## Paella: A support tool for debugging of ontologies\*

Gonzalo A. Aranda-Corral<sup>1</sup> and Joaquín Borrego-Díaz<sup>2</sup>

Universidad de Huelva. Department of Information Technology.
 Crta. Palos de La Frontera s/n. 21819 Palos de La Frontera

 Universidad de Sevilla. Department of Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence.
 Avda. Reina Mercedes s/n. 41012 Sevilla. Spain
 gonzalo.aranda@dti.uhu.es,jborrego@us.es

In [1] two mereotopological interpretation were introduced. The Strong one is based on the use of Region Connection Calculus (RCC) [3] as a metaontology and the intended meaning of C(x, y) is that exists a common element in the concepts x, y in some model I of the ontology.

**Definition 1.** (Strong Interpretation of RCC as a metaontology) Two concepts  $C_1, C_2$  of an ontology  $\Sigma$  are  $\Sigma$ -connected (denoted by  $C_{\Sigma}(C_1, C_2)$ ) if

$$\Sigma \not\models \mathsf{C}_1 \sqcap \mathsf{C}_2 \equiv \bot$$

And the weak interpretation:

**Definition 2.** A spatial interpretation I of  $\Sigma$  is a interpretation in the language of  $\Sigma$ , such that  $I: concepts(\Sigma) \cup indiv(\Sigma) \to \Omega$ , where  $\Omega$  is a  $T_3$  connected topological space such that  $I \models \Sigma$  and for each  $C \in concepts(\Sigma), I(C)$  is an open regular set in  $\Omega$  and for each  $a \in indiv(\Sigma), I(a)$  is a point. A spatial model of  $\Sigma$  is a spatial interpretation which is a model of  $\Sigma$ .

First interpretation is based on Description Logics reasoning services, while the second is based on qualitative spatial reasoning and spatial representation of relationships between concepts. However, due to a result of Renz [2], if an spatial interpretation exits, then exits one at euclidean space. As concept structures are in ontologies, its easy to find an interpretation with a special feature, it can be graphically represented in not a really hard way.

This talk will describe how both interpretations are applied to build a tool for ontologies visual repairing (anomalies). Specifically, we will characterize the ontologies from Formal Concept Analysis and OWL specified, by means of three different Paella versions: Dummy, Tiny and Full.

 $<sup>^\</sup>star$  Partially supported by TIN2009-09492 project of Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation, cofinanced with FEDER founds

## References

- 1. J. Borrego-Díaz and A. M. Chávez-González. Visual ontology cleaning: Cognitive principles and applicability. In 3 European Semantic Web Congress, Lecture Notes in Computer Science n. 4011, pp. 317-331(2006).
- 2. J. Renz. A Canonical Model of the Region Connection Calculus. *Proc. 6th Int. Conf. on Principles of Knowl. Rep. and Reasoning (KR'98)* (1998).
- 3. A. G. Cohn, B. Bennett, J. M. Gooday and N. M. Gotts. Representing and Reasoning with Qualitative Spatial Relations about Regions. chapter 4 in O. Stock(ed.), Spatial and Temporal Reasoning, Kluwer, Dordrecth, 1997.