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Abstract
This paper proposes a syntax representation for nominal schemas, a new description-logic style extension of OWL 2 [2, 3]. Necessary and minimal modifications to Functional and Manchester grammars are included as well as mappings from these two syntaxes to Turtle. An appendix with two examples is added in order to clarify the proposal.

1 Introduction
Nominal schemas [6, 7] are a new description-logic style extension of OWL 2 [11] which can be used like "variable nominal classes" within axioms. Nominal Schemas have been introduced in description logics (DL) syntax.

While the semantic intuition behind nominal schemas is the same as the one behind DL-safe variables presented in [9], the difference lies in the fact that DL-safe variables are tied to rule languages, while nominal schemas integrate seamlessly with DL syntax. The proposed extension encompasses DL-safe variable SWRL [5, 10, 6] while staying within the DL/OWL language paradigm and without employing hybrid approaches.

Nominal schemas have been introduced as a new general constructor for DL, denoted by the letter V in the DL nomenclature (define DL SROIQV as an extension of the description logic SROIQ). Worst-case complexity remains N2EXPTIME-complete after the addition of this new DL extension.

We present an example of nominal schemas.

Rules such as (1) are not expressible in current OWL 2.

\[
\text{hasFather}(x,y) \land \text{hasBrother}(y,z) \land \text{hasTeacher}(x,z) \rightarrow \text{ChildTaughtByUncle}(x)
\] (1)

In contrast, using nominal schemas, rule (1) can be expressed as (2).

\[
\exists \text{hasTeacher}.\{z\} \cap \exists \text{hasFather}.\exists \text{hasBrother}.\{z\} \subseteq \text{ChildTaughtByUncle}.
\] (2)

The expression \{z\} is a nominal schema, which is to be read as a variable nominal that can only represent nominals (i.e., z binds to known individuals), where the binding is the same for all occurrences of the nominal schema in an axiom. Variables \(x\) and \(y\) can still take arbitrary values and be hidden in the DL axiom, \(z\) needs to be restricted to be DL-safe to retain the conclusion.

For a more detailed description of nominal schemas including their formal semantics see [7].
This document proposes different ways to represent nominal schemas in the main syntaxes of OWL: Functional, Manchester, Turtle and RDF/XML. For an introduction of the OWL syntaxes consult [11]. Mapping from Turtle triples to RDF/XML is a well defined and automatized process so the RDF/XML based syntax will not be directly addressed in this document, it is assumed that it can be easily derived from the Turtle Syntax.

New reserved words are presented to mark the appearance of nominal schemas in the different syntaxes (Functional, Manchester and Turtle) as well as the necessary modifications to their grammars (Functional and Manchester). The representation of nominal schemas in Turtle syntax is defined by the mappings from Functional and Manchester.

Several approaches were considered for the representation and storage of nominal schemas, such as the use of entities with the ontology namespace, but this paper proposes the use of string literals. Using this approach we prevent the possible overlap that could be produced by giving the same name to two different nominal schemas. If these are declared as entities and, by error, two of them share the same name they will end up pointing to the same node in an RDF graph when they most likely refer to different individuals.

The selected approach, the use of a xsd:string datatype, is also considered by the RIF XML format [12]. Note that the same nominal schema can never appear in two different statements of an ontology. A nominal schema will only be related with one single axiom. By using a string type the occurrence of the nominal schema is exclusively bound to the axiom where it appears and the same string could be repeated in different axioms along the ontology safely. Even if two nominal schemas use the same string it will be considered as different occurrences of a datatype and therefore, they will be two separated nodes in an RDF graph.

Using the underscore to mark the appearance of a nominal schema, as it is done for Turtle blank nodes, was also considered. This approach was rejected because it could induce errors. Although in some cases both nominal schemas and blank nodes can represent individuals in an RDF graph they are completely different concepts. Using the underscore to mark both could be tricky and would make mappings from and to Turtle syntax difficult to define. With such a similar syntax the mapping may produce errors confusing nominal schemas with blank nodes and problems may arise when we want to move from the Turtle syntax to an RDF Graph.

The document is structured as follows. Section 2 contains the necessary modifications that have to be made to the Manchester and Functional Syntax grammars in order to include nominal schemas. Section 3 refers to the mappings from these syntaxes to Turtle and. Section 4 includes the conclusions of the proposal. An appendix A is provided with two examples using nominal schemas in the different syntaxes that have been discussed in the document.

2 Grammar Modifications

We propose several changes to the grammars of the different OWL syntaxes in order to include nominal schemas. The presented changes are designed to be minimal and imply very small modifications to the formal definitions of these grammars.

Functional Syntax Grammar Modifications

We define in this section the required modifications we propose for the Functional Syntax grammar [1]. The reserved word ObjectVariable will be used to mark the appearance of the nominal schema. The nominal schema will be in parentheses and will always be followed by the expression `'xsd:string'`. The proposed
changes are as follows

Add the last line, (ObjectVariable), to the ClassExpression production rule:

```
ClassExpression ::= 
    Class | 
    ObjectIntersectionOf | ObjectUnionOf ObjectComplementOf | ObjectOneOf | 
    ObjectSomeValuesFrom | ObjectAllValuesFrom | ObjectHasValue | ObjectHasSelf | 
    ObjectMinCardinality | ObjectMaxCardinality | ObjectExactCardinality | 
    DataSomeValuesFrom | DataAllValuesFrom | DataHasValue | 
    DataMinCardinality | DataMaxCardinality | DataExactCardinality | 
    ObjectVariable
```

Add the next production rule to the grammar:

```
ObjectVariable ::= 'ObjectVariable ("quotedString"ˆˆxsd:string)'
```

Although nominal schemas are not conceptually class expressions, their addition in this part of the grammar has been chosen in order to keep the modifications as small as possible.

**Manchester Syntax Grammar Modifications**

Again, the reserved word ObjectVariable will be used to mark the appearance of the nominal schemas in the Manchester Syntax [4]. As in the Functional Syntax, the nominal will be in parentheses and followed by ‘ˆˆxsd:string’. The needed changes to this grammar are:

Add the last line, (ObjectVariable), to atomic production rule:

```
atomic ::= 
    classIRI | 
    '{individualList}' | 
    '('description')' | 
    ObjectVariable
```

Add the next production rule to the grammar:

```
ObjectVariable ::= 'ObjectVariable ("quotedString"ˆˆxsd:string)'
```

### 3 Mapping FS and MS to Turtle

We define the syntax of nominal schemas in Turtle through the mapping from Functional and Manchester Syntaxes to the triple-notation. We assume that from this notation the process to move to RDF/XML is already formalized so, as said before, the XML syntax will not be directly addressed in this document.

**Functional Syntax to and from Turtle**

The W3C document containing the formal mapping from FS to Turtle can be found in [8]. To add nominal schemas syntax to the mappings add the next row to the mapping from FS to Turtle:
### Functional-Style Syntax

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RDF/XML Triples</th>
<th>Functional Syntax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_:x rdf:type owl:ObjectVariable</td>
<td>ObjectVariable(&quot;v1&quot;ˆˆxsd:string)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_:x owl:variableId &quot;v1&quot;</td>
<td>_:x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And add the next row to the mapping from Turtle to FS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manchester Syntax to and from Turtle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable &quot;v1&quot;ˆˆxsd:string</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_:x rdf:type owl:ObjectVariable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_:x owl:variableId &quot;v1&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Manchester Syntax to and from Turtle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manchester-Style Syntax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable &quot;v1&quot;ˆˆxsd:string</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And add the next row to the mapping from Turtle to FS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manchester Syntax to and from Turtle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable &quot;v1&quot;ˆˆxsd:string</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4 Conclusions

In this document we propose ways for representing nominal schemas in the different syntaxes of the OWL language. Reserved words have been provided for Functional, Manchester, Turtle and RDF/XML syntaxes, along with the consistent modifications to their grammars and mapping functions. Nominal schemas will be stored as string values in the OWL syntaxes to prevent overlapping errors. In the appendix of this document two examples are presented showing nominal schemas across the different covered syntaxes of OWL.
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A Syntax Examples

A.1 Example 1

Rule Syntax

\[
\text{hasFather}(x, y) \land \text{hasBrother}(y, z) \land \text{hasTeacher}(x, z) \land
\rightarrow \text{ChildTaughtByUncle}(x)
\]

DL Syntax

\[
\exists \text{hasFather}.(\exists \text{hasBrother}.\{z\}) \sqcap \exists \text{hasTeacher}.\{z\} \sqsubseteq \text{ChildTaughtByUncle}
\]

Functional Syntax

\[
\text{SubClassOf}(

\text{ObjectIntersectionOf}(

\text{ObjectSomeValuesFrom}(\text{:hasFather}

\text{ObjectSomeValuesFrom}(\text{:hasBrother ObjectVariable("v1"^^xsd:string) })))
\]

5
ObjectSomeValuesFrom( :hasTeacher ObjectVariable("v1"^^xsd:string) )
)
:ChildTaughtByUncle
)

RDF/XML Syntax

_:x1 rdfs:subClassOf :ChildTaughtByUncle

_:x1 rdf:type owl:Class
_:x1 owl:intersectionOf ( _:x2 _:x3)

_:x2 rdf:type owl:Restriction
_:x2 owl:onProperty :hasFather
_:x2 owl:someValuesFrom _:x5

_:x3 rdf:type owl:Restriction
_:x3 owl:onProperty :hasTeacher
_:x3 owl:someValuesFrom _:x4

_:x4 rdf:type owl:Restriction
_:x4 owl:onProperty :hasBrother
_:x4 owl:someValuesFrom :x6

_:x5 rdf:type owl:ObjectVariable
_:x5 owl:variableId "v1"

Manchester Syntax

Class: ChildTaughtByUncle
SubtClassOf:
( hasTeacher some (Variable "v1"^^xsd:string) )
and
( hasSubmittedPaper some
( hasFather some (hasBrother some (Variable "v1"^^xsd:string))) )

A.2 Example 2

Rule Syntax

hasReviewAssignment(v, x) \∧\ hasAuthor(x, y) \∧\ atVenue(x,z) \∧\n
hasSubmittedPaper(v, u) \∧\ hasAuthor(u, y) \∧\ atVenue(u, z)
⇒ ReviewerWithConflictingAssignment(v)

DL Syntax

∃hasReviewAssignment.(∃hasAuthor.\{a\} \sqcap \existsatVenue.\{b\}) \sqcap
∃hasSubmittedPaper.(∃hasAuthor.\{a\} \sqcap \existsatVenue.\{b\})
\sqsubseteq ReviewerWithConflictingAssignment

Functional Syntax

SubClassOf(
    ObjectIntersectionOf(

        ObjectSomeValuesFrom( :hasTeacher ObjectVariable("v1"^^xsd:string) )
    )
)

:ChildTaughtByUncle
)
RDF/XML Syntax

```
_:x1 rdfs:subClassOf :ReviewerWithConflictingAssignment

_:x1 rdf:type owl:Class
_:x1 owl:intersectionOf ( _:x2 _,:x3 )

_:x2 rdf:type owl:Restriction
_:x2 owl:onProperty :hasReviewAssign
_:x2 owl:intersectionOf ( _:x4 _,:x5 )

_:x4 rdf:type owl:Restriction
_:x4 owl:onProperty :hasAuthor
_:x4 owl:someValuesFrom :_:x6

_:x6 rdf:type owl:ObjectVariable
_:x6 owl:variableId "v1"

_:x5 rdf:type owl:Restriction
_:x5 owl:onProperty :atVenue
_:x5 owl:someValuesFrom :_:x7

_:x7 rdf:type owl:ObjectVariable
_:x7 owl:variableId "v2"

_:x3 rdf:type owl:Restriction
_:x3 owl:onProperty :hasSubmittedPaper
_:x3 owl:intersectionOf ( _:x8 _,:x9 )

_:x8 rdf:type owl:Restriction
_:x8 owl:onProperty :hasAuthor
_:x8 owl:someValuesFrom :_:x10

_:x10 rdf:type owl:ObjectVariable
_:x10 owl:variableId "v1"

_:x9 rdf:type owl:Restriction
_:x9 owl:onProperty :atVenue
_:x9 owl:someValuesFrom :_:x11

_:x11 rdf:type owl:ObjectVariable
_:x11 owl:variableId "v2"
```

Manchester Syntax

Class: ReviewerWithConflictingAssignment
SubClassOf:
  ( hasReviewAssign some
    ( (hasAuthor some (Variable "v1"^^xsd:string)) and (atVenue some (Variable "v2"^^xsd:string)) ) )
  and
  ( hasSubmittedPaper some
    ( (hasAuthor some (Variable "v1"^^xsd:string)) and (atVenue some (Variable "v2"^^xsd:string)) ) )