Towards Compact and Tractable Automaton-based Representations of Time Granularities

Ugo Dal Lago¹, Angelo Montanari², and Gabriele Puppis²

 ¹ Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Informazione, Università di Bologna Mura Anteo Zamboni 7, 40127 Bologna, Italy dallago@cs.unibo.it
² Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica, Università di Udine via delle Scienze 206, 33100 Udine, Italy {montana, puppis}@dimi.uniud.it

- Time Granularities
- Representation Formalisms
- String-based and Automaton-based Approaches
- A Relevant Problem: The Granule Conversion Problem
- Optimizing Automaton-based Representations

Motivations:

• relational databases:

to express temporal information at different time granularities, to relate different granules and convert associated data (queries)

• artificial intelligence:

to reason about temporal relationships, e.g, to check consistency and validity of temporal constraints at different time granularities (temporal CSPs)

• data mining:

to discover temporal relationships between collected events, to derive implicit information from such relationships **Definition** $G: \mathbb{Z} \to 2^T$ is a granularity iff

- (T, <) is a linearly ordered set of temporal instants,
- $t_x < t_y$ whenever $x < y, t_x \in G(x)$, and $t_y \in G(y)$.

A granule of G is a non-empty set G(x) and $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ is said to be its *label*.



Representation Formalisms (1)

We cannot finitely represent all the granularities over an infinite temporal domain, so we have to restrict ourselves to a proper subclass of structures.

Possible approaches to model time granularities:

• algebraic one:

relationships between granularities are represented by terms built up from a finite set of operators (e.g., Week = $Group_7(Day)$ in the Calendar Algebra, see Bettini et al. '00)

• logical one:

granularities are defined by models of formulas in a given language (e.g., PLTL, see Combi et al., '02)

• string-based one:

relationships between temporal instants and granules are encoded by sequences of symbols from a given alphabet (e.g., granspecs, see Wijsen '00)

• automaton-based one:

automata are exploited to encode string-based descriptions of time granularities (e.g., Single-string Automata, see Dal Lago '01)

We focus our attention on string-based and automaton-based approaches.

Fundamental Problems

• Equivalence:

the problem of establishing whether two different representations define the same granularity

• Conversion:

the problem of relating granules from different time granularities and converting associated data

• Minimization:

the problem of computing the smallest representation(s) for a given granularity

• Optimization:

the problem of computing the representation(s) on which crucial algorithms (e.g., conversion algorithms) run faster Basic ingredients:

- a discrete temporal domain T
- restriction to *left bounded periodical* granularities, namely, granularities that have an initial granule and, ultimately, periodically group instants of the temporal domain
- a fixed alphabet $\{\blacksquare, \Box, \wr\}$, where
 - represents instants covered by some granule,
 - \Box represents gaps within and between granules,
 - > separates granules and defines labels

Example. The infinite word

represents the granularity BusinessWeek in terms of Day.

Proposition. *Ultimately periodic words* over $\{\blacksquare, \Box, i\}$ capture all the left bounded periodical granularities.

Remark. Such strings can be finitely represented by pairs (*granspecs*) of prefixes and repeating patterns.

Example. (ε , **EXAMPLE** (ε , **EXAMPLE**) is a granspec representing BusinessWeek in terms of Day.

Automaton-based Approach (1)

Connection between ultimately periodic words and automata:

Proposition. A single left bounded periodical granularity can be represented by an automaton recognizing a single string (SSA).

Example. An SSA representing BusinessWeek in terms of Day.



Problem. As for granspecs, a problem arises: such representations are *too large* with respect to inherently simple structure of granularities.

Idea. We endow automata with *counters* and we use *primary and secondary transitions* to compactly encode redundancies of generated strings.

Remark. Suitable restrictions on the rules managing counter updates and transition activations guarantee

- the same expressive power of SSA;
- the *decidability of the equivalence problem*;
- *efficient manipulation* of representations (e.g. granule conversions).

Here the notion of *Restricted Labeled Automaton* (RLA) over finite and ultimately periodic words comes into play.

Automaton-based approach (3)

Distinctive features of RLA:

- states are partitioned into labeled and non-labeled states
- each non-labeled state is endowed with a single counter and it is the source of a secondary transition
- secondary transitions are activated iff the value of the corresponding counter is positive
- counters can only be decremented whenever they are positive, otherwise they are given their initial value



Granule Conversions (1)

Example (Granule Conversion Problem):

compute the label of the business week covering the 9-th day.



Granule conversions can be reduced to problems over strings/automata.

Example. In the given example, the solution is given by 1 plus the number of occurrences of \wr in $(\blacksquare^5 \square^2 \wr)^{\omega}$ until the 9-th occurrence of \blacksquare or \square (that is, 2).

How RLA can be used to solve the problem?

• straightforward solution:

mimic the automaton transitions until the addressed occurrence has been reached

• wiser solution:

take advantage of nested repetitions in the run of the RLA in order to mimic *maximal periodic sequences* of transitions at once

⇒ The latter algorithm runs in *polynomial time* $\Theta(||M||)$, where M is the involved RLA and || || is a suitable **complexity measure** envisaging the number of states and the structure of the transition functions. **Problem.** It is worth *minimizing the complexity* $\parallel \parallel$ in order to achieve the smallest running time for granule conversion algorithms.

Remark 1. There may be complexity-optimal automata which are not size-optimal, so

optimization problem \neq minimization problem.

Remark 2. There may be many different automata which are equivalent and complexity-optimal, so

there isn't a unique solution to the optimization problem.

Idea. We cope with the optimization problem by using *dynamic programming*.

Proposition. The class of RLA is closed under

Concatenation

given two RLA recognizing u and v, it generates an RLA recognizing $u \cdot v$

Iteration

given an RLA recognizing u, it generates an RLA recognizing u^ω

Repetition

given an RLA recognizing u and a positive integer k, it generates an RLA recognizing u^k

Closure Properties of RLA (2)



Remark. Unfortunately, there exist some RLA that cannot be generated by concatenation, iteration, and repetition.

However...

Proposition. For any RLA M, there exists an *equivalent* RLA M', having the *same complexity*, which can be built starting from basic automata and using concatenation, iteration, and repetition.

 \Rightarrow We can restrict ourselves to a proper expressively complete subclass of compound automata, known as *Sharing Free RLA* (SFRLA for short). **Theorem.** Given a (finite or ultimately periodic) word u, there is a complexity-optimal SFRLA that recognizes u which is generated by combining smaller complexity-optimal SFRLA recognizing substrings of u.

Furthermore, we can restrict our search only to

a finite number of possible compositions

 \Rightarrow We can effectively build a complexity-optimal SFRLA recognizing a given string in a bottom-up fashion .

Such an optimization algorithm takes *polynomial time*.

We defined time granularities and we introduced an alternative automaton-based formalism for representing and reasoning about them.

We identified some crucial problems involving time granularities, with a special attention to the granule conversion problem.

We focused on the efficiency of conversion algorithms and we tackled the optimization of automaton-based representations.

Finally, we exploited non-trivial properties of RLA in order to solve the optimization problem.

It is an open question if a similar approach can be applied to solve the minimation problem.

References

- C. Bettini, S. Jajodia, and X.S. Wang. *Time Granularities in Databases, Data Mining, and Temporal Reasoning*. Springer, 2000.
- C. Combi, M. Francheschet, and A. Peron. A Logical approach to represent and Reason About Calendars. Proceedings of the 9th International Symposium on Temporal Representation and Reasoning, IEEE Computer Society, 2002.
- U. Dal Lago and A. Montanari. *Calendars, Time Granularities, and Automata*. Proceedings of the 7th International Symposium on Spatial and Temporal Databases, vol. 2121 of LNCS, 2001.
- U. Dal Lago, A. Montanari, and G. Puppis. *Time Granularities, Calendar Algebra, and Automata*. Technical Report 4, Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica, Università degli Studi di Udine, 2003.
- U. Dal Lago, A. Montanari, and G. Puppis. *Towards Compact and Tractable Automaton-based Representations of Time Granularities*. Technical Report 17, Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica, Università degli Studi di Udine, 2003.
- J. Wijsen. *A String-based Model for Infinite Granularities*. Proceedings of the AAAI Workshop on Spatial and Temporal Granularities, AAAI Press, 2000.