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Introduction and Motivation

Query

```
SELECT ?x WHERE { ?x a ex:Person }
```

Data

```
ex:Birte ex:presentsLecture "SPARQL" .
ex:presentsLecture rdfs:domain ex:Lecturer .
ex:Lecturer rdfs:subClassOf ex:Person .
```

- No answer using simple entailment/subgraph matching
SPARQL with Implicit Solutions

- So far: solutions through subgraph matching (simple entailment)
- Only the Bgp(·) algebra operator (exception: property paths) generates solutions
- SPARQL 1.0 specifies a BGP matching extension point to overwrite behaviour of Bgp(·)

Idea: Instead of subgraph matching use entailment relations
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Previous BGP Evaluation

Definition (Solution)

Let $P$ be a basic graph pattern. A partial function $\mu$ is a solution for $\text{Bgp}(P)$ over the queried (active) graph $G$ if:

1. the domain of $\mu$ is exactly the set of variables in $P$,
2. there exists an assignment $\sigma$ from blank nodes in $P$ to IRIs, blank nodes, or RDF literals in $G$ such that:
3. the RDF graph $\mu(\sigma(P))$ is a subgraph of $G$.

The result $\llbracket \text{Bgp}(P) \rrbracket_G$ of the evaluation of $\text{Bgp}(P)$ over $G$ is the multi set of solutions $\mu$ (multiplicity corresponds to the number of different assignments)
Naive Idea for BGP Evaluation using RDFS Entailment

**Definition (Solution)**

Let $P$ be a basic graph pattern. A partial function $\mu$ is a solution for $\text{Bgp}(P)$ over the queried (active) graph $G$ under RDFS entailment if:

1. the domain of $\mu$ is exactly the set of variables in $P$,
2. there exists an assignment $\sigma$ from blank nodes in $P$ to IRIs, blank nodes, or RDF literals such that:
   3. the RDF graph $\mu(\sigma(P))$ is RDFS-entailed by $G$.

The result $[\text{Bgp}(P)]_G$ of the evaluation of $\text{Bgp}(P)$ over $G$ under RDFS entailment is the multi set of such solutions.
Conditions for Entailment Regimes (1)

• The naive idea produces not always intuitive results
• It is not that simple since such extensions have to satisfy several conditions
Conditions for Entailment Regimes (1)

- The naive idea produces not always intuitive results
- It is not that simple since such extensions have to satisfy several conditions

A so-called entailment regime $E$ specifies

1. RDF Graphs that are well-formed for the regime
2. an entailment relation between well-formed graphs
Conditions for Entailment Regimes (1)

- The naive idea produces not always intuitive results
- It is not that simple since such extensions have to satisfy several conditions

A so-called entailment regime $E$ specifies

1. RDF Graphs that are well-formed for the regime
2. an entailment relation between well-formed graphs

We can address this:

1. For RDF(S) all RDF graphs are ok, for OWL we will further define well-formed graphs
2. We can use already defined entailment relations
Conditions for Entailment Regimes (2)

An entailment regime $E$ defines furthermore

3. The effect of a query over an inconsistent graph
4. Conditions to guarantee the uniqueness of the results modulo blank node labels

We can also address this:

3. Warning/error
4. Automatically satisfied for RDFS entailment
An entailment regime $E$ defines furthermore

5. Conditions such that for any basic graph pattern $P$ and any graph $G$, if
   $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n \in \llbracket P \rrbracket^E_G$ and $P_1, \ldots, P_n$ are copies of $P$ not sharing any blank
   nodes with $G$ or with each other:
   
   $$G \models^E (G \cup \mu_1(P_1) \cup \ldots \cup \mu_n(P_n))$$

6. Condition to prevent trivial infinite solutions

Condition 5 makes sure that blank nodes in solutions correspond to blank nodes
in the graph (no unintended co-references are introduced)
Comment for Condition 5

Example

\[ G: \textbf{a :b }_c . \quad G_1: \textbf{a :b }_b _b \quad G_2: \textbf{a :b }_b _b \quad G_3: \textbf{a :b }_b _b . \]

- _d :e :f .
- _b2 :e :f .
- _b1 :e :f .
- _b1 :e :f .

- \( G \) has as simple consequences \( G_1 \) and \( G_2 \), but not \( G_3 \) (blank nodes are merged)
Comment for Condition 5

Example

\[ G: \ :a :b \ :c . \quad G_1: \ :a :b \ :b_1 . \quad G_2: \ :a :b \ :b_2 . \quad G_3: \ :a :b \ :b_1 . \]

- \( G \) has as simple consequences \( G_1 \) and \( G_2 \), but not \( G_3 \) (blank nodes are merged)
- Let \( P = \{ :a :b \ ?x . \ ?y :e :f \} \). We would have
  \( \mu_1: \ ?x \mapsto \_ :b_1, \ ?y \mapsto \_ :b_2 \) and \( \mu_2: \ ?x \mapsto \_ :b_2, \ ?y \mapsto \_ :b_1 \) as solutions for \( P \) over \( G \) since \( \mu_1(P) = G_1, \mu_2(P) = G_2 \)
Comment for Condition 5

Example

\[ G: \text{a :b :c.} \quad G_1: \text{a :b :b1.} \quad G_2: \text{a :b :b2.} \quad G_3: \text{a :b :b1.} \quad _:\text{d :e :f.} \quad _:\text{b2 :e :f.} \quad _:\text{b1 :e :f.} \quad _:\text{b1 :e :f.} \]

- \( G \) has as simple consequences \( G_1 \) and \( G_2 \), but not \( G_3 \) (blank nodes are merged)

- Let \( P = \{ \text{a :b ?x , ?y :e :f} \} \). We would have \( \mu_1: ?x \mapsto _:\text{b1,} ?y \mapsto _:\text{b2} \) and \( \mu_2: ?x \mapsto _:\text{b2,} ?y \mapsto _:\text{b1} \) as solutions for \( P \) over \( G \) since \( \mu_1(P) = G_1, \mu_2(P) = G_2 \)

- But \( G \cup \mu_1(P) \cup \mu_2(P) \) is not a consequence (contains \( G_3 \))
Comment for Condition 5

Example

\[ G : \text{:_a :b :_c :d :e :f} \quad G_1 : \text{:_a :b :b1 :_b :e :f} \quad G_2 : \text{:_a :b :b2 :e :f} \quad G_3 : \text{:_a :b :b1 :e :f} \]

- \( G \) has as simple consequences \( G_1 \) and \( G_2 \), but not \( G_3 \) (blank nodes are merged)
- Let \( \mathcal{P} = \{ \text{:_a :b ?x :y :e :f} \} \). We would have
  \[ \mu_1 : ?x \mapsto \text{:_b1} \quad \mu_2 : ?x \mapsto \text{:_b2} \]
  and \( \mu_2 : ?y \mapsto \text{:_b1} \) as solutions for \( \mathcal{P} \) over \( G \) since \( \mu_1(\mathcal{P}) = G_1, \mu_2(\mathcal{P}) = G_2 \)
- But \( G \cup \mu_1(\mathcal{P}) \cup \mu_2(\mathcal{P}) \) is not a consequence (contains \( G_3 \))
- Problem: we introduced unintended co-references
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Problems with the Naive Evaluation Idea (1)

Even an empty RDF Graph RDFS-entails infinitely many axiomatic triples:

- \{\} \models_{\text{RDFS}} \text{rdf:}_i \text{rdf:type} \text{rdf:Property} \text{ for all } i \in \mathbb{N}

Query

```
SELECT ?x WHERE { ?x rdf:type rdf:Property }
```

\(\Rightarrow\) Query has infinitely many solutions under RDFS entailment
Solution (1)

- Bindings are limited to a finite vocabulary

**Definition (Solution)**

Let $P$ be a basic graph pattern. A partial function $\mu$ is a solution for $\text{Bgp}(P)$ over the queried (active) graph $G$ under RDFS entailment if:

1. the domain of $\mu$ is exactly the set of variables in $P$,
2. terms in the range of $\mu$ occur in $G$,
3. there exists an assignment $\sigma$ from blank nodes in $P$ to IRIs, blank nodes, or RDF literals in $G$ such that:
4. the RDF graph $\mu(\sigma(P))$ is RDFS-entailed by $G$. 
Problem with the Naive Evaluation Idea (2)

Taking only the vocabulary of $G$ is too strict:

- $\{ \text{ex:s ex:p ex:o . ex:p rdfs:domain ex:C } \} \models_{\text{RDFS}} \{ \text{ex:s rdf:type ex:C } \}$

Query

```
SELECT ?x WHERE { ex:s ?x ex:C }
```

Has no solutions ($\text{rdf:type} \notin \text{Voc(G)}$).
Solution (2)

- Let $Voc^{-}(RDFS) = Voc(RDFS) \setminus \{\text{rdf:}_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$

**Definition (Solution)**

Let $P$ be a basic graph pattern. A partial function $\mu$ is a solution for $Bgp(P)$ over the queried (active) graph $G$ under RDFS entailment if:

1. the domain of $\mu$ is exactly the set of variables in $P$,
2. terms in the range of $\mu$ occur in $G$ or $Voc^{-}(RDFS)$,
3. there exists an assignment $\sigma$ from blank nodes in $P$ to IRIs, blank nodes, or RDF literals in $G$ such that:
4. the RDF graph $\mu(\sigma(P))$ is RDFS-entailed by $G$. 
Problems with the Naive Evaluation Idea (3)

Blank nodes have existential semantics

- \{ ex:s \text{ ex:p ex:o } \} \models_{\text{RDFS}} \{ ex:s \text{ ex:p } _:\text{id} \}

for each id
Problems with the Naive Evaluation Idea (3)

Blank nodes have existential semantics

- \{ \text{ex:s} \text{ex:p} \text{ex:o} \} \models_{\text{RDFS}} \{ \text{ex:s} \text{ex:p }_\text{id} \}

for each \text{id}

We already guarantee finite results since the possible range of \(\mu\) and \(\sigma\) is finite, but . . .
Problems with the Naive Evaluation Idea (3)

Query

```
SELECT ?x WHERE { ex:s1 ex:p1 ?x }
```

Data

```
G_1 = { ex:s1 ex:p1 _:a }
G_2 = { ex:s1 ex:p1 _:a . ex:s2 ex:p2 _:b }
```
Problems with the Naive Evaluation Idea (3)

**Query**

```
SELECT ?x WHERE { ex:s1 ex:p1 ?x }
```

**Data**

\[ G_1 = \{ \text{ex:s1 ex:p1 _:a} \} \]
\[ G_2 = \{ \text{ex:s1 ex:p1 _:a . ex:s2 ex:p2 _:b} \} \]

- Has 1 solution for \( G_1 \) and 2 solutions for \( G_2 \)
Problems with the Naive Evaluation Idea (3)

**Query**

```sql
SELECT ?x WHERE { ex:s1 ex:p1 ?x }
```

**Data**

- $G_1 = \{ \text{ex:s1 ex:p1 }:_a \}$
- $G_2 = \{ \text{ex:s1 ex:p1 }:_a . \text{ex:s2 ex:p2 }:_b \}$

- Has 1 solution for $G_1$ and 2 solutions for $G_2$
- Adding a triple that is unrelated to the first one causes new solutions
Problems with the Naive Evaluation Idea (3)

Query

SELECT ?x WHERE { ex:s1 ex:p1 ?x }

Data

$G_1 = \{ \text{ex:s1 ex:p1 _:a} \} \\
G_2 = \{ \text{ex:s1 ex:p1 _:a} . \text{ex:s2 ex:p2 _:b} \}$

- Has 1 solution for $G_1$ and 2 solutions for $G_2$
- Adding a triple that is unrelated to the first one causes new solutions
- Solution: Skolemisation
Skolemisation

- Skolemisation: we consider the blank nodes as constants/normal IRIs

**Definition (Skolemisation)**

Let the prefix `skol` refer to a namespace IRI that does not occur as the prefix of any IRI in the queried (active) graph or query. The Skolemisation `sk(_ : b)` of a blank node `_:b` is defined as `sk(_, b) = skol : b`. We extend `sk(·)` to graphs in the natural way.
Example: Skolemisation

**Query**

```sparql
SELECT ?x WHERE { ex:s1 ex:p1 ?x }
```

**Data (Skolemised)**

```sparql
sk(G₁) = { ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a }
sk(G₂) = { ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a . ex:s2 ex:p2 skol:b }
```
Example: Skolemisation

Query
SELECT ?x WHERE { ex:s1 ex:p1 ?x }

Data (Skolemised)

\[ \text{sk(G}_1\text{)} = \{ \text{ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a } \} \]
\[ \text{sk(G}_2\text{)} = \{ \text{ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a . ex:s2 ex:p2 skol:b } \} \]

\[ \text{sk(G}_1\text{)} \models \text{RDFS} \{ \text{ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a } \} \]
\[ \text{sk(G}_1\text{)} \models \text{RDFS} \{ \text{ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:b } \} \]
\[ \text{sk(G}_2\text{)} \models \text{RDFS} \{ \text{ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a } \} \]
\[ \text{sk(G}_2\text{)} \models \text{RDFS} \{ \text{ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:b } \} \]
\[ \text{sk(G}_2\text{)} \models \text{RDFS} \{ \text{ex:s2 ex:p2 skol:b } \} \]
Example: Skolemisation

**Query**

```
SELECT ?x WHERE { ex:s1 ex:p1 ?x }
```

**Data (Skolemised)**

```
sk(G_1) = { ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a }
sk(G_2) = { ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a . ex:s2 ex:p2 skol:b }
```

```
\begin{align*}
sk(G_1) \models_{?RDFS} & \{ ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a \} \quad \checkmark \\
sk(G_1) \models_{?RDFS} & \{ ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:b \} \\
sk(G_2) \models_{?RDFS} & \{ ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a \} \\
sk(G_2) \models_{?RDFS} & \{ ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:b \} \\
sk(G_2) \models_{?RDFS} & \{ ex:s2 ex:p2 skol:b \} \\
\end{align*}
```
Example: Skolemisation

**Query**

```
SELECT ?x WHERE { ex:s1 ex:p1 ?x }
```

**Data (Skolemised)**

```
\text{sk}(G_1) = \{ \text{ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a} \}
\text{sk}(G_2) = \{ \text{ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a . ex:s2 ex:p2 skol:b} \}
```

```
\text{sk}(G_1) \models^{?}_{\text{RDFS}} \{ \text{ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a} \} \checkmark
\text{sk}(G_1) \models^{?}_{\text{RDFS}} \{ \text{ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:b} \} \\ \\ \\
\text{sk}(G_2) \models^{?}_{\text{RDFS}} \{ \text{ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a} \}
\text{sk}(G_2) \models^{?}_{\text{RDFS}} \{ \text{ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:b} \}
\text{sk}(G_2) \models^{?}_{\text{RDFS}} \{ \text{ex:s2 ex:p2 skol:b} \}
```

Only 1 Solution

\( \mu : ?x \mapsto \text{skol:a} \) for \( \text{sk}(G_1) \) and \( \text{sk}(G_2) \)
Example: Skolemisation

Query

```
SELECT ?x WHERE { ex:s1 ex:p1 ?x }
```

Data (Skolemised)

```
sk(G_1) = { ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a }
sk(G_2) = { ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a . ex:s2 ex:p2 skol:b }
```

```
sk(G_1) \models_{RDFS} \{ ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a \} ✓
sk(G_1) \models_{RDFS} \{ ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:b \} ⊥
sk(G_2) \models_{RDFS} \{ ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a \} ✓
sk(G_2) \models_{RDFS} \{ ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:b \}
sk(G_2) \models_{RDFS} \{ ex:s2 ex:p2 skol:b \} ✓
```
Example: Skolemisation

**Query**

```
SELECT ?x WHERE { ex:s1 ex:p1 ?x }
```

**Data (Skolemised)**

```
sk(G₁) = { ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a }
sk(G₂) = { ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a . ex:s2 ex:p2 skol:b }
```

```
sk(G₁) ⊨^RDFS { ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a } ✓
sk(G₁) ⊨^RDFS { ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:b } ✗
sk(G₂) ⊨^RDFS { ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a } ✓
sk(G₂) ⊨^RDFS { ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:b } ✗
sk(G₂) ⊨^RDFS { ex:s2 ex:p2 skol:b } ✓
```
Example: Skolemisation

**Query**

```sql
SELECT ?x WHERE { ex:s1 ex:p1 ?x }
```

**Data (Skolemised)**

- `sk(G_1) = { ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a }`
- `sk(G_2) = { ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a . ex:s2 ex:p2 skol:b }`

```
sk(G_1) \models_{\text{RDFS}} \{ ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a \} ✓
sk(G_1) \models_{\text{RDFS}} \{ ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:b \} ❌
sk(G_2) \models_{\text{RDFS}} \{ ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a \} ✓
sk(G_2) \models_{\text{RDFS}} \{ ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:b \} ❌
sk(G_2) \models_{\text{RDFS}} \{ ex:s2 ex:p2 skol:b \} ✓
```
Example: Skolemisation

**Query**

```sql
SELECT ?x WHERE { ex:s1 ex:p1 ?x }
```

**Data (Skolemised)**

- `sk(G_1) = { ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a }`
- `sk(G_2) = { ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a . ex:s2 ex:p2 skol:b }`

- `sk(G_1) ⊨_{RDFS} { ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a }` ✓
- `sk(G_1) ⊨_{RDFS} { ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:b }` ❔
- `sk(G_2) ⊨_{RDFS} { ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:a }` ✓
- `sk(G_2) ⊨_{RDFS} { ex:s1 ex:p1 skol:b }` ❔
- `sk(G_2) ⊨_{RDFS} { ex:s2 ex:p2 skol:b }` ✓

**Only 1 Solution**

\[ \mu: ?x \mapsto skol:a \] for `sk(G_1)` and `sk(G_2)`
Problems with Skolemisation

- Of course we do not want to see Skolem constants in solutions
  \[\rightsquigarrow\] Use Skolemisation only as a condition, applied to the graph and query
Solutions in the RDFS Entailment Regime

**Definition (Solutions under RDFS entailment)**

Let \( P \) be a basic graph pattern. A partial function \( \mu \) is a solution for \( \text{Bgp}(P) \) over the queried (active) graph \( G \) under RDFS entailment if:

1. the domain of \( \mu \) is exactly the set of variables in \( P \),
2. terms in the range of \( \mu \) occur in \( G \) or \( \text{Voc}^-(\text{RDFS}) \),
3. there exists an assignment \( \sigma \) from blank nodes in \( P \) to IRIs, blank nodes, or RDF literals in \( G \) such that:
4. the RDF graph \( \text{sk}(\mu(\sigma(P))) \) is well-formed and RDFS-entailed by \( G \).

The well-formed criterion prevents literals in subject position.
SPARQL Entailment Regime

SPARQL entailment regimes define

- A name for the regime
- What entailment relation is used, e.g., RDFS-entailment
- Above described restrictions to address extension point conditions
- Legal graphs and queries (for RDFS all RDF graphs and SPARQL queries are legal)
- Handling of inconsistencies
- Errors handling
- How a regime can be described in SPARQL service descriptions
Standard SPARQL Semantics as Entailment Regime

**Definition (Solutions under simple entailment)**

Let $P$ be a basic graph pattern. A partial function $\mu$ is a solution for $\text{Bgp}(P)$ over the queried (active) graph $G$ under RDFS simple entailment if:

1. the domain of $\mu$ is exactly the set of variables in $P$,
2. terms in the range of $\mu$ occur in $G$ or $\text{Voc} \cup (\text{RDFS})$,
3. there exists an assignment $\sigma$ from blank nodes in $P$ to IRIs, blank nodes, or RDF literals in $G$ such that:
4. the RDF graph $\text{sk}(\mu(\sigma(P)))$ is well-formed and RDFS simply entailed by $G$. 

Standard SPARQL Semantics as Entailment Regime

**Definition (Solutions under simple entailment)**

Let $P$ be a basic graph pattern. A partial function $\mu$ is a solution for $\text{Bgp}(P)$ over the queried (active) graph $G$ under simple entailment if:

1. the domain of $\mu$ is exactly the set of variables in $P$,
2. terms in the range of $\mu$ occur in $G$ or $\text{Voc}(\text{RDFS})$,
3. there exists an assignment $\sigma$ from blank nodes in $P$ to IRIs, blank nodes, or RDF literals in $G$ such that:
4. the RDF graph $\text{sk}(\mu(\sigma(P)))$ is well-formed and $\text{RDFS}$ simply entailed by $G$.

⇝ Same definition can be used with simple entailment to obtain subgraph matching semantics
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Implementation of the RDFS Entailment Regime

The definition based on entailment relations allows for different implementation techniques

- Materialisation / forwards-chaining
- Query rewriting / backwards-chaining
- Hybrid approaches
RDFS Entailment Regime via Materialisation

**Query**

```
SELECT ?x WHERE { ?x a ex:Person }
```

**Data**

```
ex:Birte ex:presentsLecture "SPARQL" .
ex:presentsLecture rdfs:domain ex:Lecturer .
ex:Lecturer rdfs:subClassOf ex:Person .
```

- No answer under simple entailment/subgraph matching
RDFS Entailment Regime via Materialisation

Query

SELECT ?x WHERE { ?x a ex:Person }

Data

ex:Birte ex:presentsLecture "SPARQL" .
ex:presentsLecture rdfs:domain ex:Lecturer .
ex:Lecturer rdfs:subClassOf ex:Person .

- No answer under simple entailment/subgraph matching
- Idea: we extend the queried graph with relevant inferred triples
RDFS Entailment Regime via Materialisation

**Query**

```sparql
SELECT ?x WHERE { ?x a ex:Person }
```

**Data**

```sparql
ex:Birte ex:presentsLecture "SPARQL" .
ex:presentsLecture rdfs:domain ex:Lecturer .
ex:Lecturer rdfs:subClassOf ex:Person .
```
RDFS Entailment Regime via Materialisation

**Query**

```
SELECT ?x WHERE { ?x a ex:Person }
```

**Data**

```
ex:Birte ex:presentsLecture "SPARQL" .
ex:presentsLecture rdfs:domain ex:Lecturer .
ex:Lecturer rdfs:subClassOf ex:Person .
```
### RDFS Entailment Regime via Materialisation

**Query**

```
SELECT ?x WHERE { ?x a ex:Person }
```

**Data**

``` ...
ex:Birte ex:presentsLecture "SPARQL" .
ex:presentsLecture rdfs:domain ex:Lecturer .
ex:Lecturer rdfs:subClassOf ex:Person .
ex:Birte rdf:type ex:Lecturer .
```
RDFS Entailment Regime via Materialisation

Query

```
SELECT ?x WHERE { ?x a ex:Person }
```

Data

```
ex:Birte ex:presentsLecture "SPARQL" .
ex:presentsLecture rdfs:domain ex:Lecturer .
ex:Lecturer rdfs:subClassOf ex:Person .
ex:Birte rdf:type ex:Lecturer .
```
RDFS Entailment Regime via Materialisation

Query

```
SELECT ?x WHERE { ?x a ex:Person }
```

Data

```
ex:Birte ex:presentsLecture "SPARQL" .
ex:presentsLecture rdfs:domain ex:Lecturer .
ex:Lecturer rdfs:subClassOf ex:Person .
ex:Birte rdf:type ex:Lecturer .
ex:Birte rdf:type ex:Person .
```
RDFS Entailment Regime via Materialisation

Query

```
SELECT ?x WHERE { ?x a ex:Person }
```

Data

```
ex:Birte ex:presentsLecture "SPARQL" .
ex:presentsLecture rdfs:domain ex:Lecturer .
ex:Lecturer rdfs:subClassOf ex:Person .
ex:Birte rdf:type ex:Lecturer .
ex:Birte rdf:type ex:Person .
```

- Query over the extended graph: $\mu: ?x \mapsto ex:Birte$
RDFS Entailment Regime via Materialisation

**Query**

```
SELECT ?x WHERE { ?x a ex:Person }
```

**Data**

```
ex:Birte ex:presentsLecture "SPARQL".
ex:presentsLecture rdfs:domain ex:Lecturer.
ex:Lecturer rdfs:subClassOf ex:Person.
ex:Birte rdf:type ex:Lecturer.
ex:Birte rdf:type ex:Person.
```

- **Query over the extended graph:** $\mu: ?x \mapsto ex:Birte$
- **Disadvantages:**

TU Dresden  
Foundations of Semantic Web Technologies  
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RDFS Entailment Regime via Materialisation

**Query**

```
SELECT ?x WHERE { ?x a ex:Person }
```

**Data**

```
ex:Birte ex:presentLecture "SPARQL" .
ex:presentLecture rdfs:domain ex:Lecturer .
ex:Lecturer rdfs:subClassOf ex:Person .
ex:Birte rdf:type ex:Lecturer .
ex:Birte rdf:type ex:Person .
```

- Query over the extended graph: $\mu: ?x \mapsto \text{ex:Birte}$
- Disadvantages:
  - Size of the queried graph grows
  - Each update requires recomputation of the closure (extension)
RDFS Ent. Regime via Query Rewriting

**Query**

```
SELECT ?x WHERE { ?x a ex:Person }
```

**Data**

```
ex:Birte ex:presentsLecture "SPARQL" .
ex:presentsLecture rdfs:domain ex:Lecturer .
ex:Lecturer rdfs:subClassOf ex:Person .
```

- Idea: extend the query rather than the queried graph
RDFS Ent. Regime via Query Rewriting

**Query**

```sparql
SELECT ?x WHERE { ?x a ex:Person } 
```

**Data**

```sparql
ex:Birte ex:presentsLecture "SPARQL" .
ex:presentsLecture rdfs:domain ex:Lecturer .
ex:Lecturer rdfs:subClassOf ex:Person .
```

- Idea: extend the query rather than the queried graph
- Rule rdfs9 produces a relevant consequence

```sparql
u rdfs:subClassOf x . v rdf:type u .
```

```sparql
v rdf:type x .
```

ru 9
RDFS Ent. Regime via Query Rewriting

**Query**

```
SELECT ?x WHERE { ?x a ex:Person } UNION { ?x a ex:Lecturer }
```

**Data**

```
ex:Birte ex:presentsLecture "SPARQL" .
ex:presentsLecture rdfs:domain ex:Lecturer .
ex:Lecturer rdfs:subClassOf ex:Person .
```

- Idea: extend the query rather than the queried graph
- Rule rdfs9 produces a relevant consequence

```
u rdfs:subClassOf x . v rdf:type u .
rdfs9
v rdf:type x .
```
RDFS Ent. Regime via Query Rewriting

Query

```
SELECT ?x WHERE { ?x a ex:Person } UNION
{ ?x a ex:Lecturer }
```

Data

```
ex:Birte ex:presentsLecture "SPARQL" .
ex:presentsLecture rdfs:domain ex:Lecturer .
ex:Lecturer rdfs:subClassOf ex:Person .
```

- Rule rdfs2 produces now also a relevant consequence

```
\[ a \text{ rdfs:domain } x . \quad u \ a \ y . \quad \text{rdfs2} \\
\underline{u \ \text{rdf:type } x} .
```
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Query

```sparql
SELECT ?x WHERE { ?x a ex:Person } UNION
{ ?x a ex:Lecturer } UNION
{ ?x ex:presentsLecture _:y }
```

Data

```sparql
ex:Birte ex:presentsLecture "SPARQL" .
ex:presentsLecture rdfs:domain ex:Lecturer .
ex:Lecturer rdfs:subClassOf ex:Person .
```

- Rule rdfs2 produces now also a relevant consequence

```
a rdfs:domain x . u a y .
\hline
u rdf:type x .
```
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Query

```
SELECT ?x WHERE {
  ?x a ex:Person
} UNION
{
  ?x a ex:Lecturer
} UNION
{
  ?x ex:presentsLecture _ :y
}
```

Data

```
ex:Birte ex:presentsLecture "SPARQL" .
ex:presentsLecture rdfs:domain ex:Lecturer .
ex:Lecturer rdfs:subClassOf ex:Person .
```

- Solution \( \mu: ?x \mapsto \text{ex:Birte} \) (from 3. disjunct)
RDFS Ent. Regime via Query Rewriting

Query

SELECT ?x WHERE { ?x a ex:Person } UNION
{ ?x a ex:Lecturer } UNION
{ ?x ex:presentsLecture _ :y }
RDFS Ent. Regime via Query Rewriting

**Query**

```
SELECT ?x WHERE {
?x a ex:Person } UNION
{ ?x a ex:Lecturer }UNION
{ ?x ex:presentsLecture _:y }
```

**Data**

```
ex:Birte ex:presentsLecture "SPARQL" .
ex:presentsLecture rdfs:domain ex:Lecturer .
ex:Lecturer rdfs:subClassOf ex:Person .
```

- Solution \( \mu: \ ?x \mapsto \text{ex:Birte} \) (from 3. disjunct)
- Disadvantages:
  - Hard/impossible to find all solutions (RDFS vocabulary used in unusual ways, queries not just for instances or subclasses)
  - Query Rewriting is done at run-time \( \leadsto \) every query is evaluated a bit slower
Hybrid Approaches

- Combine materialisation and query rewriting
- Common (beyond RDFS): do not materialise `owl:sameAs`
- Extract schema part and use that for rewriting
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How can we use OWL’s Direct Semantics with SPARQL?

1. Based on Description Logics
2. Semantics defined in terms of OWL structural objects
   - owl:intersectionOf, ObjectIntersectionOf, \( \sqcap \)
3. OWL DL ontologies can be mapped into RDF graphs
4. Not every RDF graph can be mapped into an OWL DL ontology
OWL Direct Semantics Entailment Regime only works on well-formed RDF graphs, which can be mapped into OWL DL ontologies.
SPARQL with OWL Direct Semantics

1. OWL Direct Semantics Entailment Regime only works on well-formed RDF graphs, which can be mapped into OWL DL ontologies.
2. Basic graph patterns are mapped into extended OWL structural objects with variables.
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1. OWL Direct Semantics Entailment Regime only works on well-formed RDF graphs, which can be mapped into OWL DL ontologies

2. Basic graph patterns are mapped into extended OWL structural objects with variables

3. Type declarations required to disambiguate the parsing process
OWL Direct Semantics Entailment Regime only works on well-formed RDF graphs, which can be mapped into OWL DL ontologies.

Basic graph patterns are mapped into extended OWL structural objects with variables.

Type declarations required to disambiguate the parsing process:

- ?x a owl:ObjectProperty .
- ?y a owl:ObjectProperty .
OWL Direct Semantics Entailment Regime only works on well-formed RDF graphs, which can be mapped into OWL DL ontologies.

Basic graph patterns are mapped into extended OWL structural objects with variables.

Type declarations required to disambiguate the parsing process:
- ?x a owl:ObjectProperty .
- ?y a owl:ObjectProperty .

Variables can occur in class, property, individual, or literal positions.
SPARQL with OWL Direct Semantics

1. OWL Direct Semantics Entailment Regime only works on well-formed RDF graphs, which can be mapped into OWL DL ontologies.

2. Basic graph patterns are mapped into extended OWL structural objects with variables.

3. Type declarations required to disambiguate the parsing process:
   - `?x a owl:ObjectProperty .`
   - `?y a owl:ObjectProperty .`  

4. Variables can occur in class, property, individual, or literal positions.

5. Definition of solutions analogously to the one for RDFS plus specification of well-formed BGPs and graphs.
Implementation of the OWL DS Regime

- Materialisation impossible
- For example, we could have arbitrary disjunctions in the query (e.g., matching students that are not profs):
  SELECT ?x WHERE { ?x a [ a owl:Class ; owl:ObjectUnionOf ( ex:Student ex:Prof ) ] }

Turtle is not an easy syntax for complex OWL expressions

- Usability problems
- Queries go beyond simple instance queries
- Optimisation is difficult for such complex queries
  ⇝ Often we have to test all possible bindings
Implementation of the OWL DS Regime

- Materialisation impossible
- For example, we could have arbitrary disjunctions in the query (e.g., matching students that are not profs):
  \[
  \text{SELECT } \?x \text{ WHERE } \{ \?x \text{ a [ a owl:Class ; owl:ObjectUnionOf ( ex:Student ex:Prof ) ] } \}
  \]
- Turtle is not an easy syntax for complex OWL expressions
  ⇝ Usability problems
- Queries go beyond simple instance queries
- Optimisation is difficult for such complex queries
  ⇝ Often we have to test all possible bindings
SPARQL with OWL Profiles

OWL Profiles better suited for web applications

- OWL RL profile can be implemented via materialisation
- Polynomial complexity
- Extends RDFS semantics (i.e., can be used with OWL’s RDF-Based Semantics)
- Works on arbitrary RDF graphs
Further Entailment Regimes

- RDF Entailment Regime (just simpler than RDFS)
- D-Entailment Regime (adds datatype reasoning to RDFS)
- RIF Core Entailment Regime
  - Specify rules and query an RDF graph plus the rules
Introduction and Motivation

Conditions for Extending the Bgp Operator

BGP Evaluation with RDFS Entailment

Implementation Options

BGP Evaluation with OWL Semantics

Summary
Summary

- SPARQL can now be used with RDF(S), OWL, and RIF semantics
- Entailment Regimes overwrite evaluation of basic graph patterns
- Property Paths from SPARQL Query 1.1 problematic
- Definition of solutions (relatively) general
  - Works also for subgraph matching/simple entailment
  - OWL’s Direct Semantics needs extra conditions/definitions
- Implementation and efficiency for OWL problematic
  \(\Rightarrow\) OWL 2 Profiles