IOSR Journal of Engineering (IOSRJEN) **www.iosrjen.org**
ISSN (e): 2250-3021, ISSN (p): 2278-8719
Vol. 08, Issue 12 (December. 2018), ||V (II) || PP 01-03

Using ontologies within the knowledge interpretation

KatarínaZábovská, Boris Bučko, Michal Zábovský
University of Žilina, Faculty ofManagement Science and Informatics, Žilina, Slovakia
Corresponding Author: KatarínaZábovská

Abstract: The most intuitive form of description of the world for people is natural language. Situations, relationships, real or abstract objects are assigned to expressions (words, phrases), by which they distinguish between them. The advantage of natural language is the ability to describe the object for which we do not know the exact phrase, by combining familiar words. We tend to use native language to describe world around us. But what happens when we try to extract information from the written sources? We soon realise that we need to identify the context based on relationships between the written expressions. This paper considers using ontology for knowledge interpretation.

Keywords: descriptive logic, knowledge, knowledgebase, ontology.

Date of Submission: 29-11-2018 Date of acceptance: 13-12-2018

I. WORLD DESCRIPTION AND ONTOLOGY

In order to properly extract information from hearing or reading the data, we need to know not only the meaning (semantics) of words, but also the context. This means identifying the contents on the basis of relations between terms. Such a method of data handling is quite natural for people, because throughout life we learn the semantics of words, while we create the context (relations) between them. This way, we build intelligent dictionary of terms in your brain, which we might call knowledge base. Using the adopted logical system, we can derive new knowledge from the existing remembered facts, which have not been explicitly expressed.

The term "ontology" has its origins in philosophy where it is used in the context of the question of existence and being as a whole. "What is?", "What does it mean to be?", "What is the meaning of existence?" - These are questions which address ontology in philosophy. At first glance it might seem that this is an abstract topic and there is no room for ontology in the informatics and information systemsdevelopment but that is not true.

According to the definition often used by an American scientist in the field of knowledge-based systems and artificial intelligence Gruber [1] ontology is an explicit specialization of conceptualization. The term conceptualization generally expresses a system of terms and concepts which model the specific part of the world. Specification of the conceptualization must be explicitly expressed. Another definition by Gruber says that ontology is a specification represented by dictionary that is used for sharing discussions about the domain: definition of classes, relations, functions and other objects.

II. DESCRIPTIVE LOGIC

In Descriptive logic (DL) the model of the world can be understood as a set of concepts and a set of roles (relationships between concepts). All concepts and relations form a set, called the domain. Each concept is a subset of the domain and semantic relationships define relations in this domain. Among the concepts there are always included: the universal concept (and non-existent concept (). Each concept is more specific than universal concept and more general than non-existent concept. Description of objects in this way is largely simplified, and therefore it is called the model.

Formally is DL based on predicate e logic, with the modified language, which is sufficient for the purposes of modelling and also has good computational properties, such as decidability, or clarity. It is important to note that DL is widely recognized and mathematically correct approach. Knowledge representation through DL is divided into two basic, interrelated components: [2]

1. **TBox** (Terminology Box) contains terminology used in a given domain. It introduces all the concepts, defining their characteristics and role hierarchy between them. Principally, TBox can be compared to a database schema.
2. **ABox** (Assertions Box) contains statements about individuals with the terminology of TBOX and there are assigned to concepts. Individuality is a specific instance of the concept. Concepts, therefore describe the

role of the individual and the roles describe relations between individualities. ABox can be compared to a database instance with the appropriate data.

In view of the presumption of validity of the missing information in the description of model, there are two different general approaches. One is closed world assumption and the other is assumption of an open world. Open world assumption is an important starting point for an understanding of DL, but so far closed world assumption was widely spread.

Closed world assumption (CWA Closed World Assumption) is essentially the assumption that anything that is not currently known is not valid. CWA envisages that all relevant arguments are contained in formal knowledge system, so any claim that is true in the modelled world, can be formally deduced from the formally stored facts. This approach is currently the most often applied one in various information systems. Theory (and not only the scientific theory) is however rarely complete. This is way there is an alternative approach **open world assumption** (OWA Open World Assumption). OWA assumes that from the missing data are not automatically invalid. [3]

Open world assumption is rather unusual, but for a proper understanding of the principle of DL it is necessary to acquire it. One of its properties is the presumption of overlapping concepts. From the statement "Peter is a man" it cannot be automatically implied that Peter is not a woman. In order to be able to say that Peter is not a woman, it is necessary to specify that Man and Woman are disjoint concepts.

III. STORING KNOWLEDGE WITHIN THE ONTOLOGY

On the standard information system, it is possible to look from the perspective of layers: a data, logic and presentation layer. Using formalized means such as DL, it is possible to define the ontological layer that adds semantics to the data in the data layer and combines them in a common concept. Its purpose is making the most accurate explicit definition of the intended model with respect to modelled reality. This means that the language and implementation independent concepts of the selected domain that form an abstract domain structure (fixed frame) must be expressed by user in the chosen formalism. Ontology is in this sense the most general fundament al knowledge base in the studied domain.

Descriptive logic allows us to mathematically formulate the area of interest, but itself it is not a computer language. The terms and means of the conceptual model can be represented through a range of different languages. There are several ontology languages (OWL, RDF, CYCL, OBO, SCL, LOOM, OWL / RDF), which are used for different types of ontologies. [4]

OWL language, just like RDF, is designed to provide the means for defining classes, their properties and relations. RDF however provides only the most basic of those resources. OWL is in some versions equipped with the means of descriptive logic and thus allows the expression of restrictions on classes and provides other means for defining classes and reasoning base d on a logical basis. The basic domain, which generated ontology concerns, forms classes arranged in hierarchical structures (taxonomy). Each element is representing the object of the real world belongs to a universal class (top concept) owl:Thing. The concept oriented representation, which has the character of a multidimensional hierarchy, has also the empty class owl:Nothing, which represents an absurd concept.

Language OWL uses a standardized XML format, which because of the general prevalence allows easy sharing and transferring of knowledge between different platforms (operating systems, software tools, programming languages, etc.). [5]

IV. STORING KNOWLEDGE WITHIN THE ONTOLOGY

Working with knowledge is not only about the storage and representation, but also about the access. It is very closely linked to the issue of mapping, which can be seen at several levels:

- At the level of modelling it is a mapping of ER model into the conceptual model
- At a formal transcript level, it can be seen as the conversion between relational data models and formal ontology
- at the implementation level it is mapping of a relational database schema into RDF schema or OWL
- and it can be also seen as mapping of the individual database instances into the instances of OWL and RDF. To access the ontological knowledge, SPARQL language can be used. It is partly like database query language SQL. If the ontology is based on the DL, it is possible to use a language SPARQL DL. There are several tools designed to create documents defining OWL ontologies for specific domains. One of them is the Protege tool developed at the Stanford University School of Medicine, which besides the main functionality (ontology editor) includes the possibility to visualize the ontology, to gain additional knowledge by means of automatic reasoning of ontologies, and questions over created OWL using the SPARQL language. [6]

V. CONCLUSION

The issue of storing knowledge is very broad and open. Our proposed approach of using ontologies based on the principle of D L is one of the solutions based on current options. Given the growing need for data and information processing in the context it is very likely that the future will bring completely different and effective approaches.

AKNOWLEDGEMENT

This paper is supported by the followingproject: University Science Park of the University ofZilina – II. phase (ITMS: 313011D013) supported bythe The Operational Programme Research andInnovation funded by the European RegionalDevelopment Fund.

REFERENCES

[1]. Gruber, 1992. [Online]. Available: http://www-ksl.stanford.edu/kst/what-is-an-ontology.html.
[2]. M. O bitko, „Introduction to Ontologies and Semantic Web,“ 2006 2007. [Online]. Available: http://www.obitko.com/tutorials/ontologies semantic web/description logics.html). [Cit. 14 10 2013]
[3]. H. H. T. Z. V. M. Lukasová A., Formální reprezentace znalostí, O strava: Ostravská univerzita v Ostravě, 2010.
[4]. S. D. Maniraj V., „Ontology Languages A Review,“ International Journal of Computer Theory and Engineering, zv. Vol.2, %1. vyd.No.6, 2010.
[5]. „Semantic Web,“W3C, [Online]. Available: http://www.w3.org/standards/semanticweb/. [Cit. 14 10 2013].
[6]. „protégé,“ Stanford Center for Biomedical Informatics Research, 2013. [Online]. Available: http://protege.stanford.edu/. [Cit. 14 10 2013].J. D. Poston and W. D. H orne, “Discontiguous OFDM considerations for dynamic spectrum access in idel TV channels,” in Proc. IEEE DySPAN, 2005.

KatarínaZábovská. "Using ontologies within the knowledge interpretation."IOSR Journal of Engineering (IOSRJEN), vol. 08, no. 12, 2018, pp. 01-03.