

Chapter 18

Description Logic–Based Resource Retrieval

Simona Colucci

Politecnico di Bari, Italy

Tommaso Di Noia

Politecnico di Bari, Italy

Eugenio Di Sciascio

Politecnico di Bari, Italy

Francesco M. Donini

Università della Tuscia, Italy

Marina Mongiello

Politecnico di Bari, Italy

Category: Technologies for Knowledge Management

INTRODUCTION

Resource retrieval addresses the problem of finding best matches to a request among available resources, with both the request and the resources described with respect to a shared interpretation of the knowledge domain the resource belongs to. The problem of resource matching and retrieval arises in several scenarios, among them, personnel recruitment and job assignment, dating agencies, but also generic electronic marketplaces, Web

services discovery and composition, resource matching in the Grid. All these scenarios share a common purpose: given a request, find among available descriptions those best fulfilling it, or at “worse,” when nothing better exists, those that fulfill at least some of the requirements.

Exact, or full, matches are usually rare and the true *matchmaking* process is aimed at providing one or more “promising” matches to be explored. Non-exact matches should take into account both missing information—details that could be positively assessed in a second phase—and conflicting information—details that could leverage negotiation if the proposed match is worth enough pursuing.

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-59904-931-1.ch018

Because of its intangibility, it is now a widely shared opinion that knowledge has to be modeled to make unambiguous the interpretation of any information domain. This disambiguation process is usually obtained through an *ontology*, that is, a specification of a representational vocabulary for a shared domain of discourse—definitions of classes, relations, functions, and other objects (Gruber, 1993).

Once a knowledge domain has been modeled, and several different resources have been described using such a model, issues that need to be faced for efficient knowledge management are: What, if any, kind of retrieval is possible on these resources? How could we benefit both of the model and formalisms used to build the model, in order to perform a “smart” search of described resources matching a request? The above questions focus on important aspects of knowledge-based retrieval:

- formalisms used to model a knowledge domain
- retrieval services that fully use the expressiveness of the formalism to infer new knowledge from the model in order to perform a knowledge-based search

Knowledge domain is modeled with a formalism, whose expressiveness is used in the retrieval process to infer not elicited information from the model. In such a context, choosing this formalism strongly affects the complexity, as well as success probability, of the retrieval process.

In recent years *description logics* (DLs) have been investigated by both the academic and industrial world as a formalism for knowledge representation. Modeling an information domain through the formalism of a DL allows one to employ reasoning services provided by DLs to perform a knowledge-based search. Knowledge domains are formalized in ontologies, which resource descriptions refer to. The use of ontologies allows elicited descriptions to be stored so

that information can be inferred from them to retrieve a resource.

The remainder of this article is structured as follows: Background work is revised, including DL basics with associated reasoning services and previous approaches to resource retrieval, including non-logic- and logic-based alternatives. Then, we introduce semantic-based resource retrieval, first highlighting new non-standard inference services and then showing how they can be used for “smart” resource retrieval. Finally, we propose some future trends and draw a conclusion.

BACKGROUND

Description Logics Basics

Description, or terminological, logics (Baader, Calvanese, Mc Guinness, Nardi, & Patel-Schneider, 2002; Donini, Lenzerini, Nardi, & Schaerf, 1996) are a family of logic formalisms for knowledge representation. All DLs are endowed of a syntax and a model-theoretic semantics. The basic syntax elements of DLs are: *concept* names, *role* names, *individuals*. Intuitively, concepts stand for sets of objects, and roles link objects belonging to different concepts. Individuals are special named elements of the sets of objects concepts represent.

We give a more formal definition of the outlined basic elements by introducing the concept of semantic *interpretation*.

Definition 1: *A semantic interpretation is a pair $I=(\Delta, \times^I)$ made up of a domain Δ and an interpretation function \times^I , which maps every concept to a subset of Δ , every role to a subset of $\Delta \times \Delta$, and every individual to an element of Δ .*

Usually, a so-called *Unique Name Assumption* (UNA) is made which ensures different individuals to be mapped to different elements of Δ , i.e., $a^I \neq b^I$ for individuals $a \neq b$.

11 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:
www.igi-global.com/chapter/description-logic-based-resource-retrieval/48969

Related Content

Designing, Setting Up, and Facilitating a Knowledge Sharing Virtual Community of Practice, between Social Work Lecturers in the UK and India

Isabel Williams (2012). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 22-49).

www.irma-international.org/article/designing-setting-facilitating-knowledge-sharing/75165

Big Data and Healthcare Data: A Survey

Bikash Kanti Sarkar (2017). *International Journal of Knowledge-Based Organizations* (pp. 50-77).

www.irma-international.org/article/big-data-and-healthcare-data/188499

Organizational Learning and the Learning Organization

(2015). *Organizational Knowledge Dynamics: Managing Knowledge Creation, Acquisition, Sharing, and Transformation* (pp. 286-312).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/organizational-learning-and-the-learning-organization/125918

Knowledge Intermediation

Enrico Scarso and Ettore Bolisani (2006). *Encyclopedia of Knowledge Management* (pp. 360-367).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/knowledge-intermediation/16972

Knowledge Management Practices and the Focus on the Individual

Isabel Rechberg and Jawad Syed (2014). *International Journal of Knowledge Management* (pp. 26-42).

www.irma-international.org/article/knowledge-management-practices-and-the-focus-on-the-individual/112064