

# NEGLECTING SEMANTIC RELATIONS: CONSEQUENCES AND PROPOSALS \*

Francisco Alvarez Montero

*Universidad Autónoma de Sinaloa, Dirección de Informática, Ángel Flores y Vicente Riva Palacio, 80060, Culiacán,  
Sinaloa, México.  
fjalvare@fdi.ucm.es*

Antonio Vaquero Sánchez, Fernando Sáenz Pérez

*Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Facultad de Informática, C/Profesor José García Santesmases, s/n, 28040,  
Madrid, Spain  
{vaquero, fernan}@sip.ucm.es*

Manuel de Buenaga Rodríguez

*Universidad Europea de Madrid, Departamento de Sistemas Informáticos, 28670, Villaviciosa de Odón. Madrid, Spain  
buenaga@uem.es*

## ABSTRACT

Semantic relations are an important element in the construction of ontologies and models of problem domains. Nevertheless, they remain under-specified. This is a pervasive problem in Software Engineering and Artificial Intelligence. Thus, we find semantic links that can have multiple interpretations in wide-coverage ontologies, semantic data models with abstractions that are not enough to capture the relation richness of problem domains, and improperly structured taxonomies. However, if relations are provided with precise semantics, some of these problems can be avoided, and meaningful operations can be performed on them. In this paper, we present some insightful issues about the modeling, representation and usage of relations including the available taxonomy structuring methodologies as well as the initiatives aiming to provide relations with precise semantics. Moreover, we explain and propose the control of relations as a key issue for the coherent construction of ontologies.

## KEYWORDS

Semantic Relations, Software Engineering, Artificial Intelligence, Ontologies, Algebraic Properties, Intrinsic Properties

## 1. INTRODUCTION

It has been suggested that ontologies can provide benefits for almost any knowledge based information system. Among these suggested benefits is the ability to reuse an ontology developed for one task in another task. However, there is one neglected aspect that severely compromises the reusability and integration of ontologies: semantic relations. Although they hold together the entities that represent a domain and shape its structure, semantic relations have not been given the attention they deserve. The focus has been on concepts, their properties and the operations that can be performed on them, rather than on the semantics of relations.

Hence, in order to avoid some of the problems that arise from this neglectful attitude, semantic relations (whether taxonomic or not) must be provided with fine-grained semantics. This is an important issue, in particular for the development of problem-solving ontology-based information systems. Tackling a precise task inside a given domain requires precise semantics, not only at the entity or concept level but also at the relation level, that is, we should be able to describe relations in the same breadth of detail as concepts.

---

\* The research described in this paper has been partially supported by the Spanish Ministry of Education and Science and the European Union from the European Regional Development Funds (ERDF) - (TIN2005-08988-C02-01 and TIN2005-08988-C02-02) and (ERDF) - (FIT-350200-2005-16).

As part of the SINAMED and ISIS projects [11], we have pointed out in [22, 23] the need to: a) provide the relations used in ontologies with definite semantics and b) to develop ontology-based linguistic resources (OBLR) following a software engineering approach. Nonetheless, although a set of ideas has been proposed for the representation of relations and their semantics, the results of our research stem mainly from an analysis of “task-neutral” linguistic resources (LR) presented in [24].

In this paper, we present an analysis of the state-of-the-art in the representation of semantic relations in Software Engineering (SE) and Artificial Intelligence (AI), including the available methodologies to structure taxonomies. Our goal is to gain a better insight of this normally neglected topic, underline its importance for the development of information systems, and determine if the available technology is well-suited to provide semantic relations with the level of granularity that problem-solving ontology-based information systems need. Furthermore, we aim at covering some of the blanks left in the current research regarding the representation of relations and their semantics, and its possible application to the construction of domain and task dependent ontological resources.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, the limitations of SE semantic data models in terms of relations representation are described. In Section 3, the overstress of concepts in detriment of relation representation in AI including the available taxonomy structuring methodologies is shown. In Section 4, some of the initiatives aiming to provide relations with explicit semantics are presented. In Section 5, the control of relations is introduced as a key aspect to coherently structure an ontology. Finally, in Section 6, some conclusions and future work are outlined.

## 2. SEMANTIC RELATIONS IN SOFTWARE ENGINEERING

Semantic relations (relationships in the SE vocabulary) are a key component of vital design artefacts such as Entity-Relationship (E-R) models and object-class diagrams (OCD). However, they only capture a limited set of relationships, leaving much of the domain’s relationship structure out of the design [28].

In the E-R model [5] the model of the problem is represented by identifying its entities, attributes and relationships. In this model, relationships are classified among entities as binary, n-ary, and recursive. Nonetheless, although they are depicted on the E-R diagram, the amount of information they convey is rather limited, that is, the model itself only provides minimal information describing the relationships (i.e., mainly the cardinality among entities and attributes). Figure 1 shows a simple E-R model with two entities (i.e., Employee and Department) and two relationships (i.e., Manager and “Works On”). Notice that although in the E-R model relationships can have attributes, it is not enough to represent relationships with different semantics or granularities.




Figure 1. A Simple E-R Model

In OCD [3, 18], objects are organized by their similarities into classes that describe a set of objects having the same attributes and behavior patterns. In these models, relationships among classes can be classified under three basic categories denoting: a) generalization-specialization; b) whole-part/aggregation and c) an association among otherwise unrelated classes. The first two relationships are strongly defined among classes. Nevertheless, all other types of relationships that exist in the problem domain are lumped into the association category and depicted by a name connecting the classes. These names only indicate that a dependency exists but do not explicitly indicate how. Thus, association relationships are identified more implicitly than explicitly. Furthermore, the distinction between aggregation and association is often a matter of state rather than a difference on semantics [21].

In UML [4] relationships suffer from the same under-specification. UML categorizes relationships under five categories: association, aggregation (denoting a part-of relationship), dependency, generalization-

specialization (denoting an is-a relationship) and realization. As with OCD relationship classification, generalization and aggregation relationships are strongly defined among classes. However, association, dependency and realize relationships have to be identified by looking at the sequence and collaboration diagrams. Furthermore, only a label is used to indicate that these relationships exist. Thus, as in OCD, they are identified more implicitly than explicitly. Figure 2 shows a UML diagram with a dependency relationship between the class Player and the class Coach.




Figure 2. UML Diagram with an Association Relationship

Although we have described just a few semantic data models here, several others suffer from the same problem: namely minimal information describing relationships. As can be seen, relations are neglected in favor of object or entity representation. However, as it will be shown next, this is not inherent to SE; it is also a pervasive phenomenon in AI.

### 3. SEMANTIC RELATIONS IN ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

In AI, we find that knowledge representation formalisms (e.g., DAML and OWL) are intended to describe the terminology of a domain in terms of classes/concepts describing sets of individuals and properties/roles relating these [9]. However, although in the above formalisms is possible to make statements about a set of concepts, such as to declaratively specify that two classes are disjoint, analogous declarative statements are not possible for relations. This also comprises the assignment of properties, while concepts are assigned with as many properties as needed, the same level of precision cannot be applied to semantic relations. Figures 3 and 4 show the definitions of the class Musical and the “process\_of” relation in OWL respectively.

```

<owl:Class rdf:about="#Musical">
  <rdfs:subClassOf rdf:resource="#MusicDrama"/>
  <owl:disjointWith rdf:resource="#Opera"/>
  <owl:disjointWith rdf:resource="#Operetta"/>
</owl:Class>
  
```

Figure 3. Class Definition in OWL

```

<owl:ObjectProperty rdf:ID="process_of">
  <rdfs:domain rdf:resource="#BiologicFunction">
  <rdfs:range rdf:resource="#Organism">
</owl:ObjectProperty>
  
```

Figure 4. Semantic Relation Definition in OWL

Furthermore, the modeling effort is done through the construction of subsumption hierarchies among the defined classes and properties, that is, taxonomic reasoning is restricted to a generalization-based one. This is partially caused by the lack of conclusive mechanisms to reason along other types of relations [20], and because generalization was initially regarded as the primary mechanism for mastering the complexity of domains.

Consequently, there is a subsumption overload that has led to the misuse, confusion and conflation of semantic relations due to the lack of analysis to: a) distinguish between the different relations to be used in the representation of a domain and b) precise the semantics of these relations. For instance, without such an analysis what we have are ontological resources that have very general or imprecise relations that cannot be

adequately interpreted [15], resources whose relations are subject to multiple interpretations [9], resources where the semantics of the relations are not fine-grained enough as to allow to differentiate between two relations that are close in meaning but are not the same (e.g., the is-a and hypernym relations [8]), and improperly structured taxonomies.

For instance, in the UMLS (Unified Medical Language System) metathesaurus we find an example of a relation that cannot be adequately interpreted. In an analysis done to UML, [13] informs us that it has relations like CONCEPTUALLY-RELATED-TO whose meaning is imprecise: “this relation is too vague because it is obvious that all concepts are related to each other. The interesting thing would be to see in which way they are related by properly detailing this relation.”

In SNOMED-RT (a clinical terminology developed by the College of American Pathologists), we find an example of a mix of close-related relations that leads to an improperly structured taxonomy. In SNOMED-RT, the concept “testis” subsumes (correctly) the concepts “left testis”, “right testis” and “undescended testis”, but also “both testes”. We could accept “both testes” as being part-of another concept (e.g., “Testes”) denoting the mereological sum of the left and right testes, but hardly as being a “Testis”. The mistake could have been introduced mainly because of two reasons: a) the reliance on a single relation (i.e., subsumption in this case) to model a domain; b) the inability of the ontology developer to distinguish between the is-a and part-of relations. Figure 5 shows this mistake.




Figure 5. Both Testes are not a Testis

In addition to these causes, we can identify another one: the lack of control mechanisms in the usage of relations as part of the management tools of SNOMED-RT, an issue that we will retake in Section 5.

Although this kind of problems represents a serious obstacle in the development and integration of ontological resources, there are only two proposals that actually deal with it: The OntoClean [26] and Archonte [1] methodologies. These methodologies are similar but at the same time, as it will be seen below, follow opposite approaches to attain the same goal.

### 3.1 The Metaphysical Approach of OntoClean

OntoClean is grounded on the philosophical and metaphysical ideas of essentialism [2] that state that for any specific kind of entity (e.g., a tiger), it is theoretically possible to specify a finite list of properties (e.g., the rigidity, identity and unity metaproperties of OntoClean) all of which any entity must have to belong to a specific group or natural kind (e.g., see the table of properties and the taxonomy of kinds in [26]).

It is also influenced by the ideas of psychological essentialism [12] that enunciate that the world is divided into essences from which preset associated properties can be inferred (e.g., the metaproperties mentioned above), and that these properties play a key role in our everyday reasoning and categorization tasks by backing-up our inferences about kind membership.

Hence, OntoClean can be understood as a reasoning heuristic and inference system that establishes that the compatibility between the metaproperties defining the essence of concepts determines if a concept can subsume another and vice versa. Nevertheless, a global theory of reference and categorization, independent of any domain and task, like the one OntoClean provides is not possible. Recent work in cultural psychology has shown systematic cognitive differences between East Asians and Westerners, and some work indicates that this extends to intuitions about philosophical cases [10]. It seems that the creators of OntoClean take their own intuitions regarding the referents of objects, and those of their philosophical colleagues to be universal, and evidence suggests that it is wrong to assume a priori, the universality of their own semantic intuitions.

If the last 30 years of research in cognitive science have taught us anything, it's that many of our basic cognitive intuitions, biases, tendencies, and processes, are unavailable for (philosophical) reflection. This is, in fact, why cognitive psychology is useful. If we could simply discover what our minds are doing through

disciplined reflection, and this is what philosophers studying reference do, we would have no need for third-person experimental techniques.

Furthermore, it is interesting to note that just like in OCD and the UML, the generalization (is-a) and aggregation (part-of) relations are strongly defined in OntoClean. This is done through an axiomatization (see the set of definitions in [26]) that presents itself as an absolute truth. However, just like OCD, any other relation that falls out of the scope of the methodology can neither be described nor controlled. Hence, the limited set of abstractions wherewith OntoClean pretends to master the complexity of any domain and structure an ontology is not enough. Figure 6 shows the OntoClean approach.




Figure 6. The OntoClean Approach

### 3.2 The Linguistic Approach of Archonte

Archonte relies on the work of [17] that states that even for well-defined domains, the norms that fix the meaning of a word and of its reference (e.g., its concept) cannot be foreseen, and that the meaning of words is immanent to a given situation and context of usage. Archonte claims to provide concepts with a domain and task-dependent meaning by means of the similarities and differences that a linguistic unit has with other neighboring units in the same context of usage, and that these differences and similarities can be found by analyzing a corpus.

This method requires the use of terminological extraction tools to discover candidate concepts from the corpus. Once this is done, it uses a set of principles [1] to create and structure a backbone taxonomy where the differences and similarities between concepts are expressed in natural language. This is much in the spirit of the taxonomies or semantic networks that can be created using the definitions of nouns in machine-readable dictionaries [27]. Nonetheless, while the taxonomies from machine-readable dictionaries (MRD) contain loops and ruptures in knowledge representation, Archonte provides a manual method to create properly structured linguistic taxonomies from words, with the aid of an expert.

The principles used to structure a taxonomy are the following: a) similarity with parent (SWP); b) similarity with siblings (SWS); c) difference with siblings (DWS) and d) difference with parent (DWP). Since these principles are attached to concepts, herein lies the similarity with OntoClean. In order to structure an ontology, concepts (not relations) must have a set of (meta) properties that determine if a semantic link can exist between them. Nonetheless, although Archonte claims to be domain and task-dependent, it is clear that it is only domain-dependent. Concepts and relations are obtained by processing a domain-dependent corpus, but the corpus itself is independent of any task, as well as the set of properties used to arrange the concepts. Figure 7 illustrates the Archonte approach.




Figure 7. The Archonte Approach

Given the evidence, we claim that structuring an ontology cannot be done relying solely on the properties of concepts, and this must be done by putting also part of the semantic load on the relations. In the next section, we will try to clarify this last point.

#### 4. REFINING AND DESCRIBING SEMANTIC RELATIONS

In [24] we do an analysis of “task-neutral” LR and point out the need to provide relations with intrinsic semantics in order to prevent the taxonomic flaws of these resources, and in [22, 23] we propose to divide the semantics of relations into algebraic and intrinsic properties and to apply the principles of SE to the development of OBLR. Nonetheless, several things were left out.

First, do SE and AI provide the tools to supply semantic relations with the level of granularity that is needed for the development of software engineered, domain and task-dependent OBLR? Second, do taxonomy structuring methodologies actually deal with the contents of the semantic link around which the backbone taxonomy is constructed? Third, although the algebraic properties of relations can be well understood in our proposal [22], the intrinsic properties are left unspecified. Hence, what could these intrinsic properties be? What is the meaning they could convey? What would they be useful for?

Sections 2 and 3 provide an answer for the first two questions. As for the third one, relation element theory (RET) provides an answer. As explained in [19], RET is an effort to provide an exhaustive as possible classification (under the form of a taxonomy) of binary semantic relations (here, the reader must notice the resemblance between RET and the relationship classification of OCD and UML), on the basis of the nature of the relation between a parent or domain concept and a child or range concept. However, this classification of relations is not enough to determine the exact meaning of relations. Hence, [19] proposes a set of relation elements or relation primitives that can be used to describe and refine the semantics of a relation between two entities. These elements are the following: Composable, Connected, Functional, Homeomeric, Intangible, Intrinsic, Near, Separable, Structural and Temporal.

A possible application of these primitives would allow countering the polysemy and synonymy of relations within a same knowledge domain or context. For instance, a part-of relation linking an entity Engine to another entity Car could be defined synonymously in another ontology as “physicalParts”, but a machine without prior definitions cannot infer that these two relations are identical. Moreover, providing that we have a suitable algebra, there is the possibility of doing plausible inference [19] by using the semantic primitives of relations to infer new relation instances between previously unrelated sets of entities.

However, although the use of the aforementioned set of primitives can clarify the underlying semantics of relations, and meaningful operations can be performed with them, it seems these primitives conflate several properties that should be separately and explicitly represented as part of the semantics of a single relation or they simply ignore these properties despite the fact that, as it will be seen below, these properties stem from the definition of the primitive itself.

First, the primitive Connected indicates that the domain element is temporally or physically connected to the range element either directly or transitively. Here, direction and transitivity are conflated into one single primitive and made inherent to the primitive itself. This is a mistake, because for a given domain, a relation can be directed and transitive or directed and non-transitive, as demonstrated by [6] in their analysis of semantic relations in the medical domain.

Second, the primitive Intangible denotes that the relation that links the domain and range elements is hierarchical with regard to ownership or mental inclusion. However, it is well-known that hierarchical relations (e.g., is-a and part-of), can have a set of algebraic properties (e.g., asymmetry, irreflexivity, transitivity, etc.) that are useful to make valid syllogistic inferences. Nonetheless, it is unknown (as it is not explicitly stated) if the primitive comprises any of these properties or others.

Third, the primitive Structural specifies that the domain and range elements have a hierarchical relationship in which the domain element is below the range element in the hierarchy. Basically, what this primitive is telling us is that the range subsumes the domain or vice versa. Nevertheless, as with the primitive Intangible the set of algebraic properties related to hierarchical relations are simply ignored.

In spite of this, [19] argues that the scope of these primitives could be restricted to a knowledge domain of interest or to a context within a knowledge domain, in order to avoid the complications that arise when aiming for a universal set of primitives that could describe every relation in every domain. RET, just like

OCD, UML, OntoClean and Archonte, seeks universality by using a small set of abstractions to model any domain.

As opposed to this, in [22], we propose to represent semantic relations in terms of intrinsic and algebraic properties. We achieve several objectives by partitioning the semantics of relations this way: a) to separate those properties needed to make syllogistic inferences (e.g. transitivity) from any domain or task dependent properties (as it will be seen below); b) to avoid making any property or primitive a general definitional property of a relation; c) to allow making fine-grained distinctions for each relation independently of any knowledge representation language. Nevertheless, it has to be clearly stated that, as opposed to RET, we do not aim for an exhaustive classification of relations nor do we propose a universal set of properties through which any relation can be represented. We just propose to represent relations with well-defined semantics up to the granularity that is needed for the task at hand.

Therefore, for a given domain and task, each relation must be provided with a set of properties defining its semantics. Thus, we have algebraic properties that are domain-independent and intrinsic properties that are domain-dependent and task-dependent. This is necessary for modeling non-formal domains like medicine where we not only need to define relations with a simple tag, but also to qualify or precise the relations that link a part and a whole, a child and a parent, etc. with additional attributes in order to prevent relation vagueness. Some examples taken from the medical domain might help to clarify our point.

#### 4.1 Modeling Relations in the Medical Domain

In the medical domain, the part-of relation not only states that A is part of B, it also needs a set of properties to precise its meaning within a given context. For example, parts of an organ can be shared (they belong to several anatomical entities) or unshared (they belong to a single anatomical entity). Blood vessels and nerves that branch within a muscle must be considered a part-of that muscle and of the vascular or neural trees to which they belong. In contrast, the fleshy part-of the muscle (made of muscle tissue) and the tendon (made of connective tissue) are unshared. Similarly, the “adjacent to” relation not only expresses that A is adjacent to B, it also must have a set of attributes defining the adjacency: left, right, inferior, posterior, etc. In Figure 8, taken from [16] we can see an example of this. The brachialis is “adjacent to” the biceps tendon but is located behind (posterior to) it. The same applies to any other relation that is necessary to model a domain.




Figure 8. The Biceps and its Parts

Furthermore, we must “artificially” subdivide a domain according to the demands of a given task. Hence, if for a given anatomical structure we want to record the site of an injury with precision, we must further subdivide it in terms of concepts and relations, in order to capture the granularity of this task. For instance, as can be seen in Figure 8, the biceps muscle has several anatomical parts that are structurally distinct from one another (i.e., a long head, a short head, a belly, a tendon). Nonetheless, if we want to record the site of an injury with precision in this structure, we must distinguish the intracapsular part of the tendon of the long head of the biceps (which is enclosed within the capsule of the shoulder joint) from the extracapsular part of the same tendon, although these parts, anatomically, are one and the same.

This is precisely what OntoClean, Archonte, RET and even description logics cannot provide: the fine-grained distinctions that a problem-solving task in a given domain requires in terms of relation representation, because the nature and number of relations covering any domain and task is impossible to foresee. As can be deduced from the above examples, relations used in the modeling of non-formal domains need precise semantics that can be given under the form of properties. Under our proposed approach [2], all the properties that could be useful to prevent relation vagueness can be represented whether they are domain-dependent, task-dependent or useful to make syllogistic inferences. Figure 9 shows this approach.




Figure 9. Representing Relations with Algebraic and Intrinsic Properties

In spite of this, we find resources like GALEN whose semantic relations are imprecise. This is due to the fact that GALEN makes use of the taxonomy of relations proposed by RET [24], thus, bypassing any relation analysis of the domain, like the one done in [6, 16]. This relation analysis, as it will be seen in the next section, becomes essential if we are to coherently structure an ontology.

## 5. CONTROLLING THE USE OF SEMANTIC RELATIONS

As far as semantic relations are concerned, control entails that for a given domain and task, a set of conditions must be established to test whether two concepts can be linked by a given relation. Nevertheless, this can only be enforced but through the use of relations with well-defined semantics highly dependent on the domain and task.

The goal is to properly structure an ontology by using a set of properties that can act as domain constraints, without resorting to the metaphysical universality or to the linguistic generality of the available taxonomy structuring methods, as they do not take into account the semantics of relations nor the task for which an ontology is being built. Consequently, a complete set of relations must be identified and documented early at the development process by doing an analysis of the domain and the task to be carried out. Moreover, for each relation, its set of intrinsic and algebraic properties must be established as well.

Let us suppose that we are trying to develop an ontology to support a legal information system to “assess claims for immigration” in “Schengen signatory countries”. Our domain analysis might show that only the is-a relation is needed to model the problem domain with the following properties: a) asymmetry, reflexivity and transitivity as algebraic properties; b) has borders, has constitution and has central government as domain-dependent intrinsic properties; and c) signed treaty of adhesion and signed Schengen agreement as task-dependent intrinsic properties. Based on these properties, the system could ask meaningful questions to the ontology developer in order to prevent inappropriate modeling choices. Figure 10 illustrates this.




Figure 10. A Domain Modeled with a Single Relation



In section 4.1 we pointed out the importance of doing a relation analysis of the domain. There are two reasons to do this: a) because the number of relations considered directly affects the structure of the ontology and b) because they are at the root of certain phenomena. For instance, whenever a relation is added, new concepts could appear. If we take Figure 5 and we add the part-of relation not only the “both testes” mistake disappears, but extension set concepts automatically appear. Moreover, what at first appeared to be a single relation (e.g., the part-of) can be further subdivided in different levels of abstraction represented by other relations (e.g., the component-of relation) each presenting, depending on the domain and task, dissimilar granularities, that have to be carefully studied. Figure 11 shows this plausible modeling scenario.




Figure 11. Plausible Modeling Choices for Testis

At this point, it is interesting to note that even the efforts [16] that recognize the need to characterize relations with properties do not enforce any control mechanisms for relations. The reason is that these efforts, along with the others mentioned here (i.e., UMLS, SNOMED) seek universality, that is, they aim to be useful (i.e., reusable) for any number of tasks whatsoever, and universality, as we pointed out in [24] is based on content. Hence, if all the possible tasks are being considered, it is highly improbable that mechanisms for the control of relations can ever be enforced. This is simply because control at the relation level can only be enforced if the domain and tasks have been previously defined.

## 6. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

Semantic relations are an important part in the construction of the model of a problem domain in SE and AI. However, they have been neglected in favor of concepts or entities.

In SE, semantic data models have an emphasis on entity representation. Relationship representation is done through a small set of fundamental abstractions and when a relationship falls outside their scope it is loosely defined and represented by a tag, or lumped under a category that does not account for its semantics.

In AI, the level of semantic precision in terms of properties and attributes, as well as the operations that can be performed on semantic relations is surprisingly low. Besides frames, AI does not provide any tools for the description and refinement of semantic links. Moreover, although the under-specification of semantic links has been pointed out for main OBLR [9, 24], few initiatives [22, 19] exist that aim at providing not only a richer semantics to these links but also to propose specific operations that can be performed on them.

We are interested in the control of relations, as we believe its enforcement through the properties of relations would allow to properly structure an ontology and have the kind of verification that [7] states that knowledge-based systems need. Furthermore, we claim that this structuring is dependent not only on the domain but also on the task for which the resource is being built; as it is the context of the task (a specific application) the one that allows fixing the pertinent meaning features of concepts and relations. We are currently in the stage of developing a tool based on the one described in [14] in order to include the ideas mentioned here. Our final goal is to develop an OBLR with a Mikrokosmos-like structure and philosophy [25] that will be used as part of a summarization and categorization system.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Bachimont, B., Isaac, A., Troncy, R. 2002. Semantic Commitment for Designing Ontologies: A Proposal. LNCS 2473, pp. 114-119.

- [2] Barrett, H.C. 2001. On the Functional Origins of Essentialism. *Mind and Society* 3(2), pp. 1-30.
- [3] Booch, G. 1986. Object-Oriented Development. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 12(12).
- [4] Booch, G., Rumbaugh, J & Jacobson, I. 1999. *The Unified Modeling Language User Guide*. Addison Wesley.
- [5] Chen, P. 1976. The Entity-Relationship Model – Toward a Unified View of Data. *ACM Transactions on Database Systems* 1(1)
- [6] Hahn, U., Schulz, S., Romacker, M. 1999. Part-whole Reasoning: A Case Study in Medical Ontology Engineering. *Intelligent Systems and their applications*, Vol. 14(5), pp.59-67, IEEE Computer Society.
- [7] Hicks, R.C. 2003. Knowledge-Based Management System-Tools for Creating Verified Intelligent Systems. *Knowledge Based Systems* 16, pp. 165-171.
- [8] Hirst G. 2004. Ontology and the Lexicon. In Staab & Studer (eds), *Handbook on Ontologies*, Springer-Verlag, pp. 209-230.
- [9] Kashyap, V. and Borgida, A. 2003. Representing the UMLS® Semantic Network using OWL. *LNCS* 2870, pp. 1-16.
- [10] Machery, E. et al. 2004. Semantics Cross-Cultural Style. *Cognition* 92, pp.B1-B12.
- [11] Maña, M. et al. 2006. Los proyectos SINAMED e ISIS: Mejoras en el Acceso a la Información Biomédica mediante la integración de Generación de Resúmenes, Categorización Automática de Textos y Ontologías. *Procesamiento de Lenguaje Natural* nº 37, 353-354.
- [12] Medin, D. & Ortony, A. 1989. Psychological Essentialism. In S. Vosniadou & A. Ortony (eds.) *Similarity and Analogical Reasoning*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 179-195.
- [13] Montero, S. 2003. Estructuración conceptual y formalización terminográfica de frasemas en el subdominio de la oncología. *Estudios de Lingüística Española (ELiEs)*, Vol. 19.
- [14] Moreno, A. and Pérez, C. 2000. Reusing the Mikrokosmos Ontology for Concept-Based Multilingual Terminology Databases. In *Proc. of the 2nd LREC*, pp. 1061-1067.
- [15] Nirenburg, S. et al. 2005. Ontological Semantic Text Processing in the Biomedical Domain. Working Paper #03-05, Institute for Language and Information Technologies, University of Maryland.
- [16] Noy, F. Musen, M., Mejino, J., Rosse, C. 2004. Pushing the envelope: challenges in a frame-based representation of human anatomy. *Data & Knowledge Engineering*, 48(3), 335-359.
- [17] Rastier, F., Cavazza, M., Abeillé, A. 1994. *Sémantique pour l'analyse*. De la linguistique à l'informatique, Masson.
- [18] Rumbaugh, J. 1991. *Object-Oriented Modeling and Design*. Prentice-Hall, New Jersey.
- [19] Russomanno, D. 2006. A Plausible Inference Prototype for the Semantic Web. *Journal of Intelligent Information Systems*, Vol. 26(3), pp.227-246.
- [20] Schulz et al. 1999. From Knowledge Import to Knowledge Finishing: Automatic Acquisition and Semiautomatic Refinement of Medical Knowledge. In *Proc. of the 12th Banff Knowledge Acquisition for Knowledge-Based Systems Workshop - KAW'99*.
- [21] Steimann, F., Gößner, J. and Mück, T. 2003. On the Key Role of Composition in Object-Oriented Modeling. *LNCS* 2863, pp. 106–120.
- [22] Vaquero, A., Sáenz, F., Alvarez, F., Buenaga, M. 2006. Conceptual Design for Domain and Task Specific Ontology-Based Linguistic Resources. *LNCS* 4275, pp. 658-668.
- [23] Vaquero, A. Sáenz, F. Alvarez, F., Buenaga, M. 2006. Thinking Precedes Action: Using Software Engineering for the Development of a Terminology Database to Improve Access to Biomedical Documentation. *LNCS* 4345, pp. 207-218.
- [24] Vaquero, A. Álvarez, F. and Sáenz, F. 2007. A Review of Common Problems in Linguistic Resources and a New Way to Represent Ontological Relationships. *Electronic Journal of the Argentine Society for Informatics and Operations Research*, Vol. 7(1), ISSN 1514 - 6774, pp. 1-11.
- [25] Viegas, E. et al. 1999. Semantics in Action. In P. Saint-Dizier (ed.), *Predicative Forms in Natural Language and in Lexical Knowledge Bases*, Kluwer, pp. 1-33.
- [26] Welty, C. & Guarino, N. 2001. Supporting Ontological Analysis of Taxonomic Relationships. *Data and Knowledge Engineering*, Vol. 39(1)
- [27] Wilks, Y., Slator, B., Guthrie, L. 1996. *Electric Words: Dictionaries, Computers and Meanings*. Chapter 10: Genus Hierarchies and Networks, pp. 161-181.
- [28] Yoo, J., Catanio, J. and Ravi, P. 2004. Relationship Analysis in Requirements Engineering. *Requirements Engineering*, Vol. 9(4), pp. 238-247.