

TU Vienna

2007 Winter Semester
End of Semester Examination

ESW

Einführung ins Semantic Web

Time: 2.0 Hours
Date of Examination: January 28th, 2008

SID:

Instructions to the Candidate:

- **Please ensure that your student id number is filled in on this cover!**
- Answer all questions in this booklet in the spaces provided.
- The size of the empty space reflects roughly the expectation on the length of your answer.
- You may use any course material.
- For multiple-choice questions any number of correct answers is possible (zero, 1, ..., all).
- Text questions must be answered in a few sentences.
- If you run out of space, you can use the empty page on the left.

Question 1**(10%)**

Formalize each of the following statements into description logic (DL). When a particular statement (or a part of it) cannot be fully expressed in DL, explain why not.

- Someone is a CATOWNER if he (or she) owns at least one CAT.
- sackpicker is a CAT.
- Always when someone is a CATOWNER he must be a CATLOVER.
- If a particular person loves a particular cat, then that person also owns that cat.
- A DOGLOVER is a PERSON who owns only DOGS as an ANIMAL (and not a single CAT, which is also an ANIMAL).

Question 2**(10%)**

In Topic Maps the identification of subjects is done with subject identifiers (sometimes called *indicators*) and/or subject locators (sometimes called the *addresses*). Explain how these relate to the identification of resources in RDF.

- *subject identifiers*:

- *subject address*:

Question 3**(9%)**

Consider the following T-box:

```

Bundesland    a        owl:Class ;
              owl:oneOf (:Wien :Burgenland :Salzburg) .

:Person       a        owl:Class .

:istHauptGemeldet
  a          owl:ObjectProperty ;
  rdfs:domain :Person .

:Wiener       a        owl:Class ;
  rdfs:subClassOf :Person ;
  rdfs:subClassOf
    [ a        owl:Restriction ;
      owl:onProperty :istHauptGemeldet ;
      owl:someValuesFrom
        [ a        owl:Class ;
          owl:oneOf (:Wien)
        ]
    ] .

:NichtWiener  a        owl:Class ;
  rdfs:subClassOf :Person ;
  owl:equivalentClass
    [ a        owl:Class ;
      owl:complementOf :Wiener
    ] .

:Oesterreicher a        owl:Class ;
  rdfs:subClassOf :Person ;
  owl:equivalentClass
    [ a        owl:Class ;
      owl:unionOf (:Wiener :NichtWiener)
    ] .

```

- Is it inconsistent? Justify your answer (e.g. by finding a model).

- If it is consistent, does it have another serious problem? Justify your answer.

Question 5**(10%)**

Given the following ontology (together with some instance data)

```
@prefix :      <http://www.whatever.com/#> .

:Person       a      owl:Class .

:Opus         a      owl:Class .

:Painting     a      owl:Class ; rdfs:subClassOf :Opus .

:MasterPiece  a      owl:Class ; rdfs:subClassOf :Painting .

:hasCreated   a      owl:ObjectProperty .

:hasPainted   a      owl:ObjectProperty ; rdfs:subPropertyOf :hasCreated .

:Genius       a      owl:Class ; rdfs:subClassOf :Person ;
              owl:equivalentClass
                [ a      owl:Restriction ;
                  owl:onProperty :hasCreated ;
                  owl:someValuesFrom :MasterPiece
                ] .

:VanGogh      a      :Person ; :hasPainted :TheOldMill .

:TheOldMill   a      :MasterPiece .
```

- If the SPARQL query

```
SELECT ?person
WHERE {
  ?person a <http://www.whatever.com/#Genius>
}
```

is used with software (such as Redland libRDF) which does not support DL inferencing, what would be the expected result?

- If you **have to** use, say, Redland, but you need inferencing, what are your technical options? Describe at least one.

Question 6**(15%)**

Translate the following DL formulas into FOL (predicate logic):

- $\text{CATLOVER} \equiv \exists \text{loves.CAT} \sqcap \text{PERSON}$
- $\text{CATHATERS} \sqsubseteq \text{PERSON} \sqcap \neg \text{CATLOVER}$
- $\forall \text{loves.CAT} \sqsupseteq \exists \text{hates.DOG}$

Translate the following FOL formulas into DL:

- $\forall d \in \text{DOG} : \forall p \in \text{PERSON} : \text{loves}(d, p) \Rightarrow \text{loves}(p, d)$
- $\forall c \in \text{CAT} : \exists p \in \text{PERSON} : \text{loves}(c, p) \Rightarrow \text{loves}(p, c)$

Question 7**(15%)**

Regarding property characteristics in OWL:

- If you tag a property p as *symmetric* and *functional*, what are the consequences for the property and the connected nodes, if any?
- If you tag a property p as *symmetric* and *inverse functional*, what are the consequences for the property and the connected nodes, if any?
- If you tag a property p as *transitive* and *functional*, what are the consequences for the property and the connected nodes, if any?

Question 8

(10%)

Given the following RDF triples, how would that translate into a topic map? Draw a diagram and label all nodes and arcs appropriately.

```
:rho isa :Person .
```

```
:sacklpicker isa :Cat .
```

```
:rho :owns :sacklpicker .
```

Question 9

(12%)

Ad SPARQL:

- The query result is a single boolean value if ASK instead of SELECT is used. Under which circumstances can (should) ASK be preferred over the more generic SELECT?
- You cannot write `SELECT ... WHERE { NOT $p a foaf:Person } .` Why not?
- Describe a use case for using several data sets.

End of Paper.