Query Languages for Unrestricted Graph Data

Alin Deutsch UC San Diego

The Age of the Graph Is Upon Us (Again)

- Early-mid-90s: semi- or un-structured data research was all the rage
 - data logically viewed as graph
 - initially motivated by modeling WWW (page=vertex, link=edge)
 - query languages expressing constrained reachability in graph
- Late 90s: special case XML (graph restricted to tree shape)
- 2000s: JSON and friends (also tree shaped)
- ~2010 to present: back to unrestricted graphs
 - Initially motivated by analytic tasks in social networks,
 - Now universal use (data is linked in all scenarios)

The Unrestricted Graph Data Model

- Nodes correspond to entities
- Edges are binary, correspond to relationships
- Edges may be directed or undirected
- Nodes and edges may carry labels
- Nodes and edges annotated with data
 both have sets of attributes (key-value pairs)
- A schema is not required to formulate queries

Example Graph

Vertex types:

- Product (name, category, price)
- Customer (ssn, name, address)

Edge types:

- Bought (discount, quantity)
- Customer c bought 100 units of product p at discount 5%:

modeled by edge

c -- (Bought {discount=5%, quantity=100}) → p

Expressing Graph Analytics

- Two Different Approaches
 - High-level query languages à la SQL
 - Low-level programming abstractions
 - Programs written in C++, Java, Scala, Groovy...
- Initially adopted by disjoint communities (recall NoSQL debates)
- Recent trend towards unification

High-Level Query Languages

Some Modern Graph QLs We Will Discuss

There is a host of them! Spectrum includes

- Datalog with aggregation (LogicBlox)
- Cypher (neo4j)
 - declarative, highly similar to StruQL (and hence CRPQs)
- Gremlin (Apache and commercial projects)
 - dataflow programming model: graph annotated with tokens ("traversers") that flow through it according to user program
- New arrival: GSQL (TigerGraph)
 - Inspired by SQL + BSP, extended for more flexible grouping/ aggregation

Key Ingredients for High-Level Query Languages

- Pioneered by academic work on Conjunctive Query (CQ) extensions for graphs (since '87)
 - Path expressions (PEs) for navigation
 - Variables for manipulating data found during navigation
 - − Stitching multiple PEs into complex navigation patterns
 → conjunctive regular path queries (CRPQs)
- Beyond CRPQs, needed in modern applications:
 - Aggregation of data encountered during navigation
 - → support for bag semantics as prerequisite
 - Intermediate results assigned to nodes/edges
 - Control flow support for class of iterative algorithms that converge to result in multiple steps
 - (e.g. PageRank-class, recommender systems, shortest paths, etc.)

Path Expressions

Path Expressions

- Express reachability via constrained paths
- Early graph-specific extension over conjunctive queries
- Introduced initially in academic prototypes in early 90s
 - StruQL (AT&T Research, Fernandez, Halevy, Suciu)
 - WebSQL (Mendelzon, Mihaila, Milo)
 - Lorel (Widom et al)
- Today supported by languages of commercial systems

 Cypher, SparQL, Gremlin, GSQL

Path Expression Syntax

Notations vary. Adopting here that of SparQL W3C Recommendation.

path \rightarrow edge label ^ edge label path . path path | path path* (path)

// wildcard, any edge label

- // inverse edge
- // concatenation
- // alternation
- // 0 or more reps
- path*(min,max) // at least min, at most max

Path Expression Examples (1)

• Pairs of customer and product they bought:

Bought

Pairs of customer and product they were involved with (bought or reviewed)

Bought | Reviewed

• Pairs of customers who bought same product (lists customers with themselves)

Bought.^Bought

Path Expression Examples (2)

 Pairs of customers involved with same product (likeminded)

(Bought | Reviewed).(^Bought | ^Reviewed)

 Pairs of customers connected via a chain of like-minded customer pairs

((Bought|Reviewed).(^Bought|^Reviewed))*

Path Expression Semantics

- In most academic research, the semantics are defined in terms of sets of node pairs
- Traditionally specified in two ways:
 - Declaratively, based on satisfaction of formulae/ patterns
 - Procedurally, based on algebraic operations over relations
- These are equivalent

Classical Declarative Semantics

- Given:
 - graph G
 - path expression PE
- the meaning of PE on G, denoted PE(G) is

the set of node pairs (src, tgt)
s.t. there exists a path in G from src to tgt
whose concatenated labels spell out a word in L(PE)

L(PE) = language accepted by PE when seen as regular expression over alphabet of edge labels

Classical Procedural Semantics

PE(G) is a binary relation over nodes, defined inductively as:

- E(G) = set of s-t node pairs of E edges in G
- _(G) = set of s-t node pairs of any edges in G
- ^E(G) = set of t-s node pairs of E edges in G
- P1.P2(G) = P1(G) o P2(G)
- P1|P2(G) = set union (P1(G), P2(G))

relational composition

• P*(G) = reflexive transitive closure of P(G)

finite due to saturation

Conjunctive Regular Path Queries

- Replace relational atoms appearing in CQs with path expressions.
- Explicitly introduce variables binding to source and target nodes of path expressions.
- Allow multiple path expression atoms in query body.
- Variables can be used to stitch multiple path expression atoms into complex patterns.

CRPQ Examples

• Pairs of customers who have bought same product (do not list a customer with herself):

Q1(c1,c2) :- c1 -Bought.^Bought-> c2, c1 != c2

Customers who have bought and also reviewed a product:

Q2(c) :- c -Bought-> p, c -Reviewed-> p

CRPQ Semantics

- Naturally extended from single path expressions, following model of CQs
- Declarative
 - lifting the notion of satisfaction of a path expression atom by a source-target node pair to the notion of satisfaction of a conjunction of atoms by a tuple
- Procedural
 - based on SPRJ manipulation of the binary relations yielded by the individual path expression atoms

Limitation of Set Semantics

- Common graph analytics need to aggregate data
 - e.g. count the number of products two customers have in common
- Set semantics does not suffice
 - baked-in duplicate elimination affects the aggregation
- As in SQL, practical systems resort to bag semantics

Path Expressions Under Bag Semantics

PE(G) is a bag of node pairs, defined inductively as:

- E(G) = set bag of s-t node pairs of E edges in G
- _(G) = set bag of s-t node pairs of any edges in G
- ^E(G) = set bag of t-s node pairs of E edges in G
- P1.P2(G) = P1(G) o P2(G)
- P1|P2(G) = set bag union (P1(G), P2(G))
- P*(G) = reflexive transitive closure of P(G)

relational composition for **bags**

Not necessarily finite under bag semantics!

Issues with Bag Semantics

- Performance and semantic issues due to number of distinct paths
- Multiplicity of s-t pair in query output reflects number of distinct paths connecting s with t
 - Even in DAGs, these can be exponentially many.
 Chain of diamonds example:
 - More serious: in cyclic graphs, can be infinitely many

Solutions In Practice: Bound Traversal Length

- Upper-bound the length of the traversed path
 Recall bounded Kleene construct *(min,max)
 - Bounds length and hence number of distinct paths considered
 - Supported by Gremlin, Cypher, SparQL, GSQL, very common in tutorial examples and in industrial practice

Solutions In Practice: Restrict Cycle Traversal

- No repeating vertices (simple paths)
 - Rules out paths that go around cycles
 - Recommended in Gremlin style guides, tutorials, formal semantics paper
 - Gremlin's simplePath () predicate supports this semantics
 - Problem: membership of s-t pair in result is NP-hard
- No repeating edges
 - Allows cyclic paths
 - Rules out paths that go around same cycle more than once
 - This is the Cypher semantics

Solutions In Practice: Mix Bag and Set Semantics

- Bag semantics for star-free fragments of PE
- Set semantics for Kleene-starred fragments of PE
- Combine them using (bag-aware) joins
- Example: *p1.p2*.p3*(G)

treated as

p1(G) o (distinct (**p2***(G))) o **p3**(G)

• This is the SparQL semantics (in W3C Recommendation)

Solutions In Practice: Leave it to User

- User explicitly programs desired semantics
- Path is first-class citizen, can be mentioned in query
- Can simulate each of the above semantics, e.g. by checking the path for repeated nodes/edges
- Could lead to infinite traversals for buggy programs
- Supported by Gremlin, GSQL
 - also partially by Cypher (modulo restriction that only edge non-repeating paths are visible)

One Semantics I Would Prefer

- Allow paths to go around cycles, even multiple times
- Achieve finiteness by restriction to *pumping-minimal* paths
 - in the sense of Pumping Lemma for Finite State Automata (FSA)
 - PE are regular expressions, they have an equivalent FSA representation (unique up to minimization)
 - As path is traversed, FSA state changes at every step
 - Rule out paths in which a vertex is repeatedly reached in the same FSA state
- Can be programmed by user in Gremlin and GSQL (costly!)

A Tractable Semantics: Shortest Paths

- For pattern
 - x –Pattern-> y,

vertex pair (s,t) is an answer iff there is a path p from s to t s.t.

- word spelled by edge labels of p is in L(Pattern)
- p is *shortest* among all such paths from s to t
- Multiplicity of (s,t) in answer is the count of such shortest paths

Contrasting Semantics

• pattern E* over graph:



- s-t is an answer under all semantics, but
 - Simple-path: s-t has multiplicity 2
 - Unique-edge: s-t has multiplicity 3
 - Shortest-path: s-t has multiplicity 1

Aggregation

Let's See it First as CQ Extension

• Count toys bought in common per customer pair

Q(c1, c2, count (p)) :- c1 -Bought-> p, c2 -Bought-> p, p.category = "toys", c1 < c2

- c1, c2: composite group key no explicit group-by clause
- Standard syntax for aggregation-extended CQs and Datalog
- Rich literature on semantics

 (tricky for Datalog when aggregation and recursion interleave).

Aggregation in Modern Graph QLs

 Cypher's RETURN clause uses similar syntax as aggregation-extended CQs

 Gremlin and SparQL use an SQL-style GROUP BY clause

 GSQL uses aggregating containers called "accumulators"

Flavor of Representative Languages

Running Example in CRPQ Form

• Recall:

count toys bought in common per customer pair

Q(c1, c2, count (p)) :- c1 -Bought-> p, c2 -Bought-> p, p.category = "toys", c1 < c2

SparQL

- Query language for the semantic web
 - graphs corresponding to RDF data are directed, labeled graphs

• W3C Standard Recommendation

Running Example in SparQL

SELECT ?c1, ?c2, count (?p)

WHERE { ?c1 bought ?p. ?c2 bought ?p. ?p category ?cat.

FILTER (?cat == "toys" && ?c1 < ?c2) }

GROUP BY ?c1, ?c2
SparQL Semantics by Example

• Coincides with CRPQ version

Q(c1, c2, count (p)) :- c1 -Bought-> p, c2 -Bought-> p, p.category = "toys", c1 < c2

Cypher

- The query language of the neo4j commercial native graph db system
- Essentially StruQL with some bells and whistles
- Also supported in a variety of other systems:

 SAP HANA Graph, Agens Graph, Redis Graph, Memgraph, CAPS (Cypher for Apache Spark), ingraph, Gradoop, Ruruki, Graphflow

Running Example in Cypher

MATCH (c1:Customer) -[:Bought]-> (p:Product)
 <-[:Bought]- (c2:Customer)</pre>

WHERE p.category = "Toys" **AND** c1.name < c2.name

RETURN c1.name AS cust1, c2.name AS cust2, COUNT (p) AS inCommon

> c1.name, c2.name are composite group key – no explicit group-by clause, just like CQ

Cypher Semantics by Example

• Coincides with CRPQ version

Q(c1, c2, count (p)) :- c1 -Bought-> p, c2 -Bought-> p, c1 < c2

• Modulo non-repeating edge restriction

 no effect here since repeated-edge paths satisfying the two PE atoms would necessarily have c1 = c2

Gremlin

- Supported by major Apache projects

 TinkerPop and JanusGraph
- Also by commercial systems including
 - TitanGraph (DataStax)
 - Neptune (Amazon),
 - Azure (Microsoft),
 - IBM Graph

Gremlin Semantics

- Based on *traversers*, i.e. tokens that flow through graph binding variables along the way
- A Gremlin program adorns the graph with a set of traversers that co-exist simultaneously
- A program is a pipeline of steps, each step works on the set of traversers whose state corresponds to this step
- Steps can be
 - map steps (work in parallel on individual traversers)
 - reduce steps (aggregate set of traversers into a single traverser)

V()

place one traverser on each vertex

V().hasLabel('Customer')

filter traversers by label

V().hasLabel('Customer').as('c1')

extend each traverser t: bind variable 'c1' to the vertex where t resides

V().hasLabel('Customer').as('c1')

.out('Bought')

Traversers flow along out-edges of type 'Bought'.

If multiple such edges emanate from a Customer vertex v, the traverser at v *splits* into one copy per edge, placed at edge destination.

V().hasLabel('Customer').as('c1')

.out('Bought').hasLabel('Product').has('category','Toys')

filter traversers at destination of 'Bought' edges: vertex label must be 'Product' and they must have a property named 'category' of value 'Toys'

V().hasLabel('Customer').as('c1')

.out('Bought').hasLabel('Product').has('category','Toys').as('p')

extend surviving traversers with binding of variable 'p' to their location vertex.

now each surviving traverser has two variable bindings: c1, p

V().hasLabel('Customer').as('c1')

```
.out('Bought').hasLabel('Product').has('category','Toys').as('p')
.in('Bought')
```

Surviving traversers cross incoming edges of type 'Bought'. Multiple in-edges result in further splits.

V().hasLabel('Customer').as('c1')

.out('Bought').hasLabel('Product').has('category','Toys').as('p') .in('Bought').hasLabel('Customer').as('c2')

.select ('c1', 'c2', 'p').by('name')

for each traverser extract the tuple of bindings for variables c1,c2,p, return its projection on 'name' property.

V().hasLabel('Customer').as('c1')

```
.out('Bought').hasLabel('Product').has('category','Toys').as('p')
.in('Bought').hasLabel('Customer').as('c2')
```

```
.select ('c1', 'c2', 'p').by('name')
.where ('c1', lt('c2'))
```

filter these tuples according to where condition





• The query language of TigerGraph, a native parallel graph db system

 A recent start-up founded by UCSD DB lab's PhD alum Yu Xu

• Full disclosure: I have been involved in design

GSQL Accumulators

- GSQL traversals collect and aggregate data by writing it into accumulators
- Accumulators are containers (data types) that
 - hold a data value
 - accept inputs
 - aggregate inputs into the data value using a binary operation
- May be built-in (sum, max, min, etc.) or user-defined
- May be
 - global (a single container accessible from all traversal steps)
 - local (one per node, accessible only when reached by traversal)

Running Example in GSQL



SELECT

- **FROM** Customer:c1 -(Bought>)- Product:p -(<Bought)- Customer:c2
- **WHERE** p.category == "Toys" **AND** c1.name < c2.name
- **ACCUM** @@res += (c1.name, c2.name -> 1);

aggregate this input into accumulator

create input associating value 1 to key (c1.name, c2.name)

GSQL Semantics by Example

GroupByAccum <string cust1, string cust2,</pre>

SumAccum<int> inCommon> @@res;

For every distinct path satisfying FROM pattern and WHERE condition...

- SELECT
- **FROM** Customer:c1 -(Bought>)- Product:p -(<Bought)- Customer:c2
- **WHERE** p.category == "Toys" **AND** c1.name < c2.name
- **ACCUM** @@res += (c1.name, c2.name -> 1);

...execute ACCUM clause

Why Aggregate in Accumulators Instead of Select-Group By Clauses?

revenue per customer

GroupByAccum <**string** cust, **SumAccum**<**float**> total> @@cSales; **GroupByAccum** <**string** prod, **SumAccum**<**float**> total> @@pSales;

revenue per product

SELECT

FROM Customer:c -(Bought>:b)- Product:p

ACCUM float thisSalesRevenue = b.quantity*(1-b.discount)*p.price, @@cSales += (c.name -> thisSalesRevenue), @@pSales += (p.name -> thisSalesRevenue);

local variable, this is a let clause

multiple aggregations in one pass, even on different group keys

Local Accumulators

• Minimize bottlenecks due to shared global accums, maximize opportunities for parallel evaluation

SumAccum<float> @cSales, @pSales;

SELECT

local accums, one instance per node

- **FROM** Customer:c -(Bought>:b)- Product:p
- ACCUM float thisSalesRevenue = b.quantity*(1-b.discount)*p.price,

c.@cSales += thisSalesRevenue,

p.@pSales += thisSalesRevenue;

groups are distributed, each node accumulates its own group

Role of SELECT Clause? Compositionality

- queries can output set of nodes, stored in variables
- used by subsequent queries as traversal starting point:



Recommended Toys Ranked by Log-Cosine Similarity

SumAccum<float> @rank, @lc; SumAccum<int> @inCommon;

I = {Customer. 1};

ToysILike, OthersWhoLikeThem =

SELECT	р, о
FROM	I:c -(Likes>)- Product:p -(<likes)- customer:o<="" th=""></likes)->
WHERE	p.category == "Toys" and o != c
ACCUM	o.@inCommon += 1
POST-ACCUM	o.@lc = log (1 + o.@inCommon);

ToysTheyLike =	SELECT	t
	FROM	OthersWhoLikeThem: o -(Likes>)- Product: t
	WHERE	t.category == "toy"
	ACCUM	t.@rank += o.@lc;

RecommendedToys = ToysTheyLike – ToysILike;

Control Flow Primitives

Loops Are Essential

- Loops (until condition is satisfied)
 Explicitly supported in Gremlin and GSQL
 - Necessary to program iterative algorithms like
 PageRank, recommender systems, shortest-path, etc.
 - Can be used to program match of Kleene-starred path expressions under various semantics
- If-then-else, case constructs

 Supported by all QLs in some way

PageRank in GSQL

CREATE QUERY pageRank (float maxChange, int maxIteration, float dampingFactor) {

MaxAccum<float> @@maxDifference = 9999; // max score change in an iteration SumAccum<float> @received_score = 0; // sum of scores received from neighbors SumAccum<float> @score = 1; // initial score for every vertex is 1.

AllV = {Page.*}; // start with all vertices of type Page WHILE @@maxDifference > maxChange LIMIT maxIteration DO @@maxDifference = 0;

S= SELECT	S	
FROM	AllV:s -(Linkto)-> :t	
ACCUM	t.@received_score += s.@score/s.outdegree()	
POST-ACCUM	s.@score = 1-dampingFactor + dampingFactor * s.@received_score,	
	s.@received_score = 0,	
	<pre>@@maxDifference += abs(s.@score - s.@score');</pre>	

END;

Low-level, NoSQL-style Programming for Parallel Graph Analytics

Think-Like-a-Vertex (TLAV) aka Vertex-Centric

- Parallel computing abstraction
- Conceptually, each vertex is a processor
- Vertices execute a vertex program in parallel
- Instances of vertex programs communicate via messages to neighbors
- Vertices typically execute in lockstep (via synchronization barriers)

Pregel: A TLAV Programming Abstraction

- Bulk-synchronous parallel computing abstraction
- Introduced by Pregel System (Google)
- Supported in open-source systems

 e.g. Giraph (Apache), GraphX (Apache Spark)
- Pregel program executes in lockstep a series of supersteps
- During each superstep, vertices (in parallel)
 - receive inbound messages sent in previous superstep,
 - compute a new value for the vertex data
 - send messages to neighboring vertices (received in next superstep)

Gather-Apply-Scatter (GAS)

- Isomorphic with Pregel when vertices evaluate in lockstep
- Also supports asynchronous evaluation
- Introduced by GraphLab system (an open-source project)
- Each vertex program step is organized in three phases:
 - Gather: may directly access information from its one-hop neighborhood, aggregating it with user-defined function
 - Apply: vertex value is updated by incorporating this sum
 - Scatter: neighborhood values updated using result of apply phase
- Communication abstraction: shared memory, not messaging

PowerGraph

- Refinement of GAS abstraction to process *edges* in parallel
 for load balancing in presence of high-degree vertices
- Gather phase executes a function that maps over edges
- Results of edge map are reduced by a user-defined Sum function
- Apply phase uses the reduced result
- Only edges incident on *active vertices* work.
 - Vertices can be explicitly activated during scatter phase.

GSQL's Edge-Map/Vertex-Reduce (EM/VR)

- Extends PowerGraph for flexibility
 - user can define *multiple* independent reducers via accumulators
 - accums can be local or global
 - accums are *first-class citizens*
 - persist across steps, can be mentioned by future steps
 - parallel map over edges generates accum inputs
 - reduce phase updates each accum value by aggregating all inputs into it

GSQL As High-level EM/VR Program



ACCUM clause executes per edge, generates accum inputs

Summary

- We discussed representative high-level graph QLs
 - from point of view of expressive power and semantics
 - de-emphasizing syntax
- We have seen NoSQL-style low-level parallel graph programming abstractions
- No need to choose between high-level and low-level (false choice claimed by prior NoSQL-related debates)
 – abstraction levels can be harmonized (as shown for GSQL)

Topics Not Covered Here

- Creating/modifying vertices and edges
 - As opposed to just returning tables of variable bindings
- Non-scalar vertex and edge properties (these can be lists/arrays and other containers)
- Behavior when a vertex/edge property does not exist (options are comprehensively laid out in Part A on hierarchical graph model)
- Graph schemas