# Appendix: OntoPriv Evaluation Process Gabriela Suntaxi, Kelvin Ojeda, Francisco Rodríguez April 2024

In this appendix, you will find the rest of the quantitative and qualitative evaluation process applied to OntoPriv. Here you can see the results obtained when evaluating OntoPriv in its dimensions: Language, Tool, Methodology, Cost, and Design.

### 1 Quantitative evaluation process: Ontometrics

For the Ontology Design dimension, the formulas present in the study "Evaluating the Proposed Public Budget Ontological Model" were used, relying on what was presented in the tool created by the University of Rostock, and the following was obtained:

- Number of classes: 176 classes present on OntoPriv.
- Attribute Richness (AR): applying the formula, it was obtained that the richness of attributes in the developed ontology is 1,875.

$$AR = \frac{|330|}{|176|} = 1.875 \tag{1}$$

• Inheritance Richness (IR): applying the formula, it was obtained that the inheritance richness in the developed ontology is 0.994318.

$$IR = \frac{|175|}{|176|} = 0.994318 \tag{2}$$

• Relationship Richness (RR): applying the formula, it was obtained that the richness of relationships in the developed ontology is 0.435484.

$$RR = \frac{|135|}{|175| + |135|} = 0.435484 \tag{3}$$

# 2 Qualitative evaluation process: OntoMetric

The evaluation process of the remaining dimensions present in OntoMetric and that evaluate OntoPriv as a whole follow the same scoring method present in the main article and since they are qualitative dimensions, compliance or not with the aspects discussed in the different dimensions are subject to the developers' criteria.

#### 2.1 Language Dimension

In this dimension, the language with which OntoPriv was developed is taken into consideration. That being the case, the language to evaluate is OWL. The result of the evaluation is presented below.

Table 1: Results obtained when evaluating OWL

		Language Dimension	
Factor	Characteristic	Sub - Characteristic	Scor
		Allows Instances of Class	1
	Concepts/	Has Metaclasses	1
	Instances/Facts/ Claims	Can Define Classes without Metaclasses	1
		Allows Facts	1
		Allows Claims	0
	Atributes	Can Define Class Attributes	1
		Can Define Instance Attributes	1
		Can Define Local Attributes	1
		Can Define Global Attributes	1
		Can Define Polymorph Attributes	1
		Can Define Exceptions In Attributes	1
		Has Default Attribute Values	0
	Facets	Has Attribute Types	1
		Can Define Cardinality of Attributes	1
		Allows Define Procedural Knowledge	0
		Allows New Facets	1
		Allows Definition of Functions	1
		Arbitrary N-ary Relations	0.5
	Relations	Allows Define Ad-hoc Relations (for this specific purpose)	0.5
Domain		Can Constrain The Type In Relations (Type restriction)	1
Knowledge		Can Constrain The Value in Relations (Type restriction)	1
			1
		Has Operational Definition  Can Deplace Properties in Polations	
		Can Declare Properties in Relations Contain-SubclassOf-Relation	1 1
	Taxonomies	Contain-SubclassOf-Relation Contain-NotSubclassOf-Relation	_
			1
		Can Define Exhaustive Decomposition	1
		Can Define Disjoint Decomposition	1
		Multiple-Subclass-of in Classes	1
		Multiple-Instance-of in Instances	1
	Axioms	Allows Axioms Embedded in Terms	1
		Allows Independent Axioms	1
		Allows Axioms in First Order Logic	1
		Allows Axioms in Second Order Logic	1
	Production Rules	Allows Disjuntives in PRs (Ownership restrictions)	0
		Allows Conjuntives in PRs	0
		Each Rule Has Defined a Chaining Mechanism	0
		Each Rule Has Defined a Priority	0
		Procedures in The Consequent in PRs	0
		Certainty Values in PR	0
	Reasoning Potential	Allows Multiple Inheritance	1
		Allows Monotonous Reasoning	1
		Allows Non Monotonous Reasoning	0
		Makes Exceptions in Inheritance	0
Inference Mechanism		Axioms Keep The Consistency	1
		Execute Procedures	0
		Inference Mechanism in PR	1
	Inference Engine	IE is Sound and Complete	1
		IE Performs Automatic Clasifications	1
		IE Deals Exceptions	1
		IE Deals Multiple Inherance	1
		Allows New Inference Engine	1
Total			39/8

#### 2.2 Tool Dimension

In this dimension, the tool/program with which OntoPriv was developed is taken into consideration. That being the case, the tool/program to evaluate is Protégé. The result of the evaluation is presented below.

Table 2: Results obtained when evaluating Protégé

Tool Dimension		
Factor	Characteristic	Score
	Local Use	1
	Network Use	1
G 1.111.1	Internet-based Use	1
Capabilities	Clarity of User Interface	0.5
	Response Time	0.5
	Reliability	1
	Browsers Shows Whole Information of Terms	0.5
37' 1'	Browser Allows Selection of Detail Level	0.5
Visualization	Browser Shows Taxonomy	1
	Browser Shows Ad-hoc Relations	0
	Tool Builds The Same of Language	1
T7 114 1	Tool Allows Edition in Any Time	1
Edition	Tool Shows Taxonomy Graphically	1
	Tool Allows Definition of New Relations	1
	Tool Allows Independent Use	1
	Tool Supplies Access Interfaces	1
Interaction	Documentation Using Access Interfaces	1
	Access Interfaces are OpenSource	1
	Documentation Programming Access Interfaces	1
	Tool Supports Whole Life Cicle	1
Methodological	Tool Supports Important Development Activities	1
Aspects	Tool Supplies Documentation About Built Products	1
	Tool Checks Consistency	0.5
	Tool Creates Work Groups	0
	Tool Allows Simultaneous Working	0
Cooperative	Tool Looks Edited Ontologies	0
Aspects	Tool Looks Edited Terms	1
	Tool Notifies The Changes to Group	0
	Tool Identifies The User Changes	0.5
	Tool Imports From Others Langs	0
	Tool Imports From Markup Langs	0.5
Translation	Tool Exports to Langs	1
Translation	Tool Exports to Markup Langs	1
	Translations Lose Minimun Semantic	1
	Translation is Supervised	0
	Ease of Integration	1
	Difficulty of Referring New Terms	0.5
Integration	Tool Allows Selection of Terms to Integration	0.5
21110814011	Tool Checks Consistency in Integration or Merge	1
	Assistance For Manual Merge	1
	Semi-automatic Merge	0.5
Total		29/41

### 2.3 Methodology Dimension

In this dimension, the methodology with which OntoPriv was developed is taken into consideration. That being the case, the methodology to be evaluated is Development Methodology 101 (MOD-101). The result of the evaluation is presented below.

Table 3: Results obtained when evaluating MOD-101

Methodology Dimension		
Factor	Characteristic	Score
	Delimitation of Phases	1
Precision	Specification of Activities by Phases	1
	Specification of Personnel by Phases	0
	Specification of Techiques by Phases	0.5
	Specification of Finished Products by Phases	0.5
Usability	Clarity of Activities and Techniques Description	0.5
	Quality of Manuals	0.5
	Manuals With Complete Examples	0.5
Maturity	Number of Developed Ontologies	1
	Number of Different Domains	1
	Importance of Developed Ontologies	1
Total		7.5/11

#### 2.4 Costs Dimension

This dimension takes into consideration the costs involved in the development of OntoPriv. The result of the evaluation is presented below.

Table 4: Results obtained when evaluating OntoPriv costs

Costs Dimension		
Factor	Score	
Use Licences of the Ontology	0	
Estimated costs of hw and sw	0	
Costs of access interfaces	0	
Use Licences of the ontology tools	1	
Total	$\overline{1/4}$	

## 2.5 Summary of Results

Finally, a summary table is observed where the results achieved in the qualitative evaluation process carried out on OntoPriv are placed.

Table 5: Results obtained in the evaluation process

# Results of the Evaluation Process using OntoMetric

Dimension	Obtained score
Content	22/23 points
Language	39/51 points
Tool	29/41 points
Methodology	7.5/11 points
Costs	1/4 points