



**HAL**  
open science

## Wondering why data are missing from query results?

### Ask Conseil Why-Not

Melanie Herschel

► **To cite this version:**

Melanie Herschel. Wondering why data are missing from query results? Ask Conseil Why-Not. International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM), 2013, Burlingame, United States. hal-00909210

**HAL Id: hal-00909210**

**<https://hal.inria.fr/hal-00909210>**

Submitted on 26 Nov 2013

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Wondering Why Data are Missing from Query Results? Ask Conseil Why-Not

Melanie Herschel  
Université Paris Sud 11 / INRIA Saclay Ile-de-France  
91405 Orsay Cedex  
melanie.herschel@lri.fr

## ABSTRACT

In analyzing and debugging data transformations, or more specifically relational queries, a subproblem is to understand why some data are not part of the query result. This problem has recently been addressed from different perspectives for various fragments of relational queries. The different perspectives yield different, yet complementary explanations of such *missing-answers*.

This paper first aims at unifying the different approaches by defining a new type of explanation, called *hybrid* explanation, that encompasses the variety of previously defined types of explanations. This solution goes beyond simply forming the union of explanations produced by different algorithms and is shown to be able to explain a larger set of missing-answers. Second, we present *Conseil*, an algorithm to generate hybrid explanations. *Conseil* is also the first algorithm to handle non-monotonic queries. Experiments on efficiency and explanation quality show that *Conseil* is comparable to and even outperforms previous algorithms.

## Categories and Subject Descriptors

H.4 [Information Systems Applications]: Miscellaneous

## General Terms

Algorithms

## Keywords

why-not data provenance, query-analysis

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In designing data transformations, e.g., for data integration tasks, developers often face the problem that they cannot properly inspect or debug the individual steps of their transformation specification, which is commonly specified declaratively. Instead, when observing result data that do not match their expectation, developers manually search for the reason for the unexpected behavior.

One important sub-problem in this context is the explanation of *missing-answers*, i.e., data missing from the query result (although the developer expected it). Recently, approaches to explain missing-answers of relational and SQL queries have been pro-

```
SELECT P.ProdID, Name, MAX(Rating)
FROM Ratings R, Products P
WHERE R.ProdID = P.ProdID
AND P.Loc = 'US'
GROUP BY P.ProdID, P.Name
HAVING MAX(R.Rating) <= 2
```

Products			Ratings	
ProdID	Name	Loc	ProdID	Rating
P1	Car	US	P1	5
P2	Truck	US	P2	2
P3	Bus	CH	P2	1

Figure 1: Sample query and input data

posed. These approaches generate either *instance-based explanations* [12, 13], *query-based explanations* [4], or *modification-based explanations* [18], which we illustrated by the following example.

EXAMPLE 1. Fig. 1 shows an SQL query and sample input data. We assume *ProdID* is a primary key in *Products*.

Assume the tuple  $\langle P1, Car, v_1 \rangle$  is not in the query result, although the developer or an analyst expected it to be. Here,  $v_1$  is a variable standing for “could be any value”. An instance-based explanation for this missing-answer may indicate that the maximum rating of the product with *ProdID* = *P1* exceeds 2, i.e., *Ratings* “wrongly” includes one or more tuples of the form  $\langle P1, v_2 \rangle$ , where  $v_2$  is a variable value that is required to be above 2 (in denoting such conditional tuples in the future, we will add the condition as last attribute, e.g.,  $\langle P1, v_2, v_2 > 2 \rangle$ ). A query-based explanation may identify that, although the product exists in *Products* together with corresponding ratings in *Ratings*, the selection predicate  $MAX(R.Rating) \leq 2$  is responsible for filtering the missing-answer. Finally, a modification-based explanation modifies the query such that the tuple appears in the result, e.g., it may raise the selectivity of the selection by changing it to  $MAX(R.Rating) \leq 5$ .

Unfortunately, it is not guaranteed that, given a missing-answer, an algorithm finds an explanation. As the next example shows, it is even possible that no explanation of any type is returned.

EXAMPLE 2. Continuing our example, no explanation can be computed for the missing-answer  $\langle P3, Bus, 0 \rangle$ . Indeed, an instance-based explanation would have to insert tuple  $\langle P3, Bus, US \rangle$  into *Products* (in addition to inserting the missing rating), which is however not possible due to the constraint on *ProdID* [12, 13]<sup>1</sup>. Due to the lack of a rating of 0 in *Ratings*, neither a query-based explanation nor a modification-based explanation will be computed by state-of-the-art algorithms [4, 18] that assume the existence of data necessary to produce the missing-answer in the source tables.

Ideally, an explanation pointing out both the problem of missing source data and the problem of problematic query operators would help a developer in analyzing the query in the above example. Therefore, we introduce a novel type of explanation that combines existing types of explanations and produces an explanation even in cases where no other individual approach produces a result. We refer to this new type of explanation as *hybrid explanation*.

<sup>1</sup>[13] also considers updating attribute values but we can easily exclude this solution by enforcing a trust constraint [13].

EXAMPLE 3. In the scenario of Ex. 2, a possible hybrid explanation inserts a tuple  $\langle P3, 0 \rangle$  into *Ratings* so as to fulfill the join with the existing tuple in *Products*. In addition, it points out that this combination of source data does not make it to the result because of the selection predicate on location.

To generate hybrid explanations, we present the *Conseil* algorithm. More specifically, we provide a formal **definition of hybrid explanations** and **extend** definitions of other types of explanations to also support **non-monotonic** queries. We also present the **Conseil algorithm** that computes hybrid explanations for a restricted class of **non-monotonic queries** and **experimentally compare** it to state-of-the-art algorithms.

In the rest of this paper, we first analyze related work in Sec. 2. Next, we formalize our framework to compute hybrid explanations in Sec. 3. Sec. 4 focuses on the *Conseil* algorithm, which is evaluated in Sec. 5 before we conclude in Sec. 6. A long version of this paper is available at <http://nautilus.saclay.inria.fr/publications>.

## 2. RELATED WORK

The problem of simplifying the analysis of the behavior of data transformations to more easily understand and verify transformation behavior and semantics has been addressed by a variety of techniques [5, 9, 7, 11, 15, 17]. The work presented in this paper falls in the category of data provenance research [5], focusing on a specific sub-problem referred to as why-not provenance [4, 16]. We briefly review existing approaches for why-not provenance.

The Missing-Answers (MA) algorithm [13] computes instance-based explanations given a single missing tuple and a single select-project-join (SPJ) query. Essentially, it rewrites the SPJ query such that the result of the rewritten query corresponds to all possible instance-based explanations for the specified missing-answer. Instance-based explanations either insert or update the source data, and their number can be reduced by trusting tables (attributes), which prevents inserts (updates) on these.

Artemis [12] extends the MA algorithm in the sense that it applies to a set of non-nested SQL queries that involve selection, projection, join, union, and aggregation (SPJUA queries). Furthermore, more than one missing-answer can be specified. Artemis also considers explanation side-effects for pruning explanations. A side-effect is any tuple that, upon changing the source data according to an instance-based explanation, appears in the result of any considered query in addition to the specified missing-answer.

Why-Not [4] computes query-based explanations. First, given a missing-answer, it identifies tuples in the source database that contain the constant values or that satisfy the conditions of the missing-answer and that are not part of the lineage [6] of any tuple in the query result. The values in those tuples are traced over the query operators to identify which operators have them as input but not as output. In [4] the algorithm is shown to work for one query involving selection, projection, join, and union (SPJU query).

ConQueR [18], outputs modification-based explanations. Given a set of missing-answers, an SPJUA query, and a source database, it first determines if the necessary source data to produce the missing-answers are available. This is similar to Why-Not. The SQL query is then changed such that all missing-answers become part of the output, while side-effects are minimized.

The algorithm in [10] computes modification-based explanations while considering side-effects to answer why-not questions on top-k queries [10]. Its focus lies on changing  $k$  or preference weights to make the missing-answer appear in the query result.

Compared to previous work, *Conseil* is the first to consider non-monotonous queries and hybrid explanations. However, it does not consider side-effects nor top-k queries.

## 3. FRAMEWORK AND DEFINITIONS

In defining our unified framework for why-not provenance, we first define the most general input scenario, referred to as *debugging scenario* (as in [12]). Our definition, relying on conditional tuples [14], covers the general case that considers multiple missing-answers and multiple queries and provably captures all previous definitions while offering enough freedom for further algorithms.

DEFINITION 1 (CONDITIONAL TUPLE (C-TUPLE)). A conditional tuple  $t = \langle a_1, \dots, a_n, cond \rangle$  is a tuple with attributes  $a_1$  to  $a_n$  having constant or variable values, and  $cond$  being a boolean expression. The semantics are that tuple  $t$  represents all possible tuples that contain the same constants and that satisfy  $cond$ .

To indicate the relation  $R$  a c-tuple  $t = \langle a_1, \dots, a_n \rangle$  belongs to, we use  $R(a_1, \dots, a_n, cond)$ , and  $relation(t) = R$ . Also, we refer to an attribute  $a$  within a c-tuple  $t$  using the notation  $t.a$ .

DEFINITION 2 (DEBUGGING SCENARIO). A debugging scenario is a 5-tuple  $(E, Q, Q(D), D, C)$ , where  $Q$  is a set of queries,  $Q(D)$  is the result of these queries over some source instance  $D$ ,  $E$  is a set of missing-answers to be explained, specified as a set of c-tuples missing from  $Q(D)$ , and  $C$  being a set of constraints defined over the remaining four components of the debugging scenario.

Let us now turn to the definition of explanations, i.e., the output of an algorithm explaining missing-answers. Our definitions generalize previous definitions of query-based, instance-based, and modification-based explanations to cover queries involving operators from relational algebra plus aggregation.

An instance-based explanation consists of labeled c-tuples. The definition of these relies on compatible c-tuples.

DEFINITION 3 (COMPATIBLE C-TUPLES). A c-tuple  $t_1$  is compatible with a c-tuple  $t_2$  if (i)  $\Pi_{a_1, \dots, a_n}(t_1)$  is equal, subsumes, or complements  $\Pi_{a_1, \dots, a_n}(t_2)$  and (ii)  $t_1$  or the complement of  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  satisfies  $t_1.cond \wedge t_2.cond$ .

We reuse existing definitions for subsumption and complementation [2, 8], except that unlike these, we consider value NULL as part of the constant domain (and NULL equals NULL!), and unknown semantics are attributed to the variables of a c-tuple.

EXAMPLE 4. Consider c-tuples  $t_1 = \langle P1, Car, v_1, v_1 \neq 'UK' \rangle$ ,  $t_2 = \langle P1, v_2, US, v_2 LIKE 'C%' \rangle$ , and  $t_3 = \langle P1, Car, US, true \rangle$ . Here,  $t_3$  subsumes  $t_1$  because  $t_3$  matches all constants of  $t_1$  and has less unknown values and  $t_3$  satisfies the condition of  $t_1.cond \wedge t_3.cond$ . Thus,  $t_3$  is compatible with  $t_1$  (but not vice versa). Focusing on  $t_1$  and  $t_2$ , we see that these complement each other. The complement of  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  (without conditions) is  $\langle P1, Car, US \rangle$  for which it is easy to verify that both  $t_1.cond$  and  $t_2.cond$  hold. Hence,  $t_1$  is compatible with  $t_2$  (and vice versa).

DEFINITION 4 (LABELED C-TUPLE). A labeled c-tuple  $t = L\langle a_1, \dots, a_n, cond \rangle$  w.r.t. some data set  $D$  is a c-tuple associated with a label  $L \in \{+, -, \circ\}$  that indicates whether a c-tuple compatible with  $t$  is known to exist in  $D$  ( $L = \circ$ ), needs to exist in  $D$  ( $L = +$ ), or must not exist in  $D$  ( $L = -$ ).

When associated with label  $\circ$ , the c-tuple describes an existing tuple and hence its condition is always true. For brevity, we omit the condition *true* for tuples in  $D$  in the remainder of this paper.

DEFINITION 5 (INSTANCE-BASED EXPLANATION). An instance-based explanation  $\phi_{IB}$  for a debugging scenario describes modifications to the database  $D$  that would yield the missing-answers of  $E$  in  $Q(D)$  while satisfying constraints  $C$ . The syntax of  $\phi_{IB}$  is:

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_{IB} &:= \{\{\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_n\}\}_A & \mathcal{T} &:= C|\phi_{IB} \\
C &:= L\langle a_1, \dots, a_n, \text{cond} \rangle & A &:= \text{group}|\text{agg}|\text{group} \wedge \text{agg}|\emptyset \\
\text{group} &:= \text{group}|\text{acopv} & \text{agg} &:= \text{agg}|\text{aggF}(a)|\text{aCond}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $L\langle a_1, \dots, a_n, \text{cond} \rangle$  refers to Def. 4,  $a$  is an attribute,  $v$  a value (constant or variable),  $\text{cop} \in \{=, <, >, \leq, \geq\}$ ,  $\text{aggF}$  is an aggregation function over attribute  $a$ , and  $\text{aCond}$  a condition on the aggregated value of  $a$ . The semantics of  $\phi_{IB}$  describe the sequence of operations  $[\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_n]$  needed to yield the missing tuples, the result being grouped and aggregated following  $A$ .

Intuitively, an instance-based explanation returns a set of modifications to the database, on which a grouping or aggregation constraint of  $A$  may apply. A modification  $\mathcal{T}$  either corresponds to a labeled  $c$ -tuple  $C$  or again  $\phi_{IB}$ , necessary for nested queries.

EXAMPLE 5. The instance-based explanation of Ex. 1 is defined as follows, assuming that all ratings for  $P1$  are above 2.

$$\phi_{IB} = \{[\circ\text{Product}\langle P1, \text{Car}, \text{US} \rangle, -\text{Ratings}\langle P1, v_1, v_1 > 2 \rangle, +\text{Ratings}\langle P1, v_2, v_2 \leq 2 \rangle]\}_{P.\text{ProdID} = P1, P.\text{Name} = \text{Car}}$$

In the rest of this paper, we will simplify the notation when possible, i.e., we will omit the subscript  $\emptyset$  when no aggregation applies.

Let us now shift our attention to query-based explanations, returned for instance by Why-Not [4].

DEFINITION 6 (QUERY-BASED EXPLANATION). A query-based explanation  $\phi_{QB}$  for a debugging scenario is a set of query operators. Each operator  $op_i \in \phi_{QB}$  is responsible for pruning missing answers of  $E$  from  $Q(D)$  and satisfies  $C$ . An operator  $op_i$  is responsible for pruning a missing answer  $e \in E$  if data relevant to produce  $e$  is in the input of  $op_i$  but not in its output.

The definition leaves open the choice of one or more operators in  $\phi_{QB}$  and the choice of data relevant to produce  $e$ , as these are algorithm-specific.

EXAMPLE 6. Given the query of Ex. 1 and the missing-answer  $e = \langle P1, \text{Car}, v_1 \rangle$ , data relevant to produce  $e$  includes the tuple  $\langle P1, \text{Car}, \text{US} \rangle \in \text{Products}$  and all tuples in  $\text{Ratings}$ . These data find “successors” in the output of all operators of the query, except for the selection  $\sigma_{\text{Max}(R.\text{Rating}) \leq 2}$  (it is too selective). Consequently,  $\phi_{QB} = \{\sigma_{\text{Max}(R.\text{Rating}) \leq 2}\}$ .

The final type of explanations to define before we define hybrid explanations are modification-based explanations.

DEFINITION 7 (MODIFICATION-BASED EXPLANATION). A modification-based explanation  $\phi_{MB}$  for a debugging scenario is a rewriting of  $Q$  into a set of queries  $Q'$  such that all missing tuples in  $E$  occur in  $Q'(D)$  for a given source instance  $D$  and  $C$  is satisfied.

EXAMPLE 7. A modification-based explanation for our example replaces the existing HAVING-clause by HAVING MAX(R.Rating)  $\leq 5$ .

As illustrated in Ex. 2, the above explanation types may fail in returning explanations in some scenarios. To extend the set of debugging scenarios for which explanations can be returned, we define a new type of explanation, namely hybrid explanation.

DEFINITION 8 (HYBRID EXPLANATION). A hybrid explanation  $\phi_H$  for a debugging scenario  $S$  is a 3-tuple  $(\phi_{IB}, \phi_{QB}, \phi_{MB})$  s.t. the conjunction of all  $\phi_i \in \phi_H$  is a valid explanation, even though any conjunction of a subset of  $\phi_i$ 's is not necessarily an explanation. A hybrid explanation is valid if, once data modifications of  $\phi_{IB}$  were applied,  $\phi_{QB}$  ( $\phi_{MB}$ ) would become valid query-based (modification-based) explanations w.r.t.  $S$ .

EXAMPLE 8. The hybrid explanation described in Ex. 3 is formally described as  $(\phi_{IB}, \phi_{QB}, \perp)$  where

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_{IB} &= [\circ\text{Products}\langle P3, \text{Bus}, \text{CH} \rangle, +\text{Ratings}\langle P3, \emptyset \rangle] \\
\phi_{QB} &= \{\sigma_{P.\text{Location} = \text{US}}\}
\end{aligned}$$

## 4. THE *Conseil* ALGORITHM

We now describe *Conseil*, an algorithm implementing our framework by computing hybrid explanations of the form  $(\Phi_{IB}, \Phi_{QB}, \perp)$ . *Conseil* supports relational queries (i.e., queries involving selection  $\sigma$ , projection  $\Pi$ , join  $\bowtie$ , Cartesian product  $\times$ , union  $\cup$ , and set difference  $\setminus$ ) with the restriction that it only supports one set difference. It also supports aggregation  $\alpha$ . The rationale behind the restriction to one set difference operator per query is based on both complexity (see Sec. 4.3) and usability. Despite this restriction, we believe that *Conseil* is still widely applicable in practice.

In its current version, *Conseil* does not consider side-effects and we so far focus on explaining one missing-answer  $e$  to the result  $Q(D)$  of a query  $Q$  over a relational instance  $D$ . However, *Conseil* exploits both referential constraints and unique constraints defined over  $D$  to estimate an explanation’s cost. These are formalized in  $C$ .

The above assumptions yield the following debugging scenario for *Conseil*:  $S_{\text{Conseil}} = (\{e\}, \{Q\}, \{Q(D)\}, D, C)$ .

*Conseil* operates in four main phases: First, (1) it computes a generic witness  $\Phi$  that is then (2) annotated with passing properties determined over a canonical query tree representation (as defined in [6]). Based on the annotated generic witness, it (3) computes a set of derivations. Finally, (4) *Conseil* computes a hybrid explanation for each derivation, and returns these. We discuss each step in detail in the following. For illustration, we will use a more complex example than previously to cover more details.

EXAMPLE 9. Fig. 2 shows the canonical query tree of a query  $Q$  over data in relations  $R, S, T, U$ , and  $V$ . Please ignore the rest of the figure for now. We define  $S_{\text{Conseil}}$  with  $e = \langle a', c', d' \rangle$ ,  $Q$  and  $D$  as in Fig. 2,  $Q(D) = \{\langle a', c, d \rangle\}$ , and  $C = \emptyset$ .

### 4.1 Step 1: Generic Witness Computation

First, *Conseil* compute a generic witness that describes a pattern each explanation conforms to and that comprises an instance-based component  $\Phi_I$  and a query-based component  $\Phi_Q$ . Essentially, we use this generic witness to limit the search space explored in subsequent steps. The generic witness can be computed efficiently based on  $e$  and  $Q$  (the complexity depending on the size of  $Q$ ).

The instance-based component  $\Phi_I$  describes in the form of  $c$ -tuples what data has to be present in the sources in order to produce  $e$ .  $\Phi_Q$ , on the other hand, includes all operators that may be responsible for pruning  $e$  from the query result, i.e.,  $\sigma$ ,  $\bowtie$ , and  $\setminus$ .

To define the generic witness  $\Phi$ , we first need to distinguish between missing-tuple constraints, subsequently called *mt-constraints*, and query-constraints, or *q-constraints* for short.

DEFINITION 9 (MT-CONSTRAINT). An *mt-constraint* is a constraint that, given  $e$  and  $Q$ , can be identified as being imposed on the lineage  $[6] D^*$  of  $e$  w.r.t.  $Q$  by the missing-tuple  $e$ .

DEFINITION 10 (Q-CONSTRAINT). A *q-constraint* is a constraint that, given  $e$  and  $Q$ , can be identified as being imposed on the lineage  $D^*$  of  $e$  w.r.t.  $Q$  by the query  $Q$ .

EXAMPLE 10. For Ex. 9, one *mt-constraint* is  $R.A = a'$  whereas  $U.B = u$  illustrates a *q-constraint*.




Figure 2: Sample query tree for scenario of Ex. 9

The only operators that introduce q-constraints are  $\sigma$  and  $\bowtie$ . Indeed,  $\Pi$ ,  $\alpha$ , and  $\cup$  cannot be held responsible for pruning input tuples and  $\setminus$  does not impose a constraint on the lineage of  $e$ , as lineage is defined solely by the tuples that need to be present.

We now define the generic witness for SPJD-queries, i.e., queries involving selection, projection, join, and set difference. We then comment on how to include union and aggregation.

**DEFINITION 11 (GENERIC WITNESS  $\Phi$  FOR SPJD-QUERIES).** A generic witness  $\Phi = (\Phi_I, \Phi_Q)$  for a SPJD-query is a 2-tuple of sets  $\Phi_I$  and  $\Phi_Q$ , where  $\Phi_I = \{t_i | \text{relation}(t_i) \in D^* \text{ w.r.t. } e \text{ and } Q \wedge t_i.\text{cond the mt-constraint on } t_i\}$  and  $\Phi_Q = \{op_i | op_i \in Q \wedge op_i \in \{\sigma, \bowtie, \setminus\}\}$ .

**EXAMPLE 11.** The generic witness for the debugging scenario of Ex. 9 has  $\Phi_I = \{R(a, ?), S(?, c), T(?, ?, ?, d), U(?, ?)\}$  and  $\Phi_Q = \{\bowtie_{R.B=S.B}, \bowtie_{R.B=T.B}, \bowtie_{U.A=T.A}, \sigma_{U.B=u}, \sigma_{S.C=c}, \setminus\}$ .

In case a query involves union operators, we create one generic witness for each alternative. For instance,  $Q = (R \bowtie S) \cup T$  results in two generic witnesses, whose instance-based components have the form  $\{R(\dots), S(\dots)\}$  and  $\{T(\dots)\}$ , respectively.

When aggregation (together with grouping) is present, the c-tuples of the instance-based part of the generic witness are grouped accordingly, yielding a syntax for the generic witness similar to the syntax of the instance-based explanation, the main difference being that the c-tuples are not labeled and are sets instead of sequences (similar to the solution in [12]). For example, given a missing tuple  $(b, 3, c)$  and a query  $Q = \Pi_{B,A,C}(\alpha_{B,COUNT(A)ASA}(R) \bowtie S)$ , we obtain  $\Phi_I = \{\{R(v_a, b)\}_{B,COUNT(A)=3}, S(b, c)\}$ .

## 4.2 Step 2: Generic Witness Annotation

Having the generic witness in hand, the next step is to annotate it with passing properties. We define three passing properties, named *passing*, *blocking*, and *ambiguous*. An operator is passing if we are

<sup>2</sup>For conciseness, we use a Datalog inspired syntax to denote conditions, e.g.,  $R(r_1, r_2 | r_2 = s_1 \wedge r_1 = a), S(s_1, s_2 | s_1 = r_2) \equiv R(a, r_2), S(r_2, ?)$

<b>Rule (1):</b> $op_i = \sigma_{R_j.a \text{ cop } c}$ , where $R_j$ is a table reference, $a$ an attribute of table $R_j$ , $cop$ a comparison operator, and $c$ an constant.	$\Phi'_I = (\Phi_i \setminus \{R_j(\dots, a, \dots   \text{cond}_j)\}) \cup R_j(\dots, a, \dots   \text{cond}_j \wedge (a \text{ cop } c))$ $\Phi'_Q = \Phi_Q \setminus \{op_i\}$
<b>Rule (2):</b> $op_i = \bowtie_{R_j.a \text{ cop } R_k.b}$ where $a$ and $b$ are attributes of tables $R_j$ and $R_k$ respectively and $cop$ is a comparison operator.	$\Phi'_I = (\Phi_i \setminus \{R_j(\dots, a, \dots   \text{cond}_j), R_k(\dots, b, \dots   \text{cond}_k)\}) \cup R_j(\dots, a, \dots   \text{cond}_j \wedge (a \text{ cop } R_k.b)) \cup R_k(\dots, b, \dots   \text{cond}_k \wedge (T_j.a \text{ cop } b))$ $\Phi'_Q = \Phi_Q \setminus \{op_i\}$
<b>Rule (3):</b> $Q = Q_1 \setminus R_2$ , where $Q_1$ is a subquery without difference and $R_2$ is a base relation. Furthermore, $Q$ only contains one difference.	$\Phi'_I = \Phi_I \cup \{\beta R_2(\text{getCTuple}(\setminus, \Phi).a_1, \dots, \text{getCTuple}(\setminus, \Phi).a_n, \text{getCTuple}(\setminus, \Phi).\text{cond})\}$ $\Phi'_Q = \Phi_Q \setminus \{op_i\}$
<b>Rule (4):</b> $Q_1 \setminus Q_2$ , where $Q_1$ and $Q_2$ are both queries without difference. Furthermore, $Q$ only contains one difference.	let $v = Q_2(D)$ , i.e., let $v$ be the view defined by $Q_2$ over $D$ . Then, we apply the same derivation rule as in the previous case (i.e., Rule (3)), with the difference that we have $v$ instead of $R_2$ .

Table 1: Derivation rules

certain that it is not responsible for pruning  $e$  from the result. If, on the contrary, we know that this operator is a culprit, we assign it the blocking annotation. In all other cases, we declare it as ambiguous.

**DEFINITION 12 (ANNOTATED GENERIC WITNESS).** An annotated generic witness is a generic witness  $\Phi$  where each c-tuple in  $\Phi_I$  and each operator in  $\Phi_Q$  is assigned an annotation. The set of possible annotations is the set  $\{(A), (B), (P)\}$ , standing for *ambiguous*, *blocking*, and *passing*, respectively.

*Conseil* first canonicalizes its input query  $Q$  into its canonical tree representation  $T$ . If query  $Q$  contains a set difference, we split the query into the left and the right subtree of the set difference. On the right subtree  $v$ , we call the function *annotate* (described below) and, since we are in the negative part of the set difference, we revert passing annotations to blocking and vice versa. To correctly determine passing properties, we register the output of the subquery  $v$  over  $D$  (denoted  $v(D)$ ) to  $V$ 's topmost operator. We then process the left subtree, again calling *annotate* and return the final annotated canonical tree  $T_A$ .

In discussing *annotate*, we invite the reader to follow the discussion on Fig. 2. We assume a function  $\text{getCTuple}(R, \Phi)$  that extracts the c-tuple in the generic witness  $\Phi$  that imposes constraints on relation  $R$ . We use this function to identify tuples in  $R$  compatible with the returned c-tuple. The compatible source tuples in our example are underlined in Fig. 2. We also show annotations. Essentially, a source relation is passing if at least one compatible tuple is found and blocking otherwise.

Compatible tuples are subsequently traced in a bottom-up fashion through  $T$ . In Fig. 2, edge labels show the trace of compatible tuples or, in case a compatible tuple is “lost” at a query operator, an “invented” c-tuple standing in as a place-holder for the lost compatible tuple (marked with\*). Tracing such fictive tuples ensures that we can identify further operators responsible for pruning other compatible data. Based on this trace, a query operator is passing if every compatible input tuple has a corresponding compatible output tuple. On the other hand, it is blocking if the compatible input tuple violates a q-constraint of the operator. In all other cases, we assign the annotation ambiguous.

Tab. 2 summarizes the annotated generic witness, whose annotations equal the annotations of corresponding nodes of  $T_A$ .

## 4.3 Step 3: Derivation Computation

During derivation computation, *Conseil* refines the hybrid explanation pattern given by the generic witness by determining a set of patterns, called *derivations*.

Instance-based part	Query-based part
<b>Annotated generic witness</b>	
$\{R(a,?)\mathbb{P}, S(?,c)\mathbb{P}, T(?,?,?,d)\mathbb{B}, U(?,?)\mathbb{P}\}$	$\{\bowtie_{R.B=S.B}\mathbb{A}, \bowtie_{R.B=T.B}\mathbb{P}, \bowtie_{U.A=T.A}\mathbb{A}, \sigma_{U.B=u}\mathbb{P}, \sigma_{S.C=c}\mathbb{B}, \setminus\mathbb{P}\}$
<b>Derivations</b>	
$\{R(a,v_B)\mathbb{A}, S(?,c)\mathbb{P}, T(?,v_B,?,d)\mathbb{B}, U(?,u)\mathbb{A}, \exists v(a,c',d')\mathbb{P}\}$	$\{\bowtie_{R.B=S.B}\mathbb{A}, \bowtie_{U.A=T.A}\mathbb{A}, \sigma_{S.C=c}\mathbb{B}\}$
$\{R(a,v_B)\mathbb{A}, S(v_B,c)\mathbb{A}, T(?,v_B,?,d)\mathbb{B}, U(?,u)\mathbb{A}, \exists v(a,c',d')\mathbb{P}\}$	$\{\bowtie_{U.A=T.A}\mathbb{A}, \sigma_{S.C=c}\mathbb{B}\}$
$\{R(a,v_B)\mathbb{A}, S(?,c)\mathbb{P}, T(v_A,v_B,?,d)\mathbb{B}, U(v_A,u)\mathbb{A}, \exists v(a,c',d')\mathbb{P}\}$	$\{\bowtie_{R.B=S.B}\mathbb{A}, \sigma_{S.C=c}\mathbb{B}\}$
$\{R(a,v_B)\mathbb{A}, S(v_B,c)\mathbb{A}, T(v_A,v_B,?,d)\mathbb{B}, U(v_A,u)\mathbb{A}, \exists v(a,c',d')\mathbb{P}\}$	$\{\sigma_{S.C=c}\mathbb{B}\}$
<b>Explanations</b>	
$\{\circ R(a,b), \circ S(?,c), +T(?,b,?,d), \circ U(a,u)\}$	$\{\bowtie_{R.B=S.B}, \bowtie_{U.A=T.A}, \sigma_{S.C=c}\}$
$\{\circ R(a,b), +S(b,c), +T(?,b,?,d), \circ U(a,u)\}$	$\{\bowtie_{U.A=T.A}, \sigma_{S.C=c}\}$
$\{\circ R(a,b), \circ S(?,c), +T(a,b,?,d), \circ U(a,u)\}$	$\{\bowtie_{R.B=S.B}, \sigma_{S.C=c}\}$
$\{\circ R(a,b), +S(b,c), +T(a,b,?,d), \circ U(a,u)\}$	$\{\sigma_{S.C=c}\}$

**Table 2: Generic witness, derivations, and explanations for scenario of Ex. 9**

Given a generic witness  $\Phi = (\{t_1, \dots, t_n\}, \{op_1, \dots, op_m\})$  for an SPJD-query, where  $t_i = R_i(a_1, \dots, a_{n_i}, cond)$  and  $op \in \{\sigma, \bowtie, \setminus\}$ , we determine a derivation  $\Phi' = (\Phi_I, \Phi'_Q)$  by applying the derivation rules summarized in Tab. 1. In general, derivation is an iterative process that transfers one q-constraint of  $op_i \in \Phi_Q$  into an mt-constraint in  $\Phi_I$ .

We first apply the derivation rules to translate all passing operators of  $T_A$  into mt-constraints and corresponding c-tuples to be added to  $\Phi_I$ . The intuition behind this is that a passing operator will never contribute to a the query-based component of a hybrid explanation. However, the conditions making it passing need to be satisfied by any instance-based component of a hybrid explanation. We apply the same idea to ambiguous operators next. However, as these operators stand for the possibility that the operator can be either passing or blocking, we create a derivation corresponding to each case. In general, assuming  $k$  is the number of ambiguous operators in  $T_A$ , there exist  $2^k$  derivations. These derivations can be computed inductively in  $2^k$  steps. Note that derivations also include annotations. These can be easily deduced during the derivation procedure based on a set of rules (omitted due to space constraints).

We can conceptually extend our derivation procedure to general relational queries involving more than one set difference operator. However, for *Conseil*, we exclude this case, because for generating actual explanations in the next step of the algorithm, we have to solve the view-update problem where updates are tuple deletions, for which solutions limit to conjunctive queries [3].

When dealing with queries involving union operators, we have seen that these will result in multiple generic witnesses, i.e., one for each subquery. In this case, we perform derivation for each produced generic witness. As for aggregation, we push conditions that apply to an aggregated result (e.g.,  $\sigma_{MAX(R.Rating \leq 2)}$ ) either into the c-tuples belonging to the grouped and aggregated sub-query (for MIN and MAX) or to *agg* itself (for COUNT, SUM, AVG). The reason for this differentiation lies in the fact that we do not actually want to update the source, and an explanation inserting or deleting a possibly large number of tuples just to match a certain count, sum, or average score is more difficult to interpret than just telling “there is a count, but it does not match your expectation”.

**EXAMPLE 12.** *The derivations shown in Tab. 2 correspond to the derivation of all passing operators (line 1),  $\bowtie_{R.B=S.B}$  (line 2),  $\bowtie_{R.B=T.B}$  (line 3), and finally both joins (line 4).*

#### 4.4 Step 4: Explanation Computation

In its final step, *Conseil* computes, for each derivation, a corresponding hybrid explanation with minimal cost. We first focus on determining the label assignment of the instance-based component of each derivation.

Given a derivation  $d$ , we preprocess it such that all unambiguous label assignments are determined beforehand. More specifically, we assign the label  $\circ$  to all non-existential c-tuples (tuples not pre-

ceded by  $\exists$  in the  $d$ ) that are passing. On the other hand, if they are blocking, they are assigned the  $+$ -label. For the existential c-tuple (if any), we can remove it from the derivation’s instance-based part if it is passing. If it is either ambiguous or blocking, we compute its lineage w.r.t. the view  $v$ . If the lineage is empty, it can be removed as well, otherwise, we assign it the  $-$ -label.

As a result of pre-processing, only ambiguous non-existential c-tuples remain to be further processed. The first step of this processing is to form clusters of relations for a given derivation  $d$ , where each cluster corresponds to the non-labeled relations of a connected component of the join graph of the instance-based component.

**EXAMPLE 13.** *For the last derivation in Tab. 2, preprocessing results in the partial c-tuple label assignment  $\{R(a',v_B), S(v_B, c'), +T(v_A, v_B, ?, d'), U(v_A, u)\}$  and the clusters  $\{R, S\}$  and  $\{U\}$ .*

For each cluster, we first establish a partial order of relations in a cluster based on a cost model (details omitted due to space constraints). More specifically, each relation  $X$  has one associated  $maxCost(X)$  and  $minCost(X)$ .  $maxCost(X)$  quantifies the estimated worst case cost of modifying  $D$  in order to satisfy the constraints described by the c-tuple on  $X$  whereas  $minCost(X)$  quantifies the cost of reusing existing data in  $D$  (that already satisfies the constraints). Based on this partial order, we span a binary search tree where a node  $N$  represents a relation and whose two edges to children have labels  $\circ$  and  $+$ , respectively, standing for the two possible label-assignments for the c-tuple of the relation  $N$  represents. The root node corresponds to the relation with maximum  $maxCost$  and its child nodes correspond to the next relation as determined by our order relation. The same applies for all subsequent levels. Using a branch-and-bound algorithm, we traverse this search-space and prune sub-trees if possible to eventually determine an instance-based component of a hybrid explanation with minimal cost.

The query-based component retains all query operators of the derivation’s query-based component whose q-constraints are not satisfied by the determined instance-based component. The final minimal-cost hybrid explanations for our running example are summarized in Tab. 2.

## 5. EVALUATION

We implemented *Conseil*, Artemis [12], and Why-Not [4] in Java 1.6.. We ran all experiments on a Windows 7 installation running on a 1.7 GHz Intel Core i5 MacBook Air with 2 MB of main memory. We used a local installation of Postgres 9.2 as database system. As described in [4], lineage tracing relies on the Trio system (<http://infolab.stanford.edu/trio/>), which we also used in our implementation. For Artemis, we additionally uses Minion (available at <http://minion.sourceforge.net>).

We report results on an excerpt of our test queries, summarized in Tab. 3. We selected these queries as they are supported by all

Name	Expression
CRIME1	$\Pi_{p.name,c.type} (p \bowtie_{p.hair=sp.hair \wedge p.clothes=sp.clothes} sp \bowtie_{sp.witness=w.name} w \bowtie_{w.sector=c.sector} sector)$
CRIME2	$\Pi_{p.name} (\sigma_{c.sector>97} (c) \bowtie_{c.sector=w.sector} w \bowtie_{w.name=sp.witness} sp \bowtie_{sp.hair=p.hair \wedge sp.clothes=p.clothes} p)$
MOV2	$\Pi_{loc.loc1} (\sigma_{l.year>1994} (l) \bowtie_{l.mid=rel.mid} rel \bowtie_{rel.lid=loc.lid} loc \bowtie_{l.title=r.title} \sigma_{r.rating>9} (r))$
GOV1	$\Pi_{e.agency,e.bureau,e.title,e.desc,e.totalamount,es.substage} (e \bowtie_{e.eid=es.eid} es \bowtie_{es.sid=s.sid} (\sigma_{s.ln='Pelosi'} (s) \cup \sigma_{s.ln=X} (s)))$
GOV3	$\Pi_{c.ln,c.fn,s.competed,s.name,s.state} (\sigma_{s.dollarsOblicated>10000} (s) \bowtie_{s.state=a.state} a \bowtie_{a.id=c.id} c)$

Table 3: Queries used for evaluation

three algorithms. The queries originate from three different scenarios. The first scenario reuses the crime scenario used to evaluate Why-Not in [4]. The two other scenarios are based on real-world data from the movie and government domains [11]. To obtain competitive runtimes for Artemis, we added trust conditions on all but one table in all scenarios where necessary (i.e., all but MOV2).

**Runtime comparison.** From the results reported in Tab. 4, we see that both Why-Not and *Conseil* outperform Artemis and allow for interactive query debugging. The reason for this is that Artemis computes all possible instance-based explanations and needs to consider a large amount of alternatives. Opposed to that, both Why-Not and *Conseil* limit the result to the “best” explanations, providing a substantial advantage when considering runtime. Focusing on the relative performance of Why-Not and *Conseil*, we see that *Conseil* is slower than Why-Not in CRIME2, MOV2, and GOV3. Upon further analysis, we explain this based on the fact that in these cases, Why-Not stops very early in the process when the culprit operator is detected closely to the leaf nodes of the query tree, whereas *Conseil* performs more computations, as it also checks for possible culprit operators at higher levels by “inventing” c-tuples at the output of the first culprit operator. In CRIME1 and GOV1, *Conseil* is faster than Why-Not, as the just mentioned additional processing *Conseil* requires is compensated by the time Why-Not spends on computing the lineage of data in  $Q(D)$  that is excluded from the data traced through the query.

**Qualitative discussion.** To briefly address the question of explanation quality, we report in Tab. 4 the number of explanations each algorithm returns. We observe that Artemis is not only slower than other algorithms, it also often produces too many instance-based explanations that may overwhelm the user. For CRIME1, we observe that Artemis returns no results, which is due to the fact that the crime to laugh is not present in the database, but it cannot be inserted by an instance-based explanation due to the trust condition on table  $c$  (the crime relation). This would also cause zero query-based explanations for Why-Not, if the first join of the canonical tree representation was a join involving this table. However, in our implementation, the join between  $p$  and  $sp$  comes first, which happens to also be a culprit operator (it filters the person named Roger). Opposed to that, *Conseil* returns two explanations. The first adds label  $+$  to c-tuples on  $sp$ ,  $w$ , and  $c$ , describing that both the crime  $c$  of laughing and a witness  $w$  that observed  $c$  (as described in table  $sp$ ) are missing. The second explanation corresponds to a hybrid explanation that identifies both the missing crime being witnessed (i.e.,  $+c$  and  $+w$ ) and the failing join between  $p$  and  $sp$ . Another interesting query is GOV3, where Why-Not does not return any result as necessary source data is missing, i.e., the state “CA” (which is “California” in the database). In all other cases, *Conseil* covers the query-based explanation of Why-Not as well as one (minimal-cost) instance-based explanation of Artemis.

## 6. CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

We presented *Conseil*, an algorithm that explains why data are

Query	Missing-answer	Artemis	Why-Not	<i>Conseil</i>
CRIME1	(Roger, Laugh)	2.2s / 0	2.7s / 1	1.5s / 2
CRIME2	(Conedera)	11.9s / 424	0.5s / 1	1.8s / 2
MOV2	(Germany)	6.1s / 27	0.5s / 1	1.2s / 2
GOV1	(Edu, ?, ?, ?, $v_4$ , Enacted, $v_4 \neq NULL$ )	3.3s / 2	1.5s / 1	1.1s / 2
GOV3	(Pelosi, Nancy, ?, CA)	27.3s / 854	0.5s / 0	4.6s / 2

Table 4: Runtime (s) and #explanations for different algorithms

missing from a query result using novel hybrid explanations. Opposed to previous work, *Conseil* also considers queries including set difference. We first set the theoretical foundation by providing a general framework to address the problem of explaining missing-answers. We then concentrated on defining *Conseil* to compute hybrid-explanations in four phases, namely generic witness computation, passing property annotation, derivation, and explanation generation. Experiments demonstrated that *Conseil* combines fast runtime with an explanation quality superior to explanations produced by other algorithms.

Next, we plan to consider side-effects and more general debugging scenarios. We also plan to further study efficiency improvements and cost models and to make a more thorough usability study.

**Acknowledgements.** Fundamental ideas of the *Conseil* algorithm have been developed in collaboration with Tim Belhomme. I also thank Hanno Eichelberger for his implementation work. Finally, I thank the Baden-Württemberg Stiftung for the financial support of this research project by the Eliteprogramme for Postdocs.

## 7. REFERENCES

- [1] F. Bancilhon and N. Spyratos. Update semantics of relational views. *ACM Transactions on Database Systems (TODS)*, 6(4):557–575, 1981.
- [2] J. Bleiholder, S. Szott, M. Herschel, F. Kaufner, and F. Naumann. Subsumption and complementation as data fusion operators. In *International Conference on Extending Database Technology (EDBT)*, pages 513–524, 2010.
- [3] P. Buneman, S. Khanna, and W. C. Tan. On propagation of deletions and annotations through views. In *Symposium on Principles of Database Systems (PODS)*, pages 150–158, 2002.
- [4] A. Chapman and H. V. Jagadish. Why not? In *International Conference on the Management of Data (SIGMOD)*, pages 523–534, 2009.
- [5] J. Cheney, L. Chiticariu, and W. C. Tan. Provenance in databases: Why, how, and where. *Foundations and Trends in Databases*, 1(4), 2009.
- [6] Y. Cui, J. Widom, and J. L. Wiener. Tracing the lineage of view data in a warehousing environment. *ACM Transactions on Database Systems (TODS)*, 25(2):179 – 227, 2000.
- [7] J. Danaparamita and W. Gatterbauer. QueryViz: helping users understand SQL queries and their patterns. In *International Conference on Extending Database Technology (EDBT)*, pages 558–561, 2011.
- [8] C. A. Galindo-Legaria. Outerjoins as disjunctions. In *International Conference on the Management of Data (SIGMOD)*, pages 348–358, 1994.
- [9] T. Grust and J. Rittinger. Observing sql queries in their natural habitat (preprint). *ACM Transactions on Database Systems (TODS)*, 0(0), 2012.
- [10] Z. He and E. Lo. Answering why-not questions on top-k queries. In *International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*, pages 750–761, 2012.
- [11] M. Herschel and H. Eichelberger. The Nautilus Analyzer: understanding and debugging data transformations. In *International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM)*, pages 2731–2733, 2012.
- [12] M. Herschel and M. A. Hernández. Explaining missing answers to SPJUA queries. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment (PVLDB)*, 3(1):185–196, 2010.
- [13] J. Huang, T. Chen, A. Doan, and J. F. Naughton. On the provenance of non-answers to queries over extracted data. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment (PVLDB)*, 1(1):736–747, 2008.
- [14] T. Imieliński and J. Witold Lipski. Incomplete information in relational databases. *Journal of the ACM*, 31(4):761–791, 1984.
- [15] N. Khousainova, Y. Kwon, M. Balazinska, and D. Suciu. SnipSuggest: Context-aware autocompletion for SQL. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment (PVLDB)*, 4(1):22–33, 2010.
- [16] A. Meliou, W. Gatterbauer, K. F. Moore, and D. Suciu. The complexity of causality and responsibility for query answers and non-answers. *Proceedings of the VLDB (PVLDB)*, 4(1):34 – 45, 2010.
- [17] A. Nandi and H. V. Jagadish. Guided interaction: Rethinking the query-result paradigm. *Proceedings of the VLDB (PVLDB)*, 4(12):1466–1469, 2011.
- [18] Q. T. Tran and C.-Y. Chan. How to ConQueR why-not questions. In *International Conference on the Management of Data (SIGMOD)*, pages 15 – 26, 2010.