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ABSTRACT
SPARQL est un langage de requêtes sur les graphes RDF standardisé par le W3C. Depuis sa version 1.1, SPARQL autorise les expressions de chemin (Property Paths) et ces expressions posent de nouveaux défis aux moteurs SPARQL. En effet, en tant qu’expressions régulières, les expressions de chemin peuvent être récursives. Or l’optimisation des requêtes récursives reste un défi tant dans le monde relationnel que dans celui du web des données.

Nous avons introduit une algèbre inspirée par l’algèbre relationnelle et par l’algèbre SPARQL ainsi qu’une traduction depuis SPARQL vers cette algèbre. Nous avons ensuite équipé cette algèbre d’un schéma de réécriture : étant donné une requête SPARQL on peut alors la traduire dans notre algèbre puis générer de nombreux termes équivalents qui sont alors vus comme de possibles plans d’exécution de la requête SPARQL initiale.

Enfin, nous avons montré que nos schémas de réécritures considèrent des plans d’exécution qui ne sont pas considérés par les méthodes existantes et avons validé ce résultat expérimentalement : nous avons implémenté un évaluateur de requêtes SPARQL basé sur cette algèbre et mettant en place cette méthode. L’efficacité de notre prototype montre l’intérêt de notre approche.

1 INTRODUCTION
In the recent years, we have seen an unprecedented development of heterogeneous data formats and stores. A major challenge consists in querying datasets that are not only increasingly large, but that also come from numerous sources with different data models. It would thus be very desirable to have a common language capable of handling the diversity of data formats while allowing optimization of the querying phase especially across query languages.

SQL has long been viewed as such a common language for querying data represented as relational tables. SQL stores are very popular, well optimized, and many of the NoSQL query languages can be translated to SQL. However, for structurally rich data models such as graphs and trees, SQL has not proved to be the ideal candidate, and so far optimization techniques from the relational world hardly carry over languages such as SPARQL [4, 7]. While SQL might not be the perfect candidate, we postulate that it is possible to extend

or adapt relational algebra for other purposes and benefit from the massive amount of research invested in it.

2 PROPOSED CONTRIBUTION
We propose a new algebra, µ-algebra, inspired by works on the relational algebra, SQL and NoSQL languages (especially SPARQL) along with a prototype implementation of a SPARQL optimizer based on this algebra1. Our algebra has the following properties:

(1) It subsumes the SPARQL Algebra (under the set semantics) with a more general recursion.
(2) SPARQL with Property Paths can be efficiently translated to this algebra.
(3) We have a type system and rewriting rules for terms of this algebra that allow optimization, notably of terms involving recursion.

In this paper we illustrate the differences and the benefits of our approach on recursive query optimization. While a generic approach often comes at the cost of performance, we experimentally show that this approach actually leads to more efficient evaluation of queries with Property Paths. We also show that our approach produces Query Execution Plans (QEP) that are not considered by other existing approaches.

3 COMPARISON WITH OTHER APPROACHES
The optimized evaluation of SPARQL is a well studied especially for the BGP fragment. The evaluation of recursive queries is also a well studied subject. In this section we propose to compare our approach to various lines of work that have tackled the subject from the more ad-hoc, tailored for SPARQL to very general approaches.

3.1 Competitors
Jena ARQ. Jena ARQ2 is a sparql query evaluator. Jena evaluates the queries in the order of the query. In our benchmark (see figure 1) we compare thus the two orders (ARQ1 is quadratic and ARQ2 linear) but the size of the stack breaks the JVM for n=3000.

The relational algebra. The relational algebra introduced by Codd built the foundations of our work. The relational algebra differs from our work in several points. The two most salient ones being

1https://gitlab.inria.fr/jachiet/musparql
2https://jena.apache.org/
that the relational algebra works on a fixed domain and that it is not equipped with a fixpoint operator.

There have been attempts[1] to extend the relational algebra. With an operator \( \alpha \) representing recursive queries (if \( R \) is a binary relation \( \alpha(R) \) is the transitive closure of \( R \)). Or with a special join reachability \( a \bowtie b \) (equivalent to \( a \bowtie \alpha(a) \)).

However, if these operators are sufficient to represent SPARQL, they do not allow for a plan space as large as our \( \mu \)-algebra. For instance, on the query \( ?a \text{ knows} \{ \text{childOf} [ f \text{ friendOf} ] \} \cdot ?b \), then these approaches will need to compute the whole \( \text{knows/childOf/friendOf} \) in order to compute the transitive closure (which might be very large in comparison with the set of actual solutions when e.g. \(?a\) is conditioned by some other triple pattern).

SQL. SQL is based on the relational algebra. Both have been extensively studied either for themselves or in the context of SPARQL query evaluation. However using SQL for the optimization of SPARQL has not been very successful[4, 7] (even without recursion).

The SQL’99 standard includes Recursive Common Table Expressions (CTE). Recursive CTE are a very broad kind of recursive queries, broader than what is allowed in the alpha-extended. However not all SQL databases support recursive CTE and vendors generally consider CTE as “optimization fences”. We benchmarked several SQL stores in our benchmark comparison but they behavior is quadratic on queries where our prototype has a nice linear behavior.

Waveguide. Waveguide[12] introduced Waveguide Plans (WGP) allowing the optimized evaluation of Property Paths. WGP mix together \( \alpha \)-plans (which are plans based on the \( \alpha \)-extended relational algebra) and FA-plans (which are based on automata). Waveguide translates one PP at a time which means the method is not capable of optimizing across multiple TP. For instance given 3 TP: \( (?a \text{ knows} \cdot ?b), (\text{?b lastname Doe}), (\text{?b firstname John}) \) Waveguide computes the whole \( \text{knows} \) even on a single triple pattern it does not consider all the plans that our approach considers.

Datalog. Finally, a major line of research to tackle recursive queries is datalog. There has been translations from SPARQL 1.0 to datalog[10]. The optimization and fast execution of datalog on graph data is a challenge due to the expressive power of datalog and its logic-based form[3]. The translation SPARQL 1.1 with Property Paths to datalog seems to raise no particular issue even though we have not found any attempt in the literature therefore we hand-translated recursive queries.

3.2 Benchmark

We benchmarked the query composed of the two triple patterns \( ?a \text{ knows} \cdot ?b \) and \( ?b \text{ lastname Doe} \) on the following system: postgresql and sqlite for SQL, datalog and dlv for Datalog and Jena ARQ. Waveguide is not publicly available thus not tested. The results are in figure 1 and demonstrate that our approach is the one that is not quadratic in the size of the graph in all cases.
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