

On the Use of Large Language Models to Generate Capability Ontologies

Luis Miguel Vieira da Silva*, Aljosha Köcher*, Felix Gehlhoff*, Alexander Fay†

*Institute of Automation

Helmut Schmidt University, Hamburg, Germany

Email: {miguel.vieira, aljosha.koecher, felix.gehlhoff}@hsu-hh.de

† Chair of Automation

Ruhr University, Bochum, Germany

Email: alexander.fay@rub.de

Abstract—Capability ontologies are increasingly used to model functionalities of systems or machines. The creation of such ontological models with all properties and constraints of capabilities is very complex and can only be done by ontology experts. However, Large Language Models (LLMs) have shown that they can generate machine-interpretable models from natural language text input and thus support engineers / ontology experts. Therefore, this paper investigates how LLMs can be used to create capability ontologies. We present a study with a series of experiments in which capabilities with varying complexities are generated using different prompting techniques and with different LLMs. Errors in the generated ontologies are recorded and compared. To analyze the quality of the generated ontologies, a semi-automated approach based on RDF syntax checking, OWL reasoning, and SHACL constraints is used. The results of this study are very promising because even for complex capabilities, the generated ontologies are almost free of errors.

Index Terms—Large Language Models, LLMs, Capabilities, Skills, Ontologies, Semantic Web, Model-Generation

I. INTRODUCTION

Machine-interpretable descriptions of functionalities are indispensable for flexible systems as they facilitate algorithms for automated planning and adaptation. In recent years, the concepts of “capabilities” and “skills” have emerged as key elements in structuring these functionalities and their descriptions. Capabilities are defined as an implementation-independent specification of a function, whereas skills represent executable implementations of a function specified by a capability [1]. The terminology and information models have been standardized in recent years by working groups of *Plattform Industrie 4.0*¹ and *IDTA*². Unfortunately, the creation of model instances, particularly for capability and skill ontologies, remains a challenging and labor-intensive process, demanding a high level of expertise. While there are approaches to generate parts of these ontologies from existing information (e.g., [2]), the modeling of capabilities is still a time-consuming task.

In light of these challenges, recent advancements in Large Language Models (LLMs) offer promising avenues. LLMs are

able to automate a variety of applications ranging from natural language interactions, such as providing concise summaries and translation tasks, to solving complex problems like code-generation from natural language descriptions. With these prerequisites, using LLMs to generate capability ontologies seems promising. Accordingly, in this article, we present an investigation on how capability ontologies can effectively be generated using LLMs in order to mitigate the effort of manual or semi-automated capability modeling. More specifically, we aim to answer the following questions:

RQ 1: How do different LLMs and prompting techniques influence the quality of the generated ontologies?

RQ 2: How can the generated ontologies be tested in a reliable and, ideally, automated way?

To answer these questions, a study is presented which examines two LLMs and different prompting techniques to generate capability ontologies of increasing complexity. With a series of experiments, we seek to understand the potential of LLMs in bridging the gap in the automated generation of machine-interpretable descriptions for capabilities.

In the following section, we first introduce relevant foundations and then analyze existing contributions to capability engineering methods and studies covering the use of LLMs to generate machine-interpretable models. Afterwards in Section III, we present a concise overview of our ontological capability model, which represents the metamodel of the ontologies generated in this study. In Section IV, the study design is explained, before Section V discusses the results. The paper closes with a conclusion and outlook in Section VI.

II. STATE OF THE ART

A. Background

Ontologies defined in Web Ontology Language (OWL) offer a number of advantages for capturing knowledge, so they are often used to define machine-interpretable models of capabilities and skills. Ontologies are highly formal information models that include a set of concepts with a specification of their meaning along with definitions of how concepts are related [3]. Ontologies can be divided into a terminological box (TBox) and an assertional box (ABox). While a TBox entails

¹<https://www.plattform-i40.de/IP/Redaktion/EN/Downloads/Publikation/CapabilitiesSkillsServices.html>

²<https://github.com/admin-shell-io/submodel-templates/tree/main/development/Capability/1/0>

class knowledge about a problem domain, an ABox contains factual knowledge of one specific problem [4]. An important reason for using ontologies is *reasoning*, which automatically infers new knowledge from modeled facts, e.g., for discovering *contradictions*. If contradictions (e.g. an instance assigned to two disjoint classes) are detected by reasoning, the ontology is *inconsistent*. To ensure that certain information is or is not present in an ontology, Shapes Constraint Language (SHACL) can be used to formulate constraints that must be fulfilled [5]. With SHACL, constraints are described as so-called *shapes* to express both that information must be available and that only specified relations are permitted by using so-called closed shapes. Especially when using LLMs to generate a capability ontology, this additional validation is necessary to detect possible *hallucinations* or missing information.

Large Language Models (LLMs) are advanced computational models that are commonly based on a transformer architecture to generate texts, or more precisely, to predict word sequences based on a given input. LLMs are trained on large datasets of text data from books, websites and other media across multiple domains to identify and learn patterns between words, making them suitable for a variety of tasks [6]. To interact with LLMs, prompt engineering can be used to optimize prompts to efficiently guide LLMs in performing complex tasks. Effective prompts can significantly improve the quality and relevance of LLM responses. As a result, a variety of prompting techniques have been developed, such as *zero-shot*, *one-shot*, or *few-shot prompting*, which provide a corresponding number of examples as context in a prompt. These examples provide demonstrations to help an LLM in generating more coherent responses through a process called *in-context learning*, where LLMs use a given context to make predictions [7]. Besides using different prompting techniques, LLMs typically allow to configure certain parameters to influence the output. One such parameter is the so-called *temperature*, which controls the randomness of LLM results. A lower temperature makes the responses of an LLM more deterministic and repetitive, while a higher temperature encourages variety and creativity in the responses [8]. Even at a low temperature, LLMs can generate information that is factually incorrect, invented, or irrelevant to the given input — known as *hallucination* [6]. Hallucination needs to be handled in order not to store false information in an ontology.

B. Related Work

In [9] a systematic development process for an ontology to describe capabilities of manufacturing resources is proposed. This approach is based on the ontology engineering methodology of [10] and consists of five phases: feasibility study, kickoff, refinement, evaluation as well as application and evolution. The focus of this method is on modeling the TBox. An ABox is modeled in the evaluation phase, but no methodological approach or automated process is presented to support this activity.

Reference [2] presents a method for creating the various aspects of a capability ontology from existing engineering

artifacts, thus reducing the high effort required for ontology creation. Using a provided framework, the skill aspect is created automatically using source code of the skill behavior. For the capability aspect, a semi-automated approach using graphical modeling is used as there are no engineering artifacts describing functions in a structured manner. Thus, there is still manual effort for creating the graphical model and some parts of the capability aspect are not covered (e.g., constraints).

The *Chowlk* framework presented in [11] offers the possibility to visually model a TBox based on Unified Modeling Language (UML) instead of using cumbersome ontology editors. With *Chowlk*, a created diagram is automatically transformed into an OWL ontology. This framework is primarily intended to reduce the effort required to develop a TBox of an ontology for a specific domain, but also allows the creation of an ABox. The manual effort required to create an ABox remains high and a user still needs to be an ontology expert to be able to use the framework and understand which elements to select.

Capabilities are also modeled with the Asset Administration Shell (AAS) using an existing submodel template. In the context of the AAS, there are also initial approaches to support modeling, such as in [12], which provide a graphical modeling framework for modeling systems in accordance with the AAS standard. The authors of [13] present an approach that uses LLMs to generate instances of AAS from textual technical data. One of the considered LLMs is GPT-3.5 with a few-shot prompting technique. The results are promising, showing an effective generation rate of 62–79% and thus a reduction in the effort required to create AAS instances. Manual effort is only required to verify the results, for which no method is provided. Furthermore, ontologies are not considered by [13].

In [14], it was investigated to what extent ChatGPT and REBEL, a model specifically trained for relation extraction, can be combined with semantic technologies to enable reasoning. Both are used to extract the relations from unstructured text and write them into a TBox. In addition, another experiment is performed with ChatGPT to create the entire ontology consisting of TBox and ABox directly with a single prompt. Unfortunately, neither the prompts used nor the results of this study are publicly available. Furthermore, different prompting techniques are not investigated and due to the token limitation of ChatGPT only simple experiments are conducted. The evaluation was only carried out manually using different criteria (e.g., contradictions or redundant elements). In contrast, the aim of our paper is to test multiple prompting techniques for complex models and create a semi-automated method of evaluating the generated ontologies.

The authors of [8] present an approach to automatically create a TBox of an ontology to reduce the manual effort that requires domain experts by using GPT-3.5 Turbo. In this approach, only the subclass relation is considered. To verify the results, additional prompts are submitted to the LLM and a textual description of the generated ontology is created for manual verification. The results are considered promising, despite some cases of hallucination and incompleteness. Different LLMs or prompting techniques are not compared and

only a very simple ontology is created using a manual and subjective method to verify the results.

In [15], a variety of experiments is conducted with ChatGPT to support ontology engineering in order to overcome challenges such as expert dependency and time consumption. One of the experiments is the creation of SPARQL queries: A SPARQL query is created from natural language for a custom, small ontology because of the token limit. In addition, the creation of ontologies from product fact sheets using ChatGPT is investigated. While the information extraction is reported to be successful, modeling sometimes is incorrect. Simple prompts are used throughout and no different prompting techniques are compared. There is also a lack of a method to integrate the LLM into a workflow and verify the results.

In [16] the *LLM4OL* approach, which uses LLMs for ontology learning, is presented. The aim is to automatically extract and structure knowledge from natural language. A zero-shot prompting technique is used for this purpose. Different LLMs, such as GPT-3.5 and GPT-4, were tested for different ontologies from multiple domains. The ontology creation is divided into three parts: term typing, creating type taxonomies, and extracting further relations between types. The authors of [16] conclude that zero-shot prompting is not sufficient for fully automated ontology generation. Overall, LLMs are considered by [16] to be suitable assistants for creating ontologies as they significantly reduce the high effort involved.

We have shown that there is currently no suitable methodology to simplify the modeling of capabilities. While LLMs have shown promise in generating models, existing contributions lack a comprehensive approach for generating ontology ABoxes for a complex TBox. Moreover, there is an absence of proper methods to verify the possibly incorrect results of LLMs. Additionally, there is a need for a systematic study to determine an appropriate LLM and prompting technique.

III. CAPABILITY ONTOLOGY

In [17], we present an initial version of an OWL ontology called *CaSk*, which is based on industry standards and can be used to describe machines, their capabilities, and executable skills. *CaSk* is an extension of the reference model in [1] and available online³. In this contribution, we focus only on the capability aspect and an overview of this aspect is presented in the following.

Capabilities are required by processes, which are modeled according to [18]. A process consists of process operators that can have products, information or energy as inputs and outputs. These inputs and outputs are further characterized by data elements to describe properties according to [19]. A data element consists of a type description and one or more instance descriptions. While a type description contains type-related information about a data element (e.g., ID, name, unit of measure), an instance description captures one distinct value expression of that data element. Instance descriptions can be further subdivided by their expression goal into requirements,

assurances, and actual (i.e., measured) values, as well as unbound parameters.

Following this approach, processes and thus capabilities can be modeled with their possible inputs and outputs in a detailed way. In Figure 1, a simplified excerpt of an ontology representing a transport capability is shown. This capability moves a product (*Input_Product*) from its current position (*CurrentProductPosition*) to a target position (*TargetPosition*). This capability is one of the capabilities used in our study (see Section IV).

For properties of inputs, requirements of permissible values can be expressed. These requirements can either be constant or dependent on other model elements. For example, the transport capability could only lift products up to a constant height. An example for a dependent requirement is given in Figure 1: the current position of the input product is required to be equal to the position of the transport resource (*AGVPosition*), as otherwise the product cannot be picked up. In addition to requirements, unbound parameters can also be modeled. In Figure 1, for example, *TargetPosition* is an unbound parameter without expression goal.

The properties of outputs are typically modeled as assurances. Here, too, constant values as well as values depending on other elements can be represented. In Figure 1, the transport capability guarantees that the assured position after transport is equal to the desired position to be selected (i.e., the input parameter *TargetPosition*). Figure 1 only shows equality relations for simplicity purposes. In our model, arbitrary mathematical relations can be expressed using the *OpenMath* ontology presented in [20].

Figure 1 shows that representing even a simplified example with an ontology can quickly become complicated and extensive. Therefore, methods for simplified ontology creation are required.

IV. STUDY DESIGN

In order to evaluate the use of LLMs to create a capability ontology in a structured manner, the following methodology is applied. With *GPT-4 Turbo*⁴, in the following GPT, and *Claude 3*⁵, in the following Claude, we used two different LLMs, each with three prompting techniques, to generate seven different capabilities with different levels of complexity. We had originally planned to use *Gemini Pro*⁶, but its token limit is too small to capture the ontology provided as context. These three LLMs are among the most popular LLMs and perform best in benchmarks [21]. An overview of the main features of the considered LLMs is shown in Tab I. However, the number of tokens given for the context size of the LLMs is not directly comparable, as these LLMs calculate tokens differently. In this paper, an LLM is intended to provide reliable solutions for the creation of capability ontologies, so that the parameter *temperature* is set to 0 in order to obtain deterministic solutions. The three prompting techniques used

⁴<https://openai.com/gpt-4>

⁵<https://claude.ai>

⁶<https://gemini.google.com>

³<https://github.com/caskade-automation/cask>




Fig. 1. Simplified representation of a transport capability and its properties modeled with the CaSk ontology. All nodes are individuals (class names in bold).

TABLE I
OVERVIEW OF THE LLMs CONSIDERED IN THIS STUDY

Name	Version	Training Data	Context Size [Tokens]
GPT-4	gpt-4-turbo-2024-04-09	December 2023	128.000
Claude 3	claude-3-opus-20240229	August 2023	200.000
Gemini	gemini-1.0-pro	February 2024	30.720

are *zero-shot*, *one-shot* and *few-shot prompting*, for which templates are created. In Listing 1 the one-shot prompt template is shown. The three templates have the same structure and differ only in the included examples. Every template starts with a general *instruction* to create a capability. The instruction is short and concise and describes that the LLM should transform a natural language description of a capability into an OWL ontology, taking the following *context* into account. Each template takes the TBox of the CaSk ontology (see Section III) in Turtle syntax as context. In addition, each template contains a task description containing a natural language text for the specific capability (placeholder `#{Task Description}` in Listing 1) as well as a placeholder for the output to create. The one-shot template additionally contains a simple coffeemaking capability as an example with task description and ontology as the solution. The few-shot prompts of the study contain three examples. In addition to the coffee-making example, a distillation capability and a simple mathematical operation with multiplication are included in few-shot prompts. All templates and prompts used are available online⁷.

⁷<https://github.com/CaSkade-Automation/llm-capability-generation>

Listing 1. One-shot prompt template

```

--- Instruction ---
Translate a natural language input describing a
capability into an OWL ontology ...

--- Context ---
#{CaSk ontology}

--- Input Data ---
#{Coffeemaking Task Description}

--- Output ---
OWL-Ontology:
#{Coffeemaking Result}

--- Input Data ---
#{Task Description}

--- Output ---
OWL-Ontology:

```

The capabilities to be generated in this study range from a simple functionality to check the parity of a given number to a mixing operation from process manufacturing. The simplest capability *parity* receives a single integer a as an input and returns true if a is even. There are no other inputs or outputs and no constraints. *Mixing* on the other hand is a more complicated capability. It has three input products (liquid 1 - 3), all related to a data element defining the volume fraction of each liquid in the mix. In addition, the total volume to produce v_{total} can also be passed as an input to the capability. Mixing has one output product and two constraints that ensure correct behavior. The sum of the three input volume fractions needs

TABLE II
OVERVIEW OF THE CAPABILITIES USED IN THIS STUDY

Name	Description	Inputs	Outputs	Constraints
E1: Coffeemaking	Brew a coffee c of specific type t from water w and beans b	w : product, b : product with $temp_w$ t_{in} : information, string	c : product, $grounds$: product with $temp_{out}$ and t_{out}	$temp_{in} \geq 0$, $temp_{in} \leq 50$ $t_{out} = t_{in}$ $temp_{out} \geq 90$
E2: Multiplication	Multiply two numbers	a : information, integer b : information, integer	$product$: information, real	-
E3: Distillation	Distill a mix m in distillate d and residue r	m : product with $boil_{liq1}$, $mass_{liq1}$ and $boil_{liq2}$, $mass_{liq2}$	d : product with $boil_d$ and $mass_d$ r : product with $boil_r$ and $mass_r$	$boil_{liq1} \neq boil_{liq2}$ $boil_d \leq boil_r$ $mass_{liq1} + mass_{liq2} = mass_d + mass_r$
C1: Parity	Check whether a given number is even or odd	a : information, integer	$isEven$: information, boolean	-
C2: Addition	Add two numbers and returns their sum	a : information, integer b : information, integer	sum : information, integer	-
C3: Division	Divide a number a by a number b	a : information, integer b : information, integer	$quotient$: information, real	$b \neq 0$
C4: Drilling	Drill a hole with a given depth and diameter	p_{in} : product $diam_{in}$: information, real $depth_{in}$: information, real	p_{out} : product with $diam_{out}$ and $depth_{out}$	$diam_{in} \leq 20$, $depth_{in} \leq 80$ $diam_{out} = diam_{in}$ $depth_{out} = depth_{in}$
C5: Transport	Transport a product to a given position with an AGV	p_{in} : product, agv : resource with pos_{in}^p and pos_{in}^{agv} pos_{in} : information, real	p_{out} : product with pos_{out}	$pos_{in}^p = pos_{in}^{agv}$ $pos_{out} = pos_{in}$
C6: Assembly	Assemble two products into one	a_{in} : product, b_{in} : product with $weight_{in}^a$ and $weight_{in}^b$	p_{out} : product with $weight_{out}$	$weight_{out} = weight_{in}^a + weight_{in}^b$
C7: Mixing	Mix three liquids with given volume fractions	liq_1 , liq_2 , liq_3 : product vf_1 , vf_2 , vf_3 : information, real v_{total} : information, real	p_{out} : product	$vf_1 + vf_2 + vf_3 = 1$ $v_{total} \leq 20$

to equate 1. And the total volume must not surpass 20. A list of all capabilities to be generated (C1-C7) and examples used in one-shot and few-shot prompts (E1-E3) with their inputs, outputs and constraints is given in Table II.

For each of the capabilities given in Table II, a natural language task description was defined. Then, with the three prompt templates described above for each of the 7 capabilities, all 21 individual prompts were generated by filling the placeholders in each prompt template with the CaSk ontology, the examples as well as the individual task descriptions for each capability using a Python script. The 21 prompts were then entered into GPT and Claude and the resulting ontologies were stored. For each capability, the expected result was manually modeled.

One major challenge when using LLMs to automatically generate machine-interpretable ontologies is checking the generated ontologies for correctness and completeness. To achieve this, we follow a multi-step approach with automated and manual checks. Every generated ontology is first checked for syntactic errors by opening the ontology in the *Protege*⁸ ontology editor, which throws warnings for syntax errors. Each syntax error is fixed and recorded (see column \mathcal{S} in Tables III and IV). After that, the syntax-corrected version can be opened in Protege and the OWL reasoner *Pellet*⁹ is used to check

for inconsistencies. An inconsistency indicates that an LLM did not fully understand the rules governing applicability of a certain class or property, such as disjoint classes, domain and range definitions or various restrictions as defined in our ontology in [17]. Every incorrectly modeled element leading to an inconsistency is counted (see column \mathcal{C} in Tables III and IV). After analyzing inconsistencies, two checks are carried out to verify completeness of the generated ontology. First of all, it is important to keep the number of *hallucinated model elements* as low as possible. We use the term *hallucinated model elements* to refer to elements that cannot be traced back to the natural language task description. For example, the CaSk ontology contains terms that are not used in any textual description, e.g., skill or skill interface. These model elements should not be created by the LLMs. To find hallucinated elements, constraints were defined using SHACL. Using closed SHACL shapes, one can restrict properties that are to be applied to individuals of a certain class. Additional properties are reported as errors. All hallucinated element scores are shown in column \mathcal{H} in Tables III and IV. In addition to checking for hallucinated elements, SHACL constraints are also used to check for missing model content. For example, the capabilities shown in Table II all have at least one input and output property. The existence of at least one input and output can be checked with a SHACL constraint. However, the six SHACL shapes we defined are only a first step to checking the completeness of each individual capability as

⁸<https://protege.stanford.edu/>

⁹<https://github.com/stardog-union/pellet>

TABLE III
RESULTS OBTAINED WITH GPT BY GENERATING EVERY CAPABILITY WITH THREE PROMPTING TECHNIQUES.
 \mathcal{S} : Syntax Errors \mathcal{C} : Contradictions (Inconsistencies) \mathcal{H} : Hallucinations \mathcal{I} : Incompleteness

	# Triples	zero-shot					one-shot					few-shot				
		\mathcal{S}	\mathcal{C}	\mathcal{H}	\mathcal{I}	Σ	\mathcal{S}	\mathcal{C}	\mathcal{H}	\mathcal{I}	Σ	\mathcal{S}	\mathcal{C}	\mathcal{H}	\mathcal{I}	Σ
C1: Odd / Even	33	0	0.06	0.15	0.21	0.42	0	0	0.03	0.03	0.06	0	0	0	0	0
C2: Addition	42	0	0.21	0.19	0.38	0.79	0	0	0.07	0	0.07	0	0	0.02	0	0.02
C3: Division	52	0	0.04	0.10	0.40	0.54	0	0	0.08	0.21	0.29	0.02	0	0.04	0.10	0.15
C4: Drilling	95	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.38	0.43	0	0	0.02	0.16	0.18	0.01	0.02	0	0.14	0.17
C5: Transport	83	0	0.04	0.05	0.29	0.37	0	0	0	0.06	0.06	0.01	0	0.01	0.04	0.06
C6: Assembly	82	0	0.05	0.06	0.30	0.41	0	0	0	0.07	0.07	0	0	0	0	0
C7: Mixing	120	0	0.02	0.04	0.55	0.61	0	0	0	0.25	0.25	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.34	0.04
Mean error score						0.51					0.14					0.12

TABLE IV
RESULTS OBTAINED WITH CLAUDE BY GENERATING EVERY CAPABILITY WITH THREE PROMPTING TECHNIQUES.
 \mathcal{S} : Syntax Errors \mathcal{C} : Contradictions (Inconsistencies) \mathcal{H} : Hallucinations \mathcal{I} : Incompleteness

	# Triples	zero-shot					one-shot					few-shot				
		\mathcal{S}	\mathcal{C}	\mathcal{H}	\mathcal{I}	Σ	\mathcal{S}	\mathcal{C}	\mathcal{H}	\mathcal{I}	Σ	\mathcal{S}	\mathcal{C}	\mathcal{H}	\mathcal{I}	Σ
C1: Odd / Even	33	0	0	0.15	0.24	0.39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
C2: Addition	42	0	0	0.19	0.33	0.52	0	0	0.26	0	0.26	0	0	0	0	0
C3: Division	52	0	0	0.04	0.52	0.56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
C4: Drilling	95	0	0.05	0.07	0.53	0.65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.06	0.06
C5: Transport	83	0	0	0	0.29	0.29	0	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.06	0	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.07
C6: Assembly	82	0	0	0.04	0.21	0.24	0	0	0.01	0	0.01	0	0	0	0	0
C7: Mixing	120	0	0	0.07	0.68	0.74	0	0	0	0.07	0.07	0	0	0	0.10	0.1
Mean error score						0.49					0.06					0.03

there are many capability-specific elements to look out for. Thus, every generated capability was also manually checked. The incompleteness score of each prompt result can be seen in column \mathcal{I} of Tables III and IV.

V. RESULTS

As written in Section IV, each capability was generated with all three prompting techniques and by both GPT and Claude. Errors regarding syntax (\mathcal{S}), contradictions (\mathcal{C}), hallucinations (\mathcal{H}) and incompleteness (\mathcal{I}) were recorded. In order to relate these errors to the size of each capability ontology, a relative error measure is calculated by dividing the absolute errors by the number of triples to be modeled. The results are shown in Table III (GPT) and Table IV (Claude). A summary showing the relative completeness $1 - \mathcal{I}$ is given in Figure V.

One of the first findings is that both LLMs make very few syntax errors, regardless of the complexity of the generated capability and even with simple zero-shot prompts. The syntax errors found in GPT outputs are all due to missing prefix declarations. Claude did not make a single syntax error in the generated ontologies. However, with both LLMs, additional text output occurred a few times behind the actual ontology, regardless of the prompting technique. This extra output was often an interpretation or explanation of the generated ontology. It was particularly interesting that in some cases, Claude created additional task descriptions in natural language together with corresponding solutions in its output. We attribute this to fact that the base instruction might not have

been formulated precise enough. In all cases with additional text output, we did not assign any syntax errors if the actual ontologies were syntactically correct.

There is a clear trend towards improving results with a better prompting technique — an unsurprising finding. Overall, Claude performs slightly better than GPT, which is particularly evident in the few-shot prompts. However, it is also noticeable in the zero-shot prompts that Claude causes significantly fewer contradictions (\mathcal{C}) than GPT. This suggests that Claude better understands constraints such as domain and range, which are modeled in the CaSk ontology given as context. GPT seems to pick up these constraints only with the examples (see improving \mathcal{C} for one-shot and few-shot prompts in Table III).

One triple that is missing in all zero-shot results is the `owl:imports` statement to import the CaSk ontology. Neither GPT nor Claude imported the CaSk ontology just from the task description and CaSk given as context. In order to test for inconsistencies, import statements were manually added. After adding examples in the prompts (i.e., using one-shot and few-shot prompts), import statements were reliably included.

Simple elements of the ontology (e.g., definition of capabilities, link to their inputs and outputs) can be handled well by both LLMs even in the zero-shot case. However, the more complicated capabilities (C4 and higher) feature an increasing amount of properties and also constraints, which are rather complicated to model. In order to correctly represent constraints using the OpenMath ontology, modeling guidelines must be adhered to. These modeling guidelines cannot be




Fig. 2. Completeness of the generated ontologies. A value of 1 means that all triples to be created have been generated correctly.

learned from the CaSk ontology alone without examples, which is why both GPT and Claude have rather high values for the incompleteness measure \mathcal{I} for C4 and higher. The improvement from zero-shot to one-shot prompts is clearly visible. This is reflected in the difference of the mean error scores (-0.37 for GPT and -0.43 for Claude) and is also noticeable when correcting the generated ontologies. While many manual corrections and additions are necessary for the zero-shot results, the one-shot results (especially for Claude) are practically error-free. For the transition from one-shot to

few-shot prompts, the decline of error measure scores is much smaller. And some one-shot prompts even performed better than their few-shot counterparts (see the mixing capability generated by GPT or the drilling capability generated by Claude). A possible reason might be the compilation of examples. Further studies are needed to compare multiple few-shot prompts using different examples in varying compilations.

The results include some particularly noteworthy individual cases, which are worth discussing in a bit more detail. Claude generated the addition capability with the zero-shot prompt not as a general capability, but instead defined specific values and solved the addition $42 + 23 = 65$. However, this did not occur in the division capability, even though the natural language descriptions are very similar. Claude also sometimes uses a more compact syntax with blank nodes (e.g., in the zero-shot result for the transport capability) — something not included in the examples. This indicates a high level of understanding of Turtle syntax. Furthermore, Claude sometimes models simple constraints, which we typically model as value expressions (e.g., $\neq 0$), as more complex OpenMath constraints (e.g., in the one-shot result for the division capability). This more complex representation for simple relations is not included in the examples, but the expressions generated by Claude are all valid. We also observe this different approach to expressing simple relations for GPT (e.g., in the few-shot result for the division capability). Even though we specifically asked to only use the capability aspect of the CaSk ontology, GPT created many hallucinated skill elements in the zero-shot results. With Claude, that was not the case at all. None of the experiments produced a complete result of the transport capability. This can be attributed to the fact that there is no example capability for the one-shot and few-shot prompts that contains a resource as a capability provider. Accordingly, this relation is missing in all experiments. All data of this study is available at <https://github.com/CaSkade-Automation/llm-capability-generation>.

Overall, we are impressed with the results. The big advantage of having LLMs generate a capability ontology from natural language descriptions is that — in contrast to approaches like [2] — no models need to be manually created at all. The zero-shot results are already a great simplification to our previous approach of capability modeling, although quite a few corrections to the generated ontologies are still necessary. However, the few-shot results are of such high quality that incomplete ones could be checked and corrected quickly. Both the entire CaSk ontology and the example ontologies (for one- and few-shot prompts) are passed in the prompts, resulting in rather high amounts of tokens: While the simplest prompt (one-shot prompt for the parity capability) uses 22,730¹⁰ input tokens, the most complex one uses 28,561¹¹ (few-shot prompt for the mixing capability). This results in average costs per prompt of 0.31 USD for GPT and 0.65 USD for Claude.

¹¹Calculated with OpenAI’s tokenizer. Token count varies for other LLMs

VI. CONCLUSION

In this contribution, we presented a study to examine the suitability of LLMs for generating capability ontologies from natural language descriptions. The use of LLMs is intended to reduce effort and expertise needed to create such an ontology. To answer RQ1, we analyzed two LLMs with three prompting techniques to generate seven capability ontologies with different levels of complexity. Even zero-shot results are quite convincing, but the few-shot results — especially those generated by Claude — are close to perfect. Even complex capabilities with mathematical constraints are accurately modeled. One limitation of the study is that the prompts used were not subject to any further testing. Future work should evaluate different types of few-shot prompts, e.g., with different examples. Furthermore, the natural language capability description was given as plain text written by ontology experts. Comparing this with a more structured input that is clearly subdivided into capabilities, inputs, outputs etc. is also worth examining. In addition, the natural language capability descriptions should be written by users without ontology expertise in another study.

One persistent issue with LLMs is the fact that their generated output is less dependable than rule-based mapping approaches, which guarantee to generate a defined output for a given input. We therefore developed an approach to test the generated output in a robust and semi-automated way (RQ2). This testing approach consists of an automated syntax check, using OWL reasoning to test for inconsistencies as well as SHACL shapes to test for hallucinations and incompleteness. Currently, these tests need to be conducted and interpreted by ontology experts to properly record errors. In our future work, we want to use the findings of this study to create an engineering method that can be used by users without ontology expertise. A first step in this direction is presented in [22]. Furthermore, we will further improve the CaSk ontology, in which annotations such as `rdfs:label` or `rdfs:comment` are rarely used. These attributes, intended as purely human-readable additional information, can be processed by LLMs to better understand model elements. And finally, one drawback of our prompts is that they include the CaSk TBox as well as the examples as plain text. This leads to high token consumption and in turn rather high cost per prompt. It also limits the choice of LLMs to be used to those with very large context windows. More efficient ways to integrate context information by using embedding techniques like the one presented in [23] are thus worth investigating.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research in the RIVA project is funded by dtcc.bw – Digitalization and Technology Research Center of the Bundeswehr. dtcc.bw is funded by the European Union – NextGenerationEU

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Köcher, A. Belyaev *et al.*, “A Reference Model for Common Understanding of Capabilities and Skills in Manufacturing,” *at - Automatisierungstechnik*, no. 2, 2023.
- [2] A. Köcher, C. Hildebrandt *et al.*, “Automating the Development of Machine Skills and their Semantic Description,” in *2020 25th IEEE International Conference on Emerging Technologies and Factory Automation (ETFA)*. IEEE, 08.09.2020 - 11.09.2020, pp. 1013–1018.
- [3] M. Uschold, “Knowledge level modelling: concepts and terminology,” *The Knowledge Engineering Review*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 5–29, 1998.
- [4] F. Baader, D. Calvanese *et al.*, *The Description Logic Handbook: Theory, Implementation, and Applications*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [5] A. Hogan, *The Web of Data*, 1st ed. Cham: Springer International Publishing and Imprint: Springer, 2020.
- [6] Y. Chang, X. Wang *et al.*, “A Survey on Evaluation of Large Language Models,” *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 1–45, 2024.
- [7] T. Brown, B. Mann *et al.*, “Language Models are Few-Shot Learners,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato *et al.*, Eds., vol. 33. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020, pp. 1877–1901. [Online]. Available: https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2020/file/1457c0d6bfc4967418bfb8ac142f64a-Paper.pdf
- [8] M. Funk, S. Hosemann *et al.*, “Towards Ontology Construction with Language Models,” 2023. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/pdf/2309.09898>
- [9] E. Järvenpää, N. Siltala *et al.*, “The development of an ontology for describing the capabilities of manufacturing resources,” *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 959–978, 2019.
- [10] Y. Sure, S. Staab, and R. Studer, “Ontology Engineering Methodology,” in *Handbook on Ontologies*, S. Staab and R. Studer, Eds. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2009, pp. 135–152.
- [11] S. Chávez-Feria, R. García-Castro, and M. Poveda-Villalón, “Chowlk: from UML-Based Ontology Conceptualizations to OWL,” in *The Semantic Web*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, P. Groth, M.-E. Vidal *et al.*, Eds. Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2022, vol. 13261, pp. 338–352.
- [12] Y. Huang, S. Dhouib, and J. Malenfant, “An AAS Modeling Tool for Capability-Based Engineering of Flexible Production Lines,” in *IECON 2021 - 47th Annual Conference of the IEEE Industrial Electronics Society*. Piscataway, NJ: IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–6.
- [13] Y. Xia, Z. Xiao *et al.*, “Generation of Asset Administration Shell With Large Language Model Agents: Toward Semantic Interoperability in Digital Twins in the Context of Industry 4.0,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 12, pp. 84 863–84 877, 2024.
- [14] M. Trajanoska, R. Stojanov, and D. Trajanov, “Enhancing Knowledge Graph Construction Using Large Language Models,” 2023. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/pdf/2305.04676>
- [15] L.-P. Meyer, C. Stadler *et al.*, “LLM-assisted Knowledge Graph Engineering: Experiments with ChatGPT,” in *Working conference on Artificial Intelligence Development for a Resilient and Sustainable Tomorrow*. Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 2024, pp. 103–115.
- [16] H. Babaei Giglou, J. D’Souza, and S. Auer, “LLMs4OL: Large Language Models for Ontology Learning,” in *The semantic web - ISWC 2023*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, T. R. Payne, V. Presutti *et al.*, Eds. Cham: Springer, 2023, vol. 14265, pp. 408–427.
- [17] A. Köcher, C. Hildebrandt *et al.*, “A Formal Capability and Skill Model for Use in Plug and Produce Scenarios,” in *2020 25th IEEE International Conference on Emerging Technologies and Factory Automation (ETFA)*. IEEE, 9/8/2020 - 9/11/2020, pp. 1663–1670.
- [18] “VDI 3682: Formalised Process Descriptions - Concept and Graphic Representation,” 2015.
- [19] “DIN EN 61360: Standard Data Element Types with Associated Classification Scheme - Part 1: Definitions - Principles and Methods,” 2018.
- [20] K. Wenzel, “OpenMath-RDF: RDF encodings for OpenMath objects and Content Dictionaries,” in *31th OpenMath Workshop at CICM 2021*, 2021.
- [21] Anthropic, “The Claude 3 Model Family: Opus, Sonnet, Haiku,” Anthropic, Tech. Rep., 2024. [Online]. Available: https://www-cdn.anthropic.com/de8ba9b01c9ab7cbabf5c33b80b7bbc618857627/Model_Card_Claude_3.pdf
- [22] L. M. Vieira da Silva, A. Köcher *et al.*, “Toward Automatically Generating Capability Ontologies from Natural Language Descriptions with Large Language Models,” in *submitted for publication at 2024 29th IEEE ETFA*, 2024.
- [23] J. Chen, P. Hu *et al.*, “OWL2Vec*: embedding of OWL ontologies,” *Machine Learning*, vol. 110, no. 7, pp. 1813–1845, 2021, pII: 5997.