

# Peer Responses.

## 1. To Dominic Lambert

Re: Initial Post

by Anastasia Rizzo - Friday, 27 October 2023, 11:23 PM

Peer Response.

Dominic,

I wholeheartedly concur with the observation regarding the paramount importance of familiarity when selecting ontology frameworks. It's a sentiment that resonates with my own experiences and understanding of how individuals often navigate their tool choices.

The comfort of using a tool with which one is already familiar is not to be underestimated. In practice, I've seen this preference play out countless times. Individuals and teams tend to gravitate toward tools they've used before, even when presented with potentially more advanced or feature-rich options. The reasons for this are multifaceted. There's the natural resistance to change and the time investment required to become proficient with a new tool. Additionally, there may be business or academic constraints that make learning a new tool less feasible. This inclination to "shoe-horn" one's work through a familiar yet potentially inferior product is a common occurrence.

Familiarity often outweighs considerations of whether a tool is the best fit for a specific task. This is particularly true for those who've been introduced to a particular ontology framework as their first language, such as Protégé. It's a tool that's widely known and used, despite its interface and functionality possibly being perceived as somewhat archaic.

It's a practical consideration that highlights the human element in decision-making and reinforces the need for user-friendly and intuitive tools in the field of ontology engineering.

References:

Kalibatiene, D. & Vasilecas, O. (2011) Survey on Ontology Languages. Lecture Notes in Business Information Processing. 90. 124-141.

Liberatore, M. J., & Pollack-Johnson, B. (2003) Factors influencing the usage and selection of project management software. IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management, 50(2), 164-174.

## 2. To Astrid van Toor

Re: Initial Post

by Anastasia Rizzo - Friday, 27 October 2023, 11:20 PM

Peer Response.

Astrid,

I appreciate your perspective in the post, and I would like to express my agreement with two key points you've made. Interestingly, these points align closely with my own views:

Your observation regarding the versatility of OWL2, with its comprehensive profiles and enhanced capabilities, is well-founded. This adaptability is indeed a critical advantage, making it a suitable choice for a wide range of web-based ontology applications, and I share this viewpoint.

I agree with your point about OWL2's integration with the web. The fact that OWL2 includes RDF mappings for smooth integration is a significant advantage, especially in the context of the Semantic Web. I also see this integration as a key factor in making OWL2 a robust choice.

Your analysis underscores the importance of considering OWL2 as a powerful and adaptable ontology language, particularly when focusing on the requirements of web-based software agents, and I find myself in agreement with these points.

References:

Kalibatiene, D. & Vasilecas, O. (2011) Survey on Ontology Languages. Lecture Notes in Business Information Processing. 90. 124-141.

RDF Working Group (2014) Resource Description Framework (RDF). Available from: <https://www.w3.org/RDF/> [Accessed 25 October].

W3C (2004) OWL Web Ontology Language Overview. Available from:  
<https://www.w3.org/TR/owl-features/#:~:text=OWL%20Full%20can%20be%20viewed,Lite%20or%20OWL%20DL%20document> [Accessed 25 October].

W3C (2012) OWL 2 Web Ontology Language Document Overview (Second Edition).  
Available from: <https://www.w3.org/TR/owl2-overview/> [Accessed 25 October].