation  $a$  we have  $\#$  we need to simply do the same but stay put. That is, for any transition  $tr = (q, \#, \varphi(x_{curr}, \bar{x}_R, \bar{x}'_R, \bar{x}_P), q')$  of  $\Delta$ , where  $\bar{x}_R = x_{r_1}, \dots, x_{r_\ell}$ ,  $\bar{x}'_R = x'_{r_1}, \dots, x'_{r_\ell}$ ,  $\bar{x}_P = x_{p_1}, \dots, x_{p_s}$ . We define the formula  $\rho_{tr}(x_{curr}, x'_{curr}, x_{state}, x'_{state}, \bar{x}_R, \bar{x}'_R, \bar{x}_P)$  associated to this transition to be

$$x_{curr} = x'_{curr} \wedge (x_{state} = x_q) \wedge (x'_{state} = x_{q'}) \wedge \varphi(x_{curr}, \bar{x}_R, \bar{x}'_R, \bar{x}_P).$$

Let  $\rho$  be the disjunction of all the  $\rho_{tr}$  for all transitions  $tr$  in  $\Delta$ . We can now define the formula representing an (accepting) run of  $\mathcal{A}$  on a **path** of a structure. It is simply the transitive closure of  $\rho$ , where we use, as **parameters**, the variables  $\bar{x}_Q = x_{q_1}, \dots, x_{q_n}$  representing the states and the variables  $\bar{x}_P$  representing the **read-only registers**. Finally, one must check that the transitive closure of  $\rho$  applies where  $x_{curr}$  and  $x'_{curr}$  bind to the only two free variables of the formula. Further,  $x_{state}$  and  $x'_{state}$  bind to initial and final states respectively,  $\bar{x}_R$  and  $\bar{x}'_R$  bind to any pair of **register** (active

domain) valuations, and  $\bar{x}_P$  binds to any valuation. Formally, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}}(x, x') = & \exists \bar{x}_Q \bar{x}_P \bar{x}_R \bar{x}'_R x_{init} x_{end} \bigwedge_{q \neq q'} x_q \neq x_{q'} \wedge \\ & \bigvee_{q \in Q_0} x_{init} = x_q \wedge \bigvee_{q \in F} x_{end} = x_q \wedge \\ & [\text{TC}_{\bar{u}, \bar{v}}(\rho(\bar{u} \bar{v} \bar{x}_P \bar{x}_Q))](x x_{init} \bar{x}_R, x' x_{end} \bar{x}'_R) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u} &= x_{curr} x_{state} \bar{x}_R \\ \bar{v} &= x'_{curr} x'_{state} \bar{x}'_R \\ \bar{x}_Q &= x_{q_1} \cdots x_{q_n} \quad \text{for } Q = \{q_1, \dots, q_n\} \end{aligned}$$

CLAIM C.1.  $(v, v')$  is returned by  $x \xrightarrow{\bar{\mathcal{A}}} y$  on a  $\langle \sigma, \mathfrak{M} \rangle$ -structure  $\mathbf{S}$  if, and only if,  $\llbracket \varphi_{\bar{\mathcal{A}}} \rrbracket_{x \mapsto v, x' \mapsto v'}^{\mathbf{S}} = \top$ .

*Small structures.* The above encoding fails on **embedded structures** with less than  $n$  active domain constants. If the structure has, nevertheless, at least two constants, then we can still do the encoding with vectors of size  $\lceil \log n \rceil = m$ . Concretely, we replace

$$\exists x_{q_1}, \dots, x_{q_n} \bigwedge_{i \neq j} x_{q_i} \neq x_{q_j}$$

in the formula above with

$$\exists x_0, x_1 (x_0 \neq x_1);$$

replace any appearance of  $x_{q_i}$  with the vector  $(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_m})$ , where  $j_1 \dots j_m$  is the number  $i$  in binary; and replace any appearance of  $x_{state}, x'_{state}, x_{init}, x_{end}$  with  $\bar{x}_{state}, \bar{x}'_{state}, \bar{x}_{init}, \bar{x}_{end}$  respectively, where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{x}_{state} &= x_{state_1}, \dots, x_{state_m} \\ \bar{x}'_{state} &= x'_{state_1}, \dots, x'_{state_m}, \\ \bar{x}_{init} &= x_{init_1}, \dots, x_{init_m}, \quad \text{and} \\ \bar{x}_{end} &= x_{end_1}, \dots, x_{end_m}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, if the **embedded structure** has only *one* element, then the query can be expressed in FO.  $\square$