

## CSE 636: Test #2 (due 12/13/11)

Submit all the answers as a **single pdf file**, using `submit_cse636`. This is **individual work**. Duplicate solutions will be considered violations of academic integrity. Please write your name and the text **“The submitted solutions are my individual work.”** at the beginning of the submitted file.

### Problem 1 (10 pts)

Two databases, DA and DB, are defined as follows:

- **DA:** There are two relations  $EmpName(SSN, Name, Addr)$  and  $EmpDept(SSN, DeptName)$ , with  $SSN$  being the key in both.
- **DB:** There are as many relations as there are departments. Each of them has a schema of the form  $X(SSN, Name)$ . A tuple  $(s, n)$  is in the relation  $X$  if and only if a tuple  $(s, n, a)$  is in  $EmpName$  for some  $a$ , and the tuple  $(s, X)$  is in  $EmpDept$ . The first attribute is the key in both relations.

To do:

- Define in FISQL the mappings between the databases DA and DB (in both directions).
- **Extra credit:** Show a database C containing a single relation in which there is a column for every department. This column assumes *true* values for the employees working in that department; otherwise it is *null*. Define in FISQL the mappings between the databases DB and DC (in both directions).

### Problem 2 (10 pts)

The source database has 3 relations:

- $Faculty(EmpSSN, EmpName, Rank)$ ;
- $Staff(EmpSSN, EmpName, Level)$ ;
- $Dependent(EmpSSN, DepSSN, DepName, Status)$  where  $Status$  is equal to 1 for the spouse and 2 for a child.

The target database has 2 relations:

- $EmpSpouse(EmpSSN, EmpName, SpouseName)$ ;
- $EmpChildren(EmpSSN, ChildName, Age)$ ,

and 2 integrity constraints:

- $EmpSpouse$ :  $EmpSSN \rightarrow EmpName \ SpouseName$ ;
- $EmpChildren$ :  $EmpSSN$  is a foreign key referencing  $EmpSpouse(SSN)$ .

1. Define the appropriate source-to-target dependencies.
2. You are given a source instance consisting of the following facts:  $Faculty(123, mark, full)$ ,  $Staff(456, frank, 11)$ ,  $Dependent(123, 999, julie, 1)$ ,  $Dependent(333, 321, bill, 2)$ :
  - Compute a corresponding universal target instance.
  - What are the certain answers for the following queries: (a)  $EmpSpouse(x, y, z)$ , (b)  $\exists y, z. EmpSpouse(x, y, z)$ ?
3. Show a source instance for which there is no corresponding universal target instance.

### Problem 3 (10 pts)

Suppose you are given a relation  $R(A, B)$ .

1. Write down the integrity constraint stating that  $R$  is symmetric in logical notation.
2. Rewrite the query  $Q = R(x, y)$  to a query that computes all the consistent answers to  $Q$ .
3. Consider the instance  $r = \{(1, 2), (2, 3), (3, 2)\}$  of  $R$ . What are the repairs of  $r$  with respect to the given integrity constraint? What is the set of consistent answers to  $Q$  w.r.t. the constraint in  $r$ ?
4. **Extra credit.** Consider the same questions if, additionally, there is a key constraint on  $A$ .

### Problem 4 (20 pts)

Definitions:

- A knowledge base KB (TBox + ABox) is *satisfiable* if there is an interpretation that satisfies it.
- A knowledge KB *implies* an assertion A if every interpretation that satisfies KB also satisfies A.

(A) You have the following ontology:

There are two kinds of entities: movies and persons, mutually disjoint. Movies are directed by (single) persons and star zero or more actors.

1. Express this ontology as a satisfiable description logic knowledge-base KB. Explain why it is satisfiable.
2. Which axioms of KB can be expressed in (a) RDF/RDFS, (b) DL-Lite?
3. Define the following notions in description logics:
  - *actor, director*;
  - *actor that starred only in movies directed by Spielberg*;
  - *movie in which Orson Welles was both actor and director*.
4. Add axioms and assertions to KB to make the resulting knowledge-base unsatisfiable.
5. Using the assertions in KB, rewrite the following query:

$$q_0(x) \leftarrow Person(x).$$

**Extra credit.** Express KB using first-order logic.

**Extra credit:** Consider the knowledge base consisting of the following Description Logic ABox:

*Inherits(eve, mark).*  
*Inherits(mark, jean).*  
*Inherits(eve, jean).*  
*Inherits(jean, marie).*  
*French(mark).*  
*¬French(marie).*

Does this knowledge base imply the following fact:

$$eve \in (\exists Inherits.(French \sqcap \exists Inherits. \neg French))?$$

*Explain your answers in detail using the formal semantics of description logics.*