Translating Web Data

Lucian Popa†  Yannis Velgrakis‡  Renée J. Miller‡  Mauricio A. Hernández†  Ronald Fagin†

1IBM Almaden Research Center
650 Harry Road
San Jose, CA 95120

2University of Toronto
6 King’s College Road
Toronto, ON M5S 3H5

Abstract

We present a novel framework for mapping between any combination of XML and relational schemas, in which a high-level, user-specified mapping is translated into semantically meaningful queries that transform source data into the target representation. Our approach works in two phases. In the first phase, the high-level mapping, expressed as a set of inter-schema correspondences, is converted into a set of mappings that capture the design choices made in the source and target schemas (including their hierarchical organization as well as their nested referential constraints). The second phase translates these mappings into queries over the source schemas that produce data satisfying the constraints and structure of the target schema, and preserving the semantic relationships of the source. Non-null target values may need to be inferred in this process. The mapping algorithm is complete in that it produces all mappings that are consistent with the schema constraints. We have implemented the translation algorithm in Clio, a schema mapping tool, and present our experience using Clio on several real schemas.

1 Introduction

An important issue in modern information systems and e-commerce applications is providing support for inter-operability of independent data sources. A broad variety of data is available on the Web in distinct heterogeneous sources, stored under different formats: database formats (e.g., relational model), semi-structured formats (e.g., DTDs, SGML or XML Schema), scientific formats, etc. Integration of such data is an increasingly important problem. Nonetheless, the effort involved in such integration, in practice, is considerable: translation of data from one format (or schema) to another requires writing and managing complex data transformation programs or queries.

We present a new, comprehensive solution to building, refining and managing transformations between heterogeneous schemas. Given the prevalent use of the Web for data exchange, any data translation tool must handle not only relational data but also data represented in nested data models that are commonly available on the Web. Our solutions are applicable to any structured and semi-structured data that can be described by a schema (a relational schema, a nested XML Schema or DTD). We do not, in this work, consider the exchange of documents or unstructured data (including multimedia and unstructured text). Our approach can be distinguished by its treatment of two fundamental issues. We discuss them below, highlighting our contributions and the main related work.

Heterogeneous Semantics We consider the schema mapping problem, where we are given a pair of independently created schemas and asked to translate data from one (the source) to the other (the target). The schemas may have different semantics, and this may be reflected in differences in their logical structures and constraints. In contrast, most work on heterogeneous data focuses on the schema integration problem where the target (global) schema is created from one or more source (local) schemas (and designed as a view over the sources) [8].1 The target is created to reflect the semantics of the source and has no independent semantics of its own. Even our own earlier work on schema mapping considered the problem of mapping a source schema (with a rich logical structure) into a flat (single table) target schema with no constraints, thus ignoring half of the more general problem [12]. In contrast, Section 2 gives a semantic translation algorithm that preserves semantic relationships during the translation from source to target, where the source and
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1Alternatively, in a local-as-view approach each source schema is modeled as a view on the target schema [8].
the target schemas may contain very rich, yet highly heterogeneous constraints.

**Heterogeneous Data Content** We do not assume that the source and target schema represent the same data. Certainly there may be source data that are not represented in the target (and should be omitted from the translation). More interesting, however, is the case where there is a need for data in the target that are not represented in the source. In some cases, values must be produced for undetermined elements (attributes) in the target schema (i.e., target elements for which there is no corresponding source element). Values may be needed if the target element cannot be null (e.g., elements in a key) and no default is given. More importantly, the creation of new values for such target elements is essential for ensuring the consistency of the target data (e.g., we may need to create values for foreign keys in the target, to ensure that source data is correctly mapped). This problem has been previously addressed by specialized translation languages that include Skolem functions for value creation (most notably ILOG [7]). However, previous research has not considered the problem of automatically determining a correct set of Skolem functions that respects the target constraints and preserves information in a translation. Our data translation algorithm, in Section 3, provides a new solution for automatically generating missing target values, based on Skolem functions, and guarantees that the translated data satisfies the nested structure and constraints of the target.

In developing our solutions, we paid special attention to developing algorithms and techniques that could fuel our schema mapping tool Clio. Hence, the overall design was motivated by practical considerations. Clio [15] has been evaluated on several real world schemas with promising results. Section 4 further details our experience with mapping these schemas.

### 1.1 Our Solutions

We highlight the main design choices and illustrate our solutions with examples.

**Example 1.1** Consider the two schemas in Figure 1. Both schemas are shown in a common nested relational representation (defined in Section 2.1) which is used in our tool and throughout this paper. The left-hand schema represents a source relational schema with three tables: company(cid, cname, city), grant(grantee, pi, amount, sponsor, proj), and project(name, year). It describes information about companies, their projects and the grants given for those projects. Each grant is given to a company for a specific project. Therefore, each grant tuple has foreign keys (grantee and proj) referencing the associated company and project tuples. Foreign keys are shown as dashed lines. In addition, a grant has a principal investigator (pi), an amount (amount), and a sponsor (sponsor). The right-hand schema represents a target XML schema. While the information that the target contains is similar to that of the source, the data is structured in a different way. Organizations and projects are grouped by city. For each different city, there is an element cityStat containing the organizations (org) and the grants (financials) in that city. Project funding data are then nested within org and related with the financial information through a foreign key based on the aid element.

**Inter-Schema Correspondences** To perform translation, we must understand how two schemas correspond to each other. There are numerous proposals for representing inter-schema correspondences, including proposals for using general logic expressions to state how components of one schema correspond to components of another. We use perhaps the simplest form of correspondence: element (attribute) correspondences. Intuitively, an element correspondence is a pair of a source element and a target element (we give a formal definition in Section 2). Figure 1 shows three example correspondences: v1, v2 and v3.

While semantically impoverished, we use simple element correspondences for several reasons. First, element correspondences are independent of logical design choices such as the grouping of elements into tables (normalization choices) or the nesting of records or tables (for example, the hierarchical structure of an XML schema). Thus, one need not specify the logical access paths (join or navigation) that define the associations between elements involved. Even users unfamiliar with the complex structure of the schema can provide such correspondences. In addition, automated techniques for schema matching have proven to be very successful in extracting such correspondences (see the recent work of [6] as well as [18] for a survey of techniques including CUPID, LSD and DIKE). In Clio, we use a modular design that lets us plug in any schema matching component. The current version uses an automated attribute matcher to suggest correspondences [14] and provides a GUI to permit users to augment or correct those correspondences [19].

**Understanding Schema Semantics** While easy to create and manipulate, element correspondences are inherently ambiguous. There may be many transla-
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**Figure 1:** Example source (left) & target (right).
tions that are consistent with a set of correspondences, and not all have the same effect. In our approach we then find, among the many possible translations, those that are consistent with the constraints of the schemas.

Example 1.2 Consider correspondences \( v_1 \) and \( v_2 \). To translate data, we must understand how to associate a company name with a principal investigator of a grant. It is unlikely that all combinations of cname and pi values are semantically meaningful. Rather, we make use of the semantic information from the source schema to determine which combinations of values are meaningful. The foreign key constraint between grant.grantee and company.cid indicates that each grant (and its pi) is naturally associated with one company (through a foreign key). To populate the target, that is to place values of cname and pi correctly in the target, we use the semantic information expressed in the target schema. In this example, the semantics is conveyed not through constraints, but through the nesting structure of the target. Specifically, fund tuples are nested within org tuples. Hence, for each org (that is, for each company name), we must group together all pi values into the nested fundings set.

There are many semantic associations in a schema, and even the same set of elements could be associated in more than one way. In our example, there may be many ways of associating cname and pi. Suppose that a sponsor is always a company, so sponsor is a foreign key for company. We could then associate cname of companies either with pi of grants they have been given (a join on grantee), or with pi of grants they sponsor (a join on sponsor). The choice depends on semantics that are not represented in the source schema and must instead be given by a user.

Reasoning about data semantics can be a time-consuming process for large schemas. Clio supports incremental creation and modification of mappings. Thus, it is important that such modifications can be made efficiently. To support this, we compile the semantics of the schemas into a convenient data structure that represents the semantic relationships embedded in each schema. Using this compiled form, our semantic translation algorithm efficiently interprets correspondences.

Semantic Translation Our semantic translation provides an interpretation of correspondences that is faithful to the semantics of the schemas. In addition, we enumerate all such faithful interpretations, which we call logical mappings. Enumeration of all such mappings is an essential ingredient of our approach. Any one, any subset or all of the mappings could correspond to the user's intentions for a given pair of schemas and their correspondences. The entire process of semantic translation is therefore a semi-automatic process. The system generates all logical mappings consistent with the schema specifications, and the user chooses a subset of them. Our experience with real schemas has shown that the number of such mappings is typically not large (see Section 4) and that there are real situations in which the intended semantics includes all these mappings. Thus, a heuristic approach that prunes some consistent mappings will not work in general. To reduce the burden on the user, we order mappings so that users can focus on the most likely mappings, and we provide a data viewer (described elsewhere [19]) that uses carefully chosen data examples to help explain each mapping.

Data Translation The second translation phase is data translation, in which we generate an implementation of the logical mappings. The result of this phase is a set of internal rules, one for each logical mapping. These rules have a direct translation as external queries, and we provide query wrappers for XQuery and XSLT (in the XML case) and SQL (in the relational case). To correctly translate data, values may need to be produced for undetermined target elements and the data may need to be nested according to the target structure.

Example 1.3 In Figure 1, pi and amount of grant are mapped, via \( v_2 \) and \( v_3 \), to pi of fund and amount of financial. The foreign key from aid of fund to aid of financial indicates that pi values are associated with amount. Thus, the semantic translation algorithm generates a logical mapping that includes both \( v_2 \) and \( v_3 \) (\( v_1 \) as well, but let us focus on \( v_2 \) and \( v_3 \)). However, to populate the target, we must have values for the two aid elements. To maintain the proper association in the target, these values may neither be arbitrary nor null. However, as is often the case with elements that carry structural information but no real data, there is no correspondence that maps into aid from the source. Our solution is to invent id values in a way that maintains source data associations.

In Section 2, we present our semantic translation algorithm, along with a completeness guarantee that all semantic relationships that exist between elements in a schema are discovered by the algorithm. Section 3 contains the data translation algorithm that converts logical mappings into queries using rich restructuring constructs (resembling ILOG [7], WOL [4] and XML-QL [5]). Section 4 describes our experience mapping real schemas using our prototype.

2 Semantic Translation

To perform schema mapping, we seek to interpret the correspondences in a way that is consistent with the semantics of both the source and target schemas. We call this interpretation process semantic translation. Since we use semantics that is encoded in logical structures, we call the resulting interpretation a logical mapping.

2.1 Data Model

To present our results, we use a simple nested relational data model. In our tool, relational and
semi-structured schemas (including DTDs and XML Schemas) are represented internally in this model.

The model includes a set of atomic types \( \tau \), set types of the form SetOf[\( \tau \)], and record types of the form Rec[\( A_1 : \tau_1, \ldots, A_k : \tau_k \)], where each \( \tau_i \) represents either an atomic, set, or record type. The symbols \( A_1, \ldots, A_k \) are called labels or elements. If \( \tau_1 \) is an atomic type, then \( A_1 \) is an atomic element. Records of type Rec[\( A_1 : \tau_1, \ldots, A_k : \tau_k \)] are unordered tuples of label-value pairs: \( \langle A_1 = a_1, \ldots, A_k = a_k \rangle \), where \( a_1, \ldots, a_k \) are of types \( \tau_1, \ldots, \tau_k \), respectively. Within a record, elements are non-repeatable. Elements that may be repeated are modeled by set types. A value of type SetOf[\( \tau \)] is represented by a set ID and an associated set \( \{ e_1, \ldots, e_n \} \) of “children”, with each \( e_i \) of type \( \tau \). This representation of sets (using set IDs) is used to faithfully capture the graph-based data models of XML. For ease of exposition, we assume in this paper that a schema consists of a single named (root) type (as in XML Schema\(^2\)). A relational schema with multiple tables is modeled by a record type the components of which are set types (one for each table). In queries and constraints, we refer to an element of a set by using clauses such as \( c \text{ in } \text{expenseDB.companies} \). To refer to the value (contents) of such elements, we use record projection notation (e.g. \( c \text{.company} \)).

Our model also supports optional and nullable elements, along with key constraints. Referential constraints (foreign keys) can be expressed as explained in the next subsection.

2.2 Primary Paths and Constraints

Consider the correspondences \( v_1 \) and \( v_2 \) of Figure 1. To understand these arrows, we must first understand if company names are semantically related to the Ps of grants in the source schema and also if the target elements org.name and fund.pi are associated. If not, then we can treat these correspondences separately. That is, we can map company data independently of grant data. However, if any of these elements are associated, we must interpret the correspondences in a way that is consistent with this association. Hence, our first step is to learn how elements may be semantically related within each schema.

In relational schemas, semantic associations between atomic elements are represented in two ways. First, the organization of attributes into tables (the schema structure) indicates semantic groupings. The fact that \( \text{name} \) and \( \text{city} \) are attributes of the same table indicates that for each tuple these attribute values are semantically related. In addition, attributes within different tables may be associated using foreign key dependencies. For example, information about companies, the grants they hold and the projects for which they receive grants may, in a logical design, be broken up into separate tables using foreign key dependencies.

\(^2\)http://www.w3.org/TR/xmldsig-0

\( S_1: \text{select } * \text{ from } c \text{ in expenseDB.companies} \)
\( S_2: \text{select } * \text{ from } s \text{ in expenseDB.grants} \)
\( S_3: \text{select } * \text{ from } p \text{ in expenseDB.projects} \)
\( T_1: \text{select } * \text{ from } s \text{ in statDB} \)
\( T_2: \text{select } * \text{ from } s \text{ in statDB, } o \text{ in s.cityStat.orgs} \)
\( T_3: \text{select } * \text{ from } s \text{ in statDB, } o \text{ in s.cityStat.orgs, } f \text{ in o.org.fundings} \)
\( T_4: \text{select } * \text{ from } s \text{ in statDB, } f' \text{ in s.cityStat.financials} \)

Figure 2: Primary paths of (a) expenseDB (b) statDB.

Similarly, in semi-structured data models, both the schema structure and constraints can represent semantic associations. The nesting structure of the schema represents semantic groupings of elements. This structure may then be augmented with (nested) referential constraints (often in the form of simple pointers or key references as in XML Schema) to provide a richer semantics for connecting related elements.

In this section, we consider how to compute sets of semantically related atomic elements either within the source schema or within the target schema. We first represent the elements related through the schema structure without constraints. We refer to these sets as primary paths and show next how they are computed.

Example 2.1 Figure 2 shows the primary paths for the schemas of Figure 1, represented as queries that return a set of semantically related atomic elements. We use the notation “\( \text{select } * \)” as a shorthand for all atomic elements immediately reachable from a variable of the query (this excludes atomic elements contained in nested set elements). For example, in \( T_1 \), “\( \text{select } * \)” is equivalent to “\( \text{select } s.\text{cityStat.city} \)” since all other atomic elements underneath \( \text{cityStat} \) are reachable only through a nested set type (either \( \text{orgs} \) or \( \text{financials} \)).

For a relational schema, there is a primary path for each individual relation. For a nested schema, the primary paths are obtained by constructing a tree with a node at each set type in the schema, and with an edge between two nodes whenever the first node is a set type that contains the second. A primary path is then the set of all elements found on a path from the root to any intermediate node or leaf in this tree.

For our nested schema example, \( \text{statDB} \), the first primary path \( T_1 \) denotes the set of \( \text{cityStat} \) records (within \( \text{statDB} \)) that may or may not have \( \text{orgs} \) or \( \text{financials} \). \( T_2 \) denotes \( \text{cityStat} \) records that do have organizations (although these organizations may or may not have \( \text{funds} \)). Thus, primary paths for a schema denote all vertical data relationships that can exist in any instance conforming to that schema.

To consider data relationships that span horizontally (that is, relationships between two records where one is not nested within the other), we need to consider the various ways in which primary paths can be associated. We consider all associations that are faithful to the semantics conveyed by the (nested) referential integrity constraints in the schemas. Referential constraints assert the equality of an element (or set of
elements) in two primary paths. They can be used to combine primary paths into larger sets of logically related elements.

**Example 2.2** For the schemas of Figure 1, the two source foreign keys can be represented as follows.

\[
\text{1: } \text{for } g \text{ in expenseDB grants} \\
\text{exists } c \text{ in expenseDB companies} \\
\text{where } c\text{.company.cid} = g\text{.grant.grantee} \\
\text{2: } \text{for } p \text{ in expenseDB projects} \\
\text{exists } c \text{ in expenseDB companies} \\
\text{where } p\text{.project.name} = g\text{.grant.grantee}
\]

Each constraint is of the form \(\forall P_1 \exists P_2 B\) where \(P_1\) and \(P_2\) are bodies of primary paths and \(B\) is an equality condition relating the two paths. Path \(P_1\) in \(r_1\) is the primary path \(S_1\) of Figure 2, and \(P_2\) is \(S_1\). In constraints, we write the primary paths in a simplified form ignoring the atomic elements they return in the select clause. For the target schema, we use a similar notation to represent nested referential integrity constraints:

\[
\text{3: } \text{for } e \text{ in statDB, o in s.cityStat.orgs, } f \text{ in o.org.fundings} \\
\text{exists } f \text{ in s.cityStat.financials} \\
\text{where } f\text{.financial.aid} = f\text{.fund.aid}
\]

For the nested constraint in our example, we used a primary path, then a second path that is relative to the first (through the variable \(e\) in the example). The second path does not start at the root, but rather from the \(cityStat\) record of the first path. This allows us to express the fact that each \(fund\) within an organization and within a \(cityStat\) refers through \(aid\) to some \(financial\) tuple within the set \(financials\) of the same \(cityStat\) record. The ability to express such nested dependencies is central to being able to generate nested logical relationships.

**Definition 2.3** Given two primary paths \(P_1\) and \(P_2\), where \(P_2\) may be specified relative to a variable in \(P_1\), along with an equality condition \(B\) relating the two paths, a nested referential integrity constraint (NRI) is then an expression of the form for \(P_1\) exists \(P_2\) where \(B\).

Nested referential integrity constraints include a large class of referential constraints. Relational foreign keys fall into this class along with XML Schema’s Key Reference constraints. Note that our solutions do not require that there be any declared constraints. We simply use these constraints to our advantage if they are declared or if they are suggested by a constraint-discovery tool.

Constraints can be used to combine primary paths.

**Example 2.4** Constraint \(r_3\) of Example 2.2 represents a horizontal relationship between the primary paths \(T_2\) and \(T_3\) of Figure 2. Using \(r_3\), we can combine these paths to form the logical relation \(B_3\) of Figure 3. Note that the logical relation contains only one copy of equated elements (\(aid\) in this case). Intuitively, \(B_3\) represents fund information with its \(org\) and \(city\) (associated through the nesting structure) and its \(financial\) data (associated through the key reference on \(aid\)).

### 2.3 Logical Relations

We now consider how to generate maximal sets of logically related elements. The chase is a classical relational method [10] that can be used to assemble logically connected elements. Intuitively, the chase works by enumerating logical joins, based on a set of dependencies, in a relational schema. We use an extension [16] of the relational chase to enumerate logical joins in nested schemas.

**Definition 2.5** A logical relation is the result of chasing a primary path of a schema using its NRIs.

We assume the reader is familiar with the basics of the chase. Here, we illustrate with an example.

**Example 2.6** The result of chasing the source primary path \(S_2\) of Figure 2 using the constraint \(r_1\) of Example 2.2 can be represented by the following query.

\[
\text{select * from } g \text{ in expenseDB grants, } c \text{ in expenseDB companies} \\
\text{where } c\text{.company.cid} = g\text{.grant.grantee}
\]

Note that \(S_2\) is not equivalent to \(S_1\) since the latter returns a larger set of atomic elements. (However, \(S_2\) projected on the elements of \(S_2\) is equivalent to \(S_2\).)

Applying the chase again to \(S_2\) using \(r_2\) we obtain the following query.

\[
\text{select * from } g \text{ in expenseDB grants, } c \text{ in expenseDB companies, } p \text{ in expenseDB projects} \\
\text{where } c\text{.company.cid} = g\text{.grant.grantee and } g\text{.grant.proj} = p\text{.project.name}
\]

Since no further chase steps can be applied (i.e., \(S_2\) cannot be expanded further) \(S_2''\) is a logical relation. Chasing \(S_2\) with the NRIs of the schema brings together all the components of the schema containing tuples that are logically related with tuples in \(expenseDB\) grants (i.e., company and project tuples). Moreover, the chase computes the join conditions that exist between such tuples.

The primary path \(S_1\) cannot be chased with either of the two NRIs in the schema. Intuitively, this means that \(S_1\) tuples can exist without any other tuples; hence they make up a logical relation by themselves. Figure 3 lists the logical relations for our schemas (note that \(S_2''\) is \(A_2\) in the figure). In our nested target, paths \(T_1, T_2\) and \(T_3\) cannot be chased, so they form logical relations by themselves \((B_1, B_2\) and \(B_4\), respectively).

The primary path \(T_3\) can be chased using \(r_3\) to produce the logical relation \(B_3\).

### 2.4 Mapping Algorithm

Logical relations are used to understand correspondences. In our example, the existence of a logical (source) relation containing both the elements \(company\.c\text{name}\) and \(grant\.pi\) tells us that the correspondences \(v_1\) and \(v_2\) should be interpreted together. In this section, we formalize this intuition and give an algorithm for interpreting correspondences.
A1: \texttt{select c.company.cid, c.company.cname, c.company.city}  
\texttt{from c in expenseDB.companies}

A2: \texttt{select c.company.cid, c.company.cname, c.company.city,}  
\texttt{g.grant.pi, g.grant.amount, g.grant.sponsor,}  
\texttt{g.grant.proj, p.project.year}  
\texttt{from g in expenseDB.grants, c in expenseDB.companies,}  
\texttt{p in expenseDB.projects}  
\texttt{where c.company.cid = g.grant.grantee}  
\texttt{and p.project.name = g.grant.proj}

A3: \texttt{select p.project.name, p.project.year}  
\texttt{from p in expenseDB.projects}

B1: \texttt{select s.cityStat.city}  
\texttt{from s in statDB}

B2: \texttt{select s.cityStat.city, o.org.cid, o.org.name}  
\texttt{from s in statDB, o in s.cityStat.orgs}

B3: \texttt{select s.cityStat.city, o.org.cid, o.org.name,}  
\texttt{f.fund.pi, f.fund.aid, f.'financial.amount,}  
\texttt{f.'financial.proj, f.'financial.year}  
\texttt{from s in statDB, o in s.cityStat.orgs,}  
\texttt{f in o.org.fundings, f'M in s.cityStat.financials}  
\texttt{where f.'financial.aid = f.fund.aid}

B4: \texttt{select s.cityStat.city, f.'financial.aid, f.'financial.amount,}  
\texttt{f.'financial.proj, f.'financial.year}  
\texttt{from s in statDB, f'M in s.cityStat.financials}

Figure 3: All logical relations for expenseDB, statDB.

\textbf{Example 2.7} The correspondences \(v_1\) and \(v_2\) (Figure 1) can be interpreted as simple (inter-schema) referential constraints.

\(v_1\) for \(c\) in expenseDB.companies  
\texttt{exists s in statDB, o in s.cityStat.orgs}  
\texttt{where c.company.cname = o.org.name}

\(v_2\) for \(g\) in expenseDB.grants  
\texttt{exists s in statDB, o in s.cityStat.orgs, f in o.org.fundings}  
\texttt{where g.grant.pi = f.fund.pi}

The correspondence \(v_1\) uses the primary paths \(S_1\) from the source and \(T_2\) from the target. (The primary paths are used simply as a way of unambiguously referring to atomic elements in the nested schemas.) Similarly, \(v_2\) uses \(S_2\) and \(T_3\). This interpretation ignores the semantics of the source and target schemas. It indicates that fundings are created from grants but does not say that fundings must be nested within an org generated from the appropriate company (that is, the company receiving the grant). To create an interpretation that is faithful to the semantics of the schemas, we can use logical relations rather than primary paths to state the (inter-schema) constraint. The source elements \(c.name\) and \(pi\) both appear in the logical relation \(A_2\) (Figure 3) which represents how companies and grants are logically associated. The target elements \(name\) and \(pi\) both appear in the logical relation \(B_3\) (which represents how orgs and fundings are logically associated). Hence, we can combine \(v_1\) and \(v_2\) using these two logical relations into an interpretation \(v_{12}\).

\(v_{12}\) for \(g\) in expenseDB.grants, \(c\) in expenseDB.companies, \(p\) in expenseDB.projects  
\texttt{where c.company.cid = g.grant.grantee}  
\texttt{and p.project.name = g.grant.proj}

\texttt{let w_1 = c.company.cname, w_2 = g.grant.pi}  
\texttt{exists s in statDB, o in s.cityStat.orgs,}  
\texttt{f in o.org.fundings, f'M in s.cityStat.financials}  
\texttt{where f.'financial.aid = f.fund.aid}  
\texttt{and o.org.name = w_1 and f.fund.pi = w_2}

The \texttt{for} clause comes from the source logical relation \(A_2\). It indicates which source data should be used to populate the target. We have added a \texttt{let} clause to make it clear which source data will be translated. The \texttt{exists} clause comes from the target relation \(B_3\) and indicates how the source data should appear in the target. The \texttt{where} clause includes the target join condition (from \(B_3\)) along with conditions indicating the placement of the source data \(w_1\) and \(w_2\).

So far, the example ignored \(v_3\). If we consider \(v_3\) then amount of \texttt{financial} also appears in the target logical relation \(B_3\). We would then replace \(v_{12}\) with a more meaningful \(v_{123}\) that covers \(v_{12}\) and \(v_3\). The \texttt{interpretation} \(v_{123}\) is similar to \(v_{12}\) above except that it binds one more variable in the \texttt{let} clause and it has one more equality in the \texttt{exists} clause (corresponding to \(v_3\)).

We describe next the algorithm for creating interpretations like \(v_{12}\). The algorithm begins with a set of correspondences expressed using the primary paths of the schema (such as \(v_1\) and \(v_2\) in Example 2.7). A correspondence is a simple case of an (inter-schema) referential constraint that specifies the placement of source values in the target.

\textbf{Definition 2.8} Given a primary path \(P_i\) from the source and \(P_j\) from the target, along with an equality condition \(E_i\) equating a single atomic element of \(P_i\) with a single atomic element of \(P_j\), a correspondence is an expression of the form \texttt{for P_i exists P_j where E_i}.

To determine sets of correspondences that can be interpreted together, we find sets of correspondences that all use source elements in one logical relation and target elements in one target logical relation. As seen in the previous section, logical relations are not necessarily disjoint. For example, \(A_1\) and \(A_2\) of Figure 3 both include \texttt{company} information; however, \(A_2\) also includes \texttt{grant} and \texttt{project} information. Thus, a correspondence can be relevant to several logical relations (in both source and target). Rather than looking at each individual correspondence, the mapping algorithm (Algorithm 2.11) looks at each pair of a source logical relation and a target logical relation. For each such pair, it then computes an interpretation of the correspondences that expresses how the source logical relation is mapped into the target logical relation. Like correspondences, these interpretations are modeled as \texttt{source-to-target (s-t)} referential constraints or dependencies. However, instead of primary paths, these interpretations use logical relations. The constraint \(v_{12}\) of Example 2.7 is an example of an \(s-t\) dependency. The computation of the dependency is driven by all the correspondences that are \texttt{covered} by a pair of logical relations.

Coverage of a correspondence \(v\) by a logical relation is slightly more complicated than is suggested by Example 2.7. It is not enough to check whether the logical relation includes the element name involved in
v. This is ambiguous, in general. We do not assume that element names are different across the schema. Moreover, the same element of a schema may be included more than once in a logical relation (see the next example). To precisely identify which element in the logical relation corresponds to the element involved in the correspondence, we need to match the path defining v with the variables defining the logical relation. Specifically, we must find a renaming function from the variables of a correspondence into the variables of a logical relation. Since we are using nested schemas, we also have the additional problem of matching paths, rather than flat element references. In general, there may be multiple ways to cover a correspondence with respect to a pair of source and target logical relations. Our algorithm takes into account all such choices.

Example 2.9 Assume that the source schema of Figure 1 has an additional restriction that the sponsor is always a company. This means that sponsor is also a foreign key referencing company. We can describe it by the following NRI:

\[ r_4 \text{ for } g \text{ in expenseDB grants exists } c \text{ in expenseDB companies where } c.\text{company} = g.\text{grant}.\text{sponsor} \]

The logical relation \( A_2 \) in Figure 3 is the result of chasing the primary path \( S_2 \) of Figure 2 with the constraints \( r_1 \) and \( r_2 \). Given the additional constraint \( r_4 \), we can extend \( A_2 \) to the logical relation:

\[ A'_2 \text{ select c.company, c.name, c.company.city, } g.\text{grant.pl}, g.\text{grant.amount, g.grant.proj, } c'.\text{company.cid, c'.company.name, c'.company.city, } p.\text{project.year} \]

\[ \text{from } g \text{ in expenseDB grants, } c \text{ in expenseDB companies, } c' \text{ in expenseDB companies, } p \text{ in expenseDB projects where } c.\text{company} = g.\text{grant}.\text{grantee} \text{ and } c'.\text{company} = g.\text{grant}.\text{sponsor} \text{ and } p.\text{project} = g.\text{grant}.\text{proj} \]

It is not hard to see that \( v_1 \) and \( v_2 \) are both covered by \( \langle A'_2, B_2 \rangle \). However, \( v_1 \) can be covered in multiple ways. More specifically, there are two possible renaming functions. One maps the variable \( c \) of \( v_1 \) to the variable \( c' \) of \( A'_2 \) and the other maps \( c \) to \( c'' \) of \( A'_2 \).

Thus the element cname in \( v_1 \) can be renamed in two ways with the cname element of the source schema. This reflects the fact that companies and grants can be joined in two ways, one through the grantee foreign key and the other through the sponsor. The two different renaming functions are two different interpretations of the correspondences. The first one generates a query that maps the companies that have some grants for some projects while the second maps the companies that are funding other companies. Both interpretations are meaningful.

Definition 2.10 A coverage of a pair \( \langle A, B \rangle \) of logical relations is a set \( V' \) of correspondences together with renaming functions from the variables of correspondences in \( V' \) into those of \( A \) and \( B \).

Algorithm 2.11 - Semantic Translation

Input: source schema \( S \) with NRIs \( \Sigma_s \), target schema \( T \) with NRIs \( \Sigma_t \), set \( V \) of correspondences.

Phase 1. Compile schemas

- Chase \( \Sigma_s \) on \( S \) to compute source logical relations \( \{A_1, \ldots, A_n\} \).
- Chase \( \Sigma_t \) on \( T \) to compute target logical relations \( \{B_1, \ldots, B_m\} \).

Phase 2. Interpret correspondences

- For each pair \( \langle A_i, B_j \rangle \)
  - For each coverage \( \delta \) of \( \langle A_i, B_j \rangle \) by \( V' \subseteq V \) create s-t dependency: \( \text{for } A_i \text{ exists } B_j \text{ where } V' \)

Output: the set \( \Sigma_{st} \) of all generated s-t dependencies

For each coverage, we generate a source-to-target dependency of the form \( \text{for } A \text{ exists } B \text{ where } C \) with \( C \) containing the equality conditions of the correspondences in \( V' \) (with the variables renamed appropriately). Note that since \( A \) and \( B \) are logical relations, they may each have their own where clause as in our example \( v_{12} \) of Example 2.7 where we wrote \( C \) inside the where clause of \( B \). The result of the semantic translation algorithm (Algorithm 2.11) is a systematic enumeration of all s-t dependencies. The full paper [17] gives further details, including a component that eliminates redundant s-t dependencies, thus drastically reducing the number of interpretations.

2.5 Complexity and Completeness

Logical Compilation NRIs generalize the class of relational inclusion dependencies [2]. They are also a special case of the embedded path-conjunctive dependencies (EPCDs) used in [16] to express constraints in nested and object-oriented schemas. The chase that we use to compute logical relations is a special case of the chase with EPCDs. Even for this special case, the chase may not terminate. One possible solution to this problem is to restrict the class of legal constraints so that the chase is guaranteed to terminate. Acyclic sets of inclusion dependencies [3] are a particularly useful class since they capture naturally many of the integrity constraints of relational schemas, and most of the constraints met in real world semi-structured schemas. For acyclic sets of NRIs (fully defined in [17]), our compilation terminates in polynomial time in the size of the schema and the given NRIs. Furthermore, it is complete as we mention next.

We have given a procedural definition of logical relations (that is, the result of chasing along any primary path of the schema). The chase clearly finds “natural” associations between elements. What is not so obvious is whether all the natural associations are discovered by our algorithm. In fact, we can dust off some old relational theory to find a declarative definition of the set of all logical associations or connections that exist in a schema [11]. Using their definition, we can show that our algorithm is complete in that it finds all such
connections (and only those connections).

**Theorem 2.12 (Completeness)** Let $S$ be a schema with an acyclic set of NRIs. Let $X$ be any set of atomic elements in $S$. Then there is a connection between $X$ [11] iff there exists a logical relation that contains $X$.

Algorithm 2.11 is able to abstract away the specific schema details such as normalization and nesting. The above theorem is a precise statement of this. We could change the logical design (in the source and/or target), but we would get the same logical mapping for a given set of correspondences, as long as the elements have the same meaning.

Cyclic schemas are schemas with cyclic sets of constraints (consider the standard example of the employees whose managers are also employees), or with recursively defined structures (e.g., a part of a machine is composed of other parts). Mapping between such schemas may result in infinitely many possible translations. Clio permits users to work with such schemas but only in a restricted way that gives up completeness. In particular it stops the chase on every branch that closes a cycle. As a result, when mapping employee name and address, Clio will associate an employee name with the employee's address (but not with the manager's address neither with the manager's manager's address, etc.)

**Interpretation of Correspondences** To interpret correspondences, we must compute coverages— that is, the set of elements covered by a logical relation. This process is similar to that of determining when a view can be used to answer a query [9]. However, it is important to note that the correspondences are represented by simple paths. Hence, the process of matching them to logical relations is very fast (linear for each correspondence and relation).

We interpret correspondences as source-to-target dependencies. An important consequence of our mapping algorithm is the fact that any implementation of the generated s-t dependencies automatically satisfies all the target constraints. Here implementation means: given a source instance, find a target instance such that the s-t dependencies are satisfied. There are many such implementations, and Section 3 gives a canonical implementation of s-t dependencies as queries. Here we state the following result (for any implementation).

**Theorem 2.13** Let $\Sigma_s$ and $\Sigma_t$ be as in Algorithm 2.11. Moreover, we require that $\Sigma_s$ is an acyclic set of NRIs. Let $I_s$ and $I_t$ be instances over the source and, respectively, target schemas. Then $I_t$ satisfies $\Sigma_t$ whenever $I_s$ and $I_t$ together satisfy $\Sigma_s$.

This result allows us to focus on the implementation of s-t dependencies alone, i.e., we do not have to worry about satisfaction of target constraints. They have already been taken into account when producing the target logical relations (via the chase with $\Sigma_t$). This theorem does not hold for Algorithm 2.11 if we extend the class of legal target constraints from NRIs to arbitrary nested dependencies (e.g., join dependencies) [17]. Thus, it is essential that NRIs are based on linear paths for the above theorem to hold. Still, NRIs are a very useful fragment for representing integrity constraints in relational and nested schemas, as they include the referential constraints expressible in most standards (notably SQL and XML Schema).

### 3 Data Translation

The source-to-target dependencies generated by Algorithm 2.11 are inclusion dependencies (in the relational sense [2]) between source logical relations and target logical relations. For example, $\psi_1$ of Section 2.4 is an inclusion dependency $A_2[cname,pi] \subseteq B_3[cname,pi]$ meaning that the projection of logical relation $A_2$ on $cname$ and $pi$ must be contained in the projection of $B_3$ on $name$ and $pi$. If we also take the correspondence $\psi_2$ into account, then $\psi_2$ is replaced by a similar dependency, $A_2[cname,pi,amount] \subseteq B_3[cname,pi,amount]$, that "specifies" one more atomic element of the target. Still, not all atomic elements of the target logical relation may be specified by a dependency. In order to materialize the target we will have to fill in the values for the undetermined atomic elements. Null values may not always be sufficient. Moreover, we do not want to materialize a target logical relation but rather the nested schema over which the logical relation is only a flat view.

These issues are addressed by the second phase of our translation process: data translation. Specifically, two main problems are considered: 1) creation of new values in the target, whenever such values are needed and whenever they are not specified by the dependencies, and 2) grouping of nested elements, a form of data merging that is also not specified by the dependencies but is often desirable. We illustrate these issues with some simple examples on which we also highlight our design principles. These design principles are implemented by a component of our system that compiles the s-t dependencies into a set of low-level, but language-independent, rules. These rules in turn are compiled into the transformation language at hand (XSLT or XQuery for XML, SQL for relational).

#### 3.1 Creation of New Values in the Target

Consider the simple mapping scenario of Figure 4(a). The source (**Emps**$_s$) and the target (**Emps**$_t$) are sets of employee (**Emp** elements). An **Emp** element in the source has atomic subelements $A, B$ and $C$, while an **Emp** element in the target has an extra atomic subelement $E$. For the purpose of the discussion, we chose to use the abstract names $A, B, C$ and $E$ because we will associate several scenarios with these elements. In the mapping, the two source elements $A$ and $B$ are mapped
into the target elements A and B, while C and E in the target are left unmapped. The s-t dependency:

```plaintext
for x in Emps,
    for y in Emps
        where y, Emp.A = x, Emp.A and y, Emp.B = x, Emp.B
        does not specify any value for C and E either. However, to populate the target we need to decide on what values (if any) to use for these elements. A frequent case in practice is the one in which an unmapped element does not play a crucial role for the integrity of the target. For example, A and B could be employee name and salary, while C and E could be address and, respectively, date of birth. Creating a null value for either C or E is then sufficient. Or, if the unmapped element is optional in the target schema, then we can leave it out entirely. For example, if C is optional while E is not optional but nullable, we translate the s-t dependency as the following rule (with the obvious semantics):

```plaintext
for x in Emps,
    let a = x, Emp.A, b = x, Emp.B
    return (Emp = (A = a, B = b, E = null)) in Emps
```

**Creation of needed values** However, E could be a key in the target relation, e.g. E could be employee id. The intention of the mapping would be in this case to copy employee data from the source and assign a new id for each employee, in the target. Thus a non-null value for E is needed for the integrity of the target.

* A **target element E is needed if E is (part of) a key or foreign key or is both not nullable and not optional.*

For our example, we create a different but unique value for E, for each combination of the source values for A and B. Technically speaking, values for E are created by using a one-to-one (Skolem) function \( f_E[A, B] \). The rule that translates the s-t dependency in this case is the same as the previous rule except that we use \( f_E[A, B] \) instead of **null** for E.

Similarly, if C is a needed element in the target, it will be created by a different function \( f_C[A, B] \). This function does not depend on the value of the source element C. Thus even if in the source there may exist two tuples with the same combination for A and B but with two different values for C (e.g. C is spouse, and an employee could be listed with two spouses), in the target there will be only one tuple for the given combination of A and B (with one, unknown, spouse). Thus, the semantics of the target is given solely by the values of the source elements that are mapped. Of course, a new correspondence from C to C will change the mapping; the employee with two spouses will appear twice in the target and E will be \( f_E[A, B, C] \).

A similar mechanism for creation of new values in one target relation is adopted by the semantics of ILOG [7]. Next, we generalize this mechanism.

**Generalization:** multiple, correlated, sets of elements in the target** The second frequent case that requires creation of non-null values is that of a foreign key. In Figure 4(b) the target element C is stored in a different location (the set Spouses) than that of elements A and B. However, the association between A, B values and C values is meant to be preserved by a foreign key constraint (E plays the role of a pointer in this case). Our semantic translation recognizes such situations by computing the logical relation \( L(A, B, E, C) \) that joins Emps and Spouses, and generating an s-t dependency \( \text{Emps}[A, B, C] \subseteq L[A, B, C] \). However, this does not give a value for the needed element E. As in the case of a single target set (but this time with a logical relation instead), we assign a function \( f_E[A, B, C] \) to create values for E. The generated rule is:

```plaintext
for x in Emps,
    let a = x, Emp.A, b = x, Emp.B, c = x, Emp.C
    return (Emp = (A = a, B = b, E = f_E[a, b, c])) in Emps,
    Spouses = (E = f_E[a, b, c], C = c) in Spouses
```

Briefly, the meaning of the rule is the following: for each \((a, b, c)\) triple of values from the source create an element Emp in Emps and create an element Spouse in Spouses, with the given source values \((a, b, c)\) in the corresponding places and with the **same** invented value \( f_E[a, b, c] \) in the two places where the element E occurs. If duplicate \((a, b, c)\) triples occur in the source (maybe with different D values) only one element is generated in each of Emps and, respectively, Spouses. Thus, we eliminate duplicates in the target.

In general, when the level of nesting is one (i.e. flat case), the rule used to associate Skolem functions with needed elements is as follows (for the fully nested case we will make an adjustment in Section 3.3).

**Skolemization for atomic elements** *Given an s-t dependency, each needed element in the target is computed by using a (different) one-to-one function that depends on all the mapped atomic elements of the target logical relation.*

The presence of functional dependencies in the target schema may change the functions used for value creation. To illustrate, if C is a key in Spouses (i.e., the functional dependency \( C \rightarrow E \) holds) then in the above rule we replace \( f_E[a, b, c] \) with \( f_E[c] \).

### 3.2 Grouping of Nested Elements

Consider Figure 5(a), in which the target schema is nested on two levels: elements A and C are at the top level, while a B element can have multiple B sub-elements (Bs is of set type). Elements A, B, and C of the source Emps are mapped, via correspondences, into the respective elements of the target Emps. The mapping, and the corresponding s-t dependency, requires all \((A, B, C)\) values that can be found in the source to
be moved to the target. However, in addition to this, the intended semantics requires all the different b values to be grouped together, for fixed values of A and C. For illustration, if A, B, and C are employee, child, and spouse names, respectively, the mapping requires the grouping of all children under the same set, if the employee and the spouse are the same. This behavior is not specified by an s-t dependency (which is stated at the level of flat logical relations). Thus, one of the tasks of data translation is providing the desired grouping in the target. Grouping is performed at every nesting level, as dictated by the target schema. The property that the resulting target instance will satisfy is a well-known one: Partitioned Normal Form (PNF) [1].

**PNF:** In any target nested relation, there can not exist two distinct tuples that coincide on all the atomic elements (whether from source or created).

To achieve this behavior, we use Skolemization as well. If a target element has set type, then its identifier (recall that each set is identified in the data model by a set id) is created via a Skolem function. This function does not depend on any of the atomic elements that may be under the respective set type, in the schema hierarchy. Instead it depends on all the atomic elements at the same level or above (up to the root of the schema). The same Skolem function (for a given set type of the target schema) is used across all s-t dependencies. Intuitively, we perform a deep union of all data in the target independently of their source. For the example of Figure 5(a), we create the rule:

for x in Emps,
let a = x.Emp.A, b = x.Emp.B, c = x.Emp.C
return (Emp = (A = a, BS = fBS[a, c], C = c)) in Emps,
(B = b) in fBS[a, c]

The meaning of the above rule is the following: for each (a,b,c) triple of values from the source, create first (if not already there) a sub-element Emp in Emps, with the appropriate A and C sub-elements, and with a BS sub-element the value of which is the set id fBS[a, c]. Thus, the Skolem function fBS is used here to create a set node. Also, we create (if not already there) a sub-element B, with value b, under fBS[a, c]. Later on, if a triple with the same A and C values (i.e. a,c) but different B value (b') is retrieved from the source, then we skip the first creation step (the required Emp sub-element already exists). However, the second part of the return clause applies, and we append a new B sub-element with value b' under the previously constructed set node fBS[a, c]. This mechanism achieves the desired grouping of B elements for fixed A and C values. A similar grouping mechanism can be expressed in XML-QL [5], using Skolem functions. It can also be implemented for languages that do not support Skolem functions like XQuery or XSLT as described in [17].

### 3.3 Value Creation Interacts with Grouping

To create a nested target instance in PNF, we need to refine the process of creation of new values, which was described in Section 3.1 only for the non-nested case. We again explain our technique with an example. Consider Figure 5(b), where the elements A and C are stored in separate target sets. The association between A (e.g., employee name) and C (e.g., spouse name) is preserved via the foreign key E (spouse id). Thus, E is a needed element and must be created. However, in this case, it is rather intuitive that the value of E should not depend on the value of B but only on the A and C value. This, combined with the PNF requirement, means that all the B (child) values are grouped together if the employee and spouse names are the same. We achieve therefore the same effect that the mapping of Figure 5(a) achieves. In contrast, if E is created differently based on the different B values, then each child will end up in its own singleton. In our implementation of the logical mapping, we choose the first alternative, because we believe that this is the more natural interpretation. Thus, we adjust the Skolemization scheme of Section 3.1 as follows.

**The function used for creation of an atomic element E does not depend on any of the atomic elements that occur at a lower level than E, in the target schema.**

For the example of Figure 5(b) we create the rule:

for x in Emps,
let a = x.Emp.A, b = x.Emp.B, c = x.Emp.C
return (Emp = (A = a, BS = fBS[a, c], E = fE[a, c]),
(B = b) in fBS[a, c],
(Spouse = (E = fE[a, c], C = c)) in Spouses)

As an extreme but instructive case, suppose that in Figure 5(b) we remove the correspondences into A and C, but keep the one into B. If A and C are needed, then they will be created by Skolem functions with no arguments. This is the same as saying that they will be assigned some constant values. Consequently, the two target sets Emps and Spouses will each contain a single element: some unknown employee, and some unknown spouse, respectively. In contrast, the nested set BS will contain all the B values (all the children listed in Emps). Thus, the top-level part of the schema plays only a structural role: it is minimally created in order to satisfy the schema requirements but the respective values are irrelevant. But this is fine, since there is nothing mapped into it. Later on, as correspondences may be added to A and C, the children will be separated into different sets, depending on the mapped values.
The Skolemization algorithm sketched in this section is a polynomial-time, graph-walking algorithm. It is described in full detail in [17], which also describes the translation from rules to XQuery and XSLT.

4 Experience

We have implemented our solutions in our prototype system Clio. Our experience has shown that the intended semantics of the correspondences are captured by the system, and the user effort in creating (and debugging) the translation queries is significantly less than with other approaches (including manually writing the query or using other query building tools). Although there is no standard benchmark or evaluation methodology for the subjective task of integration, we attempt to provide some evidence for the performance and effectiveness of our tool by discussing our usage of Clio on several schemas of different sizes and complexity. Our test schemas are listed in Table 1 with pairs of source and target schemas listed consecutively. They include: two XML Schemas for the DBLP bibliography (the first obtained from the DBLP Web Site); the relational TPC-H schema and a nested XML view of this benchmark; two relational schemas from the Amalgam integration suite for bibliographic data; the relational and DTD version of the Mondial database; and two schemas representing a variety of gene expression (microarray) experimental results. We have made all these schemas available on our web page (www.cs.toronto.edu/db/.clio), which also contains links to their original sources.

We included the DBLP schemas as examples of schemas with few constraints. These schemas still differ semantically, only the semantics is encoded primarily in the (different) nesting structure of the schemas, rather than through constraints. The Amalgam relational schemas, on the other hand, are examples of schemas without any nesting structure where all the semantics are captured by a rich set of referential constraints. We have also included real XML schemas with relatively few constraints (GeneX) and with many constraints (Mondial). Table 1 shows some characteristics of all these schemas in our internal nested relational representation. The nesting depth indicates the nesting of repeated elements (set types). There is often more nesting through record types, but this does not affect the efficiency of our algorithms.

The load and compile time indicate, respectively, the time to read the schemas and the time to compile the schemas into our internal logical representation. The compile time includes the time to understand the nested structure (by computing primary paths) and to combine structures linked by constraints (using the chase to compute logical relations). While the load time, as expected, closely reflects the schema size (including both the schema structure and constraints), the compile time is mostly affected by the number of NRIs. On schemas with few or no NRIs, the compile time is almost negligible while schemas with a large number of NRIs take much more time to compile. Although compile time can be as large as several seconds (in our unoptimized prototype) for schemas with many constraints, we found this to be an acceptable delay for Clio users. Recall that compilation occurs only once when a schema is loaded.

To evaluate the results of our semantic translation, we sought to understand whether our algorithms were producing the right results and whether they were doing so in an effective way. Table 2 shows the total number of source-to-target dependencies that Clio generates for our test schemas (column labeled “With NRIs”). For comparison, we have also included the number of s-t dependencies that would be produced if we ignored all (intra-schema) NRIs (column labeled “No NRIs”). These dependencies preserve the semantics of nesting but ignore any referential semantics embedded in schema constraints. Although schema constraints may increase the number of possible s-t dependencies, we find that in practice the number of s-t dependencies remains manageable, and users do not get overwhelmed with too many choices. Furthermore, the last column (labeled “Subsumed”) shows how many of the dependencies generated without NRIs were subsumed by better, association-preserving dependencies when NRIs were used. For instance, in the case of the expenseDB/statDB mapping, the number of dependencies created with and without dependencies is the same: five. Three of the dependencies created without NRIs appeared again, unchanged, when NRIs were used. The other two dependencies were subsumed by dependencies that embraced the available NRIs. We, thus, end up with a better quality mapping that maintains the implied relationships in the schemas.

For all the schemas, the user was able to select a
subset of the generated s-t dependencies to form the
correct (desired) translation. In some cases (e.g., DBLP,
Amalgam, expenseDB), the intended transformation re-
quired all the created dependencies, in other cases it
required only a strict subset. Clio’s DataViewer [19]
has proven to be very effective in helping users un-
derstand and select the desired s-t dependencies.

5 Discussion and Future Work

We have presented new algorithms for schema map-
ping and data translation between nested schemas
with nested referential constraints. Our solutions are
distinguished in that we take advantage of schema se-
manitics to generate all consistent translations. We
 guarantee that the target instance we produce satisfies
the target structure and constraints, even when such
an instance must contain data that are not derived
from the source. The logical mappings we produce are
source-to-target dependencies relating a source query
(specifying how source data may be collected together)
and a target query (specifying how this data is restruc-
tured in the target). Such dependencies may be used in
a data integration scenario where the target is virtual
and queries on the target are answered using the source
instance [8]. They may also be used to materialize a
target instance. Our data translation algorithm gives
one such implementation of the dependencies which
creates a target instance in PNF.

Our queries make use of the rich restructuring ca-
pabilities and id-vention of the translation languages
that precede this work [7, 4]. Yet, we differ in that we
automatically generate translation queries in a way
that respects the semantics encoded in the schemas.
In this respect, our work is similar to that of Tran-
Scm [13], one of the first techniques to use schema in-
formation to help automate data translation. Tran-
Scm uses predefined matching rules that describe com-
monly used transformations to derive a translation.
Hence, their technique is not as flexible and general as
ours. The relationship of our work to other integration
approaches and to work on logical data independence
[11] is explored in greater detail in the full version of
this paper [17].

Our motivation was to provide a tool that quickly
generates correct translations between rich Web data
sources. Hence, we have focused on building a robust
tool that captures the semantics embedded in nested
structures. We have currently extended our algorithms
to consider additional types from XML Schema, in-
cluding union types, and we are planning to include
order in our framework. To support order, we would
need to include list types and enhance the generated
mappings with ordering predicates.

Many thanks to Peter Buneman, Howard Ho,
Phokion G. Kolaitis, Felix Naumann, Val Tannen and
the anonymous reviewers for helpful suggestions.
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