

Answering Constraint Path Queries over Graphs

Heyang Li

University of Kaiserslautern-Landau
Kaiserslautern, Germany
heyang.li@cs.rptu.de

Anthony Widjaja Lin

University of Kaiserslautern-Landau
and MPI-SWS
Kaiserslautern, Germany
awlin@mpi-sws.org

Domagoj Vrgoč

PUC Chile and IMFD Chile
Santiago, Chile
vrdomagoj@uc.cl

ABSTRACT

Constraints are powerful declarative constructs that allow users to conveniently restrict variable values that potentially range over an infinite domain. In this paper, we propose a constraint path query language over property graphs, which extends Regular Path Queries (RPQs) with SMT constraints on data attributes in the form of equality constraints and Linear Real Arithmetic (LRA) constraints. We provide efficient algorithms for evaluating such path queries over property graphs, which exploits optimization of macro-states (among others, using theory-specific techniques). In particular, we demonstrate how such an algorithm may effectively utilize highly optimized SMT solvers for resolving such constraints over paths. We implement our algorithm in MillenniumDB, an open-source graph engine supporting property graph queries and GQL. Our extensive empirical evaluation in a real-world setting demonstrates the viability of our approach.

Artifact Availability:

The source code, data, and/or other artifacts have been made available at <https://github.com/Wanshuiquan/MillenniumDB/tree/artifact>.

1 INTRODUCTION

Graph databases have been an increasingly popular technology in the database ecosystem over the past decades, with multiple open-source [25, 37, 42] and proprietary systems [33, 38, 39, 41, 43] being developed, and a steady stream of research literature on the subject [1, 2, 11]. Graphs offer an intuitive modelling of the application domain with nodes representing entities and edges representing connections between these entities. Edges are usually labelled to identify the type of the connection, giving rise to the edge-labelled graph database model [2, 8]. Extending this model with the ability to add attributes with their associated values to both nodes and edges (and also to label the nodes) is supported in the property-graph data model [1].

While the early work on graph databases focused on edge-labelled graphs, partly due to their widespread use in the Semantic Web community and the availability of standards such as RDF [7] and SPARQL [21], the main focus of commercial vendors these days are property graphs. Historically the main player in this space has been Neo4j with their Cypher query language [18], with many vendors implementing their variants Cypher. Many different flavours of the query language also meant low interoperability, so significant amount of efforts was put into standardizing property-graph query languages by the ISO/IEC resulting in SQL/PGQ [22], and GQL [23] standards for querying property graphs.

At their core, both standards share the same pattern matching capabilities, starting from graph patterns [1], which allow finding a

small graph-like pattern inside of a larger property graph. Another core feature of all graph query languages are *path queries*, which allow traversing the graph with paths whose length is not known in advance. Traditionally [1, 8, 21], the main class of such queries were *regular path queries (RPQs)*, which were specified via a regular expression and would return pairs of nodes connected by a path whose edge labels spell a word in the language of the expression.




Figure 1: Social network property graph.

In GQL and SQL/PGQ path queries were significantly enhanced compared to previous efforts, allowing regular path queries to return different sort of paths between two nodes (shortest, simple, etc.), and there is an ongoing effort to include reasoning on complex path properties such as length, maximum values, or cost into the GQL standard. To illustrate the importance of such features, consider the social network graph in Figure 1 representing information about people who know each other. Suppose now that we wish to find paths labelled by follows such that the link is rather new (e.g. established after 2021), but also that the maximum difference between the age of two people along this paths is no more than seven years. In our example the path Alice→Charlie→Diana is one such path connecting Alice to Diana. While such queries are relevant in practice, not many existing engines can specify them or execute them efficiently, be it because they lack full support for RPQs [12], or because they cannot express complex data properties such as the maximum age gap in the example above [18, 28].

Constraints. The aforementioned query is an example of *constraint queries* [26] specifically applied to graph databases. That is, one allows variables over a possibly infinite domain (e.g. the set of real numbers), which could be constrained by using formulas over certain logical theories (e.g. Linear Real Arithmetic (LRA)). Constraints were studied systematically in database theory in the 1990s resulting in several prototypes including DEDALE [20], MLPQ [34], and DISCO [6], although such systems were limited to databases not exceeding hundreds of tuples. To the best of our knowledge,

none of these systems are still maintained and available in the public domain. Recently, constraints have been revisited in the context of graph databases [14, 16, 29]. In particular, a large class of constraint path queries can be answered efficiently (i.e. in nondeterministic logarithmic space and polynomial time, for any fixed query). Unfortunately, all of these algorithms rely on heavy machinery from embedded finite model theory called *Restricted Quantifier Collapse (RQC)*. In fact, the proposed algorithms rewrite a given constraint query into a simpler one that is in the worst case *doubly exponentially larger* than the original query!

Contributions. In this paper, we demonstrate that it is possible to enrich RPQs with complex data constraints, without sacrificing efficiency and scalability of query evaluation. Specifically, our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We introduce *parametric regular expressions*, which provide a clean syntax to specify path patterns which: (a) conform to a regular expression; (b) allow defining complex data constraints on attribute values along such paths. In particular, constraints of the form of (dis)equality over strings and existential (in)equality formulas over linear terms over rational variables are permitted.
- We show that parametric regular expressions can be converted into *parametric automata* [14, 15, 24], which may be construed as a subclass of Regular Data Path Queries [14], where variables are “read-only” but they are allowed to take values that are not in the database. Among others, this allows an extension of the product-graph construction used to evaluate RPQs [12], yielding a constraint reachability problem over property graphs.
- We provide new lightweight query evaluation algorithms, which do not use heavy machinery from constraint databases and embedded finite model theory (in particular, RQC [14, 16]). The new algorithm is essentially a graph reachability algorithm over “macro-states” (i.e. a data structure consisting of a node in the graph, a state in the automaton, and a set of accumulated constraints). In particular, a simplex algorithm (which is supported by most SMT-solvers) can be used to efficiently determine feasibility of a macro-state. The algorithm runs in $O(2^c \cdot |A| \cdot (|V| + |E|))$ time, where the query has size A with c (in)equalities constraints, and the property graph has $|V|$ vertices and $|E|$ edges. The algorithm is exponential only in the size of the query, which is unavoidable owing to our NP-hardness of the problem. Since the query is typically much smaller than the database, we may use *data complexity* [40] to measure the complexity of the algorithm (i.e., c and $|A|$ as a constant size), in which case our algorithm runs in linear time.
- We implement our new query evaluation algorithms inside of MillenniumDB [42], an open-source graph engine supporting property graph queries and GQL; and
- We provide an extensive experimental evaluation showing the feasibility of our approach in a real-world setting, *up to tens of millions of tuples*. This is far beyond the database size that previous constraint database systems [6, 20, 34] could handle, i.e., up to hundreds of tuples. On average, our approach can evaluate most queries within 100 ms for medium

dense graphs and complicated queries over extremely dense graphs within 1 s. This performance is despite the NP-hard combined complexity of the problem.

Related work. While path queries that constrain how data values change along a path conforming to a regular expression (or extensions thereof for constraining data) have been studied in the theoretical literature [3, 14, 28], to the best of our knowledge, not much work was done on actually evaluating such queries in practice. This might not be surprising, given that such data conditions mimic aggregation over paths, which is a provably hard problem [17]. However, such queries are highly relevant in practice, and are being actively added to the current version of the GQL standard [11]. For this same reason, certain path constraints are supported in existing systems through the UNWIND operator [43], which allows to first collect all the values along a path and then subsequently process them as a list, the performance in such cases seems to be somewhat lacking [19], which is to be expected given that the number of paths matching the underlying regular pattern can easily become exponential [12] and the UNWIND approach requires collecting all of them for post-processing. Even when such approaches are efficient, they do not provide a systematic way of expressing path constraints as parameterized regex we introduce do, since the latter can support data constraints under a regular pattern.

Organization. The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Preliminary definitions are given in Section 2. We define parametric RPQs and their automaton model in Section 3. Algorithms for their evaluation are given in Section 4 and Section 5. Experimental evaluation is in Section 6. We conclude in Section 7.

2 PRELIMINARIES

Here we define basic notions used throughout the paper.

Graphs and paths. Following the usual conventions in the research literature [10], we define *property graphs* as directed graphs where both edges and nodes carry labels and a series of attributes (i.e. properties) with their associated values. Formally, we assume disjoint countably infinite sets Vertices of vertex identifiers, Edges of edge identifiers, and Labels of edge labels. Similarly, we assume a countably infinite set Properties of node and edge property names and Values of property values. We can then define property graphs as follows:

Definition 2.1. A *property graph* is a tuple $G = (V, E, \rho, \lambda, \pi)$ where: (1) $V \subseteq \text{Vertices}$ is a finite set of vertex identifiers; (2) $E \subseteq \text{Edges}$ is a finite set of edge identifiers; (3) $\rho : E \rightarrow (V \times V)$ is a total function mapping edges to ordered pairs of vertices. For convenience, instead of writing $\rho(e) = (v_1, v_2)$, we shall often write $v_1 \xrightarrow{e} v_2$; (4) $\lambda : (V \cup E) \rightarrow \text{Labels}$ is a total function assigning a label to a vertex or an edge; and (5) $\pi : (V \cup E) \times \text{Properties} \rightarrow \text{Values}$ is a partial function mapping an element (edge or vertex) and a property name to a property value.

Example 2.2. Consider the property graph G depicted in Figure 1 modeling a social network, where vertices represent people, and edges represent relationships between them. The labels of vertices is Person, while edges are labeled as follow or favorite. Each

person vertex has a name property and an age property. Each edge has a since property indicating the year when the relation started.

Definition 2.3 (Path). A path from v to w in a property graph $G = (V, E, \rho, \lambda, \pi)$, where $v, w \in V$, is an alternating sequence $v = v_0 e_1 v_1 e_2 \dots e_n v_n = w$ of vertices and edges where $n \geq 0$, such that a path can be a unit vertex v where $n = 0$, or for all $i \in [1, n]$, $e_i \in E$ and $\rho(e_i) = (v_{i-1}, v_i)$ for forward edge or $\rho(e_i) = (v_i, v_{i-1})$ for backward edge.

Note: a path can be empty, denoted by ϵ .

Regular path queries. Regular path queries (RPQs for short) [2] in a graph database G is an expression of the form $(v, \text{regex}, ?x)$, where v is a node in G and regex is a regular over the alphabet of edge labels, and $?x$ the output variable. The output of an RPQ over G , denoted $[[v, \text{regex}, ?x]]_G$, is the set of all nodes v' such that v' can be reached from v by a path P in G and the edge labels along this path form a word accepted by the regular expression regex .

The product graph construction. A common way to evaluate RPQs is based on the product graph construction [8, 12]. Given a graph database $G = (V, E, \rho, \lambda, \pi)$ and an RPQ $q = (v, \text{regex}, ?x)$, the *product graph* is constructed by first converting the regular expression regex into an equivalent non-deterministic finite automaton $(Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$. Here Q is a finite set of states, Σ a finite alphabet of edge labels, $\delta \subseteq Q \times \Sigma \times Q$ the transition relation, and the initial state is q_0 , while F is the set of final states. The product graph G_\times is defined as the graph database $G_\times = (V_\times, E_\times, \rho_\times, \lambda_\times, \pi_\times)$, where (1) $V_\times = V \times Q$; (2) $E_\times = \{(e, (q_1, a, q_2)) \in E \times \delta \mid \lambda(e) = a\}$; (3) $\rho_\times(e, d) = ((x, q_1), (y, q_2))$ if: $d = (q_1, a, q_2)$, $\lambda(e) = a$ and $\rho(e) = (x, y)$; (4) $\lambda_\times((e, d)) = \lambda(e)$; (5) $\pi_\times(v, q) = \pi(v)$; (6) $\pi_\times(e, d) = \pi(e)$. In the final two items we abuse the notation slightly to signal that the set of attributes for nodes or edges is inherited from the original database G . Each node of the form (u, q) in G_\times corresponds to the node u in G and, furthermore, each path P of the form $(v, q_0)(e_1, d_1)(v_1, q_1) \dots (e_n, d_n)(v_n, q_n)$ in G_\times corresponds to a path $p = v e_1 v_1 \dots e_n v_n$ in G that (a) has the same length as P and (b) brings the automaton from state q_0 to q_n . As such, when $q_n \in F$, then this path in G matches regex . In other words, all nodes v' that can be reached from v by a path that matches regex can be found by using standard graph search algorithms (e.g., BFS/DFS) on G_\times starting in the node (v, q_0) .

3 QUERY LANGUAGE

This section introduces the syntax and semantics of *parametric regular expressions* and *parametric regular path queries*. Parametric regular expressions extend standard regular expressions (used in RPQs and GQL) in two aspects: (i) parametric regular expressions can not only express patterns over edges, but also express patterns over nodes; and (ii) parametric regular expressions have *constraints* on data domains of edges and nodes, and these constraints can query beyond the active domain of a property graph with *global parameters*. In addition to parametric regular expressions, we also introduce *parametric automata*, which serve as an execution model for parametric regular path queries. Finally, we analyze the complexity of evaluating parametric regular path queries over property graphs.

3.1 Parametric Regular Expressions

Syntax. The syntax of parametric regular expressions is based on the syntax of regular expressions in [42], and the formal definition is given below.

Definition 3.1 (Syntax of Parametric Regular Expressions). We assume a set \mathcal{L} of labels, a finite set \mathcal{P}_n of numerical properties, a finite set \mathcal{P}_c of string properties and a set of global parameters Var such that $Var \subset \mathbb{Q}$. The syntax of parametric regular expressions is defined as follows:

| | | | |
|----------|-------|----------------------|--|
| E | $::=$ | (t, ϕ) | $t \in \mathcal{L}$ |
| | $ $ | \hat{E} | inverse |
| | $ $ | E_1/E_2 | concatenation of E_1 and E_2 |
| | $ $ | $E_1 \mid E_2$ | alternation of E_1 and E_2 |
| | $ $ | E^* | |
| | $ $ | E^+ | |
| | $ $ | $E^?$ | |
| ϕ | $::=$ | $x = c_{str}$ | $x \in \mathcal{P}_c$ and c_{str} is a string constant |
| | $ $ | $t_{ar} \sim t_{ar}$ | $\sim \in \{>, <, \leq, \geq, \neq, =\}$ |
| | $ $ | $\phi \wedge \phi$ | |
| t_{ar} | $::=$ | c | $c \in \mathbb{Q}$ |
| | $ $ | $c \cdot p$ | $c \in \mathbb{Q}$ |
| | $ $ | $t_{ar} + t_{ar}$ | |
| p | $::=$ | $attr$ | $attr \in \mathcal{P}_n$ |
| | $ $ | $?x$ | $?x \in Var$ |

For the convenience of presentation, we call $attr \in \mathcal{P}_n$ as *numerical attributes*, and $attr \in \mathcal{P}_c$ as *string attributes*.

Semantics. We start with the *sequence of elements*, which is what can be captured by a parametric regular expression. We assume a countably infinite set $Labels$ of forward labels, Properties of properties names and Values of properties values. For each forward label $l \in Labels$, we have a related *inverse label* \hat{l} , and the set of inverse labels is denoted as \hat{Labels} . An element is a pair (l, f) , such that $l \in Labels \cup \hat{Labels}$ and $f : Properties \mapsto Values$. We denote a set of elements as Σ .

A *sequence of elements* is a finite list p such that $p \in \Sigma^*$. Given two sequences $p_1, p_2 \in \Sigma^*$, where $p_1 = (l_1, f_1), \dots, (l_n, f_n)$ and $p_2 = (l'_1, f'_1), \dots, (l'_n, f'_n)$, the *concatenation* of p_1 and p_2 is a new sequence $p_1 \cdot p_2 = (l_1, f_1), \dots, (l_n, f_n), (l'_1, f'_1), \dots, (l'_n, f'_n)$.

Interpretation of Data Constraints. The data constraints in parametric regular expressions are interpreted in terms of *assignments* to global parameters and the theory of Quantifier-Free Linear Real Arithmetic and the theory of equality (with string constants) [5] which are supported by major SMT solvers like Z3 [9]. In the following, we denote the theory of Quantifier-Free Linear Real Arithmetic and equality as \mathcal{T} .

A global parameters assignment is a total function that assigns each global parameter to a rational value, and we write \emptyset for empty assignments. Given two assignments μ and μ' , we say that μ and μ' are *unifiable* if $\mu(x) = \mu'(x)$ for all $x \in dom(\mu) \cap dom(\mu')$, and we define the *unification* $(\mu \cup \mu')$ of two unifiable assignment μ, μ' $(\mu \cup \mu')(x) = \mu(x)$ if $x \in dom(\mu)$, and otherwise $(\mu \cup \mu')(x) = \mu'(x)$.

Definition 3.2 (Semantics of Data Constraint). Given an element (l, f) , an assignment to global parameters μ and a data constraints

$\phi(\bar{x}, \bar{p})$ where \bar{x} are global parameters and \bar{p} are properties variables. $\mathfrak{I} \models \phi(\mu(\bar{x}), f(\bar{p}))$ is defined inductively over ϕ as follows:

- $\mathfrak{I} \models \theta_1 \wedge \theta_2$ iff $\mathfrak{I} \models \theta_1$ and $\mathfrak{I} \models \theta_2$.
- $\mathfrak{I} \models f(p) = c_{str}$ iff p is a string property variable and $f(p) = c_{str}$.
- $\mathfrak{I} \models \theta(\mu(\bar{x}), f(\bar{p}))$ iff \bar{p} are numeric properties variables and $\theta(\bar{x}, \bar{p})$ is an (in)equality over linear terms over rational variables.

Definition 3.3 (Language of Parametric Regular Expression). The language of a parametric regular expression r with an assignment μ is a set of sequences over Σ , denoted as $\llbracket r \rrbracket^\mu \subseteq \Sigma^*$. $\llbracket r \rrbracket^\mu$ is defined inductively as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \epsilon \rrbracket^\mu &= \{\epsilon\} \\ \llbracket (l, \phi(\bar{x}, \bar{p})) \rrbracket^\mu &= \{(l, f) \mid \mathfrak{I} \models \phi(\mu(\bar{x}), f(\bar{p}))\} \\ \llbracket \cdot^* \rrbracket^\mu &= \{(\cdot, f) \mid (l, f) \in \llbracket r \rrbracket^\mu\} \\ \llbracket r_1/r_2 \rrbracket^{\mu_1 \cup \mu_2} &= \{(a_1 \cdot a_2) \mid a_1 \in \llbracket r_1 \rrbracket^{\mu_1}, a_2 \in \llbracket r_2 \rrbracket^{\mu_2}\} \\ \llbracket r_1 \mid r_2 \rrbracket^{\mu_1 \cup \mu_2} &= \{a \mid a \in \llbracket r_1 \rrbracket^{\mu_1} \cup \llbracket r_2 \rrbracket^{\mu_2}\} \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, assuming that $r^1 = r$ and $r^{n+1} = r^n/r$ for every $n \geq 1$, we have:

$$\llbracket r^* \rrbracket^{\emptyset \cup \mu_1 \cup \dots \cup \mu_i} = \llbracket \epsilon \rrbracket^\emptyset \cup \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \llbracket r^n \rrbracket^{\mu_i}$$

where each $\mu_i, \mu_j, 0 \leq i, j \leq n$ are pairwise unifiable.

The definition of r^+ can be derived from r/r^* , and $r^?$ can be derived from $r \mid \epsilon$.

Definition 3.4 (Membership of Parametric Regular Expressions). We say that r accepts an element sequence e with an assignment μ , as long as $e \in \llbracket r \rrbracket^\mu$. The acceptance is denoted by $p \in \mathcal{L}(r)$.

Semantics over Property Graphs. The semantics of parametric regular expressions is coherent with the semantics of path patterns over property graphs [42]. We take each path p over a property graph $G = (V, E, \rho, \lambda, \pi)$ as a sequence of elements $(l_1, \pi'_1), \dots, (l_n, \pi'_n)$, where for each $p_i \in E \cup V$, $l_i = \lambda(p_i)$, and $\pi' : \text{Properties} \mapsto \text{Values}$ is a partial function such that $\pi'(a) = \pi(p_i, a)$. Note the inverse-labeled element in a path p are interpreted as nodes or inverse edges over G , i.e. if $p_i \in p$ such that $p_i = (l_i, \pi'_i)$ and $l_i = \cdot$, then either $p_i \in V$ and $l = \lambda(p_i)$, or $p_i = \rho(p_{i+1}, p_{i-1})$.

The set of answers of a parametric regular expression r over a property graph $G = (V, E, \rho, \lambda, \pi)$, denoted as $\llbracket r \rrbracket_G$ is a set of paths, such that each path $p \in \mathcal{L}(r)$.

3.2 Parametric Regular Path Queries

Definition 3.5 (Parametric Path Regular Queries). A parametric regular path query (PRPQ for short) over a property graph $G = (V, E, \rho, \lambda, \pi)$ is an expression of the form $q = (v, \text{regex})$, with $v \in V$, and *regex* a parametric regular expression. The query q over a property graph $G = (V, E, \rho, \lambda, \pi)$ returns true if there exists a node v' , a path p from v to v' , such that $p \in \llbracket \text{regex} \rrbracket_G$. Otherwise the query returns false.

Example 3.6. Now we give an example of parametric regular path query. Let us consider the property graph in example 2.2, and assume we want to check whether there is a path using follow

edges, such that *the distance between the maximal and the minimal age is smaller than 7, and all follow connections should start in 2019*. This can be formalized as the following parametric regular expression r_f :

$$\begin{aligned} &((\text{Person}, ?p \leq \text{age} \wedge ?q \geq \text{age} \wedge ?q - ?p \leq 7) / \\ &(\text{follow}, \text{since} > 2019))^* / \\ &(\text{Person}, ?p \leq \text{age} \wedge ?q \geq \text{age} \wedge ?q - ?p \leq 7) \end{aligned}$$

If we denote the node representing 'Alice' as v_0 , and we can formalize the above problem as PRPQ(v_0, r_f).

3.3 Parametric Automaton

We propose *parametric automaton* as our execution model inspired by sequence theory [24] which decide the constraints over a sequence of objects with data domains. Parametric automata take an input path as a sequence of objects with attributes, capture object patterns and evaluate data conditions and find a model for global parameters. We will show that parametric automata have the same computation power as parametric regular expressions.

Definition 3.7 (Parametric Automaton). A parametric automaton is a tuple $(L, \chi, \text{Attr}, Q, Q_0, F, \Delta)$, where: (1) $L \subseteq \text{Labels}$ is a set of symbols (2) χ is a set of global variables. (3) $\text{Attr} \subseteq \text{Properties}$ is a set of properties. (4) Q is a finite set of states (5) $Q_0 \subseteq Q$ is a set of start states. (6) $F \subseteq Q$ is a set of final states. (7) We define the transitions Δ as follows: $\Delta \subseteq Q \times (\Sigma \times T(\chi, \text{Attr}) \times \mathbb{B}) \times Q$ where $T(\chi, \text{Attr})$ is the set of string and linear arithmetic formulas over $\chi \cup \text{Attr}$ following the format of Definition 3.1, and \mathbb{B} is a boolean value that indicates the transition is inverse if it is true and vice versa. If $(q, (\sigma, \phi, \text{inv}), q') \in \Delta$, where $\sigma \in L, \phi \in T(\chi, \text{Attr})$, then we write $q \xrightarrow{(\sigma, \phi, \text{inv})} q'$.

Definition 3.8 (Acceptance Conditions of Parametric Automaton). A parametric automaton $\text{Aut} = (L, \chi, \text{Attr}, Q, Q_0, F, \Delta)$. *Aut* accepts an element sequence $(l_1, f_1), \dots, (l_n, f_n) \in \Sigma^*$ with respect to an assignment μ , if there is a sequence of transitions

$$q_0 \xrightarrow{(\sigma_1, \phi_1, \text{inv}_1)} q_1 \xrightarrow{(\sigma_2, \phi_2, \text{inv}_2)} q_2 \dots \xrightarrow{(\sigma_n, \phi_n, \text{inv}_n)} q_n$$

such that: (1) $q_0 \in Q_0, q_n \in F$ (2) $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \sigma_i = l_i$; (3) $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \mathfrak{I} \models \phi_i(\mu(\bar{x}), f_i(\bar{p}))$. (4) if inv_i is true, l_i should be an *inverse* label, and otherwise l_i should be a *forward* label.

Example 3.9. The parametric regular expression in example 3.6 can be formalized as the following parametric automaton *Aut* depicted in figure 2.




Figure 2: Parametric automaton example, where $\phi := ?p \leq \text{age} \wedge ?q \geq \text{age} \wedge ?q - ?p \leq 7$;

Each parametric regular expression can be converted to a parametric automata. The following conversion is a variant of a standard regular expression to NFA conversion. For completeness, we present the conversion.

THEOREM 3.10. *For each parametric regular expressions r , there is a parametric automaton $\mathcal{A} = (\Sigma, \chi, Attr, Q, Q_0, F, \Delta)$ with a single initial state such that for each $p \in \llbracket r \rrbracket^\mu$, r is accepted by \mathcal{A} with assignment μ .*

PROOF. We prove by structural induction on parametric regular expressions.

Base case: For atomic expression $E = (t, \phi)$, the parametric automaton of E is $Aut = (L, \chi, Attr, Q, \{q_0\}, F, \Delta)$, where: (1) $L = \{t\}$ (2) χ is all the global parameters in ϕ . (3) $Attr$ is all the properties in ϕ . (4) $Q = \{q_0, q_f\}$ (5) $\{q_0\}$ is the only start state. (6) $F = \{q_f\}$ is a set of final states. (7) $\Delta = \{(q_0, (t, \phi, false), q_f)\}$.

We can verify each $p \in \llbracket (t, \phi) \rrbracket^\mu$ accepted by Aut according to Definition 3.3.

Induction Step. : For a concatenation expression E_1/E_2 , if E_1 is translated to $Aut_1 = (L_1, \chi_1, Attr_1, Q_1, \{q_{01}\}, F_1, \Delta_1)$, and E_2 is translated to $Aut_2 = (L_2, \chi_2, Attr_2, Q_2, \{q_{02}\}, F_2, \Delta_2)$, we construct a parametric automaton $Aut' = (\Sigma, \chi, Attr, Q, \{q_{01}\}, F', \Delta')$, with $F = F_2$. we redirect all transition towards states in F_1 to q_{02} . Formally

$$\Delta' = (\Delta_1 \setminus \{(q, (t, \phi, inv), q_f) \mid q_f \in F_1\}) \cup \Delta_2 \\ \cup \{(q, (t, \phi, inv), q_{02}) \mid \forall (q, (t, \phi, inv), q_1) \in \Delta_1, q_1 \in F_1\}$$

For each $p' \in \llbracket E_1 \cdot E_2 \rrbracket^\mu$, we have $p' = p_1 \cdot p_2$ and $\mu' = \mu_1 \cup \mu_2$ where $p_1 \in \llbracket E_1 \rrbracket^{\mu_1}$ and $p_2 \in \llbracket E_2 \rrbracket^{\mu_2}$. By induction hypothesis, p_1 is accepted by Aut_1 with μ_1 , and p_2 is accepted by Aut_2 with μ_2 . Then e has an accept run with the new transition in Δ' and the unified assignment μ' .

For an alternation expression $E_1 \mid E_2$, E_1 is translated to an automaton $Aut_1 = (L_1, \chi_1, Attr_1, Q_1, \{q_{01}\}, F_1, \Delta_1)$, and E_2 is translated to an automaton $Aut_2 = (L_2, \chi_2, Attr_2, Q_2, \{q_{02}\}, F_2, \Delta_2)$. We construct $Aut' = (\Sigma, \chi, Q, \Sigma, q'_0, F', \Delta')$ by introducing a new initial state q_0 and discarding q_{01} and q_{02} . The final states set is $F' = F_1 \cup F_2$, and let all transitions from q_{01} and q_{02} start from q'_0 , formally

$$\Delta' = (\Delta_1 \setminus \{(q_{01}, (t, \phi, inv), q) \mid q \in Q_1\}) \\ \cup (\Delta_2 \setminus \{(q_{02}, (t, \phi, inv), q) \mid q \in Q_2\}) \\ \cup \{(q'_0, (t, \phi, inv), q) \mid (q_{01}, (t, \phi, inv), q) \in \Delta_1\} \\ \cup \{(q'_0, (t, \phi, inv), q) \mid (q_{02}, (t, \phi, inv), q) \in \Delta_2\}$$

For each $p' \in \llbracket E_1 \mid E_2 \rrbracket^\mu$, we have $p' = p_1$ or $p' = p_2$ and $\mu' = \mu_1 \cup \mu_2$ where $p_1 \in \llbracket E_1 \rrbracket^\mu$ and $p_2 \in \llbracket E_2 \rrbracket^\mu$. By induction hypothesis, p_1 is accepted by Aut_1 with μ_1 , and p_2 is accepted by Aut_2 with μ_2 . Then p' has an accept run with the new transition from q'_0 with μ' .

For a Kleene star expression E^* , if E is translated to $Aut = (L, \chi, Attr, Q, \{q_0\}, F, \Delta)$, the parametric automaton of E^* is $Aut' = (L, \chi, Attr, Q', \{q_0\}, F', \Delta')$ with $Q' = (Q \setminus F)$ and $F' = \{q_0\}$, and we redirect all transitions in Δ_f to q_0 , i.e.

$$\Delta' = (\Delta \setminus \Delta_f) \\ \cup \{(q, (t, \phi, inv), q_0) \mid (q, (t, \phi, inv), q_f) \in \Delta_f\}$$

For each $p' \in \llbracket E^* \rrbracket^\mu$, we have $p' \in \llbracket E^i \rrbracket^{\mu_i}$ where $i > 0$ or $p' = \epsilon$ with empty assignment. For the ϵ case, since the initial state is also the final state, then ϵ is accepted without any conditions. If we have $p' \in \llbracket E^i \rrbracket^{\mu_i}$, by induction hypothesis, p' is accepted by Aut with μ_i , and then p has an accept run towards q_0 with assignment μ .

For an inverse expression \hat{E} , and E can be translated to $Aut = (L, \chi, Attr, Q, \{q_0\}, F, \Delta)$, it suffices to modify all transitions of Δ , such that $\Delta' = \{(q, (t, \phi, !inv), q') \mid (q', (t, \phi, inv), q) \in \Delta\}$. For each $p \in \llbracket \hat{E} \rrbracket^\mu$, according to Definition 3.3, p satisfies the condition of inverse transitions.

Since $?$ and $+$ are derivable from $|$ and $*$, it is enough to show the above basic operators. \square

3.4 The Hardness of Parametric Regular Path Queries

Although the data complexity (i.e. the complexity of evaluating a fixed PRPQ($v, pregex$) query over a property graph G) is NL-complete [14, 35], the combined complexity (where both the query and G are part of the input) is NP-hard in general. This can be shown by a reduction from the Boolean satisfiability problem (3-SAT).

THEOREM 3.11. *The combined complexity of parametric regular path queries over a property graph is NP-hard.*

PROOF. We reduce from the Boolean satisfiability problem (3-SAT). Given a Boolean formula ϕ in CNF with variables x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n and clauses C_1, C_2, \dots, C_m , we construct a property graph G and a PRPQ($v, pregex$) query such that ϕ is satisfiable if and only if there exists a path in G .

We construct G with a single vertex v labeled by v with a single property a such that $\pi(v, a) = 1$, and a single self loop edge e labeled by e with no properties and $\rho(e) = (v, v)$.

We construct a parametric regular expression based on the formula ϕ inductively, with a set of rational global parameters $\{?x_1, \dots, ?x_n\}$. The base case starts from the first clause C_1 , where we construct a parametric regular expression r_1 as follows:

$$r_1 = (v, ?x_i \sim_i 0) \mid (v, ?x_j \sim_j 0) \mid (v, ?x_k \sim_k 0)$$

if $?x_i$ is positive in C_1 , then \sim_i is \neq otherwise \sim_i is $=$. The cases for $?x_j, ?x_k$ are similar.

If we encode C_1, \dots, C_i by a parametric regular expression r_i , we construct r_{i+1} for clause C_{i+1} as follows:

$$r_{i+1} = r_i / (((e, true) / (v, ?x_i \sim_i 0) \\ \mid (e, true) / (v, ?x_j \sim_j 0) \\ \mid (e, true) / (v, ?x_k \sim_k 0)))$$

where \sim_i, \sim_j, \sim_k are defined as in the base case.

According to the Definition 3.5, we construct the parametric regular path query as PRPQ(v, r_m), and if there exists a path in G that matches r_m , then the corresponding assignment of global parameters $\{?x_1, \dots, ?x_n\}$ in r_m also satisfies all clauses in ϕ . Conversely, if ϕ is satisfiable, the model of all clauses provides an assignment to the global parameters $\{?x_1, \dots, ?x_n\}$ in r_m , and then there exists a path in G that matches r_m .

Therefore, we have reduced 3-SAT to the problem of evaluating a PRPQ($v, pregex$) query over a property graph, proving that the combined complexity is NP-hard. \square

4 NAIVE EVALUATION ALGORITHM

Algorithm 1 is a straight-forward naive algorithm for $\text{PRPQ}(v, r)$ over a property graph $G = (V, E, \rho, \lambda, \pi)$ based on the SIMPLE path semantics [13] i.e., the paths do not repeat any node. Algorithm 1 returns a pair $(\text{true}, (p, \mu))$ if $p \in \mathcal{L}(r)$ is detected, and otherwise returns $(\text{false}, \emptyset)$. Algorithm 1 compiles r into a parametric automaton \mathcal{A} , explores G by *synchronized breadth-first search* and accumulating all visited data constraints. As long as the algorithm reaches a final state in \mathcal{A} , the algorithm checks accumulated constraints by an SMT solver, and constructs a path by backtracking if the checking results are satisfied.

Synchronized Transitions. Synchronized BFS is a variant of search on the product graph, because parametric regular expressions include patterns on both edges and nodes. Synchronized BFS is based on synchronized transitions. During traversal, whenever a new node v' or edge e' is encountered in G , the algorithm matches the element's labels against \mathcal{A} 's transition conditions, advances the automaton state accordingly, and accumulates the corresponding formulas.

When the algorithm visits a node v in property graph G and the 'current' location in \mathcal{A} is q , the algorithm *makes a node synchronized transition* by $\text{TRANSNODE}(v, q, G, \mathcal{A})$ scans all transitions $q \xrightarrow{(l, \varphi, \text{inv})} q'$ of \mathcal{A} that originate from q , checks whether the transition label l matches the label of v , and returns all satisfied successor states q' .

When the algorithm explores the neighbor edges from a node v in G , the algorithm *makes an edge synchronized transition* by $\text{TRANSEGE}(e, q, G, \mathcal{A})$ scans all transitions $q \xrightarrow{(l, \varphi, \text{inv})} q'$ that originate from q and matches with edges by case analysis on the inv flag. If the inv flag is \top , the function collects all edges e' *originate from* v with $\lambda(e) = l$, and returns with successor states and the destination node v' pairwise. If the inv flag is \perp , the function collect all edges e' *enter into* v with $\lambda(e) = l$, and returns with successor states and the source node v pairwise.

Formally, the synchronized transition functions are defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TRANSNODE}(v, q, G, \mathcal{A}) &= \{q' \mid q \xrightarrow{(l, \varphi, \text{inv})} q', l = \lambda(v)\} \\ \text{TRANSEGE}(e, q, G, \mathcal{A}) &= \left\{ \begin{aligned} &\{(v', e', q') \mid q \xrightarrow{(l, \varphi, \top)} q', l = \lambda(e'), v \xrightarrow{e'} v'\} \\ &\{(v, e', q') \mid q \xrightarrow{(l, \varphi, \perp)} q', l = \lambda(e'), v' \xrightarrow{e'} v\} \end{aligned} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

After a synchronized transition $q \xrightarrow{(l, \varphi, \text{inv})} q'$ with an object $o \in V \cup E$, the algorithm substitutes the attributes in φ with actual property values from o , and accumulate the resulting instantiated formula in a set of visited formulas. We formalize the accumulation by the following function:

$$\text{UPDATE}(q, q', o, \mathcal{A}, G, F) = F \cup \{ \varphi[\text{attr}/\pi(o, \text{attr})] \mid q \xrightarrow{(l, \varphi, \text{inv})} q' \}$$

The naive algorithm manipulates *search states* to record the above information. Each search state represents a snapshot containing: the current position in both the automaton and property graph (q and v respectively), the traversed edge (e), a reference to the preceding state ($prev$), and the accumulated formulas (\mathcal{F}).

Definition 4.1. A search state is a tuple $(v, q, e, prev, \mathcal{F})$ where: (1) $v \in V$ is the current graph node (2) $q \in Q$ is the current automaton state (3) $e \in E$ is the current graph edge. (4) $prev$ is a pointer to the previous search state (enabling path reconstruction via backtracking [13]) (5) \mathcal{F} contains formulas with attribute variables instantiated using actual property values from visited nodes/edges

Query Algorithm. The NAIVEQUERY procedure in Algorithm 1 is the main procedure to evaluate a parametric regular query, which requires the following data structures: (1) *Open*, which is a queue of search states, with usual queue operations (enqueue, dequeue). (2) *Visited*, which is a dictionary of search states using tuples (v, e, q) as keys, that have already been explored, maintained to avoid infinite loops, and the visited node can be collected by function $\text{VISITEDNODE}(\text{Visited}) = \{v \mid (v, e, q) \in \text{Visited.keys}()\}$

The procedure begins exploration from the initial state (v, q_0) . First, it checks whether a trivial path only containing $v \in V$ constitutes a valid answer (Lines 5-8), and such case does not require a model of global parameters. The procedure then performs an initial synchronization with (v, q_0) (Lines 8-12): executing one transition in \mathcal{A} starting from v , accumulating the corresponding data constraints, and enqueueing the resulting search states into the *Open* queue.

The main loop (Lines 13-35) processes states until either the 'Open' queue is exhausted, for each iteration: (1) Dequeues a search state $(v, q, e, prev, \mathcal{F})$ from *Open* (Line 14), and skip repeated nodes (Lines 16-18). (2) Performs two synchronized transitions in \mathcal{A} , first with the outgoing edge e' from v by TRANSEGE (Line 15), and second with the adjacent node v' connected via e' by TRANSNODE (Line 20). The algorithm accumulates instantiated data constraints after each transition by UPDATE (Lines 19 and 21). (3) Tests if the resulting state (v', q') has been visited before (Line 23), if not, the algorithm enqueues the resulting search states into the *Open* queue and adds to the *Visited* dictionary. (4) If the automaton state q' is a final state, the algorithm checks whether the accumulated formulas \mathcal{F} are satisfiable. If these conditions are satisfied, the algorithm constructs the path by the GETPATH procedure via backtracking on the $prev$ domain of search states, and constructs a model of the global parameters by querying an SMT solver, and then the algorithm returns *true* with the path and the model.

If the 'Open' queue is exhausted, and no answer is detected, then the algorithm returns *false*.

5 OPTIMIZED QUERY EVALUATION

Although Theorem 3.11 states that the combined complexity of parametric regular path queries is NP-hard, Algorithm 3 presents a *feasible algorithm* based on *macro states*, to replace accumulated formulas with bounds of global parameters

terms stored in *macro states*.

Definition 5.1 (Macro State). A macro state is a tuple $(q, e, v, prev, up, low, neq)$ where: (1) $q, e, v, prev$ are the same as in a search state according to Definition 4.1. (2) up stores the upper bounds of terms. Formally, for $\sum a_i p_i \leq c$, where $a_i, c \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $p_i \in \chi$, if and only if $up[\sum a_i p_i] = c$ (3) low stores the lower bounds of terms. Formally, for $\sum a_i p_i \geq c$, where $a_i, c \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $p_i \in \chi$, if

Algorithm 1 Query evaluation of PRPQ($v, regex$) over a property graph $G = (V, E, \rho, \lambda, \pi)$.

```

1: procedure NAIVEQUERY( $regex, G, v$ )
2:    $\mathcal{A} \leftarrow \text{Automaton}(regex)$   $\triangleright q_0$  initial state,  $F$  final states
3:   Open.init()
4:   Visited.init()
5:   if  $v \in V$  and  $q_0 \in F$  then
6:     return(true,  $(v, \emptyset)$ )  $\triangleright$  No need for a model
7:   end if
8:   for all  $q' \in \text{TRANSNODE}(v, q_0, G, \mathcal{A})$  do
9:      $\mathcal{F} \leftarrow \text{UPDATE}(q_0, q', v, \mathcal{A}, G, \emptyset)$ 
10:    start_state  $\leftarrow (v, q', \perp, \perp, \mathcal{F})$ 
11:    Open.enqueue(start_state)
12:   end for
13:   while Open  $\neq \emptyset$  do
14:     state =  $(v, q, e, prev, \mathcal{F}) \leftarrow \text{Open.dequeue}()$ 
15:     for all  $(v', e', q') \in \text{TRANSEGE}(e, q, G, \mathcal{A})$  do
16:       if  $v' \in \text{VISITEDNODE}(\text{Visited})$  then
17:         continue  $\triangleright$  Skip not simple path
18:       end if
19:        $\mathcal{F}' \leftarrow \text{UPDATE}(q, q', e', \mathcal{A}, G, \mathcal{F})$ 
20:       for all  $q'' \in \text{TRANSNODE}(v', q', G, \mathcal{A})$  do
21:          $\mathcal{F}'' \leftarrow \text{UPDATE}(q', q'', v', \mathcal{A}, G, \mathcal{F}')$ 
22:         nextState  $\leftarrow (v', q'', e', curr, \mathcal{F}'')$ 
23:         if  $(v', q'', e', *, *) \notin \text{Visited}$  then
24:           Visited.add(nextState)
25:           Open.enqueue(nextState)
26:           if  $q'' \in F$  and  $\text{CHECKSAT}(\mathcal{F}'')$  then
27:             path  $\leftarrow \text{GETPATH}(\text{nextState})$ 
28:              $\mu \leftarrow \text{GETMODEL}(\mathcal{F}'')$ 
29:             return (true,  $(\text{path}, \mu)$ )
30:           end if
31:         end if
32:       end for
33:     end for
34:   end while
35:   return (false,  $\emptyset$ )  $\triangleright$  No path detected
36: end procedure
37: procedure GETPATH(state =  $(v, q, e, prev, \mathcal{F})$ )
38:   if  $prev = \perp$  then
39:     return  $v$ 
40:   else
41:     return GETPATH( $prev$ ).extend( $e, v$ )
42:   end if
43: end procedure
    
```

and only if $low[\sum a_i p_i] = c$ (4) neq handles the \neq operand. Formally, for $\sum a_i p_i \neq c$, where $a_i, c \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $p_i \in \chi$, if and only if $neq[\sum a_i p_i] = c$

As macro states only permit upper and lower bounds, we introduce a new constant ϵ with $\epsilon > 0$, and rewrite the (in)equalities of

each data constraint by applying the following rewriting rules:

$$\begin{aligned}
 t_l < t_r &\mapsto t_l + \epsilon \leq t_r \\
 t_l > t_r &\mapsto t_l - \epsilon \geq t_r \\
 t_l = t_r &\mapsto t_l \leq t_r \wedge t_l \geq t_r
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The rewriting introduces $O(n)$ new (in)equalities over linear terms over rational variables, where n is the number of (in)equalities in original formula.

Algorithm 3 takes the synchronized transitions framework as the naive algorithm with the same TRANSNODE and TRANSEGE procedures, and the main change is to leverage a new procedure to update a macro state and check the consistency of bounds by querying an *oracle*, which is formalized in the NEWUPDATE procedure in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 Update the bounds of terms (up, low) with an object o of a property graph G from q to q' in a parametric automaton \mathcal{A}

```

1: procedure NEWUPDATE( $q, q', o, A, G, (up, low)$ )
2:    $\varphi' \leftarrow \varphi[attr/\pi(o, attr)]$  where  $q \xrightarrow{(l, \varphi, inv)} q'$ 
3:   for all  $atom \in \varphi'$  do  $\triangleright \varphi'$  is a conjunction of atoms
4:     if  $atom$  is string constraint and not satisfiable then
5:       return  $\perp, \emptyset$   $\triangleright$  Inconsistency detected
6:     end if
7:     Normalize  $atom$  into  $\sum a_i p_i \sim c$  where  $\sim \in \{\leq, \geq, \neq\}$ 
8:     if  $\sim$  is  $\leq$  then
9:       if  $\sum a_i p_i \notin up$  or  $c \leq up[\sum a_i p_i]$  then
10:         $up[\sum a_i p_i] \leftarrow c$ 
11:       end if
12:     else if  $\sim$  is  $\geq$  then
13:       if  $\sum a_i p_i \notin low$  or  $c \geq low[\sum a_i p_i]$  then
14:         $low[\sum a_i p_i] \leftarrow c$ 
15:       end if
16:     else if  $\sim$  is  $\neq$  then
17:        $neq[\sum a_i p_i] \leftarrow c$ 
18:     end if
19:   end for
20:   if  $\text{CHECKSAT}(up, low, neq)$  then  $\triangleright$  Query the oracle to
      check consistency
21:     return  $\top, (up, low, neq)$   $\triangleright$  Update successful
22:   else
23:     return  $\perp, \emptyset$   $\triangleright$  Inconsistency detected
24:   end if
25: end procedure
    
```

Complexity Analysis. However, Algorithm 3 queries the linear programming solver $O(2^c \cdot |A| \cdot (|V| + |E|))$ times, where \mathcal{A} is a parametric automaton with c (in)equality constraints. The 2^c factor arises because each of the c constraints can be independently either present or absent in a macro state, and the algorithm must explore all such combinations in the worst case.

6 EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION

In this section, we present an experimental evaluation of parametric regular path queries using the algorithms presented in Section 4 and Section 5. Given that, to the best of our knowledge, no other system

Algorithm 3 Optimized Query Evaluation of PRPQ($v, regex$) over a property graph $G = (V, E, \rho, \lambda, \pi)$

```

1: procedure OPTIMIZEDQUERY( $regex, G, v$ )
2:    $\mathcal{A} \leftarrow \text{Automaton}(regex)$   $\triangleright q_0$  initial state,  $F$  final states
3:   Rewrite all data constraints in  $\mathcal{A}$  according to (1)
4:   Open.init()
5:   Visited.init()
6:   if  $v \in V$  and  $q_0 \in F$  then
7:     return(true, ( $v, \emptyset$ ))
8:   end if
9:   for all  $q' \in \text{TRANSNode}(v, q_0, G, \mathcal{A})$  do
10:     $init, b_0 \leftarrow \text{NEWUPDATE}(q_0, q', v, \mathcal{A}, G, (\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset))$ 
11:    if  $init$  then
12:       $(up_0, low_0, neq_0) \leftarrow b_0$ 
13:       $start\_state \leftarrow (v, q', \perp, \perp, up_0, low_0, neq_0)$ 
14:      Open.enqueue( $start\_state$ )
15:    end if
16:  end for
17:  while Open  $\neq \emptyset$  do
18:     $state = (v, q, e, prev, up, low, neq) \leftarrow \text{Open.dequeue}()$ 
19:    for all  $(v', e', q') \in \text{TRANSEdge}(e, q, G, \mathcal{A})$  do
20:      if  $v' \in \text{VISITEDNode}(\text{Visited})$  then
21:         $continue$   $\triangleright$  skip no simple path
22:      end if
23:       $b \leftarrow (up, low, neq)$ 
24:       $flag, b' \leftarrow \text{NEWUPDATE}(q, q', e', \mathcal{A}, G, b)$ 
25:      if not  $flag$  then
26:         $continue$   $\triangleright$  inconsistency detected
27:      end if
28:      for all  $q'' \in \text{TRANSNode}(v', q', G, \mathcal{A})$  do
29:         $flag', b'' \leftarrow \text{NEWUPDATE}(q', q'', v', \mathcal{A}, G, b')$ 
30:        if not  $flag'$  then
31:           $continue$   $\triangleright$  inconsistency detected
32:        end if
33:         $(up', low') \leftarrow b''$ 
34:         $nextState \leftarrow (v', q'', e', curr, up', low', neq')$ 
35:        if  $(v', q'', e', *, *, *, *) \notin \text{Visited}$  then
36:          Visited.add( $nextState$ )
37:          Open.enqueue( $nextState$ )
38:          if  $q'' \in F$  then
39:             $path \leftarrow \text{GETPATH}(nextState)$ 
40:             $\mu \leftarrow \text{GETMODEL}(up', low', neq)$ 
41:            return(true, ( $path, \mu$ ))
42:          end if
43:        end if
44:      end for
45:    end for
46:  end while
47:  return (false,  $\emptyset$ )  $\triangleright$  No path detected
48: end procedure

```

supports parametric regular path queries, we focus on showing the efficiency of our algorithms over real world graphs. In particular, we focus on showing that the optimized version of our approach, presented in Algorithm 3 is a *feasible* solution over large graphs,

and that its macro-state based optimization achieves significant improvement of the baseline solution given in Algorithm 1. For this, we focus on the following research questions:

- RQ1** How does Algorithm 3 scale with graph size and density?
- RQ2** How does the performance vary with different queries depending both on regular expressions and data constraints?
- RQ3** How does the oracle query affect the overall performance?
- RQ4** What is the performance improvement of the optimized algorithm (Algorithm 3) over the naive algorithm (Algorithm 1)?

6.1 Experiment Setup

Implementation. We implement parametric regular path queries and their evaluation algorithms in MILLENNIUMDB [42], an open-source persistent graph database system written using the C++ programming language. We use the Z3 SMT solver [9] as oracle for queries. The syntax of parametric regular expression is embedded into the MQL query syntax used in MILLENNIUMDB, which resembles Cypher and GQL. Both the naive query algorithm and the optimized query algorithm are incorporated into the standard execution pipeline of MILLENNIUMDB.

Datasets. Table 1 lists the characteristics of the labeled-graph dataset used in the experiments. The ICIJ-Leaks and ICIJ-Paradises datasets [31, 32] contain information about offshore entities and their relationships, which have natural attributes and labels on both nodes and edges. These datasets are relatively sparse. The LDBC01 and LDBC10 datasets are originally used for graph database benchmarking [30], which are synthetic datasets and simulate a social network with various types of nodes and edges. These datasets are relatively densely connected, and the LDBC10 dataset is significantly larger than the other datasets used in the experiments. The Pokec dataset [36] is a social network. Nodes represent users and contain many attributes including age, gender, and location, while edges represent relations between users. Labels on nodes and edges are generated synthetically. Pokec dataset has a large size and higher density. The Telecom dataset [27] contains the relationships between users and behaviors in a telecom network, which has natural attributes and labels on both nodes and edges. This dataset is also the most dense graph among the datasets we used.

Table 1: Dataset Characteristics.(1 M = 10^6 , 1 K = 10^3)

| Name | Dataset | $ V $ | $ E $ | $ Le $ | $ Lv $ | $\frac{ E }{ V }$ |
|------|----------------|-------|-------|--------|--------|-------------------|
| IL | ICIJ-Leaks | 1.9M | 3.2M | 14 | 5 | 1.68 |
| IP | ICIJ-Paradises | 163K | 364K | 6 | 5 | 2.23 |
| L0 | LDBC01 | 180K | 768K | 8 | 15 | 4.17 |
| L1 | LDBC10 | 30M | 178M | 9 | 15 | 5.93 |
| PO | Pokec | 1.6M | 30.6M | 3 | 1 | 18.7 |
| TE | Telecom | 170K | 50M | 3 | 4 | 294 |

Query Generation. Query templates in our experiments consist of two components: *regular path templates* which are regular expressions that represent patterns of paths, and *data constraint templates* that describe relations between objects along a path. A *query template* is instantiated by incorporating a data constraint into a

regular path template. A concrete query is then constructed by: (i) incorporating a start node into the query (ii) replacing label placeholders in path templates with concrete edge labels; and (iii) replacing attribute name placeholders in data constraint templates with concrete attribute names. Next we describe each component in detail.

Table 2 lists the 12 regular path templates used in the experiments. These are the top-12 most frequent property-path query patterns occurring in practice based on the study of publicly available query logs for SPARQL endpoints [4]. We use regular expressions in Table 2 as regular path templates in the experiments, and fix $k = 3$. Notice that edge labels here (e.g. a_1, a_2 , etc.) are abstract placeholders which get instantiated with concrete labels.

Table 2: Regular templates used in the experiments.

| Name | Type | Name | Type |
|-------|-------------------------|----------|-------------------------|
| Q_1 | $(a_1 \dots a_k)^*$ | Q_7 | $a_1?/\dots/a_k?$ |
| Q_2 | a^* | Q_8 | $a/(b_1 \dots b_k)$ |
| Q_3 | $a_1/\dots/a_k$ | Q_9 | $a_1/a_2?/\dots/a_k?$ |
| Q_4 | a^*/b | Q_{10} | $(a/b^*) c$ |
| Q_5 | $a_1 \dots a_k$ | Q_{11} | $a^*/b?$ |
| Q_6 | a^+ | Q_{12} | $a/b/c^*$ |

We classify regular path templates into three categories based on their occurrence in query logs (see Table 5 in [4]). The results of this classification are listed in Table 3.

Table 3: Categories of regular templates used in the experiments.

| Category | Regular Templates | Relative Occurrence | Total Percentage |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| Frequently-used | Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, Q_4 | >10% | 87.58% |
| Occasionally-used | Q_5, Q_6, Q_7 | >1% and <10% | 12.34% |
| Rarely-used | $Q_8, Q_9, Q_{10}, Q_{11}, Q_{12}$ | >0.01% and <1% | 0.08% |

Table 4 (column labelled “Description”) lists the descriptions of 5 data constraint templates we use, including two *simple arithmetic constraints* D_1 and D_2 , and three *complex arithmetic constraints* D_3 , D_4 and D_5 . Combining the five data constraint templates with the twelve regular path templates, gives us a total of 60 query templates. A concrete query is then constructed in two phases. First, we replace the label placeholders in path templates with concrete edge labels, and replace attribute name placeholders in data constraint templates with concrete attribute names, giving rise to a parametric regular expression pregex. We then select a starting node v for our parametric regular path query (v, pregex) (see Definition 3.5). An example of a partially instantiated query template (changing only the edge labels) is given in Table 4 (rightmost column). The source vertices are chosen randomly from the graph, and replacing label placeholders with labels selected from most frequent edge labels occurring in the graph. These 100 concrete query instances per

each template are used to evaluate the naive algorithm, the optimized algorithm, and we also use a version which removes the data constraints to compare the impact of incorporating data constraints into RPQs. The latter serves as a baseline which is supported by MILLENNIUMDB, so it allows us to do a fair comparison.

How we ran the experiments? The evaluation is conducted on a Ubuntu 22.04 LTS subsystem on a Intel i3700H laptop assigned with 16 GB RAM. The experiments set a time-out threshold of 10 s for each query for all data sets except the Telecom dataset, and the time-out threshold for the Telecom dataset is set to 30 s due to its larger size and density.

Baseline. As a baseline we use the default implementation of RPQs in MILLENNIUMDB. This means that for each query we generate, we have a baseline RPQ which simply removes all the data constraints. This will allow us to measure the effect of adding data constraints to RPQs.

Evaluation Metrics. We evaluate the performance of the algorithms based on three metrics: (1) running time of each query; (2) general memory consumption: each run was executed against a dedicated, freshly started instance of MILLENNIUMDB, and the memory consumption was measured externally by monitoring the peak Resident Set Size (RSS) of MILLENNIUMDB process during query execution; (3) oracle query memory consumption: we export the memory consumption of Z3 during a query evaluation by its C API; and (4) oracle query count: the number of invocations of the SMT solver recorded in the logs of MILLENNIUMDB, which we treat as queries to an external oracle, because it is a new feature introduced to graph path queries.

6.2 Scalability Evaluation

This subsection studies the *feasibility* of the optimized algorithm (Algorithm 3). For this, we test how the optimized algorithm performs across different queries, graph sizes and graph density; i.e. we answer research questions **RQ1**, **RQ2** and **RQ3**. We start by measuring the time performance of our solution over different queries and different graph sizes.

Time Performance. We study the *running-time distribution* of the optimized algorithm. Although our macro-state algorithm increases significantly rather than normal regular path queries, the optimized algorithm still performs well across different datasets and queries.

Figure 3 presents the running time distribution across datasets and data constraints, and Figure 4 presents the running time distribution across datasets and regular templates. We observe that the optimized algorithm maintains a low median running time across datasets, and distributions over sparse graphs are more concentrated than those over dense graphs, while dense graphs, although running time distributions are wider, most queries can still be evaluated within 1 s. Such results indicate that *the optimized algorithm scales well with graph density and size*, and provide a positive answer to **RQ1** from the perspective of time performance.

The performance variation with different queries is also studied and we obtain positive results. According to the results in Figure 4, we observe that the optimized algorithm performs well over frequently-used templates with most queries can be finished within

Table 4: Data constraints used in the experiment.



| Name | Description | Example with a^* | Category |
|------|--|---|----------|
| D1 | The distance between the average of attribute $attr$ and the values of $attr$ should within a threshold c | $\{a_v, ?p - attr \leq c \wedge attr - ?p \leq c\} / (\{a_e, \top\} / \{a_v, ?p - attr \leq c \wedge attr - ?p \leq c\})^*$ | Simple |
| D2 | Upper and lower bound of an attribute $attr$ | $\{a_v, ?p \leq attr \wedge q \geq attr\} / (\{a_e, \top\} / \{a_v, ?p \leq attr \wedge q \geq attr\})^*$ | Simple |
| D3 | The distance of upper and lower bound of attribute $attr$ should be within threshold c . | $\{a_v, ?p \leq attr \wedge q \geq attr \wedge q - ?p \leq c\} / (\{a_e, \top\} / \{a_v, ?p \leq attr \wedge q \geq attr \wedge q - ?p \leq c\})^*$ | Complex |
| D4 | Let the value of attribute $attr_1$ of the start point be a_{10} , and the value of attribute $attr_2$ of the start point be a_{20} for each successor along a path, $0.5 \cdot a_{10} + c_1 \leq attr_1$ and $ a_{20} - attr_2 \leq c_2$ | $\{a_v, ?p = attr_1 \wedge ?q = attr_2\} / (\{a_e, \top\} / \{a_v, ?p \cdot 0.5 + c_1 \leq attr_1 \wedge ?q - attr_2 \leq c_2 \wedge attr_2 - ?q \leq c_2\})^*$ | Complex |
| D5 | Let the two-dimensional manhattan distance between the start point (x_1, y_1) and each node along a path (x_2, y_2) be within a threshold c . | $\{a_v, ?p = attr_1 \wedge ?q = attr_2\} / (\{a_e, \top\} / \{a_v, ?p - attr_1 + ?q - attr_2 \leq c \wedge attr_1 - ?q + ?p - attr_2 \leq c \wedge attr_1 - ?q + attr_2 - ?p \leq c \wedge ?q - attr_1 + attr_2 - ?p \leq c\})^*$ | Complex |

1 s no matter whether the data constraint is simple or complex, which cover nearly 90% of real-world queries. According to the results in Figure 3, we observe that complex data constraints have better time performance than simple data constraints in terms of median running time and the concentrated distribution, while the simple data constraints have a longer tail in the distribution but most queries can still be evaluated within 1 s. These results indicate that *the optimized algorithm scales well with different queries*, and provide a positive answer to **RQ2** in terms of time performance.

Baseline comparison. While we showed that our optimized algorithm scales well over real-world graph, we still need to measure the impact of adding complex data comparisons to RQs. For this, in Figure 5, we measure the time of running the regular pattern of each of tested queries and compare with the time of running parametric regular path queries. As can be observed, the optimized algorithm takes much more time compared to usual regular path queries by 10 times more average running time and wider distribution, as normal regular path queries can be evaluated within 15 ms in most cases in Figure 5. The reason for this is that the optimized algorithm does much more work since the data constraint portion of the query must be satisfied which requires an extensive amount of queries to the oracle during the evaluation. Next we measure the effect of oracle queries.

Oracle Query Count. From the view of complexity analysis, the optimized algorithm invokes the oracle with a length c which is much smaller than the size of the graph $|V| + |E|$. As a result, the total count of oracle queries dominates the performance of a parametric regular path query. Statistical evidence in Figure 6 shows that the running time of an individual query is strongly correlated to the oracle query count during the evaluation by a correlation coefficient 0.964 with $p < 0.001$.

Figure 7 presents the oracle query count distributions across data constraints and datasets. We observe that the parametric regular queries in dense graphs produce much more oracle queries

**Figure 3: Running time distributions for queries across different datasets and data constraints in Table 4****Figure 4: Running time distributions for queries across different datasets and regular templates in Table 3**

compared to sparse graphs, while most queries among the dense datasets keep oracle query count below 10^3 , except the simple-data-constraint queries in TE. We also observe that the optimized algorithm queries the oracle more times for *simple* data constraints,




Figure 5: Running time of regular path queries and parametric regular path queries across datasets.




Figure 6: The distribution of each individual parametric regular query running time and its oracle query count

especially for large and dense graphs L1, TE and PO, which indicates that complex data constraints can terminate earlier, due to reaching a contradiction more easily.

According to Figure 8 and Figure 4, we observe that the queries with the total oracle query count below 10^3 can be evaluated within 100 ms in most cases, and for the extreme cases with oracle query count above 10^4 , the running time can also be within 10 s. With simple estimations, the average time for each oracle query is about the level of 1 ms, which is acceptable for most applications. These results indicate that the optimized algorithm scales well with *high oracle query counts*, and provide strong support for our complexity analysis and a positive answer to **RQ3**.




Figure 7: The distribution of oracle query counts across different data constraints in Table 4

Figure 8 presents the oracle query count distributions across regular templates and datasets. We observe that queries in frequently-used templates produce the most oracle queries among all templates, but most queries only produce oracle queries below 10^3 ,

which indicates that 87.58% of real-world queries can be still evaluated efficiently. Both queries in occasionally-used and rarely-used templates produce less oracle queries, and the counts are moderate by most below 10^2 .




Figure 8: The distribution of oracle query counts across different regular templates in Table 3.

Memory Performance. The memory consumption of the optimized algorithm is moderate but increases markedly during regular path queries (Figure 9), which shows that our macro-state approach is feasible in terms of memory consumption.

We attribute this increase to the cost of querying the oracle (the SMT solver), i.e. $M_{oracle} = M_{prpq} - M_{rpq}$, where M_{prpq} is the memory usage of a parametric regular path query, and M_{rpq} is the memory usage of a regular path query with the same start point and regular template as M_{prpq} respectively. We measure the memory consumption of the SMT solver M_{Z3} , and calculate the increasing memory $\Delta M = M_{prpq} - M_{rpq}$.

Table 5 shows a strong linear correlation between the sample-level differences of ΔM and Z3’s memory usage for datasets L1, L0, PO, IL, and IP ($r = 0.963\text{--}1.000$, $p < 0.001$). The TE dataset was an exception, showing moderate correlations for D1 and D2 ($r = 0.454\text{--}0.470$, $p < 0.001$) but strong correlations for D3-D5 ($r = 0.869\text{--}0.977$, $p < 0.001$), indicating variability in early measures. The statistical analysis confirms that oracle queries are the principal cause of increased memory usage.

However, we have not observed a strong correlation between the memory consumption of oracle queries and graph size or density, or variation of queries and data constraints, which indicates that the memory consumption of oracle queries is mainly determined by the SMT solver itself rather than the graph or queries, which provides an answer to **RQ1**, **RQ2** and **RQ3** from the perspective of memory consumption.




Figure 9: The distribution of parametric regular path queries and normal regular path queries memory consumption.

Table 5: Sample-level correlation between the memory usage differences ΔM and the memory consumption of Z3 with $p < 0.001$

| Dataset | D1 | D2 | D3 | D4 | D5 |
|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| L1 | 0.970 | 0.969 | 0.971 | 0.963 | 0.967 |
| L0 | 0.999 | 0.999 | 0.999 | 0.999 | 0.999 |
| PO | 0.995 | 0.995 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| TE | 0.454 | 0.470 | 0.869 | 0.977 | 0.946 |
| IL | 0.998 | 0.998 | 0.998 | 0.998 | 0.996 |
| IP | 0.998 | 0.998 | 0.998 | 0.998 | 0.995 |

Conclusions. Overall, even if the parametric regular path queries evaluation is NP-hard according to Theorem 3.11, the experimental results demonstrate the *feasibility* of the optimized algorithm (Algorithm 3) which scales well with large and dense datasets and complex data constraints.

6.3 Performance Comparison

This subsection focuses on **RQ4** and compares the performance of the naive algorithm (Algorithm 1) and the optimized algorithm (Algorithm 3), showing a significant gain in deploying the optimizations described in Section 5.

Running Time Analysis. The optimized algorithm significantly improves the running time for queries that both algorithms can complete within the time limit. Figure 10 shows the running time distributions of both algorithms across all datasets and data constraints (for queries that do not time out). We observe that the optimized algorithm has lower median running time and more concentrated distribution compared to the naive algorithm for complex data constraints across the dense and large-size graphs. Although the performance of the naive algorithm is slightly better to that of the optimized algorithm on sparse graphs such as IL, the difference is marginal, and the general running time of optimized algorithm still remains fast.

Time-out Analysis. A significant gain of the optimized algorithm can be observed with respect to the number of queries that time out. That is, the optimized algorithm reduces the time-out rate considerably compared to the naive algorithm. Figure 11 presents the time-out rates of naive and optimized algorithm across data constraints and datasets where timeouts occur. We observe that *optimized algorithm improves the time-out markedly for complex data constraints*, where the naive algorithm fails to complete a markedly larger portion of queries within the time limit, while *most* queries are successfully evaluated by the optimized algorithm within the prescribed timeout threshold for each dataset.

Overall, these results provides positive evidence to **RQ4**, demonstrating that *the optimized algorithm significantly reduces the time-out rate and improves the running time, especially for complex data constraints*.

7 CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we extend navigational query languages for graph databases with the constraints for reasoning on how data values

Figure 10: Running time across datasets and data constraints in Table 4





Figure 11: Time-out rate across datasets and data constraints in Table 4



change along the explored paths. To this end, we introduced parametric regular path queries and developed efficient algorithms for evaluation of these queries. We implemented our solution on top of MillenniumDB — an open-source industry-strength graph database system that fully supports regular path queries — showing its feasibility in real-world scenarios. Furthermore, our implementation of the algorithm constitutes the first scalable constraint database system, which can handle databases with up to tens of millions of edges. There are many avenues for future work, in particular supporting more intricate constraints. Although our algorithm can be extended to handle linear integer arithmetic, it does not immediately extend to *nonlinear* real arithmetic. In particular, *can we achieve this without the heavy machinery of constraint database theory?* We leave this as an open problem.

REFERENCES

- [1] Renzo Angles, Marcelo Arenas, Pablo Barceló, Aidan Hogan, Juan L. Reutter, and Domagoj Vrgoč. 2017. Foundations of Modern Query Languages for Graph Databases. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 50, 5 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3104031>
- [2] Pablo Barceló Baeza. 2013. Querying graph databases. In *Symposium on Principles of Database Systems (PODS)*. ACM, 175–188. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2463664.2465216>
- [3] Pablo Barceló, Gaele Fontaine, and Anthony Widjaja Lin. 2015. Expressive Path Queries on Graphs with Data. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.* 11, 4 (2015).
- [4] Angela Bonifati, Wim Martens, and Thomas Timm. 2017. An Analytical Study of Large SPARQL Query Logs. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 11, 2 (2017), 149–161. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3149193.3149196>
- [5] Aaron R. Bradley and Zohar Manna. 2007. *The Calculus of Computation - Decision Procedures with Applications to Verification*. Springer.
- [6] Jo-Hag Byon and Peter Z. Revesz. 1995. DISCO: A Constraint Database System with Sets. In *Constraint Databases and Applications, ESPRIT WG CONTESSA Workshop, Friedrichshafen, Germany, September 8-9, 1995, Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Gabriel M. Kuper and Mark Wallace (Eds.), Vol. 1034. Springer, 68–83. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-60794-3_14
- [7] World Wide Web Consortium. 2014. RDF 1.1: Resource Description Framework (RDF) specification. W3C Recommendation. <https://www.w3.org/TR/rdf11-concepts/>
- [8] Isabel F. Cruz, Alberto O. Mendelzon, and Peter T. Wood. 1987. A Graphical Query Language Supporting Recursion. In *International Conference on Management of Data (SIGMOD)*. 323–330. <https://doi.org/10.1145/38713.38749>
- [9] Leonardo de Moura and Nikolaj Bjørner. 2008. Z3: An Efficient SMT Solver. In *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems, C. R. Ramakrishnan and Jakob Rehof (Eds.)*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 337–340.
- [10] Alin Deutsch, Nadime Francis, Alastair Green, Keith Hare, Bei Li, Leonid Libkin, Tobias Lindaaker, Victor Marsault, Wim Martens, Jan Michels, Filip Murlak, Stefan Plantikow, Petra Selmer, Oskar van Rest, Hannes Voigt, Domagoj Vrgoč, Mingxi Wu, and Fred Zemke. 2022. Graph Pattern Matching in GQL and SQL/PQ. In *Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference on Management of Data (Philadelphia, PA, USA) (SIGMOD '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2246–2258. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3514221.3526057>
- [11] Alin Deutsch, Nadime Francis, Alastair Green, Keith W. Hare, Bei Li, Leonid Libkin, Tobias Lindaaker, Victor Marsault, Wim Martens, Jan Michels, Filip Murlak, Stefan Plantikow, Petra Selmer, Oskar van Rest, Hannes Voigt, Domagoj Vrgoč, Mingxi Wu, and Fred Zemke. 2022. Graph Pattern Matching in GQL and SQL/PQ. In *International Conference on Management of Data (SIGMOD)*. ACM, 2246–2258. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3514221.3526057>
- [12] Benjamin Farias, Wim Martens, Carlos Rojas, and Domagoj Vrgoč. 2024. PathFinder: Returning Paths in Graph Queries. In *International Semantic Web Conference (ISWC)*. 135–154. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-77850-6_8
- [13] Benjamin Farias, Carlos Rojas, and Domagoj Vrgoč. 2023. Evaluating Regular Path Queries in GQL and SQL/PQ: How Far Can The Classical Algorithms Take Us? *CoRR abs/2306.02194* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2306.02194> arXiv:2306.02194
- [14] Diego Figueira, Artur Jez, and Anthony W. Lin. 2022. Data Path Queries over Embedded Graph Databases. In *PODS*. ACM, 189–201.
- [15] Diego Figueira and Anthony Widjaja Lin. 2022. Reasoning on Data Words over Numeric Domains. In *LICS*. ACM, 37:1–37:13.
- [16] Diego Figueira, Anthony W. Lin, and Liat Peterfreund. 2025. Complexity of Evaluating GQL Queries. arXiv:2407.06766 [cs.DB] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.06766>
- [17] Nadime Francis, Amélie Gheerbrant, Paolo Guagliardo, Leonid Libkin, Victor Marsault, Wim Martens, Filip Murlak, Liat Peterfreund, Alexandra Rogova, and Domagoj Vrgoč. 2023. GPC: A Pattern Calculus for Property Graphs. In *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGAI Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS 2023, Seattle, WA, USA, June 18-23, 2023*, Floris Geerts, Hung Q. Ngo, and Stavros Sintos (Eds.). ACM, 241–250. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3584372.3588662>
- [18] Nadime Francis, Alastair Green, Paolo Guagliardo, Leonid Libkin, Tobias Lindaaker, Victor Marsault, Stefan Plantikow, Mats Rydberg, Petra Selmer, and Andrés Taylor. 2018. Cypher: An Evolving Query Language for Property Graphs. In *International Conference on Management of Data (SIGMOD)*. ACM, 1433–1445. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3183713.3190657>
- [19] Amélie Gheerbrant, Leonid Libkin, and Alexandra Rogova. 2025. Dangers of List Processing in Querying Property Graphs. *Proc. ACM Manag. Data* 3, 3 (2025), 144:1–144:25. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3725281>
- [20] Stéphane Grumbach, Philippe Rigaux, Michel Scholl, and Luc Segoufin. 2000. The DEDALE Prototype. In *Constraint Databases*, Gabriel M. Kuper, Leonid Libkin, and Jan Paredaens (Eds.). Springer, 365–382.
- [21] Steve Harris, Andy Seaborne, and Eric Prud'hommeaux. 2013. SPARQL 1.1 Query Language. W3C Recommendation. <https://www.w3.org/TR/sparql11-query/>
- [22] ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32. 2023. *ISO/IEC 9075-16:2023. Information technology – Database languages SQL. Part 16: Property Graph Queries (SQL/PQ)*. Technical Report. ISO.
- [23] ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 32. 2024. *ISO/IEC 39075:2024. Information technology – Database languages GQL*. Technical Report. ISO.
- [24] Artur Jez, Anthony W. Lin, Oliver Markgraf, and Philipp Rümmer. 2023. Decision Procedures for Sequence Theories. In *CAV (2) (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Vol. 13965. Springer, 18–40.
- [25] Guodong Jin, Xiyang Feng, Ziyi Chen, Chang Liu, and Semih Salihoglu. 2023. KUZU Graph Database Management System. In *13th Conference on Innovative Data Systems Research, CIDR 2023, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, January 8-11, 2023*. www.cidrdb.org. <https://www.cidrdb.org/cidr2023/papers/p48-jin.pdf>
- [26] Gabriel Kuper, Leonid Libkin, and Jan Paredaens. 2000. *Constraint Databases*. Springer.
- [27] Jure Leskovec and Andrej Krevl. 2014. SNAP Datasets: Stanford Large Network Dataset Collection. <http://snap.stanford.edu/data>.
- [28] Leonid Libkin, Wim Martens, and Domagoj Vrgoč. 2016. Querying Graphs with Data. *J. ACM* 63, 2 (2016), 14:1–14:53. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2850413>
- [29] Leonid Libkin, Cristina Sirangelo, and Deniz Yilmaz. 2025. Extending Pattern Matching Queries in Property Graphs with Interpreted Predicates. In *Proceedings of the 8th Joint Workshop on Graph Data Management Experiences & Systems (GRADES) and Network Data Analytics (NDA), Berlin, Germany, June 22-27, 2025*, Akhil Arora and Stefania Dumbrava (Eds.). ACM, 6:1–6:9. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3735546.3735855>
- [30] Matteo Lissandrini, Martin Brugnara, and Yannis Velegrakis. 2018. Beyond Macrobenchmarks: Microbenchmark-based Graph Database Evaluation. *PVLDB* 12, 4 (Dec. 2018), 390–403. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3297753.3297759>
- [31] International Consortium of Investigative Journalists. 2013. *ICIJ Offshore Leaks Database*. <https://offshoreleaks.icij.org> Accessed: 2025-08-18.
- [32] International Consortium of Investigative Journalists. 2017. *Paradise Papers dataset*. <https://www.icij.org/investigations/paradise-papers/> Accessed: 2025-08-18.
- [33] Oracle. [n.d.]. Oracle Graph Database. <https://www.oracle.com/database/graph/>.
- [34] Peter Z. Revesz, Rui Chen, Pradip Kanjamala, Yiming Li, Yuguo Liu, and Yonghui Wang. 2000. The MLPQ/GIS Constraint Database System. In *Proceedings of the 2000 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data, May 16-18, 2000, Dallas, Texas, USA*, Weidong Chen, Jeffrey F. Naughton, and Philip A. Bernstein (Eds.). ACM, 601. <https://doi.org/10.1145/342009.336590>
- [35] Michael Sipser. 1997. *Introduction to the theory of computation*. PWS Publishing Company.
- [36] L. Takac and M. Záborský. 2012. Data analysis in public social networks. *International Scientific Conference and International Workshop Present Day Trends of Innovations* (Jan. 2012), 1–6.
- [37] Jena Team. 2021. Jena TDB. <https://jena.apache.org/documentation/tdb/>
- [38] Memgraph Team. 2023. Memgraph. <https://memgraph.com/>
- [39] TigerGraph Team. 2021. TigerGraph Documentation – version 3.1. <https://docs.tigergraph.com/>
- [40] Moshe Y. Vardi. 1982. The complexity of relational query languages (Extended Abstract). In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing* (San Francisco, California, USA) (*STOC '82*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 137–146. <https://doi.org/10.1145/800070.802186>
- [41] Vesoft Inc/Nebula. 2023. NebulaGraph. <https://www.nebula-graph.io/>
- [42] Domagoj Vrgoč, Carlos Rojas, Renzo Angles, Marcelo Arenas, Diego Arroyuelo, Carlos Buil-Aranda, Aidan Hogan, Gonzalo Navarro, Cristian Riveros, and Juan Romero. 2023. MillenniumDB: An Open-Source Graph Database System. *Data Intelligence* 5, 3 (08 2023), 560–610. https://doi.org/10.1162/dint_a_00229 arXiv:https://direct.mit.edu/dint/article-pdf/5/3/560/2158194/dint_a_00229.pdf
- [43] Jim Webber. 2012. A programmatic introduction to Neo4j. In *SPLASH*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2384716.2384777>