

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 P08: Missing annotations.

3 cases

Minor

This pitfall consists in creating an ontology element and failing to provide human readable annotations attached to it. Consequently, ontology elements lack annotation properties that label them (e.g. rdfs:label, lemon:LexicalEntry, skos:prefLabel or skos:altLabel) or that define them (e.g. rdfs:comment or dc:description). This pitfall is related to the guidelines provided in [5].

- The following elements have neither rdfs:label or rdfs:comment (nor skos:definition) defined:
 - > <http://www.ontologydesignpatterns.org/cp/owl/collectionentity.owl#Collection>
 - > <http://www.ontologydesignpatterns.org/cp/owl/agentrole.owl#Role>
 - > <http://www.ontologydesignpatterns.org/cp/owl/agentrole.owl#Agent>

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 P11: Missing domain or range in properties. 1 case 1 case

Important

Object and/or datatype properties without domain or range (or none of them) are included in the ontology.

- This pitfall appears in the following elements:

> <http://www.example.org/ontology/hospital#isPartOf>

- **Tip:** Solving this pitfall may lead to new results for other pitfalls and suggestions. We encourage you to solve all cases when needed and see what else you can get from OOPS!

Results for P13: Inverse relationships not explicitly declared.

25 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.

- OOPS! has the following suggestions for the relationships without inverse:

> <http://www.example.org/ontology/hospital#hasArticle> could be inverse of
<http://www.example.org/ontology/hospital#isPartOfCollection>
> <http://www.example.org/ontology/hospital#hasMember> could be inverse of
<http://www.example.org/ontology/hospital#memberOf>
> <http://www.example.org/ontology/hospital#hasWrittenEvaluation> could be inverse of
<http://www.example.org/ontology/hospital#providedBy>
> <http://www.example.org/ontology/hospital#evaluates> could be inverse of
<http://www.example.org/ontology/hospital#hasEvaluationStatement>
<http://www.example.org/ontology/hospital#hasEvaluationStatement>

- Sorry, OOPS! has no suggestions for the following relationships without inverse:

> <http://www.example.org/ontology/hospital#hasUnion>
> <http://www.example.org/ontology/hospital#hasStudyPeriod>
> <http://www.example.org/ontology/hospital#presentedArticle>
> <http://www.example.org/ontology/hospital#hasAuthor>
> <http://www.example.org/ontology/hospital#locatedIn>
> <http://www.example.org/ontology/hospital#hasMedicalDegree>
> <http://www.example.org/ontology/hospital#represents>
> <http://www.example.org/ontology/hospital#hasEmployment>
> <http://www.example.org/ontology/hospital#studiesFor>
> <http://www.example.org/ontology/hospital#hasMembershipPeriod>
> <http://www.example.org/ontology/hospital#hasRole>
> <http://www.example.org/ontology/hospital#hasDegree>
> <http://www.example.org/ontology/hospital#takesPlaceAt>
> <http://www.example.org/ontology/hospital#roleInUnion>
> <http://www.example.org/ontology/hospital#isPartOf>
> <http://www.example.org/ontology/hospital#employedAt>
> <http://www.example.org/ontology/hospital#isLocatedIn>

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

1 case
1 case

Critical

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://www.example.org/ontology/hospital#employedAt>

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 conformance 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). ▼
- [12] Vatant, B. (2012). ▼

Enter your ontology to scan:

Enter a URI:

Example: 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
P37. Ontology not available
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)},
  pages={7--34},
  year={2014},
  publisher={IGI Global}
}
```



Escuela Técnica
Superior de
Ingenieros Informáticos

[María Poveda](#)

Contact email: oops(at)delicias.dia.fi.upm.es. Latest revision April 2021



Universidad
Politécnica
de Madrid