I N F S Y S
R E S E A R C H
R E P O R T

INSTITUT FÜR INFORMATIONSSYSTEME

ABTEILUNG WISSENSBASIERTE SYSTEME

PROBABILISTIC OBJECT BASES

Thomas EITER
Thomas LUKASIEWICZ
James J. LU
V.S. SUBRAHMANIAN

INFSYS RESEARCH REPORT 1843-99-11
NOVEMBER 1999 & APRIL 2001

Institut für Informationssysteme
Abtg. Wissensbasierte Systeme
Technische Universität Wien
Favoritenstraße 9-11
A-1040 Wien, Austria
Tel: +43-1-58801-18405
Fax: +43-1-58801-18493
sek@kr.tuwien.ac.at
www.kr.tuwien.ac.at

TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT WIEN

INFSYS RESEARCH REPORT

INFSYS RESEARCH REPORT 1843-99-11, NOVEMBER 1999 & APRIL 2001

PROBABILISTIC OBJECT BASES

REVISED VERSION, APRIL 2001

Thomas Eiter[1] James J. Lu[2]
Thomas Lukasiewicz[1] V.S. Subrahmanian[3]

Abstract. Though there are many applications where an object oriented data model is a good way of representing and querying data, current object database systems are unable to handle objects whose attributes are uncertain. In this paper, we extend previous pioneering work by Kornatzky and Shimony to develop an algebra to handle object bases with uncertainty. We propose concepts of consistency for such object bases, together with an NP-completeness result, and classes of probabilistic object bases for which consistency is polynomially checkable. In addition, as certain operations involve conjunctions and disjunctions of events, and as the probability of conjunctive and disjunctive events depends both on the probabilities of the primitive events involved as well as on what is known (if anything) about the relationship between the events, we show how all our algebraic operations may be performed under arbitrary probabilistic conjunction and disjunction strategies. We also develop a host of equivalence results in our algebra, which may be used as rewrite rules for query optimization. Last but not least, we have developed a prototype probabilistic object base server on top of ObjectStore. We describe experiments to assess the efficiency of different possible rewrite rules.

[1]Institut und Ludwig Wittgenstein Labor für Informationssysteme, Technische Universität Wien, Favoritenstraße 9–11, A-1040 Wien, Austria. E-mail: {eiter, lukasiewicz}@kr.tuwien.ac.at

[2]Department of Computer Science, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, PA 17837, USA. E-mail: jameslu@bucknell.edu

[3]Institute for Advanced Computer Studies, Institute for Systems Research and Department of Computer Science, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, USA. E-mail: vs@cs.umd.edu

Acknowledgements: This work were supported by a TASC/DARPA grant J09301S98061, by the Army Research Laboratory under contract number DAAL01-97-K0135, by an NSF Young Investigator award IRI-93-57756 and an NSF grant CCR9731893, and by the Austrian Science Fund under project N Z29-INF.

Copyright © 2001 by the authors

Contents

1 Introduction **1**

2 A Motivating Example **2**

3 Architecture of a Probabilistic Object Base **2**

4 Basic Probability Definitions **4**
4.1 Probabilistic Combination Strategies 4
4.2 Probability Distribution Functions 6

5 Types and Probabilistic Object Base Schemas **7**
5.1 Types and Values 7
5.2 Probabilistic Object Base Schema 9

6 Inheritance and Probabilistic Object Base Instances **16**
6.1 Inheritance Completion and Fully Inherited Schemas 17
6.2 Probabilistic Object Base Instance 18

7 Probabilistic Object Bases: Algebraic Operations **20**
7.1 Selection 20
7.2 Projection and Renaming 25
7.3 Cartesian Product 29
7.4 Join 32
7.5 Intersection, Union, and Difference 35
7.6 Consistency Preservation 36

8 POB-Algebra: Equivalence Results **37**

9 Implementation **39**
9.1 POB-Server 39
9.2 Experiments 39

10 Related Work **40**

11 Conclusion **44**

1 Introduction

The concept of an *object base* is gaining numerous adherents because it allows data to be organized in an application specific manner for scalability, while still supporting a common query language. However, there are many applications where *probabilistic* data needs to be stored. For instance, image interpretation programs are uncertain in their identification of features in images and such image databases are typically stored using object databases [19]. Similarly, an application tracking a set of mobile objects using an object database may only know that an object is at one of a given set of points right now, but the precise location may be unknown. Likewise, an application that forecasts stock movements or the weather needs to represent uncertainty in the forecast. When the application data (stocks, weather) is in an object repository, methods to represent uncertain aspects of these objects need to be developed. In short, the ability to represent probabilistic information in an object base, and to manipulate such "probabilistic object bases" (POBs for short) efficiently is important for a variety of applications.

To date, there has been only one significant attempt in the database community to merge probability models with object bases, namely that by Kornatzky and Shimony [27], who proposed a probabilistic object calculus. Building upon their influential work, we make the following contributions:

1. First and foremost, we propose a notion of a probabilistic schema and formally define a logical model theory for it. We define what *consistent schemas* are and prove that consistency checking is NP-complete. We identify special classes of schemas for which consistency may be polynomially checked. Previous work on probabilistic object bases had no associated concept of consistency.

2. We then propose an algebra for probabilistic object bases in which the classical relational algebra operators are extended to apply to probabilistic object bases. It is well known [29] that the probabilities of conjunctive and disjunctive events are computed in different ways depending upon the dependencies between the events involved. Our algebraic operators are parameterized by the user's knowledge (or lack thereof) of such dependencies — hence, the user can ask queries of the form "Find the join of ... under ignorance", which describes a join assuming no knowledge about the dependencies between the events involved. Previous work on probabilistic object bases assumed that all events involved were independent. To our knowledge, this is the first (extension of the) relational algebra for POBs

3. We then prove a host of equivalence results in our algebra. These equivalence results may be used as the set of rewrite rules that a database query optimizer uses for query rewriting.

4. We have implemented a distributed POB system in C++ on top of ObjectStore. This implementation allowed us to conduct experiments across the network to evaluate the performance of our system and also to see how to rewrite queries.

This paper is structured as follows. In the next section, we consider a motivating database application. Section 3 describes the architecture of a POB system. After some basic definitions of probability concepts in Section 4, we develop our POB model in Sections 5 and 6. A query algebra is then presented in Section 7, and equivalence results in this algebra are derived in Section 8. We report on an implementation of POBs in Section 9, and discuss related work in Section 10. Detailed proofs of all results may be found in the appendix.



Figure 1: Plant identification example

2 A Motivating Example

Consider the task of building an extensive database describing the types of vegetation found in the Amazon rainforest. The creation of such a database is a formidable task. Individuals need to exhaustively examine the vegetables, herbs, and other kinds of plants growing in these forests, and provide information describing soil conditions, climactic conditions, etc.

When describing the plants growing in such rainforests, there are several possible causes of *uncertainty*. First and foremost, some plant species may not be uniquely identifiable by the surveyor in the field. He may classify a particular herb as either being Silver Thyme or French Thyme (two different species of thyme), without being able to specify exactly which species the plant in question belongs to. By the same token, if he were slightly more expert, he might be able to say that he is not sure whether the herb is Silver Thyme or French Thyme, but he rates the probability that it is Silver Thyme twice as high as that it is French Thyme.

Figure 1 shows a very simple class hierarchy that describes plants as either being perennials or annuals, and either being vegetables, herbs, or flowers. Clearly, the classes perennials and annuals are disjoint (i.e., a plant cannot be both an annual and a perennial), as are the classes vegetables, herbs, and flowers. Mutually disjoint classes are connected by a "**d**" in Figure 1. Note that we can certainly have plants that are annuals and herbs (e.g., Basil). For now, the numbers labeling edges in Figure 1 may be ignored. They will be revisited later.

In the rest of this paper, we repeatedly use this example to illustrate our definitions. By the end of this paper, we would have described how to build and query a POB that captures the Plant Database of this example as a special case.

3 Architecture of a Probabilistic Object Base

In this section, we describe the overall architecture of a probabilistic object base (POB) system. Figure 2 presents an architecture for query processing in probabilistic object bases. The architecture consists of the following components:

1. The user expresses queries through a graphical user interface which generates as output a query in a



Figure 2: Architecture of POB system

declarative *probabilistic object calculus* (POB-calculus). Note that queries in this calculus are declarative queries. A pioneering attempt at such a calculus is that of Kornatzky and Shimony [27].

2. The calculus query generated will be fed into a *Converter* which converts POB-calculus queries into queries in a *probabilistic object algebra* (POB-algebra).

3. The algebraic query generated by the converter will be fed into a *Query Manager*, which will take as input a set of *rewrite rules* (reflecting equivalences between different queries in the POB-algebra) and a set of *cost models* to perform a query optimization. Given a set of rewrite rules and a set of cost models, the task of finding a rewriting of a query that has minimal expected cost (according to the cost models) is well-studied, and good commercial implementations of such code exist (e.g., Graefe's CASCADES system [18] is presently being used by Microsoft).

4. The "optimized" algebra query thus produced will be physically executed on the probabilistic object base.

5. All the components above use *libraries* consisting of: (i) A set of probabilistic *conjunction, disjunction and difference* strategies that allow the user to express her knowledge of the dependencies between events — this is used in query formulation, query optimization, cost evaluation and query execution. (ii) A set of distribution functions that allow a user to specify how probabilities are distributed over a space of possible values for an unknown attribute.

Giving a detailed description of all these components is clearly beyond the scope of a single paper. In previous work, Kornatzky and Shimony [27] developed a probabilistic object calculus. In this paper, we will expand the concept of a probabilistic object base used by them and formally define a POB-algebra and prove a host of query equivalence results. We will report on a prototype implementation of the POB-algebra and describe experimental results — given a query equivalence $q_1 = q_2$, these experimental results will identify when a query of the form q_1 should be rewritten to a query of the form q_2 and vice versa. To our knowledge, this paper is the first to propose a probabilistic object algebra, the first to present results on query equivalences in such an algebra, and the first to implement such an algebra on top of a commercial object database system.

4 Basic Probability Definitions

In this section, we present some basic definitions used to set up a probabilistic extension of object bases. The probabilistic concepts are divided into two parts — (i) probabilistic combination strategies and (ii) distribution functions.

4.1 Probabilistic Combination Strategies

Suppose we know the probabilities of events e_1 and e_2. For example, e_1 may be the event "The photographed plant p_1 (in image I) is French Thyme." Similarly, e_2 may be the event "The photographed plant p_2 (in image I) is Mint." Assume now that we are interested in the probability of the complex event $(e_1 \wedge e_2)$. The probability of $(e_1 \wedge e_2)$ is computed in different ways based upon our knowledge of the dependencies between e_1 and e_2.

- e_1 *and* e_2 *are independent.* This may occur if *we know* that the plants p_1 and p_2 are growing in the area independently of each other. In this case, $\mathbf{P}(e_1 \wedge e_2) = \mathbf{P}(e_1) \cdot \mathbf{P}(e_2)$ (i.e., the probability of $(e_1 \wedge e_2)$ is the product of the probabilities of e_1 and e_2).
- e_1 *and* e_2 *are mutually exclusive.* Suppose, for example, we know that p_1 and p_2 are the same plant. Since the events e_1 and e_2 are mutually exclusive, we can immediately say that $\mathbf{P}(e_1 \wedge e_2) = 0$.
- *We are ignorant of the relationship between* e_1 *and* e_2. This case occurs when we do not know anything about the relationship between the plants p_1 and p_2 growing in the same area. As shown by Boole [6], the best we can say in this case about the probability of $(e_1 \wedge e_2)$ is that it lies in the interval $[\max(0, \mathbf{P}(e_1) + \mathbf{P}(e_2) - 1), \min(\mathbf{P}(e_1), \mathbf{P}(e_2))]$.

Thus, the probability of $(e_1 \wedge e_2)$ depends not only on the probabilities of e_1 and e_2, but also on the relationship between the events e_1 and e_2. A similar situation applies when we consider complex events such as $(e_1 \vee e_2)$. The above are only three *examples* of different ways of evaluating probabilities of complex events. In general, depending on exactly what is known about the dependencies between the events involved, there is a whole plethora of such probability computations.

In our framework, we use probability intervals instead of point probabilities for two reasons: (i) In many applications, the probability of an event is often not precisely given; (ii) as already shown by Boole [6], when we do not know the dependencies between two events, all that we can say about the probability of the conjunction / disjunction of two events is that it belongs to an interval.

Definition 4.1 (consistent probabilistic intervals for two events) Suppose e_1 and e_2 have probabilities in the intervals $I_1 = [L_1, U_1]$ and $I_2 = [L_2, U_2]$, respectively. Such an assignment of probabilistic intervals is called *consistent* iff $L_1 \leq U_1$, $L_2 \leq U_2$, and the following conditions hold:

- If $(e_1 \wedge e_2)$ is contradictory[1], then $L_1 + L_2 \leq 1$.
- If $(e_1 \wedge \neg e_2)$ is contradictory, then $L_1 \leq U_2$.
- If $(\neg e_1 \wedge e_2)$ is contradictory, then $L_2 \leq U_1$.
- If $(\neg e_1 \wedge \neg e_2)$ is contradictory, then $U_1 + U_2 \geq 1$.

[1] Contradictory here merely means "inconsistent in classical propositional logic."

In the sequel, all assignments of probabilistic intervals are implicitly assumed to be consistent unless stated otherwise. Suppose $I_1 = [L_1, U_1]$ and $I_2 = [L_2, U_2]$. We use $I_1 \leq I_2$ as an abbreviation for $L_1 \leq L_2$ and $U_1 \leq U_2$, and $I_1 \subseteq I_2$ to denote that I_1 is contained in I_2, i.e., $L_2 \leq L_1$ and $U_1 \leq U_2$.

As many dependencies between events cannot be automatically inferred, it is imperative that the user be able to specify, in his query, what knowledge he has about such relationships. To facilitate this, Lakshmanan et al. [29] have introduced generic probabilistic conjunction and disjunction strategies. Any function that satisfies the axioms listed in Table I is called a probabilistic conjunction or disjunction strategy, respectively. (Given two events e_1 and e_2 with probabilities in the intervals $I_1 = [L_1, U_1]$ and $I_2 = [L_2, U_2]$, respectively, the notations "$I = I_1 \otimes I_2$" and "$I = I_1 \oplus I_2$" are shorthand for "$(e_1 \wedge e_2, I) = (e_1, I_1) \otimes (e_2, I_2)$" and "$(e_1 \vee e_2, I) = (e_1, I_1) \oplus (e_2, I_2)$", respectively.)

Table I: Axioms for conjunction and disjunction strategies

Axiom Name	Conjunction Strategy
Bottomline	$(I_1 \otimes I_2) \leq [\min(L_1, L_2), \min(U_1, U_2)]$
Ignorance	$(I_1 \otimes I_2) \subseteq [\max(0, L_1 + L_2 - 1), \min(U_1, U_2)]$
Identity[2]	$(I_1 \otimes [1, 1]) = I_1$
Commutativity	$(I_1 \otimes I_2) = (I_2 \otimes I_1)$
Associativity	$((I_1 \otimes I_2) \otimes I_3) = (I_1 \otimes (I_2 \otimes I_3))$
Monotonicity	$(I_1 \otimes I_2) \leq (I_2 \otimes I_3)$ if $I_2 \leq I_3$

Axiom Name	Disjunction Strategy
Bottomline	$(I_1 \oplus I_2) \geq [\max(L_1, L_2), \max(U_1, U_2)]$
Ignorance	$(I_1 \oplus I_2) \subseteq [\max(L_1, L_2), \min(1, U_1 + U_2)]$
Identity[2]	$(I_1 \oplus [0, 0]) = I_1$
Commutativity	$(I_1 \oplus I_2) = (I_2 \oplus I_1)$
Associativity	$((I_1 \oplus I_2) \oplus I_3) = (I_1 \oplus (I_2 \oplus I_3))$
Monotonicity	$(I_1 \oplus I_2) \leq (I_1 \oplus I_3)$ if $I_2 \leq I_3$

While the notion of conjunction and disjunction strategies are recapitulated from Lakshmanan et al. [29], the concept of difference strategies below is new.

Definition 4.2 (probabilistic difference strategy) Suppose e_1 and e_2 have probabilities in the intervals $I_1 = [L_1, U_1]$ and $I_2 = [L_2, U_2]$, respectively. A *probabilistic difference strategy* is a binary operation $\ominus$ that uses this information to compute a probabilistic interval $I = [L, U]$ for the event $(e_1 \wedge \neg e_2)$. When the events involved are clear from context, we use "$I = I_1 \ominus I_2$" to denote "$(e_1 \wedge \neg e_2, I) = (e_1, I_1) \ominus (e_2, I_2)$". Difference strategies satisfy the following postulates:

Bottomline: $(I_1 \ominus I_2) \leq [\min(L_1, 1 - U_2), \min(U_1, 1 - L_2)]$.

Ignorance: $(I_1 \ominus I_2) \subseteq [\max(0, L_1 - U_2), \min(U_1, 1 - L_2)]$.

Identity: If $(\neg e_1 \wedge \neg e_2)$ and $(e_1 \wedge \neg e_2)$ are not contradictory[3], then $(I_1 \ominus [0, 0]) = I_1$.

[2]The Identity-axioms for probabilistic conjunction (resp., disjunction) strategies assume that $e_1 \wedge e_2$ and $\neg e_1 \wedge e_2$ (resp., $\neg e_1 \wedge \neg e_2$ and $e_1 \wedge \neg e_2$) are not contradictory.

[3]Note that the precondition is necessary. E.g., if $I_1 = [0, 1]$, and $\neg e_1 \wedge \neg e_2$ (resp., $e_1 \wedge \neg e_2$) is contradictory, then $(I_1 \ominus [0, 0]) = [1, 1] \neq I_1$ (resp., $(I_1 \ominus [0, 0]) = [0, 0] \neq I_1$) by the laws of probability.

Examples of probabilistic conjunction, disjunction, and difference strategies are given in Table II. Note that we do not assume any postulates that relate probabilistic conjunction, disjunction, and difference strategies to each other (for example, postulates that express the distributivity of conjunction and disjunction strategies). Readers may make such assumptions if they wish — however, the results of this paper stand even if these assumptions are not made.

Table II: Examples of probabilistic combination strategies

Strategy	Operators
Ignorance	$([L_1, U_1] \otimes_{ig} [L_2, U_2]) \equiv [\max(0, L_1 + L_2 - 1), \min(U_1, U_2)]$
	$([L_1, U_1] \oplus_{ig} [L_2, U_2]) \equiv [\max(L_1, L_2), \min(1, U_1 + U_2)]$
	$([L_1, U_1] \ominus_{ig} [L_2, U_2]) \equiv [\max(0, L_1 - U_2), \min(U_1, 1 - L_2)]$
Independence	$([L_1, U_1] \otimes_{in} [L_2, U_2]) \equiv [L_1 \cdot L_2, U_1 \cdot U_2]$
	$([L_1, U_1] \oplus_{in} [L_2, U_2]) \equiv [L_1 + L_2 - (L_1 \cdot L_2), U_1 + U_2 - (U_1 \cdot U_2)]$
	$([L_1, U_1] \ominus_{in} [L_2, U_2]) \equiv [L_1 \cdot (1 - U_2), U_1 \cdot (1 - L_2)]$
Positive Correlation	$([L_1, U_1] \otimes_{pc} [L_2, U_2]) \equiv [\min(L_1, L_2), \min(U_1, U_2)]$
(when e_1 implies e_2,	$([L_1, U_1] \oplus_{pc} [L_2, U_2]) \equiv [\max(L_1, L_2), \max(U_1, U_2)]$
or e_2 implies e_1)	$([L_1, U_1] \ominus_{pc} [L_2, U_2]) \equiv [\max(0, L_1 - U_2), \max(0, U_1 - L_2)]$
Mutual Exclusion	$([L_1, U_1] \otimes_{me} [L_2, U_2]) \equiv [0, 0]$
(when e_1 and e_2 are	$([L_1, U_1] \oplus_{me} [L_2, U_2]) \equiv [\min(1, L_1 + L_2), \min(1, U_1 + U_2)]$
mutually exclusive)	$([L_1, U_1] \ominus_{me} [L_2, U_2]) \equiv [L_1, \min(U_1, 1 - L_2)]$

4.2 Probability Distribution Functions

Probability distribution functions assign probabilities to elementary events in a coherent way. For example, if we are told that plant p_1 is currently at one of the locations a, b, c with probability 60-70%, then a distribution function allows us to assign parts of this probability mass to the events "plant p_1 is at location a," "plant p_1 is at location b," and "plant p_1 is at location c."

Definition 4.3 (distribution function) Let X be a finite set. A *(probability) distribution function α over X* is a mapping from X to the real interval $[0, 1]$ such that $\Sigma_{x \in X}\, \alpha(x) \leq 1$.

We do not require that $\Sigma_{x \in X}\, \alpha(x) = 1$ holds; a distribution function α with this property is said to be *complete*. The above definition allows to assign probabilities to a subset $X \subseteq Y$ of elements, leaving the probabilities of the other elements open.

An important distribution function which we often encounter in practice is the *uniform distribution*. For a finite set X, it is defined by $\mathrm{u}_X(x) = \frac{1}{|X|}$ for all $x \in X$. We abbreviate u_X by u, whenever X is clear from the context. Many other distribution functions are conceivable; we do not study this further here.

Definition 4.4 (probabilistic triple) A *probabilistic triple* $\langle X, \alpha, \beta \rangle$ consists of a finite set X, a distribution function α over X, and a function $\beta : X \to [0, 1]$ mapping X to the real interval $[0, 1]$ such that (i) $\alpha(x) \leq \beta(x)$ for all $x \in X$ and (ii) $\sum_{x \in X} \beta(x) \geq 1$ hold.

Informally, a probabilistic triple assigns to each element $x \in X$ a probability interval $[\alpha(x), \beta(x)]$. This assignment is consistent in the sense that we can assign each element in X a probability $p(x)$ from $[\alpha(x), \beta(x)]$

such that the sum of all $p(x)$ adds up to 1. In the sequel, we implicitly assume that all probabilistic triples $\langle X, \alpha, \beta \rangle$ are *tight*, i.e., for each $x \in X$, the bounds $\alpha(x)$ and $\beta(x)$ are the minimum and maximum, respectively, of $p(x)$ subject to all complete distribution functions p over X such that $p(x') \in [\alpha(x'), \beta(x')]$ for all $x' \in X$. Thus, any probabilistic triple that is entered by a user or computed by our algebraic operations is implicitly assumed to be transformed into its tight equivalent (which can easily be done).

5 Types and Probabilistic Object Base Schemas

In this section, we provide some basic definitions underlying a probabilistic object base (POB). We first consider types and values, and then the schema of a POB. The notion of POB-schema is more complex than in the context of relational databases, and may lead to inconsistent specifications; we present efficient algorithms for checking schema consistency.

5.1 Types and Values

We start with the definition of types.

Definition 5.1 (types) Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a set of *attributes* and let $\mathcal{T}$ be a set of *atomic types*. We define *types* inductively as follows:

- Every atomic type from $\mathcal{T}$ is a type.
- If τ is a type, then $\{\tau\}$ is a type, which is called the *set type* of τ;
- If $A_1, \ldots, A_k$ are pairwise distinct attributes from $\mathcal{A}$ and $\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_k$ are types, then $[A_1\colon \tau_1, \ldots, A_k\colon \tau_k]$ is a type. This type is called a *tuple type* over the set of attributes $\{A_1, \ldots, A_k\}$. Given such a type $\tau = [A_1\colon \tau_1, \ldots, A_k\colon \tau_k]$, we use $\tau.A_i$ to denote τ_i. We call $A_1, \ldots, A_k$ the *top-level attributes* of τ.

Example 5.1 (Plant Example: types) In the Plant Example, some atomic types from $\mathcal{T}$ are integer, real, string, soiltype, and suntype. The attributes soil, sun (sun-exposure), and rain (daily water) describe conditions needed for a plant to grow. Some other attributes are pname, size, height, and width. Some (non atomic) types include: {soiltype}, [soil: {soiltype}, sun: suntype, rain: integer], and [pname: string, size: [height: integer, width: integer]].

Definition 5.2 (values) Every atomic type $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ has an associated *domain* $\mathrm{dom}(\tau)$. We define *values* by induction as follows:

- For all atomic types $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, every $v \in \mathrm{dom}(\tau)$ is a value of type τ.
- If $v_1, \ldots, v_k$ are values of type τ, then $\{v_1, \ldots, v_k\}$ is a value of type $\{\tau\}$.
- If $A_1, \ldots, A_k$ are pairwise different attributes from $\mathcal{A}$ and $v_1, \ldots, v_k$ are values of types $\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_k$, then $[A_1\colon v_1, \ldots, A_k\colon v_k]$ is a value of type $[A_1\colon \tau_1, \ldots, A_k\colon \tau_k]$.

Example 5.2 (Plant Example: values) Let us return to the types of Example 5.1. We assign the usual domains to integer, real, and string. Let soiltype and suntype be enumerated types having the domains {loamy, swampy, sandy} and {mild, medium, heavy}, respectively. The value sets associated with the types of Example 5.1 are as follows:

- soiltype: Any element of $\{\mathsf{loamy}, \mathsf{swampy}, \mathsf{sandy}\}$ is a value of soiltype. For example, loamy is a value of soiltype. When associated with a particular plant, this value might say that the plant needs loamy soil to flourish.

- $\{\mathsf{soiltype}\}$: Any set of values of soiltype is a value of this type. For example, if a particular plant can grow well in either loamy or swampy soil, then $\{\mathsf{loamy}, \mathsf{swampy}\}$ is an appropriate value of this type that can be associated with this plant.

- $[\mathsf{soil}: \{\mathsf{soiltype}\}, \mathsf{sun}: \mathsf{suntype}, \mathsf{rain}: \mathsf{integer}]$: Any triple (v_1, v_2, v_3) is a value of this type, where v_1 is a *set* of values of soiltype, v_2 is a value of suntype, and v_3 is a value of integer. For example, $(\{\mathsf{loamy}, \mathsf{swampy}\}, \mathsf{mild}, 3)$ is a value of this type. It says that the plant needs either loamy or swampy soil, mild sun, and 3 units of water per day to flourish.

Definition 5.3 (probabilistic tuple values) If $A_1, \ldots, A_k$ are pairwise different attributes from $\mathcal{A}$ and $(V_1, \alpha_1, \beta_1), \ldots, (V_k, \alpha_k, \beta_k)$ are probabilistic triples where $V_1, \ldots, V_k$ are *sets* of values of types $\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_k$, then the expression $[A_1 : (V_1, \alpha_1, \beta_1), \ldots, A_k : (V_k, \alpha_k, \beta_k)]$ is a *probabilistic tuple value* of type $[A_1 : \tau_1, \ldots, A_k : \tau_k]$ over the set of attributes $\{A_1, \ldots, A_k\}$. For probabilistic tuple values $ptv = [A_1 : (V_1, \alpha_1, \beta_1), \ldots, A_k : (V_k, \alpha_k, \beta_k)]$, we use $ptv.A_i$ to denote (V_i, α_i, β_i).

Note that the order of the $A_i : (V_i, \alpha_i, \beta_i)$'s in a probabilistic tuple value $ptv = [A_1 : (V_1, \alpha_1, \beta_1), \ldots, A_k : (V_k, \alpha_k, \beta_k)]$ is not important.

Example 5.3 (Plant Example: probabilistic tuple values) Suppose we know that the soil type of a wild forest plant is loamy (presumably, as we can see, the plant is flourishing in the place in which it is currently growing). Moreover, we are sure that this plant is Thyme, but unsure whether it is French Thyme (french), Silver Thyme (silver) or Wooly Thyme (wooly). If we are sure with 20–60% probability each that it is French Thyme, Silver Thyme, and Wooly Thyme, then we may encode this knowledge via the following probabilistic tuple value of type $[\mathsf{soil}: \mathsf{soiltype},\ \mathsf{classification}: \mathsf{string}]$ over the set of attributes $\{\mathsf{soil}, \mathsf{classification}\}$:

$$[\mathsf{soil}: \langle\{\mathsf{loamy}\}, \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{u}\rangle,\ \mathsf{classification}: \langle\{\mathsf{french}, \mathsf{silver}, \mathsf{wooly}\}, 0.6\,\mathrm{u}, 1.8\,\mathrm{u}\rangle]\,.$$

Note that the expressions "0.6 u" and "1.8 u" denote the distribution function α and the function β, respectively, that are defined by $\alpha(x) = 0.6 \cdot 1/3$ and $\beta(x) = 1.8 \cdot 1/3$ for all x from $\{\mathsf{french}, \mathsf{silver}, \mathsf{wooly}\}$.

In the above definition, a probabilistic triple (V_i, α_i, β_i) may only assign a probability interval to some values v (viz. those in V_i) for the attribute A_i. Nothing is stated for the (possibly infinitely many) other values that A_i could have according to its type τ_i. We must find a clean and appealing way in which such incomplete knowledge about the probability assignment is handled.

As in relational databases, we adopt a *closed world assumption* (CWA): We assume that every value $v \in \mathrm{dom}(\tau_i) - V_i$ has probability 0, i.e., it is implicitly assigned the probability interval $[0, 0]$. Under this convention, "consistency" (which we will define formally later) of the probability information given by (V_i, α_i, β_i) is preserved in the larger context of $\mathrm{dom}(\tau_i)$: there exists a probability function p over $\mathrm{dom}(\tau_i)$ that is compatible with (V_i, α_i, β_i) such that all $p(v)$ with $v \in \mathrm{dom}(\tau_i)$ sum up to 1. The probabilistic object base algebra defined in Section 7 will be based on this CWA. Notice that an open world view is still possible for particular values. We may, for instance, add v to V and set $\alpha(v) = 0$, $\beta(v) = 1$; this explicitly expresses that the probability of v is unknown.

5.2 Probabilistic Object Base Schema

Informally, a probabilistic object base schema consists of a hierarchy of classes. Membership of an object in an immediate subclass of any class is expressed by a probability value.

Definition 5.4 (probabilistic object base schema) A *probabilistic object base schema (POB-schema)* is a quintuple $(\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$, where:

- $\mathcal{C}$ *is a finite set of* classes. Intuitively, these reflect the classes associated with this probabilistic object base.
- τ *maps each class from* $\mathcal{C}$ *to a tuple type.* Intuitively, this mapping specifies the data type of each class.
- $\Rightarrow$ *is a binary relation on* $\mathcal{C}$ *such that* $(\mathcal{C}, \Rightarrow)$ *is a directed acyclic graph (dag).* Intuitively, each node of the directed acyclic graph $(\mathcal{C}, \Rightarrow)$ is a class from $\mathcal{C}$ and each edge $c_1 \Rightarrow c_2$ says that the class c_1 is an *immediate subclass* of c_2.
- me *maps each class* c *to a partition of the set of all immediate subclasses of* c. Intuitively, suppose class c has the five subclasses $c_1, \ldots, c_5$ and suppose $\mathrm{me}(c)$ is given by the partition $\{\{c_1, c_2\}, \{c_3, c_4, c_5\}\}$. Here, $\mathrm{me}(c)$ produces two clusters. An object $o \in c$ can belong to either or both clusters. However, the classes within a cluster are mutually exclusive, i.e., o cannot belong to both c_1 and c_2 at the same time.
- $\wp$ *maps each edge in* $(\mathcal{C}, \Rightarrow)$ *to a positive rational*[4] *number in the unit interval* $[0, 1]$ *such that for all classes* c *and all clusters* $\mathcal{P} \in \mathrm{me}(c)$*, it holds that* $\Sigma_{d \in \mathcal{P}} \wp(d, c) \leq 1$. Intuitively, if $c_1 \Rightarrow c_2$, then $\wp(c_1, c_2)$ specifies the conditional probability that an arbitrary object belongs to the subclass c_1 given that it belongs to the superclass c_2. The summation condition says that the sum of the probabilities of edges within a mutually exclusive set of subclasses must sum up to less than or equal to 1.

A *directed path* in the directed acyclic graph $(\mathcal{C}, \Rightarrow)$ is a sequence of classes $c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_k$ such that $c_1 \Rightarrow c_2 \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow c_k$ and $k \geq 1$. We use $\Rightarrow^\star$ to denote the reflexive and transitive closure of $\Rightarrow$. Note that $\Rightarrow^\star$ induces a natural partial order $\leq$ on $\mathcal{C}$ by $c \leq d$ iff $c \Rightarrow^\star d$ for all $c, d \in \mathcal{C}$.

We use $\mathrm{S}(c) = \{d \in \mathcal{C} \mid d \Rightarrow c\}$ to denote the set of all *immediate subclasses* of $c \in \mathcal{C}$, and $\mathrm{S}^\star(c) = \{d \in \mathcal{C} \mid d \Rightarrow^* c\}$ to denote the set of *subclasses* of $c \in \mathcal{C}$. A class d is a *subclass* of a partition cluster $\mathcal{P}$ iff d is a subclass of some $c \in \mathcal{P}$.

We will represent the above structure (excluding the type assignment τ) in a graphical way as shown in Figure 1, where the edges are labeled by conditional probabilities.

Example 5.4 (Plant Example: probabilistic object base schema) A POB-schema for the Plant Example may consist of the following components:

- $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathsf{plants}, \mathsf{annuals}, \mathsf{perennials}, \mathsf{vegetables}, \mathsf{herbs}, \mathsf{flowers}, \mathsf{annuals_herbs}, \mathsf{perennials_flowers}\}$.
- τ is given by Table III.

[4] Note that we assume rational numbers here, since we will adopt a probabilistic semantics of class hierarchies that is based on relative cardinalities of sets of objects. We can easily generalize our model to real numbers, if we assume a more general probabilistic semantics that is based on real-valued probability functions over a set of possible worlds. All the results of this subsection, except for the NP-membership result in Theorem 5.2, carry over to this more general setting.

Table III: Type assignment τ

c	$\tau(c)$
plants	[pname: string, soil: soiltype, rain: integer]
annuals	[pname: string, soil: soiltype, rain: integer, sun: suntype]
perennials	[pname: string, soil: soiltype, rain: integer, sun: suntype, expyears: integer]
vegetables	[pname: string, soil: soiltype, rain: integer, sun: suntype, expyears: integer]
herbs	[pname: string, soil: soiltype, rain: integer, sun: suntype, expyears: integer, classification: string]
flowers	[pname: string, soil: soiltype, rain: integer, sun: suntype, expyears: integer, classification: string]
annuals_herbs	[pname: string, soil: soiltype, rain: integer, sun: suntype, expyears: integer, classification: string]
perennials_flowers	[pname: string, soil: soiltype, rain: integer, sun: suntype, expyears: integer, classification: string]

Table IV: Probability assignment $\wp$

edge	probability
annuals $\Rightarrow$ plants	0.6
perennials $\Rightarrow$ plants	0.4
vegetables $\Rightarrow$ plants	0.2
herbs $\Rightarrow$ plants	0.3
flowers $\Rightarrow$ plants	0.4
annuals_herbs $\Rightarrow$ annuals	0.4
annuals_herbs $\Rightarrow$ herbs	0.8
perennials_flowers $\Rightarrow$ perennials	0.3
perennials_flowers $\Rightarrow$ flowers	0.3

- $(\mathcal{C}, \Rightarrow)$ is the graph obtained from Figure 1 by contracting the d-nodes to plants and ignoring probabilities.
- me is the partitioning of edges shown in Figure 1.
- $\wp$ is the probability assignment in Table IV.

For example, annuals and annual_herbs are subclasses of plants, and annuals is an immediate subclass of plants while annual_herbs is not; annual_herbs is a subclass of the cluster {annuals, perennials}.

The POB-schemas defined thus far may be inconsistent, i.e. it may not always be possible to find a set of objects that satisfies the taxonomic and probabilistic knowledge expressed by the directed acyclic graph, the partitioning of edges, and the probability assignment. The formal definition of consistency of a POB-schema is given below.

Definition 5.5 (consistent POB-schema) Let $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ be a POB-schema. An *interpretation* of $\mathbf{S}$ is any mapping ε from $\mathcal{C}$ to the set of all finite subsets of a set $\mathcal{O}$. An interpretation ε of $\mathbf{S}$ is called a *taxonomic model* of $\mathbf{S}$ iff:

C1 $\varepsilon(c) \neq \emptyset$, for all classes $c \in \mathcal{C}$.

C2 $\varepsilon(c) \subseteq \varepsilon(d)$, for all classes $c, d \in \mathcal{C}$ with $c \Rightarrow d$.

C3 $\varepsilon(c) \cap \varepsilon(d) = \emptyset$, for all distinct classes $c, d \in \mathcal{C}$ that belong to the same cluster $\mathcal{P} \in \bigcup \mathrm{me}(\mathcal{C})$.

Two classes $c, d \in \mathcal{C}$ are *taxonomically disjoint* (*t-disjoint*) iff $\varepsilon(c) \cap \varepsilon(d) = \emptyset$ for all taxonomic models ε of $\mathbf{S}$. ε is a *taxonomic and probabilistic model* (or simply *model*) of $\mathbf{S}$ iff it is a taxonomic model of $\mathbf{S}$ and it satisfies the condition:

C4 $|\varepsilon(c)| = \wp(c, d) \cdot |\varepsilon(d)|$ for all classes $c, d \in \mathcal{C}$ with $c \Rightarrow d$.

We say $\mathbf{S}$ is *consistent* iff it has a model.

Let us illustrate this definition within the Plant Example.

Example 5.5 (Plant Example: consistent POB-schema) Let $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ be the POB-schema given in Example 5.4. Let $\mathcal{O}$ be a set of cardinality 800, which is partitioned into pairwise disjoint subsets $\mathcal{O}_1, \mathcal{O}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{O}_{10}$ having cardinalities 90, 27, 126, 45, 192, 21, 98, 35, 70, and 96, respectively. An interpretation ε of $\mathbf{S}$ is given in Table V. It is easy to see that ε is also a model of $\mathbf{S}$. For example, $\varepsilon(\mathsf{plants}) \neq \emptyset$, $\varepsilon(\mathsf{annuals}) \subseteq \varepsilon(\mathsf{plants})$, $\varepsilon(\mathsf{annuals}) \cap \varepsilon(\mathsf{perennials}) = \emptyset$, and $|\varepsilon(\mathsf{annuals})| = 0.6 \cdot |\varepsilon(\mathsf{plants})|$. Hence, $\mathbf{S}$ is consistent.

Table V: Interpretation ε of schema $\mathbf{S}$

c	$\varepsilon(c)$	$\lvert\varepsilon(c)\rvert$
plants	$\mathcal{O}_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{O}_{10}$	800
annuals	$\mathcal{O}_1 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{O}_5$	480
perennials	$\mathcal{O}_6 \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{O}_{10}$	320
vegetables	$\mathcal{O}_1 \cup \mathcal{O}_9$	160
herbs	$\mathcal{O}_2 \cup \mathcal{O}_5 \cup \mathcal{O}_6$	240
flowers	$\mathcal{O}_3 \cup \mathcal{O}_7 \cup \mathcal{O}_{10}$	320
annuals_herbs	$\mathcal{O}_5$	192
perennials_flowers	$\mathcal{O}_{10}$	96

It would be nice to have an efficient algorithm for deciding the consistency of a given POB-schema. For this purpose, we need a suitable characterization of consistency. The following condition is a natural candidate.

Definition 5.6 (pseudo-consistent POB-schema) The POB-schema $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ is *pseudo-consistent* iff the following conditions hold:

P1 For any two different classes $c_1, c_2 \in \mathcal{C}$ with $c_1 \Rightarrow^\star c_2$, the product of the edge probabilities is the same on all paths from c_1 up to c_2.

P2 For all clusters $\mathcal{P} \in \bigcup \mathrm{me}(\mathcal{C})$, no two distinct classes $c_1, c_2 \in \mathcal{P}$ have a common subclass.

Example 5.6 (Plant Example: pseudo-consistent POB-schema) It is easy to see that the POB-schema $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ shown in Example 5.4 is pseudo-consistent:

- The two paths from annuals_herbs up to plants and from perennials_flowers up to plants have both 0.24 and 0.12, respectively, as the product of the edge probabilities.
- Neither annuals_herbs nor perennials_flowers is a subclass of two t-disjoint classes.

Indeed, it is straightforward to show that pseudo-consistency is a necessary condition for consistency.

Theorem 5.1 *Every consistent POB-schema is pseudo-consistent.*

However, pseudo-consistency is not a sufficient condition for consistency. Even worse, deciding the consistency of a pseudo-consistent POB-schema is intractable. We have the following result.

Theorem 5.2 *The problem of deciding whether a given POB-schema* $\mathbf{S}$ *is consistent is NP-complete. Hardness holds even if* $\mathbf{S}$ *is pseudo-consistent.*

Proof. The problem is in NP, since it polynomially reduces to the NP-complete problem of deciding whether a weight formula is satisfiable in a measurable probability structure [14]. Notice that the proof of NP-membership of the latter problem heavily relies on results from the theory of linear programming (the main idea is to prove a *small model theorem*, which says that a weight formula is satisfiable in a measurable probability structure iff it is satisfiable in a measurable probability structure of polynomial size, see [14]).

More precisely, *weight formulas* are defined as Boolean combinations of *basic weight formulas*, which are expressions of the form $a_1 \cdot w(\phi_1) + \cdots + a_k \cdot w(\phi_k) \geq a$ with integers $a_1, \ldots, a_k, a$ and propositional formulas $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_k$. A *measurable probability structure* can be identified with a probability function on the finite set of all truth assignments to the primitive propositions, which is extended in a natural way to propositional formulas, basic weight formulas, and weight formulas.

It can now easily be shown that a POB-schema $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ is consistent iff the conjunction of the following weight formulas, which capture C1–C4 in Definition 5.5, is satisfiable:

C1 $\neg((-1) \cdot w(c) \geq 0)$ for all classes $c \in \mathcal{C}$.

C2 $(w(c \wedge \neg d) \geq 0) \wedge ((-1) \cdot w(c \wedge \neg d) \geq 0)$ for all classes $c, d \in \mathcal{C}$ with $c \Rightarrow d$.

C3 $(w(c \wedge d) \geq 0) \wedge ((-1) \cdot w(c \wedge d) \geq 0)$ for all distinct classes $c, d \in \mathcal{C}$ of the same cluster.

C4 $(n \cdot w(c) + (-m) \cdot w(d) \geq 0) \wedge ((-n) \cdot w(c) + m \cdot w(d) \geq 0)$ for all classes $c, d \in \mathcal{C}$ with $c \Rightarrow d$, where m and n are natural numbers such that $\wp(c, d) = \frac{m}{n}$.

The proof of NP-hardness is given in the appendix. □

Nonetheless, polynomial algorithms for deciding the consistency of a POB-schema in relevant special cases may be possible. Well-structured POB-schemas, which we introduce next, enjoy this property.

Definition 5.7 (well-structured POB-schema) The POB-schema $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ is *well-structured* iff the following conditions hold:

W1 There exists a class $c \in \mathcal{C}$ such that every class $d \in \mathcal{C}$ is a subclass of c (i.e., the graph $(\mathcal{C}, \Rightarrow)$ has a *top element*).

W2 For every class $c \in \mathcal{C}$ and distinct $c_1, c_2 \in \mathrm{S}(c)$, the set $S := \mathrm{S}^\star(c_1) \cap \mathrm{S}^\star(c_2)$ is either empty or has a unique element $d_m \neq c_1, c_2$ such that $d \Rightarrow^\star d_m$ for all $d \in S$ (i.e., for every class $c \in \mathcal{C}$, any two distinct immediate subclasses c_1 and c_2 of c either have no common subclass or a greatest common subclass d_m, which is different from them).

W3 For every class $c \in \mathcal{C}$, the undirected graph $G_{\mathbf{S}}(c) = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ that is defined by $\mathcal{V} = \mathrm{me}(c)$ and $\mathcal{E} = \{\{\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2\} \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V} \mid \mathcal{P}_1 \neq \mathcal{P}_2, \bigcup \mathrm{S}^\star(\mathcal{P}_1) \cap \bigcup \mathrm{S}^\star(\mathcal{P}_2) \neq \emptyset\}$ is acyclic (i.e., for every class $c \in \mathcal{C}$, the partition clusters in $\mathrm{me}(c)$ are not cyclically connected through common subclasses. Roughly speaking, multiple inheritance does not cyclically connect partition clusters).

W4 For every class $c \in \mathcal{C}$: if the graph $G_{\mathbf{S}}(c)$ has an edge, i.e., two distinct clusters $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2 \in \mathrm{me}(c)$ have a common subclass, then every path from a subclass of c to the top element of $(\mathcal{C}, \Rightarrow)$ goes through c (i.e., multiple inheritance can be *locally isolated* in the graph $(\mathcal{C}, \Rightarrow)$).

Informally, these conditions restrict multiple inheritance so that a model for the schema $\mathbf{S}$ can be built bottom up from models of subschemas. Specifically, W2 and W3 ensure that a model for a subschema under a class $c \in \mathcal{C}$ can be constructed from models of smaller subschemas that are related to the partition clusters in $\mathrm{me}(c)$. Moreover, W4 and W1 ensure that these local constructions do not influence each other, and that they yield a model for the whole schema $\mathbf{S}$, respectively. We feel that well-structuredness is a reasonable restriction on multiple inheritance[5]. In particular, W1 and W2 can always be satisfied by simply adding missing top elements to certain sets of classes (during the design of a POB-schema, before specifying the probability assignment $\wp$). Let us now reconsider the Plant Example.

Example 5.7 (Plant Example: well-structured POB-schema) The POB-schema $\mathbf{S}$ given in Example 5.4 is well-structured:

- Every class is a subclass of plants.
- The classes annuals_herbs and perennials_flowers are t-disjoint.
- There are no cyclically connected partition clusters.
- The multiple inheritance at the classes annuals_herbs and perennials_flowers is locally isolated under the class plants.

As far as well-structured POB-schemas are concerned, we have the nice result that pseudo-consistency is a necessary and sufficient condition for consistency. However, the proof of this result is highly nontrivial, see the appendix.

Theorem 5.3 *Every pseudo-consistent and well-structured POB-schema* $\mathbf{S}$ *is consistent.*

It is easily seen that any $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ without multiple inheritance, i.e., $|\{d \in \mathcal{C} \mid c \Rightarrow d\}| \leq 1$ for each class $c \in \mathcal{C}$, satisfies W2-W4. We obtain the following corollary to Theorem 5.3.

Corollary 5.4 *Every POB-schema with top element and without multiple inheritance is consistent.*

It now remains to show that pseudo-consistency and well-structuredness of a POB-schema can be decided efficiently. We first first show, via Algorithm 5.2 (which used Algorithm 5.1) how to check pseudo-consistency.

[5]Note that multiple inheritance was considered an optional feature of object-oriented database systems in the "manifesto" [2].

Theorem 5.5 *The problem of deciding whether a given POB-schema* $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ *is pseudo-consistent can be done using Algorithm 5.2 in time* $O(n(e+n))$*, where* $n = |\mathcal{C}|$ *and* e *is the number of directed edges in* $(\mathcal{C}, \Rightarrow)$*.*

Proof. Algorithm 5.2 decides the pseudo-consistency of $\mathbf{S}$. It uses Algorithm 5.1, which computes the reachability relation of the graph $(\mathcal{C}, \Rightarrow)$.

Algorithm 5.1 works as follows. Steps 1–4 initialize the reachability relation. In steps 5–8, for each class c, the set $S(c)$ of all its subclasses, and the number $\delta(c)$ of all its immediate superclasses are computed. Step 9 calculates the set of all classes c with $\delta(c) = 0$. The **while**-loop in 10–20 then computes the reachability relation. In detail, every time step 10 is entered, the product of the edge probabilities is correctly computed along all paths that involve only edges $a \Rightarrow b$ with classes b such that $\delta(b) = 0$ and $b \notin N$. Given this, in 11–18, we take some $c \in N$, and we correctly compute the edge probabilities along all paths $d \Rightarrow c \Rightarrow^\star e$, where $c \Rightarrow^\star e$ involves only edges $a \Rightarrow b$ with classes b such that $\delta(b) = 0$ and $b \notin N$. In step 16, we return *nil* when two distinct products are computed between two classes d and e.

In Algorithm 5.2, we first check in steps 1 and 2 whether the schema $\mathbf{S}$ violates P1. We then check in steps 3–5 whether a class c exists that is a subclass of two distinct classes in the same cluster, that is, whether $\mathbf{S}$ violates P2.

We now show that Algorithm 5.1 runs in time $O(n(e+n))$: The initialization steps 1–4, 5–8, and 9 run in time $O(n^2)$, $O(ne)$, and $O(n)$, respectively. Next, it is easy to see that the **for**-loop in 15–17 is performed as many times as there are edges in $(\mathcal{C}, \Rightarrow)$, and each execution takes $O(n)$ time. Thus, the whole **while**-loop in 10–20 runs in time $O(ne)$.

Hence, also Algorithm 5.2 runs in time $O(n(e+n))$: The steps 1–2 run in time $O(n(e+n))$. The **for**-loop in 4–5 runs in linear time in the input size of me (i.e, in e). Thus, the whole **for**-loop in 3–5 runs in time $O(ne)$. □

We now focus on deciding well-structuredness via Algorithm 5.3.

Theorem 5.6 *The problem of deciding whether a pseudo-consistent POB-schema* $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ *is well-structured can be solved using Algorithm 5.3 in time* $O(n^2 e)$*, where* $n = |\mathcal{C}|$ *and* e *is the number of directed edges in* $(\mathcal{C}, \Rightarrow)$*.*

Proof. Algorithm 5.3 decides the well-structuredness of $\mathbf{S}$. Steps 1–3 check whether $\mathbf{S}$ satisfies W1. In 4–16, it is then checked whether $\mathbf{S}$ satisfies W2. Moreover, the union of all undirected graphs $G_{\mathbf{S}}(c)$ with $c \in \mathcal{C}$ and the set of all classes with multiple inheritance at subclasses are computed. Step 17 checks that all the graphs $G_{\mathbf{S}}(c)$ with $c \in \mathcal{C}$ are acyclic, i.e., that $\mathbf{S}$ satisfies W3. In steps 18–22, it is finally checked whether $\mathbf{S}$ satisfies W4.

We now show that Algorithm 5.3 runs in time $O(n^2 e)$. It is easy to see that steps 1–2, 3, and 4 run in time $O(ne)$, $O(n)$, and $O(n(e+n)) = O(ne)$, respectively (note that W1 ensures $e \geq n - 1$). Step 10 is done one time for each edge in $(\mathcal{C}, \Rightarrow)$ and each class in a set of classes limited by $\mathcal{C}$. The set $\mathcal{D}$ there can be computed in time $O(n)$. The tests in steps 11 and 12 can be done, using a simple algorithm, in time $O(n)$. Hence, steps 5–16 run in time $O(n^2 e)$. In step 17, the number of clusters in $\bigcup \mathrm{me}(\mathcal{C})$ is in the worst case equal to e. Thus, step 17 can be performed in time $O(e)$ using standard algorithms for checking acyclicity. Finally, it is easy to see that steps 18–22 run in time $O(n^2 e)$. □

Algorithm 5.1: reachability(S)

Input: POB-schema $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$.
Output: If $\mathbf{S}$ does not satisfy P1, then *nil* is returned. Otherwise, a mapping $w\colon \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \to [0, 1]$ is returned such that $w(c, d)$ is the product of the edge probabilities on all paths from c up to d if such a path exists and $w(c, d)$ is 0 otherwise.

1. **for each** $c, d \in \mathcal{C}$ **do**
2. **if** $c = d$ **then** $w(c, d) := 1$
3. **else if** $c \Rightarrow d$ **then** $w(c, d) := \wp(c, d)$
4. **else** $w(c, d) := 0$;
5. **for each** $c \in \mathcal{C}$ **do begin**
6. $\mathrm{S}(c) := \{d \in \mathcal{C} \mid d \Rightarrow c\}$;
7. $\delta(c) := |\{d \in \mathcal{C} \mid c \Rightarrow d\}|$
8. **end**;
9. $N := \{c \in \mathcal{C} \mid \delta(c) = 0\}$;
10. **while** $N \neq \emptyset$ **do begin**
11. take any $c \in N$;
12. **for each** $d \in \mathrm{S}(c)$ **do begin**
13. $\delta(d) := \delta(d) - 1$;
14. **if** $\delta(d) = 0$ **then** $N := N \cup \{d\}$;
15. **for each** $e \in \mathcal{C}$ with $w(c, e) > 0$ **do**
16. **if** $w(d, e) > 0$ **and** $w(d, e) \neq w(d, c) \cdot w(c, e)$ **then return** *nil*
17. **else** $w(d, e) := w(d, c) \cdot w(c, e)$
18. **end**;
19. $N := N - \{c\}$;
20. **end**;
21. **return** w.

Figure 3: Algorithm 5.1

Algorithm 5.2: pseudo-consistent(S)

Input: POB-schema $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$.
Output: *true* if $\mathbf{S}$ is pseudo-consistent and *false* otherwise.

1. $w := \mathit{reachability}(\mathbf{S})$;
2. **if** $w = \mathit{nil}$ **then return** *false*; ($\mathbf{S}$ does not satisfy P1)
3. **for each** $c \in \mathcal{C}$ **do**
4. **for each** $\mathcal{P} \in \bigcup \mathrm{me}(\mathcal{C})$ **do**
5. **if** $|\{e \in \mathcal{P} \mid w(c, e) > 0\}| > 1$ **then return** *false*; ($\mathbf{S}$ does not satisfy P2)
6. **return** *true*. ($\mathbf{S}$ is pseudo-consistent)

Figure 4: Algorithm 5.2

Algorithm 5.3: well-structured(S)

Input: Pseudo-consistent POB-schema $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$.
Output: *true* if $\mathbf{S}$ is well-structured and *false* otherwise.
Notation: We use $top(\mathbf{S})$ to denote the top element of $(\mathcal{C}, \Rightarrow)$. For classes $c \in \mathcal{C}$, the expression $\mathbf{S} - c$ denotes the POB-schema that is obtained from $\mathbf{S}$ by removing c. $\max(\mathcal{D})$, where $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, is the set of all maximal members in $\mathcal{D}$ w.r.t. $\Rightarrow^\star$.

1. **for each** $c \in \mathcal{C}$ **do**
2. $\quad \delta(c) := |\{d \in \mathcal{C} \mid c \Rightarrow d\}|$;
3. **if** $|\{c \in \mathcal{C} \mid \delta(c) = 0\}| > 1$ **then return** *false*; ($\mathbf{S}$ does not satisfy W1)
4. $w := reachability(\mathbf{S})$;
5. $\mathcal{E} := \emptyset$;
6. $M := \emptyset$;
7. **for each** $c \in \mathcal{C}$ **do**
8. $\quad$ **for each** distinct $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2 \in \mathrm{me}(c)$ **do**
9. $\quad\quad$ **for each** $(c_1, c_2) \in \mathcal{P}_1 \times \mathcal{P}_2$ **do begin**
10. $\quad\quad\quad \mathcal{D} := \{d \in \mathcal{C} \mid w(d, c_1) > 0$ and $w(d, c_2) > 0\}$;
11. $\quad\quad\quad$ **if** $|\max(\mathcal{D})| > 1$ or $\mathcal{D} \cap \{c_1, c_2\} \neq \emptyset$ **then return** *false* ($\mathbf{S}$ does not satisfy W2)
12. $\quad\quad\quad\quad$ **else if** $|\max(\mathcal{D})| = 1$ **then begin**
13. $\quad\quad\quad\quad\quad \mathcal{E} := \mathcal{E} \cup \{\{\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2\}\}$;
14. $\quad\quad\quad\quad\quad M := M \cup \{c\}$
15. $\quad\quad\quad\quad$ **end**
16. $\quad\quad$ **end**;
17. **if** $(\bigcup \mathrm{me}(\mathcal{C}), \mathcal{E})$ contains a cycle **then return** *false*; ($\mathbf{S}$ does not satisfy W3)
18. **for each** $c \in M$ **do begin**
19. $\quad v := reachability(\mathbf{S} - c)$;
20. $\quad$ **for each** $d \in \mathcal{C}$ with $w(d, c) > 0$ **do**
21. $\quad\quad$ **if** $v(d, top(\mathbf{S})) > 0$ **then return** *false*; ($\mathbf{S}$ does not satisfy W4)
22. **end**;
23. **return** *true*. ($\mathbf{S}$ is well-structured)

Figure 5: Algorithm 5.3

6 Inheritance and Probabilistic Object Base Instances

Thus far, we have not addressed inheritance of attributes that may arise through subclass relationships in a POB-schema $\mathbf{S}$. For example, if c is a subclass of d, and d's type has a top-level attribute A, then class c should inherit this attribute, unless c already has such an attribute. The issue of inheritance has been extensively discussed in the literature, e.g. [5]. We now incorporate inheritance in our framework, and define instances of a POB-schema.

6.1 Inheritance Completion and Fully Inherited Schemas

The main idea behind the inheritance of attributes is that every class should inherit all top-level attributes of all its superclasses. In order to handle cases in which the same attribute is inherited from more than one superclass, we make use of inheritance strategies.

Let us assume that any schema $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ has an associated *inheritance strategy* $\mathsf{inh}_\mathbf{S}$ that determines from which superclass d a class c inherits a top-level attribute A. More formally, let $\mathbf{A}$ denote the set of all top-level attributes of $\mathbf{S}$. For each pair $(c, A) \in \mathcal{C} \times \mathbf{A}$, let c_A be defined as follows:

$$c_A = \{d \in \mathcal{C} \mid c \Rightarrow^\star d,\ A \text{ is a top-level attribute of } \tau(d)\}.$$

We now define $\mathsf{inh}_\mathbf{S} : \mathcal{C} \times \mathbf{A} \to \mathcal{C}$ as a partial mapping that assigns each pair $(c, A) \in \mathcal{C} \times \mathbf{A}$ with $c_A \neq \emptyset$ a minimal element in c_A under the partial order $\Rightarrow^\star$ (the value of $\mathsf{inh}_\mathbf{S}(c, A)$ is undefined if $c_A = \emptyset$). In particular, $\mathsf{inh}_\mathbf{S}(c, A) = c$ if A is a top-level attribute of $\tau(c)$.

This notion of inheritance strategy covers strategies (such as an ordering on classes) that are commonly used to resolve multiple inheritance in practice. Similarly, if we wish to use the strategy of the O_2 system [3] where renamed inheritance of the same attribute with distinct origins is desired, we could generalize $\mathsf{inh}_\mathbf{S}(c, A)$ to return all pairs (d, A') with classes d from which attribute A, renamed to A', is inherited.

Applying $\mathsf{inh}_\mathbf{S}$ on a POB-schema $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ induces another POB-schema $\mathbf{S}^\star = (\mathcal{C}, \tau^\star, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$, which only differs from $\mathbf{S}$ in its type assignment $\tau^\star$. More precisely, for each $c \in \mathcal{C}$, we define $\tau^\star(c) = [A_1 : \tau(d_1).A_1, \ldots, A_k : \tau(d_k).A_k]$, where $A_1, \ldots, A_k$ are the top-level attributes that are inherited by c via $\mathsf{inh}_\mathbf{S}$ from the classes $d_1, \ldots, d_k$, respectively. We call $\mathbf{S}^\star$ the *inheritance completion* of $\mathbf{S}$. A POB-schema $\mathbf{S}$ is *fully inherited* iff $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S}^\star$.

Example 6.1 (Plant Example: probabilistic object base schema) Let us consider the POB-schema $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ for the Plant Example defined in Example 5.4. It is easily checked that for every subclass c of any class d, each top-level attribute of $\tau(d)$ is a top-level attribute of $\tau(c)$, i.e., all attributes in d are already present in c. Thus, no attributes are inherited from proper superclasses, which means that $\mathbf{S}$ is fully inherited. The type assignment τ in $\mathbf{S}$ may be considered ill-designed, however, as it does not reflect natural inheritance relationships.

Consider now the redesigned schema $\mathbf{S}' = (\mathcal{C}, \tau', \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ with the redesigned type assignment τ' shown in Table VI, and adopt an inheritance strategy $\mathsf{inh}_{\mathbf{S}'}$ that resolves multiple inheritance by ordering "left-to-right" in Figure 1, i.e., orders annuals before herbs and perennials before flowers.[6] Then, the original schema $\mathbf{S}$ is given by the inheritance completion of $\mathbf{S}'$.

Table VI: Redesigned type assignment τ'

c	$\tau'(c)$
plants	[pname: string, soil: soiltype, rain: integer]
annuals	[sun: suntype]
perennials	[sun: suntype, expyears: integer]
vegetables	[sun: suntype, expyears: integer]
herbs	[sun: suntype, expyears: integer, classification: string]
flowers	[sun: suntype, expyears: integer, classification: string]
annuals_herbs	[]
perennials_flowers	[]

[6] No renaming is assumed here for the same attribute with distinct origins.

In the rest of this paper, we implicitly assume that all POB-schemas $\mathbf{S}$ are consistent (see Definition 5.5), and that they are all fully inherited. In particular, POB-instances in the next subsection, and operations in our POB-Algebra in Section 7 are defined with respect to fully inherited POB-schemas. Note that these definitions can easily be extended to POB-schemas $\mathbf{S}$ that are not fully inherited.

6.2 Probabilistic Object Base Instance

We are now ready to define a probabilistic object base instance (POB-instance). The following assumption is common in object-oriented databases [25].

Assumption. In the rest of this paper, we assume that there is a (countably) infinite set $\mathcal{O}$ of *object identifiers* (*oids*).

Each object, represented by an oid, is associated with a value. The objects populate a POB-instance as follows.

Definition 6.1 (probabilistic object base instance) Let $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ be a consistent POB-schema. A *probabilistic object base instance (POB-instance)* over $\mathbf{S}$ is a pair (π, ν), where:

- $\pi : \mathcal{C} \to 2^{\mathcal{O}}$ maps each class c to a finite subset of $\mathcal{O}$, such that $\pi(c_1) \cap \pi(c_2) = \emptyset$ for different $c_1, c_2 \in \mathcal{C}$. That is, the classes in $\mathcal{C}$ are mapped to pairwise disjoint sets of oids. We use $\pi(\mathcal{C})$ to abbreviate $\bigcup\{\pi(c) \mid c \in \mathcal{C}\}$. We define the mapping $\pi^\star : \mathcal{C} \to 2^{\mathcal{O}}$ by $\pi^\star(c) = \bigcup\{\pi(c') \mid c' \in \mathcal{C}, c' \Rightarrow^\star c\}$.

  Intuitively, $\pi(c)$ denotes the ids of all objects that are *defined in* the class c, while $\pi^\star(c)$ denotes the ids of all objects that *belong to* the class c (i.e., that are defined in c or in one of its proper subclasses).

- ν maps each oid $o \in \pi(\mathcal{C})$ to a probabilistic tuple value of the appropriate type, i.e., type $\tau(c)$ for the class c such that $o \in \pi(c)$.

Let us provide a POB-instance for the POB-schema of Example 5.4.

Example 6.2 (Plant Example: probabilistic object base instance) A POB-instance over the POB-schema shown in Example 5.4 is given as follows:

- π and $\pi^\star$ are the mappings shown in Table VII. Clearly, this is a very simple probabilistic object base (it contains only seven distinct objects).

- ν is the mapping shown in Table VIII.

In classical object bases, the extent of a class c consists of all oids belonging to c. The probabilistic extent of c specifies the probability that an oid belongs to c.

Definition 6.2 (probabilistic extent) Let $\mathbf{I} = (\pi, \nu)$ be a POB-instance over the consistent POB-schema $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$. For all classes $c \in \mathcal{C}$, the *probabilistic extent* of c, denoted $\mathrm{ext(c)}$, maps each oid $o \in \pi(\mathcal{C})$ to a *set* of rational numbers in $[0, 1]$ as follows:

1. If $o \in \pi^\star(c)$, then $\mathrm{ext(c)}(o) = \{1\}$.

2. If $o \in \pi^\star(c')$ with a class $c' \in \mathcal{C}$ that is t-disjoint from c (i.e., for all models ε of $\mathbf{S}$, the sets $\varepsilon(c')$ and $\varepsilon(c)$ are disjoint), then $\mathrm{ext(c)}(o) = \{0\}$.

Table VII: Mappings π and $\pi^\star$

c	$\pi(c)$	$\pi^\star(c)$
plants	$\{o_1\}$	$\{o_1, o_2, o_3, o_4, o_5, o_6, o_7\}$
annuals	$\{\}$	$\{o_2, o_3, o_5, o_6, o_7\}$
perennials	$\{\}$	$\{o_4\}$
vegetables	$\{\}$	$\{\}$
herbs	$\{\}$	$\{o_2, o_3, o_5, o_6, o_7\}$
flowers	$\{\}$	$\{o_4\}$
annuals_herbs	$\{o_2, o_3, o_5, o_6, o_7\}$	$\{o_2, o_3, o_5, o_6, o_7\}$
perennials_flowers	$\{o_4\}$	$\{o_4\}$

Table VIII: Value assignment ν

oid	$\nu(oid)$
o_1	[pname: $\langle\{\text{Lady-Fern, Ostrich-Fern}\}, \text{u}, \text{u}\rangle$, soil: $\langle\{\text{loamy}\}, \text{u}, \text{u}\rangle$, rain: $\langle\{25, \ldots, 30\}, \text{u}, \text{u}\rangle$]
o_2	[pname: $\langle\{\text{Cuban-Basil, Lemon-Basil}\}, \text{u}, \text{u}\rangle$, soil: $\langle\{\text{loamy, sandy}\}, 0.7\,\text{u}, 1.3\,\text{u}\rangle$, rain: $\langle\{20, \ldots, 30\}, \text{u}, \text{u}\rangle$, sun: $\langle\{\text{mild, medium}\}, 0.8\,\text{u}, 1.2\,\text{u}\rangle$, expyears: $\langle\{2, 3, 4\}, 0.6\,\text{u}, 1.8\,\text{u}\rangle$, classification: $\langle\{\text{french, silver, wooly}\}, 0.6\,\text{u}, 1.8\,\text{u}\rangle$]
o_3	[pname: $\langle\{\text{Mint}\}, \text{u}, \text{u}\rangle$, soil: $\langle\{\text{loamy}\}, \text{u}, \text{u}\rangle$, rain: $\langle\{20\}, \text{u}, \text{u}\rangle$, sun: $\langle\{\text{mild}\}, \text{u}, \text{u}\rangle$, expyears: $\langle\{2, 3, 4\}, 0.6\,\text{u}, 1.8\,\text{u}\rangle$, classification: $\langle\{\text{french, silver, wooly}\}, 0.6\,\text{u}, 1.8\,\text{u}\rangle$]
o_4	[pname: $\langle\{\text{Aster, Salvia}\}, \text{u}, \text{u}\rangle$, soil: $\langle\{\text{loamy, sandy}\}, 0.6\,\text{u}, 1.4\,\text{u}\rangle$, rain: $\langle\{20, \ldots, 25\}, \text{u}, \text{u}\rangle$, sun: $\langle\{\text{mild}\}, \text{u}, \text{u}\rangle$, expyears: $\langle\{2, 3, 4\}, 0.6\,\text{u}, 1.8\,\text{u}\rangle$, classification: $\langle\{\text{french, silver, wooly}\}, 0.6\,\text{u}, 1.8\,\text{u}\rangle$]
o_5	[pname: $\langle\{\text{Thyme}\}, \text{u}, \text{u}\rangle$, soil: $\langle\{\text{loamy}\}, \text{u}, \text{u}\rangle$, rain: $\langle\{20, \ldots, 25\}, \text{u}, \text{u}\rangle$, sun: $\langle\{\text{mild, medium}\}, 0.8\,\text{u}, 1.2\,\text{u}\rangle$, expyears: $\langle\{2, 3\}, 0.8\,\text{u}, 1.2\,\text{u}\rangle$, classification: $\langle\{\text{french, silver, wooly}\}, 0.6\,\text{u}, 1.8\,\text{u}\rangle$]
o_6	[pname: $\langle\{\text{Mint}\}, \text{u}, \text{u}\rangle$, soil: $\langle\{\text{loamy}\}, \text{u}, \text{u}\rangle$, rain: $\langle\{20\}, \text{u}, \text{u}\rangle$, sun: $\langle\{\text{mild}\}, \text{u}, \text{u}\rangle$, expyears: $\langle\{2, 3, 4\}, 0.6\,\text{u}, 1.8\,\text{u}\rangle$, classification: $\langle\{\text{apple, curly}\}, 0.6\,\text{u}, 1.4\,\text{u}\rangle$]
o_7	[pname: $\langle\{\text{Sage}\}, \text{u}, \text{u}\rangle$, soil: $\langle\{\text{sandy}\}, \text{u}, \text{u}\rangle$, rain: $\langle\{20, 21\}, \text{u}, \text{u}\rangle$, sun: $\langle\{\text{mild}\}, \text{u}, \text{u}\rangle$, expyears: $\langle\{2, 3, 4\}, 0.6\,\text{u}, 1.8\,\text{u}\rangle$, classification: $\langle\{\text{red, tricolor}\}, 0.6\,\text{u}, 1.4\,\text{u}\rangle$]

3. Otherwise, $\mathrm{ext(c)}(o) = \{p \mid p$ is the product of the edge probabilities on a path from c up to a class $c' \in \mathcal{C}$, where c' is minimal with $o \in \pi^\star(c')$ and $c \Rightarrow^\star c'\}$.

We return to the Plant Example to see what the extents of the various classes are.

Example 6.3 (Plant Example: probabilistic extent) In the Plant Example, the probabilistic extents of annuals_herbs and perennials_flowers are given as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{ext}(\mathsf{annuals_herbs})(o_1) = \{0.24\} & \mathrm{ext}(\mathsf{perennials_flowers})(o_1) = \{0.12\} \\
\mathrm{ext}(\mathsf{annuals_herbs})(o_2) = \{1\} & \mathrm{ext}(\mathsf{perennials_flowers})(o_2) = \{0\} \\
\mathrm{ext}(\mathsf{annuals_herbs})(o_3) = \{1\} & \mathrm{ext}(\mathsf{perennials_flowers})(o_3) = \{0\} \\
\mathrm{ext}(\mathsf{annuals_herbs})(o_4) = \{0\} & \mathrm{ext}(\mathsf{perennials_flowers})(o_4) = \{1\} \\
\mathrm{ext}(\mathsf{annuals_herbs})(o_5) = \{1\} & \mathrm{ext}(\mathsf{perennials_flowers})(o_5) = \{0\} \\
\mathrm{ext}(\mathsf{annuals_herbs})(o_6) = \{1\} & \mathrm{ext}(\mathsf{perennials_flowers})(o_6) = \{0\} \\
\mathrm{ext}(\mathsf{annuals_herbs})(o_7) = \{1\} & \mathrm{ext}(\mathsf{perennials_flowers})(o_7) = \{0\}
\end{array}$$

Definition 6.3 (coherent POB-instance) Let $\mathbf{I} = (\pi, \nu)$ be a POB-instance over the consistent POB-schema $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$. The POB-instance $\mathbf{I}$ is *coherent* iff for all classes $c \in \mathcal{C}$ and all objects $o \in \pi(\mathcal{C})$, the probabilistic extent $\mathrm{ext(c)}(o)$ contains *at most* one element.

It is easy to see that the Plant Example described thus far is coherent and that testing coherence of a given POB-instance $\mathbf{I}$ of a consistent schema $\mathbf{S}$ can be done in polynomial time.

7 Probabilistic Object Bases: Algebraic Operations

In this section, we formally define the analogs of the classical relational operations on POBs. All standard operations on POBs take POB-instances as input, and produce POB-instances as output. Recall that all POB-schemas of input POB-instances are implicitly assumed to be consistent and fully inherited.

The probability computations in our POB-algebra are based on probabilistic combination strategies. As shown in [12], all common probabilistic combination strategies can be computed in a constant number of operations from the input intervals. Thus, under these strategies, the probability computations in our POB-algebra are all tractable, and it is easy to see that our algebraic operations are all computable in polynomial time in the size of the input POB-instances.

7.1 Selection

Intuitively, given a POB-instance $\mathbf{I}$ over the POB-schema $\mathbf{S}$, the result of a selection operation is another POB-instance $\mathbf{I}'$ over $\mathbf{S}$ such that the objects in the extents of the classes in $\mathbf{I}'$ all satisfy the selection condition of the query. Before describing the selection operation, we formally define the syntax and the semantics of selection conditions. We start by defining the syntax of path expressions and selection expressions.

Definition 7.1 (path expression) Let $\tau = [A_1 \colon \tau_1, \ldots, A_k \colon \tau_k]$ be any type. We define *path expressions* by induction as follows: (i) every A_i is a path expression for τ, and (ii) if P_i is a path expression for τ_i, then $A_i.P_i$ is a path expression for τ, for every $i = 1, \ldots, k$.

We use the Plant Example to demonstrate some path expressions.

Example 7.1 (Plant Example: path expression) In the Plant Example, two path expressions for the type [pname: string, size: [height: integer, width: integer]] are given by pname and size.height.

We now define the syntax of atomic selection expressions.

Definition 7.2 (atomic selection expression) Let $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ be a POB-schema and let $\mathcal{X}$ be a set of *object variables*. An *atomic selection expression* has one of the following forms:

- $x \in c$, where x is an object variable from $\mathcal{X}$, and c is a class from $\mathcal{C}$.
- $x.P\ \theta\ v$, where x is an object variable from $\mathcal{X}$, P is a path expression over attributes from $\mathcal{A}$, θ is a binary predicate from $\{=, \neq, \leq, \geq, <, >, \subseteq, \supseteq, \in, \ni\}$, and v is a value.
- $x.P_1 =_{\otimes} x.P_2$, where x is an object variable from $\mathcal{X}$, P_1 and P_2 are two distinct path expressions over attributes from $\mathcal{A}$, and $\otimes$ is a probabilistic conjunction strategy.

Let us consider some examples of atomic selection expressions.

Example 7.2 (Plant Example: atomic selection expression) In the Plant Example, some atomic selection expressions are as follows (x is an object variable):

- Find all objects *that are annuals and herbs.* This selection can be represented by the atomic selection expression $x \in \mathsf{annuals_herbs}$.
- Find all objects *that require a mild sun.* This selection can be represented by the atomic selection expression $x.\mathsf{sun} = \mathsf{mild}$.
- Find all objects *that require over 21 units of rain.* This selection can be represented by the atomic selection expression $x.\mathsf{rain} > 21$.

We now define the syntax of selection expressions.

Definition 7.3 (selection expression) Let $\mathbf{S}$ be a POB-schema. We define *conjunctive* and *disjunctive selection expressions* by induction as follows:

If ϕ is an atomic selection expression and $\otimes$ is a probabilistic conjunction strategy, then ϕ is a conjunctive selection expression over $\otimes$. If ϕ and ψ are conjunctive selection expressions over the same object variable and the same probabilistic conjunction strategy $\otimes$, then $\phi \otimes \psi$ is a conjunctive selection expression over $\otimes$.

If ϕ is an atomic selection expression and $\oplus$ is a probabilistic disjunction strategy, then ϕ is a disjunctive selection expression over $\oplus$. If ϕ and ψ are disjunctive selection expressions over the same object variable and the same probabilistic disjunction strategy $\oplus$, then $\phi \oplus \psi$ is a disjunctive selection expression over $\oplus$.

A *selection expression* is a conjunctive or disjunctive selection expression.

Let us illustrate this definition via the Plant Example.

Example 7.3 (Plant Example: selection expression) In the Plant Example, some selection expressions are given as follows (x is an object variable):

- The atomic selection expressions $x \in \mathsf{annuals_herbs}$, $x.\mathsf{sun} = \mathsf{mild}$, and $x.\mathsf{rain} > 21$ given in Example 7.2 are selection expressions.
- Find all objects *that are annuals and herbs and that require a mild sun.* This selection can be represented by the selection expression $x \in \mathsf{annuals_herbs} \otimes x.\mathsf{sun} = \mathsf{mild}$, where $\otimes$ is a probabilistic conjunction strategy.
- Find all objects *that require a mild sun or over 21 units of rain.* This selection can be represented by the selection expression $x.\mathsf{sun} = \mathsf{mild} \oplus x.\mathsf{rain} > 21$, where $\oplus$ is a probabilistic disjunction strategy.

We are now ready to define the syntax of selection conditions.

Definition 7.4 (selection condition) Let $\mathbf{S}$ be a POB-schema. (i) If ϕ is a selection expression and L and U are real numbers from $[0, 1]$ with $L \leq U$, then $(\phi)[L, U]$ is a selection condition. (ii) If α and β are selection conditions *over the same object variable*, then $\neg\alpha$, $(\alpha \wedge \beta)$, and $(\alpha \vee \beta)$ are selection conditions.

Let us consider some examples of selection conditions.

Example 7.4 (Plant Example: selection condition) In the Plant Example, some selection conditions are given as follows (x is an object variable):

- The selection of all objects *that require both a mild sun and over 21 units of rain with a probability of 30–50%*, can be done by using the selection condition

$$(x.\mathsf{sun} = \mathsf{mild} \otimes\ x.\mathsf{rain} > 21)[0.3, 0.5]\,,$$

  where $\otimes$ is a probabilistic conjunction strategy.
- The selection of all objects *that require a mild sun with a probability of at least 40%,* and *over 21 units of rain with a probability of at least 80%,* can be done by using the following selection condition:

$$(x.\mathsf{sun} = \mathsf{mild})[0.4, 1] \wedge (x.\mathsf{rain} > 21)[0.8, 1]\,.$$

- The selection of all objects *that do not require a mild sun with a probability of at least 40%* can be done by using the following selection condition:

$$\neg(x.\mathsf{sun} = \mathsf{mild})[0.4, 1]\,.$$

Note that a selection expression and a selection condition can contain exactly one object variable.

It now remains to define the semantics of selection expressions and selection conditions. For this purpose, each triple $(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{I}, o)$ consisting of a POB-schema $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$, a POB-instance $\mathbf{I} = (\pi, \nu)$ over $\mathbf{S}$, and an oid $o \in \pi(\mathcal{C})$ in $\mathbf{I}$ is associated with a probabilistic interpretation $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o}$, which assigns a probability interval to selection expressions, and a truth value to selection conditions. We first interpret path expressions and selection expressions.

Definition 7.5 (interpretation of path expressions) Suppose we are given a tuple type $\tau = [A_1 : \tau_1, \ldots, A_k : \tau_k]$. The *interpretation* of a path expression P for τ under a value $v = [A_1 : v_1, \ldots, A_k : v_k]$ of type τ, denoted $v.P$, is inductively defined by $v.A_i = v_i$ and $v.A_i.P_i = v_i.P_i$, for every $i = 1, \ldots, k$.

The following example shows how path expressions are interpreted.

Example 7.5 (Plant Example: interpretation of path expressions) In the Plant Example, the interpretation of the path expressions pname and size.height under the value [pname: Thyme, size: [height: 4, width: 12]] is given by the values Thyme and 4, respectively.

We next assign probabilistic intervals to atomic selection expressions:

Definition 7.6 (interpretation of atomic selection expressions) Assume we are given a POB-instance $\mathbf{I} = (\pi, \nu)$ over the POB-schema $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$, and let $o \in \pi(\mathcal{C})$. The *probabilistic interpretation* with respect to $\mathbf{S}$, $\mathbf{I}$, and o, denoted $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o}$, is the partial mapping from all atomic selection expressions to the set of all subintervals of $[0, 1]$ that is defined as follows:

- $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o}(x \in c) = [\min(\mathrm{ext(c)}(o)), \max(\mathrm{ext(c)}(o))]$. Intuitively, $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o}(x \in c)$ describes the interval for the probability that the object o belongs to the class c.
- If $\nu(o).A = \langle V, \alpha, \beta \rangle$, and $P = AP'$ is a path expression for the type of o, where P' is either empty or of the form $.P''$, then:

$$\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o}(x.P\,\theta\,v) = \begin{cases} [\sum_{u \in W} \alpha(u),\ \min(1, \sum_{u \in W} \beta(u))], & \text{if } W \neq \emptyset; \\ [0, 0], & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

  where $W = \{u \in V \mid uP'\,\theta\,v\}$. Note that $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o}(x.P\,\theta\,v)$ is undefined[7], if P is undefined for $\nu(o)$, or if $uP'\,\theta\,v$ is undefined for some $u \in V$. Intuitively, $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o}(x.AP'\,\theta\,v)$ describes the interval for the probability that the object o has a value u in attribute A such that $uP'\,\theta\,v$.
- If $\nu(o).A_i = \langle V_i, \alpha_i, \beta_i \rangle$, and $P_i = A_i P_i{}'$ is a path expression for the type of o, where $P_i{}'$ is either empty or of the form $.P_i{}''$, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, then:

$$\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o}(x.P_1 =_{\otimes} x.P_2) = \begin{cases} [\sum_{u \in W} \alpha(u),\ \min(1, \sum_{u \in W} \beta(u))], & \text{if } W \neq \emptyset; \\ [0, 0], & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

  where $W = \{(u_1, u_2) \in V_1 \times V_2 \mid u_1 P_1{}' = u_2 P_2{}'\}$, and

$$[\alpha(u), \beta(u)] = [\alpha_1(u_1), \beta_1(u_1)] \otimes [\alpha_2(u_2), \beta_2(u_2)] \text{ for all } u = (u_1, u_2) \in W.$$

  Note that $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o}(x.P_1 =_{\otimes} x.P_2)$ is undefined[5], if P_1 or P_2 is undefined for $\nu(o)$. Intuitively, $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o}(x.A_1 P_1{}' =_{\otimes} x.A_2 P_2{}')$ describes the interval for the probability that the object o has a value u_1 in attribute A_1 *and* a value u_2 in attribute A_2 such that $u_1 P_1{}' = u_2 P_2{}'$. The selected conjunction strategy $\otimes$ reflects the dependencies between the two attributes A_1 and A_2.

Let us give an example to illustrate this definition.

Example 7.6 (interpretation of atomic selection expressions) In the Plant Example, the probabilistic interpretations $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o}$ with $o \in \{o_1, o_2, \ldots, o_7\}$ map the atomic selection expressions $x \in$ annuals_herbs, $x.\mathsf{sun} = \mathsf{mild}$, and $x.\mathsf{rain} > 21$ to the subintervals of $[0, 1]$ shown in Table IX.

[7] As a consequence, two selections on $\mathbf{I}$ with respect to logically equivalent selection conditions ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 generally produce the same result only when $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o}$ is defined for every atomic selection expression in ϕ_1 and ϕ_2, and every object o in $\mathbf{I}$.

Table IX: Interpretation of atomic selection expressions

o	$\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o}(x \in \mathsf{annuals_herbs})$	$\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o}(x.\mathsf{sun} = \mathsf{mild})$	$\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o}(x.\mathsf{rain} > 21)$
o_1	$[0.24, 0.24]$	undefined	$[1.00, 1.00]$
o_2	$[1.00, 1.00]$	$[0.40, 0.60]$	$[0.82, 0.82]$
o_3	$[1.00, 1.00]$	$[1.00, 1.00]$	$[0.00, 0.00]$
o_4	$[0.00, 0.00]$	$[1.00, 1.00]$	$[0.67, 0.67]$
o_5	$[1.00, 1.00]$	$[0.40, 0.60]$	$[0.67, 0.67]$
o_6	$[1.00, 1.00]$	$[1.00, 1.00]$	$[0.00, 0.00]$
o_7	$[1.00, 1.00]$	$[1.00, 1.00]$	$[0.00, 0.00]$

We now assign probabilistic intervals to selection expressions:

Definition 7.7 (interpretation of selection expressions) Let $\mathbf{I} = (\pi, \nu)$ be a POB-instance over the POB-schema $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ and let $o \in \pi(\mathcal{C})$. We extend $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o}$ to a partial mapping from the set of all selection expressions to the set of all closed subintervals of [0,1] as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o}(\phi \otimes \psi) &= \mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o}(\phi) \otimes \mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o}(\psi). \\ \mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o}(\phi \oplus \psi) &= \mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o}(\phi) \oplus \mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o}(\psi). \end{aligned}$$

Let us illustrate this definition via the Plant Example.

Example 7.7 (Plant Example: interpretation of selection expressions) In the Plant Example, the two selection expressions ϕ_{st} = "$x \in \mathsf{annuals_herbs} \otimes_{st} x.\mathsf{sun} = \mathsf{mild}$" and ψ_{st} = "$x.\mathsf{sun} = \mathsf{mild} \otimes_{st} x.\mathsf{rain} > 21$" are assigned the subintervals of $[0, 1]$ shown in Table X.

Table X: Interpretation of selection expressions

o	$\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o}(\phi_{in})$	$\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o}(\phi_{ig})$	$\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o}(\psi_{in})$	$\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o}(\psi_{ig})$
o_1	undefined	undefined	undefined	undefined
o_2	$[0.40, 0.60]$	$[0.40, 0.60]$	$[0.33, 0.49]$	$[0.22, 0.60]$
o_3	$[1.00, 1.00]$	$[1.00, 1.00]$	$[0.00, 0.00]$	$[0.00, 0.00]$
o_4	$[0.00, 0.00]$	$[0.00, 0.00]$	$[0.67, 0.67]$	$[0.67, 0.67]$
o_5	$[0.40, 0.60]$	$[0.40, 0.60]$	$[0.27, 0.40]$	$[0.07, 0.60]$
o_6	$[1.00, 1.00]$	$[1.00, 1.00]$	$[0.00, 0.00]$	$[0.00, 0.00]$
o_7	$[1.00, 1.00]$	$[1.00, 1.00]$	$[0.00, 0.00]$	$[0.00, 0.00]$

We are now ready to assign truth values to selection conditions:

Definition 7.8 (satisfaction of selection conditions) Let $\mathbf{I} = (\pi, \nu)$ be a POB-instance over the POB-schema $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ and let $o \in \pi(\mathcal{C})$. We extend $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o}$ to selection conditions as follows:

- $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o} \models (\phi)[L, U]$ iff $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o}(\phi) \subseteq [L, U]$.
- $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o} \models \neg\phi$ iff it is not the case that $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o} \models \phi$.
- $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o} \models \phi \wedge \psi$ iff $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o} \models \phi$ and $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o} \models \psi$.
- $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o} \models \phi \vee \psi$ iff $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o} \models \phi$ or $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o} \models \psi$.

Let us give an illustrating example.

Example 7.8 (Plant Example: satisfaction of selection conditions) In the Plant Example, we have:

- $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o_2} \models (x.\mathsf{sun} = \mathsf{mild} \otimes_{in} x.\mathsf{rain} > 21)[0.3, 0.5]$ (see Example 7.7).
- $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o_2} \not\models (x.\mathsf{sun} = \mathsf{mild} \otimes_{ig} x.\mathsf{rain} > 21)[0.3, 0.5]$ (see Example 7.7).
- $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o_2} \models (x.\mathsf{sun} = \mathsf{mild})[0.4, 1] \wedge (x.\mathsf{rain} > 21)[0.8, 1]$ (see Example 7.6).
- $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o_3} \not\models (x.\mathsf{sun} = \mathsf{mild})[0.4, 1] \wedge (x.\mathsf{rain} > 21)[0.8, 1]$ (see Example 7.6).

We are now finally ready to define the selection operation.

Definition 7.9 (selection on POB-instances) Let $\mathbf{I} = (\pi, \nu)$ be a POB-instance over the POB-schema $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ and let ϕ be a selection condition over the object variable x. The *selection on* $\mathbf{I}$ *with respect to* ϕ, denoted $\sigma_\phi(\mathbf{I})$, is the POB-instance (π', ν') over $\mathbf{S}$, where:

- $\pi'(c) = \{o \in \pi(c) \mid \mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o} \models \phi\}$.
- $\nu' = \nu \mid \pi'(\mathcal{C})$ (i.e., the mapping ν restricted to $\pi'(\mathcal{C})$).

The following example shows precisely what happens in the Plant Example when we perform selection with respect to selection conditions.

Example 7.9 (Plant Example: selection) In the Plant Example, the selection on $\mathbf{I} = (\pi, \nu)$ with respect to the selection condition

$$(x.\mathsf{sun} = \mathsf{mild})[0.4, 1] \wedge (x.\mathsf{rain} > 21)[0.8, 1]$$

is the POB-instance (π', ν') over $\mathbf{S}$ (see Example 7.6), where π' and ν' are shown in Tables XI and XII, respectively. This result is also obtained by the selection on $\mathbf{I}$ with respect to $(x.\mathsf{sun} = \mathsf{mild} \otimes_{in} x.\mathsf{rain} > 21)[0.3, 0.5]$ (see Example 7.7).

The selection on $\mathbf{I}$ with respect to $(x.\mathsf{sun} = \mathsf{mild} \otimes_{ig} x.\mathsf{rain} > 21)[0.3, 0.5]$, in contrast, produces the empty POB-instance over $\mathbf{S}$ (see Example 7.7).

7.2 Projection and Renaming

In this section, we define the projection of POB-instances on arbitrary sets of attributes, and the renaming of (top-level) attributes in POB-instances. We start by defining projection on POB-instances. We first define the projection of POB-schemas on sets of attributes.

Definition 7.10 (projection of POB-schemas) Let $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ be a POB-schema and let $\mathbf{A}$ be a set of attributes. The *projection of* $\mathbf{S}$ *on* $\mathbf{A}$, denoted $\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{S})$, is the POB-schema $(\mathcal{C}, \tau', \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$, where the new type $\tau'(c)$ of each class $c \in \mathcal{C}$ is obtained from the old type $\tau(c) = [B_1 \colon \tau_1, \ldots, B_k \colon \tau_k]$ by deleting all $B_j \colon \tau_j$'s with $B_j \notin \mathbf{A}$.

Let us consider an example to illustrate the projection of POB-schemas.

Table XI: π' resulting from selection

c	$\pi'(c)$
plants	$\{\}$
annuals	$\{\}$
perennials	$\{\}$
vegetables	$\{\}$
herbs	$\{\}$
flowers	$\{\}$
annuals_herbs	$\{o_2\}$
perennials_flowers	$\{\}$

Table XII: ν' resulting from selection

oid	$\nu'(oid)$
o_2	[pname: $\langle\{$Cuban-Basil, Lemon-Basil$\}$, u, u$\rangle$, soil: $\langle\{$loamy, sandy$\}, 0.7\,\mathrm{u}, 1.3\,\mathrm{u}\rangle$, rain: $\langle\{20,\ldots,30\}$, u, u$\rangle$, sun: $\langle\{$mild, medium$\}, 0.8\,\mathrm{u}, 1.2\,\mathrm{u}\rangle$, expyears: $\langle\{2,3,4\}, 0.6\,\mathrm{u}, 1.8\,\mathrm{u}\rangle$, classification: $\langle\{$french, silver, wooly$\}, 0.6\,\mathrm{u}, 1.8\,\mathrm{u}\rangle$]

Example 7.10 (Plant Example: projection of POB-schemas) Consider the POB-schema $\mathbf{S}$ described in Example 5.4. Then, the projection of $\mathbf{S}$ on the set of attributes $\mathbf{A} = \{\mathsf{pname}, \mathsf{rain}\}$ has the type assignment τ' shown in Table XIII.

We next define the projection of probabilistic tuple values.

Definition 7.11 (projection of probabilistic tuple values) Let ptv be a probabilistic tuple value of the form $[B_1 : (V_1, \alpha_1, \beta_1), \ldots, B_k : (V_k, \alpha_k, \beta_k)]$ and let $\mathbf{A}$ be a set of attributes. The *projection* of ptv on $\mathbf{A}$, denoted $\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(ptv)$, is obtained from $[B_1 : (V_1, \alpha_1, \beta_1), \ldots, B_k : (V_k, \alpha_k, \beta_k)]$ by deleting all $B_j : (V_j, \alpha_j, \beta_j)$'s with $B_j \notin \mathbf{A}$.

We give a small example to illustrate the projection of probabilistic tuple values.

Example 7.11 (Plant Example: projection of probabilistic tuple values) Let the probabilistic tuple value ptv be given as follows (note that ptv is associated with the object o_2 in Example 6.2):

$$
\begin{aligned}
ptv = [\ & \mathsf{pname}: \langle\{\text{Cuban-Basil, Lemon-Basil}\}, \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{u}\rangle,\\
& \mathsf{soil}: \langle\{\text{loamy, sandy}\}, 0.7\,\mathrm{u}, 1.3\,\mathrm{u}\rangle,\\
& \mathsf{rain}: \langle\{20,\ldots,30\}, \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{u}\rangle,\\
& \mathsf{sun}: \langle\{\text{mild, medium}\}, 0.8\,\mathrm{u}, 1.2\,\mathrm{u}\rangle,\\
& \mathsf{expyears}: \langle\{2,3,4\}, 0.6\,\mathrm{u}, 1.8\,\mathrm{u}\rangle,\\
& \mathsf{classification}: \langle\{\text{french, silver, wooly}\}, 0.6\,\mathrm{u}, 1.8\,\mathrm{u}\rangle]\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

The projection of ptv on the set of attributes $\mathbf{A} = \{\mathsf{pname}, \mathsf{rain}\}$ is given as follows:

$$
\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(ptv) \ = \ [\mathsf{pname}: \langle\{\text{Cuban-Basil, Lemon-Basil}\}, \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{u}\rangle,\ \mathsf{rain}: \langle\{20,\ldots,30\}, \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{u}\rangle]\,.
$$

Table XIII: τ' resulting from projection

c	$\tau'(c)$
plants	[pname: string, rain: integer]
annuals	[pname: string, rain: integer]
perennials	[pname: string, rain: integer]
vegetables	[pname: string, rain: integer]
herbs	[pname: string, rain: integer]
flowers	[pname: string, rain: integer]
annuals_herbs	[pname: string, rain: integer]
perennials_flowers	[pname: string, rain: integer]

We are now ready to define projection of POB-instances.

Definition 7.12 (projection of POB-instances) Let $\mathbf{I} = (\pi, \nu)$ be a POB-instance over the POB-schema $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ and let $\mathbf{A}$ be a set of attributes. The *projection of* $\mathbf{I}$ *on* $\mathbf{A}$, denoted $\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{I})$, is defined as the POB-instance (π', ν') over the POB-schema $\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{S})$, where:

- $\pi'(c) = \pi(c)$ for all classes $c \in \mathcal{C}$.
- $\nu'(o) = \Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\nu(o))$ for all oids $o \in \pi(\mathcal{C})$.

Let us illustrate this definition within the Plant Example.

Example 7.12 (Plant Example: projection of POB-instances) Consider the POB-instance $\mathbf{I} = (\pi, \nu)$ described in Example 6.2. The projection of $\mathbf{I}$ on $\mathbf{A} = \{\mathsf{pname}, \mathsf{rain}\}$ is the POB-instance (π', ν'), where π' is the same as π, and ν' is given in Table XIV.

Table XIV: ν' resulting from projection

oid	$\nu'(oid)$
o_1	[pname: $\langle\{\mathsf{Lady\text{-}Fern}, \mathsf{Ostrich\text{-}Fern}\}, \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{u}\rangle$, rain: $\langle\{25, \ldots, 30\}, \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{u}\rangle$]
o_2	[pname: $\langle\{\mathsf{Cuban\text{-}Basil}, \mathsf{Lemon\text{-}Basil}\}, \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{u}\rangle$, rain: $\langle\{20, \ldots, 30\}, \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{u}\rangle$]
o_3	[pname: $\langle\{\mathsf{Mint}\}, \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{u}\rangle$, rain: $\langle\{20\}, \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{u}\rangle$]
o_4	[pname: $\langle\{\mathsf{Aster}, \mathsf{Salvia}\}, \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{u}\rangle$, rain: $\langle\{20, \ldots, 25\}, \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{u}\rangle$]
o_5	[pname: $\langle\{\mathsf{Thyme}\}, \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{u}\rangle$, rain: $\langle\{20, \ldots, 25\}, \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{u}\rangle$]
o_6	[pname: $\langle\{\mathsf{Mint}\}, \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{u}\rangle$, rain: $\langle\{20\}, \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{u}\rangle$]
o_7	[pname: $\langle\{\mathsf{Sage}\}, \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{u}\rangle$, rain: $\langle\{20, 21\}, \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{u}\rangle$]

We next define the renaming of (top-level) attributes in POB-instances. This operation is especially useful in connection with Cartesian product and join (see Sections 7.3 and 7.4). We first define renaming expressions.

Definition 7.13 (renaming expression) Let $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ be a POB-schema and let $\mathbf{A}$ be the set of all top-level attributes of $\mathbf{S}$. A *renaming expression* has the form $\vec{\mathbf{B}} \leftarrow \vec{\mathbf{C}}$, where $\vec{\mathbf{B}} = B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_l$ is a list of distinct attributes from $\mathbf{A}$, and $\vec{\mathbf{C}} = C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_l$ is a list of distinct attributes from $\mathcal{A} - (\mathbf{A} - \{B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_l\})$ (this condition ensures that each attribute C_i that belongs to $\mathbf{A}$ must also occur in $\vec{\mathbf{B}}$, i.e., each such C_i must itself be renamed).

We now define the renaming of attributes in POB-schemas.

Definition 7.14 (renaming in POB-schemas) Let $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ be a POB-schema and let $N = B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_l \leftarrow C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_l$ be a renaming expression. The *renaming in* $\mathbf{S}$ *with respect to* N, denoted $\delta_N(\mathbf{S})$, is the POB-schema $(\mathcal{C}, \tau', \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$, where the new type $\tau'(c)$ of each class $c \in \mathcal{C}$ is obtained from the old type $\tau(c) = [A_1 \colon \tau_1, \ldots, A_k \colon \tau_k]$ by replacing each attribute A_j with $A_j = B_i$ for some $i \in \{1, \ldots, l\}$ by the new attribute C_i.

Note. Though the above definition does not include renaming of nested attributes, this may be accomplished by a straightforward extension. For the sake of simplicity, we skip this.

Let us give an example to illustrate the renaming of attributes in POB-schemas.

Example 7.13 (Plant Example: renaming in POB-schemas) Let us consider again the POB-schema $\mathbf{S}$ computed in Example 7.10. The renaming in $\mathbf{S}$ with respect to the renaming expression

$$\mathsf{pname}, \mathsf{rain} \leftarrow \mathsf{pname2}, \mathsf{rain2}$$

has the type assignment τ' shown in Table XV.

Table XV: τ' resulting from renaming

c	$\tau'(c)$
plants	[pname2: string, rain2: integer]
annuals	[pname2: string, rain2: integer]
perennials	[pname2: string, rain2: integer]
vegetables	[pname2: string, rain2: integer]
herbs	[pname2: string, rain2: integer]
flowers	[pname2: string, rain2: integer]
annuals_herbs	[pname2: string, rain2: integer]
perennials_flowers	[pname2: string, rain2: integer]

We next define the renaming of attributes in probabilistic tuple values.

Definition 7.15 (renaming in probabilistic tuple values) Let ptv be a probabilistic tuple value of the form $[A_1 \colon (V_1, \alpha_1, \beta_1), \ldots, A_k \colon (V_k, \alpha_k, \beta_k)]$ and let $N = B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_l \leftarrow C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_l$ be a renaming expression. The *renaming in* ptv *with respect to* N, denoted $\delta_N(ptv)$, is obtained from $[A_1 \colon (V_1, \alpha_1, \beta_1), \ldots, A_k \colon (V_k, \alpha_k, \beta_k)]$ by replacing each attribute A_j with $A_j = B_i$ for some $i \in \{1, \ldots, l\}$ by the new attribute C_i.

We are now ready to define the renaming of attributes in POB-instances.

Definition 7.16 (renaming in POB-instances) Let $\mathbf{I} = (\pi, \nu)$ be a POB-instance over the POB-schema $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ and let N be a renaming expression. The *renaming in* $\mathbf{I}$ *with respect to* N, denoted $\delta_N(\mathbf{I})$, is defined as the POB-instance (π', ν') over the POB-schema $\delta_N(\mathbf{S})$, where:

- $\pi'(c) = \pi(c)$ for all classes $c \in \mathcal{C}$.
- $\nu'(o) = \delta_N(\nu(o))$ for all oids $o \in \pi(\mathcal{C})$.

Let us illustrate this definition within the Plant Example.

Example 7.14 (Plant Example: renaming in POB-instances) Consider the POB-instance $\mathbf{I} = (\pi, \nu)$ computed in Example 7.12. The renaming in $\mathbf{I}$ with respect to the renaming expression pname, rain $\leftarrow$ pname2, rain2 is the POB-instance (π', ν'), where π' is the same as π, and ν' is given in Table XVI.

Table XVI: ν' resulting from renaming

oid	$\nu'(oid)$
o_1	[pname2: ⟨{Lady-Fern, Ostrich-Fern}, u, u⟩, rain2: ⟨{25, . . . , 30}, u, u⟩]
o_2	[pname2: ⟨{Cuban-Basil, Lemon-Basil}, u, u⟩, rain2: ⟨{20, . . . , 30}, u, u⟩]
o_3	[pname2: ⟨{Mint}, u, u⟩, rain2: ⟨{20}, u, u⟩]
o_4	[pname2: ⟨{Aster, Salvia}, u, u⟩, rain2: ⟨{20, . . . , 25}, u, u⟩]
o_5	[pname2: ⟨{Thyme}, u, u⟩, rain2: ⟨{20, . . . , 25}, u, u⟩]
o_6	[pname2: ⟨{Mint}, u, u⟩, rain2: ⟨{20}, u, u⟩]
o_7	[pname2: ⟨{Sage}, u, u⟩, rain2: ⟨{20, 21}, u, u⟩]

7.3 Cartesian Product

In relational databases, the Cartesian product of two relations consists of the set of all tuples that can be obtained by concatenating a tuple in the first relation with a tuple in the second relation. If one follows this intuition, the Cartesian product of two POB-instances should be obtained by concatenating the property list of any object in the first POB-instance with the property list of any object in the second POB-instance. This will be the intuition underlying our definition of Cartesian product (a similar idea stands behind Ojoin by Shaw and Zdonik [36]).

Let us first come back to the Plant Example to show that the Cartesian product is meaningful.

Example 7.15 (Plant Example: Cartesian product) Suppose we are interested in pairs of plants that flourish with a certain probability in the same environment (for example, in pairs of plants that have the same rain requirements with some probability). To obtain this information, we must somehow connect the knowledge tied to each oid with the knowledge tied to other oids.

The first challenge in defining the Cartesian product of two POB-instances is the following. Suppose we know that the POB-schemas of our two POB-instances are $\mathbf{S}_1 = (\mathcal{C}_1, \tau_1, \Rightarrow_1, \mathrm{me}_1, \wp_1)$ and $\mathbf{S}_2 = (\mathcal{C}_2, \tau_2, \Rightarrow_2, \mathrm{me}_2, \wp_2)$. Let the POB-schema of the Cartesian product instance be denoted by $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$. What should the relationship between $\mathbf{S}_1$, $\mathbf{S}_2$, and $\mathbf{S}$ be?

Recall first that in classical relational algebra (based on attributes, and not on a numbering of the columns in each relation), the Cartesian product $R_1 \times R_2$ of two relation schemas R_1 and R_2 is in general only defined if they have disjoint sets of attributes. Thus, we define the Cartesian product only for two input schemas $\mathbf{S}_1$ and $\mathbf{S}_2$ that do not have any top-level attributes in common.

Recall next that in classical relational algebra, $R_1 \times R_2$ and $R_2 \times R_1$ yield the same schema. Similarly, we also desire that $\mathbf{S}_1 \times \mathbf{S}_2 = \mathbf{S}_2 \times \mathbf{S}_1$ holds in our POB-algebra. Suppose now that the sets of classes of $\mathbf{S}_1 \times \mathbf{S}_2$ and $\mathbf{S}_2 \times \mathbf{S}_1$ are given by $\mathcal{C}_1 \times \mathcal{C}_2$ and $\mathcal{C}_2 \times \mathcal{C}_1$, respectively. Then, the desired relationship $\mathbf{S}_1 \times \mathbf{S}_2 = \mathbf{S}_2 \times \mathbf{S}_1$ implies the condition $\mathcal{C}_1 \times \mathcal{C}_2 = \mathcal{C}_2 \times \mathcal{C}_1$. The latter is achieved by the following technique of assuming that every set of classes of a POB-schema is actually a classical relation over a classical relation schema:

Assumption. In the rest of this paper, we assume that for each POB-schema $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$, the set of classes $\mathcal{C}$ is a classical relation over a classical relation schema $R(\mathbf{S}) = \{A_1, \ldots, A_m\}$ associated with $\mathbf{S}$. That is, each class $c \in \mathcal{C}$ is considered as a tuple over $R(\mathbf{S})$. In particular, for each basic POB-schema $\mathbf{S}$, the relation schema $R(\mathbf{S})$ consists of a single distinguished attribute $A_{\mathbf{S}}$.

Thus, as another restriction on the input schemas $\mathbf{S}_1$ and $\mathbf{S}_2$, we also assume that $R(\mathbf{S}_1)$ and $R(\mathbf{S}_2)$ are disjoint. We now summarize which POB-schemas $\mathbf{S}_1$ and $\mathbf{S}_2$ can be combined using Cartesian product.

Definition 7.17 (Cartesian-product-compatible POB-schemas) The two POB-schemas $\mathbf{S}_1 = (\mathcal{C}_1, \tau_1, \Rightarrow_1, \mathrm{me}_1, \wp_1)$ and $\mathbf{S}_2 = (\mathcal{C}_2, \tau_2, \Rightarrow_2, \mathrm{me}_2, \wp_2)$ are *Cartesian-product-compatible* iff $\mathbf{S}_1$ and $\mathbf{S}_2$ do not have any top-level attributes in common, and $R(\mathbf{S}_1)$ and $R(\mathbf{S}_2)$ are disjoint.

Note that any two POB-schemas $\mathbf{S}_1$ and $\mathbf{S}_2$ can be made Cartesian-product-compatible by renaming all the common top-level attributes of $\mathbf{S}_1$ and $\mathbf{S}_2$, and all the attributes in $R(\mathbf{S}_1) \cap R(\mathbf{S}_2)$.

We are now ready to define the Cartesian product of two schemas $\mathbf{S}_1$ and $\mathbf{S}_2$.

Definition 7.18 (Cartesian product of POB-schemas) Let $\mathbf{S}_1 = (\mathcal{C}_1, \tau_1, \Rightarrow_1, \mathrm{me}_1, \wp_1)$ and $\mathbf{S}_2 = (\mathcal{C}_2, \tau_2, \Rightarrow_2, \mathrm{me}_2, \wp_2)$ be two Cartesian-product-compatible POB-schemas, and let $R_1 = R(\mathbf{S}_1)$ and $R_2 = R(\mathbf{S}_2)$. The *Cartesian product* of $\mathbf{S}_1$ and $\mathbf{S}_2$, denoted $\mathbf{S}_1 \times \mathbf{S}_2$, is the POB-schema $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ such that:

- $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_1 \times \mathcal{C}_2$.
- For all classes $c \in \mathcal{C}$, let $\tau(c[R_1], c[R_2]) = [A_1 \colon \tau_1, \ldots, A_k \colon \tau_k, A_{k+1} \colon \tau_{k+1}, \ldots, A_{k+m} \colon \tau_{k+m}]$, where $\tau_1(c[R_1]) = [A_1 \colon \tau_1, \ldots, A_k \colon \tau_k]$ and $\tau_2(c[R_2]) = [A_{k+1} \colon \tau_{k+1}, \ldots, A_{k+m} \colon \tau_{k+m}]$.[8]
- The directed acyclic graph $(\mathcal{C}, \Rightarrow)$ is defined as follows. For all $c, d \in \mathcal{C}$:

$$c \Rightarrow d \quad \text{iff} \quad (c[R_1] \Rightarrow_1 d[R_1] \wedge c[R_2] = d[R_2]) \text{ or } (c[R_1] = d[R_1] \wedge c[R_2] \Rightarrow_2 d[R_2]).$$

- The partitioning me is given as follows. For all $c \in \mathcal{C}$:

$$\mathrm{me}(c) = \{\mathcal{P}_1 \times \{c[R_2]\} \mid \mathcal{P}_1 \in \mathrm{me}_1(c[R_1])\} \cup \{\{c[R_1]\} \times \mathcal{P}_2 \mid \mathcal{P}_2 \in \mathrm{me}_2(c[R_2])\}.$$

[8] As usual, $c[U]$ denotes the restriction of tuple c to the attributes in U.



Figure 6: Some classes in the Cartesian product of the Plant Example

- The probability assignment $\wp$ is defined as follows. For all $c \Rightarrow d$:

$$\wp(c,d) \;=\; \begin{cases} \wp_1(c[R_1], d[R_1]) & \text{if } c[R_2] = d[R_2] \\ \wp_2(c[R_2], d[R_2]) & \text{if } c[R_1] = d[R_1]\,. \end{cases}$$

(Note that $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_1 \times \mathcal{C}_2$ implicitly defines that $R(\mathbf{S}) = R_1 \cup R_2$.)

Let us illustrate this definition within the Plant Example.

Example 7.16 (Plant Example: Cartesian product of POB-schemas) Let $\mathbf{S}_1$ be the POB-schema computed in Example 7.10, and let $\mathbf{S}_2$ be the POB-schema computed in Example 7.13 in which each class c is replaced by c'. The Cartesian product schema $\mathbf{S}_1 \times \mathbf{S}_2 = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ is given as follows:

- A partial view on the set of classes $\mathcal{C}$ is given in Figure 6 (note that we use pl, an, pe, ve, he, fl, ah, and pf as abbreviations for plants, annuals, perennials, vegetables, herbs, flowers, annuals_herbs, and perennials_flowers, respectively).
- Each class $c \in \mathcal{C}$ is assigned the following type under τ:

$$\tau(c) = [\mathsf{pname}\colon \mathsf{string}, \mathsf{rain}\colon \mathsf{integer}, \mathsf{pname2}\colon \mathsf{string}, \mathsf{rain2}\colon \mathsf{integer}]\,.$$

- A partial view on the directed acyclic graph $(\mathcal{C}, \Rightarrow)$, the partitioning me, and the probability assignment $\wp$ is also given in Figure 6.

We now define the Cartesian product of probabilistic tuple values.

Definition 7.19 (Cartesian product of probabilistic tuple values) Let ptv_1 and ptv_2 be two probabilistic tuple values over the disjoint sets of attributes $\mathbf{A}_1$ and $\mathbf{A}_2$, respectively. The *Cartesian product* of ptv_1 and ptv_2, denoted $ptv_1 \times ptv_2$, is the probabilistic tuple value ptv over the set of attributes $\mathbf{A}_1 \cup \mathbf{A}_2$ defined by:

- $ptv.A = ptv_1.A$ for all attributes $A \in \mathbf{A}_1$.
- $ptv.A = ptv_2.A$ for all attributes $A \in \mathbf{A}_2$.

Note that $ptv_1 \times ptv_2 = ptv_2 \times ptv_1$, since by convention the ordering of attributes in a probabilistic tuple value is immaterial.

Example 7.17 (Cartesian product of probabilistic tuple values) Consider the following two probabilistic tuple values (taken from Examples 7.12 and 7.14, respectively):

$$\begin{aligned} ptv_1 &= [\mathsf{pname}\colon \langle\{\mathsf{Cuban\text{-}Basil}, \mathsf{Lemon\text{-}Basil}\}, \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{u}\rangle, \mathsf{rain}\colon \langle\{20, \ldots, 30\}, \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{u}\rangle] \\ ptv_2 &= [\mathsf{pname2}\colon \langle\{\mathsf{Mint}\}, \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{u}\rangle, \mathsf{rain2}\colon \langle\{20\}, \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{u}\rangle] . \end{aligned}$$

The Cartesian product $ptv_1 \times ptv_2$ of ptv_1 and ptv_2 is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &[\mathsf{pname}\colon \langle\{\mathsf{Cuban\text{-}Basil}, \mathsf{Lemon\text{-}Basil}\}, \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{u}\rangle, \mathsf{rain}\colon \langle\{20, \ldots, 30\}, \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{u}\rangle, \\ &\mathsf{pname2}\colon \langle\{\mathsf{Mint}\}, \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{u}\rangle, \mathsf{rain2}\colon \langle\{20\}, \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{u}\rangle]. \end{aligned}$$

We are finally ready to define the Cartesian product of two POB-instances.

Assumption. In the rest of this paper, we assume that each oid $o \in \mathcal{O}$ that occurs in a POB-instance $\mathbf{I}$ over $\mathbf{S}$ is a tuple over $R(\mathbf{S}) = \{A_1, \ldots, A_m\}$. Each such o may be written as $(o[A_1], \ldots, o[A_m])$.

Roughly speaking, each object in the Cartesian product instance is obtained from two objects in the input instances by first concatenating their two oids, and second collecting all their attribute values. The class in which the new object is defined is obtained by concatenating the classes in which the two input objects are defined.

Definition 7.20 (Cartesian product of POB-instances) Let $\mathbf{I}_1 = (\pi_1, \nu_1)$ and $\mathbf{I}_2 = (\pi_2, \nu_2)$ be two POB-instances over the Cartesian-product-compatible POB-schemas $\mathbf{S}_1 = (\mathcal{C}_1, \tau_1, \Rightarrow_1, \mathrm{me}_1, \wp_1)$ and $\mathbf{S}_2 = (\mathcal{C}_2, \tau_2, \Rightarrow_2, \mathrm{me}_2, \wp_2)$, respectively, and let $R_1 = R(\mathbf{S}_1)$ and $R_2 = R(\mathbf{S}_2)$. The *Cartesian product* of $\mathbf{I}_1$ and $\mathbf{I}_2$, denoted $\mathbf{I}_1 \times \mathbf{I}_2$, is defined as the POB-instance (π, ν) over the POB-schema $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S}_1 \times \mathbf{S}_2$, where

- $\pi(c) = \pi_1(c[R_1]) \times \pi_2(c[R_2])$, for all $c \in \mathcal{C}$ (here, $\pi(c) \subseteq \mathcal{O}$ is assumed, for all $c \in \mathcal{C}$).
- $\nu(o) = \nu_1(o[R_1]) \times \nu_2(o[R_2])$, for all $o \in \pi(\mathcal{C})$.

Let us illustrate this definition within the Plant Example.

Example 7.18 (Plant Example: Cartesian product of POB-instances)
Let $\mathbf{I}_1$ and $\mathbf{I}_2$ be the two POB-instances computed in Examples 7.12 and 7.14, respectively. The Cartesian product of $\mathbf{I}_1$ and $\mathbf{I}_2$ is the POB-instance (π, ν), where partial views of π and ν are given in Tables XVII and XVIII, respectively.

7.4 Join

In classical relational databases, the join operator is a generalization of the Cartesian product. This will also be the case for the join of POB-instances, which is defined in this section. We start with the notion of join-compatibility.

Table XVII: π resulting from Cartesian product (partial view)

c	$\pi(c)$
(pl, pl)	$\{(o_1, o_1)\}$
(an, pl)	$\{\}$
(ah, pl)	$\{(o_2, o_1), (o_3, o_1), (o_5, o_1), (o_6, o_1), (o_7, o_1)\}$
(pf, pl)	$\{(o_4, o_1)\}$

Table XVIII: ν resulting from Cartesian product (partial view)

oid	$\nu(oid)$
(o_1, o_1)	[pname: $\langle\{$Lady-Fern, Ostrich-Fern$\}$, u, u$\rangle$, rain: $\langle\{25, \ldots, 30\}$, u, u$\rangle$, pname2: $\langle\{$Lady-Fern, Ostrich-Fern$\}$, u, u$\rangle$, rain2: $\langle\{25, \ldots, 30\}$, u, u$\rangle$]
(o_2, o_1)	[pname: $\langle\{$Cuban-Basil, Lemon-Basil$\}$, u, u$\rangle$, rain: $\langle\{20, \ldots, 30\}$, u, u$\rangle$, pname2: $\langle\{$Lady-Fern, Ostrich-Fern$\}$, u, u$\rangle$, rain2: $\langle\{25, \ldots, 30\}$, u, u$\rangle$]
(o_3, o_1)	[pname: $\langle\{$Mint$\}$, u, u$\rangle$, rain: $\langle\{20\}$, u, u$\rangle$, pname2: $\langle\{$Lady-Fern, Ostrich-Fern$\}$, u, u$\rangle$, rain2: $\langle\{25, \ldots, 30\}$, u, u$\rangle$]

Definition 7.21 (join-compatible POB-schemas) Two POB-schemas $\mathbf{S}_1 = (\mathcal{C}_1, \tau_1, \Rightarrow_1, \mathrm{me}_1, \wp_1)$ and $\mathbf{S}_2 = (\mathcal{C}_2, \tau_2, \Rightarrow_2, \mathrm{me}_2, \wp_2)$ are *join-compatible* iff $R(\mathbf{S}_1)$ and $R(\mathbf{S}_2)$ are disjoint and $\tau_1(c_1).A = \tau_2(c_2).A$ for all classes $c_1 \in \mathcal{C}_1$, $c_2 \in \mathcal{C}_2$ and attributes A defined for both $\tau_1(c_1)$ and $\tau_2(c_2)$.

We next define the join of two POB-schemas.

Definition 7.22 (join of POB-schemas) Let $\mathbf{S}_1 = (\mathcal{C}_1, \tau_1, \Rightarrow_1, \mathrm{me}_1, \wp_1)$ and $\mathbf{S}_2 = (\mathcal{C}_2, \tau_2, \Rightarrow_2, \mathrm{me}_2, \wp_2)$ be two join-compatible POB-schemas, and let $R_1 = R(\mathbf{S}_1)$ and $R_2 = R(\mathbf{S}_2)$. The *join* of $\mathbf{S}_1$ and $\mathbf{S}_2$, denoted $\mathbf{S}_1 \bowtie \mathbf{S}_2$, is the POB-schema $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$, where $\mathcal{C}$, $\Rightarrow$, me, and $\wp$ are as in the definition of $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S}_1 \times \mathbf{S}_2$ (see Definition 7.18), and τ is defined as follows:

- For all $c \in \mathcal{C}$, the tuple type $\tau(c) = [A_1 : \tau_1, \ldots, A_l : \tau_l]$ contains exactly all $A_i : \tau_i$ that belong to either the tuple type $\tau_1(c[R_1])$ or the tuple type $\tau_2(c[R_2])$.

For the join of two probabilistic tuple values ptv_1 and ptv_2, we need to combine the two values of a common attribute A_i to a single value for the result. This is done through conjunction of the probabilistic triples representing these values, along the following definition.

Definition 7.23 (conjunction strategies on probabilistic triples) Let $pt_1{=}(V', \alpha', \beta'), pt_2{=}(V'', \alpha'', \beta'')$ be probabilistic triples, and let $\otimes$ be a probabilistic conjunction strategy. Then, $pt_1 \otimes pt_2$ is the probabilistic triple $pt = (V, \alpha, \beta)$ with:

- $V = \{v \in V' \cap V'' \mid [\alpha'(v), \beta'(v)] \otimes [\alpha''(v), \beta''(v)] \neq [0, 0]\}$.
- $[\alpha(v), \beta(v)] = [\alpha'(v), \beta'(v)] \otimes [\alpha''(v), \beta''(v)]$ for all $v \in V$.

Note that impossible values v in $V' \cap V''$ (having probability 0) are excluded from V as they are implicitly represented by the CWA. The outcome $pt = pt_1 \otimes pt_2$ is well-defined only if pt is consistent, which requires that $\sum_{v \in V} \beta(v) \geq 1$. When an inconsistency arises, we flag an error. Moreover, note that when some intervals $[\alpha'(v), \beta'(v)]$ and $[\alpha''(v), \beta''(v)]$ are inconsistent under the event dependencies associated with $\otimes$ (see Definition 4.1), we also flag an error.

We now define the join of two probabilistic tuple values.

Definition 7.24 (join of probabilistic tuple values) Let ptv_1 and ptv_2 be two probabilistic tuple values over the sets of attributes $\mathbf{A}_1$ and $\mathbf{A}_2$, respectively, such that for all $A \in \mathbf{A}_1 \cap \mathbf{A}_2$, the values $ptv_1.A$ and $ptv_2.A$ are of the same type. Let $\otimes$ be a probabilistic conjunction strategy. The *join* of ptv_1 and ptv_2 under $\otimes$, denoted $ptv_1 \bowtie_{\otimes} ptv_2$, is the probabilistic tuple value ptv over $\mathbf{A}_1 \cup \mathbf{A}_2$ defined by:

- $ptv.A = ptv_1.A$ for all attributes $A \in \mathbf{A}_1 - \mathbf{A}_2$.
- $ptv.A = ptv_2.A$ for all attributes $A \in \mathbf{A}_2 - \mathbf{A}_1$.
- $ptv.A = ptv_1.A \otimes ptv_2.A$ for all attributes $A \in \mathbf{A}_1 \cap \mathbf{A}_2$.

Note that for any probabilistic conjunction strategy $\otimes$, $ptv_1 \bowtie_{\otimes} ptv_2 = ptv_2 \bowtie_{\otimes} ptv_1$, i.e., the join of probabilistic tuple values is commutative.

Example 7.19 *Let us consider the following two probabilistic tuple values:*

$$\begin{aligned} ptv_1 &= [A\colon \langle\{a,b\}, 0.6\,\mathrm{u}, 1.4\,\mathrm{u}\rangle,\ B\colon \langle\{a,c\}, 0.7\,\mathrm{u}, 1.3\,\mathrm{u}\rangle]\,, \\ ptv_2 &= [A\colon \langle\{a,b,c\}, 0.3\,\mathrm{u}, 2.4\,\mathrm{u}\rangle,\ C\colon \langle\{c,d\}, 0.4\,\mathrm{u}, 1.6\,\mathrm{u}\rangle]\,. \end{aligned}$$

The join $ptv_1 \bowtie_{\otimes_{in}} ptv_2$ *of* ptv_1 *and* ptv_2 *under independence is given by:*

$$[A\colon \langle\{a,b\}, 0.06\,\mathrm{u}, 1.12\,\mathrm{u}\rangle,\ B\colon \langle\{a,c\}, 0.7\,\mathrm{u}, 1.3\,\mathrm{u}\rangle,\ C\colon \langle\{c,d\}, 0.4\,\mathrm{u}, 1.6\,\mathrm{u}\rangle]\,.$$

We are now ready to define the join of two POB-instances.

Definition 7.25 (join of POB-instances) Let $\mathbf{I}_1 = (\pi_1, \nu_1)$ and $\mathbf{I}_2 = (\pi_2, \nu_2)$ be POB-instances over the join-compatible POB-schemas $\mathbf{S}_1 = (\mathcal{C}_1, \tau_1, \Rightarrow_1, \mathrm{me}_1, \wp_1)$ and $\mathbf{S}_2 = (\mathcal{C}_2, \tau_2, \Rightarrow_2, \mathrm{me}_2, \wp_2)$, respectively, and let $R_1 = R(\mathbf{S}_1)$ and $R_2 = R(\mathbf{S}_2)$. Let $\mathbf{A}_1$ and $\mathbf{A}_2$ be the sets of top-level attributes of $\mathbf{S}_1$ and $\mathbf{S}_2$, respectively. Let $\otimes$ be a probabilistic conjunction strategy. The *join* of $\mathbf{I}_1$ and $\mathbf{I}_2$ under $\otimes$, denoted $\mathbf{I}_1 \bowtie_{\otimes} \mathbf{I}_2$, is the POB-instance (π, ν) over the POB-schema $\mathbf{S}_1 \bowtie \mathbf{S}_2$, where:

- $\pi(c) = \{(o_1, o_2) \in \pi_1(c[R_1]) \times \pi_2(c[R_2]) \mid$ for all $A \in \mathbf{A}_1 \cap \mathbf{A}_2$: if $(\nu_1(o_1) \bowtie_{\otimes} \nu_2(o_2)).A = \langle V, \alpha, \beta\rangle$, then $V \neq \emptyset\}$, for all $c \in \mathcal{C}_1 \times \mathcal{C}_2$.
- $\nu(o) = \nu_1(o[R_1]) \bowtie_{\otimes} \nu_2(o[R_2])$, for all $o \in \pi(\mathcal{C})$.

We remark that the join is the only operation of our algebra in which probabilistic attribute values of *two distinct* objects are combined. The selection operation and the intersection operation (see next subsection), in contrast, just allow to combine probabilistic attribute values assigned to *one single* object.

7.5 Intersection, Union, and Difference

In this section, we define the classical set operations of *intersection*, *union*, and *difference* for two POB-instances over the same schema.

The definition of intersection is intuitive: common objects are selected, and their respective attribute values are combined by conjunction.

Definition 7.26 (intersection of probabilistic tuple values) Let ptv_1 and ptv_2 be two probabilistic tuple values over the same set of attributes $\mathbf{A}$, and let $\otimes$ be a probabilistic conjunction strategy. The *intersection* of ptv_1 and ptv_2 under $\otimes$, denoted $ptv_1 \cap_\otimes ptv_2$, is the probabilistic tuple value ptv over $\mathbf{A}$ defined by $ptv.A = ptv_1.A \otimes ptv_2.A$ for all $A \in \mathbf{A}$.

Definition 7.27 (intersection of POB-instances) Let $\mathbf{I}_1{=}(\pi_1, \nu_1)$ and $\mathbf{I}_2{=}(\pi_2, \nu_2)$ be two POB-instances over the same POB-schema $\mathbf{S}$, and let $\otimes$ be a probabilistic conjunction strategy. The *intersection* of $\mathbf{I}_1$ and $\mathbf{I}_2$ under $\otimes$, denoted $\mathbf{I}_1 \cap_\otimes \mathbf{I}_2$, is the POB-instance (π, ν) over $\mathbf{S}$, where:

- $\pi(c) = \pi_1(c) \cap \pi_2(c)$.
- $\nu(o) = \nu_1(o) \cap_\otimes \nu_2(o)$.

The union of two POB-instances is defined in the same spirit as their intersection.

Definition 7.28 (disjunction strategies on probabilistic triples) Let $pt_1{=}(V', \alpha', \beta')$, $pt_2{=}(V'', \alpha'', \beta'')$ be probabilistic triples, and let $\oplus$ be a probabilistic disjunction strategy. Then, $pt_1 \oplus pt_2$ is the probabilistic triple $pt = (V, \alpha, \beta)$, where:

- $V = V' \cup V''$.
- $[\alpha(v), \beta(v)] = \begin{cases} [\alpha'(v), \beta'(v)] & \text{if } v \in V' - V'' \\ [\alpha''(v), \beta''(v)] & \text{if } v \in V'' - V' \\ [\alpha'(v), \beta'(v)] \oplus [\alpha''(v), \beta''(v)] & \text{if } v \in V' \cap V'' . \end{cases}$

As in the case of conjunction, the outcome pt of $pt_1 \oplus pt_2$ is only defined if pt is consistent, which requires that $\sum_{v \in V} \alpha(v) \leq 1$. A violation of this condition indicates incorrect data or improper application of the disjunction strategy $\oplus$. Again, this is flagged as an error.

Definition 7.29 (union of probabilistic tuple values) Let ptv_1 and ptv_2 be two probabilistic tuple values over the same set of attributes $\mathbf{A}$, and let $\oplus$ be a probabilistic disjunction strategy. The *union* of ptv_1 and ptv_2 under $\oplus$, denoted $ptv_1 \cup_\oplus ptv_2$, is the probabilistic tuple value ptv over $\mathbf{A}$ defined by $ptv.A = ptv_1.A \oplus ptv_2.A$ for all $A \in \mathbf{A}$.

Definition 7.30 (union of POB-instances) Let $\mathbf{I}_1 = (\pi_1, \nu_1)$ and $\mathbf{I}_2 = (\pi_2, \nu_2)$ be two POB-instances over the same POB-schema $\mathbf{S}$ such that $\pi_1(c_1) \cap \pi_2(c_2) = \emptyset$ for all pairs of distinct classes $c_1, c_2 \in \mathcal{C}$. Let $\oplus$ be a probabilistic disjunction strategy. The *union* of $\mathbf{I}_1$ and $\mathbf{I}_2$ under $\oplus$, denoted $\mathbf{I}_1 \cup_\oplus \mathbf{I}_2$, is defined as the POB-instance (π, ν) over $\mathbf{S}$, where:

- $\pi(c) = \pi_1(c) \cup \pi_2(c)$.

- $\nu(o) = \begin{cases} \nu_1(o) & \text{if } o \in \pi_1(\mathcal{C}) - \pi_2(\mathcal{C}) \\ \nu_2(o) & \text{if } o \in \pi_2(\mathcal{C}) - \pi_1(\mathcal{C}) \\ \nu_1(o) \cup_{\oplus} \nu_2(o) & \text{if } o \in \pi_1(\mathcal{C}) \cap \pi_2(\mathcal{C}) \,. \end{cases}$

Finally, we consider the *difference* of two POB-instances. For this, we use the notion of a difference strategy for probabilistic tuple values.

Definition 7.31 (difference strategies on probabilistic triples) Let $pt_1 = (V', \alpha', \beta'), pt_2 = (V'', \alpha'', \beta'')$ be probabilistic triples, and let $\ominus$ be a probabilistic difference strategy. Then, $pt_1 \ominus pt_2$ is the probabilistic triple $pt = (V, \alpha, \beta)$, where:

- $V = V' - \{v \in V' \cap V'' \mid [\alpha'(v), \beta'(v)] \ominus [\alpha''(v), \beta''(v)] = [0, 0]\}$.
- $[\alpha(v), \beta(v)] = \begin{cases} [\alpha'(v), \beta'(v)] & \text{if } v \in V - V'' \\ [\alpha'(v), \beta'(v)] \ominus [\alpha''(v), \beta''(v)] & \text{if } v \in V \cap V'' \,. \end{cases}$

Definition 7.32 (difference of probabilistic tuple values) Let ptv_1 and ptv_2 be two probabilistic tuple values over the same set of attributes $\mathbf{A}$, and let $\ominus$ be a probabilistic difference strategy. The *difference* of ptv_1 and ptv_2 under $\ominus$, denoted $ptv_1 -_{\ominus} ptv_2$ is the probabilistic tuple value ptv over $\mathbf{A}$ defined by $ptv.A = ptv_1.A \ominus ptv_2.A$ for all $A \in \mathbf{A}$.

Definition 7.33 (difference of POB-instances) Let $\mathbf{I}_1 = (\pi_1, \nu_1)$ and $\mathbf{I}_2 = (\pi_2, \nu_2)$ be POB-instances over the same POB-schema $\mathbf{S}$, and let $\ominus$ be a probabilistic difference strategy. The *difference* of $\mathbf{I}_1$ and $\mathbf{I}_2$ under $\ominus$, denoted $\mathbf{I}_1 -_{\ominus} \mathbf{I}_2$, is defined as the POB-instance (π, ν) over $\mathbf{S}$, where:

- $\pi(c) = \pi_1(c)$.
- $\nu(o) = \begin{cases} \nu_1(o) & \text{if } o \in \pi_1(\mathcal{C}) - \pi_2(\mathcal{C}) \\ \nu_1(o) -_{\ominus} \nu_2(o) & \text{if } o \in \pi_1(\mathcal{C}) \cap \pi_2(\mathcal{C}) \,. \end{cases}$

7.6 Consistency Preservation

We now prove that all operations of our POB-algebra that produce new POB-schemas preserve consistency. In detail, given consistent POB-schemas as input, the operations projection, renaming, Cartesian product, and join always produce a consistent POB-schema as output. This is shown by the following theorem.

Theorem 7.1 *Let $\mathbf{S}$, $\mathbf{S}_1$, and $\mathbf{S}_2$ be POB-schemas. Let $\mathbf{S}_1$ and $\mathbf{S}_2$ be Cartesian-product-compatible in (c) and join-compatible in (d). Let $\mathbf{A}$ be a set of attributes, and let N be a renaming expression.*

(a) If $\mathbf{S}$ is consistent, then $\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{S})$ is consistent.

(b) If $\mathbf{S}$ is consistent, then $\delta_N(\mathbf{S})$ is consistent.

(c) If $\mathbf{S}_1$ and $\mathbf{S}_2$ are consistent, then $\mathbf{S}_1 \times \mathbf{S}_2$ is consistent.

(d) If $\mathbf{S}_1$ and $\mathbf{S}_2$ are consistent, then $\mathbf{S}_1 \bowtie \mathbf{S}_2$ is consistent.

It is worth noting that in the POB-algebra, users may express queries that are sometimes "internally inconsistent". For instance, a user may ask a selection query involving the selection condition $(x.\mathsf{soil} = \mathsf{loamy} \otimes_{me} x.\mathsf{soil} = \mathsf{loamy})[0.3, 0.7]$. Here, the user is selecting objects that have loamy soil assuming mutual exclusion of two identical selection expressions ! Clearly, this query does not make sense. Similarly, a query involving the selection condition $(x.\mathsf{rain} < 10 \otimes_{in} x.\mathsf{rain} > 20)[0.3, 0.7]$ does not make sense — one cannot assume independence of rain being less than 10 and over 20 ! Determining what queries are "safe" w.r.t. such probabilistic intuitions is a major challenge that will be addressed in a future paper.

8 POB-Algebra: Equivalence Results

In this section, we derive some results on equivalences that hold in our POB-algebra. We focus here on equivalences similar to well-known equivalences in the context of classical relational algebra. The list of equivalences is by no means complete, but shows that query optimization in our POB-algebra is possible along similar lines as in classical relational algebra [1]. Our first result says that selections may be reordered.

Theorem 8.1 *Let $\mathbf{I} = (\pi, \nu)$ be a POB-instance over the POB-schema $\mathbf{S}$. Let ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 be two selection conditions. Then*

$$\sigma_{\phi_1}(\sigma_{\phi_2}(\mathbf{I})) \;=\; \sigma_{\phi_2}(\sigma_{\phi_1}(\mathbf{I})) \;=\; \sigma_{\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2}(\mathbf{I}), \tag{1}$$

where the last expression assumes that ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 have the same object variable.

Our next result says two things: first that the projections may be reordered and second, that projections may be pushed through selections under appropriate conditions.

Theorem 8.2 *Let $\mathbf{I}$ be a POB-instance over the POB-schema $\mathbf{S}$. Let $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ be sets of attributes, and let ϕ be a selection condition in which all path expressions start with attributes from $\mathbf{A}$. Then,*

$$\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\Pi_{\mathbf{B}}(\mathbf{I})) \;=\; \Pi_{\mathbf{B}}(\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{I})) \tag{2}$$

$$\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\sigma_{\phi}(\mathbf{I})) \;=\; \sigma_{\phi}(\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{I}))\,. \tag{3}$$

Note that, for example, for $\mathbf{A} \subseteq \mathbf{B}$, Equation (2) reduces to $\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\Pi_{\mathbf{B}}(\mathbf{I})) = \Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{I})$, since $\Pi_{\mathbf{B}}(\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{I})) = \Pi_{\mathbf{A}\cap\mathbf{B}}(\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{I})) = \Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{I})$ (see Definition 7.10).

The next result, which states that selections and projections can be pushed through the renaming operator, requires some notation. For any renaming expression $N : \vec{\mathbf{B}} \leftarrow \vec{\mathbf{C}}$, the *inverse* of N, denoted by N^{-1}, is the renaming expression $\vec{\mathbf{C}} \leftarrow \vec{\mathbf{B}}$. Furthermore, the notation $\delta_N(X)$ stands for the result of applying the renaming specified by N on the formal object X.

Theorem 8.3 *Let $\mathbf{I}$ be a POB-instance over the POB-schema $\mathbf{S}$, and let N be a renaming expression for $\mathbf{S}$. Let ϕ be a selection condition and let $\mathbf{A}$ be a set of attributes. Then*

$$\sigma_{\phi}(\delta_N(\mathbf{I})) \;=\; \delta_N(\sigma_{\delta_{N^{-1}}(\phi)}(\mathbf{I})) \tag{4}$$

$$\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\delta_N(\mathbf{I})) \;=\; \delta_N(\Pi_{\delta_{N^{-1}}(\mathbf{A})}(\mathbf{I}))\,. \tag{5}$$

The following theorem shows that joins are always associative and commutative, regardless of what conjunction strategy is used in the join. In addition, selects may be pushed "through" a join by appropriately splitting the selection condition and the same is true of projections.

Theorem 8.4 *Let $\mathbf{S}_1$, $\mathbf{S}_2$, and $\mathbf{S}_3$ be pairwise join-compatible POB-schemas and let $\mathbf{I}_1$, $\mathbf{I}_2$, and $\mathbf{I}_3$ be POB-instances over $\mathbf{S}_1$, $\mathbf{S}_2$, and $\mathbf{S}_3$, respectively. Let $\otimes$ be a probabilistic conjunction strategy. Let ϕ_1, ϕ_2, and ϕ_3 be selection conditions such that ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 involve only attributes from $\mathbf{A}_1 - \mathbf{A}_2$ and $\mathbf{A}_2 - \mathbf{A}_1$, respectively, where $\mathbf{A}_1$ and $\mathbf{A}_2$ denote the sets of top-level attributes of $\mathbf{S}_1$ and $\mathbf{S}_2$, respectively. Let $\mathbf{B}$ be a set of attributes and define $\mathbf{B}_1 = (\mathbf{B} \cup \mathbf{A}_2) \cap \mathbf{A}_1$ and $\mathbf{B}_2 = (\mathbf{B} \cup \mathbf{A}_1) \cap \mathbf{A}_2$. Then*

$$\mathbf{I}_1 \bowtie_{\otimes} \mathbf{I}_2 = \mathbf{I}_2 \bowtie_{\otimes} \mathbf{I}_1 \tag{6}$$

$$(\mathbf{I}_1 \bowtie_{\otimes} \mathbf{I}_2) \bowtie_{\otimes} \mathbf{I}_3 = \mathbf{I}_1 \bowtie_{\otimes} (\mathbf{I}_2 \bowtie_{\otimes} \mathbf{I}_3) \tag{7}$$

$$\sigma_{\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 \wedge \phi_3}(\mathbf{I}_1 \bowtie_{\otimes} \mathbf{I}_2) = \sigma_{\phi_3}(\sigma_{\phi_1}(\mathbf{I}_1) \bowtie_{\otimes} \sigma_{\phi_2}(\mathbf{I}_2)) \tag{8}$$

$$\Pi_{\mathbf{B}}(\mathbf{I}_1 \bowtie_{\otimes} \mathbf{I}_2) = \Pi_{\mathbf{B}}(\Pi_{\mathbf{B}_1}(\mathbf{I}_1) \bowtie_{\otimes} \Pi_{\mathbf{B}_2}(\mathbf{I}_2)) . \tag{9}$$

Note that in classical relational databases, Equivalence (8) remains true if ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 access common attributes of $\mathbf{A}_1$ and $\mathbf{A}_2$. This is no longer guaranteed for POBs, as the join may change the value of common attributes. As Cartesian product is a special case of join, we obtain the following corollary to Theorem 8.4.

Corollary 8.5 *Let $\mathbf{S}_1$, $\mathbf{S}_2$, and $\mathbf{S}_3$ be pairwise Cartesian-product-compatible POB-schemas and let $\mathbf{I}_1$, $\mathbf{I}_2$, and $\mathbf{I}_3$ be POB-instances over $\mathbf{S}_1$, $\mathbf{S}_2$, and $\mathbf{S}_3$, respectively. Let ϕ_1, ϕ_2, and ϕ_3 be selection conditions such that ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 involve only attributes from the sets of top-level attributes $\mathbf{A}_1$ and $\mathbf{A}_2$ of $\mathbf{S}_1$ and $\mathbf{S}_2$, respectively. Let $\mathbf{B}$ be a set of attributes and let $\mathbf{B}_1 = \mathbf{B} \cap \mathbf{A}_1$ and $\mathbf{B}_2 = \mathbf{B} \cap \mathbf{A}_2$. Then*

$$\mathbf{I}_1 \times \mathbf{I}_2 = \mathbf{I}_2 \times \mathbf{I}_1 \tag{10}$$

$$(\mathbf{I}_1 \times \mathbf{I}_2) \times \mathbf{I}_3 = \mathbf{I}_1 \times (\mathbf{I}_2 \times \mathbf{I}_3) \tag{11}$$

$$\sigma_{\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 \wedge \phi_3}(\mathbf{I}_1 \times \mathbf{I}_2) = \sigma_{\phi_3}(\sigma_{\phi_1}(\mathbf{I}_1) \times \sigma_{\phi_2}(\mathbf{I}_2)) \tag{12}$$

$$\Pi_{\mathbf{B}}(\mathbf{I}_1 \times \mathbf{I}_2) = \Pi_{\mathbf{B}_1}(\mathbf{I}_1) \times \Pi_{\mathbf{B}_2}(\mathbf{I}_2) . \tag{13}$$

Theorem 8.6 *Let $\mathbf{I}_1$, $\mathbf{I}_2$, and $\mathbf{I}_3$ be POB-instances over the same POB-schema $\mathbf{S}$. Let $\otimes / \oplus / \ominus$ be a probabilistic conjunction/disjunction/difference strategy and let $\mathbf{A}$ be a set of attributes. Then,*

$$\mathbf{I}_1 \cap_{\otimes} \mathbf{I}_2 = \mathbf{I}_2 \cap_{\otimes} \mathbf{I}_1 \tag{14}$$

$$(\mathbf{I}_1 \cap_{\otimes} \mathbf{I}_2) \cap_{\otimes} \mathbf{I}_3 = \mathbf{I}_1 \cap_{\otimes} (\mathbf{I}_2 \cap_{\otimes} \mathbf{I}_3) \tag{15}$$

$$\mathbf{I}_1 \cup_{\oplus} \mathbf{I}_2 = \mathbf{I}_2 \cup_{\oplus} \mathbf{I}_1 \tag{16}$$

$$(\mathbf{I}_1 \cup_{\oplus} \mathbf{I}_2) \cup_{\oplus} \mathbf{I}_3 = \mathbf{I}_1 \cup_{\oplus} (\mathbf{I}_2 \cup_{\oplus} \mathbf{I}_3) \tag{17}$$

$$\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{I}_1 \cap_{\otimes} \mathbf{I}_2) = \Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{I}_1) \cap_{\otimes} \Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{I}_2) \tag{18}$$

$$\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{I}_1 \cup_{\oplus} \mathbf{I}_2) = \Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{I}_1) \cup_{\oplus} \Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{I}_2) \tag{19}$$

$$\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{I}_1 -_{\ominus} \mathbf{I}_2) = \Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{I}_1) -_{\ominus} \Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{I}_2) . \tag{20}$$

Note that literally taken, Equations (18) and (20) are not true for relational databases. The reason is that we use oids for objects in POBs, while relational databases only contain values.

Finally, we remark that Equations (2), (5), (10), (11), and (13) are actually unrelated to probabilities (since the operations projection, renaming, and Cartesian product are unrelated to probabilities).

9 Implementation

We have implemented a prototype distributed POB system. The server (POB-server) runs on top of ObjectStore and is implemented in SUN-C++. A thin client for handling database transactions is implemented using GNU-C++.

9.1 POB-Server

The POB-server is a collection manager of POB-schemas. Each POB-schema consists of a set of POB-classes and their associated POB-object instances. The POB-server manages (i) persistent schemas, which correspond to permanent data and (ii) temporary schemas, which maintain intermediate schemas.

The **probability interpreter** contains functions for computing probabilistic conjunction and disjunction strategies. It also contains a library of distribution functions for manipulating probabilistic tuple values associated with objects in the database.

The **POB-schema class** maintains an inheritance probability table (the probability assignment $\wp$ in Definition 5.4). The class contains methods to add, remove, and retrieve POB-classes and POB-objects. In addition, given two classes c_1 and c_2, where c_1 is a subclass of c_2, there is a method that computes the conditional probability that an arbitrary object belongs to c_1 given that it belongs to c_2.

POB-classes are objects in the POB-schema class. They have a name, a collection of attributes (with associated types), and a collection of parent POB-class names along with associated probability assignments. Methods associated with POB-classes provide abilities to establish attribute/type information, parent POB-class/probability assignments, adding and removing POB-objects from the POB-class, and various self-replicating functions that are useful for query processing.

POB-objects contain an object name, the oid, a collection of probabilistic tuple values, and a POB-class pointer which points to the POB-class of which it is an instance. The POB-class pointer is provided for fast access to class-level information: attributes, types, parents, etc. Methods associated with POB-objects include functions for setting probabilistic tuple values and various self-replicating functions to facilitate query processing.

The **POB-server** handles client requests. It contains a pointer to an ObjectStore database which provides persistence services. The POB-server includes methods for: connecting to a database, disconnecting from a database, creating and removing schemas, creating and removing classes, creating and removing objects, computing the probability that an object is a member of class c_1 given that it is a member of class c_2, computing the probabilistic extent of a class, checking if an object satisfies a given selection condition, executing an arbitrary query in the probabilistic object algebra, and a variety of printing functions.

Note that each method may not correspond to a logical unit of work — in this case a request. In some instances, several requests are handled within one method while in other instances, a single request is handled through a combination of methods.

9.2 Experiments

Using the POB-server, we have conducted a set of experiments to assess the various equivalences described in Section 8 as well as to assess the performance of selection. We do not describe all the experiments we conducted (due to space reasons), but only a few sample experiments are listed below. The limiting factor in all experiments was the size of the "largest intermediate schema." This is the number of objects in the largest schema encountered when executing the query. For a selection query, this is just the number of objects in the POB-instance on which the selection is performed. In the case of a join/Cartesian product, this is the

product of the sizes of the POB-instances being joined (or whose Cartesian product is being computed). In the experiments involving Equations (8), (12) and (13) described below, we varied the number of objects in the largest intermediate schema from 0 to 270,000 objects and measured the times taken (on a Sun Ultra 10 workstation) for both the left side and the right side of the rewrite rules in question. The idea was to see whether the left side of a rule should be rewritten to the right side or the other way round.

Effectiveness of Equation (8). Our first experiment evaluated the effectiveness of pushing selections into joins (Theorem 8.4). Figure 7 (a) shows what happens if the selectivity is varied using independence. It is easy to see that the right side of this equation pays off in a huge way and that as the selectivity decreases (i.e., fewer and fewer objects are selected), more and more objects can be efficiently handed. For instance, with 20% selectivity, 270,000 objects in the largest intermediate schema can be computed in about 30 seconds.

Figure 7 (b) shows the effect of evaluating the right side of Equation (8) with different probabilistic strategies. We see that precisely which strategy is used has very little impact on the computation time.

Effectiveness of Equation (12). We conducted experiments similar to those described above with Equation (12). Figure 7 (c) shows the result of testing — it shows that pushing selections into a Cartesian product may save up to 80–90% of the time and this saving increases as the number of objects increases.

Effectiveness of Equation (13). We conducted experiments similar to those described above with Equation (13). Figure 8 (a) shows the result of testing — it shows that pushing projections into a Cartesian product does not help very much. The reason for this is because projection does not reduce the number of objects.

Effectiveness of Selection. We also conducted some experiments on the effectiveness of selection on POB-schemas of sizes between 3000 and 10000 objects. In the experiment, we executed queries of the form "Select x from schema e where $x.D > val$". Figure 8 (b) shows the result when two different selectivities are used — 50% (i.e., half the objects satisfy the selection condition) and 30% (i.e., 30% of the objects satisfy the selection condition). We also tested what happens when we consider *membership* selection queries of the form "Select x from schema e where (x is a member of class C)". Figure 8 (c) shows the result of this query with two different selectivities. Note that the queries generally exhibit linear behavior w.r.t. the number of objects. In addition, membership queries are computationally more expensive than simple inequality queries.

We are part way towards developing a POB query optimizer. While the equivalence results of Section 8 readily serve as rewrite rules, the problem of developing a cost model is a challenge that we are currently working on. Once cost models for POBs are developed, a CASCADES [18] style framework may be readily used for query optimization. We are currently working on this problem.

10 Related Work

Our work has been inspired by the prior work of Kornatzky and Shimony [27] who describe a probabilistic object-oriented data model in which, like in our approach, uncertainty in the values of attributes and in the class graph may be represented by probabilities. The main differences between [27] and our approach can be briefly summarized as follows:

1. Kornatzky and Shimony introduce an object calculus for extracting objects from probabilistic object-oriented databases. This calculus can thus be compared to our selection operation. It is more restrictive in the sense that it only handles probabilities on atomic formulas (which always evaluate to either true or false), while our selection operation also handles probabilities on conjunctions and disjunctions of atomic formulas, using probabilistic conjunction and disjunction strategies. Specifically, we make no



(a)



(b)



(c)

Figure 7: Experimental results



(a)



(b)



(c)

Figure 8: Experimental results

independence assumption (as Kornatzky and Shimony do). On the other hand, their object calculus has quantifiers, which our selection operation does not include. However, it could be easily extended in this direction.

2. We also discuss, in detail, the algebraic operations of projection, renaming, Cartesian product, join, selection, union, intersection, and difference. As they were developing a calculus, Kornatzky and Shimony do not deal with this.

3. We introduce, for the first time, results on query equivalences in probabilistic object bases, and to our knowledge, our system is the first implementation of a probabilistic object base.

4. Kornatzky and Shimony assume that the class graph is a directed tree *without multiple inheritance*. Moreover, incomparable classes are always disjoint. In contrast, in our approach, the class graph may be any directed acyclic graph, thus allowing multiple inheritance. Furthermore, the disjointness of classes can be expressed in a flexible way by grouping them into partition clusters. The consistency of schema declarations is guaranteed for a large subclass extending directed trees.

5. Kornatzky and Shimony assume a precise probability distribution on the set of all possible values of an attribute (including a null value $\perp$ that represents the inapplicability of an attribute). Our approach, in contrast, just requires an interval range for probability distributions. Furthermore, objects occurring as attribute values are given special treatment in [27]; our model can be extended in this respect.

6. In [27], the probabilistic extent of a class is derived from statistical and subjective probabilities. Since, in general, inconsistency may arise, the notion of *cutsets* of classes is introduced there. The probabilistic extent of a class is then given by statistical probabilities in the class hierarchy and by subjective probabilities with respect to a cutset. Our probabilistic extent, in contrast, is just derived from statistical probabilities and classical class membership. We thus avoid all the problems that come along with mixing up statistical and subjective probabilities.

Sadri [35] describes how to extend object-oriented databases by using the *information source tracking method*, in which every piece of information is assigned a vector of confirming information sources. The formalism is based on a non-probabilistic lattice structure, but Sadri mentions a possible extension by numerical and especially probabilistic uncertainty. He models uncertainty on the attribute, object, and class level, which roughly relates to our probabilistic attributes, to our interpretation of selection expressions, and to our probabilistic extents, respectively.

In the area of uncertainty in AI, there is related work on object-oriented Bayesian networks by Koller and Pfeffer [26] and by Laskey and Mahoney [33], and on constructing Bayesian networks from first-order probabilistic knowledge bases by Haddawy [21]. The main idea behind object-oriented Bayesian networks is to use methods from object-oriented programming languages in order to enable flexible and large-scale knowledge representation with Bayesian networks. The objects in this framework are given by Bayesian network fragments. Objects that share common features are grouped together into classes, which are organized along inheritance hierarchies. Query processing in object-oriented Bayesian networks is essentially reduced to a form of Bayesian network inference that exploits some locality aspects of the object-oriented modeling for increased efficiency. Haddawy [21] aims at a first-order generalization of Bayesian networks. More precisely, he describes how queries to first-order probabilistic knowledge bases satisfying certain constraints can be translated into Bayesian network inference problems.

A step towards the model proposed in the present paper is an extension of the relational model allowing complex values [12, 13] with probabilities. However, the model in [12, 13] has no class hierarchy and, in particular, inheritance is not addressed. Thus, it has no features of an object oriented system, and is essentially in the group of probabilistic relational database models, which we discuss next.

ProbView [29] is a probabilistic relational database model which generalizes various approaches (like, for example, [4, 7]). Cavallo and Pittarelli's important paper [7] views relations in a (flat) relational database as probability distribution functions, where tuples in the same relation are viewed as pairwise disjoint events whose probabilities sum up to 1. Drawbacks of this approach have been pointed out in [9]. An extension of the model using probability intervals, which are viewed as constraints on the probabilities, is reviewed in [34]. Barbará et al. [4] consider a probabilistic extension to the relational model, in which imprecise attributes are modeled as probability distributions over finite sets of values. No probabilities can be assigned to outmost tuples. Their approach assumes that key attributes are deterministic (have probability 1) and that non-key attributes in different relations are independent. As pointed out in [4], "lossy" joins are possible in this model.

Another important probabilistic database model is that of Dey and Sarkar [9], which assigns each tuple in a (flat) relational database a probability value in a special attribute. Based on [9], a probabilistic extension to SQL is developed in [10]. The classical relational operations are defined in [9] adopting different assumptions on the relationship between tuples; in particular, join assumes independence; union and difference assume positive correlation; and compaction assumes disjointness or positive correlation. Our model is far more general.

Fuhr and Rölleke [15] consider a probabilistic version of NF2 relations, extending their approach for flat tuples [16], and define a relational algebra for this model. Probabilities are assigned to tuples and to values of nested tuples (i.e., set-valued attributes), which are viewed as events that have an associated event expression. The algebraic operators manipulate tuples by combining value and event expressions appropriately. An intensional semantics is developed in [15] in which probabilities are defined through possible worlds. The evaluation method assumes that in nondeterministic relations (i.e., relations with uncertain tuples), joint occurrence of two different values is either always independent or impossible—this is certainly restrictive.

Dyreson and Snodgrass [11] provide a version of SQL to handle temporal indeterminacy, where there is uncertainty about when an event occurs. They use a relational framework and focus on the important case where the space of values over which uncertainty exists is huge.

Kießling and his group [23] developed a framework called DUCK for reasoning with uncertainty. They provide an elegant, logical, axiomatic theory for uncertain reasoning in the presence of rules. In contrast, in our framework, rules are not present; rather, our interest is in extending object database models to handle uncertainty in an algebraic setting.

In an important paper, Lakshmanan and Sadri [31] show how selected probabilistic strategies can be used to extend the previous probabilistic models. Lakshmanan and Shiri [32] show how deductive databases may be parameterized through the use of conjunction and disjunction strategies, an approach also followed by Dekhtyar and Subrahmanian [8]. We have built in this paper upon the important concept of probabilistic conjunction and disjunction strategies, but in an object oriented instead of a logic programming setting.

11 Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed an extension of the relational algebra to handle probabilistic modes of uncertainty in object oriented database systems. More precisely, the main contributions of this paper can be briefly

summarized as follows:

1. We presented a formal definition of a probabilistic object base, which extends previous definitions given by Kornatzky and Shimony [27].
2. We gave a formal model theoretic basis for discussing the consistency of POBs, and showed that consistency checking is NP-complete in general. We then defined classes of POBs for which consistency can be checked in polynomial time, and provided efficient algorithms for this task.
3. We developed an algebra that extends the relational algebra to probabilistic object bases. Specifically, this algebra recognizes that probabilities of complex events depend on existing knowledge about dependencies between events, and hence, it allows users to express algebraic queries under appropriate conjunction, disjunction, and difference strategies (which encode such dependence information).
4. We presented a number of equivalence results that may form a set of rewrite rules to be used in query optimization.
5. Our POB framework has been implemented on top of ObjectStore in C++.
6. Finally, we conducted a set of experiments on the efficacy of our equivalence results for query rewriting (and hence for query optimization).

Several tasks remain for further work. One is the enhancement of the current prototype by a sophisticated POB-algebra query manager, which optimizes queries by using cost models and rewrite rules as shown in Figure 2. For the front end of the system, it would be well worth developing a probabilistic version of SQL (similar to, for example, Dey and Sarkar's language PSQL [10]).

Another important task for further work is to develop a model-theoretic semantics for probabilistic attribute values. Specifically, we are planning to map the probabilistic knowledge in top-level attributes into a language in probabilistic logic, which can be interpreted by probability distributions over a set of possible worlds.

A further topic of future research is to generalize our model. For example, one could think about allowing arbitrary sets of probability distributions [28] as values of top-level attributes (and not just convex sets of distributions that are specified by probabilistic triples), or about allowing negations besides in selection conditions also, at a lower level, in selection expressions. It would also be interesting to allow objects as attribute values.

Finally, another important topic is to explore how to perform updates on probabilistic attribute values of existing objects in POBs.

Appendix: Proofs

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Let $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ be a consistent POB-schema. We first show P1. Suppose that there are two different paths from a class c_1 to another class c_2. Let p and q be the products of the edge probabilities on these two paths. By C1 and C4, every model ε of $\mathbf{S}$ satisfies $\varepsilon(c_2) \neq \emptyset$ and $p \cdot |\varepsilon(c_2)| = |\varepsilon(c_1)| = q \cdot |\varepsilon(c_2)|$. Thus, we get $p = q$.

We next prove P2 by contradiction. Let us assume that there exists some cluster $\mathcal{P} \in \bigcup \mathrm{me}(\mathcal{C})$ and that there are two distinct classes $c_1, c_2 \in \mathcal{P}$ that have a common subclass $c \in \mathcal{C}$. Hence, by C2 and C3, every model ε of $\mathbf{S}$ satisfies $\varepsilon(c) = \emptyset$. But this contradicts C1. □

Proof of Theorem 5.2. It remains to show NP-hardness. We give a polynomial reduction from the NP-complete problem of graph 3-colorability [17]. Let (V, E) be an undirected graph. We now have to construct a POB-schema $\mathbf{S}$ such that (V, E) is 3-colorable iff $\mathbf{S}$ is consistent. The main idea is to represent each node $v \in V$ by three pairwise disjoint and nonempty classes d_v^1, d_v^2, and d_v^3, which encode the three colors and the properties of a mapping from V into the color set. Each edge $\{u, v\} \in E$ is then represented by making d_u^1, d_u^2, and d_u^3 disjoint from d_v^1, d_v^2, and d_v^3, respectively.

The technical formalization is quite tricky. The POB-schema $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ is constructed as follows. We initialize $\mathcal{C}$, $\Rightarrow$, and $\wp$ with $\{b, c_1, c_2, d\}$, $\{(c_1, b), (c_2, b), (d, c_1)\}$, and $\{(c_1, b, 1/4), (c_2, b, 3/4), (d, c_1, 1)\}$, respectively, and extend them as follows. We add to $\mathcal{C}$ for each $v \in V$ and $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ classes c_v^i and d_v^i, and for each $\{u, v\} \in E$ and $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ classes $d_{u,v}^i$ and $d_{v,u}^i$. For each $v \in V$ and $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, we add the edges $c_v^i \Rightarrow b$, $d \Rightarrow c_v^i$, $d_v^i \Rightarrow c_v^i$, and $d_v^i \Rightarrow c_2$, and assign them the probabilities $1/2$, $1/2$, $1/2$, and $1/3$, respectively. Furthermore, for each $d_{u,v}^i \in \mathcal{C}$ where $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, we add the edges $d_{u,v}^i \Rightarrow c_u^i$ and $d_{u,v}^i \Rightarrow c_2$, and assign them probabilities $1/2$ and $1/3$, respectively. Finally, let $\tau(c) = [\,]$ for all $c \in \mathcal{C}$ and me as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{me}(b) &= \{\{c_1, c_2\}\} \cup \{\{c_v^i\} \mid v \in V,\ i \in \{0, 1, 2\}\},\\
\mathrm{me}(c_1) &= \{\{d\}\},\\
\mathrm{me}(c_2) &= \{\{d_v^1, d_v^2, d_v^3\} \mid v \in V\} \cup \{\{d_{u,v}^i, d_{v,u}^i\} \mid \{u, v\} \in E,\ i \in \{0, 1, 2\}\},\\
\mathrm{me}(c_v^i) &= \{\{c\} \mid c \in \mathcal{C},\ c \Rightarrow c_v^i\} \quad \text{for all } v \in V \text{ and } i \in \{0, 1, 2\}, \text{ and}\\
\mathrm{me}(c) &= \emptyset, \text{ for all other classes } c \in \mathcal{C}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that the constructed POB-schema $\mathbf{S}$ is pseudo-consistent. It finally remains to show that the undirected graph (V, E) is 3-colorable iff $\mathbf{S}$ is consistent.

($\Rightarrow$) If (V, E) is 3-colorable, then a mapping $\gamma\colon V \to \{0, 1, 2\}$ exists with $\gamma(u) \neq \gamma(v)$ for all $\{u, v\} \in E$. As easily checked, the following interpretation ε, where $\mathcal{O} = \{o_0, o_1, o_2, o_3\}$, is a model of $\mathbf{S}$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon(b) &= \{o_0, o_1, o_2, o_3\}\\
\varepsilon(c_1) &= \{o_3\}\\
\varepsilon(c_2) &= \{o_0, o_1, o_2\}\\
\varepsilon(d) &= \{o_3\}\\
\varepsilon(c_v^i) &= \{o_j, o_3\}, \text{ where } j = (\gamma(v) + i) \bmod 3 \quad (\text{for all } v \in V \text{ and } i \in \{0, 1, 2\})\\
\varepsilon(d_v^i) &= \{o_j\}, \text{ where } j = (\gamma(v) + i) \bmod 3 \quad (\text{for all } v \in V \text{ and } i \in \{0, 1, 2\})\\
\varepsilon(d_{u,v}^i) &= \{o_j\}, \text{ where } j = (\gamma(v) + i) \bmod 3 \quad (\text{for all } d_{u,v}^i \in \mathcal{C} \text{ where } i \in \{0, 1, 2\}).
\end{aligned}
$$

($\Leftarrow$) If ε is a model of $\mathbf{S}$, then it satisfies $\varepsilon(c_2) \neq \emptyset$ and the following conditions:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|\varepsilon(d_v^i)| = 1/3 \cdot |\varepsilon(c_2)| \text{ for all } v \in V \text{ and } i \in \{0, 1, 2\}\\
&\varepsilon(d_v^i) \cap \varepsilon(d_v^j) = \emptyset, \text{ for all } v \in V \text{ and } i, j \in \{0, 1, 2\} \text{ with } i \neq j\\
&\varepsilon(d_{u,v}^i) \cap \varepsilon(d_{v,u}^i) = \emptyset, \text{ for all } \{u, v\} \in E \text{ and } i \in \{0, 1, 2\}\\
&\varepsilon(d_v^1) \cup \varepsilon(d_v^2) \cup \varepsilon(d_v^3) = \varepsilon(c_2), \text{ for all } v \in V\\
&\varepsilon(d_v^i) = \varepsilon(d_{v,u}^i), \text{ for all } d_{v,u}^i \in \mathcal{C} \text{ where } i \in \{0, 1, 2\}.
\end{aligned}
$$

In particular, the relationship $\varepsilon(d_v^i) = \varepsilon(d_{v,u}^i)$, for all $d_{v,u}^i \in \mathcal{C}$ where $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, can be shown as follows. Since $\{c_1, c_2\} \in \mathrm{me}(b)$, $d \Rightarrow c_1$, $d_v^i \Rightarrow c_2$, and $d_{v,u}^i \Rightarrow c_2$, we get $\varepsilon(d) \cap \varepsilon(d_v^i) = \emptyset$ and $\varepsilon(d) \cap \varepsilon(d_{v,u}^i) = \emptyset$.

Moreover, as $d \Rightarrow c_v^i$, $d_v^i \Rightarrow c_v^i$, and $d_{v,u}^i \Rightarrow c_v^i$, it holds $\varepsilon(d), \varepsilon(d_v^i), \varepsilon(d_{v,u}^i) \subseteq \varepsilon(c_v^i)$. Suppose now that $\varepsilon(d_v^i) \neq \varepsilon(d_{v,u}^i)$. As each among $d \Rightarrow c_v^i$, $d_v^i \Rightarrow c_v^i$, and $d_{v,u}^i \Rightarrow c_v^i$ is assigned the probability $1/2$, and $\varepsilon(d_v^i) \neq \emptyset$ and $\varepsilon(d_{v,u}^i) \neq \emptyset$, we get:

$$|\varepsilon(c_v^i)| \;\geq\; |\varepsilon(d)| + |\varepsilon(d_v^i) \cup \varepsilon(d_{v,u}^i)| \;>\; 1/2 \cdot |\varepsilon(c_v^i)| + 1/2 \cdot |\varepsilon(c_v^i)| \;=\; |\varepsilon(c_v^i)|\,,$$

which is a contradiction. It thus follows $\varepsilon(d_v^i) = \varepsilon(d_{v,u}^i)$.

Since $\varepsilon(c_2)$ is nonempty, there exists some $o \in \varepsilon(c_2)$. Let the mapping $\gamma\colon V \to \{0,1,2\}$ be defined by $\gamma(v) = i$ iff $o \in \varepsilon(d_v^i)$ for all nodes $v \in V$. It is now easy to see that γ is well-defined and that $\gamma(u) \neq \gamma(v)$ for all edges $\{u,v\} \in E$. Hence, (V,E) is 3-colorable. □

We next concentrate on the proof of Theorem 5.3. We need the following two lemmata.

Lemma 11.1 *Let $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ be a well-structured POB-schema. Let $c \in \mathcal{C}$ be any class and let $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2 \in \mathrm{me}(c)$ be two distinct partition clusters. Then the common subclasses of $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$ that are maximal with respect to $\Rightarrow^\star$ are pairwise t-disjoint.*

Proof. The claim follows immediately from W2. □

Lemma 11.2 *Let $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ be a well-structured POB-schema. Let $c \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $G_{\mathbf{S}}(c)$ contains at least one edge. Let $G_1, \ldots, G_k$ be a sequence of graphs such that $G_1 = G_{\mathbf{S}}(c)$, and that each G_i with $i \in \{2, \ldots, k\}$ is obtained from G_{i-1} by removing one leaf or isolated node. Let $\mathcal{P}_l$ be a leaf or isolated node in G_k. Suppose $d_l \in \mathcal{C}$ is a subclass of $\mathcal{P}_l$ but not of any other node $\mathcal{P}$ in G_k, and that $d \in \mathcal{C}$ is a subclass of some node $\mathcal{P}$ in G_k but not of $\mathcal{P}_l$. Then, d_l and d are not t-disjoint, $d \notin \mathrm{S}^\star(d_l)$, and $d_l \notin S^\star(d)$.*

Proof. We give a proof by contradiction. Assume first that d_l and d are t-disjoint. This means that there must be some class $c' \in \mathcal{C}$, some partition cluster $\mathcal{P}' \in \mathrm{me}(c')$, and two distinct classes $d_l', d' \in \mathcal{P}'$ such that $d_l \Rightarrow^\star d_l'$ and $d \Rightarrow^\star d'$. Suppose now that c' is not a subclass of c. By W1, there exists a top element $c_\top$ with $d_l' \Rightarrow^\star c_\top$ and $d' \Rightarrow^\star c_\top$. By W4, all paths from d_l up to $c_\top$ via d_l' and c' and all paths from d up to $c_\top$ via d' and c' must go through c. Thus, c must be a subclass of both d_l' and d'. But this contradicts P2. Hence, c' must be a subclass of c. Suppose now that $c = c'$. Thus, $\mathcal{P}'$ belongs to $\mathrm{me}(c)$. By the assumptions on d_l and d, the cluster $\mathcal{P}'$ cannot belong to G_k, which means it was removed in the construction of G_k from $G_{\mathbf{S}}(c)$. However, since the edges $\{\mathcal{P}_l, \mathcal{P}'\}$ and $\{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P}'\}$ are in $G_{\mathbf{S}}(c)$, this raises a contradiction. It follows that c' must be a proper subclass of c and thus a subclass of some cluster $\mathcal{P}'' \in \mathrm{me}(c)$. Again, by the assumptions on d_l and d, this cluster $\mathcal{P}''$ cannot belong to G_k, and assuming that $\mathcal{P}''$ was in the construction of G_k raises again a contradiction. This proves that d_l and d are t-disjoint.

Assume next that $d_l \in \mathrm{S}^\star(d)$ holds. Then d_l is a subclass of $\mathcal{P}$, which contradicts that d_l is not a subclass of any node in G_k different from $\mathcal{P}_l$. The case $d \in \mathrm{S}^\star(d)$ is analogous. □

We are now ready to prove Theorem 5.3.

Proof of Theorem 5.3. Let $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ be a pseudo-consistent and well-structured POB-schema. Let $c_\top$ denote the top element of $\mathbf{S}$. By P1 and W1, there exists a unique mapping $\alpha : \mathcal{C} \to [0,1]$ such that $\alpha(c_\top) = 1$ and that $\alpha(c) = \wp(c,d) \cdot \alpha(d)$ for all $c, d \in \mathcal{C}$ with $c \Rightarrow d$ (define $\alpha(c)$ as the product of the edge probabilities on any path from c to $c_\top$).

It is now easy to see that $\mathbf{S}$ is consistent iff there exists a finite nonempty set $\mathcal{O}$, a mapping ε from $\mathcal{C}$ to $2^{\mathcal{O}}$, and a mapping μ from $\mathcal{O}$ to the set of all rational numbers in $[0,1]$ such that:

(1) $\varepsilon(c) \subseteq \varepsilon(d)$ for all classes $c, d \in \mathcal{C}$ with $c \Rightarrow d$.

(2) $\varepsilon(c) \cap \varepsilon(d) = \emptyset$ for all distinct classes $c, d \in \mathcal{C}$ that belong to the same $\mathcal{P} \in \bigcup\{\mathrm{me}(e) \mid e \in \mathcal{C}\}$.

(3) $\sum_{o \in \mathcal{O}} \mu(o) = 1$.

(4) $\alpha(c) = \sum_{o \in \varepsilon(c)} \mu(o)$ for all classes $c \in \mathcal{C}$.

Informally, μ assigns a mass to each object (possibly 0), and $\alpha(c)$ is the share of the total mass of all objects in c. Such $\mathcal{O}$, ε, and μ are now constructed by induction on the structure of $\mathbf{S}$. Owing to possibly complex relationships between classes in $\mathbf{S}$, the proof is naturally involved.

We first consider the case where $\mathbf{S}$ has no multiple inheritance, i.e., $(\mathcal{C}, \Rightarrow)$ is a tree with root $c_\top$.

Basis: For $\mathcal{C} = \{c_\top\}$, we define $\mathcal{O} = \{o\}$, $\varepsilon(c_\top) = \{o\}$, and $\mu(o) = 1$. It is easy to see that these $\mathcal{O}$, ε, and μ have the properties (1)–(4) in $\mathbf{S}$.

Induction: Let $\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_l$ be the partition clusters in $\mathrm{me}(c_\top)$. Let $\mathbf{S}_1^\star = (\mathcal{C}_1^\star, \tau_1^\star, \Rightarrow_1^\star, \mathrm{me}_1^\star, \wp_1^\star), \ldots, \mathbf{S}_l^\star = (\mathcal{C}_l^\star, \tau_l^\star, \Rightarrow_l^\star, \mathrm{me}_l^\star, \wp_l^\star)$ be the greatest POB-schemas that are contained in $\mathbf{S}$, that have the top element $c_\top$, and that do not contain any classes from $\mathrm{S}(c_\top) - \mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathrm{S}(c_\top) - \mathcal{P}_l$.

Without loss of generality, let us consider the partition cluster $\mathcal{P}_1 = \{c_1, \ldots, c_k\}$. Let $\mathbf{S}_i = (\mathcal{C}_i, \tau_i, \Rightarrow_i, \mathrm{me}_i, \wp_i)$ be the greatest POB-schema that is contained in $\mathbf{S}$ and has the top element c_i, for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. Each $\mathbf{S}_i$ is pseudo-consistent and well-structured. Hence, by the induction hypothesis, there exist $\mathcal{O}_i$, ε_i, and μ_i that satisfy (1)–(4) in $\mathbf{S}_i$. It is now easy to verify that the following $\mathcal{O}_1^\star$, $\varepsilon_1^\star$, and $\mu_1^\star$ have the properties (1)–(4) in $\mathbf{S}_1^\star$:

- $\mathcal{O}_1^\star = \{o\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} \{c_i\} \times \varepsilon(c_i)$.
- $\varepsilon_1^\star(c_\top) = \mathcal{O}_1^\star$ and $\varepsilon_1^\star(d_i) = \{c_i\} \times \varepsilon_i(d_i)$ for all $d_i \in \mathcal{C}_i$ and $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$.
- $\mu_1^\star(o) = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k} \wp(c_i, c_\top)$ and $\mu_1^\star(c_i, o_i) = \wp(c_i, c_\top) \cdot \mu_i(o_i)$, for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, $o_i \in \mathcal{O}_i$.

That is, there exist $\mathcal{O}_1^\star, \ldots, \mathcal{O}_l^\star$, $\varepsilon_1^\star, \ldots, \varepsilon_l^\star$, and $\mu_1^\star, \ldots, \mu_l^\star$ that satisfy (1)–(4) in $\mathbf{S}_1^\star, \ldots, \mathbf{S}_l^\star$. We finally define $\mathcal{O}$, ε, and μ with the properties (1)–(4) in $\mathbf{S}$ as follows:

- $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_1^\star \times \cdots \times \mathcal{O}_l^\star$.
- $\varepsilon(c_\top) = \mathcal{O}$ and $\varepsilon(d_i^\star) = \{(o_1^\star, \ldots, o_l^\star) \in \mathcal{O} \mid o_i^\star \in \varepsilon_i^\star(d_i^\star)\}$ for all $d_i^\star \in \mathcal{C}_i^\star - \{c_\top\}$ and $i \in \{1, \ldots, l\}$.
- $\mu(o_1^\star, \ldots, o_l^\star) = \prod_{i=1}^{l} \mu_i^\star(o_i^\star)$ for all $(o_1^\star, \ldots, o_l^\star) \in \mathcal{O}$.

Let us next concentrate on POB-schemas $\mathbf{S} = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$ with limited multiple inheritance: For every $c \in \mathcal{C}$ and every two distinct $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2 \in \mathrm{me}(c)$, it holds that every $c_1 \in \mathcal{P}_1$ and $c_2 \in \mathcal{P}_2$ have at most one common subclass (which must then be different from c_1, c_2).

In this case, we must be more careful in the induction step. Along the same line of argumentation, we may construct $\mathcal{O}_i^\star$, $\varepsilon_i^\star$, and $\mu_i^\star$ with (1)–(4) in $\mathbf{S}_i^\star$, for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, l\}$, since P2 ensures that any two classes in the same partition cluster have pairwise disjoint sets of subclasses. The construction of $\mathcal{O}$, ε, and μ, however, is by induction on the structure of $G_{\mathbf{S}}(c_\top)$ as follows.

Basis: For $l = 1$, we define $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_1^\star$, $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_1^\star$, and $\mu = \mu_1^\star$.

Induction: For $l > 1$ and $G_{\mathbf{S}}(c_\top) = (\mathrm{me}(c_\top), \emptyset)$ (no common subclasses), the proof is as above.

For $l > 1$ and $G_{\mathbf{S}}(c_\top) \neq (\mathrm{me}(c_\top), \emptyset)$, by W3, the undirected graph $G_{\mathbf{S}}(c_\top)$ contains at least one leaf or one isolated node. Without loss of generality, let this node be given by $\mathcal{P}_l$. Let $\mathbf{S}' = (\mathcal{C}', \tau', \Rightarrow', \mathrm{me}', \wp')$ be the POB-schema that unifies the POB-schemas $\mathbf{S}^\star_1, \ldots, \mathbf{S}^\star_{l-1}$ under the top element $c_\top$. By the induction hypothesis, there exist $\mathcal{O}'$, ε', and μ' with the properties (1)–(4) in $\mathbf{S}'$.

Let $e_1, \ldots, e_m$ with $m \geq 0$ denote all the classes in $\mathcal{C}' \cap \mathcal{C}^\star_l - \{c_\top\}$. It is now important to point out that, by the assumption on common subclasses and Lemma 11.1, the classes e_i are pairwise t-disjoint. Moreover, by Lemma 11.2, each classes $c' \in \mathcal{C}' - \{c_\top, e_1, \ldots, e_m\}$ and $c^\star \in \mathcal{C}^\star - \{c_\top, e_1, \ldots, e_m\}$ are not t-disjoint and $c' \notin \mathrm{S}^\star(c^\star)$, $c^\star \notin \mathrm{S}^\star(c')$ hold. Let $\widehat{\mathcal{O}} = \mathcal{O}' - (\varepsilon'(e_1) \cup \cdots \cup \varepsilon'(e_m))$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^\star_l = \mathcal{O}^\star_l - (\varepsilon^\star_l(e_1) \cup \cdots \cup \varepsilon^\star_l(e_m))$. We now define $\mathcal{O}$, ε, and μ as follows:

- $\mathcal{O} \;=\; \widehat{\mathcal{O}}' \times \widehat{\mathcal{O}}^\star_l \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^m \varepsilon'(e_j) \times \varepsilon^\star_l(e_j)\,.$
- $$\varepsilon(d) \;=\; \begin{cases} \mathcal{O} & \text{if } d = c_\top \\ \varepsilon'(d) \times \varepsilon^\star_l(d) & \text{if } d \in \{e_1, \ldots, e_m\} \\ \{(o', o^\star_l) \in \mathcal{O} \mid o' \in \varepsilon'(d)\} & \text{if } d \in \mathcal{C}' - \{c_\top, e_1, \ldots, e_m\} \\ \{(o', o^\star_l) \in \mathcal{O} \mid o^\star_l \in \varepsilon^\star_l(d)\} & \text{if } d \in \mathcal{C}^\star - \{c_\top, e_1, \ldots, e_m\}\,. \end{cases}$$
- $$\mu(o', o^\star_l) \;=\; \begin{cases} \mu'(o') \cdot \mu^\star_l(o^\star_l) \,/\, \alpha(e_j) & \text{if } (o', o^\star_l) \in \varepsilon'(e_j) \times \varepsilon^\star_l(e_j) \\ \mu'(o') \cdot \mu^\star_l(o^\star_l) \,/\, (1 - \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha(e_j)) & \text{if } (o', o^\star_l) \in \widehat{\mathcal{O}}' \times \widehat{\mathcal{O}}^\star_l\,. \end{cases}$$

Note that

$$\sum_{o' \in \varepsilon'_l(e_j)} \mu'(o') = \sum_{o^\star_l \in \varepsilon^\star_l(e_j)} \mu^\star_l(o^\star_l) = \alpha(e_j)$$

and

$$\sum_{o' \in \widehat{\mathcal{O}}'} \mu'(o') = \sum_{o^\star_l \in \widehat{\mathcal{O}}^\star_l} \mu^\star_l(o^\star_l) = 1 - \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^m \alpha(e_j).$$

It can now easily be shown that $\mathcal{O}$, ε, and μ have the properties (1)–(4) in $\mathbf{S}$.

Let us finally consider the case of pseudo-consistent and well-structured POB-schemas $\mathbf{S}$ without any further restrictions. In this case, the classes $e_1, \ldots, e_m$ of the previous induction may have proper subclasses. The main ideas of the proof are now as follows. By the induction hypothesis, the subschema $\mathbf{S}_{e_j}$ under e_j is consistent. Since the classes e_j are pairwise disjoint, and each path from a class in $\mathbf{S}_{e_j}$ beyond that schema must pass through e_j, we can informally assume that the subgraph below e_j is replaced by a partition cluster $\{e_{j,1}, \ldots, e_{j,n_j}\}$ with $\sum_{i \in \{1,\ldots,n_j\}} \wp(e_{j,i}, e_j) = 1$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, where we introduce a class $e_{j,i}$ for each object in the model of $\mathbf{S}_{e_j}$. We then apply the same construction as above, using $e_{j,1}, \ldots, e_{j,n_j}$, instead of e_j, for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$. □

Proof of Theorem 7.1. (a), (b) Immediate from the fact that the consistency of $\mathbf{S}$ is independent of the type assignment of $\mathbf{S}$.

(c) Let $\mathbf{S}_1 = (\mathcal{C}_1, \tau_1, \Rightarrow_1, \mathrm{me}_1, \wp_1)$, $\mathbf{S}_2 = (\mathcal{C}_2, \tau_2, \Rightarrow_2, \mathrm{me}_2, \wp_2)$, and $\mathbf{S}_1 \times \mathbf{S}_2 = (\mathcal{C}, \tau, \Rightarrow, \mathrm{me}, \wp)$. Let $R_1 = R(\mathbf{S}_1)$ and $R_2 = R(\mathbf{S}_2)$. Let $\varepsilon_1 \colon \mathcal{C}_1 \to 2^{\mathcal{O}_1}$ and $\varepsilon_2 \colon \mathcal{C}_2 \to 2^{\mathcal{O}_2}$ be models of $\mathbf{S}_1$ and $\mathbf{S}_2$, respectively. Let the mapping $\varepsilon \colon \mathcal{C} \to 2^{\mathcal{O}}$, where $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_1 \times \mathcal{C}_2$ and $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_1 \times \mathcal{O}_2$, be defined by:

$$\varepsilon(c) \;=\; \varepsilon_1(c[R_1]) \times \varepsilon_2(c[R_2]), \quad \text{for all } c \in \mathcal{C}\,.$$

We now show that ε is a model of $\mathbf{S}$. We first prove C1. Since $\varepsilon_1(c_1) \neq \emptyset$ for all classes $c_1 \in \mathcal{C}_1$ and $\varepsilon_2(c_2) \neq \emptyset$ for all classes $c[R_2] \in \mathcal{C}_2$, we get $\varepsilon(c) \neq \emptyset$ for all classes $c \in \mathcal{C}$. We next show C2 and C4. Let $c, d \in \mathcal{C}$ with $c \Rightarrow d$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $c[R_1] \Rightarrow_1 d[R_1]$ and $c[R_2] = d[R_2]$. Since ε_1 is a model of $\mathbf{S}_1$, it holds that $\varepsilon_1(c[R_1]) \subseteq \varepsilon_1(d[R_1])$ and $|\varepsilon_1(c[R_1])| = \wp_1(c[R_1], d[R_1]) \cdot |\varepsilon_1(d[R_1])|$. Hence, it immediately follows $\varepsilon(c) \subseteq \varepsilon(d)$ and $|\varepsilon(c)| = \wp(c, d) \cdot |\varepsilon(d)|$. We finally prove C3. Let $c, d \in \mathcal{C}$ be two distinct classes that belong to the same cluster $\mathcal{P} \in \bigcup \mathrm{me}(\mathcal{C})$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $c[R_1], d[R_1] \in \mathcal{C}_1$ belong to the same cluster $\mathcal{P}_1 \in \bigcup \mathrm{me}_1(\mathcal{C}_1)$ and that $c[R_2] = d[R_2]$. Since ε_1 is a model of $\mathbf{S}_1$, it holds that $\varepsilon_1(c[R_1]) \cap \varepsilon_1(d[R_1]) = \emptyset$. Thus, $\varepsilon(c) \cap \varepsilon(d) = \emptyset$.

(d) Analogous to (c) (since the consistency of a POB-schema is independent of its type assignment). □

Proof of Theorem 8.1. Let $\mathbf{I}_2 = (\pi_2, \nu_2) = \sigma_{\phi_2}(\mathbf{I})$, $\mathbf{I}_{1,2} = (\pi_{1,2}, \nu_{1,2}) = \sigma_{\phi_1}(\sigma_{\phi_2}(\mathbf{I}))$, and $\mathbf{I}_{1\wedge 2} = (\pi_{1\wedge 2}, \nu_{1\wedge 2}) = \sigma_{\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2}(\mathbf{I})$. Since $\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2$ is logically equivalent to $\phi_2 \wedge \phi_1$, it suffices to show that $\mathbf{I}_{1,2}$ and $\mathbf{I}_{1\wedge 2}$ coincide. For each $c \in \mathcal{C}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi_{1,2}(c) &= \{o \in \pi_2(c) \mid \mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{I}_2,o} \models \phi_1\} \\
&= \{o \in \pi(c) \mid (\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o} \models \phi_2) \wedge (\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{I}_2,o} \models \phi_1)\} \\
&= \{o \in \pi(c) \mid (\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o} \models \phi_2) \wedge (\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o} \models \phi_1)\} \\
&= \{o \in \pi(c) \mid \mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o} \models \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2\} \\
&= \pi_{1\wedge 2}(c);
\end{aligned}$$

the key fact is that $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{I}_2,o} \models \phi_1$ is equivalent to $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o} \models \phi_1$, if o belongs to $\pi_2(c)$, i.e., $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o} \models \phi_2$ is true. Furthermore, for each class $c \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu_{1,2}(c) &= \nu_2(c)|\pi_{1,2}(c) \\
&= \nu(c)|\pi_2(c)|\pi_{1,2}(c) \\
&= \nu(c)|\pi_{1,2}(c) && \text{as } \pi_{1,2}(c) \subseteq \pi_2(c) \\
&= \nu(c)|\pi_{1\wedge 2}(c) && \text{as } \pi_{1,2}(c) = \pi_{1\wedge 2}(c) \\
&= \nu_{1\wedge 2}(c).
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the result. □

Proof of Theorem 8.2. Equation (2): immediate from the fact that $\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\Pi_{\mathbf{B}}(\mathbf{I})) = \Pi_{\mathbf{A}\cap\mathbf{B}}(\mathbf{I})$.

Equation (3): By the definition of selection, the oid o is selected from $\mathbf{I}$ iff $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o} \models \phi$ holds. Since ϕ accesses only attributes in the schema $\mathbf{S}' = \Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{S})$, and since the projection $\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{I}) =: \mathbf{I}'$ lets all such components of o survive, we have that $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o} \models \phi$ iff $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{I}',o} \models \phi$, for every oid o. Thus, by definition of $\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}$ it follows that $\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\sigma_\phi(\mathbf{I})) = \Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\sigma_\phi(\mathbf{I}'))$. Since $\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\sigma_\phi(\mathbf{I}'))$ and $\sigma_\phi(\mathbf{I}')$ have the same schema, we have $\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\sigma_\phi(\mathbf{I}')) = \sigma_\phi(\mathbf{I}'))$. It follows $\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\sigma_\phi(\mathbf{I})) = \sigma_\phi(\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{I}))$. □

Proof of Theorem 8.3. Equation (4): Let $\mathbf{I} = (\pi, \nu)$. Consider any top-level attribute E from the schema of $\delta_N(\mathbf{I})$. Then, there is a top-level attribute D from $\mathbf{S}$ (not necessarily different from E) such that $\delta_N(D) = E$. Let o be any oid, and set $\phi' := \delta_{N^{-1}}(\phi)$. We then obtain:

$$\delta_N(\nu(o)).E = \delta_N(\nu(o).D) = \delta_N(\nu(o).\delta_{N^{-1}}(E)).$$

By induction on the structure of ϕ, we thus obtain that $\mathrm{prob}_{\delta_N(\mathbf{I}),o} \models \phi$ iff $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{S},\mathbf{I},o} \models \phi'$ holds for all oids o populating $\mathbf{I}$ (equivalently, $\delta_N(\mathbf{I})$). Thus, o belongs to $\sigma_\phi(\delta_N(\mathbf{I}))$ iff it belongs to $\delta_N(\sigma_{\phi'}(\mathbf{I}))$, and since

selection and renaming do not change class membership, o belongs in $\sigma_\phi(\delta_N(\mathbf{I}))$ and in $\delta_N(\sigma_{\phi'}(\mathbf{I}))$ to the same class. Since selection does not affect the value assignment, o has in $\sigma_\phi(\delta_N(\mathbf{I}))$ and in $\delta_N(\sigma_{\phi'}(\mathbf{I}))$ also the same probabilistic value. Thus $\sigma_\phi(\delta_N(\mathbf{I})) = \delta_N(\sigma_{\phi'}(\mathbf{I}))$.

Equation (5): The proof is analogous as for classical relational databases (class hierarchy and probability assignment do not play a role here).

We first observe that the schemas on the two sides coincide. Indeed, if A is a top-level attribute of the schema of $\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\delta_N(\mathbf{I}))$, then $A \in \mathbf{A}$ and $\delta_{N-1}(A)$ is a top-level attribute of $\mathbf{S}$. Thus, $\delta_N(\delta_{N-1}(A)) = A$ is a top-level attribute of the schema of $\delta_N(\Pi_{\delta_{N-1}(\mathbf{A})}(\mathbf{I}))$. Conversely, if A is a top-level attribute of $\delta_N(\Pi_{\delta_{N-1}(\mathbf{A})}(\mathbf{I}))$, then $\delta_{N-1}(A)$ is a top-level attribute of $\mathbf{S}$ and, moreover, $A \in \mathbf{A}$. Thus, A is a top-level attribute of the schema of $\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\delta_N(\mathbf{I}))$. It follows from this that the schemas on the two sides of Equation (5) coincide. Since projection and renaming do not affect class membership of objects, $\mathbf{I}$, $\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\delta_N(\mathbf{I}))$, and $\delta_N(\Pi_{\delta_{N-1}(\mathbf{A})}(\mathbf{I}))$ are populated by the same objects o, with the same class membership function. The value of the (existing) attribute A of object o in both $\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\delta_N(\mathbf{I}))$ and $\delta_N(\Pi_{\delta_{N-1}(\mathbf{A})}(\mathbf{I}))$ is given by $\nu(o).\delta_{N-1}(A)$, where $\mathbf{I} = (\pi, \nu)$. This establishes that $\Pi_{\mathbf{A}}(\delta_N(\mathbf{I}))$ and $\delta_N(\Pi_{\delta_{N-1}(\mathbf{A})}(\mathbf{I}))$ coincide. □

Proof of Theorem 8.4. Equation (6) (commutativity of the join) holds because (i) the join in classical databases (used to generate the POB-schema of the join and the oids of its instance) is commutative, (ii) classical set intersection $\cap$ is commutative, and (iii) the conjunction strategy $\otimes$ is commutative.

Equation (7) (associativity of join): A simple analysis of the possible cases for membership of an attribute A in the sets of top-level attributes $\mathbf{A}_1$, $\mathbf{A}_2$, and $\mathbf{A}_3$ of $\mathbf{S}_1, \mathbf{S}_2$, and $\mathbf{S}_3$, respectively, establishes that the join of probabilistic tuple values is associative. From associativity of classical relational join and set intersection, it is then easy to see from the definition of join for POB-instances that $(\mathbf{I}_1 \bowtie_\otimes \mathbf{I}_2) \bowtie_\otimes \mathbf{I}_3 = \mathbf{I}_1 \bowtie_\otimes (\mathbf{I}_2 \bowtie_\otimes \mathbf{I}_3)$ holds.

Equation (8): By Theorem 8.1 we have $\sigma_{\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 \wedge \phi_3}(\mathbf{I}_1 \bowtie_\otimes \mathbf{I}_2) = \sigma_{\phi_3}(\sigma_{\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2}(\mathbf{I}_1 \bowtie_\otimes \mathbf{I}_2))$. Thus, it remains to establish that $\sigma_{\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2}(\mathbf{I}_1 \bowtie_\otimes \mathbf{I}_2) = \sigma_{\phi_1}(\mathbf{I}_1) \bowtie_\otimes \sigma_{\phi_2}(\mathbf{I}_2)$ holds.

The set of top-level attributes of the schema of $\mathbf{I}_{1\bowtie 2} := \mathbf{I}_1 \bowtie_\otimes \mathbf{I}_2$ is $\mathbf{A}_1 \cup \mathbf{A}_2$. For each $A \in \mathbf{A}_1 - \mathbf{A}_2$, its value for an object $o = (o_1, o_2)$ in $\mathbf{I}_{1\bowtie 2}$, provided A exists for o, is by definition of join given by $\nu_1(o_1).A$. Since ϕ_1 involves only top-level attributes from $\mathbf{A}_1 - \mathbf{A}_2$, this implies $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{I}_{1\bowtie 2}, o} \models \phi_1$ iff $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{I}_1, o_1} \models \phi_1$. Similarly, we obtain that $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{I}_{1\bowtie 2}, o} \models \phi_2$ iff $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{I}_2, o_2} \models \phi_2$; hence, $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{I}_{1\bowtie 2}, o} \models \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2$ iff $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{I}_i, o_i} \models \phi_i$, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

Thus, for every oid $o = (o_1, o_2)$ belonging to $\sigma_{\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2}(\mathbf{I}_1 \bowtie_\otimes \mathbf{I}_2)$ it holds that o_i is in $\sigma_{\phi_i}(\mathbf{I}_i)$, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, and thus (o_1, o_2) belongs to $\sigma_{\phi_1}(\mathbf{I}_1) \bowtie_\otimes \sigma_{\phi_2}(\mathbf{I}_2)$. Moreover, since selection does not change an object's value assignment, o has in $\sigma_{\phi_1}(\mathbf{I}_1) \bowtie_\otimes \sigma_{\phi_2}(\mathbf{I}_2)$ the same value as in $\sigma_{\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2}(\mathbf{I}_{1\bowtie 2})$. Conversely, if $o = (o_1, o_2)$ belongs to $\sigma_{\phi_1}(\mathbf{I}_1) \bowtie_\otimes \sigma_{\phi_2}(\mathbf{I}_2)$, then o belongs to $\mathbf{I}_{1\bowtie 2}$, and $\mathrm{prob}_{\mathbf{I}_{1\bowtie 2}, o} \models \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2$ holds. Thus, o belongs also to $\sigma_{\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2}(\mathbf{I}_{1\bowtie 2})$, and has in it the same value as in $\sigma_{\phi_1}(\mathbf{I}_1) \bowtie_\otimes \sigma_{\phi_2}(\mathbf{I}_2)$. This proves $\sigma_{\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2}(\mathbf{I}_1 \bowtie_\otimes \mathbf{I}_2) = \sigma_{\phi_1}(\mathbf{I}_1) \bowtie_\otimes \sigma_{\phi_2}(\mathbf{I}_2)$.

Equation (9): Since projection does not change class membership, both POB-instances $\Pi_{\mathbf{B}}(\mathbf{I}_1 \bowtie_\otimes \mathbf{I}_2)$ and $\Pi_{\mathbf{B}}(\Pi_{\mathbf{B}_1}(\mathbf{I}_1) \bowtie_\otimes \Pi_{\mathbf{B}_2}(\mathbf{I}_2))$ are populated by the objects $o = (o_1, o_2)$ from $\mathbf{I}_1 \bowtie_\otimes \mathbf{I}_2$. The inner projections $\Pi_{\mathbf{B}_1}, \Pi_{\mathbf{B}_2}$ remove all top-level attributes $A \in \mathbf{A}_1 \cup \mathbf{A}_2$ from o_1 and o_2, respectively, which are neither common attributes of $\mathbf{A}_1$ and $\mathbf{A}_2$ nor in $\mathbf{B}$. Each such attribute of o in $\mathbf{I}_1 \bowtie_\otimes \mathbf{I}_2$ is removed by the projection $\Pi_{\mathbf{B}}$ applied to it. Thus, the value of o in $\Pi_{\mathbf{B}}(\mathbf{I}_1 \bowtie_\otimes \mathbf{I}_2)$ and $\Pi_{\mathbf{B}_1}(\mathbf{I}_1) \bowtie_\otimes \Pi_{\mathbf{B}_2}(\mathbf{I}_2)$ is the same. It follows $\Pi_{\mathbf{B}}(\mathbf{I}_1 \bowtie_\otimes \mathbf{I}_2) = \Pi_{\mathbf{B}}(\Pi_{\mathbf{B}_1}(\mathbf{I}_1) \bowtie_\otimes \Pi_{\mathbf{B}_2}(\mathbf{I}_2))$. □

Proof of Theorem 8.6. Equations (14) and (15) are immediate from commutativity and associativity, respectively, of set intersection and the probabilistic conjunction strategy $\otimes$.

Equations (16) and (17) can be concluded similarly, with disjunction strategy $\oplus$ in place of $\otimes$, based on the following observation: without loss of generality, we may assume that each object o occurring in one of $\mathbf{I}_1$, $\mathbf{I}_2$, and $\mathbf{I}_3$ occurs in all of them and belongs to the same class; furthermore, the set V of values of a top-level attribute A associated with o is always the same. The reason is that technically, we may add o to the POB-instances in which it is missing, and add values v to V in each $\mathbf{I}_i$ and set $\alpha(v) = \beta(v) = 0$ such that V is everywhere the same. Thanks to the postulate of Ignorance for $\oplus$, this does not change the result of the expressions in Equations (16) and (17). Under this technical assumption, only the intersection case in the definitions of $[\alpha(v), \beta(v)]$ (Definition 7.28) and $\nu(o)$ as in Definition 7.30 is relevant, for which the properties obviously hold.

Equation (18) holds since projection simply removes attributes while it does not affect class membership of objects, and the intersection $pt_1 \cap_\otimes pt_2$ of probabilistic tuple values pt_1 and pt_2 is the aggregation of (independent) intersections $pt_1.A_i \otimes pt_2.A_i$ of all their attributes A_i. The argument for Equations (19) and (20) is analogous (as above, we may add oids o and values v to simplify the value assignment to o in $\mathbf{I}_1 \cup_\oplus \mathbf{I}_2$ and $\mathbf{I}_1 -_\ominus \mathbf{I}_2$, respectively). □

References

[1] S. Abiteboul, R. Hull, and V. Vianu. *Foundations of Databases*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, 1995.

[2] M. Atkinson, D. DeWitt, D. Maier, F. Bancilhon, K. Dittrich, and S. Zdonik. The object-oriented database system manifesto. In *Proceedings DOOD-89*, pages 40–57. Elsevier Science Publishers, 1989.

[3] F. Bancilhon, C. Delobel, and P. Kanellakis, editors. *Building an Object-Oriented Database System: The Story of O_2*. Morgan Kaufmann, Los Altos (CA), 1991.

[4] D. Barbara, H. Garcia-Molina, and D. Porter. The management of probabilistic data. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 4(5):387–502, 1992.

[5] E. Bertino and L. Martino. *Object Oriented Database Systems: Concepts and Architectures*. Addison-Wesley, Wokingham, 1993.

[6] G. Boole. *The Laws of Thought*. Macmillan, London, 1854.

[7] R. Cavallo and M. Pittarelli. The theory of probabilistic databases. In *Proceedings VLDB-87*, pages 71–81. Morgan Kaufmann, 1987.

[8] A. Dekhtyar and V. S. Subrahmanian. Hybrid probabilistic programs. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Logic Programming (ICLP '97)*, pages 391–405. MIT Press, 1997.

[9] D. Dey and S. Sarkar. A probabilistic relational model and algebra. *ACM Transactions on Database Systems*, 21(3):339–369, 1996.

[10] D. Dey and S. Sarkar. PSQL: A query language for probabilistic relational data. *Data & Knowledge Engineering*, 28:107–120, 1998.

[11] C. Dyreson and R. Snodgrass. Supporting valid-time indeterminacy. *ACM Transactions on Database Systems*, 23(1):1–57, 1998.

[12] T. Eiter, T. Lukasiewicz, and M. Walter. A data model and algebra for probabilistic complex values. Technical Report INFSYS RR-1843-00-04, Institut für Informationssysteme, Technische Universität Wien, 2000.

[13] T. Eiter, T. Lukasiewicz, and M. Walter. Extension of the relational algebra to probabilistic complex values. In *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Foundations of Information and Knowledge Systems (FoIKS 2000)*, volume 1762 of *LNCS*, pages 94–115. Springer, 2000.

[14] R. Fagin, J. Y. Halpern, and N. Megiddo. A logic for reasoning about probabilities. *Information and Computation*, 87:78–128, 1990.

[15] N. Fuhr and T. Rölleke. A probabilistic NF2 relational algebra for integrated information retrieval and database systems. In *Proceedings of the 2nd World Conference on Integrated Design and Process Technology*, pages 17–30. Society for Design and Process Science, 1996.

[16] N. Fuhr and T. Rölleke. A probabilistic relational algebra for the integration of information retrieval and database systems. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*, 15(1):32–66, 1997.

[17] M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. Freeman & Co., 1979.

[18] G. Graefe. The cascades framework for query optimization. *Data Engineering Bulletin*, 18(3):19–29, 1995.

[19] W. I. Grosky, R. Jain, and R. Mehrotra, editors. *The Handbook of Multimedia Information Management*. Prentice Hall, 1997.

[20] U. Güntzer, W. Kießling, and H. Thöne. New directions for uncertainty reasoning in deductive databases. In *Proceedings of ACM SIGMOD '91*, pages 178–187. ACM Press, 1991.

[21] P. Haddawy. Generating Bayesian networks from probability logic knowledge bases. In *Proceedings of the 10th Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (UAI-94)*, pages 262–269. Morgan Kaufmann, 1994.

[22] J. Y. Halpern. An analysis of first-order logics of probability. *Artificial Intelligence*, 46(3):311–350, 1990.

[23] W. Kießling, H. Thöne, and U. Güntzer. Database support for problematic knowledge. In *Proceedings EDBT-92*, volume 580 of *LNCS*, pages 421–436. Springer, 1992.

[24] M. Kifer and A. Li. On the semantics of rule-based expert systems with uncertainty. In *Proceedings ICDT-88*, volume 326 of *LNCS*, pages 102–117. Springer, 1988.

[25] W. Kim. *Introduction to Object-Oriented Databases*. MIT Press, Cambridge (MA), 1990.

[26] D. Koller and A. Pfeffer. Object-oriented Bayesian networks. In *Proceedings of the 13th Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (UAI-97)*, pages 302–313. Morgan Kaufmann, 1997.

[27] Y. Kornatzky and S. E. Shimony. A probabilistic object-oriented data model. *Data & Knowledge Engineering*, 12:143–166, 1994.

[28] H. E. Kyburg, Jr. and M. Pittarelli. Set-based Bayesianism. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics — Part A: Systems and Humans*, 26(3):324–339, 1996.

[29] L. V. S. Lakshmanan, N. Leone, R. Ross, and V. S. Subrahmanian. ProbView: A flexible probabilistic database system. *ACM Transactions on Database Systems*, 22:419–469, 1997.

[30] L. V. S. Lakshmanan and F. Sadri. Modeling uncertainty in deductive databases. In *Proceedings DEXA-94*, volume 856 of *LNCS*, pages 724–733. Springer, 1994.

[31] L. V. S. Lakshmanan and F. Sadri. Probabilistic deductive databases. In *Proceedings of the 1994 International Logic Programming Symposium (ILPS '94)*, pages 254–268. MIT Press, 1994.

[32] L. V. S. Lakshmanan and N. Shiri. A parametric approach to deductive databases with uncertainty. In *Proceedings of the International Workshop on Logic in Databases (LID '96)*, volume 1154 of *LNCS*, pages 61–81. Springer, 1996.

[33] K. B. Laskey and S. M. Mahoney. Network fragments: Representing knowledge for constructing probabilistic models. In *Proceedings of the 13th Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (UAI-97)*, pages 334–341. Morgan Kaufmann, 1997.

[34] M. Pittarelli. An algebra for probabilistic databases. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 6(2):293–303, 1994.

[35] F. Sadri. Modeling uncertainty in object-oriented databases. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Incompleteness and Uncertainty in Information Systems (IUIS'93)*, Workshops in Computing, pages 56–68. Springer, 1994.

[36] G. M. Shaw and S. B. Zdonik. A query algebra for object-oriented databases. In *Proceedings ICDE-90*, pages 154–161. IEEE Computer Society, 1990.