

Consistency, Acyclicity, and Positive Semirings

Albert Atserias¹ and Phokion G. Kolaitis²

¹Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya

²University of California Santa Cruz and IBM Research

September 20, 2020

Abstract

In several different settings, one comes across situations in which the objects of study are locally consistent but globally inconsistent. Earlier work about probability distributions by Vorob'ev (1962) and about database relations by Beeri, Fagin, Maier, Yannakakis (1983) produced characterizations of when local consistency always implies global consistency. Towards a common generalization of these results, we consider K-relations, that is, relations over a set of attributes such that each tuple in the relation is associated with an element from an arbitrary, but fixed, positive semiring K . We introduce the notions of projection of a K-relation, consistency of two K-relations, and global consistency of a collection of K-relations; these notions are natural extensions of the corresponding notions about probability distributions and database relations. We then show that a collection of sets of attributes has the property that every pairwise consistent collection of K-relations over those attributes is globally consistent if and only if the sets of attributes form an acyclic hypergraph. This generalizes the aforementioned results by Vorob'ev and by Beeri et al., and demonstrates that K-relations over positive semirings constitute a natural framework for the study of the interplay between local and global consistency. In the course of the proof, we introduce a notion of join of two K-relations and argue that it is the “right” generalization of the join of two database relations. Furthermore, to show that non-acyclic hypergraphs yield pairwise consistent K-relations that are globally inconsistent, we generalize a construction by Tseitin (1968) in his study of hard-to-prove tautologies in propositional logic.

1 Introduction

There are many situations, spanning art and science, in which the objects under consideration are locally consistent but globally inconsistent, where the terms “local”, “global”, and “consistent” are used in some intuitive sense but can be made precise in each concrete setting. In art, Escher's 1960 *Ascending and Descending* and 1961 *Waterfall* lithographs are striking depictions of locally consistent but globally inconsistent situations. Closely related to Escher's artwork is the work by L.S. Penrose and R. Penrose [PP58] on impossible objects, such as the impossible tribar (see also [Fra07]). In quantum mechanics, the interplay between local consistency and global inconsistency takes the form of non-locality and contextuality phenomena, where collections of empirical local measurements may not admit a global explanation via a hidden variable; prominent results in this area include Bell's Theorem [Bel64] and Hardy's paradox [Har92]. In probability theory, there

is work on when a given collection of pairwise consistent probability distributions admits a global distribution whose marginal distributions coincide with the given collection [Vor62]. In computer science, the interplay between local consistency and global consistency arises in such different areas as constraint satisfaction [Dec03], proof complexity [CS88], and relational databases [BFMY83].

What do the aforementioned situations have in common and is there a unifying framework behind them? Abramsky [Abr13, Abr14] pointed out that there are formal connections between non-locality and contextuality in quantum mechanics on one side and the universal relation problem in database theory on the other side. The latter is the following decision problem: given a collection X_1, \dots, X_m of sets of attributes (that is, names of columns of relations) and a collection R_1, \dots, R_m of relations over X_1, \dots, X_m (that is, X_i is the set of the attributes of R_i , for $i \in [m]$), are the relations R_1, \dots, R_m globally consistent? In other words, is there a relation R , called a *universal relation*, over $X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_m$ such that, for every $i \in [m]$, the projection $R[X_i]$ of R on X_i is equal to R_i ? Clearly, if such a universal relation exists, then the relations R_1, \dots, R_m are *pairwise consistent*, i.e., $R_i[X_i \cap X_j] = R_j[X_i \cap X_j]$, for all $i, j \in [m]$, but the converse need not hold. Switching to the quantum mechanics side and by regarding the collection of empirical measurements in [Har92] as a collection of database relations, Hardy’s paradox can be viewed as a negative instance of the universal relation problem: the database relations at hand are pairwise consistent, but globally inconsistent. Note that, since experiments are typically repeated, measurements give rise to probabilities. This way, Bell’s Theorem [Bel64] can be viewed as an instance of a collection of probability distributions that are pairwise consistent, but globally inconsistent. As regards unifying frameworks, Abramsky and Brandenburger [AB11] used sheaf theory to provide a unified account of non-locality and contextuality. This approach was explored further in [AMB11, ABK⁺15].

As mentioned in the preceding paragraph, pairwise consistency is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for a collection of relations to be globally consistent. In the setting of relational databases, Beeri, Fagin, Maier, and Yannakakis [BFMY83] characterized when pairwise consistency is also a sufficient condition for global consistency. If X_1, \dots, X_m are sets of attributes, we say that the collection X_1, \dots, X_m has the *local-to-global consistency property* if every collection R_1, \dots, R_m of pairwise consistent relations over X_1, \dots, X_m is globally consistent. The main finding in Beeri et al. [BFMY83] is that a collection X_1, \dots, X_m of sets of attributes has the local-to-global consistency property if and only if the hypergraph with X_1, \dots, X_m as hyperedges is acyclic, where the notion of hypergraph acyclicity is a suitable generalization of the notion of graph acyclicity. Observe that the local-to-global consistency property is a semantic property (in the sense that its definition involves relations over the sets of attributes), while acyclicity is a syntactic property (in the sense that it describes a structural property of hypergraphs with no reference to relations). In [BFMY83], several other syntactic conditions on hypergraphs were considered, and each was shown to be equivalent to acyclicity. In the setting of probability theory, Vorob’ev [Vor62] identified a different syntactic condition on hypergraphs, which we call *Vorob’ev regularity*, and showed that a collection of probability distributions over X_1, \dots, X_m has the local-to-global consistency property (suitably adapted to probability distributions) if and only if the hypergraph with X_1, \dots, X_m as hyperedges is Vorob’ev regular. It is perhaps worth noting that Vorob’ev’s paper [Vor62] was published much earlier, but Beeri et al. [BFMY83] were apparently unaware of Vorob’ev’s work. It is now natural to ask: is there a common generalization of the above results? This question was investigated by Barbosa in his doctoral thesis [Bar15, Chapter VI]. Barbosa explored the question in the sheaf-theoretic framework for non-locality and contextuality and showed that hypergraph acyclicity implies the local-to-global consistency property in that framework, but did not obtain the reverse direction.

We establish a common generalization of the results by Vorob’ev [Vor62] and by Beeri et al. [BFMY83]. Instead of the sheaf-theoretic framework, we work in the algebraic framework of *positive semirings*, which are commutative semirings with no zero-divisors and with the property that $a + b = 0$ holds for two elements a and b of the semiring if and only if $a = b = 0$. Positive semirings were used to study the provenance of relational database queries [GKT07] and also the provenance of first-order sentences [GT17]; furthermore, commutative semirings were considered by Abramsky [Abr13] in discussing algebraic databases as a generalization of relational databases.

Let K be a positive semiring. As a common generalization of database relations and probability distributions, we consider *K -relations*, i.e., relations over a set of attributes such that each tuple in the relation has an associated element from K as value. Note that ordinary relations are K -relations where K is the Boolean semiring, while probability distributions are K -relations with K -values adding to 1 and where K is the semiring of the non-negative real numbers. We introduce natural extensions of the notions of projection of a K -relation, pairwise consistency, global consistency, and the local-to-global consistency property for K -relations. We then show that a collection X_1, \dots, X_m of sets of attributes has the local-to-global consistency property for K -relations if and only if the hypergraph with X_1, \dots, X_m as hyperedges is acyclic. We also show that a hypergraph is Vorob’ev regular if and only if it is acyclic (this result has been mentioned in passing or has been taken for granted in earlier papers, but we have not found an explicit reference for it). The results by Vorob’ev [Vor62] and by Beeri et al. [BFMY83] then follow as immediate corollaries.

While the proof of our main result about the equivalence between hypergraph acyclicity and the local-to-global consistency property for K -relations bears some similarities and analogies with the earlier proofs of its special cases, it also brings in some new concepts and tools that may be of independent interest. We conclude this section by highlighting some of these concepts and tools.

To prove that hypergraph acyclicity implies the local-to-global consistency property for K -relations, we introduce a *join* operation on K -relations. We make the case that this is the “right” extension to K -relations of the notion of the join of two ordinary relations. In particular, we show that the join of two consistent K -relations witnesses their consistency and also that the basic results about lossless-join decompositions of ordinary relations extend to K -relations. Note that if K is the semiring of non-negative integers, then the K -relations are precisely the *bags* (also known as *multisets*). Our join operation on bags is, in general, different from the standard bag join used in SQL (for bag operations in SQL, see [UW02]). We point out, however, that unlike the join operation introduced here, the standard bag join does not always witness the consistency of two consistent bags. Furthermore, we show that the join of two consistent probability distributions is the unique probability distribution that maximizes entropy among all probability distributions that witness the consistency of the two probability distributions we started with.

To prove that the local-to-global consistency property for K -relations implies hypergraph acyclicity, we need to have a systematic way to produce negative instances of the universal relation problem, such as the instances found in Hardy’s paradox and related constructions in the study of non-locality and contextuality. Note that, in our setting, we need the relations in the negative instances to be K -relations where K is an *arbitrary* positive semiring, instead of ordinary relations over the Boolean semiring or probability distributions over the semiring of nonnegative real numbers; furthermore, we need to be able to produce such negative instance for *any* given cyclic collection X_1, \dots, X_m of sets of attributes. For the special cases of ordinary relations and probability distributions, Beeri et al. [BFMY83] and Vorob’ev [Vor62] provided suitable such constructions, which, as far as we can tell, do not generalize to arbitrary positive semirings. For our

construction, which works for an arbitrary positive semiring, we adapt an idea that can be traced to Tseitin [Tse68] in his study of hard-to-prove tautologies in propositional logic. In brief, Tseitin constructed arbitrarily large sets of propositional clauses such that any fixed number of them are satisfiable, but, when taken jointly, they are unsatisfiable. The combinatorial principle underlying Tseitin’s construction is the following basic *parity principle*: for every undirected graph and for every labeling of the vertices of the graph with 0’s and 1’s with an odd total number of 1’s, there is no subset of the edges that touches every vertex a number of times that is congruent to the label of the vertex modulo 2. To generalize this to arbitrary cyclic hypergraphs and to arbitrary semirings, we resort to a similar modular counting principle for a modulus $d \geq 2$ that depends on the structure of the hyperedges X_1, \dots, X_m . While similar but different variations of Tseitin’s construction have been used in other contexts (see, e.g., [BGIP01] and [ABD09]), we are not aware of any other construction that simultaneously generalizes the results in Beeri et al. [BFMY83] and Vorob’ev [Vor62]. Furthermore, it is worth noting that our construction contains as a special case the most basic Popescu-Rorhlich box [PR94], which is another well-known example of non-locality and contextuality (see, e.g., [AB11]). Specifically, the support of the Popescu-Rorhlich box is precisely the special case of our construction in which the hypergraph X_1, \dots, X_m is the 4-cycle AB, BC, CD, DA on the four vertices A, B, C, D .

2 Valued Relations up to Normalization

In this section we define the notion of *valued relation*, or *K-relation* for a positive semiring K of values, as a generalization of the database-theoretic notion of relation. We study its most basic properties and discuss some examples. Besides the standard concept of ordinary relation from database theory, two other canonical examples will be the *bags* and the *probability distributions*.

2.1 Definition of Valued Relations and Their Basic Properties

We start by recalling some basic terminology and notation from the theory of databases. While most of our notation is standard and well-established, we refer to the standard textbooks [Ull88] and [AHV95] for further elaboration.

Attributes, Tuples, and Relations An *attribute* A is a symbol with an associated set $\text{Dom}(A)$ called its *domain*. If X is a finite set of attributes, then we write $\text{Tup}(X)$ for the set of X -*tuples*; i.e., $\text{Tup}(X)$ is the set of maps that take each attribute $A \in X$ to an element of its domain $\text{Dom}(A)$. Note that $\text{Tup}(\emptyset)$ is non-empty as it contains the *empty tuple*, i.e., the unique map with empty domain. If $Y \subseteq X$ is a subset of attributes and t is an X -tuple, then the *projection of t on Y* , denoted by $t[Y]$, is the unique Y -tuple that agrees with t on Y . In particular, $t[\emptyset]$ is the empty tuple.

A *relation over X* is a subset of $\text{Tup}(X)$; it is a finite relation if it is a finite subset of $\text{Tup}(X)$. In what follows, we will often refer to such relations as *ordinary* relations to differentiate them from K -relations, where K is a positive semiring other than the Boolean semiring. We write $R(X)$ to emphasize the fact that the relation R has *schema* X . In this paper all sets of attributes and all relations are finite, so we omit the term. If $Y \subseteq X$ and R is a relation over X , then the *projection of R on Y* , denoted $R[Y]$, is the relation over Y made of all the projections $t[Y]$ as t ranges over R .

If R is a relation over X and S is a relation over Y , then their *join* $R \bowtie S$ is the relation over $X \cup Y$ made of all the $X \cup Y$ -tuples t such that $t[X]$ is in R and $t[Y]$ is in S .

If X and Y are sets of attributes, then we write XY as shorthand for the union $X \cup Y$. Accordingly, if x is an X -tuple and y is a Y -tuple with the property that $x[X \cap Y] = y[X \cap Y]$, then we write xy to denote the XY -tuple that agrees with x on X and on y on Y . We say that x *joins with* y , and that y *joins with* x , to *produce* the tuple xy .

Positive Semirings A *commutative semiring* is a set K with two binary operations $+$ and \times that are commutative, associative, have 0 and 1, respectively, as identity elements, \times distributes over $+$, and 0 *annihilates* K , that is, $0 \times a = a \times 0 = 0$ holds for all $a \in K$. We assume that $0 \neq 1$, that is, the semiring is *non-trivial*. The identity of multiplication 1 is also called the *unit* of the semiring. We write multiplication $a \times b$ by concatenation ab or with a dot $a \cdot b$. If there do not exist non-zero a and b in K such that $a + b = 0$, then we say that K is *plus-positive*. If there do not exist non-zero a and b in K such that $ab = 0$, then we say that K *has no zero-divisors*, or that K is a semiring *without zero-divisors*. A plus-positive commutative semiring without zero-divisors is called *positive*. In the sequel, K will always denote a non-trivial positive commutative semiring.

We introduce some examples. The *Boolean semiring* $\mathbb{B} = (\{0, 1\}, \vee, \wedge, 0, 1)$ has 0 (false) and 1 (true) as elements, and disjunction (\vee) and conjunction (\wedge) as operations. This is a commutative semiring that is plus-positive and has no zero-divisors, hence it is positive; it is not a ring since disjunction does not have an inverse. The non-negative integers $\mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$, the non-negative rationals $\mathbb{Q}^{\geq 0}$, and the non-negative reals $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ with their usual arithmetic operations $+$ and \times and their identity elements 0 and 1 are also positive semirings. In contrast, the full integers \mathbb{Z} , the rationals \mathbb{Q} , or the reals \mathbb{R} are commutative semirings without zero-divisors that are not plus-positive. The semiring of non-negative integers $\mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$ is also denoted by \mathbb{N} , and it is called the *bag semiring*. For an integer $m \geq 2$, the semiring \mathbb{Z}_m of arithmetic mod m , also denoted by $\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$, is a commutative semiring that is not plus-positive, and that has no zero-divisors if and only if m is prime; \mathbb{Z}_1 is not even non-trivial.

Under the convention that $0 < 1$, the disjunction \vee and conjunction \wedge operations of the Boolean semiring can also be written as \max and \min , respectively. Semirings over arithmetic ordered domains that combine the \max or \min operations with the usual arithmetic operations are called *tropical* semirings. The *min-plus* semiring has the extended reals $\mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty, -\infty\}$ as elements, and the standard operations of minimum and addition for $+$ and \times , with $-\infty$ playing the role of the identity for \min . The *positive min-plus* semiring has the extended positive reals $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0} \cup \{+\infty\}$ as elements, and again standard minimum and addition for $+$ and \times , with 0 playing the role of identity for \min . The *Viterbi* semiring elements ranging over the unit interval $[0, 1]$, and the standard operations of maximum and multiplication for $+$ and \times , respectively. The *rational tropical* semirings are based on the extended rational numbers in place of the extended real numbers.

Definition of K -relations and Their Marginals Let $K = (K^*, +, \times, 0, 1)$ be a semiring and let X be a finite set of attributes. A *K -relation over X* is a map $R : \text{Tup}(X) \rightarrow K$ that assigns a value $R(t)$ in K to every X -tuple t in $\text{Tup}(X)$. Note that this definition makes sense even if X is the empty set of attributes; in such a case, a K -relation over X is simply a single value from K that is assigned to the empty tuple. Note also that the ordinary relation are precisely the \mathbb{B} -relation, where \mathbb{B} is the Boolean semiring.

The *support* of the K -relation R , denoted by $\text{Supp}(R)$, is the set of X -tuples t that are assigned

non-zero value, i.e.,

$$\text{Supp}(R) := \{t \in \text{Tup}(X) : R(t) \neq 0\}. \quad (1)$$

Whenever this does not lead to confusion, we write R' to denote $\text{Supp}(R)$. Note that R' is an ordinary relation over X . A K -relation is *finitely supported* if its support is a finite set. In this paper, all K -relations are finitely supported and we omit the term. When R' is empty we say that R is the empty K -relation over X . For $a \in K$, we write aR to denote the K -relation over X defined by $(aR)(t) = aR(t)$ for every X -tuple t . It is always the case that $\text{Supp}(aR) \subseteq \text{Supp}(R)$, and, as the proof of the next lemma shows, the reverse inclusion $\text{Supp}(R) \subseteq \text{Supp}(aR)$ also holds in case a is a non-zero element of K and K has no zero-divisors. If t is a Y -tuple for some $Y \subseteq X$, then the *marginal of R over t* is defined by

$$R(t) := \sum_{\substack{r \in R' \\ r[Y]=t}} R(r). \quad (2)$$

Accordingly, any K -relation over X induces a K -relation over Y for any $Y \subseteq X$. This K -relation is denoted by $R[Y]$ and is called the *marginal of R on Y* . Note that if R is an ordinary relation (i.e., R is a \mathbb{B} -relation), then the marginal $R[Y]$ is the projection of R on Y , so the notation for the marginal is consistent with the one introduced for the projection earlier. It is always the case that $\text{Supp}(R[Y]) \subseteq \text{Supp}(R)[Y]$, and, as the proof of the next lemma shows, the reverse inclusion also holds in case the semiring K is plus-positive.

From now on, we make the blanket assumption that K is a positive semiring. This hypothesis will not be explicitly spelled out in the statements of the various lemmas in which K -relations are mentioned.

Lemma 1. *Let $R(X)$ be a K -relation. The following statements hold:*

1. *For all non-zero elements a in K , we have $(aR)' = R'$.*
2. *For all $Y \subseteq X$, we have $R'[Y] = R[Y]'$.*
3. *For all $Z \subseteq Y \subseteq X$, we have $R[Y][Z] = R[Z]$.*

Proof. For 1, the inclusion $(aR)' \subseteq R'$ holds for all semirings since if $t \in (aR)'$, then $aR(t) \neq 0$, so $R(t) \neq 0$ since 0 annihilates K , and hence $t \in R'$. For the converse, if $t \in R'$, then $R(t) \neq 0$, so $aR(t) \neq 0$ since a is non-zero and K has no zero-divisors, and hence $t \in (aR)'$. For 2, the inclusion $R[Y]' \subseteq R'[Y]$ is obvious and holds for all semirings. For the converse, assume that $t \in R'[Y]$, so there exists r such that $R(r) \neq 0$ and $r[Y] = t$. By (2) and the plus-positivity of K we have that $R(t) \neq 0$. Hence $t \in R[Y]'$. For 3, we have

$$R[Y][Z](u) = \sum_{\substack{v \in R[Y]': \\ v[Z]=u}} R[Y](v) = \sum_{\substack{v \in R'[Y]: \\ v[Z]=u}} \sum_{\substack{w \in R': \\ w[Y]=v}} R(w) = \sum_{\substack{w \in R': \\ w[Z]=u}} R(w) = R[Z](u) \quad (3)$$

where the first equality follows from (2), the second follows from Part 2 of this lemma to replace $R[Y]'$ by $R'[Y]$, and again (2), the third follows from partitioning the tuples in R' by their projection on Y , together with $Z \subseteq Y$, and the fourth follows from (2) again. \square

Some examples follow.

Example 1. When K is the Boolean semiring \mathbb{B} , a \mathbb{B} -relation over X is simply an ordinary relation over X ; its support is the relation itself, and its marginals are the ordinary projections. When K

is the bag semiring \mathbb{N} , the \mathbb{N} -relations are called *bags* or *multi-sets*. If T is a bag and t is a tuple in its support, then $T(t)$ is called the *multiplicity* of t in T . When K is the semiring of non-negative reals $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$, the finite $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ -relations T that satisfy

$$T[\emptyset] = \sum_{t \in T'} T(t) = 1 \quad (4)$$

are the probability distributions of finite support over the set $\text{Tup}(X)$ of X -tuples, or, in short, the *probability distributions over X* . Conversely, to every finite non-empty $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ -relation T one can associate a probability distribution T^* through *normalization*; this means that if we set $N_T := \sum_{t \in T'} T(t)$ and $n_T = 1/N_T$, then the $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ -relation $T^* := n_T T$ is a probability distribution. Finally, when K is the semiring of non-negative rationals $\mathbb{Q}^{\geq 0}$, the corresponding probability distributions are called *rational* probability distributions. \dashv

2.2 Equivalence of K -Relations

We introduce a notion of equivalence between two K -relations over the same set of attributes that will play an important role in the later sections of this paper. To motivate this definition, let us look again at the probability distributions seen as the $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ -relations that satisfy the normalization equation (4) from Example 1.

Derivation of the Equivalence Relation Recall that to every non-empty $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ -relation T one can associate a probability distribution T^* through normalization $T \mapsto T^*$. More generally, a normalization operation can be defined for any semiring K that is actually a *semifield*, which is a semiring whose multiplication operation \times admits an inverse \div . Note that both $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ and $\mathbb{Q}^{\geq 0}$ are semifields. Formally, if K is a semifield and T is a non-empty K -relation over a set of attributes X , then we define T^* as the K -relation defined by $T^*(t) := (1/N_T)T(t)$ for every X -tuple t , where $N_T := T[\emptyset] = \sum_{t \in T'} T(t)$, and $1/N_T$ is the multiplicative inverse of N_T in the semifield K . Note that T was assumed non-empty, so $N_T \neq 0$ since K is plus-positive, and the multiplicative inverse $1/N_T$ exists. When T is the empty K -relation, we let T^* be the empty K -relation itself.

With this definition in hand, still assuming that K is a semifield, we can define an equivalence relation $R \equiv S$ to hold between two K -relations R and S if and only if $R^* = S^*$. An important observation that follows from the definitions is that if R and S are K -relations over the same set of attributes, then $R^* = S^*$ holds if and only if $aR = bS$ for some non-zero a and b in K . For the *only if* direction just take $a = 1/N_R$ and $b = 1/N_S$ if both R and S are non-empty K -relations, and $a = b = 1$ otherwise. For the *if* direction, assuming that R and S are both non-empty K -relations over X , for every X -tuple t we have

$$R^*(t) = \frac{1}{N_R} R(t) = \frac{a}{aN_R} R(t) = \frac{b}{bN_S} S(t) = \frac{1}{N_S} S(t) = S^*(t), \quad (5)$$

where the first equality follows from the fact that R^* is defined from R through normalization, the second follows from the assumption that a is non-zero, the third follows from the assumption that $aR = bS$, so, in particular, $aR(t) = bS(t)$ and also $R' = S'$ and $aN_R = bN_S$, the fourth follows from the assumption that b is non-zero, and the last follows from the definition of S^* through normalization. This observation motivates the following definition of the equivalence relation \equiv for arbitrary positive semirings that are not necessarily semifields.

Definition of the Equivalence Relation for Positive Semirings Let K be a positive semiring. Two K -relations R and S over the same set of attributes are *equivalent up to normalization*, denoted by $R \equiv S$, if there exist non-zero a and b in K such that $aR = bS$. It is obvious that \equiv is reflexive and symmetric. The next lemma collects a few easy facts about \equiv , the first of which states that \equiv is also transitive, and hence an equivalence relation. We write $[R]$ for the equivalence class of R under \equiv .

Lemma 2. *Let $R(X), S(X), T(X)$ be K -relations over the same set X of attributes. The following statements hold:*

1. *If $R \equiv S$ and $S \equiv T$, then $R \equiv T$.*
2. *If $R \equiv S$, then $R' = S'$.*
3. *If $R \equiv S$ and $Y \subseteq X$, then $R[Y] \equiv S[Y]$.*

Proof. For 1, assume that $aR = bS$ and $cS = dT$ for non-zero a and b in K , and non-zero c and d in K . Since K has no zero-divisors we have that ac and bd are non-zero. Moreover,

$$acR = caR = cbS = bcS = bdT, \quad (6)$$

where the first equality is commutativity, the second follows from $aR = bS$, the third is commutativity, and the last follows from $cS = dT$. For 2, assume that $aR = bS$ for non-zero a and b , and that $R(t) \neq 0$ for some X -tuple t . Then $aR(t) \neq 0$ because K has no zero-divisors, hence $bS(t) \neq 0$ by the assumption that $aR = bS$, and $S(t) \neq 0$ since 0 annihilates K . This shows $R' \subseteq S'$ and the reverse inclusion follows from symmetry. For 3, assume that $aR = bS$ for non-zero a and b and that $Y \subseteq X$. For every Y -tuple u we have

$$aR(u) = a \sum_{\substack{r \in R': \\ r[Y]=u}} R(r) = \sum_{\substack{r \in R': \\ r[Y]=u}} aR(r) = \sum_{\substack{r \in R': \\ r[Y]=u}} bS(r) = \sum_{\substack{s \in S': \\ s[Y]=u}} bS(r) = b \sum_{\substack{s \in S': \\ s[Y]=u}} S(r) = bS(u), \quad (7)$$

where the first equality follows from (2), the second is distributivity, the third follows from the assumption that $aR = bS$, the fourth follows from point 2 in this lemma, the fifth is again distributivity, and the sixth is (2). \square

3 Consistency of Two K -Relations

For ordinary relations $R(X)$ and $S(Y)$, there are several different ways to define the concept of R and S being *consistent*, and all these concepts turn out to be equivalent to each other. One way is to say that R and S arise as the projections $T[X]$ and $T[Y]$ of a single relation T over the union of attributes XY . Another way is to say that R and S agree on their projections to the set $Z = X \cap Y$ of their common attributes. Yet a third way is to say that their ordinary join $R \bowtie S$ projects to R on X and to S on Y . In this section, we study the analogous concepts for K -relations with consistency defined up to normalization. Along the way, we will also define a notion of \bowtie for two K -relations.

3.1 Consistency of Two K -Relations and Their Join

Let K be an arbitrary but fixed positive semiring. We start with the definition of consistency up to normalization, or more simply, consistency of two K -relations.

Consistency Up to Normalization Let $R(X)$ and $S(Y)$ be two K -relations. We say that R and S are *consistent* if there is a K -relation $T(XY)$ such that $R \equiv T[X]$ and $S \equiv T[Y]$. We say that T *witnesses* their consistency. Two equivalence classes $[R]$ and $[S]$ of K -relations are *consistent* if their representatives R and S are consistent. It is easy to see that this notion of consistency among equivalence classes is well-defined in that it does not depend on the chosen representatives R and S . Indeed, if $[R]$ and $[S]$ are consistent and T witnesses the consistency of R and S , then for every $R_0 \equiv R$ and every $S_0 \equiv S$, we have that T also witnesses the consistency of R_0 and S_0 , by the transitivity of \equiv . Conversely, if T_0 witnesses the consistency of $R_0 \equiv R$ and $S_0 \equiv S$, then it also witnesses the consistency of R and S , again by the transitivity of \equiv .

Naive Join Operation of Two K -Relations We want to define a join operation $R \bowtie S$ for K -relations R and S with the property that if R and S are consistent, then their join witnesses the consistency. A natural candidate for such an operation would be to define $(R \bowtie S)(t)$ by $R(t[X])S(t[Y])$ for every XY -tuple t , where X and Y are the sets of attributes of R and S , respectively. This is the straightforward generalization of the ordinary join of ordinary relations since for the Boolean semiring both definitions give the same operation. Moreover, this is the way the join of bags is defined in SQL (see [UW02]). As we show below, however, this naive generalization does not work: in fact, even for bags, the bag defined this way does not always witness the consistency of two consistent bags.

Example 2. Let $R(AB), S(BC), J(ABC), U(ABC)$ be the four bags given by the following tables of multiplicities (the #-column is the multiplicity):

$R(AB)$ #	$S(BC)$ #	$J(ABC)$ #	$U(ABC)$ #
1 2 : 6	2 3 : 2	1 2 3 : 12	1 2 3 : 6
2 3 : 3	2 4 : 2	1 2 4 : 12	1 2 4 : 6
	3 4 : 2	2 3 4 : 6	2 3 4 : 6

Consider also the marginals of J and U on AB and BC :

$J[AB]$ #	$J[BC]$ #	$U[AB]$ #	$U[BC]$ #
1 2 : 24	2 3 : 12	1 2 : 12	2 3 : 6
2 3 : 6	2 4 : 12	2 3 : 6	2 4 : 6
	3 4 : 6		3 4 : 6

The bags R and S are consistent since U witnesses their consistency: $2R = U[AB]$ and $3S = U[BC]$. The bag J is actually the naive join of R and S defined by $J(t) = R(t[AB])S(t[BC])$, and there are no non-zero a and b in \mathbb{N} such that $aR = bJ[AB]$, and also there are no non-zero c and d in \mathbb{N} such that $cS = dJ[BC]$. +

This example has shown that the *naive* join need not witness the consistency of R and S . We need a different way of defining the join operation.

Derivation of the New Join Operation To arrive at the definition of the join operation that will work for arbitrary semirings, we turn again to probability distributions from Example 1 as the motivating example. Recall that a probability distribution is a $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ -relation that satisfies (4). As in the discussion for defining the equivalence relation, this motivation will generalize to any semifield beyond $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$. From there, generalizing the definition to arbitrary semirings will be a small step.

Let $R(X)$ and $S(Y)$ be probability distributions. It is easy to see that if X and Y were disjoint, then the $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ relation given by $t \mapsto R(t[X])S(t[Y])$ would again be a probability distribution. This, however, fails badly if X and Y are not disjoint as can be seen from turning the example bags $R(AB)$ and $S(BC)$ from Example 2 into probability distributions through normalization (when seen as $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ -relations). The catch is of course that if $Z = X \cap Y$ is non-empty, then two independent samples from the distributions R and S need not agree on their projections on Z . The solution is to define the join $R \bowtie S$ as the probability distribution on XY that is sampled by the following different process: first sample r from the distribution R , then sample s from the distribution S *conditioned* on $s[Z] = r[Z]$, finally output the tuple rs which is well-defined since $s[Z] = r[Z]$. This leads to the expression

$$(R \bowtie_{\mathbb{P}} S)(t) := R(t[X])S(t[Y])/S(t[Z]) \quad (8)$$

defined for all XY -tuples t , with convention that $0/0 = 0$. Observe that, by writing $r := t[X]$, $s := t[Y]$, $u := t[Y \setminus Z]$ and $v := t[Z]$, the factor $R(t[X])$ in (8) is the probability $R(r)$ of getting r in a sample from the distribution R , and the factor $S(t[Y])/S(t[Z])$ is the probability $S(s)/S(v) = S(uv)/S(v)$ of getting s in a sample from the distribution S conditioned on $s[Z] = v = r[Z]$.

Naturally, we could have equally well considered the reverse sampling process that first samples s from S , and then samples r from R *conditioned* on $r[Z] = s[Z]$. This would lead to the alternative expression

$$(R \bowtie_{\mathbb{P}} S)(t) := S(t[X])R(t[Y])/R(t[Z]). \quad (9)$$

It is clear from the definitions that $R \bowtie_{\mathbb{P}} S = S \bowtie_{\mathbb{P}} R$, but for the two proposals to agree we would need to have $R[Z] = S[Z]$. Luckily, this can actually be seen to hold in case R and S are consistent probability distributions since if T is a $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ -relation that satisfies $T[X] = R$ and $T[Y] = S$, then also $T[Z] = R[Z] = S[Z]$ by Part 3 of Lemma 1. It will follow from the lemmas below that in such a case we also have $(R \bowtie S)[X] \equiv R$ and $(R \bowtie S)[Y] \equiv S$ for both $\bowtie = \bowtie_{\mathbb{P}}$ and $\bowtie = \mathbb{P} \bowtie$, which is what we want.

It is clear that the expression in (8), in addition to being defined for $K = \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$, could have been defined for any semiring K that is actually a semifield where a division operation is available. On the other hand, to obtain an expression that works for arbitrary semirings, we need to eliminate the divisions. A natural approach for this would be to multiply the expression in (8) by the product $\prod_{s \in S[Z]'} S(s[Z])$ of all the values that appear in the denominator. This way, the denominator would cancel, yet the resulting K -relation would remain equivalent up to normalization because the multiplying products do not depend on the tuple t . We are now ready to formally define this.

Definition of the Join of Two K -Relations For a K -relation $T(X)$, a subset $Z \subseteq X$, and a Z -tuple u , define

$$c_{T,Z}^* := \prod_{v \in T[Z]'} T(v) \quad \text{and} \quad c_T(u) := \prod_{\substack{v \in T[Z]': \\ v \neq u}} T(v), \quad (10)$$

with the understanding that the empty product evaluates to 1, the unit of the semiring K . Observe that $c_T(u)$ and $c_{T,Z}^*$ are always non-zero because $T[Z]'$ is precisely the set of Z -tuples v with non-zero $T(v)$, and K has no zero-divisors. The *join* of two K -relations $R(X)$ and $S(Y)$ is the K -relation over XY defined, for every XY -tuple t , by

$$(R \bowtie S)(t) := R(t[X])S(t[Y])c_S(t[X \cap Y]). \quad (11)$$

It is worth noting at this point that the identity $c_{T,Z}^* = c_T(u)T(u)$ holds, which means that whenever K is a semifield such as $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$, we have $c_{T,Z}^*/T(u) = c_T(u)$ for all $u \in T[Z]'$, and therefore

$$R \bowtie S = c_{S[Z]}^*(R \bowtie_{\mathbb{P}} S), \quad (12)$$

where $\bowtie_{\mathbb{P}}$ is defined as in (8).

Note that, for ordinary relations, the join operation just introduced coincides with the (ordinary) join operation in relational databases. Note also that the definition of \bowtie is asymmetric. Thus, on the face of its definition, the join of two K -relations need not be commutative, i.e., there may be K -relations R and S such that $R \bowtie S \neq S \bowtie R$. As a matter of fact, something stronger holds: in general, $R \bowtie S \not\equiv S \bowtie R$; furthermore, as we shall see next, this happens even for bags. Nonetheless, we will show later that $R \bowtie S \equiv S \bowtie R$ does hold in case R and S agree on their common marginals; moreover, in that case, both joins $R \bowtie S$ and $S \bowtie R$ witness the consistency of R and S .

The example that follows illustrates the definition of the join and also shows that the join operation need not be commutative, not even up to equivalence.

Example 3. Consider the bags $R(AB)$ and $S(BC)$ from Example 2, where they were shown to be consistent using the bag $U(ABC)$ from the same example. The joins $V := R \bowtie S$ and $W := S \bowtie R$ defined by (11) are the bags given by the following tables of multiplicities. We display V and W alongside their marginals on AB and BC .

$V(ABC)$ #	$W(ABC)$ #	$V[AB]$ #	$V[BC]$ #	$W[AB]$ #	$W[BC]$ #
1 2 3 : 24	1 2 3 : 36	1 2 : 48	2 3 : 24	1 2 : 72	2 3 : 36
1 2 4 : 24	1 2 4 : 36	2 3 : 24	2 4 : 24	2 3 : 36	2 4 : 36
2 3 4 : 24	2 3 4 : 36		3 4 : 24		3 4 : 36

For example, the entry $V(234)$ is computed as $3 \cdot 2 \cdot (2+2) = 24$ according to the expression (11) that defines the join operation. By inspection, we have that $8R = V[AB]$ and $12S = V[BC]$, so V witnesses the consistency of R and S , and $24R = W[AB]$ and $18S = W[BC]$, so W also witnesses the consistency of R and S . Indeed, $3V = 2W$, which shows that $R \bowtie S \equiv S \bowtie R$ holds for these two bags R and S .

Next, we use the bag R and another bag T to show that \bowtie need not be commutative, not even up to equivalence. Consider the bag $T(BC)$ given below by its table of multiplicities together with $J_1 = R \bowtie T$ and $J_2 = T \bowtie R$:

$T(BC)$ #	$J_1(ABC)$ #	$J_2(ABC)$ #
2 3 : 2	1 2 3 : 48	1 2 3 : 36
2 4 : 2	1 2 4 : 48	1 2 4 : 36
3 4 : 4	2 3 4 : 48	2 3 4 : 72

Clearly, there are no non-zero a and b in \mathbb{N} such that $aJ_1 = bJ_2$, thus $R \bowtie T \not\equiv T \bowtie R$. Note that the pair of K -relations R and T that gave this has $R[B] \not\equiv T[B]$. This is no coincidence, since, in what follows, we will show that if the two K -relations have equivalent common marginals, then their join is commutative up to equivalence. This was the case, for example, for the pair of bags R and S considered also in this example, which had $R[B] \equiv S[B]$ and $R \bowtie S \equiv S \bowtie R$. \dashv

Properties of the Join Operation The first property we show about the join of two K -relations is that it is well-defined in the sense that its equivalence class does not depend on the representatives. In other words, we show that the join operation \bowtie is a congruence with respect to the equivalence relation \equiv on K -relations.

Lemma 3. *Let R, R_0 be two K -relations over a set X and let S, S_0 be two K -relations over a set Y . If $R \equiv R_0$ and $S \equiv S_0$, then $R \bowtie S \equiv R_0 \bowtie S_0$.*

Proof. Let X be the set of attributes of R and R_0 , and let Y be that of S and S_0 . Write $Z = X \cap Y$. Let a and b be non-zero elements in K such that $aR = bR_0$, and let c and d be non-zero elements in K such that $cS = dS_0$. First note that $R[Z]' = R_0[Z]'$ by Parts 3 and 2 in Lemma 2. Let m be the cardinality of $R[Z]' = R_0[Z]'$ and set $a^* = ac^m$ and $b^* = bd^m$. We argue that $a^*(R \bowtie S)(t) = b^*(R_0 \bowtie S_0)(t)$ for every XY -tuple t . Fix an XY -tuple t and distinguish the cases $t[Z] \notin R[Z]'$ from $t[Z] \in R[Z]'$. In the first case, we have $R(t[Z]) = 0$ and hence $R(t[X]) = 0$ by Part 2 in Lemma 1, so $R_0(t[X]) = 0$ by Part 2 in Lemma 2. It follows that $(R \bowtie S)(t) = (R_0 \bowtie S_0)(t) = 0$ in this case. In the second case, we have $m \geq 1$ and

$$a^*(R \bowtie S)(t) = aR(t[X]) \cdot cS(t[Y]) \cdot \prod_{\substack{r \in R[Z]': \\ r \neq t[Z]}} cS(r) \quad (13)$$

on one hand since $a^* = acc^{m-1}$, and

$$b^*(R_0 \bowtie S_0)(t) = bR_0(t[X]) \cdot dS_0(t[Y]) \cdot \prod_{\substack{r \in R_0[Z]': \\ r \neq t[Z]}} dS_0(r), \quad (14)$$

on the other since $b^* = bdd^{m-1}$. The right-hand sides of (13) and (14) are equal by $aR = bR_0$ and $cS = dS_0$, and $R[Z]' = R_0[Z]'$, so the lemma is proved. \square

Next, we show that the support of the join is the ordinary join of the supports.

Lemma 4. *For all K -relations R and S , we have that $(R \bowtie S)' = R' \bowtie S'$.*

Proof. Let X be the set of attributes of R , and let Y be that of S . Write $Z = X \cap Y$ and $T = R \bowtie S$. Fix an XY -tuple t . If t is in T' , then $T(t) \neq 0$ and in particular $R(t[X]) \neq 0$ and $S(t[Y]) \neq 0$ by (11). It follows that $t[X]$ is in R' and $t[Y]$ is in S' ; i.e., t is in the relational join of R' and S' . Conversely, if $T(t) = 0$, then by (11) again either $R(t[X]) = 0$ or $S(t[Y]) = 0$ or $c_S(t[Z]) = 0$ since K has no zero-divisors. The third case is absurd: we already argued that $c_S(t[Z]) \neq 0$ since $S[Z]'$ is precisely the set of Z -tuples v with $S(v) \neq 0$. In the first two cases, we can conclude that either $t[X]$ is not in R' or $t[Y]$ is not in S' , so t is not in their join. \square

The *left semijoin* $R' \bowtie_S S'$ of two ordinary relations $R'(X)$ and $S'(Y)$ is the set of X -tuples in R' that join with some Y -tuple in S' , i.e., $R' \bowtie_S S' = (R' \bowtie S')[X]$. We use Lemma 4 to show that the asymmetric join behaves like a left semijoin up to equivalence, in a strong sense (with $a = 1$).

Lemma 5. *For all K -relations R and S and all $r \in R' \bowtie_S S'$, we have that $(R \bowtie S)(r) = c_S^* R(r)$.*

Proof. Let X and Y be the sets of attributes of R and S , respectively, and write $Z = X \cap Y$ and $T = R \bowtie S$. Fix an X -tuple $r \in R' \times S'$ and write $u = r[Z]$. We have

$$T(r) = \sum_{\substack{t \in T' \\ t[X]=r}} T(t) = \sum_{\substack{t \in T' \\ t[X]=r}} R(t[X])S(t[Y])c_S(t[Z]) = c_S(u)R(r) \sum_{\substack{t \in T' \\ t[X]=r}} S(t[Y]), \quad (15)$$

where the first equality follows from (2), the second follows from (11), and the third follows from the condition that $t[X] = r$ because $Z \subseteq X$ implies $t[Z] = t[X][Z] = r[Z] = u$. At this point, we use the fact that $r \in R' \times S'$ and hence $r \in R'$, together with Lemma 4, to argue that the map

$$f : \{t \in T' : t[X] = r\} \rightarrow \{s \in S' : s[Z] = u\} :: t \mapsto t[Y] \quad (16)$$

is a bijection. Indeed, since by Lemma 4 each $t \in T'$ comes from the relational join of R' and S' , for each $t \in T'$ such that $t[X] = r$ there exists $s \in S'$ with $t[Y] = s$ and $s[Z] = t[Y][Z] = t[Z] = t[X][Z] = r[Z] = u$. Clearly this $s = t[Y]$ is uniquely determined from t . Conversely, if $s \in S'$ is such that $s[Z] = u = r[Z]$, then the join tuple t of r and s exists, it is in T' by Lemma 4 and the fact that $r \in R'$, and moreover $t[X] = r$. This t is uniquely determined from s (and the fixed r). This proves that (16) is a bijection. Therefore, continuing from (15), we have

$$c_S(u)R(r) \sum_{\substack{t \in T' \\ t[X]=r}} S(t[Y]) = c_S(u)R(r) \sum_{\substack{s \in S' \\ s[Z]=u}} S(s) = c_S(u)R(r)S(u). \quad (17)$$

where the first equality follows from the just shown fact that (16) is a bijection, and the second follows from (2). Recall now that $u = r[Z]$ and $r \in R' \times S'$, which means that $u \in (R' \times S')[Z]$. In particular, $u \in S'[Z]$, so $u \in S[Z]'$ by Part 2 of Lemma 1. Thus, by (10), we have $c_S^* = c_S(u)S(u)$, and equations (15) and (17) actually show that $T(r) = c_S^*R(r)$. \square

Next we show that if two K -relations are consistent in the sense that their marginals on the common attributes are equivalent, then their join commutes up to equivalence. Later we will use this to argue that this sense of consistency in terms of marginals is equivalent to the one defined earlier in this section, and thus that if two K -relations are consistent, then their join commutes up to equivalence.

Lemma 6. *For all K -relations $R(X)$ and $S(Y)$, if $R[X \cap Y] \equiv S[X \cap Y]$, then \bowtie commutes on R and S up to equivalence, i.e., $R \bowtie S \equiv S \bowtie R$.*

Proof. Write $Z = X \cap Y$. Let a and b be non-zero and such that $aR[Z] = bS[Z]$. First note that $R[Z]' = S[Z]'$ by Part 3 and 2 of Lemma 2. Let m be the cardinality of $R[Z]' = S[Z]'$. If $m = 0$, then $(R \bowtie S)(t) = R(t[X])S(t[Y]) = S(t[Y])R(t[X]) = (S \bowtie R)(t)$ for every XY -tuple t , and we are done. Assume then that $m \geq 1$ and set $a^* = a^{m-1}$ and $b^* = b^{m-1}$. We argue that $b^*(R \bowtie S)(t) = a^*(S \bowtie R)(t)$ for every XY -tuple t . Fix an XY -tuple t and distinguish the cases $t[Z] \notin S[Z]'$ from $t[Z] \in S[Z]'$. In the first case we have $S(t[Y]) = 0$ by Part 2 of Lemma 1 and it follows that $b^*(R \bowtie S)(t) = 0 = a^*(S \bowtie R)(t)$ in this case. In the second case we have

$$b^*(R \bowtie S)(t) = R(t[X])S(t[Y]) \prod_{\substack{s \in S[Z]': \\ s \neq t[Z]}} bS(s) \quad (18)$$

on one hand since $b^* = b^{m-1}$ and $t[Z] \in S[Z]'$, and

$$a^*(S \bowtie R)(t) = S(t[Y])R(t[X]) \prod_{\substack{r \in R[Z]': \\ r \neq t[Z]}} aR(r) \quad (19)$$

on the other since $a^* = a^{m-1}$ and $t[Z] \in S[Z]' = R[Z]'$. Now, given hat $aR(r) = bS(r)$ for every Z -tuple r , the right-hand sides of (18) and (19) are equal, and the lemma is proved. \square

We are ready to show that the join witnesses the consistency of any two consistent K -relations. Along the way, we also prove that two K -relations are consistent if and only if their marginals on the common attributes are equivalent. This result tells that the join operation on two K -relations introduced here possesses most of the desirable properties that the join of ordinary relations in relational databases does.

Lemma 7. *Let $R(X)$ and $S(Y)$ be K -relations. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (a) R and S are consistent.
- (b) $R[X \cap Y] \equiv S[X \cap Y]$.
- (c) R' and S' are consistent and $R \bowtie S \equiv S \bowtie R$.
- (d) $R \equiv (R \bowtie S)[X]$ and $S \equiv (R \bowtie S)[Y]$.

Proof. Write $Z = X \cap Y$. For (a) implies (b), let T witness that R and S are consistent, so $R \equiv T[X]$ and $S \equiv T[Y]$. Then, by Part 3 of Lemma 2, we have $R[Z] \equiv T[X][Z]$ and $S[Z] \equiv T[Y][Z]$. Since by Part 3 of Lemma 1 we also have $T[X][Z] = T[Z] = T[Y][Z]$, we get $R[Z] \equiv S[Z]$, as was to be shown. For (b) implies (c) first apply Part 2 of Lemma 1 followed by Part 2 of Lemma 2 to conclude that $R'[X \cap Y] = S'[X \cap Y]$ and hence that R' and S' are consistent as ordinary relations. By Lemma 6 we also have $R \bowtie S \equiv S \bowtie R$. For (c) implies (d) first note that the consistency of R' and S' implies that $R' = R' \bowtie S'$ and $S' = S' \bowtie R'$. Thus, Lemma 5 gives $R \equiv (R \bowtie S)[X]$ and $S \equiv (S \bowtie R)[Y]$. Together with the assumption that $R \bowtie S \equiv S \bowtie R$ this also gives $S \equiv (R \bowtie S)[Y]$ by Part 3 of Lemma 2. That (d) implies (a) is direct since (d) says that $R \bowtie S$ witnesses the consistency of R and S . \square

3.2 Justification of the Join of Two K -Relations

In this section, we address the question whether the join operation on two relations that we defined in Section 3 is well motivated. For the rest of this section, fix a finite set of attributes and let Tuple denote the set of all tuples over these attributes, which we assume is a computable set through the appropriate encodings. We also assume that the positive semiring K is a computable structure in the sense that the elements of its domain admit a computable presentation that makes its operations be computable functions. The bag semiring \mathbb{N} , as well as the semiring $\mathbb{Q}^{\geq 0}$ of non-negative rationals and many others, are of course computable in this sense. Furthermore, we require the equivalence relation \equiv to be decidable; in other words, we require that the following computational problem is decidable:

Given two K -relations R and S over the same set, does $R \equiv S$ hold?

We note that for the bag semiring \mathbb{N} , as well as for the semiring $\mathbb{Q}^{\geq 0}$ of non-negative rationals, this problem is very easily decidable, even polynomial-time solvable through what we call the *ratio test*: first, check whether $R' = S'$, and then check whether $R(t_1)/S(t_1) = R(t_2)/S(t_2)$ holds for every two tuples t_1 and t_2 in $R' = S'$.

Deciding Consistency Despite the Plethora of Witnesses Let R and S denote two K -relations on the sets of attributes X and Y and consider the following computational problem:

Given two K -relations R and S , are R and S consistent?

For an infinite positive semiring K , such as the bag semiring \mathbb{N} , there is no immediate and a priori reason to think that this problem is algorithmically solvable. The difficulty is that in principle there are infinitely many candidate K -relations to test as witness for consistency, and the arithmetic theory of the natural numbers is highly undecidable. However, what Lemma 7 shows is that the two given K -relations R and S are consistent if and only if the single, finite and explicitly defined K -relation given by $R \bowtie S$ witnesses their consistency. Thus, if K is a semiring for which the equivalence relation \equiv is decidable, this can be checked in finite time and the problem is decidable. In the next example, we show that, even for bags, the consistency of two bags may very well be witnessed by infinitely many pairwise inequivalent witnesses.

Example 4. Let a be a positive integer and let $R(AB)$, $S(BC)$ and $T_a(ABC)$ be the three bags given by the following multiplicity tables, listed alongside the two projections of T_a on AB and BC :

$R(AB) \#$	$S(BC) \#$	$T_a(ABC) \#$	$T_a[AB] \#$	$T_a[BC] \#$
0 0 : 1	0 0 : 1	0 0 0 : a	0 0 : $a + 1$	0 0 : $a + 1$
1 0 : 1	0 1 : 1	0 0 1 : 1	1 0 : $a + 1$	0 1 : $a + 1$
		1 0 0 : 1		
		1 0 1 : a		

It is evident that $T_a[AB] = (a + 1)R$ and $T_a[BC] = (a + 1)S$, but $T_a \not\equiv T_b$ unless $a = b$. The conclusion is that there are infinitely many different equivalence classes that witness the consistency of R and S . ←

Entropy Maximization Let us turn our attention again to probability distributions. The canonical representatives of the equivalence classes are the $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ -relations T that satisfy (4). We argued already that for such canonical $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ -relations we have that \equiv agrees with $=$. Therefore, the set of canonical $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ -relations T that witness the consistency of two given probability distributions $R(X)$ and $S(Y)$ can be identified with the set of feasible solutions of a linear program that has one real variable x_t representing $T(t)$ for each XY -tuple t in the join of the supports of R and S :

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{t:t[X]=r} x_t &= R(r) && \text{for each } r \in R', \\
 \sum_{t:t[Y]=s} x_t &= S(s) && \text{for each } s \in S', \\
 \sum_t x_t &= 1 \\
 x_t &\geq 0 && \text{for each } t \in R' \bowtie S'.
 \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

The set of probability distributions $P(XY)$ that witness the consistency of R and S is thus a polytope $W(R, S)$ which is non-empty if and only if R and S are consistent. A natural question to ask is whether there is some particular probability distribution in this polytope that is better motivated than any other such probability distribution. For example, following the principle of maximum entropy, we could ask for the probability distribution that maximizes *Shannon's Entropy* (see section 2.1. in [CT06]) among those that witness the consistency, i.e., we want to maximize

$$H_P(XY) = - \sum_{xy \in P(XY)'} P(xy) \log_2(P(xy)) \tag{21}$$

subject to the constraint that P is in $W(R, S)$. Since the entropy is a concave function over the probability simplex (Theorem 2.7.3 in [CT06]), and since $W(R, S)$ is a bounded polytope and hence a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^n in appropriate dimension n (unless it is empty), the maximum of (21) exists and is achieved at a unique point in $W(R, S)$. In our setting, writing $Z = X \cap Y$, it is perhaps more natural to maximize the *conditional entropy*, i.e.,

$$H_P(XY|Z) := - \sum_{z \in P(Z)'} P(z) \sum_{xy \in P(XY)'} P(xy|z) \log_2(P(xy|z)), \quad (22)$$

where $P(xy|z) := 0$ if $(xy)[Z] \neq z$ or $P(z) = 0$, and $P(xy|z) := P(xy)/P(z)$ otherwise, with the added convention that $0 \log_2(0) = 0$. For being a convex combination of concave functions over the probability simplex, the conditional entropy $H_P(XY|Z)$ is again a concave function of P ranging over $W(R, S)$, which means that the maximum also exists and is achieved at a unique point in $W(R, S)$. We write $R \bowtie_H S$ for the unique probability distribution in $W(R, S)$ that achieves the maximum of (21) and we write $R \bowtie_{CH} S$ for the one that achieves the maximum of (22). Note that, a priori, due to the logarithms in the definition of entropy, the probability distributions $R \bowtie_H S$ and $R \bowtie_{CH} S$ need not even have rational components. Interestingly, as will follow from the development below, our join operation \bowtie applied to consistent probability distributions coincides with both \bowtie_H and \bowtie_{CH} , up to the equivalence, which means that both $R \bowtie_H S$ and $R \bowtie_{CH} S$ are indeed rational probability distributions in case R and S are themselves rational.

We argued already in (12) that, for probability distributions R and S , our join $R \bowtie S$ coincides with $R \bowtie_P S$ up to equivalence. Moreover, if R and S are consistent, then we have $R[Z] = S[Z]$ for $Z := X \cap Y$, which means that if we write $r := t[X]$, $s := t[Y]$, $u := t[Z]$, and $U := R[Z] = S[Z]$, then

$$(R \bowtie_P S)(t) = R(r)S(s)/U(u). \quad (23)$$

This identity implies that $R \bowtie_P S$ is a *product extension* of R and S in the sense of Malvestuto [Mal88] (see the first paragraph of page 73 in [Mal88]), hence $R \bowtie_P S$ maximizes entropy as a consequence of Malvestuto's Theorem 8. We reproduce his short proof for completeness.

Lemma 8 ([Mal88]). *If R and S are consistent probability distributions, then $R \bowtie_P S = R \bowtie_H S$.*

Proof. Let X and Y be the sets of attributes of R and S , write $Z = X \cap Y$, and assume that R and S are consistent. Let $U := R[Z] = S[Z]$, where the equality follows from the assumption that R and S are probability distributions that are consistent. Write $P := R \bowtie_H S$ and $Q := R \bowtie_P S$. By (12) we have $Q \equiv R \bowtie S$, so Q witnesses the consistency of R and S by Lemma 7. Moreover, by design, Q is a probability distribution, and so are R and S by assumption, so $Q[Z] = R[Z] = S[Z] = U$. Since P is also a feasible solution of (20), also P is a probability distribution that witnesses the consistency of R and S , so $P[Z] = R[Z] = S[Z] = U$. The conclusion of these is that

$$P[Z] = Q[Z] = U, \quad (24)$$

$$P[X] = Q[X] = R, \quad (25)$$

$$P[Y] = Q[Y] = S. \quad (26)$$

In particular $H_P(XY) \geq H_Q(XY)$ since P maximizes (21). We show that $H_P(XY) \leq H_Q(XY)$, from which it will follow that $P = Q$ since we argued already that the maximum of (21) is unique.

Let $D(P||Q)$ denote the Kullback-Leibler divergence (see Section 2.3 in [CT06]) between two probability distributions $P(X)$ and $Q(X)$ over the same set of attributes X , which is defined as

$$D(P||Q) := \sum_{x \in P'} P(x) \log(P(x)/Q(x)), \quad (27)$$

with the conventions that $0 \log(0/q) = 0$ and $p \log(p/0) = \infty$. The Information Inequality (Theorem 2.6.3 in [CT06]) states that $D(P||Q) \geq 0$. Therefore

$$H_P(XY) = - \sum_{t \in P'} P(t) \log(P(t)) \leq - \sum_{t \in P'} P(t) \log(Q(t)). \quad (28)$$

Using (23), the right-hand side of (28) equals

$$\sum_{t \in P'} P(t) \log(U(t[Z])) - \sum_{t \in P'} P(t) \log(R(t[X])) - \sum_{t \in P'} P(t) \log(S(t[Y])) \quad (29)$$

Splitting the set of tuples t in P' by $t[Z]$, the first term in (29) rewrites into

$$\sum_{u \in U'} \sum_{\substack{t \in P': \\ t[Z]=u}} P(t) \log(U(u)) = \sum_{u \in U'} \log(U(u)) P(u) = \sum_{u \in U'} \log(U(u)) Q(u) \quad (30)$$

where the first equality follows from (2), and the second follows from (24). Exactly the same argument for the second and third terms in (29), and applying (2) to $Q(u)$, $Q(r)$, and $Q(s)$, rewrites (29) into

$$\sum_{t \in Q'} Q(t) \log(U(t[Z])) - \sum_{t \in Q'} Q(t) \log(R(t[X])) - \sum_{t \in Q'} Q(t) \log(S(t[Y])) \quad (31)$$

and therefore, by (23), into

$$- \sum_{t \in P'} Q(t) \log(Q(t)) = H_Q(XY). \quad (32)$$

Combining (28), (29), (31), and (32) we get $H_P(XY) \leq H_Q(XY)$ as was to be shown. \square

Next, we show that \bowtie_P also maximizes conditional entropy; it follows that $R \bowtie_{CH} S = R \bowtie_H S$.

Lemma 9. *If R and S are two consistent probability distributions, then $R \bowtie_P S = R \bowtie_{CH} S$.*

Proof. Let X and Y be the sets of attributes of R and S , write $Z = X \cap Y$, and assume that R and S are consistent. Let $U := R[Z] = S[Z]$, where the equality follows from the assumption that R and S are probability distributions that are consistent. Write $P := R \bowtie_{CH} S$ and $Q := R \bowtie_P S$. By (12) we have $Q \equiv R \bowtie S$, so Q witnesses the consistency of R and S by Lemma 7. Moreover, by design, Q is a probability distribution, and so are R and S by assumption, hence $Q[Z] = R[Z] = S[Z] = U$. Since P is also a feasible solution of (20), also P is a probability distribution that witnesses the consistency of R and S , hence $P[Z] = R[Z] = S[Z] = U$. The conclusion of these is that $P[Z] = Q[Z] = U$ and both P and Q are feasible solutions of (20). In particular, $H_P(XY|Z) \geq H_Q(XY|Z)$ since P maximizes (22). We show that $H_P(XY|Z) \leq H_Q(XY|Z)$, from which it will follow that $P = Q$ since we argued already that the maximum of (21) is unique.

We introduce a piece of notation. Let $X_0 := X \setminus Z$ and $Y_0 := Y \setminus Z$. For each Z -tuple $u \in U'$ we write P_u and Q_u to denote the probability distributions over X_0Y_0 defined by $P_z(w) := P(wu)/P(u)$ and $Q_z(w) := Q(wu)/Q(u)$ for every X_0Y_0 -tuple w . Using the obvious fact that if $D(X)$ is a probability distribution over X and $Z \subseteq Y \subseteq X$ then $H_D(Z) = H_{D(Y)}(Z)$, we have

$$H_P(XY|Z) = \sum_{u \in U'} U(u) H_{P_u(X_0Y_0)}(X_0Y_0), \quad (33)$$

$$H_Q(XY|Z) = \sum_{u \in U'} U(u) H_{Q_u(X_0Y_0)}(X_0Y_0). \quad (34)$$

Thus, to prove that $H_P(XY|Z) \leq H_Q(XY|Z)$ it suffices to show that $H_{P_u}(X_0Y_0) \leq H_{Q_u}(X_0Y_0)$ for each $u \in U'$. Now note that for every X_0 -tuple r_0 and every Y_0 -tuple s_0 , and every $u \in U'$, we have

$$Q_u(r_0s_0) = Q(r_0s_0u)/Q(u) = R(r_0u)S(s_0u)/U(u)^2 = R_u(r_0)S_u(s_0), \quad (35)$$

where the first follows from the definition of Q_u , the second from (23) and $Q(u) = U(u)$, and the third follows from setting $R_u(r_0) := R(r_0u)/R(u)$ and $S_u(s_0) := S(s_0u)/S(u)$ and the fact that $R(u) = S(u) = U(u)$. Now recall that $P[X] = Q[X] = R$, so $P_u[X_0] = Q_u[X_0] = R_u$ for every $u \in U'$, and also $P[Y] = Q[Y] = S$, so $P_u[Y_0] = Q_u[Y_0] = S_u$ for every $u \in U'$. The conclusion is that the marginals of P_u and Q_u agree, and those of Q_u are independent by (35). It follows that

$$H_{P_u}(X_0Y_0) \leq H_{P_u(X_0)}(X_0) + H_{P_u(Y_0)}(Y_0) \quad (36)$$

$$= H_{Q_u(X_0)}(X_0) + H_{Q_u(Y_0)}(Y_0) \quad (37)$$

$$= H_{Q_u}(X_0Y_0) \quad (38)$$

where the first follows from $D(P_u(X_0Y_0) || P_u(X_0)P_u(Y_0)) \geq 0$ by the Information Inequality (Theorem 2.6.3 in [CT06]), the second follows from equal marginals, and the third follows from the fact that $D(Q_u(X_0Y_0) || Q_u(X_0)Q_u(Y_0)) \geq 0$ holds with equality if and only if the marginals $Q_u(X_0)$ and $Q_u(Y_0)$ are independent (see again Theorem 2.6.3 in [CT06]), which we argued is the case for Q_u . \square

The following result is an immediate consequence of Lemmas 8 and 9.

Corollary 1. *Let $R(X)$ and $S(Y)$ be probability distributions, and let $Z = X \cap Y$. If R and S are consistent, then the probability distributions P and Q among those in $\mathbb{W}(R, S)$ that maximize entropy $H_P(XY)$ and conditional entropy $H_Q(XY|Z)$ are equal. Moreover, if R and S are rational, then P and Q are rational.*

Summarizing, we have proved that whenever R and S are consistent probability distributions we have $R \bowtie S \equiv R \bowtie_P S$ and $R \bowtie_P S = R \bowtie_H S = R \bowtie_{CH} S$, which we view as evidence that our definition of \bowtie is well motivated.

Lossless Join Decompositions We provide further justification for the definition of the join of two K -relations by showing that a decomposed K -relation can be reconstructed (up to equivalence) by joining its decomposed parts, under the same hypothesis that makes it possible to reconstruct an ordinary relation by joining its decomposed parts. This justification for the \bowtie operation is valid for an arbitrary positive semiring K .

Let U be a set of attributes, let P be an ordinary relation over U , and let V, W and X, Y be pairs of subsets of U . We say that P satisfies the functional dependency $V \rightarrow W$ if whenever two tuples in P agree on all attributes in V , then they also agree on all attributes in W . The decomposition of P along X and Y consists of the projections $R = P[X]$ and $S = P[Y]$ of P on the sets X and Y , respectively. Such a decomposition is said to be a *lossless-join* decomposition if $P = R \bowtie S$, that is, the relation P can be reconstructed by joining the parts $R = P[X]$ and $S = P[Y]$ of the decomposition.

The following lemma gives a sufficient condition for a decomposition to be a lossless join one. Even though this lemma is standard textbook material, we include a proof for completeness and comparison with what is to follow.

Lemma 10. *Let P be an ordinary relation that is decomposed along X and Y . If P satisfies the functional dependency $X \cap Y \rightarrow X \setminus Y$ or P satisfies the functional dependency $X \cap Y \rightarrow Y \setminus X$, then this decomposition is lossless-join.*

Proof. From the definitions, it follows that we always have $P \subseteq R \bowtie S$. Assume that P satisfies the functional dependency $X \cap Y \rightarrow X \setminus Y$ (the other case is proved using a symmetric argument). We will show that $R \bowtie S \subseteq P$. Let t be a tuple in $R \bowtie S$. It follows that $t[X] \in R = P[X]$ and $t[Y] \in S = P[Y]$. Therefore, there are tuples t_1 and t_2 in P , such that $t[X] = t_1[X]$ and $t[Y] = t_2[Y]$. Since P satisfies the functional dependency $X \cap Y \rightarrow X \setminus Y$ and since $t_1[X \cap Y] = t[X \cap Y] = t_2[X \cap Y]$, we must have that $t_1[X \setminus Y] = t_2[X \setminus Y]$. Since $t[X] = t_1[X]$ and $t[Y] = t_2[Y]$, it follows that $t = t_2$, hence $t \in P$; this completes the proof that $R \bowtie S \subseteq P$. \square

It is easy to see that there are lossless-join decompositions of relations that satisfy neither the functional dependencies $X \cap Y \rightarrow X \setminus Y$ nor the functional dependency $X \cap Y \rightarrow Y \setminus X$. Thus, Lemma 10 is a sufficient, but not necessary, condition for a decomposition to be a lossless join one. The condition, however, is necessary and sufficient for relations over a schema that satisfy a set functional dependencies. To make this statement precise, we recall a basic definition from relational databases. Let U be a set of attributes, let F be a set of functional dependencies between subsets of U , and let $V \rightarrow W$ be a functional dependency. We say that F *logically implies* $V \rightarrow W$, denoted $F \models V \rightarrow W$ if whenever a relation R satisfies every functional dependency in F , then R also satisfies $V \rightarrow W$. The following is a well known result in relational database theory (see, e.g., Theorem 7.5 in [Ull88]).

Theorem 1. *Let U be a set of attributes, let F be a set of functional dependencies between subsets of U , and let X and Y are two subsets of U . Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (a) $F \models X \cap Y \rightarrow X \setminus Y$ or $F \models X \cap Y \rightarrow Y \setminus X$.
- (b) *For every relation R over U that satisfies every functional dependency in F , it holds that if R is decomposed along X and Y , then this decomposition is a lossless-join one.*

Our next result tells that Lemma 10 extends to decompositions of K -relations, where K is a positive semiring. We first need to extend the notions appropriately. If P is a K -relation, then the decomposition of P along X and Y consists of the marginals $R = P[X]$ and $S = P[Y]$. We say that the decomposition is *lossless-join* if $P \equiv R \bowtie S$, where \bowtie is the join operation on K -relations.

Lemma 11. *Let P be a K -relation that is decomposed along X and Y . If the support P' of P satisfies the functional dependency $X \cap Y \rightarrow X \setminus Y$ or P' satisfies the functional dependency $X \cap Y \rightarrow Y \setminus X$, then this decomposition is lossless-join.*

Proof. For concreteness, let us assume that the attributes of P are ABC and that P is decomposed along $X = AB$ and $Y = BC$. The proof remains the same in the general case and with only notational changes.

We will show that $P \equiv R \bowtie S$, where $R = P[X]$ and $S = P[Y]$. In fact, we will show that $R \bowtie S = c_{S, X \cap Y}^* P$. By Part 2 of Lemma 1 we have $R' = P'[X]$ and $S' = P'[Y]$. In addition, since P' satisfies the functional dependency $X \cap Y \rightarrow X \setminus Y$ or the functional dependency $X \cap Y \rightarrow Y \setminus X$ we have $P' = R' \bowtie S' = (R \bowtie S)'$, where the first equality follows from Lemma 10 and the second from Lemma 4. Let (a, b, c) be a tuple in $(R \bowtie S)'$, so in particular $(a, b, c) \in P'$. By the definition of $R \bowtie S$, we have that $(R \bowtie S)(a, b, c) = R(a, b)S(b, c)c_S(b)$. We now examine the quantities $R(a, b)$ and $S(b, c)$ separately, and for that we distinguish by cases.

Case 1: The ordinary relation P' satisfies the functional dependency $X \cap Y \rightarrow X \setminus Y$, which, in this case, amounts to $B \rightarrow A$. For $R(a, b)$ we have

$$R(a, b) = \sum_{c': (a, b, c') \in P'} P(a, b, c') = \sum_{a', c': (a', b, c') \in P'} P(a', b, c') = P(b), \quad (39)$$

where the first follows from $R = P[X]$ and (2), the second follows from the fact that, since P' satisfies the functional dependency $B \rightarrow A$, we must have that $(a', b, c') \in P'$ implies $a' = a$, and the third follows from (2). For $S(b, c)$ we have

$$S(b, c) = \sum_{a': (a', b, c) \in P'} P(a', b, c) = P(a, b, c), \quad (40)$$

where the first follows from $S = P[Y]$ and (2), and the second follows from the fact that, since P' satisfies the functional dependency $B \rightarrow A$ and $(a, b, c) \in P'$, we must have that $(a', b, c) \in P'$ holds if and only if $a' = a$.

Case 2: The ordinary relation P' satisfies the functional dependency $X \cap Y \rightarrow Y \setminus X$, which, in this case, amounts to $B \rightarrow C$. Using a similar analysis as in the previous case, for $S(b, c)$ we have that

$$S(b, c) = \sum_{a': (a', b, c) \in P'} P(a', b, c) = \sum_{a', c': (a', b, c') \in P'} P(a', b, c') = P(b), \quad (41)$$

where the first follows from $S = P[Y]$ and (2), the second follows from the fact that, since P' satisfies the functional dependency $B \rightarrow C$, we must have that $(a', b, c') \in P'$ implies $c' = c$, and the third follows from (2). For $R(a, b)$ we have

$$R(a, b) = \sum_{c': (a, b, c') \in P'} P(a, b, c') = P(a, b, c) \quad (42)$$

where the first follows from $R = P[X]$ and (2), and the second follows from the fact that, since P' satisfies the functional dependency $B \rightarrow C$ and $(a, b, c) \in P'$ we must have that $(a, b, c') \in P'$ holds if and only if $c' = c$.

In both cases, it follows that

$$(R \bowtie S)(a, b, c) = R(a, b)S(b, c)c_S(b) = P(b)P(a, b, c)c_S(b) = c_{P, B}^* P(a, b, c), \quad (43)$$

where the first follows from (11), the second follows from (39) and (40) in one case, and from (41) and (42) in the other, and the last follows from $c_{P,B}^* = c_S(b)P(b)$ by (10) since $b \in P[B]' = P'[B]$ given that $(a, b, c) \in P'$ and Part 2 of Lemma 1. This proves that $R \bowtie S = c_{P,B}^*P$, which was to be shown. \square

The last result in this section asserts that the preceding Theorem 1 extends to decompositions of K -relations.

Proposition 1. *Let K be a positive semiring, let U be a set of attributes, let F be a set of functional dependencies between subsets of U , and let X and Y be two subsets of U . The following statements are equivalent:*

- (a) $F \models X \cap Y \rightarrow X \setminus Y$ or $F \models X \cap Y \rightarrow Y \setminus X$.
- (b) For every K -relation R over U whose support R' satisfies every functional dependency in F , it holds that if R is decomposed along X and Y , then this decomposition is a lossless-join one.

Proof. First, assume that $F \models X \cap Y \rightarrow X \setminus Y$ or $F \models X \cap Y \rightarrow Y \setminus X$. Let R be a K -relation whose support R' satisfies every functional dependency in F . Then R' satisfies the functional dependency $X \cap Y \rightarrow X \setminus Y$ or R' satisfies the functional dependency $X \cap Y \rightarrow Y \setminus X$. By Lemma 11, the decomposition of R along X and Y is lossless join.

Next, assume that for every K -relation R over U whose support R' satisfies every functional dependency in F , it holds that if R is decomposed along X and Y , then this decomposition is a lossless-join one. Let P be an arbitrary ordinary relation over U that satisfies every functional dependency in F . We will show that if P is decomposed along X and Y , then the decomposition is a lossless join one, hence, by Theorem 1, we have that $F \models X \cap Y \rightarrow X \setminus Y$ or $F \models X \cap Y \rightarrow Y \setminus X$. Turn P into a K -relation R whose support is P and where all tuples in the support have value 1 in K . In other words, consider the K -relation R such that for every tuple t , we have that $R(t) = 1$ if $t \in P$, and $R(t) = 0$ if $t \notin P$. By hypothesis, the decomposition of R along X and Y is a lossless join one. Therefore, $R \equiv R[X] \bowtie R[Y]$, as K -relations. By Lemma 4 and Part 2 of Lemma 2, we have that $R' = R[X]' \bowtie R[Y]'$, i.e., the support of the join is the join of the supports as ordinary relations. From the definition of R , we have that $R' = P$; moreover, from Part 2 of Lemma 1, we have that $R[X]' = R'[X]$ and $R[Y]' = R'[Y]$. Since $R'[X] = P[X]$ and $R'[Y] = P[Y]$, we conclude that $P = P[X] \bowtie P[Y]$, thus the decomposition of P along X and Y is a lossless join one, which was to be shown. \square

4 Consistency of Three or More K -Relations

While the definition of consistency of two K -relations has a straightforward generalization to the case of three or more K -relations, not all the related concepts will go through: the join of three or more K -relations will be particularly problematic. We start with the definitions.

Let K be a positive semiring and let $R_1(X_1), \dots, R_m(X_m)$ be K -relations. We say that the collection R_1, \dots, R_m is *globally consistent* if there is a K -relation T over $X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_m$ such that $R_i \equiv T[X_i]$ for all $i \in [m]$. We say that such a K -relation *witnesses* the global consistency of R_1, \dots, R_m . The equivalence classes $[R_1], \dots, [R_m]$ are called *globally consistent* if their representatives R_1, \dots, R_m are globally consistent. As in the case of two equivalence classes, it is easy to see using transitivity of \equiv that this notion is well-defined in that it does not depend on the chosen representatives.

We also say that the relations R_1, \dots, R_m are *pairwise consistent* if for every $i, j \in [m]$ we have that $R_i[X_i]$ and $R_j[X_j]$ are consistent. From the definitions, it follows that if R_1, \dots, R_m are globally consistent, then they are also pairwise consistent. The converse, however, need not be true, in general. In fact, the converse fails even for ordinary relations, that is, for \mathbb{B} -relations, where \mathbb{B} is the Boolean semiring. For example, it is easy to see that the ordinary relations $R(AB) = \{00, 11\}$, $S(BC) = \{01, 10\}$, $T(AC) = \{00, 11\}$ are pairwise consistent but not globally consistent.

In the context of relational databases, there has been an extensive study of global consistency for ordinary relations. We present an overview of some of the main findings next.

4.1 Global Consistency in the Boolean Semiring

For this section K is the Boolean semiring \mathbb{B} and therefore K -relations are ordinary relations or, simply, *relations*. Let R_1, \dots, R_m be a collection of relations. The *relational join* or, simply, the *join* of R_1, \dots, R_m is the relation $R_1 \bowtie \dots \bowtie R_m$ consisting of all $(X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_m)$ -tuples t such that $t[X_i]$ belongs to R_i for all $i = 1, \dots, m$. The following facts are well known and easy to prove (e.g., see [HLY80]):

- If T is a relation witnessing the global consistency of R_1, \dots, R_m , then $T \subseteq R_1 \bowtie \dots \bowtie R_m$.
- The collection R_1, \dots, R_m is globally consistent if and only if $(R_1 \bowtie \dots \bowtie R_m)[X_i] = R_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m$.

Consequently, if the collection R_1, \dots, R_m is globally consistent, then the join $R_1 \bowtie \dots \bowtie R_m$ is the largest relation witnessing their consistency.

As seen earlier, pairwise consistency is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for global consistency. This was exemplified by three relations R, S, T with schema AB, BC, AC , respectively. In contrast, it is not hard to see that if the schema of the three relations had been AB, BC, CD , then pairwise consistency would have been a necessary and sufficient condition for the global consistency of any three K -relations over these schema. This raises the question whether it is possible to characterize the set of schema for which pairwise consistency is a necessary and sufficient condition for global consistency. This question was investigated and answered by Beeri, Fagin, Maier, and Yannakakis [BFMY83]. Before describing their results, we need to introduce a number of notions from hypergraph theory.

Hypergraphs A *hypergraph* is a pair $H = (V, E)$, where V is a set of *vertices* and E is a set of *hyperedges*, each of which is a non-empty subset of V . Clearly, the undirected graphs without self-loops are precisely the hypergraphs all the hyperedges of which are two-element sets of vertices; such hyperedges are called *edges*.

Let $H = (V, E)$ be a hypergraph. The *reduction* of H , denoted by $R(H)$, is the hypergraph whose set of vertices is V itself and whose hyperedges are those hyperedges $X \in E$ that are not included in any other hyperedge of H . A hypergraph H is *reduced* if $H = R(H)$. If $W \subseteq V$, then the *hypergraph induced by W on H* , denoted by $H[W]$, is the hypergraph whose set of vertices is W and whose hyperedges are the non-empty subsets of the form $X \cap W$, where $X \in E$ is a hyperedge of H ; in symbols, $H[W] = (W, \{X \cap W : X \in E\} \setminus \{\emptyset\})$.

Every collection X_1, \dots, X_m of sets of attributes can be identified with a hypergraph $H = (V, E)$, where $V = X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_m$ and $E = \{X_1, \dots, X_m\}$. Conversely, every hypergraph $H = (V, E)$ gives rise to a collection X_1, \dots, X_m of sets of attributes, where X_1, \dots, X_m are the hyperedges of H . For

this reason, we can move from collections of sets of attributes to hypergraphs (and vice versa) in a seamless way. In what follows, we will consider several structural properties of hypergraphs that, as shown in [BFMY83], give rise to necessary and sufficient conditions for pairwise consistency to coincide with global consistency.

Acyclic Hypergraphs We begin by defining the notion of an acyclic hypergraph, which generalizes the notion of an acyclic undirected graph with no self-loops. For this, we need to introduce several auxiliary notions. If H is a hypergraph and u and v are vertices of H , then a *path from u to v* is a sequence Y_1, \dots, Y_k of hyperedges of H , for some positive integer k , such that $u \in Y_1$ and $v \in Y_k$, and $Y_i \cap Y_{i+1} \neq \emptyset$, for all $i \in [k-1]$. Using the notion of a path, one defines the notions of a *connected component* of a hypergraph and of a *connected hypergraph* in the obvious way.

Let $H = (V, E)$ be a reduced hypergraph and let X and Y be two distinct hyperedges of H with $X \cap Y \neq \emptyset$. We say that $X \cap Y$ is an *articulation set* of H if the number of connected components of the reduction $R(H[V \setminus (X \cap Y)])$ of $H[V \setminus (X \cap Y)]$ is greater than the number of the connected components of H . We say that a reduced hypergraph H is *acyclic* if for every subset W of vertices of H , if $R(H[W])$ is connected and has more than one hyperedges, then it has an articulation set. Finally, a hypergraph H is *acyclic* if its reduction $R(H)$ is acyclic. Otherwise, H is *cyclic*. We say that a collection X_1, \dots, X_m of sets of attributes is *acyclic* if the hypergraph with hyperedges X_1, \dots, X_m is acyclic; otherwise, we say that the collection X_1, \dots, X_m is *cyclic*.

To illustrate these concepts, consider the set $V = \{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ of vertices and the sets E_1 and E_2 of hyperedges, where $E_1 = \{\{A_i, A_{i+1}\} : 1 \leq i \leq n-1\}$ and $E_2 = E_1 \cup \{\{A_n, A_1\}\}$. It is not hard to verify that the hypergraph $H_1 = (V, E_1)$ is acyclic, whereas the hypergraph $H_2 = (V, E_2)$ is cyclic as soon as $n \geq 3$.

Conformal and Chordal Hypergraphs The *primal* graph of a hypergraph $H = (V, E)$ is the undirected graph that has V as its set of vertices and has an edge between any two distinct vertices that appear together in at least one hyperedge of H . A hypergraph H is *conformal* if the set of vertices of every clique (i.e., complete subgraph) of the primal graph of H is contained in some hyperedge of H . For example, both hypergraphs H_1 and H_2 above are conformal, whereas the hypergraph $H_3 = (V, E_3)$ with $V = \{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ and $E_3 = \{V \setminus \{A_i\} : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ is not conformal as long as $n \geq 3$.

A hypergraph H is *chordal* if its primal graph is chordal, that is, if every cycle of length at least four of the primal graph of H has a chord. For example, the hypergraphs H_1 and H_3 above are chordal, whereas the hypergraph H_2 is not chordal for $n \geq 4$. Observe that, in case $n = 3$, the hypergraph H_2 is chordal but not conformal.

Running Intersection Property We say that a hypergraph H has the *running intersection property* if there is a listing X_1, \dots, X_m of all hyperedges of H such that for every $i \in [m]$ with $i \geq 2$, there exists a $j < i$ such that $X_i \cap (X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_{i-1}) \subseteq X_j$.

For example, the hypergraph H_1 has the running intersection property with the listing being $\{A_1, A_2\}, \dots, \{A_{n-1}, A_n\}$, whereas the hypergraphs H_2 and H_3 do not have the running intersection property as long as $n \geq 3$.

Join Trees A *join tree* for a hypergraph H is an undirected tree T with the set E of the hyperedges of H as its vertices and such that for every vertex v of H , the set of vertices of T containing v forms

a subtree of T , i.e., if v belongs to two vertices X_i and X_j of T , then v belongs to every vertex of T in the unique path from X_i to X_j in T .

For example, the hypergraph H_1 has a join tree (in fact, the join tree is a path) with edges of the form $\{\{A_i, A_{i+1}\}, \{A_{i+1}, A_{i+2}\}\}$ for $i \in [n - 2]$, whereas the hypergraphs H_2 and H_3 do not have a join tree for $n \geq 3$.

Graham’s Algorithm Consider the following iterative algorithm on hypergraphs: given a hypergraph $H = (V, E)$, apply the following two operations repeatedly until neither of the two operations can be applied:

1. If v is a vertex that appears in only one hyperedge X_i of H , then delete v from X_i .
2. If there are two hyperedges X_i and X_j such that $i \neq j$ and $X_i \subseteq X_j$, then delete X_i from E .

It can be shown that this algorithm has the Church-Rosser property, that is, it produces the same hypergraph independently of the order in which the above two operations are applied.

We say that *Graham’s algorithm succeeds* on a hypergraph $H = (V, E)$ if the algorithm, given H as input, returns the empty hypergraph $H = (V, \emptyset)$ as output. Otherwise, we say that *Graham’s algorithm fails* on H . We also say that H is *accepted* by Graham’s algorithm if the algorithm succeeds on H ; otherwise we say that it is *rejected*.

For example, Graham’s algorithm succeeds on the hypergraph H_1 , whereas it fails on the hypergraphs H_2 and H_3 as long as $n \geq 3$ (in fact, it returns H_2 and H_3 , respectively).

This algorithm was designed by Graham [Gra79]. A similar algorithm was designed by Yu and Ozsoyoglu [YO79]; these two algorithms are often referred to as the GYO Algorithm (see [AHV95]).

Local-to-Global Consistency Property The notions introduced so far can be thought of as “syntactic” or “structural” properties that some hypergraphs possess and others do not, because their definitions involve only the vertices and the hyperedges of the hypergraph at hand. In contrast, the next notion is “semantic”, in the sense that its definition also involves relations whose sets of attributes are the hyperedges of the hypergraph at hand.

Let H be a hypergraph and let X_1, \dots, X_m be a listing of all hyperedges of H . We say that H has the *local-to-global consistency property for ordinary relations* if every pairwise consistent collection $R_1(X_1), \dots, R_m(X_m)$ of relations of schema X_1, \dots, X_m is globally consistent.

For example, it can be shown that the hypergraph H_1 has the local-to-global consistency property for ordinary relations, whereas the hypergraphs H_2 and H_3 do not have this property as long as $n \geq 3$.

We are now ready to state the main result in Beeri, Fagin, Maier, Yannakakis [BFMY83].

Theorem 2 (Theorem 3.4 in [BFMY83]). *Let H be a hypergraph. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (a) H is an acyclic hypergraph.
- (b) H is a conformal and chordal hypergraph.
- (c) H has the running intersection property.
- (d) H has a join tree.

- (e) H is accepted by Graham's algorithm.
- (f) H has the local-to-global consistency property for ordinary relations.

As an illustration of Theorem 2, let us return to the hypergraphs H_1, H_2, H_3 encountered earlier. Hypergraph H_1 has all six properties in Theorem 2, whereas hypergraphs H_2 and H_3 have none of these properties when $n \geq 3$.

4.2 Global Consistency in Arbitrary Positive Semirings

Let K be an arbitrary, but fixed, positive semiring. In this section, we investigate some aspects of global consistency for collections of K -relations.

As discussed earlier, if R_1, \dots, R_m is a globally consistent collection of ordinary relations, then the join $R_1 \bowtie \dots \bowtie R_m$ witnesses the global consistency of R_1, \dots, R_m (and, in fact, is the largest such witness). At first, one may expect that a similar result may hold for globally consistent collections R_1, \dots, R_m of K -relations. It turns out, however, that the concept of the join of three or more K -relations is problematic, even for the case in which K is the bag semiring \mathbb{N} of non-negative integers. Note that, using the join of two relations, the join of three K -relations R, S, T could be defined as either $R \bowtie (S \bowtie T)$ or as $(R \bowtie S) \bowtie T$. The join of ordinary relations is associative, hence these two expressions coincide for ordinary relations. In contrast, there are bags R, S, T that are globally consistent and such that

$$R \bowtie (S \bowtie T) \neq (R \bowtie S) \bowtie T, \quad (44)$$

and neither $R \bowtie (S \bowtie T)$ nor $(R \bowtie S) \bowtie T$ witnesses the global consistency of R, S, T .

Example 5. Let $W(ABC)$ be the bag given by its table of multiplicities below, along with its three marginals $R(AB), S(BC), T(AC)$:

$W(ABC) \#$	$R(AB) \#$	$S(BC) \#$	$T(AC) \#$
1 1 2 : 1	1 1 : 1	1 2 : 1	1 2 : 1
1 2 3 : 2	1 2 : 2	1 4 : 4	1 3 : 2
2 1 4 : 4	2 1 : 4	2 2 : 2	2 1 : 3
2 2 2 : 2	2 2 : 2	2 3 : 2	2 2 : 2
2 3 1 : 3	2 3 : 3	3 1 : 3	2 4 : 4

By construction the collection of three bags R, S, T is globally consistent as witnessed by W . We produced $N_1 := (R \bowtie S) \bowtie T$ and $N_2 := R \bowtie (S \bowtie T)$ by computer, along with their marginals on AB, BC, AC . We display two bags $[N_1]$ and $[N_2]$ that are in the equivalence classes of N_1 and N_2 , respectively, along with the two marginals $P_1 := [N_1][BC]$ and $P_2 := [N_2][AB]$ that suffice to verify the claim that neither N_1 nor N_2 witness the consistency of R, S, T :

$[N_1](ABC) \#$	$[N_2](ABC) \#$	$P_1(BC) \#$	$P_2(AB) \#$
1 1 2 : 14	1 1 2 : 1	1 2 : 22	1 1 : 1
1 2 2 : 7	1 2 2 : 5	1 4 : 48	1 2 : 10
1 2 3 : 21	1 2 3 : 5	2 2 : 35	2 1 : 20
2 1 2 : 8	2 1 2 : 4	2 3 : 21	2 2 : 5
2 1 4 : 48	2 1 4 : 16	3 1 : 42	2 3 : 15
2 2 2 : 28	2 2 2 : 5		
2 3 1 : 42	2 3 1 : 15		

The ratio test shows that $[N_1]$ and $[N_2]$ are not equivalent ($14/1 \neq 7/5$), so \bowtie is not associative, not even up to equivalence. The ratio test applied to the bags $P_1(BC)$ and $S(BC)$ shows that they are not equivalent ($22/1 \neq 48/4$), and the ratio test applied to the bags $P_2(AB)$ and $R(AB)$ shows that they are not equivalent ($1/1 \neq 10/2$). Thus, neither N_1 nor N_2 witness the consistency of R, S, T . \dashv

Observe that the collection AB, BC, AC of the sets of attributes of the relations in Example 5 is cyclic. It turns out that this is no accident. Indeed, we show next that if a collection X_1, \dots, X_m of sets of attributes is acyclic and if $R_1(X_1), \dots, R_m(X_m)$ is a globally consistent collection of K -relations of schema X_1, \dots, X_m , then a witness of their global consistency can always be built iteratively through joins of two K -relations. In fact, we show something stronger, namely, that it suffices for R_1, \dots, R_m to be pairwise consistent K -relations. For stating this lemma we need the following definition. The *iterated left-join* of the K -relations R_1, \dots, R_m is the K -relation

$$((\dots(R_1 \bowtie R_2) \bowtie \dots \bowtie R_{m-2}) \bowtie R_{m-1}) \bowtie R_m, \quad (45)$$

i.e., the sequential join of R_1, \dots, R_m with the join operations associated to the left. More formally, the iterated left-join of R_1, \dots, R_m is defined by induction on m . For $m = 1$ it is R_1 , and for $m \geq 2$ it is $R \bowtie R_m$ where R is the iterated left-join of R_1, \dots, R_{m-1} .

Lemma 12. *Let X_1, \dots, X_m be an acyclic collection of sets of attributes. There exists a permutation $\pi : [m] \rightarrow [m]$ such that if $R_1(X_1), \dots, R_m(X_m)$ are pairwise consistent K -relations of schema X_1, \dots, X_m , then they are globally consistent, and the iterated left-join of $R_{\pi(1)}, \dots, R_{\pi(m)}$ witnesses their global consistency. In particular, if they are globally consistent, then the iterated left-join of some permutation of them witnesses their global consistency.*

Proof. Assume that X_1, \dots, X_m is an acyclic collection of sets of attributes. By Theorem 2, this collection has the running intersection property, hence there exists a permutation $\pi : [m] \rightarrow [m]$ such that for every $i \in [m]$ with $i \geq 2$, there exists $j \in [m]$ such that $\pi(j) < \pi(i)$ and $X_{\pi(i)} \cap (X_{\pi(1)} \cup \dots \cup X_{\pi(i-1)}) \subseteq X_{\pi(j)}$. By renaming the sets, we may assume that π is the identity, so for every $i \in [m]$ with $i \geq 2$, there is a $j \in [i-1]$ such that $X_i \cap (X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_{i-1}) \subseteq X_j$. Fix a collection of K -relations R_1, \dots, R_m for X_1, \dots, X_m and assume that they are pairwise consistent. For each $i \in [m]$, let $T_i := ((R_1 \bowtie \dots \bowtie R_{i-2}) \bowtie R_{i-1}) \bowtie R_i$ with the joins associated to the left. We show, by induction on $i = 1, \dots, m$, that T_i is a K -relation over $X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_i$ that witnesses the consistency of R_1, \dots, R_i .

For $i = 1$ the claim is obvious since $T_1 = R_1$. Assume then that $i \geq 2$ and that the claim is true for smaller indices. Let $X := X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_{i-1}$ and let $j \in [i-1]$ be such that $X_i \cap X \subseteq X_j$. By induction hypothesis, we know that T_{i-1} is a K -relation over X that witnesses the consistency of R_1, \dots, R_{i-1} . First, we show that T_{i-1} and R_i are consistent. By Lemma 7 it suffices to show that $T_{i-1}[X \cap X_i] \equiv R_i[X \cap X_i]$. Let $Z = X \cap X_i$, so $Z \subseteq X_j$ by the choice of j , and indeed $Z = X_j \cap X_i$. Since $j \leq i-1$, we have $R_j \equiv T_{i-1}[X_j]$. By Part 3 of Lemma 2 and Part 3 of Lemma 1, we have $R_j[Z] \equiv T_{i-1}[X_j][Z] = T_{i-1}[Z]$. By assumption, also R_j and R_i are consistent, and $Z = X_j \cap X_i$, which by Lemma 7 implies $R_j[Z] \equiv R_i[Z]$. By transitivity, we get $T_{i-1}[Z] \equiv R_i[Z]$, hence, by $Z = X \cap X_i$ and Lemma 7, the K -relations T_{i-1} and R_i are consistent. We show that $T_i = T_{i-1} \bowtie R_i$ witnesses the consistency of R_1, \dots, R_i . Since T_{i-1} and R_i are consistent, first note that $T_{i-1} \equiv T_i[X]$ and $R_i \equiv T_i[X_i]$ by Lemma 7. Now fix $k \leq i-1$ and note that

$$R_k \equiv T_{i-1}[X_k] \equiv T_i[X][X_k] = T_i[X_k], \quad (46)$$

where the first equivalence follows from the fact that T_{i-1} witnesses the consistency of R_1, \dots, R_{i-1} and $k \leq i-1$, the second equivalence follows from $T_{i-1} \equiv T_i[X]$ together with Part 3 of Lemma 2 applied to $X_k \subseteq X$, and the equality follows again from $X_k \subseteq X$ and this time from Part 3 of Lemma 1. Thus, T_i witnesses the consistency of R_1, \dots, R_i , which was to be shown. \square

In what follows, we explore the interplay between pairwise consistency and global consistency of K -relations, aiming to extend Theorem 2 to arbitrary positive semirings.

Local-to-Global Consistency Property for K -relations We extend the notion of local-to-global consistency property from ordinary relations to K -relations. Let H be a hypergraph and let X_1, \dots, X_m be a listing of all hyperedges of H . We say that H has the *local-to-global consistency property for K -relations* if every pairwise consistent collection $R_1(X_1), \dots, R_m(X_m)$ of K -relations of schema X_1, \dots, X_m is globally consistent.

Theorem 3. *Let K be a positive semiring and let H be a hypergraph. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (a) H is an acyclic hypergraph.
- (b) H has the local-to-global consistency property for K -relations.

The claim that (a) implies (b) in Theorem 3 follows directly from the preceding Lemma 12. We concentrate on proving that (b) implies (a). To do this, we need four technical lemmas. By Theorem 2, a hypergraph H is acyclic if and only if it is conformal and chordal. The first two technical lemmas state, in effect, that the “minimal” non-conformal hypergraphs, as well as the “minimal” non-chordal hypergraphs, have very simple forms.

Lemma 13 ([Bra16]). *A hypergraph $H = (V, E)$ is not conformal if and only if there exists a subset W of V such that $|W| \geq 3$ and $R(H[W]) = (W, \{W \setminus \{A\} : A \in W\})$, where $R(H[W])$ is the reduction of the hypergraph $H[W]$ induced by W .*

Proof. The *if* direction is immediate since, given that $|W| \geq 3$, the set W forms a clique in the primal graph that is not included in any hyperedge of H ; otherwise no $W \setminus \{A\}$ with $A \in W$ would be a hyperedge in the reduced hypergraph of $H[W]$. For the *only if* direction, let W be a clique in the primal graph of H that is not included in any hyperedge of H and that is minimal with this property. Since the two vertices of every edge of the primal graph are included in some hyperedge of H we have $|W| \geq 3$. In addition, by minimality of W , each $W \setminus \{A\}$ with $A \in W$ is included in some hyperedge X of H that does not contain W , so $X \cap W = W \setminus \{A\}$. This means that each $W \setminus \{A\}$ is a hyperedge of $H[W]$, and also of its reduced hypergraph since W is not included in any hyperedge of H . Conversely, if X is a hyperedge in E , then there is some $A \in W$ such that $X \cap W \subseteq W \setminus \{A\}$. It follows that $R(H[W]) = (W, \{W \setminus \{A\} : A \in W\})$. \square

Lemma 14. *A hypergraph $H = (V, E)$ is not chordal if and only if there exists a subset W of V such that $|W| \geq 4$ and $R(H[W]) = (W, \{\{A_i, A_{i+1}\} : i \in [n]\})$, where A_1, \dots, A_n is an enumeration of W and $A_{n+1} := A_1$.*

Proof. The *if* direction is immediate since it implies that the primal graph of H contains a chordless cycle of length at least four. For the *only if* direction, let W be the set of vertices of a shortest chordless cycle of length at least four in the primal graph of H . \square

The next two technical lemmas state that the local-to-global consistency property for K -relations is preserved under induced hypergraphs, and also under reductions.

Lemma 15. *If a hypergraph H has the local-to-global consistency property for K -relations, then for every subset W of the vertices of H the hypergraph $H[W]$ also has the local-to-global consistency property for K -relations.*

Proof. Assume that the hypergraph $H = (V, E)$ has the local-to-global consistency property for K -relations. We will show that, for every vertex $A \in V$, the hypergraph $H[V \setminus \{A\}] = (V, \{X \setminus \{A\} : X \in E\})$ also has the local-to-global consistency property for K -relations. The statement of the lemma will follow from iterating this statement over all attributes A in $V \setminus W$.

Let X_1, \dots, X_m be a listing of all hyperedges of H . Fix a vertex A in V and write $Y_i := X_i \setminus \{A\}$ for all $i \in [m]$. Let R_1, \dots, R_m be a collection of pairwise consistent K -relations for Y_1, \dots, Y_m . Fix an arbitrary value u_0 in the domain $\text{Dom}(A)$ of the attribute A . We define a collection of K -relations S_1, \dots, S_m for X_1, \dots, X_m as follows. For each $i \in [m]$ with $A \notin X_i$, let $S_i := R_i$. For each $i \in [m]$ with $A \in X_i$, let S_i be the K -relation over X_i defined for every X_i -tuple t by $S_i(t) := 0$ if $t(A) \neq u_0$ and by $S_i(t) := R_i(t[Y_i])$ if $t(A) = u_0$. We claim that the K -relations S_1, \dots, S_m are pairwise consistent.

In order to see this, fix $i, j \in [m]$ and distinguish the two cases whether $A \notin X_i X_j$ or $A \in X_i X_j$: If $A \notin X_i X_j$, then $S_i = R_i$ and $S_j = R_j$ and therefore S_i and S_j are consistent because R_i and R_j are consistent. If $A \in X_i X_j$, then let R be a K -relation over $Y_i Y_j$ that witnesses the consistency R_i and R_j and let S be the K -relation over $X_i X_j$ defined for every $X_i X_j$ -tuple t by $S(t) := 0$ if $t(A) \neq u_0$ and by $S(t) := R(t[Y_i Y_j])$ if $t(A) = u_0$. We claim that S witnesses the consistency of S_i and S_j . We show that $S_i \equiv S[X_i]$ and a symmetric argument will show that $S_j \equiv S[X_j]$. In order to see this, first we argue that $R[Y_i] = S[Y_i]$. Indeed, for every Y_i -tuple r we have

$$R(r) = \sum_{\substack{s \in R': \\ s[Y_i]=r}} R(s) = \sum_{\substack{t \in \text{ Tup}(X_i X_j): \\ t[Y_i]=r, t(A)=u_0}} R(t[Y_i Y_j]) = \sum_{\substack{t \in S': \\ t[Y_i]=r}} S(t) = S(r), \quad (47)$$

where the first equality follows from (2), the second follows from the fact that the map $t \mapsto t[Y_i Y_j]$ is a bijection between the set of $X_i X_j$ -tuples t such that $t[Y_i] = r$ and $t(A) = u_0$ and the set of $Y_i Y_j$ -tuples s such that $s[Y_i] = r$, the third follows from the definition of S , and the fourth follows from (2). For later use, let us note that we did not assume that $i \neq j$ for showing (47). In case $i = j$, the K -relation R_i can serve as R , and S equals S_i , which shows that $R_i = S_i[Y_i]$.

In case $A \notin X_i$, we have that $Y_i = X_i$, hence Equation (47) already shows that $S_i = R_i \equiv R[Y_i] = S[Y_i]$, so $S_i \equiv S[X_i]$. In case $A \in X_i$, let $a, b \in K \setminus \{0\}$ be such that $aR_i = bR[Y_i]$ and we show $aS_i = bS[X_i]$. For every X_i -tuple r with $r(A) \neq u_0$, we have $S_i(r) = 0$ and also $S(r) = \sum_{t: t[X_i]=r} S(t) = 0$ since $t[X_i] = r$ and $A \in X_i$ implies $t(A) = r(A) \neq u_0$. Thus, $aS_i(r) = 0 = bS(r)$ in this case. For every X_i -tuple r with $r(A) = u_0$, we have

$$aS_i(r) = aR_i(r[Y_i]) = bR(r[Y_i]) = bS(r[Y_i]), \quad (48)$$

where the first equality follows from the definition of S_i and the assumption that $r(A) = u_0$, the second follows from the choices of a and b , and the third follows from (47). Continuing from the right-hand side of (48), we have

$$bS(r[Y_i]) = b \sum_{\substack{t \in S': \\ t[Y_i]=r[Y_i]}} S(t) = b \sum_{\substack{t \in S': \\ t[X_i]=r}} S(t) = bS(r), \quad (49)$$

where the first equality follows from (2), the second follows from the assumption that $A \in X_i$ and $r(A) = u_0$ together with $S(t) = 0$ in case $t(A) \neq u_0$, and the third follows from (2). Combining (48) with (49), we get $aS_i(r) = bS(r)$ also in this case. This proves that $S_i \equiv S[X_i]$; a completely symmetric argument proves that $S_j \equiv S[X_j]$.

Since S_1, \dots, S_m are pairwise consistent K -relations for X_1, \dots, X_m , by assumption they are globally consistent. Let N be a K -relation over $X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_m$ that witnesses their consistency. Let $M := N[Y_1 \cup \dots \cup Y_m]$ and we argue that M witnesses the consistency of R_1, \dots, R_m , which will prove the lemma. Fix $i \in [m]$ and let $a, b \in K \setminus \{0\}$ be such that $aS_i = bS[X_i]$. For every Y_i -tuple r we have

$$aR_i(r) = aS_i(r) = bN(r) = bM(r), \quad (50)$$

where the first follows $S_i = R_i$ in case $A \notin X_i$ and from (47) applied to $i = j$ and $R = R_i$ in case $A \in X_i$, the second follows from the choice of a and b , and the third follows from the choice of M and Part 3 of Lemma 1. \square

Lemma 16. *If a hypergraph H has the local-to-global consistency property for K -relations, then the hypergraph $R(H)$ also has the local-to-global consistency property for K -relations.*

Proof. Assume that the hypergraph $(V, \{X_1, \dots, X_m\})$ has the local-to-global consistency property for K -relations. We will show that if X_m is covered by some other hyperedge, i.e., $X_m \subseteq X_i$ for some $i \leq m-1$, then the hypergraph $(V, \{X_1, \dots, X_{m-1}\})$ also has the local-to-global consistency property for K relations. The statement of the lemma will follow from iterating this statement over all hyperedges of H that are covered by some other hyperedge of H .

Let R_1, \dots, R_{m-1} be a collection of pairwise consistent K -relations for X_1, \dots, X_{m-1} . Define $R_m := R_i[X_m]$. We claim that R_1, \dots, R_m are pairwise consistent. It suffices to check that R_j and R_m are consistent for any $j \in [m]$ with $j \neq m$. By assumption, we know that R_j and R_i are consistent, which means that there exists a K -relation T that witnesses their consistency; we have $R_j \equiv T[X_j]$ and $R_i \equiv T[X_i]$. Let $S := T[X_j X_m]$. We have

$$R_j \equiv T[X_j] = T[X_j X_m][X_j] = S[X_j], \quad (51)$$

where the first follows from the choice of T , the second follows from Part 3 of Lemma 1 and the third follows from the choice of S . Likewise,

$$R_m = R_i[X_m] \equiv T[X_i][X_m] = T[X_m] = T[X_j X_m][X_m] = S[X_m], \quad (52)$$

where the first equality is by the choice of R_m , the second follows from the choice of T , the assumption that $X_m \subseteq X_i$, and Part 3 of Lemma 2, the third follows from the assumption that $X_m \subseteq X_i$ and Part 3 of Lemma 1, the fourth follows again from Part 3 of Lemma 1, and the fifth follows from the choice of S . Thus, S witnesses the consistency of R_j and R_m .

Since R_1, \dots, R_m are pairwise consistent K -relations for X_1, \dots, X_m , by assumption they are globally consistent. The same K -relation that witnesses their global consistency also witnesses the global consistency of R_1, \dots, R_{m-1} , which completes the proof. \square

Generalized Tseitn Construction and Proof of Theorem 3 The minimal non-conformal and minimal non-chordal hypergraphs from Lemmas 13 and Lemma 14 share the following properties: 1) all their hyperedges have the same number of vertices, and 2) all their vertices appear

in the same number of hyperedges. For hypergraphs H that have these properties, we construct a collection $C(H; K)$ of K -relations that are indexed by the hyperedges of H ; these relations will play a crucial role in the proof of Theorem 3.

Let $H = (V, E)$ be a hypergraph and let d and k be positive integers. The hypergraph H is called *k-uniform* if every hyperedge of H has exactly k vertices. It is called *d-regular* if any vertex of H appears in exactly d hyperedges of H . For example, the non-conformal hypergraph of Lemma 13 is *k-uniform* and *d-regular* for $k := d := |W| - 1$. Likewise, the non-chordal hypergraph of Lemma 14 is *k-uniform* and *d-regular* for $k := d := 2$. For a positive semiring K and each *k-uniform* and *d-regular* hypergraph H with $d \geq 2$ and with hyperedges $E = \{X_1, \dots, X_m\}$, we construct a collection of K -relations $C(H; K) := \{R_1(X_1), \dots, R_m(X_m)\}$, where R_i is a K -relation that has attributes X_i . The collection $C(H; K)$ of these K -relations will turn out to be pairwise consistent but not globally consistent. Note that by the characterization of acyclicity in terms of Graham's algorithm, a hypergraph that is *k-uniform* and *d-regular* for some $k \geq 2$ and $d \geq 2$ will never be acyclic: Graham's procedure will not even start to remove any hyperedge or any vertex. Hence, the existence of the K -relations R_1, \dots, R_m that violates the local-to-global consistency property is compatible with Theorem 3. The construction is defined as follows.

For each $i \in [m]$ with $i \neq m$, let R_i be the unique unit K -relation over X_i whose support contains all tuples $t : X_i \rightarrow \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ whose total sum $\sum_{C \in X_i} t(C)$ is congruent to 0 mod d ; i.e., $R_i(t) := 1$ for each such X_i -tuple, and $R_i(t) := 0$ for any other X_i -tuple. For $i = m$, let R_m be the unique unit K -relation over X_m whose support contains all tuples $t : X_m \rightarrow \{0, \dots, d-1\}$ whose total sum $\sum_{C \in X_m} t(C)$ is congruent to 1 mod d ; i.e., again $R_m(t) := 1$ for each such X_m -tuple, and $R_m(t) := 0$ otherwise.

To show the pairwise consistency of R_1, \dots, R_m , it suffices, by Lemma 7, to show that for every two distinct $i, j \in [m]$, we have $R_i[Z] \equiv R_j[Z]$, where $Z := X_i \cap X_j$. In turn, this follows from the claim that for every Z -tuple $t : Z \rightarrow \{0, \dots, d-1\}$, we have $R_i(t) = R_j(t) = N_Z 1 = 1 + \dots + 1$, the sum of $N_Z := d^{k-|Z|-1}$ many units of the semiring K . Indeed, since by *k-uniformity* every hyperedge of H has exactly k vertices, for every $u \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$, there are exactly N_Z many X_i -tuples $t_{i,u,1}, \dots, t_{i,u,N_Z}$ that extend t and have total sum congruent to u mod d . It follows then that $R_i[Z] = R_j[Z]$ regardless of whether $n \in \{i, j\}$ or $n \notin \{i, j\}$, and hence any two R_i and R_j are consistent by Lemma 7. To argue that the relations R_1, \dots, R_m are not globally consistent, we proceed by contradiction. If R were a K -relation that witnesses their consistency, then it would be non-empty and its support would contain a tuple t such that the projections $t[X_i]$ belong to the supports R'_i of the R_i , for each $i \in [m]$. In turn this means that

$$\sum_{C \in X_i} t(C) \equiv 0 \pmod{d}, \quad \text{for } i \neq m \tag{53}$$

$$\sum_{C \in X_i} t(C) \equiv 1 \pmod{d}, \quad \text{for } i = m. \tag{54}$$

Since by *d-regularity* each $C \in V$ belongs to exactly d many sets X_i , adding up all the equations in (53) and (54) gives

$$\sum_{C \in V} dt(C) \equiv 1 \pmod{d}, \tag{55}$$

which is absurd since the left-hand side is congruent to 0 mod d , the right-hand side is congruent to 1 mod d , and $d \geq 2$ by assumption.

We now have all the tools needed to present the proof of Theorem 3.

Proof of Theorem 3. As stated earlier, the direction (a) implies (b) follows from Lemma 12. For showing that (b) implies (a), let us assume the contrary and then we will derive a contradiction.

Let $H = (V, E)$ be a smallest counterexample to the statement that (b) implies (a), meaning that the following three conditions hold: (i) H is not acyclic, (ii) H has the local-to-global consistency property for K -relations, and (iii) H is minimal in the sense that $n = |V|$ is smallest possible with properties (i) and (ii), and among those, $m = |E|$ is smallest possible. Since H is not acyclic, we know that H is either not conformal or not chordal. We distinguish the two cases.

Case 1: H is not conformal. By Lemmas 15 and 16, the minimality of H , and Lemma 13, we have $n \geq 3$ and $m = n$; indeed, $E = \{V_i : i \in [n]\}$ where $V_i = V \setminus \{A_i\}$ and A_1, \dots, A_n is an enumeration of V . Thus, H is k -uniform and d -regular for $k = d = n - 1 \geq 2$. The construction $C(H; K)$ gives a collection of K -relations R_1, \dots, R_n , where R_i has attributes V_i , which are pairwise consistent but not globally consistent, which is a contradiction.

Case 2: H is not chordal. By Lemmas 15 and 16, the minimality of H , and Lemma 14, we have $n \geq 4$ and $m = n$, and indeed $E = \{V_i : i \in [n]\}$ where $V_i = \{A_i, A_{i+1}\}$ and A_1, \dots, A_n is an enumeration of V with $A_{n+1} := A_1$. Thus, H is k -uniform and d -regular for $k = d = 2$. Again, the construction $C(H; K)$ gives a collection of K -relations R_1, \dots, R_n , where R_i has attributes V_i , which are pairwise consistent but not globally consistent, which is a contradiction. \square

An inspection of the proof of Theorem 3 reveals that actually a stronger result is established. Specifically, let H be a hypergraph and let X_1, \dots, X_m be its hyperedges. The proof of Theorem 3 shows that if H is not acyclic, then there are ordinary relations $R_1(X_1), \dots, R_m(X_m)$ such that, for every positive semiring K , the unit K -relations $S_1(X_1), \dots, S_m(X_m)$ with $S'_i = R_i$ are pairwise consistent but globally inconsistent. In more informal terms, the proof of Theorem 3 actually shows that if a hypergraph is acyclic, then there is an essentially *uniform* counterexample to the local-to-global consistency property for K -relations that works for all positive semirings K .

Before establishing the main result in this paper, we bring into the picture one more notion from hypergraph theory that was introduced by Vorob'ev [Vor62] in his study of global consistency for probability distributions.

Vorob'ev Regular Hypergraphs A *complex* is a hypergraph $H = (V, E)$ whose set E of hyperedges is closed under taking subsets, i.e., if $X \in E$ and $Z \subseteq X$, then $Z \in E$. The *downward closure* of a hypergraph H is the hypergraph whose vertices are those of H and whose hyperedges are all the subsets of the hyperedges of H . Clearly, the downward closure of a hypergraph is a complex.

Let K be a complex. Let X and Y be two different maximal hyperedges of K , where a hyperedge is *maximal* if it not a proper subset of any other hyperedge. We say that X yields a maximal intersection with Y if the intersection $X \cap Y$ is not a proper subset of the intersection $X \cap Z$ of some third ¹ hyperedge Z of K . A maximal hyperedge X of K is called *extreme in K* if all maximal intersections of X with hyperedges of K are equal. Let X be an extreme hyperedge in K . The *proper* vertices of X are those that do not belong to any other maximal hyperedge of K . The *normal subcomplex* of K corresponding to the extreme edge X is the subcomplex of K consisting of all hyperedges of K that do not intersect the set of proper vertices of e . A subcomplex K' of K is called a *normal subcomplex* if it is the normal subcomplex corresponding to some extreme

¹The condition “third” is missing in Vorob'ev [Vor62], and it is necessary since $e \cap e'$ is always a proper subset of $e \cap e''$ whenever $e = e''$ and e is maximal.

hyperedge of K . A *normal series* of K is a sequence of subcomplexes

$$K = K_0 \supset K_1 \supset \cdots \supset K_r \tag{56}$$

of the complex K in which for every ℓ with $1 \leq \ell \leq r-1$, the complex $K_{\ell+1}$ is a normal subcomplex of the complex K_ℓ , and the final complex K_r does not have any extreme hyperedges. We say that K is *regular* if there exists a normal series of K in which the last term is the complex without vertices. We say that a hypergraph H is *Vorob'ev regular* if its downward closure is a regular complex.

We will show that a hypergraph is Vorob'ev regular if and only if it is acyclic. This result will follow from the next two lemmas and Theorem 2. We have not been able to locate a published proof of this result in the literature, even though the equivalence between acyclicity and Vorob'ev regularity has been mentioned in [Hil91, Yan96].

Lemma 17. *If H is a Vorob'ev regular hypergraph, then Graham's algorithm succeeds on H .*

Proof. Let H be a Vorob'ev regular hypergraph. The proof that Graham's algorithm succeeds on H is by induction on the length of a normal series of the downward closure K of H . If the length of a normal series of K is zero, then K and hence H itself is the empty hypergraph and there is nothing to prove. Assume then that K has a normal series that has length at least one, let K_1 be the first subcomplex of K in the series, and let X be the extreme hyperedge of K corresponding to which K_1 is its normal subcomplex. Then K_1 consists of the hyperedges of K that do not intersect the proper vertices of e . Equivalently, K_1 is obtained from K by deleting all the proper vertices of e . Since the proper vertices of e appear in no other maximal hyperedge of K , this means that if we delete the proper vertices of e from all the hyperedges of H in which they appear, then we obtain a hypergraph whose downward closure is K_1 . Moreover, such a hypergraph H_1 can be obtained from H by applying a sequence of operations of Graham's algorithm: first delete all the hyperedges that are proper subsets of e , then delete all the proper vertices of X . Now, K_1 is also Vorob'ev's regular, and its normal series has length one less than that of K . Hence, by induction hypothesis, Graham's algorithm succeeds on H_1 , which means that there is a sequence of operations of Graham's algorithm that applied to H_1 yield the empty hypergraph. By concatenating the two sequences of operations, we get a single sequence of operations of Graham's algorithm that starts at H and yields the empty hypergraph. This proves that Graham's algorithm succeeds on H . \square

Lemma 18. *If H is a hypergraph that has a join tree, then H is Vorob'ev regular.*

Proof. Let H be a hypergraph that has a join tree. By induction on the number of its hyperedges, we show that H is Vorob'ev regular. Let K be the downward closure of H . If H has no hyperedges, then it is Vorob'ev regular. If H has just one hyperedge X , then X is an extreme hyperedge of K since it yields no maximal intersections at all. It follows that K is regular since all the vertices of e are proper, so H is Vorob'ev regular. Assume now that H has more than one hyperedges. Let X be a leaf of the join tree of H , and let Y be the unique hyperedge of H such that $\{X, Y\}$ is an edge of the join tree. We consider the following two cases.

Case 1: If X is not a maximal hyperedge, say $X \subseteq Z$ for some other edge Z of H , then $X = X \cap Z \subseteq X \cap Y$ by the connectivity property of the join tree since the unique path from X to Z in the tree must pass through Y . Hence, $X \subseteq Y$. Now, let H' be the hypergraph that results from deleting X from H . Since $X \subseteq Y$, the tree that results from trimming the leaf X from the join tree of H is a join tree of H' . By induction hypothesis, H' is Vorob'ev regular. But X was

not maximal in H , so H and H' have the same downward closure K , which shows that H is also Vorob'ev regular.

Case 2: If X is a maximal hyperedge of H , then we claim that X is an extreme hyperedge of K . First, X is a maximal hyperedge of K by assumption. Second, we show that X yields maximal intersection with Y . Indeed, if Z is a third hyperedge of H , then the unique path from X to Z in the join tree goes through Y and, by the connectivity property of the join tree, every vertex in $X \cap Z$ belongs to $Z \cap Y$. So $X \cap Y$ is not a proper subset of $X \cap Z$. Next, we show that all maximal intersections of X are equal to the maximal intersection of X with Y . Let Z be a third hyperedge of H and assume that X yields a maximal intersection with Z . In particular, $X \cap Z$ is not a proper subset of $X \cap Y$. But the connectivity property of the join tree implies $X \cap Z \subseteq X \cap Y$ since the unique path from X to Z in the join tree goes through Y . Thus $X \cap Z = X \cap Y$.

We proved that X is an extreme hyperedge of K . Now, let H' be the hypergraph that is obtained from H by deleting X and all the vertices that appeared only in X . The normal subcomplex K' of K corresponding to X is the downward closure of H' . If we trim the leaf X from the join tree of H , we get a join tree of H' with one node less. It follows from the induction hypothesis that H' is Vorob'ev regular. Thus K' is Vorob'ev regular, and so is K since K' is a normal subcomplex of it. \square

Lemma 17, Lemma 18, and Theorem 2 imply the following result.

Corollary 2. *Let H be a hypergraph. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (a) H is an acyclic hypergraph.
- (b) H is a Vorob'ev regular hypergraph.

Finally, by combining Theorem 2, Theorem 3, and Corollary 2, we obtain the main result of this paper.

Theorem 4. *Let K be a positive semiring and let H be a hypergraph. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (a) H is an acyclic hypergraph.
- (b) H is a conformal and chordal hypergraph.
- (c) H has the running intersection property.
- (d) H has a join tree.
- (e) H is accepted by Graham's algorithm.
- (f) H is a Vorob'ev regular hypergraph.
- (g) H has the local-to-global consistency property for K -relations.

By applying Theorem 4 with K set to the Boolean semiring \mathbb{B} , we obtain the original Beer-Fagin-Maier-Yannakakis Theorem 2. It should be noted that while our proof of Theorem 4 actually used Theorem 2 several times, all the uses of Theorem 2 made were for arguing that the various syntactic characterizations of hypergraph acyclicity are equivalent. These equivalences can be shown directly without referring to any semantic notion, and for this reason we can say that our proof does *not* rely on the semantic part of Theorem 2. In fact, the main construction that we gave

in the proof of Theorem 3 appears to be new and gives an alternative proof of the semantic part of Theorem 2: If H has local-to-global consistency property for ordinary relations, then H is acyclic.

While still different, the construction we gave in the proof of Theorem 3 is closer to Vorob'ev's proof of his theorem from [Vor62] than to the proof of the Theorem 2 from [BFMY83]. We discuss this next.

4.3 Consistency of Probability Distributions and Vorob'ev's Theorem

In the rest of this section, we study the consistency of K -relations when the semiring K is $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$, i.e., the set of non-negative real numbers with the standard addition and multiplication operations. We place the focus on probability distributions, which, to recall, are nothing but the $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ -relations T that satisfy the normalization constraint

$$T[\emptyset] = \sum_{t \in T'} T(t) = 1. \quad (57)$$

Our goal for the rest of this section is to show that the main result of Vorob'ev from [Vor62] follows from our general result Theorem 4 about arbitrary positive semirings.

Consistency of Probability Distributions Following [Vor62], we say that two probability distributions $P(X)$ and $Q(Y)$ are consistent if there exists a probability distribution $T(XY)$ such that $T[X] = P$ and $T[Y] = Q$. A collection $P_1(X_1), \dots, P_m(X_m)$ of probability distributions is *globally consistent* if there exists a probability distribution $P(X_1 \cdots X_m)$ such that $P[X_i] = P_i$ holds for every $i \in [m]$. The collection is called *pairwise consistent* if any two distributions in the collection are consistent. We start by showing that, when the probability distributions are presented as $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ -relations that satisfy (57), this classical notion of consistency of probability distributions coincides with the notion of consistency that we have been studying in this paper. The following basic fact was observed already in Section 2. It says that, as $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ -relations, the probability distributions are the canonical representatives of their equivalence classes under \equiv . We give an even shorter proof in a slightly different language.

Lemma 19. *For every two probability distributions $R(X)$ and $S(X)$ over the same set of attributes X , it holds that $R \equiv S$ if and only if $R = S$.*

Proof. The *if* direction is trivial. For the *only if* direction, let a and b be positive reals such that $aR(t) = bS(t)$ holds for every X -tuple t . Then $a = aR[\emptyset] = bS[\emptyset] = b$, where the first follows from (57), the second follows from (2) and the choice of a and b , and the third follows from (57). Dividing through by $a = b \neq 0$, it follows that $R(t) = S(t)$ holds for every X -tuple t . \square

The next lemma states that any $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ -relation that witnesses the consistency of a collection of probability distributions is itself a probability distribution.

Lemma 20. *For every collection R_1, \dots, R_m of probability distributions and every $\mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ -relation R , if R witnesses the global consistency of R_1, \dots, R_m , then R is itself a probability distribution.*

Proof. For any $i \in [m]$ we have $R[X_i] = R_i$, where X_i is the set of attributes of R_i . By Part 3 of Lemma 1 we have $R[\emptyset] = R[X_i][\emptyset] = R_i[\emptyset] = 1$, for any $i \in [m]$; i.e., R satisfies (57) and is hence a probability distribution. \square

In view of Lemma 19 and 20, the classical notions of consistency of probability distributions coincides with the notions of consistency of K -relations that we have been studying in this paper when $K = \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$. We are ready to state the local-to-global consistency property for probability distributions.

Vorob'ev's Theorem Let H be a hypergraph and let X_1, \dots, X_m be a listing of all its hyperedges. We say that H has the *local-to-global consistency property for probability distributions* if every pairwise consistent collection of probability distributions $P_1(X_1), \dots, P_m(X_m)$ is globally consistent.

One of the main motivations for writing this paper was to obtain a common generalization of the result of Beeri, Fagin, Maier, and Yannakakis stated in Theorem 2 and the result of Vorob'ev stated next.

Theorem 5 (Theorem 4.2 in [Vor62]). *Let H be a hypergraph. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (a) H is a Vorob'ev regular hypergraph.
- (b) H has the local-to-global consistency property for probability distributions.

Proof. By Lemmas 19 and 20, conditions (b) in this Theorem and (g) in Theorem 4 for $K = \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ are equivalent. The result now follows from Theorem 4 for $K = \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$. \square

Some words on the differences between our proof of Theorem 5 and Vorob'ev's proof of Theorem 4.2 in [Vor62] are in order. In the direction (a) implies (b), except for the minor differences that stem from the use of Lemma 17, our proof is basically the same as Vorob'ev's. The main construct in that proof is the operation on probability distributions that we denoted \bowtie_P in equation (8), which appears with different notation as equation (21) in page 156 of [Vor62].

In the direction (b) implies (a), again except for the minor differences that stem from the use of Lemma 18, our proof has some important similarities with Vorob'ev's, but also one important difference. The similarities lie in the structure of the argument. Vorob'ev first proves that the class of hypergraphs that have the local-to-global consistency property for probability distributions is the *unique* class of hypergraphs that contains those, satisfies certain closure properties, and excludes two concrete families of hypergraphs, that he calls $\{G_n\}$ and $\{Z_n\}$ in Theorem 2.2 in page 152 of [Vor62]. This characterization we also prove through the combination of Lemmas 15 and 16, which stand for the closure properties, Lemmas 13 and 14, whose featuring hypergraphs are precisely the hypergraphs G_n and Z_n from [Vor62], and the construction $C(H; K)$ through Case 1 for $H = G_n$, and Case 2 for $H = Z_n$, in the proof of Theorem 3. Another similarity lies in the way we handle Z_n : both proofs build a cycle of K -relations that implement equality constraints except for one K -relation in the cycle that implements an inequality constraint. The important difference lies in the way we handle G_n . Vorob'ev's proof is a linear-algebraic argument over Euclidean space that requires some non-trivial calculations, while our argument is more combinatorial and arguably simpler as it relies on basic modular arithmetic and the totally obvious fact that $0 \not\equiv 1 \pmod{d}$, for $d \geq 2$.

5 Concluding Remarks

We conclude by discussing some open problems and directions for future research.

- Beeri et al. [BFMY83] showed that hypergraph acyclicity is also equivalent to certain semantic conditions other than the local-to-global consistency property for ordinary relations. The existence of a *full reducer* is arguably the most well known and useful such semantic property (see also [Mai83, Ull88]). By definition, a *full reducer* of a hypergraph H with X_1, \dots, X_m as its hyperedges is a program consisting of a finite sequence of semijoin statements of the form $R_i := R_i \bowtie R_j$ such that if this program is given a collection $R_1(X_1), \dots, R_m(X_m)$ of ordinary relations as input, then the output is a collection of globally consistent ordinary relations.

It remains an open problem to define a suitable semijoin operation for K -relations and prove (or disprove) that for every positive semiring K , a hypergraph H is acyclic if and only if H has a full reducer for K -relations. One of the technical difficulties is that the join operation on two K -relations introduced and studied here is not, in general, associative (in fact, as seen earlier, it is not associative even when K is the bag semiring of non-negative integers).

- The notion of consistency studied here is based on the notion of equivalence \equiv of two K -relations. One could define the notion of *strict consistency*, where two K -relations $R(X)$ and $S(Y)$ are *strictly consistent* if there is a K -relation $T(XY)$ such that $T[X] = R$ and $T[Y] = S$; from there, one can define the notion of *local-to-global strict consistency property* for K -relations. The question is: do the main results presented here hold for strict consistency? In particular, is hypergraph acyclicity equivalent to the local-to-global strict consistency property for K -relations?

The crucial obstacle in following the approach we adopted here is that if K is not a semifield, then it is not clear how to define a join operation on two K -relations that witnesses their strict consistency. Actually, there are bags R and S that are strictly consistent, but every bag T that witnesses their strict consistency (as defined above) has the property that its support T' is *strictly contained* in the ordinary join $R' \bowtie S'$ of the supports R' and S' . This is in sharp contrast with our join operation, as shown in Lemma 4. The simplest such example is the pair of bags $R(AB) = \{12 : 1, 22 : 1\}$ and $S(BC) = \{21 : 1, 22 : 1\}$, whose strict consistency is witnessed by the bags $T_1(ABC) = \{122 : 1, 221 : 1\}$ and $T_2(ABC) = \{121 : 1, 222 : 1\}$, but, as one can easily verify, no other bag.

- Positive semirings have been used in different areas of mathematics and computer science (see, e.g., [Gol13, GM08]). In particular, the min-plus semiring has been used in the analysis of dynamic programming algorithms, while the Viterbi semiring has been used in the study of statistical models. It would be interesting to investigate potential applications of the results reported here to semirings other than the Boolean semiring and the semiring of the non-negative real numbers with the standard arithmetic operations.

Acknowledgments Albert Atserias was partially funded by European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme, grant agreement ERC-2014-CoG 648276 (AUTAR), and by MICCIN grant PID2019-109137GB-C22 (PROOFS). Phokion Kolaitis was partially supported by NSF Grant IIS-1814152.

References

- [AB11] Samson Abramsky and Adam Brandenburger. A unified sheaf-theoretic account of non-locality and contextuality. *CoRR*, abs/1102.0264, 2011.
- [ABD09] Albert Atserias, Andrei A. Bulatov, and Anuj Dawar. Affine systems of equations and counting infinitary logic. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 410(18):1666–1683, 2009.
- [ABK⁺15] Samson Abramsky, Rui Soares Barbosa, Kohei Kishida, Raymond Lal, and Shane Mansfield. Contextuality, cohomology and paradox. In Stephan Kreutzer, editor, *24th EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic, CSL 2015, September 7-10, 2015, Berlin, Germany*, volume 41 of *LIPICs*, pages 211–228. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2015.
- [Abr13] Samson Abramsky. Relational databases and Bell’s theorem. In Val Tannen, Limsoon Wong, Leonid Libkin, Wenfei Fan, Wang-Chiew Tan, and Michael P. Fourman, editors, *In Search of Elegance in the Theory and Practice of Computation - Essays Dedicated to Peter Buneman*, volume 8000 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 13–35. Springer, 2013.
- [Abr14] Samson Abramsky. Contextual semantics: From quantum mechanics to logic, databases, constraints, and complexity. *Bull. EATCS*, 113, 2014.
- [AHV95] Serge Abiteboul, Richard Hull, and Victor Vianu. *Foundations of Databases*. Addison-Wesley, 1995.
- [AMB11] Samson Abramsky, Shane Mansfield, and Rui Soares Barbosa. The cohomology of non-locality and contextuality. In Bart Jacobs, Peter Selinger, and Bas Spitters, editors, *Proceedings 8th International Workshop on Quantum Physics and Logic, QPL 2011, Nijmegen, Netherlands, October 27-29, 2011*, volume 95 of *EPTCS*, pages 1–14, 2011.
- [Bar15] Rui Soares Barbosa. *Contextuality in Quantum Mechanics and Beyond*. PhD thesis, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK, 2015.
- [Bel64] John S Bell. On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox. *Physics Physique Fizika*, 1(3):195, 1964.
- [BFMY83] Catriel Beeri, Ronald Fagin, David Maier, and Mihalis Yannakakis. On the desirability of acyclic database schemes. *J. ACM*, 30(3):479–513, July 1983.
- [BGIP01] Samuel R. Buss, Dima Grigoriev, Russell Impagliazzo, and Toniann Pitassi. Linear gaps between degrees for the polynomial calculus modulo distinct primes. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 62(2):267–289, 2001.
- [Bra16] Johann Brault-Baron. Hypergraph acyclicity revisited. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 49(3):54:1–54:26, 2016.
- [CS88] Vasek Chvátal and Endre Szemerédi. Many hard examples for resolution. *J. ACM*, 35(4):759–768, 1988.

- [CT06] Thomas M. Cover and Joy A. Thomas. *Elements of information theory (2. ed.)*. Wiley, 2006.
- [Dec03] Rina Dechter. *Constraint processing*. Elsevier Morgan Kaufmann, 2003.
- [Fra07] George K Francis. The impossible tribar. In *A Topological Picturebook*, pages 65–76. Springer, 2007.
- [GKT07] Todd J. Green, Gregory Karvounarakis, and Val Tannen. Provenance semirings. In Leonid Libkin, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth ACM SIGACT-SIGMOD-SIGART Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, June 11-13, 2007, Beijing, China*, pages 31–40. ACM, 2007.
- [GM08] Michel Gondran and Michel Minoux. *Graphs, dioids and semirings: new models and algorithms*, volume 41. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [Gol13] Jonathan S Golan. *Semirings and their Applications*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [Gra79] MH. Graham. On the Universal Relation. Technical report, University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada, September 1979.
- [GT17] Erich Grädel and Val Tannen. Semiring provenance for first-order model checking. *CoRR*, abs/1712.01980, 2017.
- [Har92] Lucien Hardy. Quantum mechanics, local realistic theories, and lorentz-invariant realistic theories. *Physical Review Letters*, 68(20):2981, 1992.
- [Hil91] Joe R Hill. Relational databases: A tutorial for statisticians. In *Proceedings of Symposium on the Interface between Computer Science and Statistics*, pages 86–93, 1991.
- [HLY80] Peter Honeyman, Richard E. Ladner, and Mihalis Yannakakis. Testing the universal instance assumption. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 10(1):14–19, 1980.
- [Mai83] David Maier. *The Theory of Relational Databases*. Computer Science Press, 1983.
- [Mal88] Francesco M. Malvestuto. Existence of extensions and product extensions for discrete probability distributions. *Discret. Math.*, 69(1):61–77, 1988.
- [PP58] Lionel S Penrose and Roger Penrose. Impossible objects: a special type of visual illusion. *British Journal of Psychology*, 1958.
- [PR94] Sandu Popescu and Daniel Rohrlich. Quantum nonlocality as an axiom. *Foundations of Physics*, 24(3):379–385, 1994.
- [Tse68] G. S. Tseitin. On the complexity of derivation in propositional calculus. *Structures in Constructive Mathematics and Mathematical Logic*, pages 115–125, 1968.
- [Ull88] Jeffrey D. Ullman. *Principles of Database and Knowledge-Base Systems, Volume I*, volume 14 of *Principles of computer science series*. Computer Science Press, 1988.

- [UW02] Jeffrey D. Ullman and Jennifer Widom. *A first course in database systems (2. ed.)*. Prentice Hall, 2002.
- [Vor62] Nikolai Nikolaevich Vorobev. Consistent families of measures and their extensions. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 7(2):147–163, 1962.
- [Yan96] Mihalis Yannakakis. Perspectives on database theory. *SIGACT News*, 27(3):25–49, 1996.
- [YO79] Clement Tak Yu and Meral Z Ozsoyoglu. An algorithm for tree-query membership of a distributed query. In *COMPSAC 79. Proceedings. Computer Software and The IEEE Computer Society's Third International Applications Conference, 1979.*, pages 306–312. IEEE, 1979.