

Collaborative discussion 2 – Peer response (Georgios)

Georgios defines an ontology as a set of structural rules for representing concepts to perform logic-based operations, emphasizing its role in enhancing communication between systems and humans. He advocates for OWL2 as the most useful ontology language for WWW software agents, highlighting its rich class categories, enhanced functionalities, and compatibility with semantic web standards. Jaco reinforces this view by referencing Gruber's (1993) definition of ontologies as creating shared understanding and emphasizes OWL2's reasoning capabilities and seamless integration with other semantic web tools, particularly referencing Horrocks et al.'s (2003) work on how OWL2 builds upon earlier semantic web foundations.

While both posts correctly identify OWL2's strengths, they overlook important considerations regarding implementation challenges. Georgios focuses on OWL2's technical capabilities but doesn't address the practical complexity-expressivity tradeoff that Grau et al. (2008) identify as crucial for real-world applications. Jaco appropriately highlights OWL2's reasoning capabilities but doesn't acknowledge that these come with computational costs that can impact scalability. Neither post addresses the ontology alignment challenge that Nasim (2022) identifies as fundamental to achieving interoperability across domains. As Antoniou and van Harmelen (2004) note, even with standardized languages like OWL2, differences in conceptualization across organizations create significant barriers to semantic interoperability.

In sum, it is agreed that OWL2 has technical superiority for expressing ontologies on the WWW, but a more complete analysis would acknowledge the practical challenges of implementation and alignment. As Davis et al. (1993) argue, knowledge representation is fundamentally about creating a "surrogate" for reasoning about the world, and OWL2's formal structure enables this while supporting the machine learning approaches to ontology alignment that Nasim (2022) explores. The key insight missing from both posts is that while OWL2 provides the necessary expressivity and reasoning capabilities, its effective deployment requires careful consideration of computational efficiency, domain-specific requirements, and alignment strategies to bridge semantic heterogeneity across different ontological representations.

References

- Antoniou, G. and van Harmelen, F. (2004) *A Semantic Web Primer*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Davis, R., Shrobe, H. and Szolovits, P. (1993) 'What is a knowledge representation?', *AI magazine*, 14(1), p. 17.
- Grau, B.C. et al. (2008) 'OWL 2: The next step for OWL', *Journal of Web Semantics*, 6(4), pp.309-322.
- Gruber, T.R. (1993) 'A translation approach to portable ontology specifications', *Knowledge Acquisition*, 5(2), pp.199-220.
- Horrocks, I., Patel-Schneider, P.F. and van Harmelen, F. (2003) 'From SHIQ and RDF to OWL: the making of a Web Ontology Language', *Journal of Web Semantics*, 1(1), pp. 7–26.
- Nasim, T.M. (2022) *Improving Ontology Alignment Using Machine Learning Techniques*. Master of Science Thesis. Arizona State University.