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Abstract

NoSQL databases are currently often considered for Big Data solutions as they offer efficient solutions for volume and velocity issues and can manage some of complex data (e.g., documents, graphs). Fuzzy approaches are yet often not efficient on such frameworks. Thus this article introduces a novel approach to define and run approximate queries over NoSQL graph databases using Scala by proposing the Fuzzy4S framework and the Cypherf fuzzy declarative query language. NoSQL Graph databases are currently gaining more and more interest and are applied in many real world applications. The Fuzzy4S framework is defined with an open DSL (Domain Specific Language) allowing it to define scalable approximate queries at an abstract level. Cypherf is an extension of Cypher which runs over the Neo4J NoSQL graph databases. This work consists of a complete approach embedding the whole chain from end-user declarative query level to implementation issues within the database engine. We provide both the formal definitions for defining approximate graph NoSQL queries and the experimental results which demonstrate the interest and efficiency of our proposition.
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1. Introduction

Graphs are often a natural way to represent the world \cite{1}. This is especially true for social networks, but also in biology, chemistry etc. In such areas,
relationships between objects are at least as important as the objects themselves.

For example, retrieving "friend" and "friend of friend" relationships is a key operation in social networks or in any other human relations. In [2], we have highlighted the power of the study of relations in order to retrieve fraud rings which are defined as *sophisticated chains of indirect links between fraudsters representing successive transactions (money, communications, etc.) from which rogue behaviours are detected.*

Graphs have been extensively studied in the literature and have recently gained attention with the development of Semantic Web and ontologies. Many modelizations, tools and frameworks have been suggested to represent, manage and analyze graphs with XML, OWL etc.

At the same time, the volume and complexity of information concerning these objects and their relationships are growing dramatically, leading to huge databanks.

This has led to the development of the so-called NoSQL graph databases that embed both the performance of NoSQL databases and the representativity of graphs. Several engines exist (OrientDB, Neo4J, HyperGraphDB etc.) [3]. In this article, Neo4J is used since it has been considered the top graph database management for several years [1] (Figure 1, [4]).

Such database management systems embed query processing that can be used at different levels, from the declarative level to the programmatic level within the engine. The Neo4J system offers the declarative Cypher language that allows the users to query the graph in a very intuitive manner. These queries include clauses over both nodes and relationships. Properties can be defined in the same style that NoSQL databases *i.e. with* *(key : value)* lists. The value can be of any type, including collections.

For instance, it is possible to consider nodes representing people having some properties such as age *(key = age, value = 28)* or hobbies *(key = hobby,*

---


value = \{\text{tennis, reading, travel}\}.

In some cases, it is not relevant for users to define queries in a "crisp" way, as for instance to retrieve people having friends aged between 20 and 30 but they rather want to retrieve people even if their age is 31 and not strictly between 20 and 30.

For this reason, we consider approximate queries over such numerical properties. Such queries can for instance be expressed using the fuzzy set theory framework. In our proposition we introduce Fuzzy4S, standing for Fuzzy for Scala. Scala is a modern language mixing object-oriented and functional programming [5]. Fuzzy4S is used within NoSQL databases to define fuzzy queries by introducing the Cypherf framework (which stands for Cypher fuzzy).

The rest of this article is organized as follows: Section 2 presents the preliminary concepts underlying our work: graph databases and approximate queries. Section 3 introduces the extension of graph NoSQL queries with the Cypherf framework and discusses implementation issues. Cypherf relies on the Fuzzy4S framework which is detailed in Section 4. Section 5 illustrates our contributions.
using examples and showing the efficiency of our implementation with experimental load tests over benchmarks. Section 6 concludes this paper and discusses some of the many research avenues opened by our work.

2. Preliminary Concepts and Properties

This work merges two topics, namely graph oriented NoSQL databases and approximate queries that are briefly introduced below.

For illustrating these concepts and in the rest of this paper, we rely on an example where customers are linked to the hotels they have visited. A hotel is described with properties such as the price and location with regards to the city center. Customers are described by their age.

2.1. Graph Databases

Graphs have been studied for a long time by mathematicians and computer scientists. A graph can be directed or not, labeled or not. Graph databases rely on labeled directed graphs.

Definition 1 (Labeled Directed Graph). A labeled oriented graph \( G \), also known as oriented property graph, is given by a n-tuple \( (V, E, \alpha, \beta, l_V, l_E) \) where \( V \) stands for a set of nodes and \( E \) stands for a set of edges with \( E \subseteq (V \times V) \), \( \alpha \) stands for the set of attributes defined over the nodes, \( \beta \) the set of attributes defined over the relations, \( l_V : V \to \mathcal{P}(\alpha) \) is the labeling function for nodes and \( l_E : E \to \mathcal{P}(\beta) \) is the labeling function for relationships.

In such databases, \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are not simple labels such as in labeled graphs. They are rather defined by \( (key, value) \) pairs commonly used by NoSQL databases to represent the so-called properties over nodes and relations. Keys can occur in several nodes or relations.

Figure 2 shows a graph and its anatomy in \( (key, value) \) pairs.

Queries in graph databases are defined as traversals over the graph. They can be run at several levels, either programmatically or by using declarative
languages (as done when using SQL in relational databases). No common set of operators has yet been defined as a standard. It should be noted that the result of a query over a graph is not always defined as a graph.

In Neo4J, declarative queries are run using the so-called *Cypher* language.

### 2.2. Neo4J Cypher Language

In Cypher, queries are formulated using the following syntax:\(^3\)

```
[MATCH]
[OPTIONAL MATCH WHERE]
[WITH [ORDER BY] [SKIP] [LIMIT]]
RETURN [ORDER BY] [SKIP] [LIMIT]
```

Queries are formalized through EBNF Cypher grammar, as shown below. For the sake of simplicity, we only show some extracts of the grammar.

---

\(^3\)http://neo4j.com/docs/2.2.5/cypher-refcard/

http://neo4j.com/docs/2.2.5/cypher-query-lang.html
An EBNF grammar \[7\] is an extension of BNF (Backus-Naur Form (BNF)) \[8\] for formalizing the syntax of a language. It has been extensively studied in software engineering research works. Roughly speaking, every EBNF grammar is described by means of rules, every rule being defined with a left and right part.

An open community works on the openCypher project\[4\] that aims to deliver a full and open specification of Cypher and to evolve the language through the production and acceptance of CIPs (Cypher Improvement Proposals). Our work is part of this trend and aims to contribute with fuzzy extensions.

**EBNF Grammar Extract 1.** *Cypher requests are based on sequences of statements that are regular queries. Regular queries are based on single queries that can be combined through unions. Single queries are based on 9 possible clauses: Match, Unwind, Merge, Create, Set, Delete, Remove, With, Return.*

\[
\text{Cypher} = [\text{SP}], \text{Statement}, [[\text{SP}], ';'], [\text{SP}] ;
\]

\[
\text{Statement} = \text{Query} ;
\]

\[
\text{Query} = \text{RegularQuery} ;
\]

\[
\text{RegularQuery} = \text{SingleQuery}, \{ [\text{SP}], \text{Union} \} ;
\]

\[
\text{SingleQuery} = \text{Clause}, \{ [\text{SP}], \text{Clause} \} ;
\]

\[
\text{Clause} = \text{Match}
\]

\[
| \text{Unwind}
\]

\[
| \text{Merge}
\]

\[
| \text{Create}
\]

\[
| \text{Set}
\]

\[
| \text{Delete}
\]

\[
\]
As shown here, Cypher is comprised of several distinct clauses:

- **MATCH**: the graph pattern to match. The `MATCH` clause is the primary way of getting data from the database into the current set of bindings by providing an example. It allows users to specify the patterns that Cypher will search for in the database.

- **UNWIND**: expands a list into a sequence of rows.

- **MERGE**: ensures that a pattern exists in the graph. Either the pattern already exists, or it is created.

- **CREATE**: creates nodes and relationships.

- **SET**: is used to update labels on nodes and properties on nodes and relationships.

- **DELETE**: removes graphs elements (nodes, relationships and paths).

- **REMOVE**: is used to remove properties and labels from graph elements.

- **RETURN**: what to return. It defines which parts of the pattern the user is interested in. It can be nodes, relationships, or properties on them.

- **WITH**: allows query parts to be chained together, piping the results from one to be used as starting points or criteria in the next.

For instance, it is possible to retrieve which hotels have been visited by customers between the ages of 20 and 30 as shown in listing 1.
Listing 1: Retrieve which hotels have been visited by customers between the ages of 20 and 30 Query

```sql
MATCH (hotel:Hotel)<-[VISITED]-(:Customer)
WHERE c.age <= 30 AND c.age >= 20
RETURN DISTINCT hotel
```

Such queries allow the user to answer many questions in a very efficient way. However, they do not allow soft queries, such as retrieving the hotels visited by young customers where young is defined as a fuzzy set over the numerical universe of all possible ages. For this reason, we claim that introducing approximate queries in NoSQL graph databases is important. The next section introduces approximate queries.

2.3. Approximate Queries

Many works have been proposed to deal with approximate data and queries. It should first be noted that the consideration of imperfection may have several semantics, should the data be uncertain, imprecise, vague, incomplete and/or inconsistent [9].

This work focuses on approximate queries considered as imprecise queries over precise (classical) data, relying on fuzzy set theory [10].

2.3.1. Fuzzy Queries

The works on fuzzy databases have dealt with the various topics: entity-relationship models, functional dependencies, relational models, object databases, queries, etc. We focus here on fuzzy queries over classical databases.

In [11][12][13] querying regular databases is considered by extending the SQL language. The FSQL/SQLf and FQL languages have been proposed to extend queries over relational databases in order to incorporate fuzzy descriptions of the information being searched for.

In such systems, approximation is basically associated to fuzzy labels, fuzzy comparators (e.g., fuzzy greater than) and aggregation over clauses. Thresholds can be defined for the expected fulfillment of fuzzy clauses.
For instance, when considering a database containing crisp descriptions of hotels, users can ask for cheap hotels that are close to city center, cheap and close_to_city_center being fuzzy labels described by fuzzy sets and their membership functions respectively defined on the universe of prices and distance to the city center.

For instance, SQLf allows to integrate fuzzy predicates within the WHERE clause of an SQL query:

```sql
SELECT *
FROM Table_Hotel
WHERE Price is cheap;
```

Some works have been implemented as fuzzy database engines with fuzzy querying features [14, 15].

Many works have been proposed to investigate how such fuzzy predicates can be defined by users and computed by the database engine, especially when several clauses must be merged. For instance, for retrieving a hotel that is both cheap AND close to city center, the membership degrees are aggregated with a t-norm.

Such aggregation can consider preferences, for instance for queries where price is preferred to distance to city center using weighted t-norms.

Thresholds can be added when searching for hotels where the cheap degree is greater than 0.7 for instance.

More detailed definitions of the formalism are provided in the next section.

As we consider graph data, the works on fuzzy ontology querying are very close and relevant [16, 17]. f-SPARQL provides a flexible extension for SPARQL by allowing users to apply fuzzy filters and fuzzy operators. Figure 3 shows the syntax of this extension.

However, no model has been proposed for NoSQL graph databases. We thus propose to extend our first work [18] for defining approximate queries over NoSQL graph databases, as described in the next section.
3. Fuzzy Queries over NoSQL Graph databases: Towards the Cypher Language

3.1. Fuzzy Queries over Graph Databases

This section addresses fuzzy queries over regular NoSQL Neo4J graph databases. We claim that fuzziness can be handled at the following three levels: over nodes, over properties, and over relationships.

The rest of this section presents each possibility along with its associated EBNF grammar.

EBNF Grammar Extract 2. An expression is defined with sub-expressions that can be chained with logical and arithmetical operators.

```plaintext
Query ::= Prologue ( QueryType SelectQuery | ConstructQuery | DescribeQuery | AskQuery )
QueryType ::= #FQ# | #top-k FQ# with k
Constraint ::= BracketedExpression | BuiltInCall | FunctionCall
FlexibleExpression ::= BracketedExpression
FuzzyTermExpression ::= FuzzyTermExpression | FuzzyOperatorExpression
FuzzyOperatorExpression ::= (Var [*=';','>','<','<='] NumericLiteral) [with threshold]
FuzzyOperator ::= (Modifier)*FuzzyOperator
FuzzyTerm ::= FuzzyTerm and FuzzyTerm | FuzzyTerm or FuzzyTerm
ModifiedFuzzyTerm ::= (Modifier)* ModifiedFuzzyTerm | (Modifier)* SimpleFuzzyTerm
```

Figure 3: f-SPARQL modifications to the SPARQL standard grammar
Expression7 = Expression6, { ([SP], '+', [SP], Expression6) | ([SP], '-', [SP], Expression6) } ;

Expression6 = Expression5, { ([SP], '*', [SP], Expression5) | ([SP], '/', [SP], Expression5) | ([SP], '%', [SP], Expression5) } ;

Expression5 = Expression4, { [SP], '^', [SP], Expression4 } ;

Expression4 = { ('+' | '-'), [SP] }, Expression3 ;

Expression3 = Expression2, { ([SP], '[', Expression, ']') | ([SP], '[', [Expression], '..', [Expression], ']') | ((([SP], '='~) | ([SP], (I,N)) | ([SP], (S,T,A,R,T,S), [SP], (W,I,T,H)) | ([SP], (E,N,D,S), [SP], (W,I,T,H)) | ([SP], (C,O,N,A,I,N,S))) | [SP], Expression2) | ([SP], (I,S), [SP], (N,U,L,L)) | ([SP], (I,S), [SP], (N,O,T), [SP], (N,U,L,L)) } ;

Expression2 = Atom, { [SP], (PropertyLookup | NodeLabels) } ;

Atom = Literal
| Parameter
| { ((C,O,U,N,T), [SP], ('.', [SP], '*', [SP], '.'))
| ListComprehension
| PatternComprehension
| { ((F,I,L,T,E,R), [SP], ('.', [SP], FilterExpression, [SP], '.'))
| { ((E,X,T,R,A,C,T), [SP], ('.', [SP], FilterExpression, [SP], [[SP], '|', Expression], '.'))
| { ((A,L,L), [SP], ('.', [SP], FilterExpression, [SP], '.'))
| { ((A,N,Y), [SP], ('.', [SP], FilterExpression, [SP], '.')
| { ((N,O,N,E), [SP], ('.', [SP], FilterExpression, [SP], '.'))
| { ((S,I,N,G,L,E), [SP], ('.', [SP], FilterExpression, [SP], '.'))
| RelationshipsPattern
| ParenthesizedExpression
| FunctionInvocation
3.1.1. Cypher over Nodes

Dealing with fuzzy queries over nodes allows the user to retrieve similar nodes.

To achieve that goal, we decided to reuse the grammar definition available in Cypher. Indeed, we decided to use fuzzy functions that take nodes as parameters. Cypher supports function invocations in place of Expression.

**EBNF Grammar Extract 3.** `FunctionInvocation` has a function name followed by zero to any numbers of parameters that are separated by commas.

```
FunctionInvocation = FunctionName, [SP], '(' , [SP] , [(D,I,S,T,I,N,C,T), [SP]], [Expression, [SP], { ',', [SP], Expression, [SP] }], ')';
```

For instance, it is possible to retrieve similar hotels:

```
Listing 3: Getting Similar Hotel Nodes

MATCH (h1:Hotel),(h2:Hotel)
WITH h1 AS hot1, h2 AS hot2, SimilarTo(hot1,hot2) AS sim
WHERE sim > 0.7
RETURN hot1,hot2,sim
```

In this framework, the similarity between nodes is based on the definition of measures that merge the similarities of every property from the two nodes being compared. For example, a similarity measure can be built to compare and rank hotels based on the similarities of both price and size [19].

3.1.2. Cypher over Properties

Dealing with fuzzy queries over properties leads to the consideration of fuzzy linguistic terms and/or fuzzy comparators.
Such fuzzy queries impact the MATCH, WHERE, WITH and RETURN clauses from Cypher.

In the WHERE clause, it is then possible to search for cheap hotels in some databases, or for hotels located close to city center. Note that the properties being considered can be defined at the node and relationship levels.

**Listing 4: Cheap Hotels**

```
MATCH (h:Hotel)
WHERE CHEAP(price) > 0
RETURN h
ORDER BY CHEAP(h) DESC
```

**Listing 5: Hotels Close to City Center**

```
MATCH (c:City)-[:LOCATED]->(h:Hotel)
WHERE CLOSE(c,h) > 0
RETURN h
ORDER BY CLOSE(c,h) DESC
```

In the MATCH clause, integrating fuzzy criteria are also possible:
Listing 6: Matching Hotels Close to City Center

```cypher
MATCH (h:Hotel) -[:LOCATED {CLOSE(distance)>0}]->(c:City)
RETURN h
ORDER BY CLOSE(h,c) DESC
```

To offer this possibility we have added the concept of fuzzy criterion to Cypher and we have extended its grammar. Indeed, Cypher is not able to use functions in “RelationshipPattern”. We thus introduce the following extension.

**EBNF Grammar Extension 1.** “FuzzyCriteria” is defined as a function invocation that is an optional member of a “RelationshipDetail”. A Relationship detail is an optional part of a “RelationshipPattern” which is a part of a “PatternElementChain”, and so on to the “Pattern”.

The extension of the RelationshipDetail possibilities by the addition of the FuzzyCriteria offers by transitivity the possibility to the Match clause to use FuzzyCriteria in a relationship construction.

```
Match = [(O,P,T,I,O,N,A,L), SP], (MATCH), [SP], Pattern, [[SP], Where] ;

Merge = (M,E,R,G,E), [SP], PatternPart, { SP, MergeAction } ;

Create = (C,R,E,A,T,E), [SP], Pattern ;

Pattern = PatternPart, { [SP], ',', [SP], PatternPart } ;

PatternPart = (Variable, [SP], '=', [SP], AnonymousPatternPart)
  | AnonymousPatternPart
  ;

AnonymousPatternPart = PatternElement ;

PatternElement = (NodePattern, { [SP], PatternElementChain })
  | ('(', PatternElement, ')')
  ;
```

14
NodePattern = '(', [SP], [Variable, [SP]], [NodeLabels, [SP]], [Properties, [SP]], ',') ;

PatternElementChain = RelationshipPattern, [SP], NodePattern ;

RelationshipPattern = (LeftArrowHead, [SP], Dash, [SP], [RelationshipDetail],
  [SP], Dash, [SP], RightArrowHead)
  | (LeftArrowHead, [SP], Dash, [SP], [RelationshipDetail], [SP], Dash)
  | (Dash, [SP], [RelationshipDetail], [SP], Dash, [SP], RightArrowHead)
  | (Dash, [SP], [RelationshipDetail], [SP], Dash)
;

RelationshipDetail = '[', [SP], [Variable, [SP]], [RelationshipTypes, [SP]],
  [RangeLiteral], [FuzzyCriteria], [Properties, [SP]], ']' ;

FuzzyCriteria = '{', [SP], FunctionInvocation, [SP], '}' ;

In the \textit{RETURN} clause, no selection will be achieved, but fuzzy terms can be added in order to show the users the degree to which some values possess properties represented by fuzzy sets, as for instance:

\begin{lstlisting}[language=cypher]
MATCH (h:Hotel) -[:LOCATED] -> (c:City)
RETURN h, CLOSE(h, c) AS 'ClosenessToCityCenter'
ORDER BY ClosenessToCityCenter DESC
\end{lstlisting}

\subsection*{3.1.3. Cypher over Relationships}

As for nodes, such queries may be based on properties. However it can also be based on the graph structure in order to better exploit and benefit from it.

In Cypher, the structure of the pattern being searched is mostly defined in the \textit{MATCH} clause.

The first attempt to extend pattern matching to fuzzy pattern matching is to consider chains and depth matching. Chains are defined in Cypher in the
MATCH clause with consecutive links between objects. If a node \( a \) is linked to an object \( b \) at depth 2, the pattern is written as \( (a) - [\ast 2] > (b) \). If a link between \( a \) and \( b \) without regarding the depth in-between is searched, then it is written \( (a) - [\ast] > (b) \). The mechanism also applies for searching objects linked through a range of nodes (e.g. between 3 and 5): \( (a) - [\ast 3..5] > (b) \).

In a similar way to [20], we propose thus to introduce fuzzy descriptors to define extended patterns where the depth is imprecisely described. It will then for instance be possible to search for customers linked through almost 3 hops.

The syntax \( \ast \ast \) is proposed to indicate a fuzzy linker.

**EBNF Grammar Extension 2.** *FuzzyLinker is defined as a FunctionInvocation that can be used in RelationshipDetail.*

\[
\text{RelationshipDetail} = \left[\left(\text{Variable}, \left[\text{SP}\right], \left[\text{Properties}, \left[\text{SP}\right]\right]\right), \left[\text{RangeLiteral}, \left[\text{SP}\right], \left[\text{FuzzyLinker}\right]\right]\right];
\]

\[
\text{FuzzyLinker} = \left(\left(\text{FuzzyCriteria}\right)ight);\]

Listing 8: Fuzzy Patterns

```
MATCH (c1:customer) -[:KNOWS**almost(3)]->(c2:customer)
RETURN c1, c2
```

Fuzzy linker is related to fuzzy tree and graph mining [21] where some patterns emerge from several graphs even if they do not occur exactly the same way everywhere regarding the structure.

Popular hotels may for instance be retrieved when they are chosen by many people. This is similar to the way popular people are detected if they are followed by a large number of people on social networks.

In Cypher, such queries are defined by using aggregators. For instance, the following query retrieves hotels visited by at least 2 customers:
Such crisp queries can be extended to consider fuzziness:

The question then raised is now to implement them in the existing Neo4J engine.

### 3.2. Cypher: Implementation Challenges

#### 3.2.1. Architecture

There are several ways to implement fuzzy Cypher queries:

1. Creating an overlay language on top of the Cypher language that will produce well formatted queries expressed as Cypher statements to do fuzzy computations;
2. Extending the Cypher queries and using the existing low level API behind;
3. Extending the low level API with optimized functions only available to advanced users with development skills;
4. Combining the last two possibilities: using an extended Cypher query language over an enhanced low level API.

Every possibility is debated in this section and a synthesis is then provided.

#### 3.2.2. Creating an Overlay Language

**Concept**
The concept is to create a new language dedicated to our framework. Such dedicated languages are also known as Domain Specific Languages (DSL). In this work, we consider a high-level fuzzy DSL that will be used to generate Cypher well-formed queries. The generated Cypher queries will be executed by the existing Neo4J engine.

A grammar must be defined for this external DSL which can rely on the existing Cypher syntax and only enhance it with new fuzzy features. The output of the generation process is pure Cypher code. In this scenario, Cypher is used as a low level language to achieve fuzzy queries.

**Discussion**

This solution is cheap and non-intrusive but has several serious drawbacks:

- Missing features: fuzzy queries (e.g., retrieving the data matching some fuzzy criterion) cannot be easily expressed by the current Cypher language (e.g., Listing 4) without creating ad hoc queries;

- Performance issues: Cypher is neither designed for fuzzy queries nor for being used as an algorithmic language. All the fuzzy queries will produce
Cypher query codes that are not optimized for computations embedding fuzzy sets;

- Lack of user-friendliness: some queries cannot be executed directly against the Neo4J environment, it needs a three-step process: (i) write a fuzzy query, then compile it to get the Cypher query; (ii) use the Cypher generated queries on the Neo4J database; (iii) reconstruct a “fuzzy answer” from a regular Cypher query result.

3.2.3. Extending the Cypher Queries

Concept

We propose to extend the Cypher language in order to add new features. Cypher offers various types of functions: scalar functions, collection functions, predicate functions, mathematical functions etc. To enhance this language with fuzzy features, we propose to add a new type of function: fuzzy functions. Fuzzy functions are used in the same way as other functions of Cypher (or SQL).

Cypher is an external DSL, which requires to be parsed. The query correctness must be checked and then it has to be executed. In Cypher the execution consists of retrieving the results from the query using the corresponding graph traversal.

The Neo4J’s grammar provides the guidelines of how the language is supposed to be structured and what is and is not valid. In order to implement this solution, the Cypher grammar must be extended regarding the current grammar parser. Cypher uses the Scala Parser Combinator library (that will be covered in more details in Section 4) as parsing engine. Once the Cypher query is parsed, the code has to be bound on the current programmatic API to achieve the desired result.

Discussion

This work requires a deep understanding of the Neo4J engine and more knowledge of Java/Scala programming language (used to write the Neo4J engine and API) than the previous solution. The main advantage of this solution is to
offer an easy and user-friendly way to use the fuzzy feature. The disadvantages of this solution are:

- Performance issue. This solution should have better performance than the previous one. However, it is still built on the current Neo4J engine API that is not optimized for fuzzy queries (e.g. degree computing);

- Cost of maintenance. Until Neo4J accepts to merge this contribution to the Neo4J project, it will be required to upgrade every new version of Neo4J with these enhancements. Every new version of Neo4J can make some breaking changes such as API changes. If so, part of the fuzzy extensions will need to be rewritten.

3.2.4. Extending Low Level API

Concept

This scenario consists of enhancing the core database engine with a framework to efficiently handle the fuzzy queries and to extend the programming API that can be used by developers.

Discussion

This solution offers a high performance improvement but needs advanced Neo4J skills, possibly high maintenance costs, a poor user-friendliness experience (only developers can use it) and a costly development process.

3.2.5. Extending Cypher Over an Enhanced Low Level API

Concept

The last possibility is to combine the solutions from Sections 3.2.3 and 3.2.4 adding the features handling the fuzzy queries to the database engine extending the API while also extending the Cypher language.

Discussion

Although this solution is user-friendly and provides optimized performance, it has a heavy development cost (skills, tasks, etc.) and a high cost of maintenance.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Optimized</th>
<th>User Friendliness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overlay Language</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending Cypher Queries</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending Low Level API</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypher over an Enhanced Low Level API</td>
<td>−−</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Discussion Sum-Up

Every scenario has pros and cons. Table I sums up the above discussion.

The best, but most costly, solution is still the last one: extending Cypher query language and build a low level API framework to enhance the Neo4J database engine with support of fuzzy queries as presented below.

3.3. First Implementation: Naive Implementation

Prototype

In [18], a prototype based on the extension of Cypher over an enhanced API has been introduced allowing fuzzy queries to be run as shown in Figure 6.

This first implementation is called "naive" because it deliberately rejects sophisticated architecture and is a standard "proof of concept" implementation of what has been specified in previous section.

Discussion
This implementation looks fairly user-friendly: a set of fuzzy functions to be used in Cypher queries are available to users. The main drawback of this implementation is that for each specific need a new function has to be developed.

For instance, as defined in section 3.1.1 to calculate the similarity between two nodes a function with two arguments (node1 and node2) has to be written. The calculation of the similarity between two hotels or two cars is based on different properties. This means that two different functions (SimilarityCars and SimilarityHotels) are needed. Each function makes assumption on some node properties (e.g. top speed, max power for a car).

The same problem occurs on fuzzy queries over properties: the $\mu_{\text{cheap}}$ fuzzy membership function is considered to calculate to which extent a property matches the “cheap” fuzzy term. The cheap function cannot be defined with the same $\mu_{\text{cheap}}$ membership function for a car or a hotel room: $\mu_{\text{cheap,car}}$ and $\mu_{\text{cheap,hotel}}$ have to be implemented in Scala, tested, compiled, and deployed in the Neo4J engine.

This is also a huge drawback when a user wants to define or refine a membership function: it is always a code, build, run cycle which requires the help of a developer or the possession of programming skills.
To conclude, this implementation is acceptable only for people who have few fuzzy cases to handle or have development skills to implement fuzzy functions by themselves.

This lack of genericity has highlighted the need for a new solution, described in the next section.

3.4. Cypherf: Extending Cypher to Fuzzy Queries

3.4.1. Overview

This new extension has been proposed and implemented to reduce the drawbacks listed in Section 3.3. The goal of this proposal is to provide an improved implementation on two axes: it must reduce the need for specific development and increase the capacity for the user to create his or her own membership function.

Experimentation and benchmarking are available in Section 5.

3.4.2. Cypher: an External Domain Specific Language

As said before, Cypher is an external Domain Specific Language for expressing queries on NoSQL graph databases. A Domain Specific Language (DSL) is a language tailored to a specific application domain [22].

DSLs are everywhere. Among the most popular are SQL for relational databases, Make for building softwares and CSS for styling description.

The main advantages of DSLs are that they are expressive, concise and designed at a high level of abstraction. Moreover, during the development cycle, working on DSL is more scalable and tends to produce a higher payoff. The main disadvantages are that the language design is hard and that DSLs lead to performance issues. There are two main categories of Domain Specific Languages:

- The first one is known as "internal" DSL. It uses the infrastructure of an existing programming language to build domain-specific semantics. It is implemented as a particular form of API in a host general purpose
language, often referred to as a “fluent” interface. The term fluent is used for an API that is primarily designed to be readable and to flow.

- The second category is named "external" DSL. This type of DSL is language agnostic, meaning that it is independent from a language syntax. It can thus be implemented in any language. One of the strengths of this category of DSL is its expressiveness, as it is not limited to a general/host programming language. The main drawback is that such languages have to be parsed to be manipulated. This requires the writing of a language parser or the use of a tool that uses a grammar to generate a parser for a specific language. For instance, AntLR [23] (ANother Tool for Language Recognition) can be considered for this task.

### 3.4.3. Cypherf: Adding a Fuzzy DSL to Cypher

The naive implementation extends the Cypher language with new functions: fuzzy functions.

This approach does not provide an effective way to express membership functions. To provide a more generic implementation, it is necessary to add another Domain Specific Language that allows the end-user to express fuzzy expressions.

The choice has been made to enhance Cypher with fewer functions but ones that allow the user to express fuzzy concerns with a "Fuzzy DSL". This new extension of Cypher is called Cypherf, standing for Cypherfuzzy.

### 3.4.4. Features

Cypherf allows the end-user to use fuzzy features such as defining membership function with the use of a fuzzy DSL, using t-norms and t-conorms functions as defined in [24] and using fuzzy linguistic variables.

The available functions are listed below (a formal grammar definition is available in Section 4.2.3):

- **Fuzzy(\( \mu_f \), value):** returns the degree of membership of the \( \mu_f \) function
– $\mu_f$ describes the membership function with the Fuzzy DSL

– value is expressed as a Double

- FuzzyLT(fuzzyVariable, value): returns a collection that contains for every fuzzy term of the fuzzy linguistic variable two properties: the name of the term and the degree of compatibility of a "value" with the term. For instance, for a value X and a fuzzy linguistic variable Age = (Age, [0, 130], {young, middleaged, old}, {\mu_{young}, \mu_{middle}, \mu_{old}}) the result will be:

```
{ 
  {name: "young", degree: \mu_{young}(x) },
  {name: "middle", degree: \mu_{middle}(x) },
  {name: "old", degree: \mu_{old}(x) }
}
```

- fuzzyVariable: is expressed as a String that defines the fuzzy variable. This definition is composed of the name of the fuzzy variable and a set of fuzzy-terms. Every fuzzy term is defined by its name and its membership function

- value is expressed as a Double

- TNorms( tnormName, expression1, expression2): applies a TNorm of name "tnormName" on expression1 and expression2

- TCoNorms(type, expression1, expression2): same as TNorms but this time for t-conorms.

3.4.5. Fuzzy DSL

The fuzzy DSL is used to define membership functions and fuzzy linguistic variables.

It is processed by an underlying fuzzy framework called "Fuzzy4S" that implements the fuzzy logic. Fuzzy4S has been developed explicitly as part of this new implementation but can be used separately in other projects. The
grammar of the fuzzy DSL is explained in the section 4.2.3 after the presentation of the Fuzzy4S framework and the introduction of some underlying concepts.

In this section, some contribution about defining and using fuzzy queries in a graph database has been proposed. Several implementation scenarios have been discussed and two implementations confronted. Implementations are based on an extension of the declarative graph database query language Cypher and the development of a low level engine that offers fuzzy features. The last implementation is more generic and user-friendly because it does not need programming skills to be used.

The next section presents the underlying fuzzy framework that has been developed for Cypher.

4. Fuzzy4S: A Fuzzy Logic Framework for Scala

In this contribution, approximate queries are considered in the way they are defined using fuzzy set theory.

4.1. Overview

In this paper, we introduce Fuzzy4S which is a fuzzy logic framework written in Scala. Proposed as a library, it includes membership functions, t-norms and t-conorms [10]. Upon this library, an open Domain Specific Language (DSL) has been built to define approximate queries at an abstract level. It relies on the IEC 61131 standard (IEC61131-7) that had been written for fuzzy control programming and on jFuzzyLogic (a java fuzzy logic library) [25, 26].

The need for such contributions in the fuzzy set framework has been highlighted in [27].

The rest of this section introduces our Domain Specific Language and the underlying features.
4.2. Fuzzy4S Grammar

Fuzzy4S can be manipulated directly (by using a Domain Specific Language based on a grammar that will be presented later in this section) or programmatically (by referencing objects and classes of the framework written in Scala). As written in [28], Scala is implemented as a translation to standard Java bytecode, which implies that the Scala code can be used in Java.

In the case of the Fuzzy4S DSL, the choice has been made to rely on external DSL which are more expressive than internal DSL. We have thus written a parser based on the concept of parsing expression grammar (PEG) which can be viewed as an extension of EBNF [29] and that is introduced below.

4.2.1. Fuzzy4S: Parsing Expression Grammar (PEG)

A Parsing Expression Grammar (PEG) is a recognition-based grammar formalism. The recognition-based systems have been developed in the 1970s. For decades, the Chomsky’s generative system of grammars, particularly context-free grammars (CFGs) and regular expressions (REs), has been used to express the syntax of programming languages and protocols [30].

As said in [31], the power of generative grammars to express ambiguity is crucial to their original purpose of modelling natural languages, but this very power makes it unnecessarily difficult both to express and to parse machine-oriented languages using CFGs.

A PEG provides an alternative for describing machine oriented syntax, which solves the ambiguity problem by not introducing ambiguity in the first place. Where CFGs express non-deterministic choice between alternatives, PEGs instead use prioritized choice by trying the alternatives in their order and unconditionally consuming the first successful match.

Figure 7 shows the notation of common operators available in PEG and the equivalent notation in Scala.

PEG operators are used in Fuzzy4S to parse the external DSL with a combination of several parsers. This technique is called combinatory parsing.
4.2.2. Combinatory Parsing

In functional programming, a common approach to parse domain-specific languages is to model parsers as functions and to define higher-order functions (also called combinators) that implement grammar constructions such as sequencing, choice and repetition. As explained in [33], the basic idea dates back to 1970s [34] and has become popular since 1980s in a variety of functional programming languages [35, 36, 37].

4.2.3. Fuzzy4S Parsing Expression Grammar

The parsing expression grammar for the DSL used in Fuzzy4S is defined in Listing 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>PEG notation</th>
<th>Scala notation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literal string</td>
<td>`' '</td>
<td><code>.</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literal string</td>
<td><code>&quot; &quot;</code></td>
<td><code>&quot;¨&quot;</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character class</td>
<td><code>[ ]</code></td>
<td>`[ ]&quot; r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any character</td>
<td><code>. </code></td>
<td><code>¨</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouping</td>
<td><code>(e)</code></td>
<td><code>(e)</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional</td>
<td><code>e?</code></td>
<td><code>(e?)</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-or-more</td>
<td><code>e*</code></td>
<td><code>(e*)</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-or-more</td>
<td><code>e+</code></td>
<td><code>(e+)</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And-predicate</td>
<td><code>&amp;e</code></td>
<td><code>guard(e)</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not-predicate</td>
<td><code>!e</code></td>
<td><code>not(e)</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td><code>e1 e2</code></td>
<td><code>e1 ~ e2</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritized Choice</td>
<td><code>e1 / e2</code></td>
<td>`e1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: PEG operators [31] [32]

Listing 11: Fuzzy4S Parsing Expression Grammar

```scala
def number: Parser[Double] = "\***-\?d+(\d*)?\***"
def point: Parser[Point] = "\(* ~ number ~ \," ~ number ~ \:"\)\*
def functionName: Parser[String] = "\***trian|trape|gauss|gbell|sigm\***"

def parameters = rep1(point) | rep1(number)
def memberfunction = functionName.? ~ parameters
```
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As defined in Listing 11, a point can be expressed as a pair of two numbers, the first one defining the $x$ coordinate and the second one the $y$ coordinate. A membership function has an optional function name and some parameters (point or number). A Term defines a fuzzy set, it is composed of a name and a membership function. A fuzzy linguistic variable (named fuzzyVariable in Listing 11) is composed of a name, for instance age, and all the terms that compose this fuzzy linguistic variable (young, old, ...) such as defined in Listing 12 and represented by Figure 8.

Fuzzy linguistic variable definition can be stored in files and can be loaded in Fuzzy4S by using the file path. This choice has been made in order to provide a simple way for users to create their own library to define their specific linguistic terms.

One of our potential future project’s feature will be to provide a web ap-
lication where users can publish their definition of fuzzy linguistic variable to compose an open source repository. Users will be able to load definition from this site by using HTTP URIs.

4.3. Epitomization

We claim that fuzzification is a challenge for graph databases. Our contribution is to propose an extension of the Cypher language, one of the most widely adopted graph database query language, to handle fuzzy queries.

Our first implementation attempt required to create a new function for each usecase and context (e.g., Cheap, Far, Cold, etc.). Each function implementation has to be invocated by the use of a FunctionInvocation (in Cypher’s EBNF grammar).

We think that this approach was lacking of genericity. We thus decided to offer a better support of fuzzy features to the end users through the definition of a domain specific language (DSL) called Fuzzy4S that provides the user with the ability to define his own fuzzy linguistic vocabulary and terms with associated functional membership functions and to chain them in their Cypherf queries.

Upon that, our choice of extending Cypher (instead of creating a separated language) offers the user more flexibility by the possibility to use functions (e.g. contains()) and operations (e.g. head()) of the underlying system.

The next section introduces some examples that show the power of our contribution.

5. Examples and Experimentation

This section illustrates our contributions with examples and shows the efficiency of our implementation with experimental load tests over benchmarks.

5.1. Using Fuzzy4S

This section is divided into two parts. The first is a showcase of some classical examples of what can be done with Fuzzy4S. The second introduces a web application that offers a web console to try out the Fuzzy4S framework.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership function</th>
<th>Scala code</th>
<th>DSL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PieceWise</td>
<td>PieceWiseMembershipFunction(List(0.1, ValuePoint(2.1), ValuePoint(4.0)))</td>
<td>(0.1, 2.1, 4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangular</td>
<td>TriangularMembershipFunction(0, 2.5, 5)</td>
<td>trian 0 2.5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapezoidal</td>
<td>TrapezoidalMembershipFunction(0, 2.3, 4)</td>
<td>trape 0 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigmoidal</td>
<td>SigmoidalMembershipFunction(-4, 3)</td>
<td>sigm -4 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singleton</td>
<td>SingletonMembershipFunction(2)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9: Examples of membership functions using Scala4S

5.1.1. Examples

In Figure 9 some examples of using membership functions of Fuzzy4S are provided both in Scala code and with the external DSL.

5.1.2. Try Fuzzy4S: a Web Console

A web application is proposed to test the Fuzzy4S functionality. This application is a web console that offers the opportunity to define and evaluate some membership functions with the Fuzzy4S DSL as shown in Figure 10.

5.2. Using Cypher

This section uses the example of searching for the best hotel for a trip to Paris. Two criteria will be explored: the price of the hotel for one night and the distance to the center of the city.

This section contains examples which can be seen as a step-by-step tutorial:

- example 1 and example 2 introduce basic Cypher query concepts required for the rest of this section;
- example 3 and example 4 introduce the use of membership functions with Cypher;
- example 5, example 6, and example 7 illustrate how to use linguistic variables;
• example 8 and example 9 use t-norms and t-conorms.

5.2.1. Data modelization and preliminary examples

Hotel and city center can be modeled as shown in Figure 11.

Using modelization from Figure 11 finding hotels close to the city center of the town requires calculating the distance from the hotel to the center of the city. The Euclidean distance between two points of the plane with Cartesian coordinates \((x_1, y_1)\) and \((x_2, y_2)\) is

\[
d = \sqrt{(x_2 - x_1)^2 + (y_2 - y_1)^2}.
\]

**Example 1.** Calculate the Euclidean distance in a graph database using Cypher

Listing 13: Calculate the Euclidean distance between a hotel and the city center

```cypher
match (c:Center), (h:Hotel)
with h.name as hotel, sqrt((c.posX - h.posX) * (c.posX - h.posX) + (c.posY - h.posY) * (c.posY - h.posY)) as distance
```
Figure 11: A possible data modelization

Listing 13 shows how to calculate the Euclidean distance. The first line of Listing 13 specifies which node will be searched in the request, in this example all the nodes with label “Hotel” or label “Center”. The WITH instruction manipulates the output before passing it to the rest of the query. It is a sort-of "pipe" command. In this example it takes hotels and center nodes and returns the hotel name to the rest of the query as a property called "hotel" and the distance expressed from the euclidean distance between the node and the center of the city.

In Example 1 the calculation of the euclidean distance must be done for each query execution. A better approach could be to store distance information into a relationship between the hotel and the city center.

The same technique can be considered for the result of the execution of a membership function like "close". It can also be stored in the same relationship.

Example 2. Store processed information in a relationship

Listing 14 shows how to store the result of the euclidean distance calculation in a relationship between hotel and city center.
At the end of the query execution, the graph model looks like: \((h:Hotel)\)-\(\langle r:Distance\ distance:VALUE\rangle\rightarrow(c:Center)\) as represented in Figure 12.

In order to focus on the fuzzy expression of Cypher language, the model has been transformed. The hotels no longer have \(posX\) and \(posY\) properties, only a distance property that expresses the distance between the hotel and the center of Paris. The resulting data set is shown in Listing 15 and represented in Figure 13.

Listing 15: Dataset

```cypher
CREATE (h1:Hotel { name:"h1", price:60, distance:3200 })
CREATE (h2:Hotel { name:"h2", price:70, distance:2400 })
```
5.2.2. Using a Membership Function

In this section, the goal is to retrieve the hotels close to the city center. To do so a piecewise membership function, illustrated in Figure 14, is defined as:

\[
f(x) = \begin{cases} 
1 & 0 \leq x \leq 1200 \\
\frac{x - 200}{800} + \frac{5}{4} & 1200 < x < 2000 \\
0 & x \geq 2000 
\end{cases}
\]

Example 3. Using a closeToCenter piecewise membership function in Cypherf

Listing 16 shows the use of the "fuzzy" Cypherf function that allows the user to use the Fuzzy DSL to describe a membership function. The result is the degree of membership of the hotel’s distance to the defined membership function.
Figure 14: Distance membership function

Figure 15: Result of querying distance to retrieve hotel

Listing 16: Querying distance to retrieve hotel by closeToCenter degree

```sql
MATCH (h:Hotel)
WITH h, fuzzy("(1200,1) (2000,0)", h.distance) AS distance
RETURN h.name, distance
ORDER BY distance DESC
```

Figure 15 shows the result of listing 16.

Example 4. Using a threshold on the degree of membership to closeToCenter

Listing 17 retrieves the first ten results with a degree of 0.8 at least. Figure 16 shows the results.

Listing 17: Retrieving hotels close to city center with a threshold on degree of membership to closeToCenter, limit to the top three results

```sql
MATCH (h:Hotel)
WITH h, fuzzy("(1200,1) (2000,0)", h.distance) AS distance
WHERE distance > 0.8
```
We have seen in this section how to use a membership function inside Cypher query language. The next section shows how to use linguistic variables in Cypher.

5.2.3. Using a Linguistic Variable

Let a linguistic variable price be defined with 3 terms: cheap, midPrice, expensive.

To allow users to retrieve the degree of membership associated to each term of a fuzzy linguistic variable, all membership functions must be applied. It is thus necessary to provide a "price.fl" (fl stands for FuzzyLogic) file that contains the variable definition as shown in Listing 18:

```
Listing 18: definition of price linguistic variable

FUZZIFY price
TERM cheap := (70,1) (85,0);
TERM midPrice := trapezoid 75 85 90 105;
TERM expensive := (95,0) (110,1);
END FUZZIFY
```

Example 5. Using Cypher with a linguistic variable

If the linguistic variable definition is saved in the /tmp/price.fl location then Cypher query can be used to build a query as in Listing 19:

```
RETURN h.name, distance
ORDER BY distance DESC
```

Figure 16: Result of querying distance with threshold
As shown in Figure 17, the query returns a collection of terms composed of a name and a degree. This collection is sorted by decreasing degree and (if two terms have the same degree) by term declaration order in the linguistic variable.

**Example 6. Retrieving the most appropriate term of a linguistic variable**

Listing 20 shows Cypher query to retrieve the top term of this linguistic variable for each hotel, meaning the most appropriate term of the price linguistic variable for each hotel.
Line 3 of Listing 20 shows the fuzzyLT function returning the head of the collection, which is to say the element with the highest degree and declared first in the linguistic terms. Figure 18 shows that each returned element has two properties: a name and a degree.

Listing 21 illustrates the name of the hotels and the top price term name. Results are available in Figure 19.

Listing 21: Display the best price term name

```
MATCH (h:Hotel)
WITH h, h.price AS price
RETURN h.name, head(fuzzyLT("/tmp/price.fl", price)).name
```

Example 7. Storing fuzzy information in nodes

As seen in Listing 20, information processed from the fuzzy functions can be stored back in the graph. For instance, for every hotel, the top-price name can be stored as a property of the hotel node. Listing 22 illustrates how to store the
5.2.4. Combining Fuzzy Terms

In this example section, the goal is to find the hotels close to the city center and have low price. To do so, two linguistic variables are used: the price and the distance of the hotel to the city center. The price definition remains the same as in listing 18 and the fuzzy linguistic variable distance is defined as in Listing 23.

Listing 22: Store back most appropriate term in a node, group by Category

```sql
MATCH (h:Hotel)
WITH h, h.price AS price
WITH h, head(fuzzyLT("/tmp/price.fl", price)) AS priceTerm
SET h.priceCat = priceTerm.name, h.priceDegree = priceTerm.degree
RETURN h.priceCat, collect(h.name)
```
Example 8. Using t-norms with two fuzzy linguistic variables

Listing 24 shows the Cypher query to achieve this goal and Figure 21 shows the results when using the min t-norm.

Example 9. Final example: finding the best hotels
Figure 21: Using t-norm

Figure 22: Result of using TNorm with where clause

Figure 22 shows that only one hotel, the cheapest one, could fit with our request. Nevertheless, sometimes the least expensive option is not the best match. We thus change the price criterion from "cheap" to "midPrice" as shown in Listing 26.

Listing 26: Requesting with price=midPrice and distance=Close

MATCH (h:Hotel)
Figure 23: Result of query with price=midPrice and distance=Close

```
WITH hotel, h.price AS hotelPrice, h.distance AS hotelDistance
WITH hotel, FuzzyLT("/tmp/distance.ft", hotelDistance) AS distanceTerms,
    FuzzyLT("/tmp/price.ft", hotelPrice) AS priceTerms
UNWIND distanceTerms AS distance
UNWIND priceTerms AS price
WITH hotel, distance, price
WHERE price.name = "midPrice" and distance.name = "close"
RETURN hotel.name, distance.name, price.name, TNorm("Min",
    distance.degree, price.degree) AS minR ORDER BY TNorm("Min",
    distance.degree, price.degree) DESC
```

Result of listing 26 is shown in Figure 23

5.3. Load Testing

5.3.1. Experimental Design

A test protocol has been defined to minimize the side effects (of both the
dynamic compilation as well as the JVM memory management) on performance
measurement based on works made in [32].

There are some mechanisms in the JVM which are transparent to the pro-
grammer, like automatic memory management, dynamic compilation, adaptive
optimization and so on [38, 39]. These mechanisms are triggered implicitly and
can have an enormous impact on measurements. For example:

- Just in Time (JIT) compilation: during the program the same code might
  exhibit very different performance characteristics. The HotSpot compiler
could potentially compile any part of the code at any point during the
runtime. This can happen in the middle of running a benchmark, yielding an inaccurate running time measurement;

- Classloading: JVM has global program information available (unlike a typical compiler). One method may be optimized based on the information in some unrelated method;

- Automatic memory management: the execution of running code can lead to the triggering of garbage collection cycle which changes the observed performance of the code being tested.

To generate better performance measurement, a test protocol has been defined and applied on every test:

- A separate JVM executor is created. Having a separate JVM ensures that only the bare essentials are needed to run the tests. It prevents the JIT compiler from applying some optimizations to the code.

- This executor has a default heap size set to 2GB

- To ensure that the JIT compiler optimized the code appropriately, the tests code monitors the running time during the warmup to dynamically detect if the running time has become stable

- A warmup is done before every test using statistical data analysis such as confidence interval as described in [10]

```
[info] Running test set for Fuzzy4S.membershipfunction, curve Test-0
[info] Starting warmup.
[info] 0. warmup run running time: 60 (covNoGC: NaN, covGC: NaN)
[info] 1. warmup run running time: 60 (covNoGC: NaN, covGC: NaN)
[info] 2. warmup run running time: 60 (covNoGC: NaN, covGC: NaN)
[info] 3. warmup run running time: 60 (covNoGC: NaN, covGC: NaN)
[info] 4. warmup run running time: 60 (covNoGC: NaN, covGC: NaN)
[info] 5. warmup run running time: 60 (covNoGC: NaN, covGC: NaN)
[info] 6. warmup run running time: 60 (covNoGC: NaN, covGC: NaN)
[info] 7. warmup run running time: 60 (covNoGC: NaN, covGC: NaN)
[info] 8. warmup run running time: 60 (covNoGC: NaN, covGC: NaN)
[info] 9. warmup run running time: 60 (covNoGC: NaN, covGC: NaN)
[info] 10. warmup run running time: 60 (covNoGC: NaN, covGC: NaN)
[info] 11. warmup run running time: 60 (covNoGC: NaN, covGC: NaN)
[info] 12. warmup run running time: 60 (covNoGC: NaN, covGC: NaN)
[info] 13. warmup run running time: 60 (covNoGC: NaN, covGC: NaN)
[info] 14. warmup run running time: 60 (covNoGC: NaN, covGC: NaN)
[info] 15. warmup run running time: 60 (covNoGC: NaN, covGC: NaN)
[info] 16. warmup run running time: 60 (covNoGC: NaN, covGC: NaN)
[info] 17. warmup run running time: 60 (covNoGC: NaN, covGC: NaN)
[info] 18. warmup run running time: 60 (covNoGC: NaN, covGC: NaN)
[info] 19. warmup run running time: 60 (covNoGC: NaN, covGC: NaN)
[info] 20. warmup run running time: 60 (covNoGC: NaN, covGC: NaN)
[info] Steady-state detected.
[info] Ending warmup.
```
• 36 repetitions of a measurement for every input size before moving on to benchmarking wider ranges

• a Min aggregator is used to retrieve the minimum running time of all the benchmarks run for each size

5.3.2. Fuzzy4S Measurement

The goal of this section is to determine if Fuzzy4S performs as well as a state-of-the-art fuzzy engine written on the JVM. To do so, Fuzzy4S is compared to JFuzzyLogic, a fuzzy logic framework written in Java.

The performance scenario is described below.

• Use a range generator that generates an inclusive range of integer values. For instance for an x-axis of 10, it generates values 0,1,...,10.

• Use a triangular membership function.

• Calculate the running time of JFuzzyLogic and Fuzzy4S frameworks to parse the membership function and evaluate each value of x for every range

The result of the benchmark in Figure shows, for this request, better performance for Fuzzy4S than JFuzzyLogic, meaning that Fuzzy4S is an efficient fuzzy engine implementation.

5.3.3. Cypherf Measurement

This section aims at evaluating the additional runtime costs (overhead) of Cypherf. This consists of discussing whether or not the extension of Cypher and the use of the Fuzzy4S engine handling fuzzy queries are acceptable. Listing is a pure Cypher query that retrieves hotels’ name whereas query of Listing returns for every hotel its name and the most appropriate price term.

---

*Using 36 measurements increases the probability to have at least 30 measures after removing outliers due to external events (such as garbage collection), which allows us to tighten the confidence interval.*
To better highlight performance measurement of fuzzy runtime overhead, a LIMIT 10 clause has been added. Indeed, the deserialization of query results is an important part of the overall time of each query.

Listing 27: Pure Cypher query in Neo4j

```cypher
MATCH (h:Hotel) RETURN h.name LIMIT 10
```

Listing 28: Cypherf query on Neo4j-Fuzzy

```cypher
MATCH (h:Hotel)
WITH h, h.price as price
RETURN h.name, head(fuzzyLT("/opt/research/data/price.fl", price))
LIMIT 10
```

Figure 25 shows that there is no major difference between Cypher and Cypherf execution. The additional cost of using fuzzy statements with Cypherf is thus compatible with the use of NoSQL graph databases.

Figure 24: Benchmark comparison on 1 million nodes between Fuzzy4S and JFuzzyLogic frameworks
6. Conclusion

Graph databases are becoming more and more used by both scientists and practitioners as the available engines are more and more powerful and scalable. They are used in many application domains, for the industry (e.g., logistics), ecommerce (e.g., ebay delivery service) or social networks (e.g., LinkedIn). Their ability to compute complex queries is a key feature. However, there is not yet any native possibility to compute fuzzy queries.

In this article, we thus introduce the necessary frameworks to support approximate queries in NoSQL graph databases. Fuzzy4S provides a framework via a Domain Specific Language (DSL) to define approximate linguistic variables. This DSL can then be used for querying NoSQL graph databases with Cypherf which extends the existing declarative language to manage approximate queries. Our propositions have been tested, we also have shown that the overhead is low assessing the power of the primitives that have been introduced.

This work opens up many research topics and possibilities. Regarding Big Data, many real-world applications and uses could be challenging for our approach. Fuzzy information may indeed be embedded within the data, especially in the (key; value) properties, as for instance Hotel h1 could be located at around 800 meters from the city center. It is also the case in social networks for all numerical properties on people and organizations (age, salary, size, revenue, etc.) on which various fuzzy variables may be defined depending on the context.
and/or application.

In particular, further work may focus on the definition of complex operations in such a context of schema-less databases, as for instance the definition of the *SimilarTo* function on nodes that have to be compared while they may have disjoint sets of properties.

Moreover, Fuzzy4S and Cypherf may be used to retrieve fuzzy linguistic summaries from large NoSQL databases. Such approaches require to apply complex queries and will better highlight the power of graph databases (e.g., paths).
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CREATE (h:Hotel { name: "Hotel BW", location: 2534 }), (h2:Hotel { name: "Hotel Camp", location: 45 }), (h3:Hotel { name: "Hotel South", location: 392 })

Query took 3 ms and returned no rows.
Updated the graph - created 3 nodes set 6 properties

Query:
MATCH (h:Hotel)
RETURN h.name, Close(h.location) AS CloseToCenter

Query took 14 ms and returned 3 rows.

Query:
MATCH (h:Hotel)
RETURN h.name, Close(h.location) AS CloseToCenter
ORDER BY CloseToCenter DESC

Query took 2 ms and returned 3 rows.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>DBMS</th>
<th>Database Model</th>
<th>Score Nov 2015</th>
<th>Score Oct 2015</th>
<th>Score Nov 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Neo4j</td>
<td>Graph DBMS</td>
<td>34.04</td>
<td>+0.63</td>
<td>+9.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Titan</td>
<td>Graph DBMS</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>+0.54</td>
<td>+3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>OrientDB</td>
<td>Multi-model</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>+0.57</td>
<td>+3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>ArangoDB</td>
<td>Multi-model</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>+0.13</td>
<td>+1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Giraph</td>
<td>Graph DBMS</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>+0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>AllegroGraph</td>
<td>Multi-model</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>+0.01</td>
<td>+0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Stardog</td>
<td>Multi-model</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>+0.02</td>
<td>+0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Sqrrl</td>
<td>Multi-model</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>+0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>InfiniteGraph</td>
<td>Graph DBMS</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>+0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Sparksee</td>
<td>Graph DBMS</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>HyperGraphDB</td>
<td>Graph DBMS</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>+0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>InfoGrid</td>
<td>Graph DBMS</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>+0.00</td>
<td>+0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>VelocityGraph</td>
<td>Graph DBMS</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>+0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>GlobalsDB</td>
<td>Multi-model</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>+0.02</td>
<td>+0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>FlockDB</td>
<td>Graph DBMS</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>+0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>GraphDB</td>
<td>Multi-model</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>+0.06</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>GraphBase</td>
<td>Graph DBMS</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>+0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Blazegraph</td>
<td>Multi-model</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Amisa Server</td>
<td>Multi-model</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>±0.00</td>
<td>±0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>PEG notation</td>
<td>Scala notation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literal string</td>
<td>/ /</td>
<td>“ “</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literal string</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>“ “</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character class</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>&quot;[ ]“.r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any character</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>“.”.r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouping</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>e?</td>
<td>(e?) or opt(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-or-more</td>
<td>e*</td>
<td>(e*) or rep(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-or-more</td>
<td>e+</td>
<td>(e+) or repl1(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And-predicate</td>
<td>&amp;e</td>
<td>guard(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not-predicate</td>
<td>!e</td>
<td>not(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td>e₁ e₂</td>
<td>e₁ ~ e₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritized Choice</td>
<td>e₁ / e₂</td>
<td>e₁</td>
<td>e₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hotel.name</td>
<td>distance.name</td>
<td>price.name</td>
<td>minR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h1</td>
<td>far</td>
<td>cheap</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h2</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>cheap</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h5</td>
<td>close</td>
<td>expensive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h4</td>
<td>close</td>
<td>midPrice</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h3</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>midPrice</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h3</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>cheap</td>
<td>0.3333333333333337</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h3</td>
<td>close</td>
<td>midPrice</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h3</td>
<td>close</td>
<td>cheap</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h4</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>midPrice</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h1</td>
<td>far</td>
<td>midPrice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h1</td>
<td>far</td>
<td>expensive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h1</td>
<td>close</td>
<td>cheap</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h1</td>
<td>close</td>
<td>midPrice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h1</td>
<td>close</td>
<td>expensive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h1</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>cheap</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h1</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>midPrice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
$ \text{Match (h:Hotel) WITH h as hotel, h.price as hotelPrice, h.distance as hotelDistance WITH hotel, FuzzyLT("/tmp/distance.fl...}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hotel.name</th>
<th>distance.name</th>
<th>price.name</th>
<th>minR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>h3</td>
<td>close</td>
<td>cheap</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h1</td>
<td>close</td>
<td>cheap</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h2</td>
<td>close</td>
<td>cheap</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h4</td>
<td>close</td>
<td>cheap</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h5</td>
<td>close</td>
<td>cheap</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Returned 5 rows in 78 ms.
```sql
$ Match (h:Hotel) WITH h as hotel, h.price as hotelPrice, h.distance as hotelDistance WITH hotel, FuzzyLT("/tmp/distance.fl...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hotel.name</th>
<th>distance.name</th>
<th>price.name</th>
<th>minR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>h4</td>
<td>close</td>
<td>midPrice</td>
<td>0.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h3</td>
<td>close</td>
<td>midPrice</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h1</td>
<td>close</td>
<td>midPrice</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h2</td>
<td>close</td>
<td>midPrice</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h5</td>
<td>close</td>
<td>midPrice</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Returned 5 rows in 1084 ms.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>DBMS</th>
<th>Database Model</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Neo4j</td>
<td>Graph DBMS</td>
<td>38.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Microsoft Azure Cosmos DB</td>
<td>Multi-model</td>
<td>7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>OrientDB</td>
<td>Multi-model</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Titan</td>
<td>Graph DBMS</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>ArangoDB</td>
<td>Multi-model</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Virtuoso</td>
<td>Multi-model</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Giraph</td>
<td>Graph DBMS</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>AllegroGraph</td>
<td>Multi-model</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Stardog</td>
<td>Multi-model</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>GraphDB</td>
<td>Multi-model</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Sqrrl</td>
<td>Multi-model</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Graph Engine</td>
<td>Multi-model</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>InfiniteGraph</td>
<td>Graph DBMS</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Blazegraph</td>
<td>Multi-model</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Dgraph</td>
<td>Graph DBMS</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>JanusGraph</td>
<td>Graph DBMS</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Sparksee</td>
<td>Graph DBMS</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>FlockDB</td>
<td>Graph DBMS</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>HyperGraphDB</td>
<td>Graph DBMS</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>InfoGrid</td>
<td>Graph DBMS</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Query ::= Prologue ( QueryType SelectQuery | ConstructQuery | DescribeQuery | AskQuery )
QueryType ::= '#FQ#' | #top-k FQ# with k
Constraint ::= BrackettedExpression | BuiltInCall | FunctionCall |
| FlexibleExpression
FlexibleExpression ::= FuzzyTermExpression | FuzzyOperatorExpression
FuzzyTermExpression ::= (Var ['=', '!=', '>', '>=', '<', '<='] FuzzyTerm)? [with threshold]
FuzzyOperatorExpression ::= Var FuzzyOperator NumericLiteral
FuzzyOperator ::= (Modifier)*FuzzyOperator
FuzzyTerm ::= FuzzyTerm and FuzzyTerm | FuzzyTerm or FuzzyTerm |
| not FuzzyTerm | ModifiedFuzzyTerm
ModifiedFuzzyTerm ::= (Modifier)* ModifiedFuzzyTerm | (Modifier)* SimpleFuzzyTerm
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership function</th>
<th>Scala code</th>
<th>DSL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PieceWise</td>
<td>PieceWiseMembershipFunction(List(ValuePoint(0,1), ValuePoint(2,1), ValuePoint(4,0)))</td>
<td>(0,1) (2,1) (4,0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangular</td>
<td>TriangularMembershipFunction(0,2.5,5)</td>
<td>trian 0 2.5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapezoidal</td>
<td>TrapezoidalMembershipFunction(0,2,3,4)</td>
<td>trape 0 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigmoidal</td>
<td>SigmoidalMembershipFunction(-4, 3)</td>
<td>sigm -4 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singleton</td>
<td>SingletonMembershipFunction(SingletonPoint(2))</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```sql
$ match (h:Hotel) return h.name, fuzzyLT("/tmp/price.fl", h.price)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>h.name</th>
<th>fuzzyLT(&quot;/tmp/price.fl&quot;, h.price)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>h1</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h2</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Returned 5 rows in 77 ms.
```sql
$ match (h:Hotel) with h, h.price as price return h.name, head(fuzzyLT("/tmp/price.fl", price))
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>head(fuzzyLT(&quot;/tmp/price.fl&quot;, price))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>h1</td>
<td>name: cheap, degree: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h2</td>
<td>name: cheap, degree: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h3</td>
<td>name: midPrice, degree: 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h4</td>
<td>name: midPrice, degree: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Returned 5 rows in 77 ms.
```plaintext
$ match (h:Hotel) with h, h.price as price return h.name, head(fuzzyLT("/tmp/price.fl", price)).name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>h.name</th>
<th>head(fuzzyLT(&quot;/tmp/price.fl&quot;, price)).name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>h1</td>
<td>cheap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h2</td>
<td>cheap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h3</td>
<td>midPrice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h4</td>
<td>midPrice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h5</td>
<td>expensive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Returned 5 rows in 49 ms.
```
$ match {h:Hotel} with h. h.price as price With h, head(fuzzyLT("/tmp/price.fl", price)) as priceTerm set h.priceCat = priceTerm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>h.priceCat</th>
<th>collect(h.name)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cheap</td>
<td>[h1, h2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expensive</td>
<td>[h5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>midPrice</td>
<td>[h3, h4]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Set 10 properties, returned 3 rows in 719 ms.
```
$ match (hi:Host) WITH h, fuzzy("41200,1\) (2000,0)", h.distance) as distance return h.name, distance order by distance desc
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>h.name</th>
<th>distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>h5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h4</td>
<td>0.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Returned 5 rows in 64 ms.
```
$ match (h:Hotel) WITH h, fuzzy("(1200,1) (2000,0)", h.distance) as distance return h.name, distance order by distance desc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>h.name</th>
<th>distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>h5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h4</td>
<td>0.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Returned 5 rows in 64 ms.
```
```
MATCH (h:Hotel) WITH h, fuzzy("(1200,1) (2000,0)", h.distance) as distance
WHERE distance > 0.8
RETURN h.name, distance
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>h.name</th>
<th>distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>h5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h4</td>
<td>0.875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Returned 2 rows in 45 ms.
MATCH (h:Hotel)-[:LOCATED]->(c:City)
RETURN h, CLOSE(h,c) AS ClosenessToCityCenter
ORDER BY ClosenessToCityCenter DESC
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