

# Extending *DL-Lite<sub>A</sub>* with (Singleton) Nominals

Maxim G. Haddad and Diego Calvanese

KRDB Research Centre for Knowledge and Data  
Free University of Bozen-Bolzano  
Piazza Domenicani 3, Bolzano, Italy  
`lastname@inf.unibz.it`

**Abstract.** In this paper we study the extension of description logics of the *DL-Lite* family with singleton nominals, which correspond in OWL 2 to the *ObjectHasValue* construct. Differently from arbitrary (non-singleton) nominals, which make query answering intractable in data complexity, we show that both knowledge base satisfiability and conjunctive query answering stay first-order rewritable when *DL-Lite<sub>A</sub>* is extended with singleton nominals. Our technique is based on a practically implementable algorithm based on rewriting rules, in the style of those implemented in current state-of-the-art OBDA systems based on *DL-Lite*, such as Quest. This allows us to follow the tradition of the *DL-Lite* family for employing relational database technology for query answering with optimal data complexity.

## 1 Introduction

The *DL-Lite* family [7] is a family of descriptions logics (DLs) which is designed for optimal data complexity of reasoning and query answering, while maintaining enough expressive power to capture basic ontology and conceptual data modeling languages [6]. It is at the basis of the OWL 2 QL profile of the *Web Ontology Language* (OWL) [11].

The *DL-Lite* family has been investigated thoroughly in recent years, and several extensions with respect to the original set of constructs studied in [7] have been proposed [1,5,14,8]. In particular, *DL-Lite<sub>A</sub>* [12,6] is a significant representative of the *DL-Lite* family, featuring the possibility of expressing both functionality of roles and role inclusion assertions.

*Nominals*, i.e., concepts interpreted as a singleton, are a significant construct in DLs, investigated both for expressive DLs [16], including OWL 2 [4], and for lightweight ones [2]. It is known that the addition to *DL-Lite* of arbitrary nominals, i.e., concepts interpreted as a given (in general non-singleton) set of individuals causes data complexity of query answering to become intractable [15]. However, the impact of *singleton nominals* only, i.e., concepts interpreted as a single individual, has not been investigated so far for the DLs of the *DL-Lite* family. Such construct corresponds to the *ObjectHasValue* construct in the context of OWL 2.

In this paper, we fill this gap, and present *DL-Lite<sub>A</sub><sup>o</sup>*, which extends *DL-Lite<sub>A</sub>* with singleton nominals. We concentrate on the two most significant reasoning

problems investigated in the context of *DL-Lite*, namely knowledge base satisfiability, and conjunctive query answering. We show that under this extension both inference tasks stay first-order rewritable. Our technique is based on a practically implementable algorithm based on rewriting rules, in the style of those implemented in current state-of-the-art OBDA systems based on *DL-Lite*, such as QuOnto and Quest. This allows us to follow the tradition of the *DL-Lite* family for employing relational database technology for query answering with optimal data complexity.

After some preliminaries in Section 2, we introduce *DL-Lite* <sub>$\mathcal{A}$</sub> <sup>o</sup> in Section 3. We discuss, in Section 4, the problem of query answering for satisfiable knowledge bases, and then show, in Section 5, how to rely on it to address knowledge base satisfiability. We draw some conclusions in Section 6. Proofs of most theorems can be found in the appendix.

## 2 The Description Logic *DL-Lite* <sub>$\mathcal{A}$</sub> <sup>o</sup>

We introduce the technical preliminaries, and the lightweight DL *DL-Lite* <sub>$\mathcal{A}$</sub>  [12,6], on which we base our results.

In *DL-Lite* <sub>$\mathcal{A}$</sub> <sup>1</sup>, starting from atomic concepts and atomic roles, respectively denoted by  $A$  and  $P$  (possibly with subscripts), we can build *basic concepts*  $B$  and *basic roles*  $R$  according to the following syntax:

$$B \longrightarrow A \mid \exists R \qquad R \longrightarrow P \mid P^-$$

A *DL-Lite* <sub>$\mathcal{A}$</sub>  TBox is a finite set of *assertions* of the following form:

$$\begin{array}{ll} B_1 \sqsubseteq B_2 & (\text{concept inclusion assertion}) \\ B_1 \sqsubseteq \neg B_2 & (\text{concept disjointness assertion}) \\ R_1 \sqsubseteq R_2 & (\text{role inclusion assertion}) \\ R_1 \sqsubseteq \neg R_2 & (\text{role disjointness assertion}) \\ (\text{funct } R) & (\text{functionality assertion}) \end{array}$$

In order to guarantee the good computational properties of *DL-Lite* <sub>$\mathcal{A}$</sub> , in the TBox we must avoid the interaction between functionality assertions and role inclusion assertions that would be caused by allowing a functional role to be specialized [12]. Formally, if the TBox contains  $(\text{funct } P)$  or  $(\text{funct } P^-)$ , then it cannot contain an assertion of the form  $P' \sqsubseteq P$  or  $P' \sqsubseteq P^-$ , for some role  $P'$ .

An *ABox*  $\mathcal{A}$  is a finite set of *membership assertions* of the form  $A(d)$ ,  $\neg A(d)$ ,  $P(d, d')$ , or  $\neg P(d, d')$ , where  $d, d'$  denote individuals. In the following, We use  $R^-$  to denote  $P^-$  if  $R = P$ , and  $P$  if  $R = P^-$ . Similarly, we use  $R(x, y)$  to denote  $P(x, y)$  if  $R = P$ , and  $P(y, x)$  if  $R = P^-$ . A TBox  $\mathcal{T}$  and an ABox  $\mathcal{A}$  constitute a *knowledge base* (KB)  $\mathcal{K} = \langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \rangle$ .

<sup>1</sup> We do not distinguish here between data values and objects, and hence do not introduce datatypes and attributes as done in [12], since they do not affect reasoning as far as the results in this paper are concerned.

The formal semantics in  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}$  is given in the standard way, by relying on first-order *interpretations*  $\mathcal{I} = \langle \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}, \cdot^{\mathcal{I}} \rangle$ . We refer to [3] for more details, and just observe that  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}$  adopts the *unique name assumption* (UNA), i.e., syntactically different individuals are interpreted as different domain elements. We make use of the standard notions of *satisfaction* and *model*. In this paper, we will focus on two reasoning problems, namely, query answering and KB satisfiability, defined in the standard way [7]. The *KB satisfiability problem* is to check, given a KB  $\mathcal{K}$ , whether  $\mathcal{K}$  admits at least one model. To define query answering, we present some definitions.

A *conjunctive query* (CQ)  $q$  over a KB  $\mathcal{K}$  is a first-order formula of the form:  $q(\mathbf{x}) = \exists \mathbf{y}. conj(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ , such that  $conj(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is a conjunction of atoms of the form  $A(t)$  and  $P(t, t')$ , where  $A$  and  $P$  are respectively an atomic concept and an atomic role of  $\mathcal{K}$ , and  $t, t'$  are terms, i.e., constants in  $\mathcal{K}$  or variables in  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$ . The free variables  $\mathbf{x}$  of  $q(\mathbf{x})$  are also called *distinguished variables*, and their number is called the *arity* of  $q$ . A *boolean query* is a query without distinguished variables. A *union of conjunctive queries* (UCQ) is a disjunction  $q(\mathbf{x}) = \bigvee_{i=1, \dots, n} \exists \mathbf{y}_i. conj_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_i)$  of CQs of the same arity. We sometimes use the Datalog notation for (U)CQs:

$$\begin{aligned} q(\mathbf{x}) &\leftarrow \exists \mathbf{y}_1. conj_1(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_1) \\ &\dots \\ q(\mathbf{x}) &\leftarrow \exists \mathbf{y}_n. conj_n(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_n) \end{aligned}$$

Given an interpretation  $\mathcal{I}$ , we denote by  $q^{\mathcal{I}}$  the set of tuples of elements of  $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$  obtained by evaluating  $q$  in  $\mathcal{I}$ . The *certain answers* of  $q$  over a KB  $\mathcal{K}$  is the set  $ans(q, \mathcal{K})$  of tuples  $\mathbf{a}$  of constants appearing in  $\mathcal{K}$ , such that  $\mathbf{a}^{\mathcal{I}} \in q^{\mathcal{I}}$  for every model  $\mathcal{I}$  of  $\mathcal{K}$ . If  $\mathcal{K}$  is unsatisfiable, then  $ans(q, \mathcal{K})$  is trivially the set of all possible tuples of constants in  $\mathcal{K}$  whose arity is the same as that of the query. We denote such a set by  $AllTup(q, \mathcal{K})$ . The problem of *query answering* is the computation of the set of *certain answers* for given (U)CQ  $q$  and KB  $\mathcal{K}$ .

Both for KB satisfiability and for query answering, we are interested in the *data complexity*, which is the complexity of the problem measured in the size of the ABox only (i.e., assuming the TBox and the query to be fixed).

### 3 Adding Nominals to $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}$

We present now the DL  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$ , which extends  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}$  with nominals. Specifically, in  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$ , we allow for using as basic concepts also *nominals*, i.e., concepts of the form  $\{d\}$ , which are interpreted as the singleton denoted by the individual  $d$ . Hence, basic concepts are built according to the following syntax:

$$B \longrightarrow A \mid \exists R \mid \{d\}$$

Apart from that,  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$  is defined exactly as  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

We observe that, due to the lack of disjunction in the DLs of the  $DL-Lite$  family, we restrict the attention to so-called *singleton nominals*, which cannot be composed using disjunction into *multiple element nominals*.

Nominals in  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$  may appear in the left-hand and in the right-hand side of concept inclusion and disjointness assertions, and the two kinds of occurrences play quite different roles in expressiveness and inference. Indeed, a concept inclusion assertion  $\{d\} \sqsubseteq A$  with a nominal  $\{d\}$  in the left-hand side, corresponds to an ABox assertion  $A(d)$ . Similarly, a concept disjointness assertion  $A \sqsubseteq \neg\{d\}$  (or its equivalent form  $\{d\} \sqsubseteq \neg A$ ) corresponds to an ABox assertion  $\neg A(d)$ . Hence, we can eliminate these two kinds of assertions by moving them to the ABox. Observe also that an assertion of the form  $\{d\} \sqsubseteq \{d'\}$ , where  $d \neq d'$ , is always satisfied due to the UNA, and hence can be safely eliminated from the TBox.

Formally, we call a  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$  TBox *normalized*, if all its nominals appear only in concept inclusion assertions of the form:

$$B \sqsubseteq \{d\} \tag{1}$$

A  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$  KB  $\mathcal{K} = \langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \rangle$  is normalized if  $\mathcal{T}$  is so.

We can transform each  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$  KB  $\mathcal{K} = \langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \rangle$  into an equivalent normalized KB  $\mathcal{K}_n = \langle \mathcal{T}_n, \mathcal{A}_n \rangle$  as follows:

1. Initialize  $\mathcal{T}_n$  to  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{A}_n$  to  $\mathcal{A}$ .
2. For each assertion  $\alpha \in \mathcal{T}_n$  of the form  $\{d\} \sqsubseteq \neg\{d'\}$ , where  $d \neq d'$ , remove  $\alpha$  from  $\mathcal{T}_n$ .
3. For each assertion  $\alpha \in \mathcal{T}_n$  of the form  $B \sqsubseteq \neg\{d\}$ , where  $B$  is not a nominal, replace in  $\mathcal{T}_n$   $\alpha$  with  $\{d\} \sqsubseteq \neg B$ .
4. For each nominal  $\{d\}$  appearing in the left-hand side of a concept inclusion or disjointness assertion  $\{d\} \sqsubseteq C$  in  $\mathcal{T}_n$ , introduce a fresh atomic concept  $A_d$ .
5. For each concept inclusion or disjointness assertion  $\alpha \in \mathcal{T}_n$  of the form  $\{d\} \sqsubseteq C$ , replace  $\alpha$  in  $\mathcal{T}_n$  with  $A_d \sqsubseteq C$  and add  $A_d(d)$  to  $\mathcal{A}_n$ .

Notice that Steps 4 and 5 above deal correctly also with the case of an (unsatisfiable) inclusion assertion of the form  $\{d\} \sqsubseteq \{d'\}$ , which for  $d \neq d'$  generate the assertions  $A_d(d)$  and  $A_d \sqsubseteq d'$ .

It is easy to see that the above construction of  $\mathcal{K}_n$  from  $\mathcal{K}$  can be done in logarithmic space in the size of  $\mathcal{K}$ . The following result is an easy consequence of the fact that each of the above transformations preserves the semantics of the KB, and hence  $\mathcal{K}_n$  is a model-conservative extension of  $\mathcal{K}$  [10].

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be a  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$  KB and let  $\mathcal{K}_n$  be the normalized  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$  KB constructed as described above. Then  $\mathcal{K}_n$  is satisfiable iff  $\mathcal{K}$  is satisfiable, and for each UCQ  $Q$  over  $\mathcal{K}$ , we have that  $\text{ans}(Q, \mathcal{K}) = \text{ans}Q, \mathcal{K}_n$ .*

By Lemma 1, we can from now on assume without loss of generality to deal only with  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$  KBs that are normalized. For a normalized KB, all nominals appear in the right-hand side of concept inclusion assertions that have the form as in Equation (1). In what follows, given a normalized  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$  TBox  $\mathcal{T}$ , we consider it partitioned into four parts denoted as follows:  $\mathcal{T}_n$  contains the concept and role disjointness assertions;  $\mathcal{T}_f$  contains the functionality assertions;

$\mathcal{T}_o$  contains the concept inclusion assertions involving nominals;  $\mathcal{T}_p$  contains the remaining concept inclusions, and the role inclusions. We call  $\mathcal{T}_p \cup \mathcal{T}_o$  the set of *positive inclusions* (PIs).

The concept inclusions in  $\mathcal{T}_o$  require a specific treatment in the query answering approach based on rewriting, since they *restrict* the concept on the left-hand side of the concept inclusion to be interpreted as a singleton. This leads us to introduce the notion of *domain* and *range restricted roles*, i.e., roles whose domain or range is restricted to a nominal. For such a role  $P$  for which  $\mathcal{T}_o$  contains  $\exists P \sqsubseteq \{d\}$ , for a model  $\mathcal{I}$  of  $\mathcal{T}$  we have that  $P^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \{d^{\mathcal{I}}\} \times \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ , making the interpretation of the role similar to that of a concept. If a concept is restricted to a nominal via  $B \sqsubseteq \{d\}$ , then every other concept that is restricted to the nominal indirectly, e.g., via  $B' \sqsubseteq B$ , should be restricted to the same nominal. Similarly, if a *functional* role is *domain* or *range restricted*, then the other component should have maximally one element, i.e., it is restricted to an unnamed nominal. To represent this fact we make use of underscore elements with subscripts  $_{-0}, _{-1}, \dots$ . Hence, each of the occurrences of these underscore elements denotes an *unnamed individual*, possibly coinciding with individuals representing nominals or with other unnamed individuals (i.e, for unnamed individuals the unique name assumption does not apply). We will use the underscore symbol without a subscript to denote an arbitrary unnamed element.

This motivates us to define the notion of *singleton closure* of a TBox.

**Definition 1.** *Let  $\mathcal{K} = \langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \rangle$  be a normalized  $DL\text{-Lite}_{\mathcal{A}}^o$  KB. Then the singleton closure  $SC(\mathcal{T})$  of  $\mathcal{T}$ , is obtained by including  $\mathcal{T}$  in  $SC(\mathcal{T})$ , and closing it according to the following rules:*

1. *If  $B_1 \sqsubseteq \{d\}$  is in  $SC(\mathcal{T})$  and  $B_2 \sqsubseteq B_1$  is in  $\mathcal{T}_p$ , then  $B_2 \sqsubseteq \{d\}$  is in  $SC(\mathcal{T})$ .*
2. *If  $\exists P \sqsubseteq \{d\}$  is in  $SC(\mathcal{T})$  and  $(\text{funct } P)$  is in  $\mathcal{T}$ , then  $\exists P^- \sqsubseteq \{_{-x}\}$  is in  $SC(\mathcal{T})$ , such that  $_{-x}$  is a new underscore element.*
3. *If  $\exists P^- \sqsubseteq \{d\}$  and  $(\text{funct } P^-)$  is in  $\mathcal{T}$ , then  $\exists P \sqsubseteq \{_{-x}\}$  is in  $SC(\mathcal{T})$ , such that  $_{-x}$  is a new underscore element.*

**Lemma 2.** *For every ABox  $A$ . The KB  $\mathcal{K} = \langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \rangle$  is satisfiable iff  $\langle SC(\mathcal{T}), A \rangle$  is satisfiable.*

In the following, we make use of these notions to devise query answering and reasoning techniques for  $DL\text{-Lite}_{\mathcal{A}}^o$ .

## 4 First-order Rewritability of Query Answering

Our aim is to extend the query rewriting algorithm of [7,6] to handle also nominals. For this, we exploit the fact that  $DL\text{-Lite}_{\mathcal{A}}^o$ , similarly to other DLs of the  $DL\text{-Lite}$  family, enjoys a canonical model property. Specifically, we show how to adapt the notion of *restricted chase*, adopted in [9] for the case of inclusion dependencies in databases, and extended to  $DL\text{-Lite}$  in [7,8], to show the existence of a(n in general infinite) *canonical model* for any given  $DL\text{-Lite}_{\mathcal{A}}^o$  KB. We

can construct the chase of a KB starting from the ABox, and applying positive inclusion assertions to the set of membership assertions obtained so far.

The critical difference in  $DL\text{-Lite}_A^\circ$  with respect to the chase introduced in [7] is that we have to take care of restricted roles (cf. Section 3), and hence make use of the singleton closure. As above, we use the underscore symbols to denote unnamed individuals. Throughout the construction of the canonical interpretation, some unnamed individuals will be named, and this will change the singleton closure. However, the cardinality of the singleton closure does not change. For the application of the chase rules it is assumed that we have a total (lexicographic) ordering on the assertions and on the constants (including the ones not occurring in our KB). The *chase* of  $\mathcal{K}$  is the set of membership assertions  $chase(\mathcal{K}) = \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} chase_j(\mathcal{K})$ , starting from  $chase_0(\mathcal{K}) = \mathcal{A}$ , and  $\mathcal{SC}_0$  is obtained from  $\mathcal{SC}(\mathcal{T})$  by replacing the unnamed individuals in  $\mathcal{SC}(\mathcal{T})$ , which occur in the ABox with their names. For example, if  $\exists R \sqsubseteq \{-x\}$  and  $R(a, b)$  is in the ABox, then  $\exists R \sqsubseteq \{a\}$  will replace  $\exists R \sqsubseteq \{-x\}$  in  $\mathcal{SC}_0$ . Then,  $chase_{i+1}(\mathcal{K})$  is obtained from  $chase_i(\mathcal{K})$  by adding the membership assertion  $\beta_{new}$ , i.e.,  $chase_{i+1}(\mathcal{K}) = chase_i(\mathcal{K}) \cup \{\beta_{new}\}$ , where  $\beta_{new}$  is the membership assertion obtained from  $chase_i(\mathcal{K})$  by applying one of the chase rules. Similarly,  $\mathcal{SC}_{i+1} = \mathcal{SC}_i[\sigma]$ , the result of applying  $\sigma$  on  $\mathcal{SC}_i$ , where  $\sigma$  is the substitution resulting from the application of one of the chase rules. The substitution  $\sigma$  is the empty substitution by default, unless a concept restricted to an unnamed individual in the singleton closure has been mapped to a named individual. In that case, we will substitute the underscore with the named individual.

**Table 1.** Chase Rules for  $DL\text{-Lite}_A^\circ$

rule	$\alpha$	$\beta$	$\notin chase_i(\mathcal{K})$	$\in \mathcal{SC}_i$	$\notin \mathcal{SC}_i$	$\beta_{new}$	$\sigma$
cr1	$A_1 \sqsubseteq A_2$	$A_1(a)$	$A_2(a)$			$A_2(a)$	$\emptyset$
cr2	$A \sqsubseteq \exists R$	$A(a)$	$R(a, \_x)$		$R^- \sqsubseteq \{-x\}$	$R(a, a_{new})$	$\emptyset$
cr2o	$A \sqsubseteq \exists R$	$A(a)$	$R(a, \_x)$	$R^- \sqsubseteq \{d\}$		$R(a, d)$	$\emptyset$
cr2u	$A \sqsubseteq \exists R$	$A(a)$	$R(a, \_x)$	$R^- \sqsubseteq \{-x\}$		$R(a, a_{new})$	$[R^- \sqsubseteq \{-x\} / R^- \sqsubseteq \{a_{new}\}]$
cr3	$\exists R \sqsubseteq A$	$\exists R(a)$	$A(a)$			$A(a)$	$\emptyset$
cr4	$\exists R_1 \sqsubseteq \exists R_2$	$\exists R_1(a)$	$R_2(a, \_x)$		$R_2^- \sqsubseteq \{-x\}$	$R_2(a, a_{new})$	$\emptyset$
cr4o	$\exists R_1 \sqsubseteq \exists R_2$	$\exists R_1(a)$	$R_2(a, \_x)$	$R_2^- \sqsubseteq \{d\}$		$R_2(a, d)$	$\emptyset$
cr4u	$\exists R_1 \sqsubseteq \exists R_2$	$\exists R_1(a)$	$R_2(a, \_x)$	$R_2^- \sqsubseteq \{-x\}$		$R_2(a, a_{new})$	$[R_2^- \sqsubseteq \{-x\} / R_2^- \sqsubseteq \{a_{new}\}]$
cr5	$R_1 \sqsubseteq R_2$	$R_1(a, b)$	$R_2(a, b)$			$R_2(a, b)$	$\emptyset$

The chase rules are listed in Table 1.  $\beta$  is the first (in lexicographic order) membership assertion in  $chase_i(\mathcal{K})$  such that there exists a PI (i.e., an inclusion in  $\mathcal{T}_p \cup \mathcal{T}_o$ ) that is *applicable to it*, and  $\alpha$  is the first such PI. The notion of *applicability* of a PI extends in a straightforward way the one in [7] (see below). The three subsequent columns in the table express the conditions under which the chase rule is applied in  $chase_i(\mathcal{K})$ , in terms of the atom that should be missing from  $chase_i(\mathcal{K})$ , and possibly the inclusion that should be present or absent from  $\mathcal{SC}_i$ .

**Algorithm PerfectRef**( $q, \mathcal{T}$ )  
**Input:** union of conjunctive queries  $Q$ ,  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$  TBox  $\mathcal{T}$   
**Output:** union of conjunctive queries  $Q_r$   
 $Q_r := Q$ ;  
 $ST = SC(\mathcal{T})$ ;  
**repeat** (1)  
      $Q'_r := Q_r$ ;  
     **for each**  $q \in Q'_r$   
         (O)  $q = \text{reducesingleton}(q, SC(\mathcal{T}))$ ;  
         (a) **for each**  $g$  in  $q$   
             **for each** PI  $I$  in  $ST$   
                 **if**  $I$  is applicable to  $g$   
                     **then**  $Q_r := Q_r \cup \{\text{remdup}(q[g/gr(g, I)])\}$ ;  
         (b) **for each**  $g_1, g_2$  in  $q$   
             **if**  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  unify  
                 **then**  $Q_r := Q_r \cup \{\text{remdup}(\tau(\text{reduce}(q, g_1, g_2)))\}$ ;  
**until**  $Q'_r = Q_r$ ;  
**return**  $Q_r$ .

**Fig. 1.** The algorithm PerfectRef

The *canonical interpretation*  $\text{can}(\mathcal{K}) = \langle \Delta^{\text{can}(\mathcal{K})}, \cdot^{\text{can}(\mathcal{K})} \rangle$  is defined from  $\text{chase}(\mathcal{K})$  as follows:  $\Delta^{\text{can}(\mathcal{K})}$  is the set of constants occurring in  $\text{chase}(\mathcal{K})$ ,  $a^{\text{can}(\mathcal{K})} = a$  for each constant  $a$  occurring in  $\text{chase}(\mathcal{K})$ ,  $A^{\text{can}(\mathcal{K})} = \{a \mid A(a) \in \text{chase}(\mathcal{K})\}$  for each atomic concept  $A$ , and  $P^{\text{can}(\mathcal{K})} = \{(a_1, a_2) \mid P(a_1, a_2) \in \text{chase}(\mathcal{K})\}$  for each atomic role  $P$ . The construction of the canonical interpretation guarantees the satisfiability of the positive inclusion assertions in the TBox, and if  $\langle SC(\mathcal{T}), \mathcal{A} \rangle$  is satisfiable, then it also guarantees the satisfiability of the nominal inclusion assertions.

**Lemma 3.** *For every  $i \geq 0$ , if  $\text{chase}_i(\mathcal{K})$  satisfies  $SC(\mathcal{T})$  then  $\text{chase}_{i+1}(\mathcal{K})$  satisfies  $SC(\mathcal{T})$*

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $\mathcal{K} = \langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \rangle$  be a  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$  KB. Then,  $\text{can}(\mathcal{K})$  is a model of  $\mathcal{K}$  iff  $\mathcal{K}$  is satisfiable.*

Now we can provide an adapted version of the PerfectRef algorithm presented in [7,6], which takes into account the presence of nominals in  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$ . It takes a  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$  TBox  $\mathcal{T}$  and a UCQ  $Q$  and returns a UCQ  $Q_r$ , which we will show to be the FO-rewriting of  $Q$  w.r.t.  $\mathcal{T}$ . In the following, after discussing some preliminary notions, we explain the algorithm PerfectRef, and show its termination and correctness.

Briefly, the algorithm PerfectRef, shown in Figure 1, iterates over the CQs in  $Q$  and takes into consideration those assertions in  $\mathcal{T}$  that are relevant for the computation of the answers of  $Q$  in order to produce  $Q_r$ . Note that only the assertions in  $\mathcal{T}_p$  and  $\mathcal{T}_o$  play a role in the computation of  $Q_r$ . Roughly speaking, the algorithm checks the atoms, sees whether we can rewrite them into other atoms in each query in  $Q$  using the PIs as rewriting rules, reduces the *restricted*

roles in the queries using the inclusions in  $\mathcal{T}_o$ , and unifies any resulting unifiable atoms.

We recall here the basic features that our variant of `PerfectRef` has in common with the original version as presented in [7]<sup>2</sup>. We say that a PI  $I$  is applicable to an atom  $g$  if  $g$  is unifiable with the right-hand side of the assertion. The result of the application of a PI  $gr(g, I)$  on an atom is the atom unifiable with the left-hand side of the assertion. For example, the PI  $A \sqsubseteq \exists P$  is applicable to the atoms  $P(x, -)$  and  $P(-, -)$ , with the atoms resulting from this application being  $A(x)$  and  $A(-)$ , respectively. We use  $q[g/g']$  to denote the CQ obtained by replacing every occurrence of the atom  $g$  in the query  $q$  by the atom  $g'$ . The function *remdup* removes from the body of a CQ atoms occurring more than once. We define the *most general unifier* (*mgu*) of two unifiable atoms  $g_1, g_2$  occurring in a CQ  $q$  as in [7]. The function *reduce* computes the mgu of its two arguments  $g_1, g_2$ , and applies it to the CQ  $q$ . Finally, the function  $\tau$  takes as input a CQ  $q$  and replaces every variable occurring only once with the symbol  $\_$ .

Our addition to `PerfectRef` is Step (O) which is used to handle assertions involving nominals. This step involves the reduction of restricted roles to concepts. This turns out to be necessary, since if  $R$  is a restricted role, i.e.,  $\exists R \sqsubseteq \{d\}$ , then for every model  $\mathcal{I}$  we will have that  $R^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \{d^{\mathcal{I}}\} \times \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ , which makes  $R$  “behave like a concept” w.r.t. rewriting steps. Hence, we can replace an atom  $R(x, y)$  occurring in a CQ  $q$  by  $\exists R^-(y)$ , and replace any further occurrence of  $x$  in  $q$  with  $d$ . This is accomplished by the function *reducesingleton*, which makes use of the singleton closure  $\mathcal{SC}(\mathcal{T})$ .

*Example 1.* For example, if we have  $q(x, y) \leftarrow R_1(x, y), R_2(x, y)$ , and we have  $R_2^- \sqsubseteq \{d\}$  in the TBox  $\mathcal{T}$ , then *reducesingleton* will reduce  $q$  to  $q'(x, d) \leftarrow R_1(x, d), R_2(x, -)$  (i.e.,  $y$  is being bound to  $d$  in the answers of  $q$ ).  $\square$

It is possible that one role is indirectly restricted to a singleton nominal, e.g., the assertions  $A \sqsubseteq B$  and  $B \sqsubseteq \{d\}$  induce the restriction  $A \sqsubseteq \{d\}$ . `PerfectRef` handles the effect of this interaction of positive inclusion assertions with nominal inclusion assertions by making use of  $\mathcal{SC}(\mathcal{T})$ , instead of  $\mathcal{T}$ .

Taking into consideration that the presence of nominals does not lead to an increase of the number of atoms in the rewritten queries, the termination of `PerfectRef` can be proved similarly to Lemma 34 in [7].

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a  $DL\text{-Lite}_A^o$  TBox, and  $Q$  be a union of conjunctive queries over  $\mathcal{T}$ . Then, the algorithm `PerfectRef`( $Q, \mathcal{T}$ ) terminates.*

To compute the answers of  $Q$ , given the KB  $\mathcal{K} = \langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \rangle$ , we need to evaluate the set of conjunctive queries  $Q_r$  produced by the algorithm `PerfectRef` on the ABox  $\mathcal{A}$ , which can be done in  $AC^0$  in data complexity.

Now we can start observing that query answering over satisfiable knowledge bases can in principle be done by evaluating the query over the model  $can(\mathcal{K})$ .

<sup>2</sup> Extensions of `PerfectRef` to deal with additional constructs have also been presented in [5,13,8].

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be a satisfiable  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$  KB, and let  $Q$  be a union of conjunctive queries over  $\mathcal{K}$ . Then,  $ans(Q, \mathcal{K}) = Q^{can(\mathcal{K})}$*

The proof is done analogously to the proof of Theorem 29 in [7], which states an analogous result for  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{R}}$  and  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{F}}$ .

Taking into consideration that  $can(\mathcal{K})$  is infinite in general, we cannot compute and evaluate queries over it. However, as for  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}$ , we can show that instead of computing  $Q^{can(\mathcal{K})}$  we can evaluate the UCQ  $Q_r$  computed by PerfectRef directly over the ABox, considered as a database. For this purpose, we extend the definition of database interpretation given in [7] so as to handle the presence of nominals. The *database interpretation*  $db(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}) = \langle \Delta^{db(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})}, \cdot^{db(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})} \rangle$  of a KB  $\langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \rangle$  is the interpretation whose domain  $\Delta^{db(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})}$  is the non-empty set consisting of all constants appearing in  $\mathcal{A}$  and in nominals in  $\mathcal{T}$ , and such that  $a^{db(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})} = a$  for each constant  $a$ , and  $A^{db(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})} = \{a \mid A(a) \in \mathcal{A}\}$  for each atomic concept  $A$ , and  $P^{db(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})} = \{(a_1, a_2) \mid P(a_1, a_2) \in \mathcal{A}\}$  for each atomic role  $P$ .

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$  TBox,  $Q$  a UCQ over  $\mathcal{T}$ , and  $Q_r = \text{PerfectRef}(Q, \mathcal{T})$  the UCQ returned by PerfectRef. Then, for every  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$  ABox  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $\langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \rangle$  is satisfiable, we have that  $ans(Q, \langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \rangle) = Q_r^{db(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})}$ .*

**Corollary 1.** *Query answering in  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$  is in  $AC^0$  with respect to the data complexity*

## 5 FO-Rewritability of KB Satisfiability

We now consider KB satisfiability in  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$ , and provide a technique to solve it via query evaluation, hence showing its FO-rewritability. The first case to be considered is a special case where the TBox has only positive inclusion assertions, in this case the knowledge base is just a  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}$  knowledge base with only positive inclusion assertions which is satisfiable according to lemma 7 in [7].

However, in the general case, we cannot construct the canonical interpretation unless the nominal inclusion assertions are satisfied. According to theorem 3 it suffices to show that the  $db(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})$  satisfies the nominal inclusion assertions in the singleton closure in order to show that  $can(\mathcal{K})$  satisfies the singleton closure (and hence the nominal inclusion assertions in the TBox).

The ABox  $\mathcal{A}$  satisfies  $\mathcal{SC}_{\circ}(\mathcal{T})$  when it satisfies all the assignments in  $\mathcal{SC}_{\circ}(\mathcal{T})$ . An inclusion assertion  $A \sqsubseteq \{x\}$  is satisfied when no individual, different than  $x$ , is asserted as a member to the concept  $A$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ , whereas the assertion:  $A \sqsubseteq \{-x\}$  is satisfied when no two different individuals are asserted to the concept  $A$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ . In order to formulate the latter statement, we need to introduce the notion of a (boolean) query associated to a nominal inclusion assertion (which was originally applied only to negative inclusion assertions). This query evaluates false iff the assertion is satisfied. In the following, we make use of CQs and UCQs enriched with inequalities, and express them in the Datalog notation as in [8].

**Definition 2.** Given a  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$  nominals inclusion assertion  $O$  in  $SC_{\circ}(\mathcal{T})$ , the form  $B \sqsubseteq \{d\}$ , such that  $B$  is a basic concept and  $d$  is an individual, the query associated to  $O$  is a boolean conjunctive query  $q_O$  of the form:

$$q_O \leftarrow \exists x : B(x), x \neq d$$

Whereas, assertions of the form:  $B \sqsubseteq \{-\}$  are associated with the following query:

$$q_O \leftarrow \exists x \exists y : B(x), B(y)x \neq y$$

The following Lemma states that satisfiability for a  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$  knowledge base  $\mathcal{K} = \langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \rangle$ , where  $\mathcal{T}$  contains positive inclusions and nominal inclusions, can be reduced to answering a UCQ with inequalities over  $\mathcal{A}$ .

**Lemma 6.** Let  $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{T}_p \cup T_{\circ}, \mathcal{A})$  be a  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$  KB, and  $Q_{\circ} = \bigvee_{O \in SC(\mathcal{T})} q_O$ . Then,  $\mathcal{K}$  is satisfiable iff  $\mathcal{A} \not\models Q_{\circ}$ .

Having checked the satisfiability of the singleton closure, we can build the canonical interpretation satisfying a TBox containing only positive and nominal inclusion assertions. Now we have to consider negative inclusion assertions and functionality assertions. Functionality restrictions interact with the nominal restrictions, in the sense that if a role is restricted and functional then not only the restricted component but also the other component has to be taken into the singleton closure. We have already handled this situation in our definition of the singleton closure. Finally, we have to check whether the functionality restrictions are fulfilled. This we do by defining the query associated to a functionality restriction.

**Definition 3.** Given a  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$  functionality restriction  $\mathcal{F}$  of the form (funct  $R$ ) in  $\mathcal{T}_f$ , the query associated to  $\mathcal{F}$  is a boolean conjunctive query  $q_{\mathcal{F}}$  of the form:

$$q_{\mathcal{F}} \leftarrow R(x, y), R(x, z), y \neq z$$

**Lemma 7.** Let  $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{T}_p \cup T_{\circ} \cup \mathcal{T}_f, \mathcal{A})$  be a  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$  KB, and  $Q_{\circ} = \bigvee_{O \in SC(\mathcal{T})} q_O$  and  $Q_{\mathcal{F}} = \bigvee_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{T}_f} q_{\mathcal{F}}$ . Then,  $\mathcal{K}$  is satisfiable iff  $\mathcal{A} \not\models Q_{\circ}$  and  $\mathcal{A} \not\models Q_{\mathcal{F}}$ .

Notably, since answering of  $Q_{\mathcal{F}}$  and  $Q_{\circ}$  over the ABox  $\mathcal{A}$  involves only evaluating  $Q_{\mathcal{F}}$  and  $Q_{\circ}$  over  $db(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})$ , the above lemma also entails that satisfiability of  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$  knowledge bases without NIs is FO-rewritable. Now, we can continue the tradition of [8] in using the algorithm **PerfectRef**, presented in Section 4, to check the satisfiability of the negative inclusion assertions. Note that **PerfectRef** only requires the inclusions in  $\mathcal{T}_p$  and  $\mathcal{T}_{\circ}$ .

**Definition 4.** Given a  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$  negative inclusion assertion  $N$  of the form  $B_1 \sqsubseteq \neg B_2$  in  $\mathcal{T}_n$ , the query associated to  $N$  is a boolean conjunctive query  $q_N$  of the form:

$$q_N \leftarrow B_1(x), B_2(x)$$

**Algorithm**  $\text{Consistent}(\mathcal{K})$   
**Input:**  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o \mathcal{K} = \langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \rangle$   
**Output:** *true* if it is unsatisfiable, *false* otherwise

- **Normalize knowledge base**  
 $\mathcal{K} = \text{Normalize}(\mathcal{K})$
- **Build singleton closure**  
 $\mathcal{SC}(\mathcal{T}) = \text{SingletonClosure}(\mathcal{T})$
- **Check Singleton Closure and functionality restrictions**  
 $q_{\mathcal{O}} := \perp$ ;  
**foreach**  $\alpha \in \mathcal{SC}_{\mathcal{O}}(\mathcal{T}) \cup \mathcal{SC}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{T})$   
      $q_{\mathcal{SC}(\mathcal{T})} = q_{\mathcal{SC}(\mathcal{T})} \vee q_{\alpha}$ ;  
     **if**  $q_{\mathcal{SC}(\mathcal{T})}^{db(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})} \neq \emptyset$  **return true**;
- $q_{\mathcal{T}_n} := \perp$ ;  
**foreach**  $N \in \mathcal{T}_n$   
      $q_{\mathcal{T}_n} = q_{\mathcal{T}_n} \cup \{q_{\mathcal{T}_n}\}$   
      $q_{\mathcal{T}_n} = \text{PerfectRef}(q_{\mathcal{T}_n}, \mathcal{T}_p \cup \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{O}})$

**return**  $q_{\mathcal{T}_n}^{db(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})}$

**Fig. 2.** The algorithm  $\text{Consistent}$

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $\langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \rangle$  be a satisfiable  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$  KB,  $\mathcal{T}_n$  a set of NIs,  $Q_n = \bigcup_{N \in \mathcal{T}_n} q_N$  the UCQ associated to  $\mathcal{T}_n$ . Then,  $\mathcal{K} = \langle \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}_n, \mathcal{A} \rangle$  is satisfiable iff  $\langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \rangle \not\models Q_n$ .*

Now, given Lemma 6 and Theorem 3, we can establish the satisfiability of a  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$ . This allows us to say that checking the satisfiability of  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$  KB is first-order rewritable, and we can now write an algorithm to check the satisfiability of KBs (see Figure 2). Briefly, the algorithm first normalizes the KB, then it checks whether the singleton closure is satisfied. Afterwards, it checks if the functionality restrictions are satisfied, and finally considers the satisfiability of the negative inclusion assertions. We will make use of the algorithms  $\text{Normalize}$  and  $\text{SingletonClosure}$ , where  $\text{SingletonClosure}$  is an algorithm for calculating  $\mathcal{SC}(\mathcal{T})$ . The next Theorem follows directly from the FO-rewritability.

**Theorem 4.** *KB satisfiability in  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$  is in  $AC^0$  with respect to data complexity.*

## 6 Conclusion

This paper shows that the extending  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}$  with singleton nominals does not have an impact on the data complexity of reasoning. The structure of the paper follows similar ideas to those in [7,8], but is based first define a singleton closure, and build a canonical interpretation based on this closure. Furthermore, we define a modified version of the algorithm  $\text{PerfectRef}$  to handle the nominal constructions, which shows the FO-rewritability of query answering for satisfiable knowledge bases, and finally make use of this algorithms to check for the

satisfiability of  $DL-Lite^c_{\mathcal{A}}$  knowledge bases using first-order query evaluation. Thus, showing the FO-rewritability of the satisfiability problem.

## References

1. Artale, A., Calvanese, D., Kontchakov, R., Zakharyashev, M.: The  $DL-Lite$  family and relations. *J. of Artificial Intelligence Research* 36, 1–69 (2009)
2. Baader, F., Brandt, S., Lutz, C.: Pushing the  $\mathcal{EL}$  envelope. In: Proc. of the 19th Int. Joint Conf. on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI 2005). pp. 364–369 (2005)
3. Baader, F., Calvanese, D., McGuinness, D., Nardi, D., Patel-Schneider, P.F. (eds.): *The Description Logic Handbook: Theory, Implementation and Applications*. Cambridge University Press (2003)
4. Bao, J., et al.: OWL 2 Web Ontology Language document overview (second edition). W3C Recommendation, World Wide Web Consortium (Dec 2012), available at <http://www.w3.org/TR/owl2-overview/>
5. Botoeva, E., Artale, A., Calvanese, D.: Query rewriting in  $DL-Lite_{horn}^{\mu N}$ . In: Proc. of the 23rd Int. Workshop on Description Logic (DL 2010). CEUR Electronic Workshop Proceedings, <http://ceur-ws.org/>, vol. 573, pp. 267–278 (2010)
6. Calvanese, D., De Giacomo, G., Lembo, D., Lenzerini, M., Poggi, A., Rodríguez-Muro, M., Rosati, R.: Ontologies and databases: The  $DL-Lite$  approach. In: Tessaris, S., Franconi, E. (eds.) *Semantic Technologies for Informations Systems – 5th Int. Reasoning Web Summer School (RW 2009)*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 5689, pp. 255–356. Springer (2009)
7. Calvanese, D., De Giacomo, G., Lembo, D., Lenzerini, M., Rosati, R.: Tractable reasoning and efficient query answering in description logics: The  $DL-Lite$  family. *J. of Automated Reasoning* 39(3), 385–429 (2007)
8. Calvanese, D., De Giacomo, G., Lembo, D., Lenzerini, M., Rosati, R.: Data complexity of query answering in description logics. *Artificial Intelligence* 195, 335–360 (2013)
9. Johnson, D.S., Klug, A.C.: Testing containment of conjunctive queries under functional and inclusion dependencies. *J. of Computer and System Sciences* 28(1), 167–189 (1984)
10. Lutz, C., Walther, D., Wolter, F.: Conservative extensions in expressive description logics. In: Proc. of the 20th Int. Joint Conf. on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI 2007). pp. 453–458 (2007)
11. Motik, B., Cuenca Grau, B., Horrocks, I., Wu, Z., Fokoue, A., Lutz, C.: OWL 2 Web Ontology Language profiles (second edition). W3C Recommendation, World Wide Web Consortium (Dec 2012), available at <http://www.w3.org/TR/owl2-profiles/>
12. Poggi, A., Lembo, D., Calvanese, D., De Giacomo, G., Lenzerini, M., Rosati, R.: Linking data to ontologies. *J. on Data Semantics X*, 133–173 (2008)
13. Savković, O.: *Managing Datatypes in Ontology-Based Data Access*. Master’s thesis, Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, Technische Universität Wien (2011)
14. Savkovic, O., Calvanese, D.: Introducing datatypes in  $DL-Lite$ . In: Proceedings of the Twentieth European Conference on Artificial Intelligence (ECAI 2012) (2012)
15. Seylan, I., Franconi, E., de Bruijn, J.: Effective query rewriting with ontologies over DBoxes. In: Proc. of the 21st Int. Joint Conf. on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI 2009). pp. 923–925 (2009)
16. Tobies, S.: The complexity of reasoning with cardinality restrictions and nominals in expressive description logics. *J. of Artificial Intelligence Research* 12, 199–217 (2000)

## A Proofs for Section 3

### A.1 Proof of Lemma 2

*Proof.*  $\Leftarrow$  Let  $\langle \mathcal{SC}(\mathcal{T}), \mathcal{A} \rangle$  be satisfiable and  $M$  be a model of it. Then,  $M$  is obviously a model of  $\mathcal{K} = \langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \rangle$ , since  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{SC}(\mathcal{T})$  by definition.

$\Rightarrow$  Let  $M$  be a model of  $\mathcal{K}$ , by looking at definition 1, we see three parts of  $\mathcal{SC}(\mathcal{T})$ . 1. For part one,  $M \models \mathcal{K}$ , then  $B_2^M \subseteq B_1^M$  and  $B_1^M \{x^M\}$  imply that  $B_2^M \subseteq \{x^M\}$  which means that  $M$  satisfies  $B_2 \sqsubseteq \{x\}$ .

2. For part two, if  $M \models \exists P \sqsubseteq \{d\}$  then  $\{x \in \Delta^M : \exists y : (x, y) \in P^M\} \subseteq \{d\}$ , i.e.,  $\forall (x, y) \in P^M : x = d$  and if  $M \models (\text{funct } P)$  then  $\forall x, y, z \in \Delta^M : (x, y) \in P^M, (x, z) \in P^M \rightarrow y = z$  but  $\forall (x, y) \in P^M : x = d^M$  then  $\forall (x, y) \in P^M : \exists w : x = d \wedge y = w$ , then  $\exists P^- \sqsubseteq \{-x\}$ . 3. For part three, the proof is parallel to part three.

## B Proofs for Section 4

### B.1 Proof of Lemma 3

*Proof.* Let us assume the opposite:  $\text{chase}_i(\mathcal{K})$  satisfies  $\mathcal{SC}(\mathcal{T})$  and  $\text{chase}_{i+1}(\mathcal{K}) = \text{chase}_i(\mathcal{K}) \cup \{\beta_{new}\}$  does not satisfy  $\mathcal{SC}(\mathcal{T})$ . Then there is an assertion  $B \sqsubseteq \{d\}$  in  $\mathcal{SC}(\mathcal{T})$  which has been broken by  $\beta_{new}$ . However this is not possible because if  $B \sqsubseteq \{d\}$  in  $\mathcal{SC}(\mathcal{T})$  then  $B \sqsubseteq \{d\}$  in  $\mathcal{SC}(\mathcal{T})_i$  which will enforce the execution of one of the roles: **cr2o**, **cr2u**, **cr4o**, or **cr4u** which guarantee the satisfiability of  $\mathcal{SC}(\mathcal{T})$ , which is a contradiction.

### B.2 Proof of Lemma 4

*Proof.* We first prove that given a satisfiable  $DL\text{-Lite}_A^o$  KB  $\mathcal{K} = \langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \rangle$ , and let  $\mathcal{M} = (\Delta^{\mathcal{M}}, \cdot^{\mathcal{M}})$  be a model of  $\mathcal{K}$ . Then, a model homomorphism  $\psi$  from  $\Delta^{can(\mathcal{K})}$  to  $\Delta^{\mathcal{M}}$  such that:

1. For each atomic concept  $A$  in  $\mathcal{K}$  and each object  $o \in \Delta^{can(\mathcal{K})}$ , if  $o \in A^{can(\mathcal{K})}$ , then  $\psi(o) \in A^{\mathcal{M}}$  and
2. For each atomic role  $P$  in  $\mathcal{K}$  and each pair of objects  $o, o' \in \Delta^{can(\mathcal{K})}$ , if  $(o, o') \in P^{can(\mathcal{K})}$ , then  $(\psi(o), \psi(o')) \in P^{\mathcal{M}}$

Again, the proof can be done the same way it is done in [6], among other papers, by induction on the construction of  $\text{chase}(\mathcal{K})$ . Now, we get at the statement that whenever  $\mathcal{K}$  is satisfiable,  $can(\mathcal{K})$  is a model of  $\mathcal{K}$  and vice-versa. The proof follows our definition of the chase with some changes in the inductive step, where we have to take into consideration the singleton closure.

We define the function  $\psi$  from  $\Delta^{can(\mathcal{K})}$  to  $\Delta^{\mathcal{M}}$  by a chase based induction, and show that the properties above hold.

Base Step: For each constant  $d$  occurring in  $\mathcal{A}$ , we define  $\psi(d^{can(\mathcal{K})}) = d^{\mathcal{M}}$ , note that  $\text{chase}_0(\mathcal{K}) = \mathcal{A}$  and that  $\psi(d^{can(\mathcal{K})}) = d$ . It is the case that for every

concept  $A$ :  $o \in \mathcal{A}^{cano(\mathcal{K})}$  if  $A(o) \in \mathcal{A}$  and respectively for every role  $P$ :  $(o_1, o_2) \in P^{cano(\mathcal{K})}$  if  $P(o_1, o_2) \in \mathcal{A}$ . Taking into consideration that  $\mathcal{M}$  is a model, we can say that:  $\psi(o) \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{M}}$  and  $(\psi(o_1), \psi(o_2)) \in P^{\mathcal{M}}$ .

Inductive Step:  $chase_{i+1}(\mathcal{K})$  is obtained from  $chase_i(\mathcal{K})$  by applying a certain chase rule. We will prove the case for the rules **cr2**, **cr2o**, and **cr2u**, where the other rules can be done analogously. Let us consider the rules **cr2**, **cr2o**, **cr2u** this means that the PI of the form  $A \sqsubseteq \exists R$ , where  $A$  is an atomic concept  $\mathcal{T}$ , and  $R$  is a basic role in  $\mathcal{T}$ , is applied in  $chase_i(\mathcal{K})$  to a certain assertion of the form  $A(o)$ , and there is not an assertion of the form  $P(o, -)$  in  $chase_i(\mathcal{K})$ , then:

- if there is no singleton restriction on the role  $P$ , i.e.,  $chase_{i+1}(\mathcal{K}) = chase_i(\mathcal{K}) \cup \{P(o, e)\}$  such that  $e$  is the first lexicographically not used constant. By the induction hypothesis above, there exists  $o_m \in \Delta^{\mathcal{M}}$  such that  $\psi(o) = o_m$  and because  $\mathcal{M}$  is a model of  $\mathcal{K}$  then there should be a  $o'$  such that  $(o_m, o') \in P^{\mathcal{M}}$ , hence we set  $\psi(e) = o'$
- If there is a singleton restriction on the role  $P$  of the form  $\exists P^- \in \{d\}$ , then  $chase_{i+1}(\mathcal{K}) = chase_i(\mathcal{K}) \cup \{P(o, d)\}$ . By the induction hypothesis above, there exists  $o_m \in \Delta^{\mathcal{M}}$  such that  $\psi(o) = o_m$  and because  $\mathcal{M}$  is a model of  $\mathcal{K}$  then  $(o_m, \psi(d)) \in P^{\mathcal{M}}$  should be satisfied by  $\mathcal{M}$ .
- If there is a singleton restriction on the role  $P$  of the form  $\exists P^- \in \{-\}$ , then  $chase_{i+1}(\mathcal{K}) = chase_i(\mathcal{K}) \cup \{P(o, e)\}$ , such that  $e$  is the first lexicographically not used constant. By the induction hypothesis above, there exists  $o_m \in \Delta^{\mathcal{M}}$  such that  $\psi(o) = o_m$  and because  $\mathcal{M}$  is a model of  $\mathcal{K}$  then there should be a well defined constant  $o'$  such that  $(o_m, o') \in P^{\mathcal{M}}$ , hence we set  $\psi(e) = o'$ .

Now we can prove the main theorem.

$\Rightarrow$  If  $can(\mathcal{K})$  is a model of  $\mathcal{K}$ , then  $\mathcal{K}$  is satisfiable by definition.

$\Leftarrow$  If  $\mathcal{K}$  is satisfiable then there is an interpretation  $\mathcal{M} = (\Delta^{\mathcal{M}}, \cdot^{\mathcal{M}})$  which is a model of  $\mathcal{K}$  per definition.  $can(\mathcal{K})$  satisfies  $\mathcal{A}$  because  $\mathcal{A} = chase_0(\mathcal{K}) \subseteq chase(\mathcal{K})$ .  $can(\mathcal{K})$  also satisfies  $\mathcal{T}_p$ . What is left is to prove that  $can(\mathcal{K})$  satisfies  $\mathcal{T}_o$  and  $\mathcal{T}_n$ .

Let assume that  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfies  $\mathcal{K}$ , but for some nominal inclusion assertions  $A \sqsubseteq \{d\}$   $can(\mathcal{K})$  does not satisfy  $\mathcal{K}$ , then we have  $A^{\mathcal{M}} \subseteq \{d^{\mathcal{M}}\}$  but  $A^{can(\mathcal{K})} \not\subseteq \{d^{can(\mathcal{K})}\}$ , then there exists  $o^{can(\mathcal{K})} \in \Delta^{can(\mathcal{K})}$  such that  $o^{can(\mathcal{K})} \in A^{can(\mathcal{K})}$  and  $o^{can(\mathcal{K})} \notin \{d^{can(\mathcal{K})}\}$ . Hence, given the homomorphism  $\psi : \Delta^{can(\mathcal{K})} \rightarrow \Delta^{\mathcal{M}}$ , then  $\psi(o^{can(\mathcal{K})}) \in \Delta^{\mathcal{M}}$  such that  $\psi(o^{can(\mathcal{K})}) \in A^{\mathcal{M}}$  and  $\psi(o^{can(\mathcal{K})}) \notin \{\psi(d^{can(\mathcal{K})})\}$ , which contradicts the fact that  $\mathcal{M}$  is a model. The proof for negative inclusion assertions can be done in an analogous way.

### B.3 Proof of Theorem 1

*Proof.* Note that for each constant  $d$  occurring in  $\mathcal{K}$ , we have  $d^{can(\mathcal{K})} = d$ . Hence, for every tuple  $\mathbf{t}$  composed of constants in  $\mathcal{K}$ , we have  $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{t}^{can(\mathcal{K})}$ . We can hence rephrase the claim as  $\mathbf{t} \in ans(Q, \mathcal{K})$  iff  $\mathbf{t} \in Q^{can(\mathcal{K})}$ .

“ $\Rightarrow$ ” if  $\mathbf{t} \in ans(Q, \mathcal{K})$  then  $\forall \mathcal{M}$  such that  $\mathcal{M}$  is a model of  $\mathcal{K}$ :  $\mathbf{t} \in Q^{\mathcal{M}}$ . Taking into consideration that  $can(\mathcal{K})$  is a model of  $\mathcal{K}$ , then  $\mathbf{t} \in Q^{can(\mathcal{K})}$ .

“ $\Leftarrow$ ” if  $\mathbf{t} \in Q^{can(\mathcal{K})}$  then there is an assignment  $\mu : V \rightarrow \Delta^{can(\mathcal{K})}$  which maps every distinguished variable in the query to an object in the domain of  $can(\mathcal{K})$ , such that all atoms in the query are evaluated as true. Given the fact that there is a truth-preserving homomorphism  $\psi : \Delta^{can(\mathcal{K})} \rightarrow \Delta^{\mathcal{M}}$  for every model of  $\mathcal{K}$ , then the composition function  $\psi \circ \mu : V \rightarrow \Delta^{\mathcal{M}}$  maps every distinguished variable in the query to an object in  $\Delta^{\mathcal{M}}$ , taking into consideration that  $\psi$  is truth-preserving,  $\mathbf{t} \in Q^{\mathcal{M}}$  for every model  $\mathcal{M}$ . By definition, it follows that  $\mathbf{t} \in ans(Q, \mathcal{K})$ .

#### B.4 Proof of Theorem 2

*Proof.* In order to start with the proof, we have to introduce the preliminary notion of *witness of a tuple of constants* with respect to a certain CQ  $q$ .

**Definition 5.** *Given:*

- a DL-Lite<sub>A</sub><sup>o</sup> knowledge base  $\mathcal{K} = \langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \rangle$
- a CQ  $q(\mathbf{x}) \leftarrow conj(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  over  $\mathcal{K}$
- a tuple  $\mathbf{t}$  of constants occurring in  $\mathcal{K}$

then a set of membership assertions  $\mathcal{G}$  is a witness of  $\mathbf{t}$  w.r.t.  $q$  if there exists a substitution  $\sigma$  from the variables  $\mathbf{y}$  in  $conj(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{y})$  to constants in  $\mathcal{G}$  such that the set of atoms in  $\sigma(conj(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{y}))$  is equal to  $\mathcal{G}$ .

It is intuitive that each such witness corresponds to a subset of  $chase(\mathcal{K})$ , which is sufficiently enough to make  $\exists \mathbf{y}. conj(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  evaluate true in the canonical interpretation  $can(\mathcal{K})$ , making  $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{t}^{can(\mathcal{K})}$  a member of  $q^{can(\mathcal{K})}$ . In other words,  $\mathbf{t} \in q^{can(\mathcal{K})}$  iff there exists a witness  $\mathcal{G}$  of  $\mathbf{t}$  w.r.t.  $q$  such that  $\mathcal{G} \subseteq chase(\mathcal{K})$ . The cardinality of a witness  $\mathcal{G}$ , denoted by  $|\mathcal{G}|$ , is the number of membership assertions in  $\mathcal{G}$ .

However, the finite *witness* corresponds to a subset of the possibly infinite  $chase(\mathcal{K})$ . Nevertheless,  $\mathcal{G}$  is finite, which means that there are a certain  $j$  such that  $\mathcal{G} \subseteq chase_j(\mathcal{K})$ . This motivates us to define the notion of *pre-witness*, which projects on defining the atoms in  $chase_i(\mathcal{K})$ , such that  $i < j$  which resulted in  $\mathcal{G}$  (or  $\mathcal{G}_j$ ), by repeated applications of chase rules. In order to do so, we have to introduce the notions of *ancestor* (and its dual *successor*).

In the following, we say that a membership assertion  $\beta$  is an *ancestor* of a membership assertion  $\beta'$  in a set of membership assertions  $\mathcal{S}$ , if there exist  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n$  in  $\mathcal{S}$ , such that  $\beta_1 = \beta$ ,  $\beta_n = \beta'$ , and each  $\beta_i$  can be generated by applying a chase rule to  $\beta_{i-1}$ , for  $i \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ . We also say that  $\beta'$  is a *successor* of  $\beta$ .

Given a witness of  $\mathcal{G}_k$  of a tuple  $\mathbf{t}$  w.r.t. a CQ  $q$ , such that  $k$  is the highest  $k$  such that  $\mathcal{G}_k \subseteq chase_k(\mathcal{K})$ . For each  $i \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ , we denote with  $\mathcal{G}_i$  the *pre-witness* of  $\mathbf{t}$  w.r.t.  $q$  in  $chase_i(\mathcal{K})$ , defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{G}_i = \bigcup_{\beta' \in \mathcal{G}_k} \{ \beta \in chase_i(\mathcal{K}) \mid \beta \text{ is an ancestor of } \beta' \text{ in } chase_k(\mathcal{K}) \text{ and} \\ \text{there exists no successor of } \beta \text{ in } chase_i(\mathcal{K}) \\ \text{which is an ancestor of } \beta' \text{ in } chase_k(\mathcal{K}) \}.$$

Now we can get to formalize and prove the theorem.

Since  $\langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \rangle$  is satisfiable, and the finite size of the reformulation of the query, i.e.,  $Q_r = \bigvee_{\hat{q} \in Q_r} \hat{q}$ , we need only to prove that  $\bigcup_{\hat{q} \in Q_r} \hat{q}^{db(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})} = q^{can(\mathcal{K})}$ .

“ $\Leftarrow$ ” We have to show that  $\hat{q}^{db(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})} \subseteq q^{can(\mathcal{K})}$  for each  $\hat{q} \in Q_r$ . Hence, let us consider two CQs  $q_i$  and  $q_{i+1}$ , such that  $q_{i+1}$  is obtained from  $q_i$  by applying some step of the algorithm **PerfectRef**, and show that  $q_{i+1}^{can(\mathcal{K})} \subseteq q_i^{can(\mathcal{K})}$ . Let  $\mathbf{t} \in q_{i+1}^{can(\mathcal{K})}$ , then there exists a witness  $\mathcal{G} \subseteq can(\mathcal{K})$  of  $\mathbf{t}$  w.r.t.  $q_{i+1}$ . Then there are two possibilities:

- step (a) of **PerfectRef** is applied then  $q_{i+1}$  is resulting from applying some PI  $I$ , say  $I = A_1 \sqsubseteq A$ , then:

$$q_{i+1} = q_i[A(x)/A_1(x)]$$

(note that the same methodology can be generalized to all of the other types of assertions). Then, there exists a membership assertion in  $\mathcal{G}$  for which  $I$  is applicable, implying that there exists a witness for  $\mathbf{t}$  w.r.t.  $q_i$  in  $chase(\mathcal{K})$ . Therefore,  $\mathbf{t}^{can(\mathcal{K})} \in q_i^{can(\mathcal{K})}$ .

- step (b) of **PerfectRef** is applied, then:

$$q_{i+1} = \tau(reduce(reducesingleton(q_i), g_1, g_2))$$

where  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  are two atoms belonging to  $q_i$  such that  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  unify. It is easy to see that  $\mathcal{G}$  stays a witness of  $\mathbf{t}$  w.r.t.  $q_i$ , and therefore  $\mathbf{t}^{can(\mathcal{K})} \in q_i^{can(\mathcal{K})}$ .

Since each query  $\hat{q}$  of  $Q_r$  is either  $q$  or a query resulting from  $q$  by applying **PerfectRef**  $n$ -times, where  $n \geq 1$ , we can see that for each  $\hat{q} \in Q_r$  it is the case that  $\hat{q}^{can(\mathcal{K})} \subseteq q^{can(\mathcal{K})}$  by repeating the application of the property above. Hence, it follows that  $\hat{q}^{db(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})} \subseteq \hat{q}^{can(\mathcal{K})} \subseteq q^{can(\mathcal{K})}$ , i.e.,  $\hat{q}^{db(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})} \subseteq q^{can(\mathcal{K})}$ .

“ $\Rightarrow$ ” We have to show that  $q^{can(\mathcal{K})} \subseteq Q_r^{db(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})}$ , i.e., we have to show that for each tuple  $\mathbf{t} \in q^{can(\mathcal{K})}$ , there exists  $\hat{q} \in Q_r$  such that  $\mathbf{t} \in \hat{q}^{db(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})}$ . First, since  $\mathbf{t} \in q^{can(\mathcal{K})}$ , it follows that there exists a CQ  $q$  in  $Q$  and a finite number  $k$  such that there is a witness  $\mathcal{G}_k$  of  $\mathbf{t}$  w.r.t.  $q$  contained in  $chase_k(\mathcal{K})$ . Moreover, without loss of generality, we can assume that every rule **cr1**, **cr2**, **cr2o**, **cr2u**, **cr3**, **cr4**, **cr4o**, **cr4u**, and **cr5** used in the construction of  $chase(\mathcal{K})$  is necessary in order to generate such a witness  $\mathcal{G}_k$ . Now we prove by induction on  $i$  that, starting from  $\mathcal{G}_k$ , we can “go back” through the rule applications and find a query  $\hat{q}$  in  $Q_r$  such that the pre-witness  $\mathcal{G}_{k-i}$  of  $\mathbf{t}$  w.r.t.  $q$  in  $chase_{k-i}(\mathcal{K})$  is also a witness of  $\mathbf{t}$  w.r.t.  $\hat{q}$ .

To this aim, we prove that there exists  $\hat{q} \in Q_r$  such that:

- $\mathcal{G}_{k-i}$  (the *per-witness* of  $\mathbf{t}$  w.r.t.  $q$ ) is a witness of  $\mathbf{t}$  w.r.t.  $\hat{q}$  and
- $|\hat{q}| = |\mathcal{G}_{k-i}|$ , where  $|\hat{q}|$  indicates the number of atoms in the CQ  $\hat{q}$ .

Then we can apply this claim for  $i = k$ , taking into consideration that  $\text{chase}_0(\mathcal{K}) = \mathcal{A}$ .

Base step: (i=0) There exists  $\hat{q} \in Q_r$  such that  $\mathcal{G}_k$  is a witness of  $\mathbf{t}$  w.r.t.  $\hat{q}$  and  $|\hat{q}| = |\mathcal{G}_k|$ . This is an immediate consequence of the fact that  $q \in Q_r$  and that  $Q_r$  is closed with respect to step (b) of the algorithm `PerfectRef`.

Indeed, if  $|\mathcal{G}_k| < |q|$  then there exist two atoms  $g_1, g_2$  in  $q$  and a membership assertion  $\beta$  in  $\mathcal{G}_k$  such that  $\beta$  and  $g_1$  unify and  $\beta$  and  $g_2$  unify, which implies that  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  unify.

Therefore, by step (b) of the algorithm, it follows that there exists a query  $q_1 \in Q_r$  (with  $q_1 = \text{reduce}(q, g_1, g_2)$ ) such that  $\mathcal{G}_k$  is a witness of  $\mathbf{t}$  w.r.t.  $q_1$  and  $|q_1| = |q| - 1$ . This step is exactly proved as in *DL-Lite<sub>A</sub>*, taking into consideration that our added function *reducesingleton* does not influence the statement. Now, if  $|\mathcal{G}_k| < |q_1|$ , we can iterate the above argument, thus we conclude that there exists  $\hat{q} \in Q_r$  such that  $\mathcal{G}_k$  is a witness of  $\mathbf{t}$  w.r.t.  $\hat{q}$  and  $|\hat{q}| = |\mathcal{G}_k|$ .

Inductive step: suppose that there exists  $\hat{q} \in Q_r$  such that  $\mathcal{G}_{k-i+1}$  is a witness of  $\mathbf{t}$  w.r.t.  $\hat{q}$  and  $|\hat{q}| = |\mathcal{G}_{k-i+1}|$ .

Let us assume that  $\text{chase}_{k-i+1}(\mathcal{K})$  is obtained by applying **cr2**, **cr2o**, or **cr2u** to  $\text{chase}_{k-i}(\mathcal{K})$  (the proof is analogous for rules **cr1**, **cr3**, **cr4**, **cr4o**, **cr4u**, and **cr5**). This means that a PI of the form  $A \sqsubseteq \exists P^3$ , where  $A$  is an atomic concept and  $P$  is an atomic role, is applied in  $\text{chase}_{k-i}(\mathcal{K})$  to a membership assertion of the form  $A(a)$ , such that there are no named individual  $a'$  in  $\mathbf{t}$  such that  $P(a, a') \in \text{chase}_{k-i}(\mathcal{K})$ . Therefore, if  $P$  is not a restricted role, then we apply rule **cr2**, i.e.,  $\text{chase}_{k-i+1}(\mathcal{K}) = \text{chase}_{k-i}(\mathcal{K}) \cup \{P(a, a'')\}$ , where  $a''$  is a new symbol. Since  $a''$  is not a named individual symbol, i.e., a constant not occurring elsewhere in  $\mathcal{G}_{k-i+1}$ , and since  $|\hat{q}| = |\mathcal{G}_{k-i+1}|$ , it follows that the atom  $P(x, -)$  occurs in  $\hat{q}$ . Therefore, by step (a) of the algorithm, it follows that there exists a query  $q_1 \in Q_r$  (with  $q_1 = \hat{q}[P(x, -)/A(x)]$ ) such that  $\mathcal{G}_{k-i}$  is a witness of  $\mathbf{t}$  w.r.t.  $q_1$ . If  $P$  is a restricted role, say  $\exists P \sqsubseteq \{d\}$ , then we apply **cr2o**, but in this case the function *reducesingleton* will reduce the atom  $P(a, x)$ , if  $x$  is a variable to the form  $\exists P(a)$  and replacing all the occurrences of the variable  $x$  to  $d$ , thus maintaining the answers connecting with  $d$ . The discussion is similar for the chase rule **cr2u**.

Now, there are two possible cases: either  $|q_1| = |\mathcal{G}_{k-i}|$ , and in this case the claim is immediate; or  $|q_1| = |\mathcal{G}_{k-i}| + 1$ . This last case arises if and only if the membership assertion  $A(a)$  to which the rule **cr2** is applied is both in  $\mathcal{G}_{k-i}$  and in  $\mathcal{G}_{k-i+1}$ . This implies that there exist two atoms  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  in  $q_1$  such that  $A(a)$  and  $g_1$  unify and  $A(a)$  and  $g_2$  unify, hence  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  unify. Therefore, by step (b) of the algorithm (applied to  $q_1$ ), it follows that there exists  $q_2 \in Q_r$  (with  $q_2 = \text{reduce}(q_1, g_1, g_2)$ ) such that  $\mathcal{G}_{k-i}$  is a witness of  $\mathbf{t}$  w.r.t.  $q_2$  and

<sup>3</sup> The other execution of rule **cr2** is for the case where the PI is  $A \sqsubseteq \exists P^-$ , which is analogous.

$|q_2| = |\mathcal{G}_{k-i+1}|$ , which proves the claim. Note that the restricted roles are treated exactly like  $\exists P$ , because the *reducesingleton* function will reduce them to such.  $\square$

## C Proofs for Section 5

### C.1 Proof of Lemma 7

Let  $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{T}_p \cup \mathcal{T}_o \cup \mathcal{T}_f, \mathcal{A})$  be a  $DL-Lite_{\mathcal{A}}^o$  KB, and  $Q_{\mathcal{O}} = \bigvee_{\mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{SC}(\mathcal{T})} q_{\mathcal{O}}$  and  $Q_{\mathcal{F}} = \bigvee_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{T}_f} q_{\mathcal{F}}$ . Then,  $\mathcal{K}$  is satisfiable iff  $\mathcal{A} \not\models Q_{\mathcal{O}}$  and  $\mathcal{A} \not\models Q_{\mathcal{F}}$ .

*Proof.* " $\Rightarrow$ " if  $\mathcal{K}$  is satisfiable, then per definition it suffices all the assertions in  $\mathcal{T}_p \cup \mathcal{T}_o \cup \mathcal{T}_f$ . Hence, taking into consideration that the queries  $q_{\mathcal{F}}, Q_{\mathcal{O}}$  are defined to be true only when an an assertion is not satisfied, we can say that  $\mathcal{A} \not\models Q_{\mathcal{O}}$  and  $\mathcal{A} \not\models Q_{\mathcal{F}}$ .

" $\Leftarrow$ " if  $\mathcal{A} \not\models Q_{\mathcal{O}}$  and  $\mathcal{A} \not\models Q_{\mathcal{F}}$  then the satisfaction of the nominal inclusion assertions, it follows from  $\mathcal{A} \not\models Q_{\mathcal{O}}$  that  $\mathcal{A} = \text{chase}_0(\mathcal{K})$  satisfies  $\mathcal{SC}(\mathcal{T})_o$ , which makes them satisfiable by a direct application of Lemma 2.

For the functionality assertions, let us assume that a certain assertion in  $\mathcal{T}_f$ , say (funct  $R$ ) is not satisfied. This means that there exist  $x, y, z \in \Delta^{\text{can}(\mathcal{K})}$  such  $(x, y)$  and  $(x, z)$  are in  $R^{\text{can}(\mathcal{K})}$ , and  $y \neq z$ . Well, this can not occur in  $\text{chase}_0(\mathcal{K}) = \mathcal{A}$  because of the non-satisfaction of the queries. Then there would exist an  $i$  such that  $\text{chase}_i(\mathcal{K})$  satisfies the functionality assertion, whereas  $\text{chase}_{i+1}(\mathcal{K})$  does not. The only chase rules which can break the functionality assertions are **cr2**, **cr2o**, **cr2u** and **cr4**, **cr4o**, **cr4u**. Without restriction of generality we will only prove the case for the first three (the proof for the next three is parallel)

- If it is **cr2** is applied, then only new individuals are introduced, which makes the violation of the functionality not possible.
- For if **cr2o** is applied, then the only case where the functionality assertion can be broken, if the non-restricted component contains more than one element, but this is guaranteed by the definition of the singleton closure. which is satisfied as above for the nominal inclusion assertions
- For if **cr2u** is parallel to **cr2o**

### C.2 Proof of Theorem 3

*Proof.* " $\Leftarrow$ " We show that if  $\langle \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}_n, \mathcal{A} \rangle$  is unsatisfiable then  $\langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \rangle \models Q_n$ . Consider the FOL formula  $\phi$  being the conjunction of all assertions in  $\mathcal{K}$ , in terms of first-order logic, i.e.

$$\phi = \bigwedge_{\alpha \in \mathcal{T}} \alpha \wedge \bigwedge_{\beta \in \mathcal{T}_n} \beta \wedge \bigwedge_{\gamma \in \mathcal{A}} \gamma.$$

Intuitively, if  $\mathcal{K}$  is unsatisfiable then  $\phi$  is unsatisfiable, hence, we can deduce that:

$$\bigwedge_{\alpha \in \mathcal{T}} \bigwedge_{\gamma \in \mathcal{A}} \gamma \models \bigvee_{\beta \in \mathcal{T}_n} \neg \beta$$

from which we can observe that there should be a NI  $N \in \mathcal{T}_n$  such that  $\langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \rangle \models \mathcal{N}$ , and therefore  $\langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \rangle \not\models Q_n$ .

“ $\Rightarrow$ ” We prove that if  $\langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \rangle \models Q_n$  then  $\mathcal{K} = \langle \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}_n, \mathcal{A} \rangle$  is unsatisfiable. If  $\langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \rangle \models Q_n$ , then there is some NI  $N$ , such that  $\langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \rangle \models q_N$ , which implies that every model satisfying  $\langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \rangle$  satisfies also  $q_N$ . Taking into consideration the assumed satisfiability of the first, we can deduce the satisfiability of the latter. Meaning that there are some objects in the domain which contradict the NI  $N$ , i.e.,  $\langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \rangle \not\models N$ , or  $\langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \rangle \models \neg N$ . By deduction, we have that  $\langle \mathcal{T} \cup \{N\}, \mathcal{A} \rangle$  is unsatisfiable, making any KB containing it, including  $\langle \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{T}_n, \mathcal{A} \rangle$  not satisfiable.