

# Evaluation results

There are three levels of importance in pitfalls according to their impact on the ontology:

- **Critical** It is crucial to correct the pitfall. Otherwise, it could affect the ontology consistency, reasoning, applicability, etc.
- **Important** Though not critical for ontology function, it is important to correct this type of pitfall.
- **Minor** It is not really a problem, but by correcting it we will make the ontology nicer.

Pitfalls detected:

## Results for P04: Creating unconnected ontology elements. 1 case    1 case    Minor

Ontology elements (classes, object properties and datatype properties) are created isolated, with no relation to the rest of the ontology.

- This pitfall appears in the following elements:  
  > <http://example.org/articlecollection#PublicationDate>

## Results for P05: Defining wrong inverse relationships. 2 cases    Critical

Two relationships are defined as inverse relations when they are not necessarily inverse.

- This pitfall appears in the following elements:  
  > <http://example.org/hospital#hasHospital> may not be inverse of <http://example.org/hospital#locatedIn>  
  > <http://example.org/hospital#hasCity> may not be inverse of <http://example.org/hospital#locatedIn>

## Results for P10: Missing disjointness. Ontology\*    Important

The ontology lacks disjoint axioms between classes or between properties that should be defined as disjoint. This pitfall is related with the guidelines provided in [6], [2] and [7].

\*This pitfall applies to the ontology in general instead of specific elements.

## Results for P12: Equivalent properties not explicitly declared. 14 cases

Important

The ontology lacks information about equivalent properties (owl:equivalentProperty) in the cases of duplicated relationships and/or attributes.

- The following relations could be defined as equivalent:

> <http://example.org/unionrole#hasMemberAt>, <http://example.org/union#hasMemberAt>  
> <http://example.org/union#hasMember>, <http://example.org/unionrole#hasMember>  
> <http://example.org/union#memberOfAt>, <http://example.org/unionrole#memberOfAt>  
> <http://example.org/hospital#employs>, [http://example.org/medical\\_degrees#employs](http://example.org/medical_degrees#employs)  
> <http://example.org/unionrole#atTime>, <http://example.org/union#atTime>  
> [http://example.org/medical\\_degrees#evaluates](http://example.org/medical_degrees#evaluates), <http://example.org/hospital#evaluates>  
> <http://example.org/hospital#hasCity>, <http://example.org/seminar#hasCity>  
> <http://example.org/articlecollection#contains>, [http://example.org/medical\\_degrees#contains](http://example.org/medical_degrees#contains)  
> <http://example.org/seminar#hasHospital>, <http://example.org/hospital#hasHospital>  
> <http://example.org/unionrole#memberOf>, <http://example.org/union#memberOf>  
> [http://example.org/medical\\_degrees#presents](http://example.org/medical_degrees#presents), <http://example.org/seminararticles#presents>

- The following attributes could be defined as equivalent:

> <http://example.org/seminar#hasDate>, <http://example.org/seminararticles#hasDate>  
> [http://example.org/medical\\_degrees#hasEndDate](http://example.org/medical_degrees#hasEndDate), <http://example.org/hospital#hasEndDate>  
> <http://example.org/seminar#hasDate>, <http://example.org/seminararticles#hasDate>  
> [http://example.org/medical\\_degrees#hasEndDate](http://example.org/medical_degrees#hasEndDate), <http://example.org/hospital#hasEndDate>  
> [http://example.org/medical\\_degrees#hasStartDate](http://example.org/medical_degrees#hasStartDate), <http://example.org/hospital#hasStartDate>

## Results for P13: Inverse relationships not explicitly declared. 19 cases

19 cases

Minor

This pitfall appears when any relationship (except for those that are defined as symmetric properties using owl:SymmetricProperty) does not have an inverse relationship (owl:inverseOf) defined within the ontology.

- This pitfall appears in the following elements:

> [http://example.org/medical\\_degrees#starts](http://example.org/medical_degrees#starts)  
> [http://example.org/medical\\_degrees#hasMedicalDegree](http://example.org/medical_degrees#hasMedicalDegree)  
> [http://example.org/medical\\_degrees#presents](http://example.org/medical_degrees#presents)  
> [http://example.org/medical\\_degrees#hasStudyPeriod](http://example.org/medical_degrees#hasStudyPeriod)  
> [http://example.org/medical\\_degrees#contains](http://example.org/medical_degrees#contains)  
> <http://example.org/hospital#evaluates>  
> [http://example.org/medical\\_degrees#unionRepresentative](http://example.org/medical_degrees#unionRepresentative)  
> [http://example.org/medical\\_degrees#studiesFor](http://example.org/medical_degrees#studiesFor)  
> [http://example.org/medical\\_degrees#publishes](http://example.org/medical_degrees#publishes)  
> <http://example.org/union#atTime>  
> <http://example.org/hospital#hasFirstEmployment>  
> <http://example.org/unionrole#atTime>  
> [http://example.org/medical\\_degrees#employs](http://example.org/medical_degrees#employs)  
> [http://example.org/medical\\_degrees#ends](http://example.org/medical_degrees#ends)  
> [http://example.org/medical\\_degrees#evaluates](http://example.org/medical_degrees#evaluates)  
> <http://example.org/unionrole#withinUnion>  
> [http://example.org/medical\\_degrees#hasNursingDegree](http://example.org/medical_degrees#hasNursingDegree)  
> <http://example.org/unionrole#hasRole>  
> <http://example.org/hospital#employs>

## Results for P19: Defining multiple domains or ranges in properties.

Critical

4 cases

The domain or range (or both) of a property (relationships and attributes) is defined by stating more than one rdfs:domain or rdfs:range statements. In OWL multiple rdfs:domain or rdfs:range axioms are allowed, but they are interpreted as conjunction, being, therefore, equivalent to the construct owl:intersectionOf. This pitfall is related to the common error that appears when defining domains and ranges described in [7].

- This pitfall appears in the following elements:
  - > <http://example.org/seminar#takesPlaceAt>
  - > <http://example.org/hospital#employs>
  - > <http://example.org/hospital#locatedIn>
  - > <http://example.org/seminar#hasSeminar>

## Results for P22: Using different naming conventions in the ontology.

Ontology\*

Minor

The ontology elements are not named following the same convention (for example CamelCase or use of delimiters as "-" or "\_"). Some notions about naming conventions are provided in [2].

\*This pitfall applies to the ontology in general instead of specific elements.

## Results for P36: URI contains file extension.

Ontology\*

Minor

This pitfall occurs if file extensions such as ".owl", ".rdf", ".ttl", ".n3" and ".rdffoxml" are included in an ontology URI. This pitfall is related with the recommendations provided in [9].

\*This pitfall applies to the ontology in general instead of specific elements.

### Suggestions or warnings:

According to the highest importance level of pitfall found in your ontology the conformace badge suggested is "Critical pitfalls" (see below). You can use the following HTML code to insert the badge within your ontology documentation:



```
<p>
<a href="http://oops.linkeddata.es">
</a>
</p>
```

## References

[1] Aguado-De Cea, G., Montiel-Ponsoda, E., Poveda-Villalón, M., and Giraldo-Pasmin, O.X. (2015). ▼

[2] Noy, N. F., McGuinness, D. L., et al. (2001). ▼

[3] Gómez-Pérez, A. (1999). ▼

[4] Montiel-Ponsoda, E., Vila Suero, D., Villazón-Terrazas, B., Dunsire, G., Escolano Rodríguez, E., Gómez-Pérez, A. (2011). ▼

[5] Vrandecic, D. (2010). ▼

[6] Gómez-Pérez, A. (2004). ▼

[7] Rector, A., Drummond, N., Horridge, M., Rogers, J., Knublauch, H., Stevens, R., Wang, H., and Wroe, C. (2004). ▼

[8] Hogan, A., Harth, A., Passant, A., Decker, S., and Polleres, A. (2010). ▼

[9] Archer, P., Goedertier, S., and Loutas, N. (2012). ▼

[10] Bernes-Lee Tim. (2006). ▼

[11] Heath, T. and Bizer, C. (2011). ▼

Enter your ontology to scan:

Enter a URI:

Example: [http://oops.linkeddata.es/example/swc\\_2009-05-09.rdf](http://oops.linkeddata.es/example/swc_2009-05-09.rdf)

Enter a direct input:

If you include just RDF code, the following Pitfalls will not be checked:

P36. URI contains file extension

P40. Namespace hijacking

Uncheck this checkbox if you don't want us to keep a copy of your ontology.

Scan

[Advanced evaluation](#)

## How to cite OOPS!

Poveda-Villalón, María, Asunción Gómez-Pérez, and Mari Carmen Suárez-Figueroa. "OOPS!(Ontology Pitfall Scanner!): An on-line tool for ontology evaluation." International Journal on Semantic Web and Information Systems (IJSWIS) 10.2 (2014): 7-34.

BibTex:

```
@article{poveda2014oops,
  title={{OOPS! (Ontology Pitfall Scanner!): An On-line Tool for Ontology Evaluation}},
  author={Poveda-Villal{\'o}n, Mar{\'i}a and G{\'o}mez-P{\'e}rez, Asunci{\'o}n and Su{\'a}rez-Figueroa, Mari Ca},
  journal={International Journal on Semantic Web and Information Systems (IJSWIS)},
  volume={10},
  number={2},
  pages={7--34},
  year={2014},
  publisher={IGI Global}
}
```



Escuela Técnica

María Poveda



Universidad

