

Computing expected multiplicities for bag-TIDBs with bounded multiplicities

Su Feng ✉

Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, USA

Boris Glavic ✉

Illinois Institute of Technology, USA

Aaron Huber ✉

University at Buffalo, USA

Oliver Kennedy ✉

University at Buffalo, USA

Atri Rudra ✉

University at Buffalo, USA

Abstract

In this work, we study the problem of computing a tuple’s expected multiplicity over probabilistic databases with bag semantics (where each tuple is associated with a multiplicity) exactly and approximately. We consider bag-TIDBs where we have a bound c on the maximum multiplicity of each tuple and tuples are independent probabilistic events (we refer to such databases as c -TIDBs). We are specifically interested in the fine-grained complexity of computing expected multiplicities and how it compares to the complexity of deterministic query evaluation algorithms — if these complexities are comparable, it opens the door to practical deployment of probabilistic databases. Unfortunately, our results imply that computing expected multiplicities for c -TIDBs based on the results produced by such query evaluation algorithms introduces super-linear overhead (under parameterized complexity hardness assumptions/conjectures). We proceed to study approximation of expected result tuple multiplicities for positive relational algebra queries (\mathcal{RA}^+) over c -TIDBs and for a non-trivial subclass of block-independent databases (BIDBs). We develop a sampling algorithm that computes a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation of the expected multiplicity of an output tuple in time linear in the runtime of the corresponding deterministic query for any \mathcal{RA}^+ query.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Information systems → Incomplete data

Keywords and phrases PDB, bags, polynomial, boolean formula, etc.

Digital Object Identifier 10.4230/LIPIcs.CVIT.2016.23

1 Introduction

This work explores the problem of computing the expectation of the multiplicity of a tuple in the result of a query over a c -TIDB, a type of probabilistic database with bag semantics where the multiplicity of a tuple is a random variable with range $[0, c]$ for some fixed constant c and multiplicities assigned to any two tuples are independent of each other. Formally, a c -TIDB, $\mathcal{D} = (\{0, \dots, c\}^D, \mathcal{P})$ consists of a set of tuples D and a probability distribution \mathcal{P} over all possible worlds generated by assigning each tuple $t \in D$ a multiplicity in the range $[0, c]$. Any such world can be encoded as a vector from $\{0, \dots, c\}^D$, the set of all vectors of length $n = |D|$ such that each index corresponds to a distinct $t \in D$ storing its multiplicity. A given world $\mathbf{W} \in \{0, \dots, c\}^D$ can be interpreted as follows: for each $t \in D$, \mathbf{W}_t is the multiplicity of t in \mathbf{W} . Given that the multiplicities of tuples are independent events, the probability distribution \mathcal{P} can be expressed compactly by assigning each tuple a (disjoint) probability distribution over $[0, c]$. Let $p_{t,j}$ denote the probability that tuple t is assigned multiplicity j . The probability of a particular world \mathbf{W} is then $\prod_{t \in D} p_{t, \mathbf{W}_t}$.



© Aaron Huber, Oliver Kennedy, Atri Rudra, Su Feng, Boris Glavic;
licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY 4.0

42nd Conference on Very Important Topics (CVIT 2016).

Editors: John Q. Open and Joan R. Access; Article No. 23; pp. 23:1–23:54

Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics



LIPICs Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany

45 Allowing for $\leq c$ multiplicities across all tuples gives rise to having $\leq (c+1)^n$ possible
 46 worlds instead of the usual 2^n possible worlds of a 1-TIDB, which (assuming set query
 47 semantics), is the same as the traditional set TIDB. In this work, since we are generally
 48 considering bag query input, we will only be considering bag query semantics. We denote by
 49 $Q(\mathbf{W})(t)$ the multiplicity of t in query Q over possible world $\mathbf{W} \in \{0, \dots, c\}^D$.

50 We can formally state our problem of computing the expected multiplicity of a result
 51 tuple as:

52 ► **Problem 1.1.** *Given a c -TIDB $\mathcal{D} = (\{0, \dots, c\}^D, \mathcal{P})$, \mathcal{RA}^+ query¹ Q , and result tuple t ,*
 53 *compute the expected multiplicity of t : $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{W} \sim \mathcal{P}} [Q(\mathbf{W})(t)]$.*

54 It is natural to explore computing the expected multiplicity of a result tuple as this is the
 55 analog for computing the marginal probability of a tuple in a set PDB. In this work we will
 56 assume that $c = O(1)$ since this is what is typically seen in practice. Allowing for unbounded
 57 c is an interesting open problem.

58 **Hardness of Set Query Semantics and Bag Query Semantics.** Set query evaluation
 59 semantics over 1-TIDBs have been studied extensively, and the data complexity of the
 60 problem in general has been shown by Dalvi and Suicu to be #P-hard [14]. For our setting,
 61 there exists a trivial polytime algorithm to compute Problem 1.1 for any \mathcal{RA}^+ query over a
 62 c -TIDB due to linearity of expectation (see Sec. 1.1). Since we can compute Problem 1.1 in
 63 polynomial time, the interesting question that we explore deals with analyzing the hardness
 64 of computing expectation using fine-grained analysis and parameterized complexity, where
 65 we are interested in the exponent of polynomial runtime.

66 Specifically, in this work we ask if Problem 1.1 can be solved in time linear in the runtime
 67 of an analogous deterministic query which we make more precise shortly. If this is true,
 68 then this would open up the way for deployment of c -TIDBs in practice. To analyze this
 69 question we denote by $T^*(Q, \mathcal{D})$ the optimal runtime complexity of computing Problem 1.1
 70 over c -TIDB \mathcal{D} .

71 Let $T_{det}(Q, \overline{D}, c)$ (see Sec. 2.4 for further details) denote the runtime for query Q ,
 72 deterministic database \overline{D} , and multiplicity bound c . This paper considers \mathcal{RA}^+ queries for
 73 which order of operations is *explicit*, as opposed to other query languages, e.g. Datalog, UCQ.
 74 Thus, since order of operations affects runtime, we denote the optimized \mathcal{RA}^+ query picked
 75 by an arbitrary production system as $\text{OPT}(Q) = \min_{Q' \in \mathcal{RA}^+, Q' \equiv Q} T_{det}(Q', \overline{D}, c)$. Then
 76 $T_{det}(\text{OPT}(Q), \overline{D}, c)$ is the runtime for the optimized query.²

77 **Our lower bound results.** Our question is whether or not it is always true that $T^*(Q, \mathcal{D}) \leq$
 78 $T_{det}(\text{OPT}(Q), \overline{D}, c)$. Unfortunately this is not the case. Table 1 shows our results.

79 Specifically, depending on what hardness result/conjecture we assume, we get various
 80 weaker or stronger versions of *no* as an answer to our question. To make some sense of the
 81 other lower bounds in Table 1, we note that it is not too hard to show that $T^*(Q, \mathcal{D}) \leq$
 82 $O\left((T_{det}(\text{OPT}(Q), \overline{D}, c))^k\right)$, where k is the join width (our notion of join width follows
 83 from Definition 2.2 and Fig. 1.) of the query Q over all result tuples t (and the parameter
 84 that defines our family of hard queries).

85 What our lower bound in the third row says is that one cannot get more than a polynomial
 86 improvement over essentially the trivial algorithm for Problem 1.1. However, this result

¹ An \mathcal{RA}^+ query is a query expressed in positive relational algebra, i.e., using only the relational algebra operators selection (σ), projection (π), natural join (\bowtie) and union (\cup).

² Note that our work applies to any $Q \in \mathcal{RA}^+$, which implies that specific heuristics for choosing an optimized query can be abstracted away, i.e., our work does not consider heuristic techniques.

Lower bound on $T^*(Q_{hard}, \mathcal{D})$	Num. \mathcal{P} s	Hardness Assumption
$\Omega \left((T_{det}(\text{OPT}(Q_{hard}), D, c))^{1+\epsilon_0} \right)$ for some $\epsilon_0 > 0$	Single	Triangle Detection hypothesis
$\omega \left((T_{det}(\text{OPT}(Q_{hard}), D, c))^{C_0} \right)$ for all $C_0 > 0$	Multiple	$\#W[0] \neq \#W[1]$
$\Omega \left((T_{det}(\text{OPT}(Q_{hard}), D, c))^{c_0 \cdot k} \right)$ for some $c_0 > 0$	Multiple	Conjecture 3.2

■ **Table 1** Our lower bounds for a specific hard query Q_{hard} parameterized by k . For $\mathcal{D} = \{\{0, \dots, c\}^D, \mathcal{P}\}$ those with ‘Multiple’ in the second column need the algorithm to be able to handle multiple \mathcal{P} , i.e. probability distributions (for a given D). The last column states the hardness assumptions that imply the lower bounds in the first column (ϵ_0, C_0, c_0 are constants that are independent of k).

87 assumes a hardness conjecture that is not as well studied as those in the first two rows of
 88 the table (see Sec. 3 for more discussion on the hardness assumptions). Further, we note
 89 that existing results³ already imply the claimed lower bounds if we were to replace the
 90 $T_{det}(\text{OPT}(Q), D, c)$ by just n (indeed these results follow from known lower bounds for
 91 deterministic query processing). Our contribution is to then identify a family of hard queries
 92 where deterministic query processing is ‘easy’ but computing the expected multiplicities is
 93 hard.

94 **Our upper bound results.** We introduce a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation algorithm that
 95 computes Problem 1.1 in time $O_\epsilon(T_{det}(\text{OPT}(Q), D, c))$. This means, when we are okay
 96 with approximation, that we solve Problem 1.1 in time linear in the size of the deterministic
 97 query and bag PDBs are deployable in practice. In contrast, known approximation techniques
 98 ([38, 31]) in set-PDBs need time $\Omega(T_{det}(\text{OPT}(Q), D, c)^{2k})$ (see Appendix G). Further, our
 99 approximation algorithm works for a more general notion of bag PDBs beyond c -TIDBs (see
 100 Sec. 2.2).

101 1.1 Polynomial Equivalence

102 A common encoding of probabilistic databases (e.g., in [29, 28, 5, 2] and many others) relies
 103 on annotating tuples with lineages or propositional formulas that describe the set of possible
 104 worlds that the tuple appears in. The bag semantics analog is a provenance/lineage polynomial
 105 (see Fig. 1) $\Phi[Q, D, t]$ [26], a polynomial with non-zero integer coefficients and exponents,
 106 over variables \mathbf{X} encoding input tuple multiplicities. Evaluating a lineage polynomial for a
 107 query result tuple t_{out} by, for each tuple t_{in} , assigning the variable $X_{t_{in}}$ encoding the tuple’s
 108 multiplicity to the tuple’s multiplicity in the possible world yields the multiplicity of the t_{out}
 109 in the query result for this world.

110 We drop Q, D , and t from $\Phi[Q, D, t]$ when they are clear from the context or irrelevant to
 111 the discussion. We now specify the problem of computing the expectation of tuple multiplicity

³ This claim follows from known results for the problem of counting k -cliques, where for a query Q over database D that counts the number of k -cliques. Specifically, a lower bound of the form $\Omega(n^{1+\epsilon_0})$ for some $\epsilon_0 > 0$ follows from the triangle detection hypothesis (this like our result is for $k = 3$). Second, a lower bound of $\omega(n^{C_0})$ for all $C_0 > 0$ under the assumption $\#W[0] \neq \#W[1]$ for counting k -clique [23]. Finally, a lower bound of $\Omega(n^{c_0 \cdot k})$ for some $c_0 > 0$ was shown by [11] (under the strong exponential time hypothesis).

112 in the language of lineage polynomials:

113 ► **Problem 1.2** (Expected Multiplicity of Lineage Polynomials). *Given an \mathcal{RA}^+ query Q ,*
 114 *c -TIDB \mathcal{D} and result tuple t , compute the expected multiplicity of the polynomial $\Phi[Q, D, t]$*
 115 *(i.e., $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{W} \sim \mathcal{P}} [\Phi[Q, D, t](\mathbf{W})]$, where $\mathbf{W} \in \{0, \dots, c\}^D$).*

116 We note that computing Problem 1.1 is equivalent (yields the same result as) to computing
 117 Problem 1.2 (see Proposition 2.8).

118 All of our results rely on working with a *reduced* form $(\tilde{\Phi})$ of the lineage polynomial Φ .
 119 In fact, it turns out that for the 1-TIDB case, computing the expected multiplicity (over
 120 bag query semantics) is *exactly* the same as evaluating this reduced polynomial over the
 121 probabilities that define the 1-TIDB. This is also true when the query input(s) is a block
 122 independent disjoint probabilistic database [38] (bag query semantics with tuple multiplicity
 123 at most 1), for which the proof of Lemma 1.4 (introduced shortly) holds .

124 Next, we motivate this reduced polynomial. Consider the query Q_1 defined as follows
 125 over the bag relations of Fig. 2:

```
126 SELECT DISTINCT 1 FROM T t1, R r, T t2
127 WHERE t1.Point = r.Point1 AND t2.Point = r.Point2
128
```

It can be verified that $\Phi(A, B, C, E, X, Y, Z)$ for the sole result tuple of Q_1 is $AXB + BYE + BZC$. Now consider the product query $Q_1^2 = Q_1 \times Q_1$. The lineage polynomial for Q_1^2 is given by $\Phi_1^2(A, B, C, E, X, Y, Z)$

$$= A^2X^2B^2 + B^2Y^2E^2 + B^2Z^2C^2 + 2AXB^2YE + 2AXB^2ZC + 2B^2YEZC.$$

130 To compute $\mathbb{E}[\Phi_1^2]$ we can use linearity of expectation and push the expectation through
 131 each summand. To keep things simple, let us focus on the monomial $\Phi_1^{(ABX)^2} = A^2X^2B^2$
 132 as the procedure is the same for all other monomials of Φ_1^2 . Let W_X be the random
 133 variable corresponding to a lineage variable X . Because the distinct variables in the
 134 product are independent, we can push expectation through them yielding $\mathbb{E}[W_A^2W_X^2W_B^2] =$
 135 $\mathbb{E}[W_A^2] \mathbb{E}[W_X^2] \mathbb{E}[W_B^2]$. Since $W_A, W_B \in \{0, 1\}$ we can further derive $\mathbb{E}[W_A] \mathbb{E}[W_X^2] \mathbb{E}[W_B]$
 136 by the fact that for any $W \in \{0, 1\}$, $W^2 = W$. Observe that if $X \in \{0, 1\}$, then we
 137 further would have $\mathbb{E}[W_A] \mathbb{E}[W_X] \mathbb{E}[W_B] = p_A \cdot p_X \cdot p_B$ (denoting $Pr[W_A = 1] = p_A$)
 138 $= \tilde{\Phi}_1^{(ABX)^2}(p_A, p_X, p_B)$ (see *ii*) of Definition 1.3). However, in this example, we get stuck
 139 with $\mathbb{E}[W_X^2]$, since $W_X \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ and for $W_X \leftarrow 2$, $W_X^2 \neq W_X$.

140 Denote the variables of Φ to be $\text{VARS}(\Phi)$. In the c -TIDB setting, $\Phi(\mathbf{X})$ has an equivalent
 141 reformulation $(\Phi_R(\mathbf{X}_R))$ that is of use to us, where $|\mathbf{X}_R| = c \cdot |\mathbf{X}|$. Given $X_t \in \text{VARS}(\Phi)$

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi[\pi_A(Q), \bar{D}, t] &= \sum_{t': \pi_A(t')=t} \Phi[Q, \bar{D}, t'] & \Phi[Q_1 \cup Q_2, \bar{D}, t] &= \Phi[Q_1, \bar{D}, t] + \Phi[Q_2, \bar{D}, t] \\ \Phi[\sigma_\theta(Q), \bar{D}, t] &= \begin{cases} \Phi[Q, \bar{D}, t] & \text{if } \theta(t) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} & \Phi[Q_1 \bowtie Q_2, \bar{D}, t] &= \Phi[Q_1, \bar{D}, \pi_{\text{attr}(Q_1)}t] \\ & & & \cdot \Phi[Q_2, \bar{D}, \pi_{\text{attr}(Q_2)}t] \\ & & & \Phi[R, \bar{D}, t] = X_t \end{aligned}$$

■ **Figure 1** Construction of the lineage (polynomial) for an \mathcal{RA}^+ query Q over an arbitrary deterministic database \bar{D} , where \mathbf{X} consists of all X_t over all R in \bar{D} and t in R . Here $\bar{D}.R$ denotes the instance of relation R in \bar{D} . Please note, after we introduce the reduction to 1-BIDB, the base case will be expressed alternatively.

and integer valuation $X_t \in \{0, \dots, c\}$. We can replace X_t by $\sum_{j \in [c]} j X_{t,j}$ where the variables $(X_{t,j})_{j \in [c]}$ are disjoint with integer assignments $X_t \in \{0, 1\}$. Then for any $\mathbf{W} \in \{0, \dots, c\}^D$ and corresponding reformulated world $\mathbf{W}_R \in \{0, 1\}^{Dc}$, we set $\mathbf{W}_{R,t,j} = 1$ for $\mathbf{W}_t = j$, while $\mathbf{W}_{R,t,j'} = 0$ for all $j' \neq j \in [c]$. By construction then $\Phi(\mathbf{X}) \equiv \Phi_R(\mathbf{X}_R)$ ($\mathbf{X}_R = \text{VARS}(\Phi_R)$) since for any integer valuation $X_t \in [c]$, $X_j \in \{0, 1\}$ we have the equality $X_t = j = \sum_{j \in [c]} j X_j$.

Considering again our example,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{1,R}^{(ABX)^2}(A, X, B) &= \Phi_1^{(AXB)^2} \left(\sum_{j_1 \in [c]} j_1 A_{j_1}, \sum_{j_2 \in [c]} j_2 X_{j_2}, \sum_{j_3 \in [c]} j_3 B_{j_3} \right) \\ &= \left(\sum_{j_1 \in [c]} j_1 A_{j_1} \right)^2 \left(\sum_{j_2 \in [c]} j_2 X_{j_2} \right)^2 \left(\sum_{j_3 \in [c]} j_3 B_{j_3} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since the set of multiplicities for tuple t by nature are disjoint we can drop all cross terms and have $\Phi_{1,R}^2 = \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3 \in [c]} j_1^2 A_{j_1}^2 j_2^2 X_{j_2}^2 j_3^2 B_{j_3}^2$. Computing expectation we get $\mathbb{E}[\Phi_{1,R}^2] = \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3 \in [c]} j_1^2 j_2^2 j_3^2 \mathbb{E}[W_{A_{j_1}}] \mathbb{E}[W_{X_{j_2}}] \mathbb{E}[W_{B_{j_3}}]$, since we now have that all $W_{X_j} \in \{0, 1\}$. This leads us to consider a structure related to the lineage polynomial.

► **Definition 1.3.** For any polynomial $\Phi((X_t)_{t \in D})$ define the reformulated polynomial $\Phi_R((X_{t,j})_{t \in D, j \in [c]})$ to be the polynomial $\Phi_R = \Phi\left(\left(\sum_{j \in [c]} j \cdot X_{t,j}\right)_{t \in D}\right)$ and ii) define the reduced polynomial $\tilde{\Phi}((X_{t,j})_{t \in D, j \in [c]})$ to be the polynomial resulting from converting Φ_R into the standard monomial basis (SMB),⁴ removing all monomials containing the term $X_{t,j} X_{t,j'}$ for $t \in D, j \neq j' \in [c]$, and setting all variable exponents $e > 1$ to 1.

Continuing with the example⁵ $\Phi_1^2(A, B, C, E, X_1, X_2, Y, Z)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Phi}_1^2(A, B, C, E, X_1, X_2, Y, Z) &= \\ &A \left(\sum_{j \in [c]} j^2 X_j \right) B + BYE + BZC + 2A \left(\sum_{j \in [c]} j^2 X_j \right) BYE + 2A \left(\sum_{j \in [c]} j^2 X_j \right) BZC + 2BYE ZC = \\ &ABX_1 + AB(2)^2 X_2 + BYE + BZC + 2AX_1 BYE + 2A(2)^2 X_2 BYE + 2AX_1 BZC + 2A(2)^2 X_2 BZC + 2BYE ZC. \end{aligned}$$

Note that we have argued that for our specific example the expectation that we want is $\tilde{\Phi}_1^2(\text{Pr}(A=1), \text{Pr}(B=1), \text{Pr}(C=1), \text{Pr}(E=1), \text{Pr}(X_1=1), \text{Pr}(X_2=1), \text{Pr}(Y=1), \text{Pr}(Z=1))$. Lemma 1.4 generalizes the equivalence to all \mathcal{RA}^+ queries on c -TIDBs (proof in Appendix B.5).


► **Lemma 1.4.** For any c -TIDB \mathcal{D} , \mathcal{RA}^+ query Q , and lineage polynomial $\Phi(\mathbf{X}) = \Phi[Q, \mathcal{D}, t](\mathbf{X})$, it holds that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{W} \sim \mathcal{P}}[\Phi_R(\mathbf{W})] = \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{p})$, where $\mathbf{p} = \left((p_{t,j})_{t \in D, j \in [c]} \right)$.

1.2 Our Techniques

Lower Bound Proof Techniques. Our main hardness result shows that computing Problem 1.1 is $\#W[1]$ – hard for 1-TIDB. To prove this result we show that for the same Q_1 from the

⁴ This is the representation, typically used in set-PDBs, where the polynomial is represented as sum of ‘pure’ products. See Definition 2.1 for a formal definition.

⁵ To save clutter we do not show the full expansion for variables with greatest multiplicity = 1 since e.g. for variable A , the sum of products itself evaluates to $1^2 \cdot A^2 = A$.



■ **Figure 2** Intensional Query Evaluation Model ($Q_2 = \pi_{\text{Point}} (T \bowtie_{\text{Point}=\text{Point}_1} R)$ where, for table R , $c = 2$, while for T , $c = 1$.)

175 example above, for an arbitrary ‘product width’ k , the query Q_{hard}^k is able to encode various
 176 hard graph-counting problems (assuming $O(n)$ tuples rather than the $O(1)$ tuples in Fig. 2).
 177 We do so by considering an arbitrary graph G (analogous to relation R of Q_1) and analyzing
 178 how the coefficients in the (univariate) polynomial $\tilde{\Phi}(p, \dots, p)$ relate to counts of subgraphs
 179 in G that are isomorphic to various graphs with k edges. E.g., we exploit the fact that the
 180 coefficient corresponding to the power of $2k$ in Φ of Q_{hard}^k is proportional to the number of
 181 k -matchings in G , a known hard problem in parameterized/fine-grained complexity literature.

182 **Upper Bound Techniques.** Our negative results (Table 1) indicate that c -TIDBs (even
 183 for $c = 1$) can not achieve comparable performance to deterministic databases for exact
 184 results (under complexity assumptions). In fact, under plausible hardness conjectures, one
 185 cannot (drastically) improve upon the trivial algorithm to exactly compute the expected
 186 multiplicities for 1-TIDBs. A natural followup is whether we can do better if we are willing
 187 to settle for an approximation to the expected multiplicities.

188 We adopt a two-step intensional model of query evaluation used in set-PDBs, as illustrated
 189 in Fig. 2: (i) Lineage Computation (LC): Given input D and Q , output every tuple t that
 190 possibly satisfies Q , annotated with its lineage polynomial ($\Phi(\mathbf{X}) = \Phi[Q, D, t](\mathbf{X})$); (ii)
 191 Expectation Computation (EC): Given $\Phi(\mathbf{X})$ for each tuple, compute $\mathbb{E}_{W \sim \mathcal{P}}[\Phi(\mathbf{W})]$. Let
 192 $T_{LC}(Q, D, \mathcal{C})$ denote the runtime of LC when it outputs \mathcal{C} (which is a representation of Φ as
 193 an arithmetic circuit — more on this representation in Sec. 2.3). Denote by $T_{EC}(\mathcal{C}, \epsilon)$ (recall
 194 \mathcal{C} is the output of LC) the runtime of EC, which we can leverage Definition 1.3 and Lemma 1.4
 195 to address the next formal objective:

196 **► Problem 1.5** (c -TIDB linear time approximation). *Given c -TIDB \mathcal{D} , \mathcal{RA}^+ query Q ,
 197 is there a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation of $\mathbb{E}_{W \sim \mathcal{P}}[Q(\mathbf{W})(t)]$ for all result tuples t where $\exists \mathcal{C} :$
 198 $T_{LC}(Q, D, \mathcal{C}) + T_{EC}(\mathcal{C}, \epsilon) \leq O_\epsilon(T_{det}(OPT(Q), D, c))$?*

199 We show in Appendix E.2.1 an $O(T_{det}(OPT(Q), D, c))$ algorithm for constructing the
 200 lineage polynomial for all result tuples of an \mathcal{RA}^+ query Q (or more more precisely, a single
 201 circuit \mathcal{C} with one sink per tuple representing the tuple’s lineage). A key insight of this paper
 202 is that the representation of \mathcal{C} matters. For example, if we insist that \mathcal{C} represent the lineage
 203 polynomial in SMB, the answer to the above question in general is no, since then we will
 204 need $|\mathcal{C}| \geq \Omega\left(\left(T_{det}(OPT(Q), D, c)\right)^k\right)$, and hence, just $T_{LC}(Q, D, \mathcal{C})$ will be too large.

205 However, systems can directly emit compact, factorized representations of $\Phi(\mathbf{X})$ (e.g.,
 206 as a consequence of the standard projection push-down optimization [25]). For example,

in Fig. 2, $B(Y + Z)$ is a factorized representation of the SMB-form $BY + BZ$. Accordingly, this work uses (arithmetic) circuits⁶ as the representation system of $\Phi(\mathbf{X})$.

Given that there exists a representation \mathbf{C}^* such that $T_{LC}(Q, D, \mathbf{C}^*) \leq O(T_{det}(\text{OPT}(Q), D, c))$, we can now focus on the complexity of the EC step. We can represent the factorized lineage polynomial by its corresponding arithmetic circuit \mathbf{C} (whose size we denote by $|\mathbf{C}|$). As we also show in Appendix E.2.2, this size is also bounded by $T_{det}(\text{OPT}(Q), D, c)$ (i.e., $|\mathbf{C}^*| \leq O(T_{det}(\text{OPT}(Q), D, c))$). Thus, the question of approximation can be stated as the following stronger (since Problem 1.5 has access to *all* equivalent \mathbf{C} representing $Q(\mathbf{W})(t)$), but sufficient condition:

► **Problem 1.6.** *Given one circuit $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}$ that encodes $\Phi[Q, D, t]$ for all result tuples t (one sink per t) for c -TIDB \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{RA}^+ query Q , does there exist an algorithm that computes a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation of $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{W} \sim \mathcal{P}}[Q(\mathbf{W})(t)]$ (for all result tuples t) in $O(|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}|)$ time?*

For an upper bound on approximating the expected count, it is easy to check that if all the probabilities are constant then (with an additive adjustment) $\Phi(p_1, \dots, p_n)$ (i.e. evaluating the original lineage polynomial over the probability values) is a constant factor approximation. This is illustrated in the following example using Q_1^2 from earlier. To aid in presentation we assume $c = 2$ for variable X and $c = 1$ for all other variables. Let p_A denote $Pr[A = 1]$. In computing $\tilde{\Phi}$, we have some cancellations to deal with:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{1,R}^2(\mathbf{X}) &= A^2 (X_1^2 + 4X_1X_2 + 4X_2^2) B^2 + B^2Y^2E^2 + B^2Z^2C^2 + 2AX_1B^2YE \\ &\quad + 2AX_2B^2YE + 2AX_1B^2ZC + 2AX_2B^2ZC + 2B^2YEZC \end{aligned}$$

This then implies

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Phi}^2(\mathbf{X}) &= AX_1B + 4AX_2B + BYE + BZC + 2AX_1BYE + 2AX_2BYE + 2AX_1BZC \\ &\quad + 2AX_2BZC + 2BYEzC \end{aligned}$$

Substituting \mathbf{p} for \mathbf{X} ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{1,R}^2(\mathbf{p}) &= p_A^2 p_{X_1}^2 p_B^2 + 4p_A^2 p_{X_1} p_{X_2} p_B^2 + 4p_A^2 p_{X_2}^2 p_B^2 + p_B^2 p_Y^2 p_E^2 + p_B^2 p_Z^2 p_C^2 + 2p_A p_{X_1} p_B^2 p_Y p_E + 2p_A p_{X_2} p_B^2 p_Y p_E \\ &\quad + 2p_A p_{X_1} p_B^2 p_Z p_C + 2p_A p_{X_2} p_B^2 p_Z p_C + 2p_B^2 p_Y p_E p_Z p_C \\ &\leq p_A p_{X_1} p_B + 4p_A^2 p_{X_1} p_{X_2} p_B^2 + 4p_A p_{X_2} p_B + p_B p_Y p_E + p_B p_Z p_C + 2p_A p_{X_1} p_B p_Y p_E + 2p_A p_{X_2} p_B p_Y p_E \\ &\quad + 2p_A p_{X_1} p_B p_Z p_C + 2p_A p_{X_2} p_B p_Z p_C + 2p_B p_Y p_E p_Z p_C = \tilde{\Phi}_1^2(\mathbf{p}) + 4p_A^2 p_{X_1} p_{X_2} p_B^2. \end{aligned}$$

If we assume that all probability values are at least $p_0 > 0$, then given access to $\Phi_{1,R}^2(\mathbf{p}) - 4p_A^2 p_{X_1} p_{X_2} p_B^2$ we get that $\Phi_{1,R}^2(\mathbf{p}) - 4p_A^2 p_{X_1} p_{X_2} p_B^2$ is in the range $\left((p_0)^3 \cdot \left(\tilde{\Phi}_1^2(\mathbf{p}), \tilde{\Phi}_1^2(\mathbf{p})\right)\right]$. We can simulate sampling from $\Phi_{1,R}^2(\mathbf{X})$ by sampling monomials from $\tilde{\Phi}_1^2$ while ignoring any samples $A^2 X_1 X_2 B^2$. Note however, that this is *not a tight approximation*. In sec. 4 we demonstrate that a $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ (multiplicative) approximation with competitive performance is achievable. To get an $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -multiplicative approximation and solve Problem 1.6, using \mathbf{C} we uniformly sample monomials from the equivalent SMB representation of Φ (without materializing the SMB representation) and ‘adjust’ their contribution to $\tilde{\Phi}(\cdot)$.

Applications. Recent work in heuristic data cleaning [49, 43, 40, 8, 43] emits a PDB when insufficient data exists to select the ‘correct’ data repair. Probabilistic data cleaning is a

⁶ An arithmetic circuit is a DAG with variable and/or numeric source nodes and internal, each nodes representing either an addition or multiplication operator.

crucial innovation, as the alternative is to arbitrarily select one repair and ‘hope’ that queries receive meaningful results. Although PDB queries instead convey the trustworthiness of results [35], they are impractically slow [19, 18], even in approximation (see Appendix G). Bags, as we consider, are sufficient for production use, where bag-relational algebra is already the default for performance reasons. Our results show that bag-PDBs can be competitive, laying the groundwork for probabilistic functionality in production database engines.

Paper Organization. We present relevant background and notation in Sec. 2. We then prove our main hardness results in Sec. 3 and present our approximation algorithm in Sec. 4. Finally, we discuss related work in Sec. 5 and conclude in Sec. 6. All proofs are in the appendix.

2 Background and Notation

2.1 Polynomial Definition and Terminology

Given an index set S over variables X_t for $t \in S$, a (general) polynomial ϕ over $(X_t)_{t \in S}$ with individual degree $K < \infty$ is formally defined as:

$$\phi((X_t)_{t \in S}) = \sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \{0, \dots, K\}^S} c_{\mathbf{d}} \cdot \prod_{t \in S} X_t^{d_t} \quad \text{where } c_{\mathbf{d}} \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (1)$$

► **Definition 2.1** (Standard Monomial Basis). *The term $\prod_{t \in S} X_t^{d_t}$ in Eq. (1) is a monomial. A polynomial $\phi(\mathbf{X})$ is in standard monomial basis (SMB) when we keep only the terms with $c_{\mathbf{d}} \neq 0$ from Eq. (1).*

Unless otherwise noted, we consider all polynomials to be in SMB representation. When it is unclear, we use $\text{SMB}(\phi)$ ($\text{SMB}(\Phi)$) to denote the SMB form of a polynomial (lineage polynomial) ϕ (Φ).

► **Definition 2.2** (Degree). *The degree of polynomial $\phi(\mathbf{X})$ is the largest $\sum_{t \in S} d_t$ for all $\mathbf{d} \in \{0, \dots, K\}^S$ such that $c_{(d_1, \dots, d_n)} \neq 0$. We denote the degree of ϕ as $\text{deg}(\phi)$.*

As an example, the degree of the polynomial $X^2 + 2XY^2 + Y^2$ is 3. Product terms in lineage arise only from join operations (Fig. 1), so intuitively, the degree of a lineage polynomial is analogous to the largest number of joins needed to produce a result tuple.

We call a polynomial $\Phi(\mathbf{X})$ a *c-TIDB-lineage polynomial* (or simply lineage polynomial), if it is clear from context that there exists an \mathcal{RA}^+ query Q , *c*-TIDB \mathcal{D} , and result tuple t such that $\Phi(\mathbf{X}) = \Phi[Q, \mathcal{D}, t](\mathbf{X})$.

2.2 Binary-BIDB

A block independent database BIDB \mathcal{D}' models a set of worlds each of which consists of a subset of the possible tuples D' , where D' is partitioned into m blocks B_i and all B_i are independent random events. \mathcal{D}' further constrains that all $t \in B_i$ for all $i \in [m]$ of D' be disjoint events. We refer to any monomial that includes $X_t X_{t'}$ for $t \neq t' \in B_i$ as a *cancellation*. We define next a specific construction of BIDB that is useful for our work.

► **Definition 2.3** (Binary-BIDB). *Define a Binary-BIDB to be the pair $\mathcal{D}' = (\times_{t \in D'} \{0, c_t\}, \mathcal{P}')$, where D' is the set of possible tuples such that each $t \in D'$ has a multiplicity domain of $\{0, c_t\}$, with $c_t \in \mathbb{N}$. D' is partitioned into m independent blocks B_i , for $i \in [m]$, of disjoint tuples.*

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi' [\pi_A(Q), \bar{D}', t_j] &= \sum_{\substack{t_{j'}, \\ \pi_A(t_{j'})=t_j}} \Phi' [Q, \bar{D}', t_{j'}] \quad \Phi' [Q_1 \cup Q_2, \bar{D}', t_j] = \Phi' [Q_1, \bar{D}', t_j] + \Phi' [Q_2, \bar{D}', t_j] \\ \Phi' [\sigma_\theta(Q), \bar{D}', t_j] &= \begin{cases} \theta = 1 & \Phi' [Q, \bar{D}', t_j] \quad \Phi' [Q_1 \bowtie Q_2, \bar{D}', t_j] = \Phi' [Q_1, \bar{D}', \pi_{attr(Q_1)}(t_j)] \\ \theta = 0 & 0 \quad \cdot \Phi' [Q_2, \bar{D}', \pi_{attr(Q_2)}(t_j)] \\ & \Phi' [R, \bar{D}', t_j] = j \cdot X_{t,j}. \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

■ **Figure 3** Construction of the lineage (polynomial) for an \mathcal{RA}^+ query Q over \bar{D}' .

289 \mathcal{P}' is characterized by the vector $(p_t)_{t \in D'}$, where for every block B_i , $\sum_{t \in B_i} p_t \leq 1$. Given $W \in$
 290 $\times_{t \in D'} \{0, c_t\}$ and for $i \in [m]$, let $p_i(W) = \begin{cases} 1 - \sum_{t \in B_i} p_t & \text{if } W_t = 0 \text{ for all } t \in B_i \\ 0 & \text{if there exists } t, t' \in B_i, W_t, W_{t'} \neq 0 \\ p_t & W_t \neq 0 \text{ for the unique } t \in B_i. \end{cases}$
 291 \mathcal{P}' is the probability distribution across all worlds such that, given $W \in \times_{t \in D'} \{0, c_t\}$,
 292 $Pr[\mathbf{W} = W] = \prod_{i \in [m]} p_i(W)$.⁷

293 Fig. 3 shows the lineage construction of $\Phi'(\mathbf{X})$ given \mathcal{RA}^+ query Q for arbitrary
 294 deterministic \bar{D}' . Note that the semantics differ from Fig. 1 only in the base case.

295 ► **Proposition 2.4** (*c*-TIDB reduction). Given *c*-TIDB $\mathcal{D} = (\{0, \dots, c\}^D, \mathcal{P})$, let $\mathcal{D}' =$
 296 $(\times_{t \in D'} \{0, c_t\}, \mathcal{P}')$ be the Binary-BIDB obtained in the following manner: for each $t \in D$,
 297 create block $B_t = \{\langle t, j \rangle_{j \in [c]}\}$ of disjoint tuples, for all $j \in [c]$. The probability distribution
 298 \mathcal{P}' is characterized by the vector $\mathbf{p} = ((p_{t,j})_{t \in D, j \in [c]})$. Then, the distributions \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}'
 299 are equivalent.

300 We now define the reduced polynomial $\tilde{\Phi}'$ of a Binary-BIDB.

301 ► **Definition 2.5** ($\tilde{\Phi}'$). Given a polynomial $\Phi'(\mathbf{X})$ generated from a Binary-BIDB and let
 302 $\tilde{\Phi}'(\mathbf{X})$ denote the reduced form of $\Phi'(\mathbf{X})$ derived as follows: i) compute $SMB(\Phi'(\mathbf{X}))$
 303 eliminating all monomials with cross terms $X_t X_{t'}$ for $t \neq t' \in B_i$ and ii) reduce all variable
 304 exponents $e > 1$ to 1.

305 Then given $\mathbf{W} \in \{0, 1\}^{D'}$ over the reduced Binary-BIDB of Proposition 2.4, the disjoint
 306 requirement and the semantics for constructing the lineage polynomial over a Binary-BIDB,
 307 $\Phi'(\mathbf{W})$ is of the same structure as the reformulated polynomial $\Phi_R(\mathbf{W})$ of step i) from Definition 1.3,
 308 which then implies that $\tilde{\Phi}'$ is the reduced polynomial that results from step ii) of both Definition 1.3
 309 and Definition 2.5, and further that Lemma 1.4 immediately follows for Binary-BIDB
 310 polynomials.

311 ► **Lemma 2.6.** Given any Binary-BIDB \mathcal{D}' , \mathcal{RA}^+ query Q , and lineage polynomial $\Phi'(\mathbf{X}) =$
 312 $\Phi'[Q, D', t](\mathbf{X})$, it holds that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{W} \sim \mathcal{P}'}[\Phi'(\mathbf{W})] = \tilde{\Phi}'(\mathbf{p})$.

313 Let $|\Phi|$ be the number of operators in Φ .

⁷ We slightly abuse notation here, denoting a world vector as W rather than \mathbf{W} to distinguish between the random variable and the world instance. When there is no ambiguity, we will denote a world vector as \mathbf{W} .

314 ► **Corollary 2.7.** *If Φ is a 1-BIDB lineage polynomial already in SMB, then the expectation*
 315 *of Φ , i.e., $\mathbb{E}[\Phi] = \tilde{\Phi}(p_1, \dots, p_n)$ can be computed in $O(|\Phi|)$ time.*

316 2.2.1 Possible World Semantics

317 In this section, we show how the traditional possible worlds semantics corresponds to our
 318 setup. Readers can safely skip this part without missing anything vital to the results of this
 319 paper.

320 Queries over probabilistic databases are traditionally viewed as being evaluated using the
 321 so-called possible world semantics. A general bag-PDB can be defined as the pair $\mathcal{D} = (\Omega, \mathcal{P})$
 322 where Ω is the set of possible worlds represented by \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{P} the probability distribution over
 323 Ω . Under the possible world semantics, the result of a query Q over an incomplete database
 324 Ω is the set of query answers produced by evaluating Q over each possible world $\omega \in \Omega$:
 325 $\{Q(\omega) : \omega \in \Omega\}$. The result of a query is the pair $(Q(\Omega), \mathcal{P}')$ where \mathcal{P}' is a probability
 326 distribution that assigns to each possible query result the sum of the probabilities of the
 327 worlds that produce this answer: $Pr[\omega \in \Omega] = \sum_{\omega' \in \Omega, Q(\omega')=Q(\omega)} Pr[\omega']$.

328 Suppose that \mathcal{D}' is a reduced Binary-BIDB from c -TIDB \mathcal{D} as defined by ???. Instead of
 329 looking only at the possible worlds of \mathcal{D}' , one can consider the set of all worlds, including
 330 those that cannot exist due to, e.g., disjointness. Since $|D| = n$ the all worlds set can be
 331 modeled by $\mathbf{W} \in \{0, 1\}^{nc}$, such that $\mathbf{W}_{t,j} \in \mathbf{W}$ represents whether or not the multiplicity
 332 of t is j (here and later, especially in Sec. 4, we will rename the variables as $X_1, \dots, X_{n'}$,
 333 where $n' = \sum_{t \in D} |B_t|$).⁸ We can denote a probability distribution over all $\mathbf{W} \in \{0, 1\}^{nc}$
 334 as \mathcal{P}' . When \mathcal{P}' is the one induced from each $p_{t,j}$ while assigning $Pr[\mathbf{W}] = 0$ for any \mathbf{W}
 335 with $\mathbf{W}_{t,j}, \mathbf{W}_{t,j'} \neq 0$ for $j \neq j'$, we end up with a bijective mapping from \mathcal{P} to \mathcal{P}' , such that
 336 each mapping is equivalent, implying the distributions are equivalent, and thus query results.
 337 Appendix B.2 has more details.

338 We now make a meaningful connection between possible world semantics and world
 339 assignments on the lineage polynomial.

340 ► **Proposition 2.8** (Expectation of polynomials). *Given a bag-PDB $\mathcal{D} = (\Omega, \mathcal{P})$, \mathcal{RA}^+ query*
 341 *Q , and lineage polynomial $\Phi[Q, D, t]$ for arbitrary result tuple t , we have (denoting \mathbf{D} as the*
 342 *random variable over Ω): $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{D} \sim \mathcal{P}}[Q(\mathbf{D})(t)] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{W} \sim \mathcal{P}'}[\Phi[Q, D, t](\mathbf{W})]$.*

343 A formal proof of Proposition 2.8 is given in Appendix B.3.⁹

344 2.3 Formalizing Problem 1.6

345 We focus on the problem of computing $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{W} \sim \mathcal{P}'}[\Phi[Q, D, t](\mathbf{W})]$ from now on, assume implicit
 346 Q, D, t , and drop them from $\Phi[Q, D, t]$ (i.e., $\Phi(\mathbf{X})$ will denote a polynomial).

347 Problem 1.6 asks if there exists a linear time approximation algorithm in the size of a given
 348 circuit \mathbf{C} which encodes $\Phi(\mathbf{X})$. Recall that in this work we represent lineage polynomials
 349 via *arithmetic circuits* [9], a standard way to represent polynomials over fields (particularly
 350 in the field of algebraic complexity) that we use for polynomials over \mathbb{N} in the obvious way.
 351 Since we are specifically using circuits to model lineage polynomials, we can refer to these
 352 circuits as lineage circuits. However, when the meaning is clear, we will drop the term lineage
 353 and only refer to them as circuits.


⁸ In this example, $|B_t| = c$ for all t .

⁹ Although Proposition 2.8 follows, e.g., as an obvious consequence of [29]'s Theorem 7.1, we are unaware of any formal proof for bag-probabilistic databases.

354 ► **Definition 2.9** (Circuit). A circuit \mathcal{C} is a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) whose source
 355 gates (in degree of 0) consist of elements in either \mathbb{N} or $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$. For each result
 356 tuple there exists one sink gate. The internal gates have binary input and are either sum
 357 (+) or product (\times) gates. Each gate has the following members: *type*, *input*, *val*, *partial*,
 358 *degree*, *Lweight*, and *Rweight*, where *type* is the value type $\{+, \times, \text{VAR}, \text{NUM}\}$ and *input*
 359 the list of inputs. Source gates have an extra member *val* storing the value. \mathcal{C}_L (\mathcal{C}_R) denotes
 360 the left (right) input of \mathcal{C} .

361 When the underlying DAG is a tree (with edges pointing towards the root), the structure is
 362 an expression tree T . In such a case, the root of T is analogous to the sink of \mathcal{C} . The fields
 363 *partial*, *degree*, *Lweight*, and *Rweight* are used in the proofs of Appendix D.

364 The circuits in Fig. 2 encode their respective polynomials in column Φ . Note that the
 365 circuit \mathcal{C} representing AX and the circuit \mathcal{C}' representing $B(Y + Z)$ each encode a tree, with
 366 edges pointing towards the root.



367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375 **Figure 4** Circuit encoding of $(X + 2Y)(2X - Y)$

We next formally define the relationship of
 circuits with polynomials. While the definition
 assumes one sink for notational convenience, it
 easily generalizes to the multiple sinks case.

► **Definition 2.10** ($\text{POLY}(\cdot)$). $\text{POLY}(\mathcal{C})$ maps the
 sink of circuit \mathcal{C} to its corresponding polynomial
 (in SMB). $\text{POLY}(\cdot)$ is recursively defined on
 \mathcal{C} as follows, with addition and multiplication

376

$$\text{POLY}(\mathcal{C}) = \begin{cases} \text{POLY}(\mathcal{C}_L) + \text{POLY}(\mathcal{C}_R) & \text{if } \mathcal{C}.\text{type} = + \\ \text{POLY}(\mathcal{C}_L) \cdot \text{POLY}(\mathcal{C}_R) & \text{if } \mathcal{C}.\text{type} = \times \\ \mathcal{C}.\text{val} & \text{if } \mathcal{C}.\text{type} = \text{VAR OR NUM.} \end{cases}$$

377 \mathcal{C} need not encode $\Phi(\mathbf{X})$ in the same, default SMB representation. For instance, \mathcal{C} could
 378 encode the factorized representation $(X + 2Y)(2X - Y)$ of $\Phi(\mathbf{X}) = 2X^2 + 3XY - 2Y^2$, as
 379 shown in Fig. 4, while $\text{POLY}(\mathcal{C}) = \Phi(\mathbf{X})$ is always the equivalent SMB representation.

380 ► **Definition 2.11** (Circuit Set). $\text{CSet}(\Phi(\mathbf{X}))$ is the set of all possible circuits \mathcal{C} such that
 381 $\text{POLY}(\mathcal{C}) = \Phi(\mathbf{X})$.

382 The circuit of Fig. 4 is an element of $\text{CSet}(2X^2 + 3XY - 2Y^2)$. One can think of
 383 $\text{CSet}(\Phi(\mathbf{X}))$ as the infinite set of circuits where for each element \mathcal{C} , $\text{POLY}(\mathcal{C}) = \Phi(\mathbf{X})$.

384 We are now ready to formally state the final version of Problem 1.6.

385 ► **Definition 2.12** (The Expected Result Multiplicity Problem). Let \mathcal{D}' be an arbitrary c -TIDB
 386 and \mathbf{X} be the set of variables annotating tuples in \mathcal{D}' . Fix an \mathcal{RA}^+ query Q and a result
 387 tuple t . The EXPECTED RESULT MULTIPLICITY PROBLEM is defined as follows:

389 **Input:** $\mathcal{C} \in \text{CSet}(\Phi(\mathbf{X}))$ for $\Phi'(\mathbf{X}) = \Phi'[Q, \mathcal{D}', t]$ **Output:** $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{W} \sim \mathcal{P}}[\Phi'[Q, \mathcal{D}', t](\mathbf{W})]$

390 2.4 Relationship to Deterministic Query Runtimes

391 In Sec. 1, we introduced the structure $T_{\text{det}}(\cdot)$ to analyze the runtime complexity of Problem 1.1.
 392 To decouple our results from specific join algorithms, we first lower bound the cost of a join.

393 ► **Definition 2.13** (Join Cost). Denote by $T_{join}(R_1, \dots, R_m)$ the runtime of an algorithm
 394 for computing the m -ary join $R_1 \bowtie \dots \bowtie R_m$. We require only that the algorithm must
 395 enumerate its output, i.e., that $T_{join}(R_1, \dots, R_m) \geq |R_1 \bowtie \dots \bowtie R_m|$. With this definition
 396 of $T_{join}(\cdot)$, worst-case optimal join algorithms are handled.

397 Worst-case optimal join algorithms [37, 36] and query evaluation via factorized databases [39]
 398 (as well as work on FAQs [33]) can be modeled as \mathcal{RA}^+ queries (though the query size is
 399 data dependent). For these algorithms, $T_{join}(R_1, \dots, R_n)$ is linear in the *AGM bound* [6].
 400 Our cost model for general query evaluation follows from the join cost:

$$\begin{aligned}
 T_{det}(R, \bar{D}, c) &= |\bar{D}.R| & T_{det}(\sigma Q, \bar{D}, c) &= T_{det}(Q, \bar{D}) & T_{det}(\pi Q, \bar{D}, c) &= T_{det}(Q, \bar{D}, c) + |Q(\bar{D})| \\
 T_{det}(Q \cup Q', \bar{D}, c) &= T_{det}(Q, \bar{D}, c) + T_{det}(Q', \bar{D}, c) + |Q(\bar{D})| + |Q'(\bar{D})| \\
 T_{det}(Q_1 \bowtie \dots \bowtie Q_m, \bar{D}, c) &= T_{det}(Q_1, \bar{D}, c) + \dots + T_{det}(Q_m, \bar{D}, c) + T_{join}(Q_1(\bar{D}), \dots, Q_m(\bar{D}))
 \end{aligned}$$

403 Under this model, an \mathcal{RA}^+ query Q evaluated over database \bar{D} has runtime $O(T_{det}(Q, \bar{D}, c))$.
 404 We assume that full table scans are used for every base relation access. We can model index
 405 scans by treating an index scan query $\sigma_\theta(R)$ as a base relation.

406 Lemma E.2 and Lemma E.3 show that for any \mathcal{RA}^+ query Q and D , there exists a circuit
 407 \mathcal{C}^* such that $T_{LC}(Q, D, \mathcal{C}^*)$ and $|\mathcal{C}^*|$ are both $O(T_{det}(\text{OPT}(Q), D, c))$. Recall we assumed
 408 these two bounds when we moved from Problem 1.5 to Problem 1.6. Lastly, we can handle
 409 FAQs and factorized databases by allowing for optimization, i.e. $\text{OPT}(Q)$.

410 3 Hardness of Exact Computation

411 In this section, we will prove the hardness results claimed in Table 1 for a specific (family) of
 412 hard instance (Q_{hard}, \mathcal{D}) for Problem 1.2 where \mathcal{D} is a 1-TIDB. Note that this implies hardness
 413 for c -TIDBs ($c \geq 1$), showing Problem 1.2 cannot be done in $O(T_{det}(\text{OPT}(Q), D, c))$
 414 runtime. The results also apply to Binary-BIDB and other more general PDBs.

415 3.1 Preliminaries

416 Our hardness results are based on (exactly) counting the number of (not necessarily induced)
 417 subgraphs in G isomorphic to H . Let $\#(G, H)$ denote this quantity. We can think of H
 418 as being of constant size and G as growing. In particular, we will consider the problems of
 419 computing the following counts (given G in its adjacency list representation): $\#(G, \triangle)$ (the
 420 number of triangles), $\#(G, \bowtie)$ (the number of 3-matchings), and the latter's generalization
 421 $\#(G, \bowtie^k)$ (the number of k -matchings). We use $T_{match}(k, G)$ to denote the optimal
 422 runtime of computing $\#(G, \bowtie^k)$ exactly. Our hardness results in Sec. 3.2 are based on
 423 the following hardness results/conjectures:

424 ► **Theorem 3.1** ([12]). Given positive integer k and undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ with
 425 no self-loops or parallel edges, $T_{match}(k, G) \geq \omega(f(k) \cdot |E|^c)$ for any function f and any
 426 constant c independent of $|E|$ and k (assuming $\#W[0] \neq \#W[1]$).

427 ► **Conjecture 3.2.** There exists an absolute constant $c_0 > 0$ such that for every $G = (V, E)$,
 428 we have $T_{match}(k, G) \geq \Omega(|E|^{c_0 \cdot k})$ for large enough k .

429 We note that the above conjecture is somewhat non-standard. In particular, the best known
 430 algorithm to compute $\#(G, \bowtie^k)$ takes time $\Omega(|V|^{k/2})$ (i.e. if this is the best algorithm
 431 then $c_0 = \frac{1}{4}$) [12]. What the above conjecture is saying is that one can only hope for a
 432 polynomial improvement over the state of the art algorithm to compute $\#(G, \bowtie^k)$.

433 Our hardness result in Section 3.3 is based on the following conjectured hardness result:

434 ► **Conjecture 3.3.** *There exists a constant $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that given an undirected graph*
 435 *$G = (V, E)$, computing $\#(G, \mathfrak{A})$ exactly cannot be done in time $o(|E|^{1+\epsilon_0})$.*

436 The so called *Triangle detection hypothesis* (cf. [34]), which states that detecting the presence
 437 of triangles in G takes time $\Omega(|E|^{4/3})$, implies that in Conjecture 3.3 we can take $\epsilon_0 \geq \frac{1}{3}$.

438 All of our hardness results rely on a simple lineage polynomial encoding of the edges
 439 of a graph. To prove our hardness result, consider a graph $G = (V, E)$, where $|E| = m$,
 440 $V = [n]$. Our lineage polynomial has a variable X_i for every i in $[n]$. Consider the polynomial
 441 $\Phi_G(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{(i,j) \in E} X_i \cdot X_j$. The hard polynomial for our problem will be a suitable power $k \geq 3$
 442 of the polynomial above:

443 ► **Definition 3.4.** *For any graph $G = (V, E)$ and $k \geq 1$, define*

$$444 \quad \Phi_G^k(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \left(\sum_{(i,j) \in E} X_i \cdot X_j \right)^k .$$

445 Returning to Fig. 2, it can be seen that $\Phi_G^k(\mathbf{X})$ is the lineage polynomial from query Q_{hard}^k ,
 446 which we define next (Q_2 from Sec. 1 is the same query with $k = 2$). Let us alias

```
447 SELECT DISTINCT 1 FROM T t1, R r, T t2
448 WHERE t1.Point = r.Point1 AND t2.Point = r.Point2
449
```

451 as R . The query Q_{hard}^k then becomes

```
SELECT COUNT(*) FROM R JOIN R JOIN ... JOIN R
                        k times
```

452 Consider again the c -TIDB instance \mathcal{D} of Fig. 2 and, for our hard instance, let $c = 1$.
 453 \mathcal{D} generalizes to one compatible to Definition 3.4 as follows. Relation T has n tuples
 454 corresponding to each vertex for i in $[n]$, each with probability p and R has tuples corresponding
 455 to the edges E (each with probability of 1).¹⁰ In other words, this instance \mathcal{D} contains
 456 the set of n unary tuples in T (which corresponds to V) and m binary tuples in R (which
 457 corresponds to E). Note that this implies that Φ_G^k is indeed a 1-TIDB lineage polynomial.

458 Next, we note that the runtime for answering Q_{hard}^k on deterministic database D , as
 459 defined above, is $O_k(m)$ (i.e. deterministic query processing is ‘easy’ for this query):

460 ► **Lemma 3.5.** *Let Q_{hard}^k and D be as defined above. Then $T_{det}(Q_{hard}^k, D)$ is $O_k(m)$.*

461 3.2 Multiple Distinct p Values

462 We are now ready to present our main hardness result.

463 ► **Theorem 3.6.** *Let p_0, \dots, p_{2k} be $2k + 1$ distinct values in $(0, 1]$. Then computing*
 464 $\tilde{\Phi}_G^k(p_0, \dots, p_i)$ *(over all $i \in [2k + 1]$) for arbitrary $G = (V, E)$ needs time $\Omega(T_{match}(k, G))$,*
 465 *assuming $T_{match}(k, G) \geq \omega(|E|)$.*

¹⁰Technically, $\Phi_G^k(\mathbf{X})$ should have variables corresponding to tuples in R as well, but since they always are present with probability 1, we drop those. Our argument also works when all the tuples in R also are present with probability p but to simplify notation we assign probability 1 to edges.

466 Note that the second row of Table 1 follows from Proposition 2.8, Theorem 3.6, Lemma 3.5,
 467 and Theorem 3.1 while the third row is proved by Proposition 2.8, Theorem 3.6, Lemma 3.5,
 468 and Conjecture 3.2. Since Conjecture 3.2 is non-standard, the latter hardness result should
 469 be interpreted as follows. Any substantial polynomial improvement for Problem 1.2 (over the
 470 trivial algorithm that converts Φ into SMB and then uses Corollary 2.7 for EC) would lead
 471 to an improvement over the state of the art *upper* bounds on $T_{match}(k, G)$. Finally, note
 472 that Theorem 3.6 needs one to be able to compute the expected multiplicities over $(2k + 1)$
 473 distinct values of p_i , each of which corresponds to distinct \mathcal{P} (for the same D), which explain
 474 the ‘Multiple’ entry in the second column in the second and third row in Table 1. Next, we
 475 argue how to get rid of this latter requirement.

476 3.3 Single p value

477 While Theorem 3.6 shows that computing $\tilde{\Phi}(p, \dots, p)$ for multiple values of p in general is
 478 hard it does not rule out the possibility that one can compute this value exactly for a *fixed*
 479 value of p . Indeed, it is easy to check that one can compute $\tilde{\Phi}(p, \dots, p)$ exactly in linear time
 480 for $p \in \{0, 1\}$. Next we show that these two are the only possibilities:

481 ► **Theorem 3.7.** *Fix $p \in (0, 1)$. Then assuming Conjecture 3.3 is true, any algorithm that*
 482 *computes $\tilde{\Phi}_G^3(p, \dots, p)$ for arbitrary $G = (V, E)$ exactly has to run in time $\Omega(|E|^{1+\epsilon_0})$, where*
 483 *ϵ_0 is as defined in Conjecture 3.3.*

484 Note that Proposition 2.8 and Theorem 3.7 above imply the hardness result in the first
 485 row of Table 1. We note that Theorem 3.1 and Conjecture 3.2 (and the lower bounds in the
 486 second and third row of Table 1) need k to be large enough (in particular, we need a family
 487 of hard queries). But the above Theorem 3.7 (and the lower bound in first row of Table 1)
 488 holds for $k = 3$ (and hence for a fixed query).

489 4 $1 \pm \epsilon$ Approximation Algorithm

490 In Sec. 3, we showed that Problem 1.2 cannot be solved in $O(T_{det}(\text{OPT}(Q), D, c))$ runtime.
 491 In light of this, we desire to produce an approximation algorithm that runs in time
 492 $O(T_{det}(\text{OPT}(Q), D, c))$. We do this by showing the result via circuits, such that our
 493 approximation algorithm for this problem runs in $O(|\mathcal{C}|)$ for a very broad class of circuits,
 494 (thus affirming Problem 1.6); see the discussion after Lemma 4.9 for more. The following
 495 approximation algorithm applies to bag query semantics over both c -TIDB lineage polynomials
 496 and general BIDB lineage polynomials in practice, where for the latter we note that a 1-TIDB
 497 is equivalently a BIDB (blocks are size 1). Our experimental results (see Appendix D.11)
 498 which use queries from the PDBench benchmark [1] show a low γ (see Definition 4.6)
 499 supporting the notion that our bounds hold for general BIDB in practice.

500 Corresponding proofs and pseudocode for all formal statements and algorithms can be
 501 found in Appendix D.

502 4.1 Preliminaries and some more notation

503 We now introduce definitions and notation related to circuits and polynomials that we will
 504 need to state our upper bound results. First we introduce the expansion $\mathbf{E}(\mathcal{C})$ of circuit \mathcal{C}
 505 which is used in our auxiliary algorithm SAMPLEMONOMIAL for sampling monomials when
 506 computing the approximation.

507 ► **Definition 4.1** ($E(\mathcal{C})$). For a circuit \mathcal{C} , we define $E(\mathcal{C})$ as a list of tuples (\mathbf{v}, c) , where \mathbf{v} is a
 508 set of variables and $c \in \mathbb{N}$. $E(\mathcal{C})$ has the following recursive definition (\circ is list concatenation).

$$509 \quad E(\mathcal{C}) = \begin{cases} E(\mathcal{C}_L) \circ E(\mathcal{C}_R) & \text{if } \mathcal{C}.type = + \\ \{(\mathbf{v}_L \cup \mathbf{v}_R, c_L \cdot c_R) \mid (\mathbf{v}_L, c_L) \in E(\mathcal{C}_L), (\mathbf{v}_R, c_R) \in E(\mathcal{C}_R)\} & \text{if } \mathcal{C}.type = \times \\ List[(\emptyset, \mathcal{C}.val)] & \text{if } \mathcal{C}.type = NUM \\ List[\{\mathcal{C}.val\}, 1] & \text{if } \mathcal{C}.type = VAR. \end{cases}$$

510 Later on, we will denote the monomial composed of the variables in \mathbf{v} as \mathbf{v}_m . As an example
 511 of $E(\mathcal{C})$, consider \mathcal{C} illustrated in Fig. 4. $E(\mathcal{C})$ is then $[(X, 2), (XY, -1), (XY, 4), (Y, -2)]$. This
 512 helps us redefine $\tilde{\Phi}$ (see Eq. (2)) in a way that makes our algorithm more transparent.

513 ► **Definition 4.2** ($|\mathcal{C}|$). For any circuit \mathcal{C} , the corresponding positive circuit, denoted $|\mathcal{C}|$, is
 514 obtained from \mathcal{C} as follows. For each leaf node ℓ of \mathcal{C} where $\ell.type$ is NUM, update $\ell.value$
 515 to $|\ell.value|$.

516 We will overload notation and use $|\mathcal{C}|(\mathbf{X})$ to mean $POLY(|\mathcal{C}|)$. Conveniently, $|\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1)$
 517 gives us $\sum_{(\mathbf{v}, c) \in E(\mathcal{C})} |c|$.

518 ► **Definition 4.3** ($SIZE(\cdot)$, $DEPTH(\cdot)$). The functions $SIZE$ and $DEPTH$ output the number of
 519 gates and levels respectively for input \mathcal{C} .

520 ► **Definition 4.4** ($DEG(\cdot)$).¹¹ $DEG(\mathcal{C})$ is defined recursively as follows:

$$521 \quad DEG(\mathcal{C}) = \begin{cases} \max(DEG(\mathcal{C}_L), DEG(\mathcal{C}_R)) & \text{if } \mathcal{C}.type = + \\ DEG(\mathcal{C}_L) + DEG(\mathcal{C}_R) + 1 & \text{if } \mathcal{C}.type = \times \\ 1 & \text{if } \mathcal{C}.type = VAR \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

522 Next, we use the following notation for the complexity of multiplying integers:

523 ► **Definition 4.5** ($\overline{\mathcal{M}}(\cdot, \cdot)$).¹² In a RAM model of word size of W -bits, $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(M, W)$ denotes
 524 the complexity of multiplying two integers represented with M -bits. (We will assume that for
 525 input of size N , $W = O(\log N)$.)

526 Finally, to get linear runtime results, we will need to define another parameter modeling
 527 the (weighted) number of monomials in $E(\mathcal{C})$ that need to be ‘canceled’ when monomials with
 528 dependent variables are removed (Sec. 2.2). Let $ISIND(\cdot)$ be a boolean function returning
 529 true if monomial \mathbf{v}_m is composed of independent variables and false otherwise; further, let $\mathbb{1}_\theta$
 530 also be a boolean function returning true if θ evaluates to true.

531 ► **Definition 4.6** (Parameter γ). Given a Binary-BIDB circuit \mathcal{C} define

$$532 \quad \gamma(\mathcal{C}) = \frac{\sum_{(\mathbf{v}, c) \in E(\mathcal{C})} |c| \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\neg ISIND(\mathbf{v}_m)}}{|\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1)}.$$

¹¹Note that the degree of $POLY(|\mathcal{C}|)$ is always upper bounded by $DEG(\mathcal{C})$ and the latter can be strictly larger (e.g. consider the case when \mathcal{C} multiplies two copies of the constant 1— here we have $deg(\mathcal{C}) = 1$ but degree of $POLY(|\mathcal{C}|)$ is 0).

¹²We note that when doing arithmetic operations on the RAM model for input of size N , we have that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(O(\log N), O(\log N)) = O(1)$. More generally we have $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(N, O(\log N)) = O(N \log N \log \log N)$.

533 **4.2 Our main result**

534 We solve Problem 1.6 for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$ in what follows.

535 **Algorithm Idea.** Our approximation algorithm (APPROXIMATE $\tilde{\Phi}$ pseudo code in Appendix D.1)
 536 is based on the following observation. Given a lineage polynomial $\Phi(\mathbf{X}) = \text{POLY}(\mathcal{C})$ for circuit \mathcal{C}
 537 over Binary-BIDB (recall that all c -TIDB can be reduced to Binary-BIDB by Proposition 2.4),
 538 we have:

$$539 \quad \tilde{\Phi}(p_1, \dots, p_n) = \sum_{(v, c) \in \mathbf{E}(\mathcal{C})} \mathbb{1}_{\text{ISIND}(v_m)} \cdot c \cdot \prod_{X_i \in v} p_i. \quad (2)$$

540 Given the above, the algorithm is a sampling based algorithm for the above sum: we
 541 sample (via SAMPLEMONOMIAL) $(v, c) \in \mathbf{E}(\mathcal{C})$ with probability proportional to $|c|$ and
 542 compute $Y = \mathbb{1}_{\text{ISIND}(v_m)} \cdot \prod_{X_i \in v} p_i$. Repeating the sampling an appropriate number of times
 543 and computing the average of Y gives us our final estimate. ONEPASS is used to compute the
 544 sampling probabilities needed in SAMPLEMONOMIAL (details are in Appendix D).

545 **Runtime analysis.** We can argue the following runtime for the algorithm outlined above:

546 **► Theorem 4.7.** *Let \mathcal{C} be an arbitrary Binary-BIDB circuit, define $\Phi(\mathbf{X}) = \text{POLY}(\mathcal{C})$, let
 547 $k = \text{DEG}(\mathcal{C})$, and let $\gamma = \gamma(\mathcal{C})$. Further let it be the case that $p_i \geq p_0$ for all $i \in [n]$. Then an
 548 estimate \mathcal{E} of $\tilde{\Phi}(p_1, \dots, p_n)$ satisfying*

$$549 \quad \Pr \left(\left| \mathcal{E} - \tilde{\Phi}(p_1, \dots, p_n) \right| > \epsilon' \cdot \tilde{\Phi}(p_1, \dots, p_n) \right) \leq \delta \quad (3)$$

550 *can be computed in time*

$$551 \quad O \left(\left(\text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C}) + \frac{\log \frac{1}{\delta} \cdot k \cdot \log k \cdot \text{DEPTH}(\mathcal{C})}{(\epsilon')^2 \cdot (1-\gamma)^2 \cdot p_0^{2k}} \right) \cdot \overline{\mathcal{M}}(\log(|\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1)), \log(\text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C}))) \right). \quad (4)$$

552 *In particular, if $p_0 > 0$ and $\gamma < 1$ are absolute constants then the above runtime simplifies to*
 553 $O_k \left(\left(\frac{1}{(\epsilon')^2} \cdot \text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C}) \cdot \log \frac{1}{\delta} \right) \cdot \overline{\mathcal{M}}(\log(|\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1)), \log(\text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C}))) \right)$.

554 The restriction on γ is satisfied by any 1-TIDB (where $\gamma = 0$ in the equivalent 1-BIDB
 555 of Proposition 2.4) as well as for all three queries of the PDBench BIDB benchmark (see
 556 Appendix D.11 for experimental results). Further, we can also argue the following result,
 557 recalling from Sec. 1 for c -TIDB $\mathcal{D} = \left(\{0, \dots, c\}^D, \mathcal{P} \right)$, where D is the set of possible tuples
 558 across all possible worlds of \mathcal{D} .

559 **► Lemma 4.8.** *Given \mathcal{RA}^+ query Q and c -TIDB \mathcal{D} , let \mathcal{C} be the circuit computed by $Q(\mathcal{D})$.
 560 Then, for the reduced Binary-BIDB \mathcal{D}' there exists an equivalent circuit \mathcal{C}' obtained from
 561 $Q(\mathcal{D}')$, such that $\gamma(\mathcal{C}') \leq 1 - (c)^{-(k-1)}$ with $\text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C}') \leq \text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C}) + O(nc)$ and $\text{DEPTH}(\mathcal{C}') =$
 562 $\text{DEPTH}(\mathcal{C}) + O(\log c)$.*

563 We briefly connect the runtime in Eq. (4) to the algorithm outline earlier (where we
 564 ignore the dependence on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(\cdot, \cdot)$, which is needed to handle the cost of arithmetic operations
 565 over integers). The $\text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C})$ comes from the time taken to run ONEPASS once (ONEPASS
 566 essentially computes $|\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1)$ using the natural circuit evaluation algorithm on \mathcal{C}). We
 567 make $\frac{\log \frac{1}{\delta}}{(\epsilon')^2 \cdot (1-\gamma)^2 \cdot p_0^{2k}}$ many calls to SAMPLEMONOMIAL (each of which essentially traces $O(k)$
 568 random sink to source paths in \mathcal{C} all of which by definition have length at most $\text{DEPTH}(\mathcal{C})$).

569 Finally, we address the $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(\log(|\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1)), \log(\text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C})))$ term in the runtime.

570 ▶ **Lemma 4.9.** For any Binary-BIDB circuit \mathcal{C} with $\text{DEG}(\mathcal{C}) = k$, we have $|\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1) \leq$
 571 $2^{2^k \cdot \text{DEPTH}(\mathcal{C})}$. Further, if \mathcal{C} is a tree, then we have $|\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1) \leq \text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C})^{O(k)}$.

572 Note that the above implies that with the assumption $p_0 > 0$ and $\gamma < 1$ are absolute
 573 constants from Theorem 4.7, then the runtime there simplifies to $O_k\left(\frac{1}{(\epsilon')^2} \cdot \text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C})^2 \cdot \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right)$
 574 for general circuits \mathcal{C} . If \mathcal{C} is a tree, then the runtime simplifies to $O_k\left(\frac{1}{(\epsilon')^2} \cdot \text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C}) \cdot \log \frac{1}{\delta}\right)$,
 575 which then answers Problem 1.6 with yes for such circuits.

576 Finally, note that by Proposition E.1 and Lemma E.2 for any \mathcal{RA}^+ query Q , there exists a
 577 circuit \mathcal{C}^* for $\Phi[Q, D, t]$ such that $\text{DEPTH}(\mathcal{C}^*) \leq O_{|Q|}(\log n)$ and $\text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C}^*) \leq O_k(T_{\text{det}}(Q, D, c))$.
 578 Using this along with Lemma 4.9, Theorem 4.7 and the fact that $n \leq T_{\text{det}}(Q, D, c)$, we have
 579 the following corollary:

580 ▶ **Corollary 4.10.** Let Q be an \mathcal{RA}^+ query and \mathcal{D} be a Binary-BIDB with $p_0 > 0$ and $\gamma < 1$
 581 (where p_0, γ as in Theorem 4.7) are absolute constants. Let $\Phi(\mathbf{X}) = \Phi[Q, D, t]$ for any result
 582 tuple t with $\text{deg}(\Phi) = k$. Then one can compute an approximation satisfying Eq. (3) in time
 583 $O_{k, |Q|, \epsilon', \delta}(T_{\text{det}}(\text{OPT}(Q), D, c))$ (given Q, D and p_i for each $i \in [n]$ that defines \mathcal{P}).

584 Next, we note that the above result along with Lemma 4.8 answers Problem 1.5 in the
 585 affirmative as follows:

586 ▶ **Corollary 4.11.** Let Q be an \mathcal{RA}^+ query and \mathcal{D} be a c -TIDB with $p_0 > 0$ (where p_0
 587 as in Theorem 4.7) is an absolute constant. Let $\Phi(\mathbf{X}) = \Phi[Q, D, t]$ for any result tuple
 588 t with $\text{deg}(\Phi) = k$. Then one can compute an approximation satisfying Eq. (3) in time
 589 $O_{k, |Q|, \epsilon', \delta, c}(T_{\text{det}}(\text{OPT}(Q), D, c))$ (given Q, D and $p_{t,j}$ for each $t \in D, j \in [c]$ that defines
 590 \mathcal{P}).

591 **Proof of Corollary 4.11.** The proof follows by Lemma 4.8, and Corollary 4.10. ◀

592 If we want to approximate the expected multiplicities of all $Z = O(n^k)$ result tuples
 593 t simultaneously, we just need to run the above result with δ replaced by $\frac{\delta}{Z}$. Note this
 594 increases the runtime by only a logarithmic factor.

595 **5 Related Work**

596 **Probabilistic Databases** (PDBs) have been studied predominantly for set semantics.
 597 Approaches for probabilistic query processing (i.e., computing marginal probabilities of
 598 tuples), fall into two broad categories. *Intensional* (or *grounded*) query evaluation computes
 599 the *lineage* of a tuple and then the probability of the lineage formula. It has been shown
 600 that computing the marginal probability of a tuple is #P-hard [46] (by reduction from
 601 weighted model counting). The second category, *extensional* query evaluation, is in PTIME,
 602 but is limited to certain classes of queries. Dalvi et al. [15] and Olteanu et al. [22] proved
 603 dichotomies for UCQs and two classes of queries with negation, respectively. Amarilli et al.
 604 investigated tractable classes of databases for more complex queries [3]. Another line of work
 605 studies which structural properties of lineage formulas lead to tractable cases [32, 41, 44]. In
 606 this paper we focus on intensional query evaluation with polynomials.

607 Many data models have been proposed for encoding PDBs more compactly than as sets of
 608 possible worlds. These include tuple-independent databases [47] (TIDBs), block-independent
 609 databases (BIDBs) [42], and *PC-tables* [27]. Fink et al. [20] study aggregate queries over
 610 a probabilistic version of the extension of K-relations for aggregate queries proposed in [4]
 611 (*pvc-tables*) that supports bags, and has runtime complexity linear in the size of the lineage.
 612 However, this lineage is encoded as a tree; the size (and thus the runtime) are still superlinear

613 in $T_{det}(Q, D, c)$. The runtime bound is also limited to a specific class of (hierarchical) queries,
 614 suggesting the possibility of a generalization of [15]’s dichotomy result to bag-PDBs.

615 Several techniques for approximating tuple probabilities have been proposed in related
 616 work [21, 16, 38, 13], relying on Monte Carlo sampling, e.g., [13], or a branch-and-bound
 617 paradigm [38]. Our approximation algorithm is also based on sampling.

618 **Compressed Encodings** are used for Boolean formulas (e.g, various types of circuits
 619 including OBDDs [30]) and polynomials (e.g., factorizations [39]) some of which have been
 620 utilized for probabilistic query processing, e.g., [30]. Compact representations for which
 621 probabilities can be computed in linear time include OBDDs, SDDs, d-DNNF, and FBDD.
 622 [17] studies circuits for absorptive semirings while [45] studies circuits that include negation
 623 (expressed as the monus operation). Algebraic Decision Diagrams [7] (ADDs) generalize
 624 BDDs to variables with more than two values. Chen et al. [10] introduced the generalized
 625 disjunctive normal form. Appendix H covers more related work on fine-grained complexity.

626 **6 Conclusions and Future Work**

627 We have studied the problem of calculating the expected multiplicity of a bag-query result
 628 tuple, a problem that has a practical application in probabilistic databases over multisets. We
 629 show that under various parameterized complexity hardness results/conjectures computing the
 630 expected multiplicities exactly is not possible in time linear in the corresponding deterministic
 631 query processing time. We prove that it is possible to approximate the expectation of a
 632 lineage polynomial in linear time in the deterministic query processing over TIDBs and BIDBs
 633 (assuming that there are few cancellations). Interesting directions for future work include
 634 development of a dichotomy for bag PDBs. While we can handle higher moments (this
 635 follows fairly easily from our existing results— see Appendix F), more general approximations
 636 are an interesting area for exploration, including those for more general data models.

637 **References**

-
- 638 1 pdbench. <http://pdbench.sourceforge.net/>. Accessed: 2020-12-15.
- 639 2 Parag Agrawal, Omar Benjelloun, Anish Das Sarma, Chris Hayworth, Shubha U. Nabar,
 640 Tomoe Sugihara, and Jennifer Widom. Trio: A system for data, uncertainty, and lineage. In
 641 *VLDB*, pages 1151–1154, 2006.
- 642 3 Antoine Amarilli, Pierre Bourhis, and Pierre Senellart. Probabilities and provenance via tree
 643 decompositions. *PODS*, 2015.
- 644 4 Yael Amsterdamer, Daniel Deutch, and Val Tannen. Provenance for aggregate queries. In
 645 *PODS*, pages 153–164, 2011.
- 646 5 Lyublena Antova, Thomas Jansen, Christoph Koch, and Dan Olteanu. Fast and simple
 647 relational processing of uncertain data.
- 648 6 Albert Atserias, Martin Grohe, and Dániel Marx. Size bounds and query plans for relational
 649 joins. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 42(4):1737–1767, 2013. doi:10.1137/110859440.
- 650 7 R. Iris Bahar, Erica A. Frohm, Charles M. Gaona, Gary D. Hachtel, Enrico Macii, Abelardo
 651 Pardo, and Fabio Somenzi. Algebraic decision diagrams and their applications. In *IEEE CAD*,
 652 1993.
- 653 8 George Beskales, Ihab F. Ilyas, and Lukasz Golab. Sampling the repairs of functional
 654 dependency violations under hard constraints. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 3(1):197–207, 2010.
- 655 9 Peter Bürgisser, Michael Clausen, and Mohammad Amin Shokrollahi. *Algebraic complexity*
 656 *theory*, volume 315. Springer, 1997.
- 657 10 Hubie Chen and Martin Grohe. Constraint satisfaction with succinctly specified relations. *J.*
 658 *Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 76(8):847–860, 2010.

- 659 11 Jianer Chen, Xiuzhen Huang, Iyad A. Kanj, and Ge Xia. Strong computational lower bounds
660 via parameterized complexity. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 72(8):1346–1367,
661 2006. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022000006000675>,
662 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcss.2006.04.007>.
- 663 12 Radu Curticapean. Counting matchings of size k is $w[1]$ -hard. In *ICALP*, volume 7965, pages
664 352–363, 2013.
- 665 13 N. Dalvi and D. Suciu. Efficient query evaluation on probabilistic databases. *VLDB*, 16(4):544,
666 2007.
- 667 14 Nilesh Dalvi and Dan Suciu. The dichotomy of conjunctive queries on probabilistic structures.
668 In *PODS*, pages 293–302, 2007.
- 669 15 Nilesh Dalvi and Dan Suciu. The dichotomy of probabilistic inference for unions of conjunctive
670 queries. *JACM*, 59(6):30, 2012.
- 671 16 Maarten Van den Heuvel, Peter Ivanov, Wolfgang Gatterbauer, Floris Geerts, and Martin
672 Theobald. Anytime approximation in probabilistic databases via scaled dissociations. In
673 *SIGMOD*, pages 1295–1312, 2019.
- 674 17 Daniel Deutch, Tova Milo, Sudeepa Roy, and Val Tannen. Circuits for datalog provenance. In
675 *ICDT*, pages 201–212, 2014.
- 676 18 Su Feng, Boris Glavic, Aaron Huber, and Oliver Kennedy. Efficient uncertainty tracking for
677 complex queries with attribute-level bounds. In *SIGMOD*, 2021.
- 678 19 Su Feng, Aaron Huber, Boris Glavic, and Oliver Kennedy. Uncertainty annotated databases -
679 a lightweight approach for approximating certain answers. In *SIGMOD*, 2019.
- 680 20 Robert Fink, Larisa Han, and Dan Olteanu. Aggregation in probabilistic databases via
681 knowledge compilation. *PVLDB*, 5(5):490–501, 2012.
- 682 21 Robert Fink, Jiewen Huang, and Dan Olteanu. Anytime approximation in probabilistic
683 databases. *VLDBJ*, 22(6):823–848, 2013.
- 684 22 Robert Fink and Dan Olteanu. Dichotomies for queries with negation in probabilistic databases.
685 *TODS*, 41(1):4:1–4:47, 2016.
- 686 23 Jörg Flum and Martin Grohe. The parameterized complexity of counting problems. In
687 *Proceedings of the 43rd Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, FOCS '02, page 538,
688 USA, 2002. IEEE Computer Society.
- 689 24 Jörg Flum and Martin Grohe. *Parameterized Complexity Theory*. Texts in Theoretical
690 Computer Science. An EATCS Series. Springer, 2006. doi:10.1007/3-540-29953-X.
- 691 25 Hector Garcia-Molina, Jeffrey D. Ullman, and Jennifer Widom. *Database systems - the
692 complete book (2. ed.)*. Pearson Education, 2009.
- 693 26 Todd J. Green, Gregory Karvounarakis, and Val Tannen. Provenance semirings. In *PODS*,
694 pages 31–40, 2007.
- 695 27 Todd J Green and Val Tannen. Models for incomplete and probabilistic information. In *EDBT*,
696 pages 278–296. 2006.
- 697 28 T. Imielinski and W. Lipski. Incomplete information in relational databases. 1989.
- 698 29 Tomasz Imieliński and Witold Lipski Jr. Incomplete information in relational databases.
699 *JACM*, 31(4):761–791, 1984.
- 700 30 Abhay Kumar Jha and Dan Suciu. Probabilistic databases with markovviews. *PVLDB*,
701 5(11):1160–1171, 2012.
- 702 31 Richard M. Karp, Michael Luby, and Neal Madras. Monte-carlo approximation algorithms for
703 enumeration problems. *J. Algorithms*, 10(3):429–448, 1989.
- 704 32 Batya Kenig, Avigdor Gal, and Ofer Strichman. A new class of lineage expressions over
705 probabilistic databases computable in p -time. In *SUM*, volume 8078, pages 219–232, 2013.
- 706 33 Mahmoud Abo Khamis, Hung Q. Ngo, and Atri Rudra. *Faq: Questions asked frequently*. In
707 *PODS*, pages 13–28, 2016.
- 708 34 Tsvi Kopelowitz and Virginia Vassilevska Williams. Towards optimal set-disjointness and
709 set-intersection data structures. In *ICALP*, volume 168, pages 74:1–74:16, 2020.

- 710 35 Poonam Kumari, Said Achmiz, and Oliver Kennedy. Communicating data quality in on-demand
711 curation. In *QDB*, 2016.
- 712 36 Hung Q. Ngo. Worst-case optimal join algorithms: Techniques, results, and open problems.
713 In *PODS*, 2018.
- 714 37 Hung Q. Ngo, Christopher Ré, and Atri Rudra. Skew strikes back: new developments in the
715 theory of join algorithms. *SIGMOD Rec.*, 42(4):5–16, 2013.
- 716 38 Dan Olteanu, Jiewen Huang, and Christoph Koch. Approximate confidence computation in
717 probabilistic databases. In *ICDE*, pages 145–156, 2010.
- 718 39 Dan Olteanu and Maximilian Schleich. Factorized databases. *SIGMOD Rec.*, 45(2):5–16, 2016.
- 719 40 Theodoros Rekatsinas, Xu Chu, Ihab F. Ilyas, and Christopher Ré. Holoclean: Holistic data
720 repairs with probabilistic inference. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 10(11):1190–1201, 2017.
- 721 41 Sudeepa Roy, Vittorio Perduca, and Val Tannen. Faster query answering in probabilistic
722 databases using read-once functions. In *ICDT*, 2011.
- 723 42 C. Ré and D. Suciu. Materialized views in probabilistic databases: for information exchange
724 and query optimization. In *VLDB*, pages 51–62, 2007.
- 725 43 Christopher De Sa, Alexander Ratner, Christopher Ré, Jaeho Shin, Feiran Wang, Sen Wu, and
726 Ce Zhang. Incremental knowledge base construction using deepdive. *VLDB J.*, 26(1):81–105,
727 2017.
- 728 44 Prithviraj Sen, Amol Deshpande, and Lise Getoor. Read-once functions and query evaluation
729 in probabilistic databases. *PVLDB*, 3(1):1068–1079, 2010.
- 730 45 Pierre Senellart. Provenance and probabilities in relational databases. *SIGMOD Record*,
731 46(4):5–15, 2018.
- 732 46 Leslie G. Valiant. The complexity of enumeration and reliability problems. *SIAM J. Comput.*,
733 8(3):410–421, 1979.
- 734 47 Guy Van den Broeck and Dan Suciu. Query processing on probabilistic data: A survey. 2017.
- 735 48 Virginia Vassilevska Williams. Some open problems in fine-grained complexity. *SIGACT News*,
736 49(4):29–35, 2018. doi:10.1145/3300150.3300158.
- 737 49 Ying Yang, Niccolò Meneghetti, Ronny Fehling, Zhen Hua Liu, Dieter Gawlick, and Oliver
738 Kennedy. Lenses: An on-demand approach to etl. *PVLDB*, 8(12):1578–1589, 2015.

739 **7 Acknowledgements**

740 We thank Virginia Williams for showing us Eq. (20), which greatly simplified our earlier
741 proof of Lemma 3.8, and for graciously allowing us to use it.

742 **A** Generalizing Beyond Set Inputs

743 **A.1** TIDBs

744 In our definition of TIDBs (Sec. 2.2), we assumed a model of TIDBs where each input tuple
 745 is assigned a probability p of having multiplicity 1. That is, we assumed inputs to be sets,
 746 but interpret queries under bag semantics. Other sensible generalizations of TIDBs from set
 747 semantics to bag semantics also exist.

748 One very natural such generalization is to assign each input tuple t a multiplicity m_t and
 749 probability p : the tuple has probability p to exist with multiplicity m_t , and otherwise has
 750 multiplicity 0. If the maximal multiplicity of all input tuples in the TIDB is bounded by
 751 some constant, then a generalization of our hardness results and approximation algorithm
 752 can be achieved by changing the construction of lineage polynomials (in Fig. 1) as follows
 753 (all other cases remain the same as in fig. 1):

$$754 \quad \Phi[R, D_\Omega, t] = \begin{cases} m_t X_t & \text{if } D_\Omega.R(t) = m_t \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

756 That is the variable representing a tuple is multiplied by m_t to encode the tuple's multiplicity
 757 m_t . We note that our lower bounds still hold for this model since we only need $m_t = 1$ for all
 758 tuples t . Further, it can be argued that our proofs (as is) for approximation algorithms also
 759 work for this model. The only change is that since we now allow $m_t > 1$ some of the constants
 760 in the runtime analysis of our algorithms change but the overall asymptotic runtime bound
 761 remains the same.

762 Yet another option would be to assign each tuple a probability distribution over multiplicities.
 763 It seems very unlikely that our results would extend to a model that allows arbitrary
 764 probability distributions over multiplicities (our current proof techniques definitely break
 765 down). However, we would like to note that the special case of a Poisson binomial distribution
 766 (sum of independent but not necessarily identical Bernoulli trials) over multiplicities can be
 767 handled as follows: we add an additional identifier attribute to each relation in the database.
 768 For a tuple t with maximal multiplicity m_t , we create m_t copies of t with different identifiers.
 769 To answer a query over this encoding, we first project away the identifier attribute (note that
 770 as per Fig. 1, in Φ this would add up all the variables corresponding to the same tuple t).

771 **A.2** BIDBs

772 The approach described above works for BIDBs as well if we define the bag version of BIDBs
 773 to associate each tuple t a multiplicity m_t . Recall that we associate each tuple in a block
 774 with a unique variable. Thus, the modified lineage polynomial construction shown above can
 775 be applied for BIDBs too (and our approximation results also hold).

776 **B** Missing details from Section 2

777 **B.1** \mathcal{K} -relations and $\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]$ -encoded PDBs

778 We can use \mathcal{K} -relations to model bags. A \mathcal{K} -relation [26] is a relation whose tuples
 779 are annotated with elements from a commutative semiring $\mathcal{K} = \{K, \oplus_{\mathcal{K}}, \otimes_{\mathcal{K}}, 0_{\mathcal{K}}, 1_{\mathcal{K}}\}$. A
 780 commutative semiring is a structure with a domain K and associative and commutative
 781 binary operations $\oplus_{\mathcal{K}}$ and $\otimes_{\mathcal{K}}$ such that $\otimes_{\mathcal{K}}$ distributes over $\oplus_{\mathcal{K}}$, $0_{\mathcal{K}}$ is the identity of $\oplus_{\mathcal{K}}$,

782 $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{K}}$ is the identity of $\otimes_{\mathcal{K}}$, and $\mathbb{0}_{\mathcal{K}}$ annihilates all elements of K when combined by $\otimes_{\mathcal{K}}$. Let
 783 \mathcal{U} be a countable domain of values. Formally, an n -ary \mathcal{K} -relation R over \mathcal{U} is a function
 784 $R : \mathcal{U}^n \rightarrow K$ with finite support $\text{supp}(R) = \{t \mid R(t) \neq \mathbb{0}_{\mathcal{K}}\}$. A \mathcal{K} -database is defined
 785 similarly, where we view the \mathcal{K} -database (relation) as a function mapping tuples to their
 786 respective annotations. \mathcal{RA}^+ query semantics over \mathcal{K} -relations are analogous to the lineage
 787 construction semantics of Fig. 1, with the exception of replacing $+$ with $\oplus_{\mathcal{K}}$ and \cdot with $\otimes_{\mathcal{K}}$.

788 Consider the semiring $\mathbb{N} = \{\mathbb{N}, +, \times, 0, 1\}$ of natural numbers. \mathbb{N} -databases model bag
 789 semantics by annotating each tuple with its multiplicity. A probabilistic \mathbb{N} -database (\mathbb{N} -PDB)
 790 is a PDB where each possible world is an \mathbb{N} -database. We study the problem of computing
 791 statistical moments for query results over such databases. Given an \mathbb{N} -PDB $\mathcal{D} = (\Omega, \mathcal{P})$,
 792 (\mathcal{RA}^+) query Q , and possible result tuple t , we sum $Q(D)(t) \cdot \mathcal{P}(D)$ for all $D \in \Omega$ to compute
 793 the expected multiplicity of t . Intuitively, the expectation of $Q(D)(t)$ is the number of
 794 duplicates of t we expect to find in result of query Q .

795 Let $\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]$ denote the set of polynomials over variables $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ with natural
 796 number coefficients and exponents. Consider now the semiring (abusing notation) $\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}] =$
 797 $\{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}], +, \cdot, 0, 1\}$ whose domain is $\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]$, with the standard addition and multiplication of
 798 polynomials. We define an $\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]$ -encoded PDB $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}$ as the tuple $(D_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}, \mathcal{P})$, where $\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]$ -
 799 database $D_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}$ is paired with the probability distribution \mathcal{P} across the set of possible worlds
 800 represented by $D_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}$, i.e. the one induced from $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}$, the probability distribution over \mathbf{X} .
 801 Note that the notation is slightly abused since the first element of the pair is an encoded
 802 set of possible worlds, i.e. $D_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}$ is the deterministic bounding database. We denote by
 803 $\Phi[Q, D_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}, t]$ the annotation of tuple t in the result of $Q(D_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]})(t)$, and as before, interpret
 804 it as a function $\Phi[Q, D_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}, t] : \{0, 1\}^{|\mathbf{X}|} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ from vectors of variable assignments to the
 805 corresponding value of the annotating polynomial. $\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]$ -encoded PDBs and a function Mod
 806 (which transforms an $\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]$ -encoded PDB to an equivalent \mathbb{N} -PDB) are both formalized next.

807 To justify the use of $\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]$ -databases, we need to show that we can encode any \mathbb{N} -PDB in
 808 this way and that the query semantics over this representation coincides with query semantics
 809 over its respective \mathbb{N} -PDB. For that it will be opportune to define representation systems for
 810 \mathbb{N} -PDBs.

811 **► Definition B.1 (Representation System).** *A representation system for \mathbb{N} -PDBs is a tuple*
 812 *(\mathcal{M}, Mod) where \mathcal{M} is a set of representations and Mod associates with each $M \in \mathcal{M}$ an*
 813 *\mathbb{N} -PDB \mathcal{D} . We say that a representation system is closed under a class of queries \mathcal{Q} if for*
 814 *any query $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $M \in \mathcal{M}$ we have:*

$$815 \quad Mod(Q(M)) = Q(Mod(M))$$

816 *A representation system is complete if for every \mathbb{N} -PDB \mathcal{D} there exists $M \in \mathcal{M}$ such*
 817 *that:*

$$818 \quad Mod(M) = \mathcal{D}$$

819 As mentioned above we will use $\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]$ -databases paired with a probability distribution
 820 as a representation system, referring to such databases as $\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]$ -encoded PDBs. Given
 821 $\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]$ -encoded PDB $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}$, one can think of the of \mathcal{P} as the probability distribution across
 822 all worlds $\{0, 1\}^n$. Denote a particular world to be \mathbf{w} . For convenience let $\psi_{\mathbf{w}} : \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}}$
 823 be a function that computes the corresponding \mathbb{N} -PDB upon assigning all values $w_i \in \mathbf{w}$ to
 824 $X_i \in \mathbf{X}$ of $D_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}$. Note the one-to-one correspondence between elements $\mathbf{w} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ to the
 825 worlds encoded by $D_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}$ when \mathbf{w} is assigned to \mathbf{X} (assuming a domain of $\{0, 1\}$ for each X_i).
 826 We can think of $\psi_{\mathbf{w}}(D_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]})(t)$ as the semiring homomorphism $\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ that applies the
 827 assignment \mathbf{w} to all variables \mathbf{X} of a polynomial and evaluates the resulting expression in \mathbb{N} .

828 ► **Definition B.2** (*Mod*($\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}$)). Given an $\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]$ -encoded PDB $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}$, we compute its
 829 equivalent \mathbb{N} -PDB $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}} = \text{Mod}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}) = (\Omega, \mathcal{P}')$ as:

$$830 \quad \Omega = \{\psi_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}) \mid \mathbf{w} \in \{0, 1\}^n\}$$

$$831 \quad \forall D \in \Omega : Pr(D) = \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \{0, 1\}^n : \psi_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}) = D} Pr(\mathbf{w})$$

833 For instance, consider a $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}$ consisting of a single tuple $t_1 = (1)$ annotated with
 834 $X_1 + X_2$ with probability distribution $Pr([0, 0]) = 0$, $Pr([0, 1]) = 0$, $Pr([1, 0]) = 0.3$ and
 835 $Pr([1, 1]) = 0.7$. This $\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]$ -encoded PDB encodes two possible worlds (with non-zero
 836 probability) that we denote using their world vectors.

$$837 \quad D_{[0,1]}(t_1) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad D_{[1,1]}(t_1) = 2$$

838 Importantly, as the following proposition shows, any finite \mathbb{N} -PDB can be encoded as an
 839 $\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]$ -encoded PDB and $\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]$ -encoded PDBs are closed under \mathcal{RA}^+ [26].

840 ► **Proposition B.3.** $\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]$ -encoded PDBs are a complete representation system for \mathbb{N} -PDBs
 841 that is closed under \mathcal{RA}^+ queries.

842 **Proof.** To prove that $\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]$ -encoded PDBs are complete consider the following construction
 843 that for any \mathbb{N} -PDB $\mathcal{D} = (\Omega, \mathcal{P})$ produces an $\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]$ -encoded PDB $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]} = (\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}, \mathcal{P}')$ such
 844 that $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}) = \mathcal{D}$. Let $\Omega = \{D_1, \dots, D_{|\Omega|}\}$. For each world D_i we create a corresponding
 845 variable X_i . In $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}$ we assign each tuple t the polynomial:

$$846 \quad D_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{|\Omega|} D_i(t) \cdot X_i$$

847 The probability distribution \mathcal{P}' assigns all world vectors zero probability except for $|\Omega|$ world
 848 vectors (representing the possible worlds) \mathbf{w}_i . All elements of \mathbf{w}_i are zero except for the
 849 position corresponding to variables X_i which is set to 1. Unfolding definitions it is trivial
 850 to show that $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}) = \mathcal{D}$. Thus, $\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]$ -encoded PDBs are a complete representation
 851 system.

852 Since $\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]$ is the free object in the variety of semirings, Birkhoff's HSP theorem implies
 853 that any assignment $\mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, which includes as a special case the assignments $\psi_{\mathbf{w}}$ used here,
 854 uniquely extends to the semiring homomorphism alluded to above, $\psi_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}) (t) : \mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$.
 855 For a polynomial $\psi_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}) (t)$ substitutes variables based on \mathbf{w} and then evaluates the
 856 resulting expression in \mathbb{N} . For instance, consider the polynomial $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}(t) = \Phi = X + Y$
 857 and assignment $\mathbf{w} := X = 0, Y = 1$. We get $\psi_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}) (t) = 0 + 1 = 1$. Closure under
 858 \mathcal{RA}^+ queries follows from this and from [26]'s Proposition 3.5, which states that semiring
 859 homomorphisms commute with queries over \mathcal{K} -relations. ◀

860 B.2 TIDBs and BIDBs in the $\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]$ -encoded PDB model

861 Two important subclasses of $\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]$ -encoded PDBs that are of interest to us are the bag
 862 versions of tuple-independent databases (TIDBs) and block-independent databases (BIDBs).
 863 Under set semantics, a TIDB is a deterministic database D where each tuple t is assigned
 864 a probability p_t . The set of possible worlds represented by a TIDB D is all subsets of D .
 865 The probability of each world is the product of the probabilities of all tuples that exist with
 866 one minus the probability of all tuples of D that are not part of this world, i.e., tuples are
 867 treated as independent random events. In a BIDB, we also assign each tuple a probability,

868 but additionally partition D into blocks. The possible worlds of a BIDB D are all subsets of
 869 D that contain at most one tuple from each block. Note then that the tuples sharing the
 870 same block are disjoint, and the sum of the probabilities of all the tuples in the same block
 871 B is at most 1. The probability of such a world is the product of the probabilities of all
 872 tuples present in the world. For bag TIDBs and BIDBs, we define the probability of a tuple
 873 to be the probability that the tuple exists with multiplicity at least 1.

874 In this work, we define TIDBs and BIDBs as subclasses of $\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]$ -encoded PDBs defined
 875 over variables \mathbf{X} (Definition B.2) where \mathbf{X} can be partitioned into blocks that satisfy the
 876 conditions of a TIDB or BIDB (stated formally in Sec. 2.2). In this work, we consider
 877 one further deviation from the standard: We use bag semantics for queries. Even though
 878 tuples cannot occur more than once in the input TIDB or BIDB, they can occur with a
 879 multiplicity larger than one in the result of a query. Since in TIDBs and BIDBs, there is a
 880 one-to-one correspondence between tuples in the database and variables, we can interpret a
 881 vector $\mathbf{w} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ as denoting which tuples exist in the possible world $\psi_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]})$ (the ones
 882 where $w_i = 1$). For BIDBs specifically, note that at most one of the bits corresponding to
 883 tuples in each block will be set (i.e., for any pair of bits $w_j, w_{j'}$ that are part of the same
 884 block $b_i \supseteq \{t_{i,j}, t_{i,j'}\}$, at most one of them will be set). Denote the vector \mathbf{p} to be a vector
 885 whose elements are the individual probabilities p_i of each tuple t_i . Given PDB \mathcal{D} \mathcal{P} is the
 886 distribution induced by \mathbf{p} , which we will denote $\mathcal{P}^{(\mathbf{p})}$.

$$887 \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{W} \sim \mathcal{P}^{(\mathbf{p})}} [\Phi(\mathbf{W})] = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{w} \in \{0,1\}^n \\ s.t. w_j, w_{j'}=1 \rightarrow \exists b_i \supseteq \{t_{i,j}, t_{i,j'}\}}} \Phi(\mathbf{w}) \prod_{\substack{j \in [n] \\ s.t. w_j=1}} p_j \prod_{\substack{j \in [n] \\ s.t. w_j=0}} (1 - p_j) \quad (5)$$

889 Recall that tuple blocks in a TIDB always have size 1, so the outer summation of eq. (5) is
 890 over the full set of vectors.

891 B.3 Proof of Proposition 2.8

892 **Proof.** We need to prove for \mathbb{N} -PDB $\mathcal{D} = (\Omega, \mathcal{P})$ and $\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]$ -encoded PDB $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]} = (D'_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}, \mathcal{P}')$
 893 where $Mod(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}) = \mathcal{D}$ that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{D} \sim \mathcal{P}} [Q(\mathbf{D})(t)] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{W} \sim \mathcal{P}'} [\Phi[Q, D_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}, t](\mathbf{W})]$ By expanding
 894 $\Phi[Q, D_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}, t]$ and the expectation we have:

$$895 \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{W} \sim \mathcal{P}'} [\Phi(\mathbf{W})] = \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \{0,1\}^n} Pr(\mathbf{w}) \cdot Q(D_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]})(t)(\mathbf{w})$$

896 From $Mod(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}) = \mathcal{D}$, we have that the range of $\psi_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]})$ is Ω , so

$$898 \quad = \sum_{D \in \Omega} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \{0,1\}^n: \psi_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]})=D} Pr(\mathbf{w}) \cdot Q(D_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]})(t)(\mathbf{w})$$

899 The inner sum is only over \mathbf{w} where $\psi_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}) = D$ (i.e., $Q(D_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]})(t)(\mathbf{w}) = Q(D)(t)$)

$$901 \quad = \sum_{D \in \Omega} \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \{0,1\}^n: \psi_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]})=D} Pr(\mathbf{w}) \cdot Q(D)(t)$$

902 By distributivity of $+$ over \times

$$904 \quad = \sum_{D \in \Omega} Q(D)(t) \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \{0,1\}^n: \psi_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]})=D} Pr(\mathbf{w})$$

905 From the definition of \mathcal{P} in definition B.2, given $Mod(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}) = \mathcal{D}$, we get

$$907 \quad = \sum_{D \in \Omega} Q(D)(t) \cdot Pr(D) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{D} \sim \mathcal{P}} [Q(\mathbf{D})(t)]$$

908

909 ◀

910 B.4 Proposition B.4

911 Note the following fact:

912 ► **Proposition B.4.** *For any BIDB-lineage polynomial $\Phi(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ and all \mathbf{w} such that*
 913 *$Pr[\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{w}] > 0$, it holds that $\Phi(\mathbf{w}) = \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{w})$.*

914 **Proof.** Note that any Φ in factorized form is equivalent to its SMB expansion. For each
 915 term in the expanded form, further note that for all $b \in \{0, 1\}$ and all $e \geq 1$, $b^e = b$.
 916 Finally, note that there are exactly three cases where the expectation of a monomial term
 917 $\mathbb{E} \left[c_{\mathbf{d}} \prod_{i=1}^n X_i^{d_i} \right]$ is zero: (i) when $c_{\mathbf{d}} = 0$, (ii) when $p_i = 0$ for some i where $\mathbf{d}_i \geq 1$,
 918 and (iii) when X_i and X_j are in the same block for some i, j where $\mathbf{d}_i, \mathbf{d}_j \geq 1$. ◀

919 B.5 Proof for Lemma 1.4

920 **Proof.** Let Φ be a polynomial of n variables with highest degree = K , defined as follows:

$$921 \quad \Phi(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \{0, \dots, K\}^n} c_{\mathbf{d}} \cdot \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ s.t. d_i \geq 1}}^n X_i^{d_i}.$$

922 Let the boolean function $\text{ISIND}(\cdot)$ take \mathbf{d} as input and return true if there does not exist any
 923 dependent variables in \mathbf{d} , i.e., $\nexists B, i \neq j \mid d_{B,i}, d_{B,j} \geq 1$.¹³ Then in expectation we have

$$924 \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{W}} [\Phi(\mathbf{W})] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{W}} \left[\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{d} \in \{0, \dots, K\}^n \\ \wedge \text{ISIND}(\mathbf{d})}} c_{\mathbf{d}} \cdot \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ s.t. d_i \geq 1}}^n W_i^{d_i} + \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{d} \in \{0, \dots, K\}^n \\ \wedge \neg \text{ISIND}(\mathbf{d})}} c_{\mathbf{d}} \cdot \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ s.t. d_i \geq 1}}^n W_i^{d_i} \right] \quad (6)$$

$$925 \quad = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{d} \in \{0, \dots, K\}^n \\ \wedge \text{ISIND}(\mathbf{d})}} c_{\mathbf{d}} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{W}} \left[\prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ s.t. d_i \geq 1}}^n W_i^{d_i} \right] + \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{d} \in \{0, \dots, K\}^n \\ \wedge \neg \text{ISIND}(\mathbf{d})}} c_{\mathbf{d}} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{W}} \left[\prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ s.t. d_i \geq 1}}^n W_i^{d_i} \right] \quad (7)$$

$$926 \quad = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{d} \in \{0, \dots, K\}^n \\ \wedge \text{ISIND}(\mathbf{d})}} c_{\mathbf{d}} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{W}} \left[\prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ s.t. d_i \geq 1}}^n W_i^{d_i} \right] \quad (8)$$

$$927 \quad = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{d} \in \{0, \dots, K\}^n \\ \wedge \text{ISIND}(\mathbf{d})}} c_{\mathbf{d}} \cdot \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ s.t. d_i \geq 1}}^n \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{W}} [W_i^{d_i}] \quad (9)$$

$$928 \quad = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{d} \in \{0, \dots, K\}^n \\ \wedge \text{ISIND}(\mathbf{d})}} c_{\mathbf{d}} \cdot \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ s.t. d_i \geq 1}}^n \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{W}} [W_i] \quad (10)$$

$$929 \quad = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{d} \in \{0, \dots, K\}^n \\ \wedge \text{ISIND}(\mathbf{d})}} c_{\mathbf{d}} \cdot \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ s.t. d_i \geq 1}}^n p_i \quad (11)$$

$$930 \quad = \tilde{\Phi}(p_1, \dots, p_n). \quad (12)$$

931

¹³This BIDB notation is used and discussed in sec. 2.2

Eq. (6) is the result of substituting in the definition of Φ given above. Then we arrive at eq. (7) by linearity of expectation. Next, eq. (8) is the result of the independence constraint of BIDs, specifically that any monomial composed of dependent variables, i.e., variables from the same block B , has a probability of 0. Eq. (9) is obtained by the fact that all variables in each monomial are independent, which allows for the expectation to be pushed through the product. In eq. (10), since $W_i \in \{0, 1\}$ it is the case that for any exponent $e \geq 1$, $W_i^e = W_i$. Next, in eq. (11) the expectation of a tuple is indeed its probability. Finally, it can be verified that Eq. (12) follows since eq. (11) satisfies the construction of $\tilde{\Phi}(p_1, \dots, p_n)$ in Definition 1.3. ◀

941 B.6 Proof For Corollary 2.7

942 **Proof.** Note that Lemma 1.4 shows that $\mathbb{E}[\Phi] = \tilde{\Phi}(p_1, \dots, p_n)$. Therefore, if Φ is already
943 in SMB form, one only needs to compute $\tilde{\Phi}(p_1, \dots, p_n)$ ignoring exponent terms (note that
944 such a polynomial is $\tilde{\Phi}(p_1, \dots, p_n)$), which indeed has $O(|\Phi|)$ computations. ◀

945 C Missing details from Section 3

946 C.1 Lemma C.1

947 ▶ **Lemma C.1.** *Assuming that each $v \in V$ has degree ≥ 1 ,¹⁴ the PDB relations encoding the
948 edges for Φ_G^k of Definition 3.4 can be computed in $O(m)$ time.*

949 **Proof of Lemma C.1.** Only two relations need be constructed, one for the set V and one for
950 the set E . By a simple linear scan, each can be constructed in time $O(m+n)$. Given that
951 the degree of each $v \in V$ is at least 1, we have that $m \geq \Omega(n)$, and this yields the claimed
952 runtime. ◀

953 C.2 Proof of Lemma 3.5

954 **Proof.** By the recursive definition of $T_{det}(\cdot, \cdot)$ (see Sec. 2.4), we have the following equation
955 for our hard query Q when $k = 1$, (we denote this as Q^1).

$$956 \quad T_{det}(Q^1, D) = |D.V| + |D.E| + |D.V| + T_{join}(D.V, D.E, D.V).$$

957 We argue that $T_{join}(D.V, D.E, D.V)$ is at most $O(m)$ by noting that there exists an
958 algorithm that computes $D.V \bowtie D.E \bowtie D.V$ in the same runtime¹⁵. Then by the assumption
959 of Lemma C.1 (each $v \in V$ has degree ≥ 1), the sum of the first three terms is $O(m)$. We
960 then obtain that $T_{det}(Q^1, D) = O(m) + O(m) = O(m)$. For $Q^k = Q_1^1 \times \dots \times Q_k^1$, we have
961 the recurrence $T_{det}(Q^k, D) = T_{det}(Q_1^1, D) + \dots + T_{det}(Q_k^1, D) + T_{join}(Q_1^1, \dots, Q_k^1)$. Since
962 Q^1 outputs a count, computing the join $Q_1^1 \bowtie \dots \bowtie Q_k^1$ is just multiplying k numbers, which
963 takes $O(k)$ time. Thus, we have

$$964 \quad T_{det}(Q^k, D) \leq k \cdot O(m) + O(k) \leq O(km),$$

965 as desired. ◀

¹⁴This is WLOG, since any vertex with degree 0 can be dropped without affecting the result of our hard query.

¹⁵Indeed the trivial algorithm that computes the obvious pair-wise joins has the claimed runtime. That is, we first compute $D.V \bowtie D.E$, which takes $O(m)$ (assuming $D.V$ is stored in hash map) since tuples in $D.V$ can only filter tuples in $D.E$. The resulting subset of tuples in $D.E$ are then again joined (on the right) with $D.V$, which by the same argument as before also takes $O(m)$ time, as desired.

966 C.3 Lemma C.2

967 The following lemma reduces the problem of counting k -matchings in a graph to our problem
968 (and proves Theorem 3.6):

969 ► **Lemma C.2.** *Let p_0, \dots, p_{2k} be distinct values in $(0, 1]$. Then given the values $\tilde{\Phi}_G^k(p_i, \dots, p_i)$
970 for $0 \leq i \leq 2k$, the number of k -matchings in G can be computed in $O(k^3)$ time.*

971 C.4 Proof of Lemma C.2

972 **Proof.** We first argue that $\tilde{\Phi}_G^k(p, \dots, p) = \sum_{i=0}^{2k} c_i \cdot p^i$. First, since $\Phi_G(\mathbf{X})$ has degree 2, it
973 follows that $\Phi_G^k(\mathbf{X})$ has degree $2k$. By definition, $\tilde{\Phi}_G^k(\mathbf{X})$ sets every exponent $e > 1$ to $e = 1$,
974 which means that $\text{DEG}(\tilde{\Phi}_G^k) \leq \text{DEG}(\Phi_G^k) = 2k$. Thus, if we think of p as a variable, then
975 $\tilde{\Phi}_G^k(p, \dots, p)$ is a univariate polynomial of degree at most $\text{DEG}(\tilde{\Phi}_G^k) \leq 2k$. Thus, we can write

$$976 \quad \tilde{\Phi}_G^k(p, \dots, p) = \sum_{i=0}^{2k} c_i p^i$$

977 We note that c_i is *exactly* the number of monomials in the SMB expansion of $\Phi_G^k(\mathbf{X})$ composed
978 of i distinct variables.¹⁶

979 Given that we then have $2k + 1$ distinct values of $\tilde{\Phi}_G^k(p, \dots, p)$ for $0 \leq i \leq 2k$, it follows
980 that we have a linear system of the form $\mathbf{M} \cdot \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{b}$ where the i th row of \mathbf{M} is $(p_i^0 \dots p_i^{2k})$,
981 \mathbf{c} is the coefficient vector (c_0, \dots, c_{2k}) , and \mathbf{b} is the vector such that $\mathbf{b}[i] = \tilde{\Phi}_G^k(p_i, \dots, p_i)$.
982 In other words, matrix \mathbf{M} is the Vandermonde matrix, from which it follows that we have
983 a matrix with full rank (the p_i 's are distinct), and we can solve the linear system in $O(k^3)$
984 time (e.g., using Gaussian Elimination) to determine \mathbf{c} exactly. Thus, after $O(k^3)$ work, we
985 know \mathbf{c} and in particular, c_{2k} exactly.

986 Next, we show why we can compute $\#(G, \mathfrak{I} \dots \mathfrak{I}^k)$ from c_{2k} in $O(1)$ additional time. We
987 claim that c_{2k} is $k! \cdot \#(G, \mathfrak{I} \dots \mathfrak{I}^k)$. This can be seen intuitively by looking at the expansion
988 of the original factorized representation

$$989 \quad \Phi_G^k(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{(i_1, j_1), \dots, (i_k, j_k) \in E} X_{i_1} X_{j_1} \dots X_{i_k} X_{j_k},$$

990 where a unique k -matching in the multi-set of product terms can be selected $\prod_{i=1}^k i = k!$
991 times. Indeed, note that each k -matching $(i_1, j_1) \dots (i_k, j_k)$ in G corresponds to the monomial
992 $\prod_{\ell=1}^k X_{i_\ell} X_{j_\ell}$ in $\Phi_G^k(\mathbf{X})$, with distinct indexes, and this implies that each distinct k -matching
993 appears the exact number of permutations that exist for its particular set of k edges, or $k!$.

994 Since, as noted earlier, c_{2k} represents the number of monomials with $2k$ distinct variables,
995 then it must be that c_{2k} is the overall number of k -matchings. And since we have $k!$ copies
996 of each distinct k -matching, it follows that $c_{2k} = k! \cdot \#(G, \mathfrak{I} \dots \mathfrak{I}^k)$. Thus, simply dividing
997 c_{2k} by $k!$ gives us $\#(G, \mathfrak{I} \dots \mathfrak{I}^k)$, as needed. ◀

998 C.5 Proof of Theorem 3.6

999 **Proof.** For the sake of contradiction, assume we can solve our problem in $o(T_{\text{match}}(k, G))$
1000 time. Given a graph G by Lemma C.1 we can compute the PDB encoding in $O(m)$ time. Then

¹⁶ Since $\tilde{\Phi}_G^k(\mathbf{X})$ does not have any monomial with degree < 2 , it is the case that $c_0 = c_1 = 0$ but for the sake of simplicity we will ignore this observation.

1001 after we run our algorithm on $\tilde{\Phi}_G^k$, we get $\tilde{\Phi}_G^k(p_i, \dots, p_i)$ for every $0 \leq i \leq 2k$ in additional
 1002 $O(k) \cdot o(T_{match}(k, G))$ time. Lemma C.2 then computes the number of k -matchings in G in
 1003 $O(k^3)$ time. Adding the runtime of all of these steps, we have an algorithm for computing
 1004 the number of k -matchings that runs in time

$$1005 \quad O(m) + O(k) \cdot o(T_{match}(k, G)) + O(k^3) \tag{13}$$

$$1006 \quad \leq o(T_{match}(k, G)). \tag{14}$$

1008 We obtain Eq. (14) from the facts that k is fixed (related to m) and the assumption that
 1009 $T_{match}(k, G) \geq \omega(m)$. Thus we obtain the contradiction that we can achieve a runtime
 1010 $o(T_{match}(k, G))$ that is better than the optimal time $T_{match}(k, G)$ required to compute
 1011 k -matchings. ◀

1012 C.6 Subgraph Notation and $O(1)$ Closed Formulas

1013 We need all the possible edge patterns in an arbitrary G with at most three distinct edges.
 1014 We have already seen \mathfrak{A} , \mathfrak{B} and \mathfrak{C} , so we define the remaining patterns:

- 1015 ■ Single Edge (\mathfrak{D})
- 1016 ■ 2-path (\mathfrak{E})
- 1017 ■ 2-matching (\mathfrak{F})
- 1018 ■ 3-star (\mathfrak{G})—this is the graph that results when all three edges share exactly one common
 1019 endpoint. The remaining endpoint for each edge is disconnected from any endpoint of
 1020 the remaining two edges.
- 1021 ■ Disjoint Two-Path (\mathfrak{H})—this subgraph consists of a two-path and a remaining disjoint
 1022 edge.

1023 For any graph G , the following formulas for $\#(G, H)$ compute their respective patterns
 1024 exactly in $O(m)$ time, with d_i representing the degree of vertex i (proofs are in Appendix C.7):

$$1025 \quad \#(G, \mathfrak{D}) = m, \tag{15}$$

$$1026 \quad \#(G, \mathfrak{E}) = \sum_{i \in V} \binom{d_i}{2} \tag{16}$$

$$1027 \quad \#(G, \mathfrak{F}) = \sum_{(i,j) \in E} \frac{m - d_i - d_j + 1}{2} \tag{17}$$

$$1028 \quad \#(G, \mathfrak{G}) = \sum_{i \in V} \binom{d_i}{3} \tag{18}$$

$$1029 \quad \#(G, \mathfrak{H}) + 3\#(G, \mathfrak{C}) = \sum_{(i,j) \in E} \binom{m - d_i - d_j + 1}{2} \tag{19}$$

$$1030 \quad \#(G, \mathfrak{B}) + 3\#(G, \mathfrak{A}) = \sum_{(i,j) \in E} (d_i - 1) \cdot (d_j - 1) \tag{20}$$

1033 C.7 Proofs of Eq. (15)-Eq. (20)

1034 The proofs for Eq. (15), Eq. (16) and Eq. (18) are immediate.

1035 **Proof of Eq. (17).** For edge (i, j) connecting arbitrary vertices i and j , finding all other
 1036 edges in G disjoint to (i, j) is equivalent to finding all edges that are not connected to either
 1037 vertex i or j . The number of such edges is $m - d_i - d_j + 1$, where we add 1 since edge (i, j)
 1038 is removed twice when subtracting both d_i and d_j . Since the summation is iterating over
 1039 all edges such that a pair $((i, j), (k, \ell))$ will also be counted as $((k, \ell), (i, j))$, division by 2
 1040 then eliminates this double counting. Note that m and d_i for all $i \in V$ can be computed in
 1041 one pass over the set of edges by simply maintaining counts for each quantity. Finally, the
 1042 summation is also one traversal through the set of edges where each operation is either a
 1043 lookup ($O(1)$ time) or an addition operation (also $O(1)$) time. ◀

1044 **Proof of Eq. (19).** Eq. (19) is true for similar reasons. For edge (i, j) , it is necessary to find
 1045 two additional edges, disjoint or connected. As in our argument for Eq. (17), once the number
 1046 of edges disjoint to (i, j) have been computed, then we only need to consider all possible
 1047 combinations of two edges from the set of disjoint edges, since it doesn't matter if the two
 1048 edges are connected or not. Note, the factor 3 of $\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{I}$ is necessary to account for the triple
 1049 counting of 3-matchings, since it is indistinguishable to the closed form expression which of
 1050 the remaining edges are either disjoint or connected to each of the edges in the *initial* set of
 1051 edges disjoint to the edge under consideration. Observe that the disjoint case will be counted
 1052 3 times since each edge of a 3-path is visited once, and the same 3-path counted in each
 1053 visitation. For the latter case however, it is true that since the two path in $\mathfrak{I} \mathfrak{A}$ is connected,
 1054 there will be no multiple counting by the fact that the summation automatically disconnects
 1055 the current edge, meaning that a two matching at the current vertex under consideration
 1056 will not be counted. Thus, $\mathfrak{I} \mathfrak{A}$ will only be counted once, precisely when the single disjoint
 1057 edge is visited in the summation. The sum over all such edge combinations is precisely then
 1058 $\#(G, \mathfrak{I} \mathfrak{A}) + 3\#(G, \mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{I})$. Note that all factorials can be computed in $O(m)$ time, and then
 1059 each combination $\binom{n}{2}$ can be performed with constant time operations, yielding the claimed
 1060 $O(m)$ run time. ◀

1061 **Proof of Eq. (20).** To compute $\#(G, \mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{I})$, note that for an arbitrary edge (i, j) , a 3-path
 1062 exists for edge pair (i, ℓ) and (j, k) where i, j, k, ℓ are distinct. Further, the quantity $(d_i -$
 1063 $1) \cdot (d_j - 1)$ represents the number of 3-edge subgraphs with middle edge (i, j) and outer
 1064 edges $(i, \ell), (j, k)$ such that $\ell \neq j$ and $k \neq i$. When $k = \ell$, the resulting subgraph is a triangle,
 1065 and when $k \neq \ell$, the subgraph is a 3-path. Summing over all edges (i, j) gives Eq. (20) by
 1066 observing that each triangle is counted thrice, while each 3-path is counted just once. For
 1067 reasons similar to Eq. (17), all d_i can be computed in $O(m)$ time and each summand can
 1068 then be computed in $O(1)$ time, yielding an overall $O(m)$ run time. ◀

1069 C.8 Tools to prove Theorem 3.7

1070 Note that $\tilde{\Phi}_G^3(p, \dots, p)$ as a polynomial in p has degree at most six. Next, we figure out the
 1071 exact coefficients since this would be useful in our arguments:

1072 ▶ **Lemma C.3.** For any p , we have:

$$1073 \quad \tilde{\Phi}_G^3(p, \dots, p) = \#(G, \mathfrak{I})p^2 + 6\#(G, \mathfrak{A})p^3 + 6\#(G, \mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{I})p^4 + 6\#(G, \mathfrak{A})p^3 \\ 1074 \quad + 6\#(G, \mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{A})p^4 + 6\#(G, \mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{I})p^4 + 6\#(G, \mathfrak{I} \mathfrak{A})p^5 + 6\#(G, \mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{I})p^6. \quad (21)$$

1076 **C.8.1 Proof for Lemma C.3**1077 **Proof.** By definition we have that

1078
$$\Phi_G^3(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2), (i_3, j_3) \in E} \prod_{\ell=1}^3 X_{i_\ell} X_{j_\ell}.$$

1079 Hence $\tilde{\Phi}_G^3(\mathbf{X})$ has degree six. Note that the monomial $\prod_{\ell=1}^3 X_{i_\ell} X_{j_\ell}$ will contribute to the
 1080 coefficient of p^ν in $\tilde{\Phi}_G^3(\mathbf{X})$, where ν is the number of distinct variables in the monomial. Let
 1081 $e_1 = (i_1, j_1)$, $e_2 = (i_2, j_2)$, and $e_3 = (i_3, j_3)$. We compute $\tilde{\Phi}_G^3(\mathbf{X})$ by considering each of the
 1082 three forms that the triple (e_1, e_2, e_3) can take.

1083 **CASE 1:** $e_1 = e_2 = e_3$ (all edges are the same). When we have that $e_1 = e_2 = e_3$, then
 1084 the monomial corresponds to $\#(G, \mathfrak{I})$. There are exactly m such triples, each with a p^2
 1085 factor in $\tilde{\Phi}_G^3(p, \dots, p)$.

1086 **CASE 2:** This case occurs when there are two distinct edges of the three, call them e and
 1087 e' . When there are two distinct edges, there is then the occurrence when 2 variables in the
 1088 triple (e_1, e_2, e_3) are bound to e . There are three combinations for this occurrence in $\Phi_G^3(\mathbf{X})$.
 1089 Analogously, there are three such occurrences in $\Phi_G^3(\mathbf{X})$ when there is only one occurrence of
 1090 e , i.e. 2 of the variables in (e_1, e_2, e_3) are e' . This implies that all $3 + 3 = 6$ combinations of
 1091 two distinct edges e and e' contribute to the same monomial in $\tilde{\Phi}_G^3$. Since $e \neq e'$, this case
 1092 produces the following edge patterns: $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{II}$, which contribute $6p^3$ and $6p^4$ respectively to
 1093 $\tilde{\Phi}_G^3(p, \dots, p)$.

1094 **CASE 3:** All e_1, e_2 and e_3 are distinct. For this case, we have $3! = 6$ permutations
 1095 of (e_1, e_2, e_3) , each of which contribute to the same monomial in the SMB representation
 1096 of $\Phi_G^3(\mathbf{X})$. This case consists of the following edge patterns: $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{AA}, \mathfrak{I\bar{I}}, \mathfrak{I} \mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{III}$, which
 1097 contribute $6p^3, 6p^4, 6p^4, 6p^5$ and $6p^6$ respectively to $\tilde{\Phi}_G^3(p, \dots, p)$. \blacktriangleleft

1098 Since p is fixed, Lemma C.3 gives us one linear equation in $\#(G, \mathfrak{A})$ and $\#(G, \mathfrak{III})$ (we
 1099 can handle the other counts due to equations (15)-(20)). However, we need to generate
 1100 one more independent linear equation in these two variables. Towards this end we generate
 1101 another graph related to G :

1102 **► Definition C.4.** For $\ell \geq 1$, let graph $G^{(\ell)}$ be a graph generated from an arbitrary graph
 1103 G , by replacing every edge e of G with an ℓ -path, such that all inner vertexes of an ℓ -path
 1104 replacement edge are disjoint from all other vertexes.¹⁷

1105 We will prove Theorem 3.7 by the following reduction:

1106 **► Theorem C.5.** Fix $p \in (0, 1)$. Let G be a graph on m edges. If we can compute $\tilde{\Phi}_G^3(p, \dots, p)$
 1107 exactly in $T(m)$ time, then we can exactly compute $\#(G, \mathfrak{A})$ in $O(T(m) + m)$ time.

1108 For clarity, we repeat the notion of $\#(G, H)$ to mean the count of subgraphs in G isomorphic
 1109 to H . The following lemmas relate these counts in $G^{(2)}$ to $G^{(1)}$ (G). The lemmas are used
 1110 to prove Lemma C.8.

1111 **► Lemma C.6.** The 3-matchings in graph $G^{(2)}$ satisfy the identity:

$$\begin{aligned} 1112 \quad \#(G^{(2)}, \mathfrak{III}) &= 8 \cdot \#(G^{(1)}, \mathfrak{III}) + 6 \cdot \#(G^{(1)}, \mathfrak{I} \mathfrak{A}) \\ 1113 \quad &+ 4 \cdot \#(G^{(1)}, \mathfrak{AA}) + 4 \cdot \#(G^{(1)}, \mathfrak{I\bar{I}}) + 2 \cdot \#(G^{(1)}, \mathfrak{A}). \end{aligned}$$

17 Note that $G \equiv G^{(1)}$.

1115 ▶ **Lemma C.7.** For $\ell > 1$ and any graph $G^{(\ell)}$, $\#(G^{(\ell)}, \mathfrak{A}) = 0$.

1116 Finally, the following result immediately implies Theorem C.5:

1117 ▶ **Lemma C.8.** Fix $p \in (0, 1)$. Given $\tilde{\Phi}_{G^{(\ell)}}^3(p, \dots, p)$ for $\ell \in [2]$, we can compute in $O(m)$
1118 time a vector $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that

$$1119 \quad \begin{pmatrix} 1 - 3p & -(3p^2 - p^3) \\ 10(3p^2 - p^3) & 10(3p^2 - p^3) \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \#(G, \mathfrak{A}) \\ \#(G, \mathfrak{B}) \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{b},$$

1120 allowing us to compute $\#(G, \mathfrak{A})$ and $\#(G, \mathfrak{B})$ in $O(1)$ time.

1121 C.9 Proofs for Lemma C.6, Lemma C.7, and Lemma C.8

1122 Before proceeding, let us introduce a few more helpful definitions.

1123 ▶ **Definition C.9** ($E^{(\ell)}$). For $\ell > 1$, we use $E^{(\ell)}$ to denote the set of edges in $G^{(\ell)}$. For
1124 any graph $G^{(\ell)}$, its edges are denoted by the a pair (e, b) , such that $b \in \{0, \dots, \ell - 1\}$ where
1125 $(e, 0), \dots, (e, \ell - 1)$ is the ℓ -path that replaces the edge e for $e \in E^{(1)}$.

1126 ▶ **Definition C.10** ($E_S^{(\ell)}$). Given an arbitrary subgraph $S^{(1)}$ of $G^{(1)}$, let $E_S^{(1)}$ denote the set
1127 of edges in $S^{(1)}$. Define then $E_S^{(\ell)}$ for $\ell > 1$ as the set of edges in the generated subgraph $S^{(\ell)}$
1128 (i.e. when we apply Definition C.4 to S to generate $S^{(\ell)}$).

1129 For example, consider $S^{(1)}$ with edges $E_S^{(1)} = \{e_1\}$. Then the edge set of $S^{(2)}$ is defined
1130 as $E_S^{(2)} = \{(e_1, 0), (e_1, 1)\}$.

1131 ▶ **Definition C.11** ($\binom{E}{t}$ and $\binom{E}{\leq t}$). Let $\binom{E}{t}$ denote the set of subsets in E with exactly t
1132 edges. In a similar manner, $\binom{E}{\leq t}$ is used to mean the subsets of E with t or fewer edges.

1133 The following function f_ℓ is a mapping from every 3-edge shape in $G^{(\ell)}$ to its ‘projection’
1134 in $G^{(1)}$.

1135 ▶ **Definition C.12.** Let $f_\ell : \binom{E^{(\ell)}}{3} \rightarrow \binom{E^{(1)}}{\leq 3}$ be defined as follows. For any element $s \in \binom{E^{(\ell)}}{3}$
1136 such that $s = \{(e_1, b_1), (e_2, b_2), (e_3, b_3)\}$, define:

$$1137 \quad f_\ell(\{(e_1, b_1), (e_2, b_2), (e_3, b_3)\}) = \{e_1, e_2, e_3\}.$$

1138 ▶ **Definition C.13** (f_ℓ^{-1}). For an arbitrary subgraph $S^{(1)}$ of $G^{(1)}$ with at most $m \leq 3$ edges,
1139 the inverse function $f_\ell^{-1} : \binom{E^{(1)}}{\leq 3} \rightarrow 2^{\binom{E^{(\ell)}}{3}}$ takes $E_S^{(1)}$ and outputs the set of all elements
1140 $s \in \binom{E^{(\ell)}}{3}$ such that $f_\ell(s) = E_S^{(1)}$.

1141 Note, importantly, that when we discuss f_ℓ^{-1} , that each edge present in $E_S^{(1)}$ must have an
1142 edge in $s \in f_\ell^{-1}(E_S^{(1)})$ that projects down to it. In particular, if $|E_S^{(1)}| = 3$, then it must be the
1143 case that each $s \in f_\ell^{-1}(E_S^{(1)})$ consists of the following set of edges: $\{(e_i, b), (e_j, b'), (e_m, b'')\}$,
1144 where i, j and m are distinct.

1145 We are now ready to prove the structural lemmas. To prove the structural lemmas, we
1146 will count the number of occurrences of \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} in $G^{(\ell)}$ we count for each $S \in \binom{E_1}{\leq 3}$, how
1147 many \mathfrak{B} and \mathfrak{A} subgraphs appear in $f_\ell^{-1}(E_S^{(1)})$.

1148 **C.9.1 Proof of Lemma C.6**

1149 **Proof.** For each subset $E_S^{(1)} \in \binom{E_1}{\leq 3}$, we count the number of 3-matchings in the 3-edge
 1150 subgraphs of $G^{(2)}$ in $f_2^{-1}(E_S^{(1)})$. We first consider the case of $E_S^{(1)} \in \binom{E_1}{3}$, where $E_S^{(1)}$
 1151 is composed of the edges e_1, e_2, e_3 and $f_2^{-1}(E_S^{(1)})$ is the set of all 3-edge subsets $s \in$
 1152 $\{(e_1, 0), (e_1, 1), (e_2, 0), (e_2, 1), (e_3, 0), (e_3, 1)\}$ such that $f_\ell(s) = \{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$. The size of
 1153 the output is denoted $|f_2^{-1}(E_S^{(1)})|$. For the case where each set of edges of the form
 1154 $\{(e_1, b_1), (e_2, b_2), (e_3, b_3)\}$ for $b_i \in [2], i \in [3]$ is present, we have $|f_2^{-1}(E_S^{(1)})| = 8$. We count
 1155 the number of 3-matchings from the set $f_2^{-1}(E_S^{(1)})$.

1156 We do a case analysis based on the subgraph $S^{(1)}$ induced by $E_S^{(1)}$.

1157 ■ 3-matching (⚡⚡⚡)

1158 When $S^{(1)}$ is isomorphic to ⚡⚡⚡, it is the case that edges in $E_S^{(2)}$ are *not* disjoint only for the
 1159 pairs $(e_i, 0), (e_i, 1)$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. By definition, each set of edges in $f_2^{-1}(E_S^{(1)})$ is a three
 1160 matching and $|f_2^{-1}(E_S^{(1)})| = 8$ possible 3-matchings.

1161 ■ Disjoint Two-Path (⚡ ⚡)

1162 For $S^{(1)}$ isomorphic to ⚡ ⚡ edges e_2, e_3 form a 2-path with e_1 being disjoint. This means
 1163 that in $S^{(2)}$ edges $(e_2, 0), (e_2, 1), (e_3, 0), (e_3, 1)$ form a 4-path while $(e_1, 0), (e_1, 1)$ is its own
 1164 disjoint 2-path. We can pick either $(e_1, 0)$ or $(e_1, 1)$ for the first edge in the 3-matching, while
 1165 it is necessary to have a 2-matching from path $(e_2, 0), \dots, (e_3, 1)$. Note that the 4-path allows
 1166 for three possible 2-matchings, specifically,

$$1167 \{(e_2, 0), (e_3, 0)\}, \{(e_2, 0), (e_3, 1)\}, \{(e_2, 1), (e_3, 1)\}.$$

1168 Since these two selections can be made independently, $|f_2^{-1}(E_S^{(1)})| = 2 \cdot 3 = 6$ *distinct*
 1169 3-matchings in $f_2^{-1}(E_S^{(1)})$.

1170 ■ 3-star (⚡)

1171 When $S^{(1)}$ is isomorphic to ⚡, the inner edges $(e_i, 1)$ of $S^{(2)}$ are all connected, and the
 1172 outer edges $(e_i, 0)$ are all disjoint. Note that for a valid 3-matching it must be the case that
 1173 at most one inner edge can be part of the set of disjoint edges. For the case of when exactly
 1174 one inner edge is chosen, there exist 3 possibilities, based on which inner edge is chosen.
 1175 Note that if $(e_i, 1)$ is chosen, the matching has to choose $(e_j, 0)$ for $j \neq i$ and $(e_{j'}, 0)$ for
 1176 $j' \neq i, j' \neq j$. The remaining possible 3-matching occurs when all 3 outer edges are chosen,
 1177 and $|f_2^{-1}(E_S^{(1)})| = 4$.

1178 ■ 3-path (⚡⚡)

1179 When $S^{(1)}$ is isomorphic to ⚡⚡ it is the case that all edges beginning with e_1 and ending with e_3
 1180 are successively connected. This means that the edges of $E_S^{(2)}$ form a 6-path. For a 3-matching
 1181 to exist in $f_2^{-1}(E_S^{(1)})$, we cannot pick both $(e_i, 0)$ and $(e_i, 1)$ or both $(e_i, 1)$ and $(e_j, 0)$ where
 1182 $j = i + 1$. There are four such possibilities: $\{(e_1, 0), (e_2, 0), (e_3, 0)\}, \{(e_1, 0), (e_2, 0), (e_3, 1)\},$
 1183 $\{(e_1, 0), (e_2, 1), (e_3, 1)\}, \{(e_1, 1), (e_2, 1), (e_3, 1)\}$ and $|f_2^{-1}(E_S^{(1)})| = 4$.

1184 ■ Triangle (⚡)

1185 For $S^{(1)}$ isomorphic to \mathfrak{A} , note that it is the case that the edges in $E_S^{(2)}$ are connected in a
 1186 successive manner, but this time in a cycle, such that $(e_1, 0)$ and $(e_3, 1)$ are also connected.
 1187 While this is similar to the discussion of the three path above, the first and last edges are
 1188 not disjoint. This rules out both subsets of $(e_1, 0), (e_2, 0), (e_3, 1)$ and $(e_1, 0), (e_2, 1), (e_3, 1)$, so
 1189 that $|f_2^{-1}(E_S^{(1)})| = 2$.

1190 Let us now consider when $E_S^{(1)} \in \binom{E_1}{\leq 2}$, i.e. fixed subgraphs among

1191 ■ 2-matching ($\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{I}$), 2-path (\mathfrak{A}), 1 edge (\mathfrak{I})

1192 When $|E_S^{(1)}| = 2$, we can only pick one from each of two pairs, $\{(e_1, 0), (e_1, 1)\}$ and
 1193 $\{(e_2, 0), (e_2, 1)\}$. The third edge choice in $E_S^{(2)}$ will break the disjoint property of a 3-
 1194 matching. Thus, a 3-matching cannot exist in $f_2^{-1}(E_S^{(1)})$. A similar argument holds for
 1195 $|E_S^{(1)}| = 1$, where the output of f_2^{-1} is $\{\emptyset\}$ since there are not enough edges in the input to
 1196 produce any other output.

1197 Observe that all of the arguments above focused solely on the property of subgraph $S^{(1)}$
 1198 being isomorphic. In other words, all $E_S^{(1)}$ of a given “shape” yield the same number of
 1199 3-matchings in $f_2^{-1}(E_S^{(1)})$, and this is why we get the required identity using the above case
 1200 analysis. ◀

1201 C.9.2 Proof of Lemma C.7

1202 **Proof.** The number of triangles in $G^{(\ell)}$ for $\ell \geq 2$ will always be 0 for the simple fact that all
 1203 cycles in $G^{(\ell)}$ will have at least six edges. ◀

1204 C.9.3 Proof of Lemma C.8

1205 **Proof.** The proof consists of two parts. First we need to show that a vector \mathbf{b} satisfying the
 1206 linear system exists and further can be computed in $O(m)$ time. Second we need to show
 1207 that $\#(G, \mathfrak{A}), \#(G, \mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{I})$ can indeed be computed in time $O(1)$.

1208 The lemma claims that for $\mathbf{M} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - 3p & -(3p^2 - p^3) \\ 10(3p^2 - p^3) & 10(3p^2 - p^3) \end{pmatrix}$, $\mathbf{x} = \begin{pmatrix} \#(G, \mathfrak{A}) \\ \#(G, \mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{I}) \end{pmatrix}$

1209 satisfies the linear system $\mathbf{M} \cdot \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$.

1210 To prove the first step, we use Lemma C.3 to derive the following equality (dropping the
 1211 superscript and referring to $G^{(1)}$ as G):

$$1212 \quad \#(G, \mathfrak{I})p^2 + 6\#(G, \mathfrak{A})p^3 + 6\#(G, \mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{I})p^4 + 6\#(G, \mathfrak{A})p^3 + 6\#(G, \mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{A})p^4 \\ 1213 \quad + 6\#(G, \mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{I})p^4 + 6\#(G, \mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{A})p^5 + 6\#(G, \mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{I})p^6 = \tilde{\Phi}_G^3(p, \dots, p) \quad (22)$$

$$1214 \quad \#(G, \mathfrak{A}) + \#(G, \mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{I})p + \#(G, \mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{A})p^2 + \#(G, \mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{I})p^3 \\ 1215 \quad = \frac{\tilde{\Phi}_G^3(p, \dots, p)}{6p^3} - \frac{\#(G, \mathfrak{I})}{6p} - \#(G, \mathfrak{A}) - \#(G, \mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{I})p - \#(G, \mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{A})p \quad (23)$$

$$1216 \quad \#(G, \mathfrak{A})(1 - 3p) - \#(G, \mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{I})(3p^2 - p^3) = \\ 1217 \quad \frac{\tilde{\Phi}_G^3(p, \dots, p)}{6p^3} - \frac{\#(G, \mathfrak{I})}{6p} - \#(G, \mathfrak{A}) - \#(G, \mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{I})p - \#(G, \mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{A})p \\ 1218 \quad - [\#(G, \mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{I})p + 3\#(G, \mathfrak{A})p] - [\#(G, \mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{A})p^2 + 3\#(G, \mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{I})p^2] \quad (24) \\ 1219$$

1220 Eq. (22) is the result of Lemma C.3. We obtain the remaining equations through standard
1221 algebraic manipulations.

1222 Note that the LHS of Eq. (24) is obtained using eq. (19) and eq. (20) and is indeed the
1223 product $\mathbf{M}[1] \cdot \mathbf{x}[1]$. Further note that this product is equal to the RHS of Eq. (24), where
1224 every term is computable in $O(m)$ time (by equations (15)-(20)). We set $\mathbf{b}[1]$ to the RHS of
1225 Eq. (24).

1226 We follow the same process in deriving an equality for $G^{(2)}$. Replacing occurrences of
1227 G with $G^{(2)}$, we obtain an equation (below) of the form of eq. (24) for $G^{(2)}$. Substituting
1228 identities from lemma C.6 and Lemma C.7 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
1229 \quad 0 - (8\#(G, \mathfrak{iii}) + 6\#(G, \mathfrak{i} \mathfrak{A}) + 4\#(G, \mathfrak{AA}) + 4\#(G, \mathfrak{ii}) + 2\#(G, \mathfrak{A})) (3p^2 - p^3) = \\
1230 \quad \frac{\tilde{\Phi}_{G^{(2)}}^3(p, \dots, p)}{6p^3} - \frac{\#(G^{(2)}, \mathfrak{i})}{6p} - \#(G^{(2)}, \mathfrak{A}) - \#(G^{(2)}, \mathfrak{ii})p - \#(G^{(2)}, \mathfrak{AA})p \\
1231 \quad - [\#(G^{(2)}, \mathfrak{i} \mathfrak{A})p^2 + 3\#(G^{(2)}, \mathfrak{iii})p^2] - [\#(G^{(2)}, \mathfrak{ii})p + 3\#(G^{(2)}, \mathfrak{A})p] \\
\hspace{15em} (25)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
1232 \quad (10\#(G, \mathfrak{A}) + 10G\mathfrak{iii})(3p^2 - p^3) = \\
1233 \quad \frac{\tilde{\Phi}_{G^{(2)}}^3(p, \dots, p)}{6p^3} - \frac{\#(G^{(2)}, \mathfrak{i})}{6p} - \#(G^{(2)}, \mathfrak{A}) - \#(G^{(2)}, \mathfrak{ii})p - \#(G^{(2)}, \mathfrak{AA})p \\
1234 \quad - [\#(G^{(2)}, \mathfrak{ii})p + 3\#(G^{(2)}, \mathfrak{A})p] - [\#(G^{(2)}, \mathfrak{i} \mathfrak{A})p^2 - 3\#(G^{(2)}, \mathfrak{iii})p^2] \\
1235 \quad + (4\#(G, \mathfrak{AA}) + [6\#(G, \mathfrak{i} \mathfrak{A}) + 18\#(G, \mathfrak{iii})] + [4\#(G, \mathfrak{ii}) + 12\#(G, \mathfrak{A})]) (3p^2 - p^3) \\
1236 \hspace{15em} (26)
\end{aligned}$$

1237 The steps to obtaining eq. (26) are analogous to the derivation immediately preceding. As in
1238 the previous derivation, note that the LHS of Eq. (26) is the same as $\mathbf{M}[2] \cdot \mathbf{x}[2]$. The RHS
1239 of Eq. (26) has terms all computable (by equations (15)-(20)) in $O(m)$ time. Setting $\mathbf{b}[2]$ to
1240 the RHS then completes the proof of step 1.

1241 Note that if \mathbf{M} has full rank then one can compute $\#(G, \mathfrak{A})$ and $\#(G, \mathfrak{iii})$ in $O(1)$
1242 using Gaussian elimination.

1243 To show that \mathbf{M} indeed has full rank, we show in what follows that $\text{Det}(\mathbf{M}) \neq 0$ for
1244 every $p \in (0, 1)$. $\text{Det}(\mathbf{M}) =$

$$\begin{aligned}
1245 \quad \begin{vmatrix} 1 - 3p & -(3p^2 - p^3) \\ 10(3p^2 - p^3) & 10(3p^2 - p^3) \end{vmatrix} = (1 - 3p) \cdot 10(3p^2 - p^3) + 10(3p^2 - p^3) \cdot (3p^2 - p^3) \\
1246 \quad = 10(3p^2 - p^3) \cdot (1 - 3p + 3p^2 - p^3) = 10(3p^2 - p^3) \cdot (-p^3 + 3p^2 - 3p + 1) \\
1247 \quad = 10p^2(3 - p) \cdot (1 - p)^3 \hspace{10em} (27)
\end{aligned}$$

1249 From Eq. (27) it can easily be seen that the roots of $\text{Det}(\mathbf{M})$ are 0, 1, and 3. Hence there
1250 are no roots in $(0, 1)$ and Lemma C.8 follows. ◀

1251 C.10 Proof of Theorem C.5

1252 **Proof.** We can compute $G^{(2)}$ from $G^{(1)}$ in $O(m)$ time. Additionally, if in time $O(T(m))$, we
1253 have $\tilde{\Phi}_{G^{(\ell)}}^3(p, \dots, p)$ for $\ell \in [2]$, then the theorem follows by Lemma C.8. ◀

1254 In other words, if Theorem C.5 holds, then so must Theorem 3.7.

1255 C.11 Proof of Theorem 3.7

1256 **Proof.** For the sake of contradiction, assume that for any G , we can compute $\tilde{\Phi}_G^3(p, \dots, p)$ in

1257 $o(m^{1+\epsilon_0})$ time. Let G be the input graph. Then by Theorem C.5 we can compute $\#(G, \mathfrak{g})$
 1258 in further time $o(m^{1+\epsilon_0}) + O(m)$. Thus, the overall, reduction takes $o(m^{1+\epsilon_0}) + O(m) =$
 1259 $o(m^{1+\epsilon_0})$ time, which violates Conjecture 3.3. ◀

1260 **D** Missing Details from Section 4

1261 In the following definitions and examples, we use the following polynomial as an example:

$$1262 \quad \Phi(X, Y) = 2X^2 + 3XY - 2Y^2. \quad (28)$$

1263 ▶ **Definition D.1** (Pure Expansion). *The pure expansion of a polynomial Φ is formed by*
 1264 *computing all product of sums occurring in Φ , without combining like monomials. The pure*
 1265 *expansion of Φ generalizes Definition 2.1 by allowing monomials $m_i = m_j$ for $i \neq j$.*

1266 Note that similar in spirit to ??, E(C) Definition 4.1 reduces all variable exponents $e > 1$ to
 1267 $e = 1$. Further, it is true that E(C) is the pure expansion of C.

1268 ▶ **Example D.2** (Example of Pure Expansion). *Consider the factorized representation $(X +$
 1269 $2Y)(2X - Y)$ of the polynomial in Eq. (28). Its circuit C is illustrated in Fig. 4. The*
 1270 *pure expansion of the product is $2X^2 - XY + 4XY - 2Y^2$. As an additional example of*
 1271 *Definition 4.1, $E(C) = [(X, 2), (XY, -1), (XY, 4), (Y, -2)]$.*

1272 E(C) effectively¹⁸ encodes the reduced form of POLY(C), decoupling each monomial into a
 1273 set of variables \mathbf{v} and a real coefficient \mathbf{c} . However, unlike the constraint on the input Φ to
 1274 compute $\tilde{\Phi}$, the input circuit C does not need to be in SMB/SOP form.

1275 ▶ **Example D.3** (Example for Definition 4.2). *Using the same factorization from Example D.2,*
 1276 *POLY(|C|) = $(X + 2Y)(2X + Y) = 2X^2 + XY + 4XY + 2Y^2 = 2X^2 + 5XY + 2Y^2$. Note that*
 1277 *this is not the same as the polynomial from Eq. (28). As an example of the slight abuse of*
 1278 *notation we alluded to, $POLY(|C|(1, \dots, 1)) = 2(1)^2 + 5(1)(1) + 2(1)^2 = 9$.*

1279 ▶ **Definition D.4** (Subcircuit). *A subcircuit of a circuit C is a circuit S such that S is a DAG*
 1280 *subgraph of the DAG representing C. The sink of S has exactly one gate g.*

1281 The following results assume input circuit C computed from an arbitrary \mathcal{RA}^+ query Q
 1282 and arbitrary BIDB D. We refer to C as a BIDB circuit.

1283 ▶ **Theorem D.5.** *Let C be an arbitrary BIDB circuit and define $\Phi(\mathbf{X}) = POLY(C)$ and let*
 1284 *$k = DEG(C)$. Then an estimate \mathcal{E} of $\tilde{\Phi}(p_1, \dots, p_n)$ can be computed in time*

$$1285 \quad O\left(\left(\frac{SIZE(C) + \frac{\log \frac{1}{\delta} \cdot |C|^2(1, \dots, 1) \cdot k \cdot \log k \cdot DEPTH(C)}{(\epsilon)^2 \cdot \tilde{\Phi}^2(p_1, \dots, p_n)}}{(\epsilon)^2 \cdot \tilde{\Phi}^2(p_1, \dots, p_n)}\right) \cdot \overline{\mathcal{M}}(\log(|C|(1, \dots, 1)), \log(SIZE(C)))\right)$$

1286 such that

$$1287 \quad Pr\left(\left|\mathcal{E} - \tilde{\Phi}(p_1, \dots, p_n)\right| > \epsilon \cdot \tilde{\Phi}(p_1, \dots, p_n)\right) \leq \delta. \quad (29)$$

1288 The slight abuse of notation seen in $|C|(1, \dots, 1)$ is explained after Definition 4.2 and
 1289 an example is given in Example D.3. The only difference in the use of this notation in
 1290 Theorem D.5 is that we include an additional exponent to square the quantity.

Algorithm 1 APPROXIMATE $\tilde{\Phi}(\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{p}, \delta, \epsilon)$

Input: \mathcal{C} : Circuit
Input: $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_n) \in [0, 1]^N$
Input: $\delta \in [0, 1]$
Input: $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$
Output: $\text{acc} \in \mathbb{R}$

- 1: $\text{acc} \leftarrow 0$
- 2: $N \leftarrow \left\lceil \frac{2 \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{\epsilon^2} \right\rceil$
- 3: $(\mathcal{C}_{\text{mod}}, \text{size}) \leftarrow \text{ONEPASS}(\mathcal{C})$ \triangleright ONEPASS is Algorithm 2
- 4: **for** $i \in 1$ to N **do** \triangleright Perform the required number of samples
- 5: $(\mathbf{M}, \text{sgn}_i) \leftarrow \text{SAMPLEMONOMIAL}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{mod}})$ \triangleright SAMPLEMONOMIAL is Algorithm 3. Note that sgn_i is the *sign* of the monomial's coefficient and *not* the coefficient itself
- 6: **if** \mathbf{M} has at most one variable from each block **then**
- 7: $Y_i \leftarrow \prod_{X_j \in \mathbf{M}} p_j$ \triangleright \mathbf{M} is the sampled monomial's set of variables (cref. appendix D.9)
- 8: $Y_i \leftarrow Y_i \times \text{sgn}_i$
- 9: $\text{acc} \leftarrow \text{acc} + Y_i$ \triangleright Store the sum over all samples
- 10: **end if**
- 11: **end for**
- 12: $\text{acc} \leftarrow \text{acc} \times \frac{\text{size}}{N}$
- 13: **return** acc

1291 **D.1 Proof of Theorem D.5**

1292 We prove Theorem D.5 constructively by presenting an algorithm APPROXIMATE $\tilde{\Phi}$ (Algorithm 1)
1293 which has the desired runtime and computes an approximation with the desired approximation
1294 guarantee. Algorithm APPROXIMATE $\tilde{\Phi}$ uses Algorithm ONEPASS to compute weights on the
1295 edges of a circuits. These weights are then used to sample a set of monomials of $\Phi(\mathcal{C})$ from
1296 the circuit \mathcal{C} by traversing the circuit using the weights to ensure that monomials are sampled
1297 with an appropriate probability. The correctness of APPROXIMATE $\tilde{\Phi}$ relies on the correctness
1298 (and runtime behavior) of auxiliary algorithms ONEPASS and SAMPLEMONOMIAL that we
1299 state in the following lemmas (and prove later in this part of the appendix).

► **Lemma D.6.** *The ONEPASS function completes in time:*

$$O(\text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C}) \cdot \overline{\mathcal{M}}(\log(|\mathcal{C}(1, \dots, 1)|), \log \text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C})))$$

1300 ONEPASS guarantees two post-conditions: First, for each subcircuit \mathcal{S} of \mathcal{C} , we have that
1301 $\mathcal{S}.\text{partial}$ is set to $|\mathcal{S}|(1, \dots, 1)$. Second, when $\mathcal{S}.\text{type} = +$, $\mathcal{S}.\text{Lweight} = \frac{|\mathcal{S}|(1, \dots, 1)}{|\mathcal{S}|(1, \dots, 1)}$ and
1302 likewise for $\mathcal{S}.\text{Rweight}$.

1303 To prove correctness of Algorithm 1, we only use the following fact that follows from the above
1304 lemma: for the modified circuit $(\mathcal{C}_{\text{mod}})$ output by ONEPASS, $\mathcal{C}_{\text{mod}}.\text{partial} = |\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1)$.

► **Lemma D.7.** *The function SAMPLEMONOMIAL completes in time*

$$O(\log k \cdot k \cdot \text{DEPTH}(\mathcal{C}) \cdot \overline{\mathcal{M}}(\log(|\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1)), \log \text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C})))$$

1305 where $k = \text{DEG}(\mathcal{C})$. The function returns every $(\mathbf{v}, \text{sign}(\mathbf{c}))$ for $(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{c}) \in E(\mathcal{C})$ with probability
1306 $\frac{|\mathbf{c}|}{|\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1)}$.

¹⁸The minor difference here is that $E(\mathcal{C})$ encodes the *reduced* form over the SOP pure expansion of the compressed representation, as opposed to the SMB representation

1307 With the above two lemmas, we are ready to argue the following result:

1308 ► **Theorem D.8.** For any \mathcal{C} with $\text{DEG}(\text{poly}(|\mathcal{C}|)) = k$, algorithm 1 outputs an estimate acc
1309 of $\tilde{\Phi}(p_1, \dots, p_n)$ such that

$$1310 \Pr \left(\left| \text{acc} - \tilde{\Phi}(p_1, \dots, p_n) \right| > \epsilon \cdot |\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1) \right) \leq \delta,$$

1311 in $O \left(\left(\text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C}) + \frac{\log \frac{1}{\delta}}{\epsilon^2} \cdot k \cdot \log k \cdot \text{DEPTH}(\mathcal{C}) \right) \cdot \overline{\mathcal{M}}(\log(|\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1)), \log \text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C})) \right)$ time.

1312 Before proving Theorem D.8, we use it to argue the claimed runtime of our main result,
1313 Theorem D.5.

1314 **Proof of Theorem D.5.** Set $\mathcal{E} = \text{APPROXIMATE}\tilde{\Phi}(\mathcal{C}, (p_1, \dots, p_n), \delta, \epsilon')$, where

$$1315 \epsilon' = \epsilon \cdot \frac{\tilde{\Phi}(p_1, \dots, p_n)}{|\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1)},$$

1316 which achieves the claimed error bound on \mathcal{E} (acc) trivially due to the assignment to ϵ' and
1317 theorem D.8, since $\epsilon' \cdot |\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1) = \epsilon \cdot \frac{\tilde{\Phi}(1, \dots, 1)}{|\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1)} \cdot |\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1) = \epsilon \cdot \tilde{\Phi}(1, \dots, 1)$.

1318 The claim on the runtime follows from Theorem D.8 since

$$1319 \frac{1}{(\epsilon')^2} \cdot \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta} \right) = \frac{\log \frac{1}{\delta}}{\epsilon^2 \left(\frac{\tilde{\Phi}(p_1, \dots, p_n)}{|\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1)} \right)^2}$$

$$1320 = \frac{\log \frac{1}{\delta} \cdot |\mathcal{C}|^2(1, \dots, 1)}{\epsilon^2 \cdot \tilde{\Phi}^2(p_1, \dots, p_n)}.$$

1322

1323 Let us now prove Theorem D.8:

1324 D.2 Proof of Theorem D.8

1325 **Proof.** Consider now the random variables Y_1, \dots, Y_N , where each Y_i is the value of Y_i in
1326 algorithm 1 after line 8 is executed. Overloading $\text{ISIND}(\cdot)$ to receive monomial input (recall
1327 \mathbf{v}_m is the monomial composed of the variables in the set \mathbf{v}), we have

$$1328 Y_i = \mathbb{1}_{(\text{ISIND}(\mathbf{v}_m))} \cdot \prod_{X_i \in \text{VAR}(v)} p_i,$$

1329 where the indicator variable handles the check in Line 6 Then for random variable Y_i , it is
1330 the case that

$$1331 \mathbb{E}[Y_i] = \sum_{(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{c}) \in \mathbf{E}(\mathcal{C})} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{(\text{ISIND}(\mathbf{v}_m))} \cdot \mathbf{c} \cdot \prod_{X_i \in \text{VAR}(v)} p_i}{|\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1)}$$

$$1332 = \frac{\tilde{\Phi}(p_1, \dots, p_n)}{|\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1)},$$

1333 where in the first equality we use the fact that $\text{sgn}_i \cdot |\mathbf{c}| = \mathbf{c}$ and the second equality follows
1334 from Eq. (2) with X_i substituted by p_i .

1335 Let $\bar{Y} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i$. It is also true that

1336

$$\mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[Y_i] = \frac{\tilde{\Phi}(p_1, \dots, p_n)}{|\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1)}.$$

Hoeffding's inequality states that if we know that each Y_i (which are all independent) always lie in the intervals $[a_i, b_i]$, then it is true that

$$\Pr(|\bar{Y} - \mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}]| \geq \epsilon) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{2N^2\epsilon^2}{\sum_{i=1}^N (b_i - a_i)^2}\right).$$

Line 5 shows that sgn_i has a value in $\{-1, 1\}$ that is multiplied with $O(k)$ $p_i \in [0, 1]$, which implies the range for each Y_i is $[-1, 1]$. Using Hoeffding's inequality, we then get:

$$\Pr(|\bar{Y} - \mathbb{E}[\bar{Y}]| \geq \epsilon) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{2N^2\epsilon^2}{2^2N}\right) = 2 \exp\left(-\frac{N\epsilon^2}{2}\right) \leq \delta,$$

where the last inequality dictates our choice of N in Line 2.

For the claimed probability bound of $\Pr\left(\left|\text{acc} - \tilde{\Phi}(p_1, \dots, p_n)\right| > \epsilon \cdot |\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1)\right) \leq \delta$, note that in the algorithm, acc is exactly $\bar{Y} \cdot |\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1)$. Multiplying the rest of the terms by the additional factor $|\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1)$ yields the said bound.

This concludes the proof for the first claim of theorem D.8. Next, we prove the claim on the runtime.

Run-time Analysis

The runtime of the algorithm is dominated first by Line 3 (which by Lemma D.6 takes time $O(\text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C}) \cdot \bar{\mathcal{M}}(\log(|\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1)), \log(\text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C}))))$) and then by N iterations of the loop in Line 4. Each iteration's run time is dominated by the call to `SAMPLEMONOMIAL` in Line 5 (which by Lemma D.7 takes $O(\log k \cdot k \cdot \text{DEPTH}(\mathcal{C}) \cdot \bar{\mathcal{M}}(\log(|\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1)), \log(\text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C}))))$) and the check Line 6, which by the subsequent argument takes $O(k \log k)$ time. We sort the $O(k)$ variables by their block IDs and then check if there is a duplicate block ID or not. Combining all the times discussed here gives us the desired overall runtime. ◀

D.3 Proof of Theorem 4.7

Proof. The result follows by first noting that by definition of γ , we have

$$\tilde{\Phi}(1, \dots, 1) = (1 - \gamma) \cdot |\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1).$$

Further, since each $p_i \geq p_0$ and $\Phi(\mathbf{X})$ (and hence $\tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{X})$) has degree at most k , we have that

$$\tilde{\Phi}(1, \dots, 1) \geq p_0^k \cdot \tilde{\Phi}(1, \dots, 1).$$

The above two inequalities implies $\tilde{\Phi}(1, \dots, 1) \geq p_0^k \cdot (1 - \gamma) \cdot |\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1)$. Applying this bound in the runtime bound in Theorem D.5 gives the first claimed runtime. The final runtime of $O_k\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \cdot \text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C}) \cdot \log \frac{1}{\delta} \cdot \bar{\mathcal{M}}(\log(|\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1)), \log(\text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C})))\right)$ follows by noting that $\text{DEPTH}(\mathcal{C}) \leq \text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C})$ and absorbing all factors that just depend on k . ◀

D.4 Proof of Lemma 4.8

Proof. The circuit \mathcal{C}' is built from \mathcal{C} in the following manner. For each input gate \mathbf{g}_i with $\mathbf{g}_i.\text{val} = X_t$, replace \mathbf{g}_i with the circuit \mathcal{S} encoding the sum $\sum_{j=1}^c j \cdot X_{t,j}$. We argue that \mathcal{C}' is a valid circuit by the following facts. Let $\mathcal{D} = (\{0, \dots, c\}^D, \mathcal{P})$ be the original c -TIDB \mathcal{C} was generated from. Then, by Proposition 2.4 there exists a Binary-BIDB $\mathcal{D}' = (\times_{t \in D'} \{0, c_t\}, \mathcal{P}')$, with $D' = \{\langle t, j \rangle \mid t \in D, j \in [c]\}$, from which the conversion from \mathcal{C} to \mathcal{C}' follows. Both $\text{POLY}(\mathcal{C})$ and $\text{POLY}(\mathcal{C}')$ have the same expected multiplicity since (by Proposition 2.4) the distributions \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}' are equivalent and each $j \cdot \mathbf{W}'_{t,j} = \mathbf{W}_t$ for $\mathbf{W}' \in \{0, 1\}^{cn}$ and $\mathbf{W} \in \{0, \dots, c\}^D$. Finally, note that because there exists a (sub) circuit encoding $\sum_{j=1}^c j \cdot X_{t,j}$ that is a *balanced* binary tree, the above conversion implies the claimed size and depth bounds of the lemma.

Next we argue the claim on $\gamma(\mathcal{C}')$. Consider the list of expanded monomials $\mathbf{E}(\mathcal{C})$ for c -TIDB circuit \mathcal{C} . Let \mathbf{v} be an arbitrary monomial such that the set of variables in \mathbf{v} is $\mathbf{v}_m = X_{t_1}^{d_1}, \dots, X_{t_\ell}^{d_\ell}$ with ℓ variables. Then \mathbf{v} yields the set of monomials $\mathbf{E}_\mathbf{v}(\mathcal{C}') = \left\{ j_1^{d_1} \cdot X_{t,j_1}^{d_1} \times \dots \times j_\ell^{d_\ell} \cdot X_{t,j_\ell}^{d_\ell} \right\}_{j_1, \dots, j_\ell \in [0, c]}$ in $\mathbf{E}(\mathcal{C}')$. Recall that a cancellation occurs when we have a monomial \mathbf{v}' such that there exists $t \neq t'$ in the same block B where variables $X_t, X_{t'}$ are in the set of variables \mathbf{v}'_m of \mathbf{v}' . Observe that cancellations can only occur for each $X_t^{d_t} \in \mathbf{v}_m$, where the expansion $\left(\sum_{j=1}^c j \cdot X_{t,j} \right)^{d_t}$ represents the monomial $X_t^{d_t}$ in D' . Consider the number of cancellations for $\left(\sum_{j=1}^c j \cdot X_{t,j}^{d_t} \right)^{d_\ell}$. Then $\gamma \leq 1 - c^{d_t-1}$, since for each element in the set of cross products $\left\{ \times_{i \in [d_t], j_i \in [c]} X_{t,j_i} \right\}$ there are *exactly* c surviving elements with $j_1 = \dots = j_{d_t}$, i.e. $X_j^{d_t}$ for each $j \in [c]$. The rest of the $(c)^{d_t-1}$ cross terms cancel. Regarding the whole monomial \mathbf{v}' , it is the case that the proportion of non-cancellations across each $X_t^{d_t} \in \mathbf{v}'_m$ multiply because non-cancelling terms for X_t can only be joined with non-cancelling terms of $X_{t'}^{d_{t'}}$ for $t \neq t'$. This then yields the fraction of cancelled monomials $1 - \prod_{i=1}^\ell c^{d_i-1} \leq \gamma \leq 1 - c^{-(k-1)}$ where the inequalities take into account the fact that $\sum_{i=1}^\ell d_i \leq k$.

Since this is true for arbitrary \mathbf{v} , the bound follows for $\text{POLY}(\mathcal{C}')$. \blacktriangleleft

D.5 Proof of Lemma 4.9

We will prove Lemma 4.9 by considering the two cases separately. We start by considering the case when \mathcal{C} is a tree:

► **Lemma D.9.** *Let \mathcal{C} be a tree (i.e. the sub-circuits corresponding to two children of a node in \mathcal{C} are completely disjoint). Then we have*

$$|\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1) \leq (\text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C}))^{\text{DEG}(\mathcal{C})+1}.$$

Proof of Lemma D.9. For notational simplicity define $N = \text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C})$ and $k = \text{DEG}(\mathcal{C})$. We use induction on $\text{DEPTH}(\mathcal{C})$ to show that $|\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1) \leq N^{k+1}$. For the base case, we have that $\text{DEPTH}(\mathcal{C}) = 0$, and there can only be one node which must contain a coefficient or constant. In this case, $|\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1) = 1$, and $\text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C}) = 1$, and by Definition 4.4 it is the case that $0 \leq k = \text{DEG}(\mathcal{C}) \leq 1$, and it is true that $|\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1) = 1 \leq N^{k+1} = 1^{k+1} = 1$ for $k \in \{0, 1\}$.

Assume for $\ell > 0$ an arbitrary circuit \mathcal{C} of $\text{DEPTH}(\mathcal{C}) \leq \ell$ that it is true that $|\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1) \leq N^{k+1}$.

23:40 Bag PDB Queries

1408 For the inductive step we consider a circuit \mathcal{C} such that $\text{DEPTH}(\mathcal{C}) = \ell + 1$. The sink can
 1409 only be either a \times or $+$ gate. Let k_L, k_R denote $\text{DEG}(\mathcal{C}_L)$ and $\text{DEG}(\mathcal{C}_R)$ respectively. Consider
 1410 when sink node is \times . Then note that

$$\begin{aligned}
 1411 \quad |\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1) &= |\mathcal{C}_L|(1, \dots, 1) \cdot |\mathcal{C}_R|(1, \dots, 1) \\
 1412 &\leq (N-1)^{k_L+1} \cdot (N-1)^{k_R+1} \\
 1413 &= (N-1)^{k+1} \\
 1414 &\leq N^{k+1}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

1416 In the above the first inequality follows from the inductive hypothesis (and the fact that the
 1417 size of either subtree is at most $N-1$) and Eq. (30) follows by definition 4.4 which states
 1418 that for $k = \text{DEG}(\mathcal{C})$ we have $k = k_L + k_R + 1$.

1419 For the case when the sink gate is a $+$ gate, then for $N_L = \text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C}_L)$ and $N_R = \text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C}_R)$
 1420 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 1421 \quad |\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1) &= |\mathcal{C}_L|(1, \dots, 1) + |\mathcal{C}_R|(1, \dots, 1) \\
 1422 &\leq N_L^{k+1} + N_R^{k+1} \\
 1423 &\leq (N-1)^{k+1} \\
 1424 &\leq N^{k+1}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

1426 In the above, the first inequality follows from the inductive hypothesis and definition 4.4
 1427 (which implies the fact that $k_L, k_R \leq k$). Note that the RHS of this inequality is maximized
 1428 when the base and exponent of one of the terms is maximized. The second inequality follows
 1429 from this fact as well as the fact that since \mathcal{C} is a tree we have $N_L + N_R = N-1$ and, lastly,
 1430 the fact that $k \geq 0$. This completes the proof.

1431 The upper bound in Lemma 4.9 for the general case is a simple variant of the above proof
 1432 (but we present a proof sketch of the bound below for completeness):

1433 ► **Lemma D.10.** *Let \mathcal{C} be a (general) circuit. Then we have*

$$1434 \quad |\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1) \leq 2^{2^{\text{DEG}(\mathcal{C})} \cdot \text{DEPTH}(\mathcal{C})}.$$

1435 **Proof Sketch of Lemma D.10.** We use the same notation as in the proof of Lemma D.9 and
 1436 further define $d = \text{DEPTH}(\mathcal{C})$. We will prove by induction on $\text{DEPTH}(\mathcal{C})$ that $|\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1) \leq$
 1437 $2^{2^k \cdot d}$. The base case argument is similar to that in the proof of Lemma D.9. In the inductive
 1438 case we have that $d_L, d_R \leq d-1$.

1439 For the case when the sink node is \times , we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
 1440 \quad |\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1) &= |\mathcal{C}_L|(1, \dots, 1) \times |\mathcal{C}_R|(1, \dots, 1) \\
 1441 &\leq 2^{2^{k_L} \cdot d_L} \times 2^{2^{k_R} \cdot d_R} \\
 1442 &\leq 2^{2 \cdot 2^{k-1} \cdot (d-1)} \\
 1443 &\leq 2^{2^k d}.
 \end{aligned}$$

1445 In the above the first inequality follows from inductive hypothesis while the second inequality
 1446 follows from the fact that $k_L, k_R \leq k-1$ and $d_L, d_R \leq d-1$, where we substitute the
 1447 upperbound into every respective term.

1448 Now consider the case when the sink node is $+$, we get that

$$1449 \quad |\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1) = |\mathcal{C}_L|(1, \dots, 1) + |\mathcal{C}_R|(1, \dots, 1)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
1450 \quad & \leq 2^{2^{k_L} \cdot d_L} + 2^{2^{k_R} \cdot d_R} \\
1451 \quad & \leq 2 \cdot 2^{2^k(d-1)} \\
1452 \quad & \leq 2^{2^k d}. \\
1453
\end{aligned}$$

1454 In the above the first inequality follows from the inductive hypothesis while the second
1455 inequality follows from the facts that $k_L, k_R \leq k$ and $d_L, d_R \leq d - 1$. The final inequality
1456 follows from the fact that $k \geq 0$. ◀

1457 D.6 OnePass Remarks

1458 Please note that it is *assumed* that the original call to ONEPASS consists of a call on an
1459 input circuit C such that the values of members `partial`, `Lweight` and `Rweight` have been
1460 initialized to Null across all gates.

1461 The evaluation of $|C|(1, \dots, 1)$ can be defined recursively, as follows (where C_L and C_R are
1462 the ‘left’ and ‘right’ inputs of C if they exist):

$$1463 \quad |C|(1, \dots, 1) = \begin{cases} |C_L|(1, \dots, 1) \cdot |C_R|(1, \dots, 1) & \text{if } C.type = \times \\ |C_L|(1, \dots, 1) + |C_R|(1, \dots, 1) & \text{if } C.type = + \\ |C.val| & \text{if } C.type = NUM \\ 1 & \text{if } C.type = VAR. \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

1464 It turns out that for proof of Lemma D.7, we need to argue that when $C.type = +$, we
1465 indeed have

$$1466 \quad C.Lweight \leftarrow \frac{|C_L|(1, \dots, 1)}{|C_L|(1, \dots, 1) + |C_R|(1, \dots, 1)}; \quad (33)$$

$$1469 \quad C.Rweight \leftarrow \frac{|C_R|(1, \dots, 1)}{|C_L|(1, \dots, 1) + |C_R|(1, \dots, 1)} \quad (34)$$

1472 D.7 OnePass Example


1473 ▶ **Example D.11.** Let T encode the expression $(X + Y)(X - Y) + Y^2$. After one pass,
1474 Algorithm 2 would have computed the following weight distribution. For the two inputs of the
1475 sink gate C , $C.Lweight = \frac{4}{5}$ and $C.Rweight = \frac{1}{5}$. Similarly, for S denoting the left input of
1476 C_L , $S.Lweight = S.Rweight = \frac{1}{2}$. This is depicted in Fig. 5.

1477 D.8 Proof of OnePass (Lemma D.6)

1478 **Proof.** We prove the correct computation of `partial`, `Lweight`, `Rweight` values on C by
1479 induction over the number of iterations in the topological order TOPORD (line 1) of the
1480 input circuit C . TOPORD follows the standard definition of a topological ordering over the
1481 DAG structure of C .

1482 For the base case, we have only one gate, which by definition is a source gate and must be
1483 either VAR or NUM. In this case, as per eq. (32), lines 3 and 5 correctly compute `C.partial`
1484 as 1.

1485 For the inductive hypothesis, assume that ONEPASS correctly computes `S.partial`,
1486 `S.Lweight`, and `S.Rweight` for all gates g in C with $k \geq 0$ iterations over TOPORD. We now



■ **Figure 5** Weights computed by ONEPASS in Example D.11.

■ **Algorithm 2** ONEPASS (C)

Input: C: Circuit

Output: C: Annotated Circuit

Output: sum $\in \mathbb{N}$

```

1: for g in TOPORD (C) do
2:   if g.type = VAR then
3:     g.partial  $\leftarrow$  1
4:   else if g.type = NUM then
5:     g.partial  $\leftarrow$  |g.val|
6:   else if g.type =  $\times$  then
7:     g.partial  $\leftarrow$  gL.partial  $\times$  gR.partial
8:   else
9:     g.partial  $\leftarrow$  gL.partial + gR.partial
10:    g.Lweight  $\leftarrow$   $\frac{g_L.partial}{g.partial}$ 
11:    g.Rweight  $\leftarrow$   $\frac{g_R.partial}{g.partial}$ 
12:   end if
13:   sum  $\leftarrow$  g.partial
14: end for
15: return (sum, C)

```

▷ TOPORD (·) is the topological order of C

1487 prove for $k + 1$ iterations that ONEPASS correctly computes the **partial**, **Lweight**, and
 1488 **Rweight** values for each gate g_i in C for $i \in [k + 1]$. The $g_{k + 1}$ must be in the last ordering
 1489 of all gates g_i . When $\text{SIZE}(C) > 1$, if g_{k+1} is a leaf node, we are back to the base case.
 1490 Otherwise g_{k+1} is an internal node which requires binary input.

1491 When $g_{k+1}.\text{type} = +$, then by line 9 $g_{k+1}.\text{partial} = g_{k+1_L}.\text{partial} + g_{k+1_R}.\text{partial}$,
 1492 a correct computation, as per eq. (32). Further, lines 10 and 11 compute $g_{k+1}.\text{Lweight} =$
 1493 $\frac{g_{k+1_L}.\text{partial}}{g_{k+1}.\text{partial}}$ and analogously for $g_{k+1}.\text{Rweight}$. All values needed for each computation have
 1494 been correctly computed by the inductive hypothesis.

1495 When $g_{k+1}.\text{type} = \times$, then line 7 computes $g_{k+1}.\text{partial} = g_{k+1_L}.\text{partial} \times g_{k+1_R}.\text{partial}$,
 1496 which indeed by eq. (32) is correct. This concludes the proof of correctness.

1497 **Runtime Analysis**

1498 It is known that $\text{TOPORD}(G)$ is computable in linear time. There are $\text{SIZE}(C)$ iterations, each

Algorithm 3 SAMPLEMONOMIAL (\mathcal{C})

Input: \mathcal{C} : Circuit
Output: vars : TreeSet
Output: $\text{sgn} \in \{-1, 1\}$ ▷ Algorithm 2 should have been run before this one

```

1:  $\text{vars} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
2: if  $\mathcal{C}.\text{type} = +$  then ▷ Sample at every + node
3:    $\mathcal{C}_{\text{samp}} \leftarrow$  Sample from left input ( $\mathcal{C}_L$ ) and right input ( $\mathcal{C}_R$ ) w.p.  $\mathcal{C}.\text{Lweight}$  and  $\mathcal{C}.\text{Rweight}$ . ▷ Each call to SAMPLEMONOMIAL uses fresh randomness
4:    $(v, s) \leftarrow$  SAMPLEMONOMIAL( $\mathcal{C}_{\text{samp}}$ )
5:   return  $(v, s)$ 
6: else if  $\mathcal{C}.\text{type} = \times$  then ▷ Multiply the sampled values of all inputs
7:    $\text{sgn} \leftarrow 1$ 
8:   for  $\text{input}$  in  $\mathcal{C}.\text{input}$  do
9:      $(v, s) \leftarrow$  SAMPLEMONOMIAL( $\text{input}$ )
10:     $\text{vars} \leftarrow \text{vars} \cup \{v\}$ 
11:     $\text{sgn} \leftarrow \text{sgn} \times s$ 
12:   end for
13:   return  $(\text{vars}, \text{sgn})$ 
14: else if  $\mathcal{C}.\text{type} = \text{NUM}$  then ▷ The leaf is a coefficient
15:   return  $(\{\}, \text{SGN}(\mathcal{C}.\text{val}))$  ▷  $\text{SGN}(\cdot)$  outputs  $-1$  for  $\mathcal{C}.\text{val} \geq 1$  and  $-1$  for  $\mathcal{C}.\text{val} \leq -1$ 
16: else if  $\mathcal{C}.\text{type} = \text{var}$  then
17:   return  $(\{\mathcal{C}.\text{val}\}, 1)$ 
18: end if

```

1499 of which takes $O(\overline{\mathcal{M}}(\log(|\mathcal{C}(1 \dots, 1)|), \log(\text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C}))))$ time. This can be seen since each of
1500 all the numbers which the algorithm computes is at most $|\mathcal{C}|(1, \dots, 1)$. Hence, by definition
1501 each such operation takes $\overline{\mathcal{M}}(\log(|\mathcal{C}(1 \dots, 1)|), \log \text{SIZE}(\mathcal{C}))$ time, which proves the claimed
1502 runtime. ◀

1503 D.9 SampleMonomial Remarks

1504 We briefly describe the top-down traversal of SAMPLEMONOMIAL. When $\mathcal{C}.\text{type} = +$, the
1505 input to be visited is sampled from the weighted distribution precomputed by ONEPASS.
1506 When a $\mathcal{C}.\text{type} = \times$ node is visited, both inputs are visited. The algorithm computes two
1507 properties: the set of all variable leaf nodes visited, and the product of the signs of visited
1508 coefficient leaf nodes. We will assume the TreeSet data structure to maintain sets with
1509 logarithmic time insertion and linear time traversal of its elements. While we would like to
1510 take advantage of the space efficiency gained in using a circuit \mathcal{C} instead an expression tree T ,
1511 we do not know that such a method exists when computing a sample of the input polynomial
1512 representation.

1513 The efficiency gains of circuits over trees is found in the capability of circuits to only
1514 require space for each *distinct* term in the compressed representation. This saves space
1515 in such polynomials containing non-distinct terms multiplied or added to each other, e.g.,
1516 x^4 . However, to avoid biased sampling, it is imperative to sample from both inputs of a
1517 multiplication gate, independently, which is indeed the approach of SAMPLEMONOMIAL.

1518 **D.10 Proof of SampleMonomial (Lemma D.7)**

1519 **Proof.** We first need to show that SAMPLEMONOMIAL samples a valid monomial v_m by
 1520 sampling and returning a set of variables v , such that (v, c) is in $E(C)$ and v_m is indeed a
 1521 monomial of the $\tilde{\Phi}(X)$ encoded in C . We show this via induction over the depth of C . For
 1522 the base case, let the depth d of C be 0. We have that the single gate is either a constant c
 1523 for which by line 15 we return $\{ \}$, or we have that $C.type = VAR$ and $C.val = x$, and by
 1524 line 17 we return $\{x\}$. By definition 4.1, both cases return a valid v for some (v, c) from
 1525 $E(C)$, and the base case is proven.

1526 For the inductive hypothesis, assume that for $d \leq k$ for some $k \geq 0$, that it is indeed the
 1527 case that SAMPLEMONOMIAL returns a valid monomial.

1528 For the inductive step, let us take a circuit C with $d = k + 1$. Note that each input
 1529 has depth $d - 1 \leq k$, and by inductive hypothesis both of them sample a valid monomial.
 1530 Then the sink can be either a $+$ or \times gate. For the case when $C.type = +$, line 3 of
 1531 SAMPLEMONOMIAL will choose one of the inputs of the source. By inductive hypothesis it is
 1532 the case that some valid monomial is being randomly sampled from each of the inputs. Then
 1533 it follows when $C.type = +$ that a valid monomial is sampled by SAMPLEMONOMIAL. When
 1534 the $C.type = \times$, line 10 computes the set union of the monomials returned by the two inputs
 1535 of the sink, and it is trivial to see by definition 4.1 that v_m is a valid monomial encoded by
 1536 some (v, c) of $E(C)$.

1537 We will next prove by induction on the depth d of C that for $(v, c) \in E(C)$, v is sampled
 1538 with a probability $\frac{|c|}{|C|(1, \dots, 1)}$.

1539 For the base case $d = 0$, by definition 2.9 we know that the $SIZE(C) = 1$ and $C.type =$
 1540 NUM or VAR . For either case, the probability of the value returned is 1 since there is only
 1541 one value to sample from. When $C.val = x$, the algorithm always return the variable set
 1542 $\{x\}$. When $C.type = NUM$, SAMPLEMONOMIAL will always return \emptyset .

1543 For the inductive hypothesis, assume that for $d \leq k$ and $k \geq 0$ SAMPLEMONOMIAL indeed
 1544 returns v in (v, c) of $E(C)$ with probability $\frac{|c|}{|C|(1, \dots, 1)}$.

1545 We prove now for $d = k + 1$ the inductive step holds. It is the case that the sink of C has
 1546 two inputs C_L and C_R . Since C_L and C_R are both depth $d - 1 \leq k$, by inductive hypothesis,
 1547 SAMPLEMONOMIAL will return v_L in (v_L, c_L) of $E(C_L)$ and v_R in (v_R, c_R) of $E(C_R)$, from C_L and
 1548 C_R with probability $\frac{|c_L|}{|C_L|(1, \dots, 1)}$ and $\frac{|c_R|}{|C_R|(1, \dots, 1)}$.

1549 Consider the case when $C.type = \times$. For the term (v, c) from $E(C)$ that is being sampled
 1550 it is the case that $v = v_L \cup v_R$, where v_L is coming from C_L and v_R from C_R . The probability
 1551 that SAMPLEMONOMIAL (C_L) returns v_L is $\frac{|c_{v_L}|}{|C_L|(1, \dots, 1)}$ and $\frac{|c_{v_R}|}{|C_R|(1, \dots, 1)}$ for v_R . Since both v_L
 1552 and v_R are sampled with independent randomness, the final probability for sample v is
 1553 then $\frac{|c_{v_L}| \cdot |c_{v_R}|}{|C_L|(1, \dots, 1) \cdot |C_R|(1, \dots, 1)}$. For (v, c) in $E(C)$, by definition 4.1 it is indeed the case that
 1554 $|c| = |c_{v_L}| \cdot |c_{v_R}|$ and that (as shown in eq. (32)) $|C|(1, \dots, 1) = |C_L|(1, \dots, 1) \cdot |C_R|(1, \dots, 1)$,
 1555 and therefore v is sampled with correct probability $\frac{|c|}{|C|(1, \dots, 1)}$.

1556 For the case when $C.type = +$, SAMPLEMONOMIAL will sample v from one of its inputs.
 1557 By inductive hypothesis we know that any v_L in $E(C_L)$ and any v_R in $E(C_R)$ will both be
 1558 sampled with correct probability $\frac{|c_{v_L}|}{|C_L|(1, \dots, 1)}$ and $\frac{|c_{v_R}|}{|C_R|(1, \dots, 1)}$, where either v_L or v_R will equal v ,
 1559 depending on whether C_L or C_R is sampled. Assume that v is sampled from C_L , and note that
 1560 a symmetric argument holds for the case when v is sampled from C_R . Notice also that the
 1561 probability of choosing C_L from C is $\frac{|C_L|(1, \dots, 1)}{|C_L|(1, \dots, 1) + |C_R|(1, \dots, 1)}$ as computed by ONEPASS. Then,
 1562 since SAMPLEMONOMIAL goes top-down, and each sampling choice is independent (which
 1563 follows from the randomness in the root of C being independent from the randomness used
 1564 in its subtrees), the probability for v to be sampled from C is equal to the product of the

1565 probability that C_L is sampled from C and v is sampled in C_L , and

$$\begin{aligned}
 1566 \quad & Pr(\text{SAMPLEMONOMIAL}(C) = v) = \\
 1567 \quad & Pr(\text{SAMPLEMONOMIAL}(C_L) = v) \cdot Pr(\text{SampledChild}(C) = C_L) \\
 1568 \quad & = \frac{|c_v|}{|C_L|(1, \dots, 1)} \cdot \frac{|C_L|(1, \dots, 1)}{|C_L|(1, \dots, 1) + |C_R|(1, \dots, 1)} \\
 1569 \quad & = \frac{|c_v|}{|C|(1, \dots, 1)}, \\
 1570
 \end{aligned}$$

1571 and we obtain the desired result.

1572 Lastly, we show by simple induction of the depth d of C that `SAMPLEMONOMIAL` indeed
 1573 returns the correct sign value of c in (v, c) .

1574 In the base case, `C.type` = `NUM` or `VAR`. For the former, `SAMPLEMONOMIAL` correctly
 1575 returns the sign value of the gate. For the latter, `SAMPLEMONOMIAL` returns the correct
 1576 sign of 1, since a variable is a neutral element, and 1 is the multiplicative identity, whose
 1577 product with another sign element will not change that sign element.

1578 For the inductive hypothesis, we assume for a circuit of depth $d \leq k$ and $k \geq 0$ that the
 1579 algorithm correctly returns the sign value of c .

1580 Similar to before, for a depth $d \leq k + 1$, it is true that C_L and C_R both return the correct
 1581 sign of c . For the case that `C.type` = `×`, the sign value of both inputs are multiplied, which
 1582 is the correct behavior by definition 4.1. When `C.type` = `+`, only one input of C is sampled,
 1583 and the algorithm returns the correct sign value of c by inductive hypothesis.

1584 Run-time Analysis

1585 It is easy to check that except for lines 3 and 10, all lines take $O(1)$ time. Consider an
 1586 execution of line 10. We note that we will be adding a given set of variables to some set at
 1587 most once: since the sum of the sizes of the sets at a given level is at most $\text{DEG}(C)$, each gate
 1588 visited takes $O(\log \text{DEG}(C))$. For Line 3, note that we pick C_L with probability $\frac{a}{a+b}$ where
 1589 $a = C.Lweight$ and $b = C.Rweight$. We can implement this step by picking a random number
 1590 $r \in [a + b]$ and then checking if $r \leq a$. It is easy to check that $a + b \leq |C|(1, \dots, 1)$. This
 1591 means we need to add and compare $\log |C|(1, \dots, 1)$ -bit numbers, which can certainly be done
 1592 in time $\overline{M}(\log(|C|(1, \dots, 1)), \log \text{SIZE}(C))$ (note that this is an over-estimate). Denote COST
 1593 (C) (Eq. (35)) to be an upper bound of the number of gates visited by `SAMPLEMONOMIAL`.
 1594 Then the runtime is $O(\text{COST}(C) \cdot \log \text{DEG}(C) \cdot \overline{M}(\log(|C|(1, \dots, 1)), \log \text{SIZE}(C)))$.

1595 We now bound the number of recursive calls in `SAMPLEMONOMIAL` by $O((\text{DEG}(C) + 1) \cdot$
 1596 $\text{DEPTH}(C))$, which by the above will prove the claimed runtime.

1597 Let $\text{COST}(\cdot)$ be a function that models an upper bound on the number of gates that can
 1598 be visited in the run of `SAMPLEMONOMIAL`. We define $\text{COST}(\cdot)$ recursively as follows.

$$1599 \quad \text{COST}(C) = \begin{cases} 1 + \text{COST}(C_L) + \text{COST}(C_R) & \text{if } C.type = \times \\ 1 + \max(\text{COST}(C_L), \text{COST}(C_R)) & \text{if } C.type = + \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (35)$$

1600 First note that the number of gates visited in `SAMPLEMONOMIAL` is $\leq \text{COST}(C)$. To show
 1601 that eq. (35) upper bounds the number of nodes visited by `SAMPLEMONOMIAL`, note that
 1602 when `SAMPLEMONOMIAL` visits a gate such that `C.type` = `×`, line 8 visits each input of C , as
 1603 defined in (35). For the case when `C.type` = `+`, line 3 visits exactly one of the input gates,

1604 which may or may not be the subcircuit with the maximum number of gates traversed, which
 1605 makes $\text{COST}(\cdot)$ an upperbound. Finally, it is trivial to see that when $\mathbf{C.type} \in \{\text{VAR}, \text{NUM}\}$,
 1606 i.e., a source gate, that only one gate is visited.

1607 We prove the following inequality holds.

$$1608 \quad 2(\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}) + 1) \cdot \text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}) + 1 \geq \text{COST}(\mathbf{C}) \quad (36)$$

1609 Note that eq. (36) implies the claimed runtime. We prove eq. (36) for the number of
 1610 gates traversed in `SAMPLEMONOMIAL` using induction over $\text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C})$. Recall how degree is
 1611 defined in definition 4.4.

1612 For the base case $\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}) = \{0, 1\}$, $\text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}) = 0$, $\text{COST}(\mathbf{C}) = 1$, and it is trivial to see
 1613 that the inequality $2\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}) \cdot \text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}) + 1 \geq \text{COST}(\mathbf{C})$ holds.

1614 For the inductive hypothesis, we assume the bound holds for any circuit where $\ell \geq$
 1615 $\text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}) \geq 0$. Now consider the case when `SAMPLEMONOMIAL` has an arbitrary circuit \mathbf{C}
 1616 input with $\text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}) = \ell + 1$. By definition $\mathbf{C.type} \in \{+, \times\}$. Note that since $\text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}) \geq 1$,
 1617 \mathbf{C} must have input(s). Further we know that by the inductive hypothesis the inputs \mathbf{C}_i for
 1618 $i \in \{\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{R}\}$ of the sink gate \mathbf{C} uphold the bound

$$1619 \quad 2(\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_i) + 1) \cdot \text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}_i) + 1 \geq \text{COST}(\mathbf{C}_i). \quad (37)$$

1620 In particular, since for any i , eq. (37) holds, then it immediately follows that an inequality
 1621 whose operands consist of a sum of the aforementioned inequalities must also hold. This is
 1622 readily seen in the inequality of eq. (39) and eq. (40), where $2(\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_L) + 1) \cdot \text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}_L) \geq$
 1623 $\text{COST}(\mathbf{C}_L)$, likewise for \mathbf{C}_R , and $1 \geq 1$. It is also true that $\text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}_L) \leq \text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}) - 1$ and
 1624 $\text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}_R) \leq \text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}) - 1$.

1625 If $\mathbf{C.type} = +$, then $\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}) = \max(\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_L), \text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_R))$. Otherwise $\mathbf{C.type} = \times$ and
 1626 $\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}) = \text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_L) + \text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_R) + 1$. In either case it is true that $\text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}) = \max(\text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}_L), \text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}_R)) +$
 1627 1 .

1628 If $\mathbf{C.type} = \times$, then, by eq. (35), substituting values, the following should hold,

$$1629 \quad 2(\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_L) + \text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_R) + 2) \cdot (\max(\text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}_L), \text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}_R)) + 1) + 1 \quad (38)$$

$$1630 \quad \geq 2(\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_L) + 1) \cdot \text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}_L) + 2(\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_R) + 1) \cdot \text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}_R) + 3 \quad (39)$$

$$1631 \quad \geq 1 + \text{COST}(\mathbf{C}_L) + \text{COST}(\mathbf{C}_R) = \text{COST}(\mathbf{C}). \quad (40)$$

1632 To prove (39), first, eq. (38) expands to,

$$1634 \quad 2\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_L) \cdot \text{DEPTH}_{\max} + 2\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_R) \cdot \text{DEPTH}_{\max} + 4\text{DEPTH}_{\max} + 2\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_L) + 2\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_R) + 4 + 1 \quad (41)$$

1635 where DEPTH_{\max} is used to denote the maximum depth of the two input subcircuits. Eq. (39)
 1636 expands to

$$1637 \quad 2\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_L) \cdot \text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}_L) + 2\text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}_L) + 2\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_R) \cdot \text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}_R) + 2\text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}_R) + 3 \quad (42)$$

1638 Putting Eq. (41) and Eq. (42) together we get

$$1639 \quad 2\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_L) \cdot \text{DEPTH}_{\max} + 2\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_R) \cdot \text{DEPTH}_{\max} + 4\text{DEPTH}_{\max} + 2\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_L) + 2\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_R) + 5$$

$$1640 \quad \geq 2\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_L) \cdot \text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}_L) + 2\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_R) \cdot \text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}_R) + 2\text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}_L) + 2\text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}_R) + 3 \quad (43)$$

1641 Since the following is always true,

$$1643 \quad 2\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_L) \cdot \text{DEPTH}_{\max} + 2\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_R) \cdot \text{DEPTH}_{\max} + 4\text{DEPTH}_{\max} + 5$$

$$\geq 2\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_L) \cdot \text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}_L) + 2\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_R) \cdot \text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}_R) + 2\text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}_L) + 2\text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}_R) + 3,$$

then it is the case that Eq. (43) is *always* true.

Now to justify (40) which holds for the following reasons. First, eq. (40) is the result of Eq. (35) when $\mathbf{C.type} = \times$. Eq. (39) is then produced by substituting the upperbound of (37) for each $\text{COST}(\mathbf{C}_i)$, trivially establishing the upper bound of (40). This proves eq. (36) for the \times case.

For the case when $\mathbf{C.type} = +$, substituting values yields

$$2(\max(\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_L), \text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_R)) + 1) \cdot (\max(\text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}_L), \text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}_R)) + 1) + 1 \quad (44)$$

$$\geq \max(2(\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_L) + 1) \cdot \text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}_L) + 1, 2(\text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_R) + 1) \cdot \text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}_R) + 1) + 1 \quad (45)$$

$$\geq 1 + \max(\text{COST}(\mathbf{C}_L), \text{COST}(\mathbf{C}_R)) = \text{COST}(\mathbf{C}) \quad (46)$$

To prove (45), eq. (44) expands to

$$2\text{DEG}_{\max}\text{DEPTH}_{\max} + 2\text{DEG}_{\max} + 2\text{DEPTH}_{\max} + 2 + 1. \quad (47)$$

Since $\text{DEG}_{\max} \cdot \text{DEPTH}_{\max} \geq \text{DEG}(\mathbf{C}_i) \cdot \text{DEPTH}(\mathbf{C}_i)$, the following upper bound holds for the expansion of eq. (45):

$$2\text{DEG}_{\max}\text{DEPTH}_{\max} + 2\text{DEPTH}_{\max} + 2 \quad (48)$$

Putting it together we obtain the following for (45):

$$\begin{aligned} & 2\text{DEG}_{\max}\text{DEPTH}_{\max} + 2\text{DEG}_{\max} + 2\text{DEPTH}_{\max} + 3 \\ & \geq 2\text{DEG}_{\max}\text{DEPTH}_{\max} + 2\text{DEPTH}_{\max} + 2, \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

where it can be readily seen that the inequality stands and (49) follows. This proves (45).

Similar to the case of $\mathbf{C.type} = \times$, (46) follows by equations (35) and (37).

This proves (36) as desired. \blacktriangleleft

D.11 Experimental Results

Recall that by definition of BIDB, a query result cannot be derived by a self-join between non-identical tuples belonging to the same block. Note, that by Theorem 4.7, γ must be a constant in order for Algorithm 1 to achieve linear time. We would like to determine experimentally whether queries over BIDB instances in practice generate a constant number of cancellations or not. Such an experiment would ideally use a database instance with queries both considered to be typical representations of what is seen in practice.

We ran our experiments using Windows 10 WSL Operating System with an Intel Core i7 2.40GHz processor and 16GB RAM. All experiments used the PostgreSQL 13.0 database system.

For the data we used the MayBMS data generator [1] tool to randomly generate uncertain versions of TPCH tables. The queries computed over the database instance are Q_1 , Q_2 , and Q_3 from [5], all of which are modified versions of TPC-H queries Q_3 , Q_6 , and Q_7 where all aggregations have been dropped.

As written, the queries disallow BIDB cross terms. We first ran all queries, noting the result size for each. Next the queries were rewritten so as not to filter out the cross terms. The comparison of the sizes of both result sets should then suggest in one way or another whether or not there exist many cross terms in practice. As seen, the experimental query results contain little to no cancelling terms. Fig. 6 shows the result sizes of the queries,

1687 where column CF is the result size when all cross terms are filtered out, column CI shows
 1688 the number of output tuples when the cancelled tuples are included in the result, and the
 1689 last column is the value of γ . The experiments show γ to be in a range between $[0, 0.1]\%$,
 1690 indicating that only a negligible or constant (compare the result sizes of $Q_1 < Q_2$ and their
 1691 respective γ values) amount of tuples are cancelled in practice when running queries over a
 1692 typical BIDB instance. Interestingly, only one of the three queries had tuples that violated
 1693 the BIDB constraint.

1694 To conclude, the results in Fig. 6 show experimentally that γ is negligible in practice for
 1695 BIDB queries. We also observe that (i) tuple presence is independent across blocks, so the
 1696 corresponding probabilities (and hence p_0) are independent of the number of blocks, and (ii)
 1697 BIDBs model uncertain attributes, so block size (and hence γ) is a function of the “messiness”
 1698 of a dataset, rather than its size. Thus, we expect Theorem 4.7 to hold in general.

Query	CF	CI	γ
Q_1	46,714	46,768	0.1%
Q_2	179,917	179,917	0%
Q_3	11,535	11,535	0%

■ **Figure 6** Number of Cancellations for Queries Over BIDB.

1699 E Circuits

1700 E.1 Representing Polynomials with Circuits

1701 E.1.1 Circuits for query plans

1702 We now formalize circuits and the construction of circuits for \mathcal{RA}^+ queries. As mentioned
 1703 earlier, we represent lineage polynomials as arithmetic circuits over \mathbb{N} -valued variables with
 1704 $+$, \times . A circuit for query Q and $\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]$ -encoded PDB $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}$ is a directed acyclic graph
 1705 $\langle V_{Q, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}}; E_{Q, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}}; \phi_{Q, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}}; \ell_{Q, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}} \rangle$ with vertices $V_{Q, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}}$ and directed edges $E_{Q, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}} \subset$
 1706 $V_{Q, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}}^2$. The sink function $\phi_{Q, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}} : \mathcal{U}^n \rightarrow V_{Q, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}}$ is a partial function that maps the
 1707 tuples of the n -ary relation $Q(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]})$ to vertices. We require that $\phi_{Q, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}}$'s range be limited to
 1708 sink vertices (i.e., vertices with out-degree 0). A function $\ell_{Q, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}} : V_{Q, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}} \rightarrow \{+, \times\} \cup \mathbb{N} \cup \mathbf{X}$
 1709 assigns a label to each node: Source nodes (i.e., vertices with in-degree 0) are labeled with
 1710 constants or variables (i.e., $\mathbb{N} \cup \mathbf{X}$), while the remaining nodes are labeled with the symbol $+$
 1711 or \times . We require that vertices have an in-degree of at most two. Note that we can construct
 1712 circuits for BIDBs in time linear in the time required for deterministic query processing over
 1713 a possible world of the BIDB under the aforementioned assumption that $|\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}| \leq c \cdot |D|$.

1714 E.2 Modeling Circuit Construction

1715 We now connect the size of a circuit (where the size of a circuit is the number of vertices
 1716 in the corresponding DAG) for a given \mathcal{RA}^+ query Q and $\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]$ -encoded PDB $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}$ to the
 1717 runtime $T_{det}(Q, D_\Omega)$ of the PDB's deterministic bounding database D_Ω . We do this formally
 1718 by showing that the size of the circuit is asymptotically no worse than the corresponding
 1719 runtime of a large class of deterministic query processing algorithms.

1720 Each vertex $v \in V_{Q, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}}$ in the arithmetic circuit for

$$1721 \langle V_{Q, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}}; E_{Q, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}}; \phi_{Q, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}}; \ell_{Q, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}} \rangle$$

1722 encodes a polynomial, realized as

$$1723 \quad \mathbf{lin}(v) = \begin{cases} \sum_{v':(v',v) \in E_Q, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{x}]}} \mathbf{lin}(v') & \text{if } \ell(v) = + \\ \prod_{v':(v',v) \in E_Q, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{x}]}} \mathbf{lin}(v') & \text{if } \ell(v) = \times \\ \ell(v) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

1724 We define the circuit for a \mathcal{RA}^+ query Q recursively by cases as follows. In each case, let
 1725 $\langle V_{Q_i, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{x}]}} \rangle, E_{Q_i, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{x}]}} \rangle, \phi_{Q_i, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{x}]}} \rangle, \ell_{Q_i, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{x}]}} \rangle$ denote the circuit for subquery Q_i . We implicitly
 1726 include in all circuits a global zero node v_0 s.t., $\ell_{Q, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{x}]}}(v_0) = 0$ for any $Q, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{x}]}$.

1727 Algorithm 4 defines how the circuit for a query result is constructed. We quickly review
 1728 the number of vertices emitted in each case.

1729 **Base Relation.** This circuit has $|D_\Omega.R|$ vertices.

1730 **Selection.** If we assume dead sinks are iteratively garbage collected, this circuit has at
 1731 most $|V_{Q_1, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{x}]}}|$ vertices.

1732 **Projection.** This formulation will produce vertices with an in-degree greater than two, a
 1733 problem that we correct by replacing every vertex with an in-degree over two by an equivalent
 1734 fan-in two tree. The resulting structure has at most $|Q_1| - 1$ new vertices. The corrected
 1735 circuit thus has at most $|V_{Q_1, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{x}]}}| + |Q_1|$ vertices.

1736 **Union.** This circuit has $|V_{Q_1, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{x}]}}| + |V_{Q_2, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{x}]}}| + |Q_1 \cap Q_2|$ vertices.

1737 **k -ary Join.** As in projection, newly created vertices will have an in-degree of k , and a
 1738 fan-in two tree is required. There are $|Q_1 \bowtie \dots \bowtie Q_k|$ such vertices, so the corrected circuit
 1739 has $|V_{Q_1, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{x}]}}| + \dots + |V_{Q_k, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{x}]}}| + (k-1)|Q_1 \bowtie \dots \bowtie Q_k|$ vertices.

1740 E.2.1 Bounding circuit depth

1741 We first show that the depth of the circuit (DEPTH; Definition 4.3) is bounded by the size
 1742 of the query. Denote by $|Q|$ the number of relational operators in query Q , which recall we
 1743 assume is a constant.

1744 **► Proposition E.1** (Circuit depth is bounded). *Let Q be a relational query and D_Ω be a*
 1745 *deterministic bounding database with n tuples. There exists a (lineage) circuit \mathcal{C}^* encoding*
 1746 *the lineage of all tuples $t \in Q(D_\Omega)$ for which $\text{DEPTH}(\mathcal{C}^*) \leq O(k|Q| \log(n))$.*

1747 **Proof.** We show that the bound of Proposition E.1 holds for the circuit constructed by
 1748 Algorithm 4. First, observe that Algorithm 4 is (recursively) invoked exactly once for every
 1749 relational operator or base relation in Q ; It thus suffices to show that a call to Algorithm 4
 1750 adds at most $O_k(\log(n))$ to the depth of a circuit produced by any recursive invocation.
 1751 Second, observe that modulo the logarithmic fan-in of the projection and join cases, the
 1752 depth of the output is at most one greater than the depth of any input (or at most 1 in the
 1753 base case of relation atoms). For the join case, the number of in-edges can be no greater than
 1754 the join width, which itself is bounded by k . The depth thus increases by at most a constant
 1755 factor of $\lceil \log(k) \rceil = O_k(1)$. For the projection case, observe that the fan-in is bounded by
 1756 $|Q'(D_\Omega)|$, which is in turn bounded by n^k . The depth increase for any projection node is
 1757 thus at most $\lceil \log(n^k) \rceil = O(k \log(n))$, as desired. ◀

1758 E.2.2 Circuit size vs. runtime

Algorithm 4 LC (Q, D_Ω, E, V, ℓ)

Input: Q : query
Input: D_Ω : a deterministic bounding database
Input: E, V, ℓ : accumulators for the edge list, vertex list, and vertex label list.
Output: $\mathbf{c} = \langle E, V, \phi, \ell \rangle$: a circuit encoding the lineage of each tuple in $Q(D_\Omega)$

- 1: **if** Q is R **then** ▷ **Case 1:** Q is a relation atom
- 2: **for** $t \in D_\Omega.R$ **do**
- 3: $V \leftarrow V \cup \{v_t\}; \ell \leftarrow \ell \cup \{(v_t, R(t))\}$ ▷ Allocate a fresh node v_t
- 4: $\phi(t) \leftarrow v_t$
- 5: **end for**
- 6: **else if** Q is $\sigma_\theta(Q')$ **then** ▷ **Case 2:** Q is a Selection
- 7: $\langle V, E, \phi', \ell \rangle \leftarrow LC(Q', D_\Omega, V, E, \ell)$
- 8: **for** $t \in \text{DOM}(\phi')$ **do**
- 9: **if** $\theta(t)$ **then** $\phi(t) \leftarrow \phi'(t)$ **else** $\phi(t) \leftarrow v_0$
- 10: **end for**
- 11: **else if** Q is $\pi_{\bar{A}}(Q')$ **then** ▷ **Case 3:** Q is a Projection
- 12: $\langle V, E, \phi', \ell \rangle \leftarrow LC(Q', D_\Omega, V, E, \ell)$
- 13: **for** $t \in \pi_{\bar{A}}(Q'(D_\Omega))$ **do**
- 14: $V \leftarrow V \cup \{v_t\}; \ell \leftarrow \ell \cup \{(v_t, +)\}$ ▷ Allocate a fresh node v_t
- 15: $\phi(t) \leftarrow v_t$
- 16: **end for**
- 17: **for** $t \in Q'(D_\Omega)$ **do**
- 18: $E \leftarrow E \cup \{(\phi'(t), \phi(\pi_{\bar{A}}t))\}$
- 19: **end for**
- 20: Correct nodes with in-degrees > 2 by appending an equivalent fan-in two tree instead
- 21: **else if** Q is $Q_1 \cup Q_2$ **then** ▷ **Case 4:** Q is a Bag Union
- 22: $\langle V, E, \phi_1, \ell \rangle \leftarrow LC(Q_1, D_\Omega, V, E, \ell)$
- 23: $\langle V, E, \phi_2, \ell \rangle \leftarrow LC(Q_2, D_\Omega, V, E, \ell)$
- 24: $\phi \leftarrow \phi_1 \cup \phi_2$
- 25: **for** $t \in \text{DOM}(\phi_1) \cap \text{DOM}(\phi_2)$ **do**
- 26: $V \leftarrow V \cup \{v_t\}; \ell \leftarrow \ell \cup \{(v_t, +)\}$ ▷ Allocate a fresh node v_t
- 27: $\phi(t) \leftarrow v_t$
- 28: $E \leftarrow E \cup \{(\phi_1(t), v_t), (\phi_2(t), v_t)\}$
- 29: **end for**
- 30: **else if** Q is $Q_1 \bowtie \dots \bowtie Q_m$ **then** ▷ **Case 5:** Q is a m -ary Join
- 31: **for** $i \in [m]$ **do**
- 32: $\langle V, E, \phi_i, \ell \rangle \leftarrow LC(Q_i, D_\Omega, V, E, \ell)$
- 33: **end for**
- 34: **for** $t \in \text{DOM}(\phi_1) \bowtie \dots \bowtie \text{DOM}(\phi_m)$ **do**
- 35: $V \leftarrow V \cup \{v_t\}; \ell \leftarrow \ell \cup \{(v_t, \times)\}$ ▷ Allocate a fresh node v_t
- 36: $\phi(t) \leftarrow v_t$
- 37: $E \leftarrow E \cup \{(\phi_i(\pi_{sch(Q_i(D_\Omega))}(t)), v_t) \mid i \in [m]\}$
- 38: **end for**
- 39: Correct nodes with in-degrees > 2 by appending an equivalent fan-in two tree instead
- 40: **end if**

1759 ► **Lemma E.2.** Given a $\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]$ -encoded PDB $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}$ with deterministic bounding database D_Ω ,
 1760 and an \mathcal{RA}^+ query Q , the runtime of Q over D_Ω has the same or greater complexity as the
 1761 size of the lineage of $Q(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]})$. That is, we have $|V_{Q, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}}| \leq kT_{det}(Q, D_\Omega) + 1$, where $k \geq 1$
 1762 is the maximal degree of any polynomial in $Q(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]})$.

1763 **Proof.** We prove by induction that $|V_{Q, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}} \setminus \{v_0\}| \leq kT_{det}(Q, D_\Omega)$. For clarity, we
 1764 implicitly exclude v_0 in the proof below.

1765 The base case is a base relation: $Q = R$ and is trivially true since $|V_{R, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}}| = |D_\Omega \cdot R| =$
 1766 $T_{det}(R, D_\Omega)$ (note that here the degree $k = 1$). For the inductive step, we assume that we
 1767 have circuits for subqueries Q_1, \dots, Q_m such that $|V_{Q_i, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}}| \leq k_i T_{det}(Q_i, D_\Omega)$ where k_i is
 1768 the degree of Q_i .

1769 **Selection.** Assume that $Q = \sigma_\theta(Q_1)$. In the circuit for Q , $|V_{Q, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}}| = |V_{Q_1, D_\Omega}|$ vertices,
 1770 so from the inductive assumption and $T_{det}(Q, D_\Omega) = T_{det}(Q_1, D_\Omega)$ by definition, we have
 1771 $|V_{Q, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}}| \leq kT_{det}(Q, D_\Omega)$.

1772 **Projection.** Assume that $Q = \pi_{\mathbf{A}}(Q_1)$. The circuit for Q has at most $|V_{Q_1, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}}| + |Q_1|$
 1773 vertices.

$$1774 \quad |V_{Q, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}}| \leq |V_{Q_1, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}}| + |Q_1|$$

1775 (From the inductive assumption)

$$1776 \quad \leq kT_{det}(Q_1, D_\Omega) + |Q_1|$$

1777 (By definition of $T_{det}(Q, D_\Omega)$)

$$1778 \quad \leq kT_{det}(Q, D_\Omega).$$

1779 **Union.** Assume that $Q = Q_1 \cup Q_2$. The circuit for Q has $|V_{Q_1, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}}| + |V_{Q_2, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}}| + |Q_1 \cap Q_2|$
 1780 vertices.

$$1781 \quad |V_{Q, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}}| \leq |V_{Q_1, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}}| + |V_{Q_2, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}}| + |Q_1| + |Q_2|$$

1782 (From the inductive assumption)

$$1783 \quad \leq k(T_{det}(Q_1, D_\Omega) + T_{det}(Q_2, D_\Omega)) + (|Q_1| + |Q_2|)$$

1784 (By definition of $T_{det}(Q, D_\Omega)$)

$$1785 \quad \leq k(T_{det}(Q, D_\Omega)).$$

1786 **m -ary Join.** Assume that $Q = Q_1 \bowtie \dots \bowtie Q_m$. Note that $k = \sum_{i=1}^m k_i \geq m$. The circuit
 1787 for Q has $|V_{Q_1, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}}| + \dots + |V_{Q_k, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}}| + (m-1)|Q_1 \bowtie \dots \bowtie Q_k|$ vertices.

$$1788 \quad |V_{Q, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}}| = |V_{Q_1, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}}| + \dots + |V_{Q_k, \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{N}[\mathbf{X}]}}| + (m-1)|Q_1 \bowtie \dots \bowtie Q_k|$$

1789 From the inductive assumption and noting $\forall i : k_i \leq k$ and $m \leq k$

$$1790 \quad \leq kT_{det}(Q_1, D_\Omega) + \dots + kT_{det}(Q_k, D_\Omega) +$$

$$1791 \quad (m-1)|Q_1 \bowtie \dots \bowtie Q_m|$$

$$1792 \quad \leq k(T_{det}(Q_1, D_\Omega) + \dots + T_{det}(Q_m, D_\Omega) +$$

$$1793 \quad |Q_1 \bowtie \dots \bowtie Q_m|)$$

1794 (By definition of $T_{det}(Q, D_\Omega)$ and assumption on $T_{join}(\cdot)$)

$$1795 \quad \leq kT_{det}(Q, D_\Omega).$$

1796 The property holds for all recursive queries, and the proof holds. ◀

1806 **E.2.3 Runtime of LC**

1807 We next need to show that we can construct the circuit in time linear in the deterministic
1808 runtime.

1809 ► **Lemma E.3.** *Given a query Q over a deterministic bounding database D_Ω and the \mathcal{C}^*
1810 output by Algorithm 4, the runtime $T_{LC}(Q, D_\Omega, \mathcal{C}^*) \leq O(T_{det}(Q, D_\Omega))$.*

1811 **Proof.** By analysis of Algorithm 4, invoked as $\mathcal{C}^* \leftarrow LC(Q, D_\Omega, \{v_0\}, \emptyset, \{(v_0, 0)\})$.

1812 We assume that the vertex list V , edge list E , and vertex label list ℓ are mutable
1813 accumulators with $O(1)$ amortized append. We assume that the tuple to sink mapping ϕ is
1814 a linked hashmap, with $O(1)$ insertions and retrievals, and $O(n)$ iteration over the domain of
1815 keys. We assume that the n -ary join $\text{DOM}(\phi_1) \bowtie \dots \bowtie \text{DOM}(\phi_n)$ can be computed in time
1816 $T_{join}(\text{DOM}(\phi_1), \dots, \text{DOM}(\phi_n))$ (Definition 2.13) and that an intersection $\text{DOM}(\phi_1) \cap \text{DOM}(\phi_2)$
1817 can be computed in time $O(|\text{DOM}(\phi_1)| + |\text{DOM}(\phi_2)|)$ (e.g., with a hash table).

1818 Before proving our runtime bound, we first observe that $T_{det}(Q, D) \geq \Omega(|Q(D)|)$. This
1819 is true by construction for the relation, projection, and union cases, by Definition 2.13 for
1820 joins, and by the observation that $|\sigma(R)| \leq |R|$.

1821 We show that $T_{det}(Q, D_\Omega)$ is an upper-bound for the runtime of Algorithm 4 by recursion.
1822 The base case of a relation atom requires only an $O(|D_\Omega.R|)$ iteration over the source tuples.
1823 For the remaining cases, we make the recursive assumption that for every subquery Q' , it
1824 holds that $O(T_{det}(Q', D_\Omega))$ bounds the runtime of Algorithm 4.

1825 **Selection.** Selection requires a recursive call to Algorithm 4, which by the recursive
1826 assumption is bounded by $O(T_{det}(Q', D_\Omega))$. Algorithm 4 requires a loop over every element
1827 of $Q'(D_\Omega)$. By the observation above that $T_{det}(Q, D) \geq \Omega(|Q(D)|)$, this iteration is also
1828 bounded by $O(T_{det}(Q', D_\Omega))$.

1829 **Projection.** Projection requires a recursive call to Algorithm 4, which by the recursive
1830 assumption is bounded by $O(T_{det}(Q', D_\Omega))$, which in turn is a term in $T_{det}(\pi_{\bar{A}}Q', D_\Omega)$.
1831 What remains is an iteration over $\pi_{\bar{A}}(Q(D_\Omega))$ (lines 13–16), an iteration over $Q'(D_\Omega)$ (lines
1832 17–19), and the construction of a fan-in tree (line 20). The first iteration is $O(|Q(D_\Omega)|) \leq$
1833 $O(T_{det}(Q, D_\Omega))$. The second iteration and the construction of the bounded fan-in tree are
1834 both $O(|Q'(D_\Omega)|) \leq O(T_{det}(Q', D_\Omega)) \leq O(T_{det}(Q, D_\Omega))$, by the the observation above that
1835 $T_{det}(Q, D) \geq \Omega(|Q(D)|)$.

1836 **Bag Union.** As above, the recursive calls explicitly correspond to terms in the expansion of
1837 $T_{det}(Q_1 \cup Q_2, D_\Omega)$. Initializing ϕ (line 24) can be accomplished in $O(\text{DOM}(\phi_1) + \text{DOM}(\phi_2)) =$
1838 $O(|Q_1(D_\Omega)| + |Q_2(D_\Omega)|) \leq O(T_{det}(Q_1, D_\Omega) + T_{det}(Q_2, D_\Omega))$. The remainder requires
1839 computing $Q_1 \cup Q_2$ (line 25) and iterating over it (lines 25–29), which is $O(|Q_1| + |Q_2|)$ as
1840 noted above — this directly corresponds to terms in $T_{det}(Q_1 \cup Q_2, D_\Omega)$.

1841 **m -ary Join.** As in the prior cases, recursive calls explicitly correspond to terms in our
1842 target runtime. The remaining logic involves (i) computing $\text{DOM}(\phi_1) \bowtie \dots \bowtie \text{DOM}(\phi_m)$, (ii)
1843 iterating over the results, and (iii) creating a fan-in tree. Respectively, these are:

- 1844 (i) $T_{join}(\text{DOM}(\phi_1), \dots, \text{DOM}(\phi_m))$
1845 (ii) $O(|Q_1(D_\Omega) \bowtie \dots \bowtie Q_m(D_\Omega)|) \leq O(T_{join}(\text{DOM}(\phi_1), \dots, \text{DOM}(\phi_m)))$ (Definition 2.13)
1846 (iii) $O(m|Q_1(D_\Omega) \bowtie \dots \bowtie Q_m(D_\Omega)|)$ (as (ii), noting that $m \leq k = O(1)$) ◀

1847 **F Higher Moments**

1848 We make a simple observation to conclude the presentation of our results. So far we have only
1849 focused on the expectation of Φ . In addition, we could e.g. prove bounds of the probability

1850 of a tuple’s multiplicity being at least 1. Progress can be made on this as follows: For any
 1851 positive integer m we can compute the m -th moment of the multiplicities, allowing us to e.g.
 1852 use the Chebyshev inequality or other high moment based probability bounds on the events
 1853 we might be interested in. We leave further investigations for future work.

1854 **G** The Karp-Luby Estimator

1855 Computing the marginal probability of a tuple in the output of a set-probabilistic database
 1856 query has been studied extensively. To the best of our knowledge, the current state of
 1857 the art approximation algorithm for this problem is the Karp-Luby estimator [31], which
 1858 first appeared in MayBMS/Sprout [38], and more recently as part of an online “anytime”
 1859 approximation algorithm [21, 16].

The estimator works by observing that for any ℓ random binary (but not necessarily independent) events $\mathbf{W}_1, \dots, \mathbf{W}_\ell$, the probability of at least one event occurring (i.e., $Pr(\mathbf{W}_1 \vee \dots \vee \mathbf{W}_\ell)$) is bounded from above by the sum of the independent event probabilities (i.e., $Pr(\mathbf{W}_1 \vee \dots \vee \mathbf{W}_\ell) \leq Pr(\mathbf{W}_1) + \dots + Pr(\mathbf{W}_\ell)$). Starting from this (‘easily’ computable and large) value, the estimator proceeds to correct the estimate by estimating how much of an over-estimate it is. Specifically, if \mathcal{P} is the joint distribution over \mathbf{W} , the estimator computes an approximation of:

$$\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w} \sim \mathcal{P}} \left[\left| \{ i \mid \mathbf{W}_i = 1, i \in [\ell] \} \right| \right].$$

The accuracy of this estimate is improved by conditioning \mathcal{P} on a W_i chosen uniformly at random (which ensures that the sampled count will be at least 1) and correcting the resulting estimate by $Pr(W_i)$. With an estimate of \mathcal{O} , it can easily be verified that the probability of the disjunction can be computed as:

$$Pr(\mathbf{W}_1 \vee \dots \vee \mathbf{W}_\ell) = Pr(\mathbf{W}_1) + \dots + Pr(\mathbf{W}_\ell) - \mathcal{O}$$

1860 The Karp-Luby estimator is employed on the SMB representation¹⁹ of \mathcal{C} (to solve the
 1861 set-PDB version of Problem 1.6), where each W_i represents the event that one monomial
 1862 is true. By simple inspection, if there are ℓ monomials, this estimator has runtime $\Omega(\ell)$.
 1863 Further, a minimum of $\left\lceil \frac{3 \cdot \ell \cdot \log(\frac{2}{\delta})}{\epsilon^2} \right\rceil$ invocations of the estimator are required to achieve $1 \pm \epsilon$
 1864 approximation with probability at least $1 - \delta$ [38], entailing a runtime at least quadratic in ℓ .
 1865 As an arbitrary lineage circuit \mathcal{C} may encode $\Omega(|\mathcal{C}|^k)$ monomials, the worst case runtime is
 1866 at least $\Omega(|\mathcal{C}|^{2k})$ (where k is the ‘degree’ of lineage polynomial encoded by \mathcal{C}). By contrast
 1867 note that by the discussion after Lemma 4.9 we can solve Problem 1.6 in time $O(|\mathcal{C}|^2)$ for
 1868 all BIDB circuits *independent* of the degree k .

1869 **H** Parameterized Complexity

1870 In Sec. 3, we utilized common conjectures from fine-grained complexity theory. The notion of
 1871 $\#W[1]$ – *hard* is a standard notion in *parameterized complexity*, which by now is a standard
 1872 complexity tool in providing data complexity bounds on query processing results [24]. E.g.
 1873 the fact that k -matching is $\#W[1]$ – *hard* implies that we cannot have an $n^{\Omega(1)}$ runtime.
 1874 However, these results do not carefully track the exponent in the hardness result. E.g.

¹⁹Note that since we are in the set semantics, in the lineage polynomial/formula, addition is logical OR and multiplication is logical AND.

23:54 Bag PDB Queries

1875 #W[1] – *hard* for the general k -matching problem does not imply anything specific for the
1876 3-matching problem. Similar questions have led to intense research into the new sub-field
1877 of *fine-grained complexity* (see [48]), where we care about the exponent in our hardness
1878 assumptions as well– e.g. Conjecture 3.3 is based on the popular *Triangle detection hypothesis*
1879 in this area (cf. [34]).