

1 RDF and R2RML

1.1 RDF, triples and prefixes

```
@prefix owl: <http://www.w3.org/2002/07/owl#> .
@prefix rdf: <http://www.w3.org/1999/02/22-rdf-syntax-ns#> .
@prefix xsd: <http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema#> .
@prefix rdfs: <http://www.w3.org/2000/01/rdf-schema#> .
@prefix dbo: <http://dbpedia.org/ontology/> .
@prefix dbr: <http://dbpedia.org/resource/> .
@prefix yago: <http://yago-knowledge.org/resource/> .
@prefix foaf: <http://xmlns.com/foaf/> .

dbo:TelevisionShow rdfs:subClassOf dbo:Work .

dbr:How_I_Met_Your_Mother rdf:type dbo:TelevisionShow .

dbr:How_I_Met_Your_Mother rdfs:label "How I Met Your Mother"^^xsd:string .

dbr:How_I_Met_Your_Mother owl:sameAs yago:How_I_Met_Your_Mother .

dbr:How_I_Met_Your_Mother dbo:starring yago:Alyson_Hannigan .

dbr:How_I_Met_Your_Mother foaf:name "How I Met Your Mother"^^xsd:string .
```

Missing prefix: -1

Wrong triple format: -1

Max marks: 4

Min Marks: 0

1.2 Triples for R2RML mapping

(Prefixes not required but welcome)

```
dbr:How_I_Met_Your_Mother rdf:type dbo:TelevisionShow .

dbr:How_I_Met_Your_Mother dbo:numberOfEpisodes "208"^^xsd:integer .

dbr:How_I_Met_Your_Mother dbo:numberOfSeasons "9"^^xsd:integer .
```

```

dbr:How_I_Met_Your_Mother  dbo:/genre  http://dbpedia.org/resource/Romantic_Comedy .

dbr:Modern_Family  rdf:type  dbo:TelevisionShow .

dbr:Modern_Family  dbo:numberOfEpisodes  "159"^^xsd:integer .

dbr:Modern_Family  dbo:numberOfSeasons  "7"^^xsd:integer .

dbr:Modern_Family  dbo:/genre  http://dbpedia.org/resource/Sitcom .

```

Missing/Wrong triple format: -1

Max marks: 6

Min Marks: 0

1.3 R2RML mapping from triples

```

<TriplesMap1> a rr:TriplesMap;
rr:logicalTable [rr:SQLQuery "Select * from PLAYED-ROLE" ];
rr:subjectMap
[
  rr:template "http://dbpedia.org/resource/{Actor}";
] ;
rr:predicateObjectMap
[
  rr:predicate <http://dbpedia.org/ontology/playRole>;
  rr:objectMap [ rr:template "http://dbpedia.org/resource/{Role}" ]
] .

```

Syntax errors: -1

Wrong query in logical table: -1

Wrong subject map template: -2

Wrong predicate: -1

Wrong object template: -2

Max marks: 6

Min Marks: 0

1.4 Blank Nodes

(Automatically corrected I hope)

Max marks: 4

Min Marks: it can be negative, not sure if it works in the system.

2 SPARQL

Can be tested with: <https://dbpedia.org/sparql>

2.1 TV shows in 2016

```
SELECT DISTINCT ?show
WHERE{
  [] a dbo:TelevisionEpisode ;
  dbo:releaseDate ?date ;
  dbo:series ?series .
  ?series dbp:showName ?show
  FILTER (?date >= "2016-01-01"^^xsd:date && ?date <= "2016-12-31"^^xsd:date)
}
```

Max marks: 4

Min Marks: 0

Missing DISTINCT: -1

Missing/Wrong FILTER: -1

Missing/Wrong SELECT: -1

Missing/Wrong BGP: -1

Wrong query but good attempt: -3

2.2 Shows with many guests

```
SELECT ?title, count(?guest) as ?num_guests {
  [] a dbo:TelevisionEpisode ;
  dbp:title ?title ;
```

```
    dbo:guest ?guest .
  }
GROUP BY ?title
HAVING (count(?guest)>10)
```

Max marks: 4

Min Marks: 0

Missing COUNT: -1

Missing GROUP BY: -1

Missing HAVING: -1

Missing/Wrong SELECT: -1

Missing/Wrong BGP: -1

Wrong query but good attempt: -3

2.3 Ongoing TV shows

```
CONSTRUCT {
  ?series rdf:type dbo:OngoingTVShow
}
WHERE {
  ?series a dbo:TelevisionShow .
  FILTER NOT EXISTS {?series dbo:completionDate ?date}
}
```

Max marks: 4

Min Marks: 0

Missing CONSTRUCT: -1

Missing/Wrong constructed triples: -1

Missing FILTER NOT EXISTS: -1

Missing/Wrong BGP: -1

Wrong query but good attempt: -3

2.4 long lasting shows

```
SELECT DISTINCT ?series
WHERE {
  {
    ?series a dbo:TelevisionShow .
    ?series dbo:numberOfEpisodes ?numEpisodes .
    FILTER (?numEpisodes>200)
  }
  UNION
  {
    ?series a dbo:TelevisionShow .
    ?series dbo:releaseDate ?rdate .
    ?series dbo:completionDate ?cdate .
    BIND (YEAR(?cdate)-YEAR(?rdate) AS ?duration)
    FILTER (?duration>15)
  }
}
```

Max marks: 4

Min Marks: 0

Missing DISTINCT: -1

Missing/Wrong FILTER: -1

Missing UNION: -2

Missing/Wrong BGP: -1

Use of BIND (optional): +1

Wrong query but good attempt: -3

(*) Other solution: check release date of each episode and keep first and last (using ascending/descending order)

2.5 SPARQL Entailment regimes

Simple entailment: empty

RDF entailment: empty

RDFS schema: dbr:Alyson_Hannigan and dbr:Joe_Manganiello

OWL entailment: dbr:Alyson_Hannigan and dbr:Joe_Manganiello

(*) It is missing "dbr:Josh_Radnor rdf:type Person" so we cannot say anything about "dbr:Josh_Radnor" and "freebase:Josh Radnor"

Max marks: 4

Min Marks: 0

Wrong results for entailment regime: -1

3 RDFS Inference

Triples:

- (1) :Account rdfs:subClassOf :BankService .
- (2) :SavingsAccount rdfs:subClassOf :Account .
- (3) :DebitAccount rdfs:subClassOf :Account .
- (4) :hasAccount rdfs:domain :Customer .
- (5) :hasAccount rdfs:range :Account .
- (6) :hasAccount rdfs:subPropertyOf :hasService .
- (7) :hasSavingsAccount rdfs:subPropertyOf :hasAccount .
- (8) :hasDebitAccount rdfs:subPropertyOf :hasAccount .

- (9) :sa rdf:type :SavingsAccount .
- (10) :sandra :hasSavingsAccount :sa .
- (11) :peter :hasAccount :ba .
- (12) _:x :hasService :service .

Notes on correction:

- Similar, but wrong rule: -0.5 points
- Completely wrong or missing rule: -1 point
- Missing premises in rule application: -1 point
- Missing statement on entailment: -0.5 points

3.1 Type of :sa

- (a1) :sa rdf:type :Account . (2, 9, rdfs9)
- (a2) :sa rdf:type :BankService . (a1, 1, rdfs9)

3.2 Type of :peter

(b1) :peter rdf:type :Customer (4, 11, rdfs2)

3.3 _:y has service

This is not possible to derive, since nothing has itself as service. We could use simple entailment to derive `_:y :hasService _:z` from (12). but we cannot derive that `_:y` and `_:z` denotes the same resource.

3.4 Entailed but not derivable

E.g. `:hasAccount rdfs:range :BankService` is entailed, since the range of `:hasAccount` is a subclass of `:BankService`, but it is not derivable, since there are no RDFS entailment rule deriving a range-statement.

Notes on correction:

Correct triple: +3 points
Correct explanation on non-derivability: +1 point
Correct explanation on entailment: +1 point

3.5 :sandra has account

(c1) `:hasPrivateLoan rdfs:subPropertyOf :hasService . (1, 3, rdfs5)`

(c2) `:sandra :hasService :loan . (c1, 4, rdfs7)`

Notes on correction:

Stating `_:r` cannot be used as predicate: +1 points
Giving derivation with `_:r` as predicate: 1 point

4 Description Logic and OWL

Notes on correction:

Confusing \sqsubseteq and \equiv :	-1 point
Confusing \sqsubseteq and \supseteq :	-1 point
Confusing \sqcap and \sqcup :	-1 point
Wrong or missing \forall or \exists :	-1 point
Missing paranthesis where necessary:	-0.5 points
Missing type (e.g. <i>Computer</i>):	-0.5 points
Confusing individual and class:	-1 point

4.1 Computer, CPU

Manchester: `Computer EquivalentTo hasPart some CPU`
 OWL : `Computer \equiv \exists hasPart.CPU`

4.2 Parts of computer

Manchester: `Computer SubClassOf
 hasPart only (Motherboard or connectedTo some Motherboard)`
 OWL : `Computer \sqsubseteq \forall hasPart.(Motherboard \sqcup \exists connectedTo.Motherboard)`

4.3 Super-computer

Manchester: `Computer and
 ((hasPart min 2 CPU) or (hasPart some (CPU and hasCore min 8 Cores)))
 SubClassOf SuperComputer`
 OWL : `Computer \sqcap (\geq_2 hasPart.CPU \sqcup \exists hasPart.(CPU \sqcap \geq_8 hasCore.Core))
 \sqsubseteq SuperComputer`

4.4 myCPU

Manchester: `(CPU and inverse hasPart some SuperComputer)(myCPU)`
 OWL : `(CPU \sqcap \exists hasPart-.SuperComputer)(myCPU)`

4.5 Connected to itself

Manchester: `connectedTo Self SubClassOf Nothing`
 OWL : `\exists connectedTo.Self \sqsubseteq \perp`

4.6 Not having parts

Manchester: `hasPart o hasCore SubPropertyOf hasCore`
OWL : `hasPart o hasCore \sqsubseteq hasCore`

5 RDF and OWL Semantics

5.1 Blank node semantics

For A to be true in I ($I \models A$), there needs to be a blank node valuation β such that $I, \beta \models A$.

For $I, \beta \models \text{hasFather}(_ : b, _ : c)$ to hold with the given interpretation I , it has to be the case that $\beta(_ : b) = \text{joffrey}$ and $\beta(_ : c) = \text{jaime}$, since there is only that tripe in the interpretation of `hasFather`.

But `jaime` is not in the interpretation of `King`, so with that β , $I, \beta \models \text{King}(_ : c)$ does not hold.

Therefore, there is no β such that I, β make all of A true. And therefore I does not make A true.

5.2 OWL Concept semantics

The interpretation of a concept expression is a subset of the domain.

a) the interpretation of “marriedTo **some** King” is the set $\{\text{cersei}\}$, since `cersei` is the only domain element that has a `marriedTo`-relation to an element of the interpretation of `King`.

The interpretation of “King **or** marriedTo **some** King” is the union of the interpretations of `King` and the previous $\{\text{cersei}\}$, so $\{\text{robert}, \text{cersei}\}$

b) the interpretation of “marriedTo **only** King” is the set of domain elements that are *not* `marriedTo`-related to an element that is not in the interpretation of `King`. Since the interpretation of `King` is $\{\text{robert}\}$, we are looking for domain elements that either have no `marriedTo`-link at all, or one to `robert`. The interpretation is therefore `cersei`, `jaime`, `joffrey`. `robert` is not in the set, since he is married to someone who is not a king.

The interpretation of “King **or** marriedTo **only** King” is the union of the interpretations of `King` and the previous set, so $\{\text{robert}, \text{cersei}, \text{jaime}, \text{joffrey}\}$.

5.3 OWL Axiom semantics

a) King **subClassOf** marriedTo **only** Woman

The interpretation of “marriedTo **only** Woman” is {robert, jaime, joffrey} (cersei is missing, since she is married to someone who is not in the interpretation of Woman). Since the interpretation of King is {robert}, a subset of {robert, jaime, joffrey}, the subclass axiom holds in I.

It is *not* a tautology, since there are OWL DL interpretations where it does not hold. For instance, modify I such that the interpretation of marriedTo also contains the pair <robert,robert>. Then robert is married to someone who is not a woman, and is therefore no longer in the interpretation of “marriedTo **only** Woman”.

b) King **subClassOf** marriedTo **only** owl:Thing

The interpretation of “marriedTo **only** owl:Thing” in *any* interpretation will be the whole domain: there is no way that a resource x can be marriedTo-related to another resource y, and that resource is *not in the interpretation of owl:Thing*. Generally “R **only** owl:Thing” is equivalent to owl:Thing.

So the interpretation of King is a subset of that of “marriedTo **only** owl:Thing”, no matter what the interpretation of King is.

This axiom holds in I as well as any other interpretation. It is an OWL tautology.