

# Foundational Ontologies meet Ontology Matching: A Survey

Cassia Trojahn<sup>1</sup>, Renata Vieira<sup>2</sup>, Daniela Schmidt<sup>3</sup>, Adam Pease<sup>4</sup>, Giancarlo Guizzardi<sup>5,6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institut de Recherche en Informatique de Toulouse, France*

<sup>2</sup>*CIDEHUS, University of Évora, Portugal*

<sup>3</sup>*School of Technology, PUCRS, Brazil*

<sup>4</sup>*Articulate Software, USA*

<sup>5</sup>*Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, Italy*

<sup>6</sup>*University of Twente, The Netherlands*

**Abstract.** Ontology matching is a research area aimed at finding ways to make different ontologies interoperable. Solutions to the problem have been proposed from different disciplines, including databases, natural language processing, and machine learning. The role of foundational ontologies for ontology matching is an important one, as they provide a well-founded reference model that can be shared across domains. It is multifaceted and with room for development. This paper presents an overview of the different tasks involved in ontology matching that consider foundational ontologies. We discuss the strengths and weaknesses of existing proposals and highlight the challenges to be addressed in the future.

**Keywords:** ontology matching, foundational ontologies, lexicon matching, survey

## 1. Introduction

A primary purpose of work on ontology is to create a common computable semantics for concepts in the world. An ontology describes the concepts and the relation between these concepts together with constraints on how to interpret them. *Foundational ontologies* aim to create a computable semantics for very general concepts and associated terms. With a large number of ontologies having been created for different domains, as well as different conceptualizations for upper, top or foundational ontologies, the creation of shared semantic descriptions is still an issue.

The role of foundational ontologies in ontology construction, matching and integration is manifold. Their potential for clarity in semantics and a rich formalization are important requirements for ontology development improving ontology quality [42, 53] and preventing bad ontology design [35, 76]. These ontologies may also act as semantic bridges supporting interoperability between ontologies [38, 51, 52].

In the semantic web and linked data in general, as stated in [3], *distinctions such as whether an entity is inherently a class or an individual, or whether it is a physical object or not, are rarely expressed in the linked data, although they have been largely studied and formalised by foundational ontologies*. As stated by the authors, while the first distinction showed its practical importance in modelling and meta-modelling approaches, it is also at the basis of knowledge representation formalisms (such as RDF and OWL) for supporting taxonomic reasoning. The second distinction (physical object or not) is essential to represent the physical world and express their expected physical behaviour (e.g., spatial extension, gravity). Such distinctions are however nearly ubiquitous in ontologies and domain data described by these ontologies.

When a foundational ontology is used in the development and integration of domain ontologies – during or after – *top-down* and *bottom-up* approaches may be considered [77]. With a *top-down approach*, the foundational ontology is used as a reference for deriving

1 domain concepts, taking advantage of the knowledge  
2 and experience already encoded in it. In a *bottom-up*  
3 *approach*, one usually matches an existing domain on-  
4 tology to a foundational one. The latter is more chal-  
5 lenging since inconsistencies may exist between do-  
6 main and foundational ontologies. For example, a do-  
7 main ontology might be about hypothetical or fictional  
8 entities, and a particular foundational ontology might  
9 commit only to real entities. Furthermore, one has to  
10 deal with different levels of abstraction and also of for-  
11 malization in the matching process.

12 Ontology matching is a research area aimed at find-  
13 ing ways to make different ontologies interoperable.  
14 The matching process can be seen as the task of gen-  
15 erating a set of correspondences (i.e., an alignment)  
16 between the entities of different ontologies [18]. Cor-  
17 respondences express relationships between ontology  
18 entities. For instance, the concept of *Author* in one  
19 source ontology may be marked as equivalent (that  
20 can be interpreted as logical equivalence or more in-  
21 formally as a high level of similarity) to the concept  
22 of *Writer* in one target ontology, or that *Writer* in the  
23 source is subclass of *Person* in the target. One's in-  
24 tuitions about the formalizations of those words may  
25 be that they are different, but unless an ontology spec-  
26 ifies a formalized definition, they are just labels. A  
27 linguistic-based matching algorithm might find them  
28 sufficiently similar and evaluators of the match would  
29 not have an objective basis for declaring it faulty.

30 Whereas the area of ontology matching has devel-  
31 oped in the last decades, the problem of match-  
32 ing ontologies involving foundational ontologies has  
33 seen less development regarding automatic solutions  
34 [45, 73]. This is not surprising since matching founda-  
35 tional and domain ontologies is a highly complex  
36 task, even when done manually. It requires the deep  
37 identification of the semantic context of concepts and,  
38 at a minimum, the identification of subsumption rela-  
39 tions, and in a way such that the subsumption relations  
40 must of course be consistent with the formalization of  
41 the subsuming concept in the upper ontology. In fact,  
42 subsumption and other relations are often neglected by  
43 most state-of-the-art matchers.  
44

45 There have been many manual efforts to make sense  
46 of how different foundational ontologies relate to other  
47 lexical and semantic data bases, and how they improve  
48 the process of matching domain ontologies. In this pa-  
49 per, we survey various approaches to ontology match-  
50 ing using foundational ontologies to create shared se-  
51 mantics.

1 An additional challenge is that there is little agree-  
2 ment on many of the possible goals and methods of on-  
3 tology construction or the formal languages in which  
4 to encode an ontology. Developers of ontologies have  
5 variously advocated very small upper ontologies or  
6 large ones, very expressive formal logics, or very min-  
7 imal ones as a way to support fast logical inference.  
8 Evaluations and surveys have typically been conducted  
9 by the authors themselves, or their collaborators and  
10 supporters (with the possible exception of [51]).

11 Considering this scenario, this paper reviews the fol-  
12 lowing tasks of ontology matching involving founda-  
13 tional ontologies:

- 14 (i) matching of foundational ontologies;
- 15 (ii) matching of foundational ontologies to lexicons;
- 16 (iii) matching domain ontologies with the help of  
17 foundational ontologies; and
- 18 (iv) matching foundational ontologies to domain on-  
19 tologies.

20 We discuss the main strengths and weaknesses of  
21 existing approaches and highlight the challenges to be  
22 addressed in the the future. We consider that this com-  
23 prehensive study may set the grounds for advancing  
24 domain and foundational ontology matching.

25 The scope of this paper is in using foundational on-  
26 tologies for matching and integration of ontologies.  
27 While this necessarily touches on the topics of how to  
28 create or evaluate ontologies themselves, we will ad-  
29 dress this topic only in the service of evaluation the  
30 use case of ontologies for matching. As such, we do  
31 not attempt to review all available foundational onto-  
32 logies, but just study the use of them for matching other  
33 ontologies.

34 The rest of the paper is organised as follows: §2 in-  
35 troduces the different foundational ontologies and on-  
36 tology matching. §3-§6 discuss the approaches in the  
37 categories (i)-(iv) introduced above. §7 discusses the  
38 open challenges in the field and §8 concludes the sur-  
39 vey.  
40

## 41 2. Background

### 42 2.1. Foundational ontologies

43 An ontology typically provides a vocabulary that de-  
44 scribes a domain of interest and a specification of the  
45 meaning of terms used in the vocabulary. Depending  
46 on the precision of this specification, the notion of on-  
47 tology encompasses several data and conceptual mod-  
48  
49  
50  
51

els, for example, sets of terms, classifications, database schemes, or fully axiomatized theories [81].

In particular, ontologies can be classified according to their “level of generality” [32]: (i) *foundational ontologies* describe general concepts (e.g., object, event, quality) and relations (e.g., parthood, participation, dependence, causality), which are independent of a particular domain. These ontologies, also called upper or top-level, are sometimes equipped with detailed logical formalizations, and some include (ii) *domain ontologies* that may also describe the entities related to a particular domain (e.g., biology or aeronautics).<sup>1</sup> A foundational ontology is often characterized as representing commonsense concepts and is focused on concepts that are meta, generic, and domain-independent.

Several foundational ontologies have been developed, influenced by different philosophies and views on how to conceptualize reality. Several comparisons can be found in the literature, as in [43, 51, 77]. Some common criteria for comparing ontologies are artifact representation criteria (dimensions, representation languages, modularity) [51], ontological commitments and subject domain and applications [43].

We list a number of well-known ontologies that have documented use in ontology matching and integration efforts. We introduce the main insights behind each proposal, and current term (class+property) and axiom counts. Different variants and versions, and the availability of alignments to lexical resources (such as WordNet [55]) and ontologies are discussed in the next sections.

– **BFO** [2, 28]<sup>2</sup> (*Basic Formal Ontology*) adopts a *realistic approach* in terms of the existence in time of entities populating the world. It represents the reality into two disjoint categories of *continuant* (independent and dependent continuants, attributes, and locations) and *occurrent* (processes and temporal regions). It has 35 terms and a similar number of ax-

ioms. It is defined in OWL<sup>3</sup> and first-order logic language CLIF<sup>4</sup>.

- **DOLCE** [24] (*Descriptive Ontology for Linguistic and Cognitive Engineering*) is an ontology of *particulars* which adopts a *descriptive approach*. It is based on a fundamental distinction between *endurant* and *perdurant* entities. *Endurants* represent objects or substances while *perdurants* corresponds to events or processes. The main relation between *endurants* and *perdurants* is that of participation. DOLCE was originally written in the first-order logical language KIF [27] and includes roughly 100 terms and a similar number of axioms. Recent work maintains DOLCE in OWL.
- **Cyc** [33] is a proprietary ontology comprising both an upper-level ontology and a set of domain ontologies in a wide variety of domains. It is meant for the representation of facts, rules, and heuristics to reason about the objects and events of everyday life in the Cyc knowledge base. It involves thousands of “microtheories” with hundreds of thousands of terms and millions of axioms. It comprises OpenCyc is an open source subset of Cyc that is no longer maintained. It is defined in the higher-order CycL language [47].
- **GFO** [39]<sup>5</sup> (*General Formal Ontology*) distinguishes processes and objects. Processes unfold in time, they have temporal parts. Objects (called *presentials*) have no temporal parts, and may only exist on time-boundaries. Concrete individuals exist in time or space whereas abstract individuals do not. While an *endurant* is an individual that exists in time, but cannot be described as having temporal parts or phases; a *process*, on the other hand, is extended in time. It is defined in OWL and has 243 terms.
- **PROTON** [87]<sup>6</sup> (*PROTo ONtology*) serves as a lightweight foundational ontology organized in four modules. The *top ontology* module, for instance, distinguishes entity types, such as *object* as existing entities (agents, locations, vehicles); *happening* as events and situations; and *abstract* as abstractions that are neither objects, nor happenings. It contains about 500 classes and 150 properties (650 terms), providing coverage of the general concepts necessary for a wide range of tasks, including semantic

<sup>1</sup>We here follow the terminology proposed by [32] in distinguishing top-level and domain ontologies regarding their level of generality. More recently, the term *Core Ontology* [15, 69] has been used to refer to ontologies whose generality level lays half-way between top-level and domain ontologies. These can be seen as abstractions over several domain ontologies capturing concepts that crosscut several domain conceptualizations. For the purpose of this article, core ontologies are seen on par with domain ontologies. For example, the SWEET ontology or the O&M (Observations and Measurements) ontology, both of which are discussed in Section 6 are examples of core ontologies.

<sup>2</sup><https://github.com/bfo-ontology/BFO/wiki>

<sup>3</sup><https://www.w3.org/OWL/>

<sup>4</sup><https://www.iso.org/standard/39175.html>

<sup>5</sup><http://www.onto-med.de/ontologies/gfo/>

<sup>6</sup><http://ontotext.com/proton>

Ontology	#Entities	Formats	URL
BFO	35 terms	OWL, CLIF	<a href="https://github.com/bfo-ontology/BFO/wiki">https://github.com/bfo-ontology/BFO/wiki</a>
DOLCE	100 terms/axioms (depends on the version)	OWL, KIF	<a href="http://www.loa.istc.cnr.it/ontologies/DOLCE-Lite.owl">http://www.loa.istc.cnr.it/ontologies/DOLCE-Lite.owl</a>
Cyc	100k terms and 1M axioms	CycL	<a href="http://www.cyc.com">http://www.cyc.com</a>
GFO	86 terms	OWL	<a href="http://www.onto-med.de/ontologies/gfo/">http://www.onto-med.de/ontologies/gfo/</a>
PROTON	650 terms	OWL-Lite	<a href="http://www.ontotext.com/proton/protontop.html">http://www.ontotext.com/proton/protontop.html</a>
SUMO	20.000 terms, 80.000 axioms	SUO-KIF	<a href="http://www.ontologyportal.org">http://www.ontologyportal.org</a>
UFO	51 terms, 595 axioms (depends on the version)	FOL, SROIQ (OWL)	<a href="https://nemo-ufes.github.io/gufo/">https://nemo-ufes.github.io/gufo/</a>

Table 1

Summary of foundational ontologies used in ontology integration, discussed in the next sections

annotation, indexing, and retrieval. This ontology is codified in OWL-Lite.

- **SUMO** [58, 65]<sup>7</sup> (*Suggested Upper Merged Ontology*) is defined in the higher order logical language of SUO-KIF<sup>8</sup>. It includes dozens of domains ontologies, and contains roughly 20,000 terms and 80,000 logical statements (axioms). It has an associated toolset [63], translations to languages used in theorem proving [6, 64] and a complete set of alignments to WordNet [59]
- **UFO** [34, 36]<sup>9</sup> (*Unified Foundational Ontology*) has been developed with the intention of providing foundations for Conceptual Modeling. It started as an unification of the GFO and the foundational ontology of universals underlying OntoClean<sup>10</sup> [31]. UFO is divided in three parts representing different aspects of reality: A - endurants (dependent and independent objects and their types), B - perdurants (events and situations), and C - social entities, with notions such as beliefs, desires, intentions, etc. UFO-A has been formalized in First-Order Modal Logics [34, 36, 37] (e.g., the microtheory of endurant universals contains 22 terms and 31 axioms [37]; the microtheory theory dealing with relations contains 25 terms and 20 axioms) [19]; UFO-B has been completely formalized in First-Order Logics (26 terms and 185 axioms) with a (partial) translation to *SROIQ* [4]. Taken together, the microtheory of endurants universals, the one of relations, and UFO-B amount to circa 67 terms and 236 axioms. UFO has also a partial translation to OWL termed *gUFO* (gentle UFO) [1], which is composed of 51 terms (class declarations) and 595 axioms.

This list summarized in Table 1 gives an idea of the variety of foundational ontologies. One can see the variety in number of entities ranging from dozens to thousands, on the other hand there is some uniformity in adoption of the OWL standard in a majority of the listed ontologies. We point out as well that most ontologies do not publish versioned releases and exact number of classes or identifiers are not available for most. We tried to provided the most up to date counts of terms or at least order of magnitude counts for the larger ones, along with the best reference available to any online repositories where the latest versions are available.

The list is also not exhaustive as we describe only the ontologies that are more often cited in the the task of ontology matching. There are other top or foundational ontologies such as SOWA's ontology<sup>11</sup>, YAMATO [56], GIST [90]<sup>12</sup>, KYOTO<sup>13</sup>, PSL (Process Specification Language (PSL) [29] and BORO (Business Objects Reference Ontology) [16].

## 2.2. Ontology matching

Ontology matching refers to a process that consists of generating an alignment ( $A'$ ) from a set of ontologies  $\Omega$ , usually a pair of ontologies ( $\Omega = \{o_1, o_2\}$ ).

**Definition 1** (Matching process). *The matching process can be seen as a function  $f$  which, from a pair of ontologies  $o_1$  and  $o_2$  to match, an input alignment  $A$ , a set of parameters  $p$ , and a set resources  $r$ , returns an alignment  $A'$  between  $o_1$  and  $o_2$ :*

$$A' = f(o_1, o_2, A, p, r)$$

<sup>7</sup><http://www.ontologyportal.org>

<sup>8</sup><https://github.com/ontologyportal/sigmakee/blob/master/suo-kif.pdf>

<sup>9</sup><http://dev.nemo.inf.ufes.br/seon/UFO.html>

<sup>10</sup><http://www.ontoclean.org>

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.jfsowa.com/ontology/toplevel.htm>

<sup>12</sup><https://www.semanticarts.com/gist/>

<sup>13</sup><http://kyoto-project.eu/xmlgroup.iit.cnr.it/kyoto/index.html>

Each of the elements featured in this definition can have specific characteristics which influence the difficulty of the alignment task.

An alignment ( $A$  or  $A'$ ) consists of a set of correspondences  $\{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_x\}$ :

**Definition 2** (Alignment). An alignment  $A_{o_1 \rightarrow o_2}$  is a set of correspondences  $\{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n\}$ .  $A_{o_1 \rightarrow o_2}$  is directional between a source ontology  $o_1$  and a target ontology  $o_2$ .

A correspondence expresses a relation  $r$  between ontology entities of  $o_1$  and  $o_2$ . Here, the ontology entities are members of the correspondence:

**Definition 3** (Correspondence). A correspondence  $c_i$  is a tuple  $(e_1, e_2, r)$ .  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  are the members of the correspondence. They can be simple or complex expressions with entities from respectively  $o_1$  and  $o_2$ :

- if the correspondence is **simple**, both  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  are simple expressions.
- if the correspondence is **complex**, at least one of  $e_1$  or  $e_2$  is a complex expression, involving union, intersection, disjunction, cardinality restrictions, etc.
- $r$  is a relation, e.g., equivalence ( $\equiv$ ), more general ( $\sqsupseteq$ ), more specific ( $\sqsubseteq$ ), disjointness ( $\perp$ ) holding between  $e_1$  and  $e_2$ .

The correspondence  $\langle e_1, e_2, r \rangle$  asserts that the relation  $r$  holds between the ontology entities  $e_1$  and  $e_2$ . One has to distinguish between more and less rigorous interpretations of relations. The equivalence relation, for example, can be interpreted as logical equivalence or more informally as a high level of similarity. Back to the example in the introduction, consider the fragment of the ontologies *ekaw*<sup>14</sup> and *cmt*<sup>15</sup> in Figures 1 and 2, respectively. The format used to represent the ontologies is described in [84]. The following correspondences can be established between these two ontologies: (*ekaw:Paper*; *cmt:Paper*;  $\equiv$ ) is a simple correspondence; (ii) (*ekaw:AcceptedPaper*;  $\exists$ *cmt:hasDecision.cmt:Acceptance*;  $\equiv$ ) is a complex correspondence with constructors.

While the RDF alignment format provided in the Alignment API<sup>16</sup> [14] is the format *de facto* used in the Ontology Alignment Evaluation Initiative (OAEI)




Fig. 1. Fragment of *ekaw* ontology (adapted from [88]).




Fig. 2. Fragment of *cmt* ontology (adapted from [88]).

campaigns for representing simple alignments, correspondences can also be represented as OWL 2 subclass, equivalence, and disjointness axioms (with confidence values represented as axiom annotations).

<sup>14</sup><http://oaei.ontologymatching.org/2019/conference/data/ekaw.owl>

<sup>15</sup><http://oaei.ontologymatching.org/2019/conference/data/cmt.owl>

<sup>16</sup><http://alignapi.gforge.inria.fr/format.html>

Alternatively, the EDOAL<sup>17</sup> language (Expressive and Declarative Ontology Alignment Language) extends the alignment format in order to represent complex correspondences.

In the following, we discuss the use of foundational ontologies in different matching tasks: (i) matching of foundational ontologies; (ii) matching of foundational ontologies to lexicons; (iii) matching domain ontologies with the help of foundational ontologies; and (iv) matching foundational ontologies to domain ontologies.

### 3. Matching foundational ontologies

As stated in [44], while the purpose of a foundational ontology is to address interoperability among ontologies, the development of different foundational ontologies re-introduces the interoperability problem. As briefly discussed in the previous section, these ontologies have been developed directed at different classes of applications, as well as relying on different theoretical assumptions.

Early work addressed this problem [28, 80, 86] from different perspectives on the alignments. While [28] compared specific treatments of fundamental issues (as significant discrepancies related to universals and particulars, qualities, constitution and spatio-temporality) and how similar notions apply differently in BFO and DOLCE, [80] compared the primitive relations (dependence, quality, and constitution) between these ontologies. In [86], the alignment between BFO and DOLCE was established in order to conciliate their respective realistic and cognitive points of view and to integrate medical data. While 100% of BFO categories were aligned to DOLCE, 81% of DOLCE categories were aligned to BFO.

More recently, [91] compares BORO and UFO ontologies according to their metaphysical choices that define their structure and composition. Instead of comparing terms in both ontologies, the authors compare how the two approaches address issues such as *identity* and *dynamic classification*, the treatment of *relationships* (i.e., instances of *relational properties*), as well as the relation between *existence* and *time* in the two approaches. The radical difference between these two ontologies, hence, reflect deeper differences in ways of conceiving reality.

Other studies addressed other foundational ontologies. In [44], alignments between BFO, DOLCE and GFO have been established with automatic matching tools and manually, with substantially fewer alignments found by the matching tools. The alignments in the context of the whole ontology revealed a considerable number of logical inconsistencies. This work has been extended in [75] in two ways: considering matching systems participating in OAEI 2018, and a new pair of aligned foundational ontologies (SUMO and DOLCE). The alignments in [44] and [60] served as a reference alignment to automatically evaluate the matchers. Examples of reference correspondences include: (*bfo:Occurrent,dolce-lite:perdurant,≡*) and (*dolce-lite:artifact,sumo:Device,⊑*).

Overall, the results found are in line with what has been reported when evaluating the behaviour of matchers in the task of matching domain and foundational ontologies, which would also require identification of subsumption relations [71]. Current tools fail on correctly capturing the semantics behind the ontological concepts, which requires deeper contextualization of the concepts on the basis of their hierarchy and axioms. Addressing the identification of subsumption relations, the approach in [41] relies on extracting hypernym relations from ontology annotations for establishing such kind of correspondences. Results on exploiting lexico-syntactic patterns and definitions layout on DOLCE and SUMO were evaluated on a manually generated subsumption reference.

From another perspective, the core characterization of mereotopology (a theory of physical parts) of SUMO and DOLCE has been studied in [57], relating their axiomatizations via ontology alignments. This included corrections and additions of axioms to the analyzed theories which eliminate unintended models and characterize missing ones. Finding alignments between DOLCE and SUMO was also addressed in [60], where the SmartDOLCE and SmartSUMO ontologies have been developed on the basis of DOLCE and SUMO. The alignment of the just the taxonomic statements from SUMO to DOLCE involved extracting the upper-level of SUMO and the non-trivial task of aligning the remaining concepts to appropriate DOLCE categories.

Aligning foundational ontologies reveals also the problem of matching their different versions. In [78], a method for tracking, explaining and measuring changes between successive versions of BFO1.0, BFO1.1, and BFO2.0 was applied. The aim was to provide a more comprehensive analysis of the changes

<sup>17</sup><http://alignapi.gforge.inria.fr/edoal.html>

Matching foundational ontologies			
Work	Ontologies	Approach	Available alignment
[28]	BFO 1.0, DOLCE	Manual comparison	-
[80]	BFO 1.0, DOLCE	Manual comparison	-
[86]	BFO 1.0, DOLCE	Manual alignment	Set of triples
[44]	BFO 1.1, DOLCE-Lite, GFO	Manual, matching tools	List at Romulus*
[78]	BFO 1.0, BFO 1.1, BFO 2.0	Semi-automatic (change-tracking)	-
[60]	SUMO, DOLCE	Manual alignment	-
[57]	SUMO, DOLCE-CORE	Manual alignment	FOL alignments
[75]	BFO, GFO, DOLCE-Lite, SUMO	Matching tools	Alignment API format
[41]	DOLCE-Lite, SUMO	Hypernym relation extraction	Alignment API format

Table 2

Summary of matchings of foundational ontologies (\*<http://www.thezfiles.co.za/ROMULUS/ontologyAlignment.html>)

with respect to the BFOConvert tool<sup>18</sup> which provides an alignment between previous BFO versions, as this resource is limited to allow for a full understanding of the impact of the changes.

Formalizations [10] within the Common Logic Ontology Repository (COLORE), were used in the specification of alignments between upper ontologies in [30]. These alignments serve for the verification of foundational ontologies. Similarly, [11] shows how to apply techniques for ontology verification to link interpretations among ontologies.

Table 2 summarizes work on matching of foundational ontologies. They are mostly manual efforts, with a few of the resulting alignments made available.

#### 4. Matching foundational ontologies to lexicons

Several efforts in equipping lexical resources with foundational ontologies have been made in order to associate a formal semantics to their lexical layer. As stated in [23, 24], while WordNet has been used in numerous work as an ontology, where the hyponym relations between word senses are interpreted as subsumptions relation between concepts, it is only serviceable as an ontology if some of its links are interpreted according to a formal semantics that tell us something about the world and not just about language.

For example, WordNet has the sense of "chair" as a hyponym of "seat" but only an English gloss meant for humans to read for each, and no logical semantics that defines the hyponym link, with the result that hyponyms are often incorrectly treated by users as being logically transitive. An ontology would, at a minimum,

define the axiom of transitivity, and state that it holds on the hyponym relation. Most ontologies have little more than class/subclass relations however. One might also want to state that a chair is an artifact made by humans with the intent for use in supporting a seated humans. Some upper ontologies have axioms that define their terms, and some large taxonomies have terms for specific things like chairs, but very few have axiomatized large number of detailed objects, processes and relationships. This poses a problem for matching algorithms if there aren't both detailed formalizations that can be used to objectively determine a correct match and a large inventory so that matches are not to trivially general terms like object or event.

A number of researchers have investigated different ontological problems in treating WordNet as an ontology (e.g., confusion between concepts and individuals, constraints violations, heterogeneous levels of generality, etc.) [23] and provided the WordNet taxonomy with more rigorous semantics. First the WordNet taxonomy was reorganized to meet the OntoClean [31] methodology requirements, and the resulting upper level nouns were then mapped to DOLCE classes representing their highest level categories. This alignment is concentrated on the noun database, since most particulars in DOLCE describe categories whose members are denoted by nouns. The result is the OntoWordNet resource expressing alignments between WordNet 1.6 version and DOLCE Lite Plus. An extension is presented in [25] in order to extract association relations from WordNet, and to interpret those associations in terms of a set of conceptual relations in DOLCE.

Later, this alignment has been updated [26] with a revision of the manual alignments and different versions of DOLCE and WordNet, WordNet 3.0 and (DOLCE UltraLitePlus), which is a simplified version

<sup>18</sup><http://ontobull.hegroup.org/bfoconvert> (viewed on 25/03/2019)

Matching foundational ontologies to lexicons			
Work	Ontologies	Approach	Available alignment
[22, 25]	DOLCE-LitePlus, DOLCE-UltraLite/WordNet1.6	Semi-automatic (NLP, disamb., A-links)	OWL version*
[26]	DOLCEPlusDnS Ultra Lite/WordNet3.0	Semi-automatically (transitive closure)	RDF dataset
[83]	DOLCE-LitePlus/WordNet3.0 (verbs)	Semi-automatic (annotation tool, links)	-
[79]	BFO2.0/WordNet3.0	Semi-automatic (matching rules)	-
[68]	Cyc/WordNet1.6	Semi-automatic (interactive tool, rules)	-
[59]	SUMO/WordNet1.6/3.0	Manual	Textual format
[17]	SUMO, YAGO, WordNet, Wikipedia	Semi-automatic	SUMO axioms
[46]	UFO/WordNet3.0	Automatic (SemanticMapper)	-

Table 3

Summary of matching with lexicons (\*<http://www.ontologydesignpatterns.org/ont/wn/>)

of DOLCE Lite Plus, intended to make classes and properties names more intuitive and express axiomatizations in a simpler way, among other features.

While these works focused mostly on WordNet noun synsets, [83] extended the previous alignments by aligning verbs according to their links to nouns denoting perdurants, transferring to the verb the DOLCE class assigned to the noun that best represents that verb's occurrence. They argue that many NLP applications need to deal with events, actions, states, and other temporal entities that are usually represented by verbs.

The alignment of WordNet to other foundational ontologies has been also addressed. In [79], a semi-automatic method for aligning WordNet 3.0 and BFO2.0 is described. It adopts previous alignments between WordNet and the KYOTO ontology, whose top layer is based on DOLCE. The method involves manually creating a set of alignments between the ontologies and implementing a set of matching rules.

In [68], the authors report the matching and integration of several background resources and ontologies of varying complexity to the Cyc knowledge base. These resources and ontologies included large pharmaceutical and medical thesauri and large portions of WordNet. For this task, ontologists have been trained with domain experts and interactive clarification dialog-based tools were developed to enable experts to directly match/integrate their ontologies. In [59], SUMO was originally mapped manually to WordNet 1.6 and then manually updated to 3.0<sup>19</sup>. It is the only manual alignment of an ontology to every word sense in WordNet.

<sup>19</sup><https://github.com/ontologyportal/sumo/tree/master/WordNetMappings>

SUMO and WordNet were used in a semi-automated process to match the millions of terms in the YAGO<sup>20</sup> taxonomy and create a single large ontology and Factbase [17].

Finally, in [46], WordNet has been extended by applying the notion of *semantic types* in order to establish matching rules between the noun synsets of WordNet and the top-level constructs of the UFO ontology. The proposed rules were validated through an experiment with approximately 5,200 sample correspondences and average accuracy of 93%.

Table 3 summarizes the works presented in this section. There are some available alignments, approaches are mostly semi-automatic, with one case of manual alignment and one case of automatic alignment. WordNet is the lexical resource that is considered in all work listed and two different versions are involved in the alignments (1.6 and 3.0).

## 5. Matching domain via foundational ontologies

Foundational ontologies provide a reference for rigorous comparisons of different ontological approaches, and a framework for analysing, harmonizing, matching and integrating existing domain ontologies [60]. In domain ontology matching, in particular, they act as semantic bridges to help the task. For instance, reducing the matching space to the entities under a same category e.g., avoiding matching *dolce:endurants* to *dolce:perdurants*.

Despite the potential gain of exploiting foundational ontologies in domain ontology matching, few works have addressed this alternative, possibility due to the still lack of systematic alignments between domain

<sup>20</sup><http://yago.r2.enst.fr>



Matching domain ontologies via foundational ontologies			
Work	Ontologies	Approach	Available alignment
[49]	SUMO, Cyc/SENSUS	Semi-automatic (LOM matcher)	-
[52]	SUMO-OWL, OpenCyc, DOLCE/ 17 ont. (agent, bibtex, etc).	Automatic (structural matching)	-
[82]	BFO/GO, INOH Event	Automatic (FOAM+OBOAEA)	-
[61]	UFO/Conference	Manual pattern analysis	-

Table 4

Summary of matching via foundational ontologies

and foundational ontologies. This gain has been quantitatively measured in [52], where a set of algorithms exploiting such semantic bridges are applied. The circumstances of cases where foundational ontologies improve domain ontology matching, with respect to approaches ignoring them, were then studied. The experiments were conducted with SUMO-OWL (a restricted version of SUMO), OpenCyc and DOLCE and demonstrate that overall the alignment via upper ontologies impacts in F-measure positively. Additionally, in [61] a set of alignment patterns based on OntoUML (a conceptual modeling language based on UFO) are applied to a set of alignments generated by matching systems. An analysis of the impact of patterns to avoid common errors was presented.

The semi-automatic LOM matcher [49] combines WordNet synset matching (checking terms from the ontologies to be matched sharing common synsets) and *type matching*. This strategy employs SUMO to determine the ontological category of each word constituent for matching using the alignments from WordNet synsets to SUMO. LOM takes the source terms and collects the set of SUMO terms that their synsets map to, and then compares the SUMO term sets to their counterpart for each term in the target ontology.

From a manually established alignment between biomedical ontologies and BFO, in [82], a matching approach relies on filtering out correspondences at domain level that relate two different kinds of ontology entities. The matching approach is based on a set of similarity measures and the use of foundational ontology as a parameter for better understanding the conceptual nature of terms within the similarity calculation step. Besides the reported improvement in the results obtained, the introduction of foundational ontologies in the alignment process increased the influence of semantic factors in this task, further expanding the universe of information to be explored during the alignment.

Table 4 summarizes the use of foundational ontologies as an aid to the of matching domain ontologies.

Here the automatic approaches are adopted more frequently. Alignments, however, were not found to be available.

## 6. Matching domain to foundational ontologies

Methodologies for constructing ontologies should not neglect the use of foundational ontologies and may better address it in a *top-down* approach [2, 42]. As one example, existing methodologies including OntoUML [20], allow for creating a domain or core ontology compliant to UFO.

While matching foundational ontologies is mostly manually done, with more automation in matching domain ontologies via foundational ones, in this section, both approaches have been performed.

### 6.1. Manual Alignment

Many approaches for mapping rely on a manual alignment process. In [8], DOLCE was used to integrate two geoscience knowledge representations, the GeoSciML schema and the SWEET ontology, in order to facilitate cross-domain data integration. The aim was to produce a unified ontology in which the GeoSciML and SWEET representations are aligned to DOLCE and to each other. In that perspective, DOLCE works as a semantic bridge and this approach fits in the category of domain matching with foundational ontologies. The alignments have been manually established and representation incompatibility issues have been discussed so far. Similarly, in [67], manual alignments were established between the O&M (Observations and Measurements) ontology and DOLCE, in order to restrict the interpretations of entities in the O&M model and to make explicit the relations between their categories.

DOLCE has been manually aligned to the domain ontology describing services (OWL-S) in [53], in order to address its conceptual ambiguity, poor axiomati-

Matching domain ontologies to foundational ontologies			
Work	Ontologies	Approach	Available alignment
[53]	DOLCE/OWL-S	Manual	-
[8]	DOLCE-LitePlus/GeoSciML2.0, SWEET1.1	Manual	UML-syntax
[50]	DOLCE Ultralite/Mobile services ontology	Automatic (lexical+reasoning)	-
[72]	DOLCE-LitePlus/OAEI Conference	Automatic (indirect matching)	-
[73]	DOLCE-LitePlus, DOLCE Ultralite, SUMO/Conf, SSN, CORA	Automatic (indirect+embeddings)	Alignment API format [14]
[3]	DOLCE-LitePlus/DBPedia	Automatic (machine learning)	-
[12]	PROTON/DBPedia, Freebase, Geonames	Manual	-
[40]	PROTON/DBPedia, Freebase, Geonames	Automatic (BLOOMS+)	-
[13]	PROTON,OpenCyc(UMBEL)/Freebase, Geonames		-
[82]	BFO/GO, INOH Event	Manual	-
[74]	SUMO/OAEI Conference	Manual (via WordNet)	-
[66]	SUMO/CORA Robotics	Manual	<a href="http://purl.org/ieee1872-owl">http://purl.org/ieee1872-owl</a>

Table 5

Summary of matching with domain ontologies and cross-domain ontologies (\*<https://github.com/danielasch/top-match>).

zation, loose design and narrow scope. They have also developed a core ontology of services to serve as middle level between the foundational and OWL-S, and can be reused to align other Web Service description languages.

In [12], several schemata of FactForge, which enables SPARQL queries over a LOD cloud, have been aligned to the foundational ontology PROTON in order to provide a unified way to access to the data. The alignments were created by knowledge engineers through a manual process. Equivalence e.g., (*geonames:Country,proton:Country,≡*) and subsumption relations (*Proton:Situation, DBpedia:OlympicResult,⊑*) between DBPedia, Geonames and Freebase concepts and PROTON classes have been established. In other similar work, [13] includes an open-source extract of the OpenCyc knowledge base (UMBEL).

As stated in §5, manual alignments have also been established between biomedical ontologies and BFO, in [82]. In this line, [9] analysed the “compatibility” between an ontology of the biomedical domain (UMLS) and the Cyc Ontology, by manually aligning UMLS to Cyc.

In [74], ontologies from the OAEI Conference track have been manually aligned to SUMO. As a complete manual alignment between SUMO and WordNet is available, such alignments have been used as bridges to facilitate the matching task. Four annotators have been worked on the alignments. Table 6 shows a fragment of the spreadsheet used for the annotators to align the domain concepts to the SUMO concepts.

During the process of alignment, several difficulties arose for interpreting the real meaning that the concept represents in the domain ontology. For instance, the concepts *cmt:Bid* and *cmt:Preference* had no description clarifying their use, and no sub- or super-concepts that could be used to clarify their meaning. In addition, some concepts represented in the ontology present other kind of problems such as doubts regarding ontology elements’ adequacy, for example, the concept *edas:ReviewRating*, for which, according to the discussion raised by the evaluators, a rating could be a relationship between a thing, an agent and a rating value, rather than a class or individual as it would appear.

In contrast, one can examine a SUMO definition of a term such as *sumo:FormalMeeting* and see that it is necessarily a *sumo:Meeting* which is not a *sumo:SocialParty*, that it must be temporally preceded by a *sumo:Planning* which has the result of creating the meeting, as well as constraints that other events like a *sumo:Resolution*, which to be considered as such, may only occur at a *sumo:FormalMeeting*. It provides information something like the level of detail in a modern dictionary, but with the definitions expressed in logic, rather than human language, so that a machine can perform computation (and consistency checking) with those definitions. The cases described above consist of ontological representation problems commonly present in lightweight ontologies, and hinder the reuse and reliability of the represented knowledge. In addition, they highlight the importance of advancing in research that

1 uses foundational ontologies to give more formaliza-  
2 tion to domain ontologies.

3 In [62], existing alignments between DBpedia ontol-  
4 ogy and DOLCE-Zero<sup>21</sup> [21, 24], a subset of the  
5 modules of the formal ontology, are used to iden-  
6 tify inconsistent statements (systematic errors or anti-  
7 patterns) in DBpedia. DOLCE-Zero simplifies some  
8 of the distinctions in DUL, which has been created  
9 to optimize the alignment of WordNet used by the  
10 Tipalo method for automatic typing of Wikipedia re-  
11 sources [26]. Systematic errors are sets of individual  
12 errors following a similar pattern and having a com-  
13 mon root cause (e.g., a wrong correspondence). The  
14 alignment has been defined by a DOLCE-Zero de-  
15 signer. By using these alignments and by combining  
16 reasoning and clustering of the reasoning results, er-  
17 rors affecting statements can be identified at a minimal  
18 human workload.

## 19 6.2. Automatic and Semi-Automatic Alignment

20 While the previous proposals mainly generate man-  
21 ual alignments, BLOOMS+ [40] is an early work on  
22 automatising the process. It has been used to automat-  
23 ically align PROTON to LOD datasets using as gold  
24 standard the alignments provided in [12]. BLOOMS+  
25 first uses Wikipedia to construct a set of category hier-  
26 archy trees for each class in the source and target ontol-  
27 ogy. It then determines which classes to align using  
28 1) similarity between classes based on their cate-  
29 gory hierarchy trees; and 2) contextual similarity be-  
30 tween these classes to support (or reject) an align-  
31 ment. BLOOMS+ significantly outperformed existing  
32 matchers in the task.

33 In [72] the authors have proposed an automatic ap-  
34 proach for matching domain and foundational ontolo-  
35 gies that exploits existing alignments between Word-  
36 Net and foundational ontologies. The matching pro-  
37 cess is divided in two main steps. The first step iden-  
38 tifies the correct synset to a concept and the second  
39 one identifies the correspondence of a domain con-  
40 cept to a foundational concept. The approach has been  
41 evaluated using DOLCE and domain ontologies from  
42 the OAEI conference data set<sup>22</sup>, with the help of the  
43 alignments provided in [25, 59]. This work has been  
44 further extended in [73], where two similarity mea-  
45 sures for synset disambiguation have been adopted: (1)  
46 an adaptation of the Lesk[48] measure and (2) word  
47

1 embeddings[54] similarity. The evaluation has been  
2 also extended including DOLCE and SUMO ontolo-  
3 gies and their alignments to WordNet and three do-  
4 main ontologies (SSN<sup>23</sup>, CORA<sup>24</sup>, and OAEI Con-  
5 ference). SSN (W3C Semantic Sensor Network Ontol-  
6 ogy) describes sensors, devices, observations, mea-  
7 surements and other terms, enabling reasoning of in-  
8 dividual sensors and the connection of them. A recent  
9 version of SSN includes a lightweight core ontology  
10 called SOSA (Sensor, Observation, Sample, and Actu-  
11 tors). SSN is aligned to SOSA and both ontologies are  
12 aligned to DOLCE Ultralite (DUL). SSN is composed  
13 of 18 first level concepts, from those, 8 concepts are  
14 aligned to the top ontology DUL. CORA (IEEE Core  
15 Ontology for Robotic and Automation) [66] is an effort  
16 of the IEEE Ontologies for Robotics and Automation  
17 Working group (ORA). It specifies the main concepts,  
18 relations, and axioms of robotics and automation do-  
19 mains. CORA is aligned to the SUMO top-level ontol-  
20 ogy. CORA is composed of 34 first level concepts,  
21 from which 29 of them are aligned to SUMO.

22 In [50] WordNet was used as background knowl-  
23 edge, and their matching approach combines con-  
24 cept definition enrichment, disambiguation and filter-  
25 ing of candidate correspondences with inconsistency  
26 detection. The approach has been used for matching  
27 DOLCE+DnS Ultralite and a domain ontology de-  
28 scribing mobile services.

29 Automatic foundational distinctions of LOD entities  
30 (class vs. instance or physical vs. non-physical objects)  
31 is done in [3] with two strategies: an (unsupervised)  
32 alignment approach and a (supervised) machine learn-  
33 ing approach. The alignment approach, in particular,  
34 relies on the linking structure of alignments between  
35 DBpedia, DOLCE, and lexical linked data, using re-  
36 sources such as BabelNet, YAGO and OntoWordNet.  
37 For instance, they use the paths of alignments and tax-  
38 onomic relations in these resources and automated in-  
39 ferences to classify whether a DBpedia entity is a phys-  
40 ical object or not.

41 Table 5 summarizes work in alignments between  
42 domain and foundational ontologies. Several efforts  
43 have been made to align DOLCE to domain ontolo-  
44 gies, SUMO and PROTON are also considered in more  
45 than one work. These projects use different domain  
46 ontologies, and results are unavailable in most of the  
47

48  
49  
50 <sup>21</sup><http://www.ontologydesignpatterns.org/ont/dul/d0.owl>

51 <sup>22</sup><http://oaei.ontologymatching.org/2017/conference/index.html>

48  
49  
50 <sup>23</sup><https://www.w3.org/TR/vocab-ssn/>

51 <sup>24</sup>IEEE Standard Ontologies for Robotics and Automation," in  
IEEE Std 1872-2015 , vol., no., pp.1-60, 10 April 2015

Domain concept	WordNet synsets(S)	SUMO concept
cmt#Conference	S1: conference group discussion S2: league conference S3: conference	1: Communication+ 2: SportsLeague+ 3: <b>FormalMeeting</b>
cmt#Decision	S1: decision determination conclusion S2: decision determination conclusion S3: decisiveness decision S4: decision S5: decision	1: <b>Learning+</b> 2: Deciding+ 3: TraitAttribute+ 4: ConstantQuantity+ 5: ConstantQuantity+

Table 6

Fragment of the spreadsheet for the manual alignment between *cmt* ontology in Figure 2 and SUMO, via WordNet.

cases, therefore a detailed third-party comparison of approaches is yet not possible.

## 7. Discussion

The following sections discuss a series of issues regarding matching of foundational ontologies: the complexity of the task, the automation of systems with capabilities to include such alignments, the lack of evaluation data sets, the evolution of different versions and the problems that poses, the desired variety and lack of expressiveness in the alignments, and finally, multilingualism.

### 7.1. Complexity of the task

The problem of matching ontologies gets more complex when involving foundational ontologies, that explains why there is less development regarding automatic solutions [45, 73]. It requires the deep identification of the semantic context, the identification of subsumption relations, and consistency with the formalization. In fact, subsumption and other relations are often neglected by most state-of-the-art matchers.

As seen in the previous sections, most approaches still rely on manually or semi-automatically established alignments. This task is far from being trivial, even when done manually. This has been recently corroborated in [85], where manually classifying domain entities under foundational ontology classes is reported to be very difficult to do correctly. Manual ontology matching is also an expensive task that may introduce a bias as it represents a point of view expressing the interpretation of the concepts influenced by the background of the expert. As knowledge on foundational ontologies is specialized, it is important that such evaluation considers an overview of different experts in this area. Moreover, while manual alignment

on a small set of concepts is feasible, bigger data sets would require considerable effort. The findings in [85] also point out the need for improving the methodological process of manual integration of domain and foundational ontologies, in accordance with what has been stated in [42].

### 7.2. Automation

While more automation is an obvious requirement in the field, the poor performance of solutions addressing automatically matching different foundational ontologies or with domain ontologies have demonstrated the difficulty of the task, as reported in experiments evaluating current matching tools [44, 70]. Current tools fail on correctly capturing the semantics behind concepts (even when such semantics are present), which requires deeper contextualization on the basis of hierarchies and axioms. In that sense, further context and documentation is required, in particular for domain ontologies, to help identifying the right semantics (e.g. the ontologies from the largely used OAEI Conference dataset have a very poor lexical layer and limited or non-existent axiomatized semantics).

Furthermore, while diverse (domain) ontology matching approaches rely on external background knowledge, (BabelNet<sup>25</sup>, WordNet<sup>26</sup>, UMLS<sup>27</sup>, etc.), the coverage of foundational ontologies in these resources is still low. More recently, the resource Framester<sup>28</sup>, exposed as a knowledge graph, addresses this aspect as a hub between several resources such as VerbNet<sup>29</sup>, BabelNet, DBpedia<sup>30</sup>, and YAGO<sup>31</sup>. Hence, match-

<sup>25</sup><https://babelnet.org>

<sup>26</sup><https://wordnet.princeton.edu>

<sup>27</sup><https://uts.nlm.nih.gov/home.html>

<sup>28</sup><https://lipn.univ-paris13.fr/framester/>

<sup>29</sup><https://verbs.colorado.edu/verbnet/>

<sup>30</sup><https://wiki.dbpedia.org>

<sup>31</sup><http://yago.r2.enst.fr>

ers need to be improved to include more abstract and philosophical semantic relations and semiotic matching, to take advantage of structural features of the ontologies and axioms in order to better compare their formal definitions, and also of background knowledge from external resources, targeting subsumption and other relations. These have to be combined with logical reasoning techniques for guarantee the consistency of the generated alignments. The current approaches have to be thus revised to better deal with the specificities of matching with foundational ontologies. While automatic approaches have been mostly manually evaluated, with few exceptions [12, 73], systematically evaluations of matching systems have been so far dedicated to domain ontologies.

### 7.3. Other relations than equivalence

Besides the points raised above, the task requires the identification of other relations than equivalences, such as subsumption and meronymy. The latter is largely neglected by current matchers. In particular, the main problem of matching foundational and domain ontologies is that, most matchers typically rely on string-based techniques as an initial estimate of the likelihood that two elements refer to the same real world phenomenon, hence the found correspondences represent equivalences with concepts that are equally or similarly written. However, in many cases, this correspondence is not the case [70]. In fact, when having different levels of abstraction it might be that the matching process is capable of identifying subsumption correspondences rather than equivalence, since the foundational ontologies have concepts at a higher level.

### 7.4. Evaluation

Despite the variety of tasks in the OAEI campaigns<sup>32</sup>, evaluations involving foundational ontologies have not been addressed. Producing comprehensive evaluation data sets on which matching solutions can be evaluated would foster the development of approaches involving foundational ontologies and support a next generation of semantic matching approaches. With that respect, few of the established alignments generated by the approaches have being publicly made available. Furthermore, very few of them adopted a format that can be processed by automatic tools. Only [72] adopts the Alignment API For-

mat, the standard *de facto* adopted in the OAEI campaigns.

### 7.5. Versioning

Another aspect refers to the evolution or the consistency of alignments with respect to the evolution or the different variants of the ontologies. For example, DOLCE and its different variants have been used in diverse proposals, as many efforts have been dedicated to the development of this ontology. DOLCE has been exposed with reduced axiomatization and extensions with generic or domain plugins, such as for DOLCE-Lite [25], DOLCE Lite Plus<sup>33</sup> or still DOLCE+DnS Ultralite<sup>34</sup>. Besides their substantial differences in the hierarchical organization and expressiveness, these versions are mostly compatible, what is not the case for other ontologies. For instance, BFO 2.0 represents major updates to BFO not strictly backwards compatible with BFO 1.1 and a manual alignment was required to express their incompatibilities. UFO is also currently being extended by incorporating a new theory of types (including higher-order types), as well as a fuller theory of relationships and events [36]. Despite being, to a large extent, backwards compatible with the original ontology, these are important changes of UFO 2.0.

Another issue is related to the evolution of the resources aligned to the ontologies. As stated in [62], conflicts may arise between an alignment defined on a version, and a newer version. The alignment provided for an older version may become incoherent in case of a non-conservative change of the ontology in the newer version. It is the case in the alignments between DOLCE and the different versions of DBpedia. Taking the example presented by the authors, for instance, *dbo:team* used to hold between career stations (professional situations of e.g. an athlete) and teams in DBpedia 3.9 ontology, but in DBpedia 2014 it holds between agents and sports teams. Since *dul:Situation* (aligning *dbo:CareerStation*), and *dul:Person* (aligning *dbo:Athlete*) are disjoint, inconsistencies are detected. In particular, in particular where a) the DBpedia2014 ontology has used DBpedia 3.9 alignments, but the basic ontology had changed; and b) some properties are applied ambiguously, which should lead either to a change of the alignment, or of the DBpedia data or ontology.

<sup>32</sup><http://oaei.ontologymatching.org/2020/>

<sup>33</sup>[http://www.loa.istc.cnr.it/old/ontologies/DLP\\_397.owl](http://www.loa.istc.cnr.it/old/ontologies/DLP_397.owl)

<sup>34</sup><http://www.ontologydesignpatterns.org/ont/dul/DUL.owl>

1 Evolving alignments to cope with the different ver-  
2 sions of the ontologies is still an open challenge.

### 3 7.6. Expressiveness

4  
5  
6 Most alignments generated in the research we have  
7 surveyed were limited to linking of a single entity of  
8 a source ontology to a single entity of a target ontol-  
9 ogy. The links lack expressiveness to a large extent. In  
10 order to better express the relationships between enti-  
11 ties from different ontologies, they require rather full  
12 fledged axioms, as pointed out in [12, 68]. In the ex-  
13 ample from [12], a complex correspondence states that  
14 the professions are modeled as instances of the class  
15 *Profession* in PROTON, and the single entity of DB-  
16 Pedia is matched to an expression in PROTON which  
17 restricts the property *hasProfession* to the value of the  
18 profession of interest. However, generating complex  
19 correspondences is still an open challenge in the ontol-  
20 ogy matching field in general.

21 The most significant issue in ontology matching is  
22 that most ontologies lack definitions of terms in logic,  
23 comparable to the completeness of natural language  
24 definitions in dictionaries. Most of the intended seman-  
25 tics of terms are left to the intuition of humans reading  
26 their names. Until richer definitions become the norm,  
27 ontology matching, whether manual or automatic, will  
28 remain difficult to conduct or evaluate.

### 29 7.7. Multilingualism

30  
31  
32 Very few foundational ontologies are equipped with  
33 lexical layers in languages other than English (e.g.,  
34 BFO has been enriched with a lexical annotation in  
35 Portuguese, SUMO is the exception and is matched to  
36 the 26 languages in Open Multilingual WordNet [7]).  
37 However, with the increasing amount of multilingual  
38 data on the Web and the consequent development of  
39 ontologies in different languages, foundational ontol-  
40 ogy should also be equipped with richer multilingual  
41 annotations in order to facilitate the multilingual and  
42 cross-lingual ontology matching tasks.

## 43 8. Final remarks

44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

would also promote their use as semantic bridges in  
the task of matching domain ontologies. One of the  
difficulties however is the need of specialised knowl-  
edge as injecting foundational ontologies in ontology  
matching, in general, requires deeply understanding  
the foundational concepts and its relations. Another is-  
sue concerns the lack of formal definitions associated  
to lexicons (comments and labels) helping to under-  
stand the precise semantics of each concept. These are  
among the main brakes to automatise together with  
the points discussed above.

This paper has provided an overview of the adoption  
and exploration of foundational ontologies in the task  
of ontology matching, on different perspectives: work  
attempting to compare and match foundational ontol-  
ogies, natural language definitions vs logical state-  
ment issues addressed by linking lexicons and founda-  
tional ontologies, the role of foundational ontologies  
as bridges for linking domain ontologies; and equip-  
ping existing domain ontologies with foundational dis-  
tinctions. We have pointed out the limitations to be ad-  
dressed in order to bring the clarity of semantics of  
foundational ontologies in ontologies in general.

In a broader scope, semantic web in general and  
its materialisation with the linked open data initiative  
still lack such ontological distinction, as recently stated  
in [3, 89]. This has been further corroborated in [5],  
where it is stated that in the semantic web, there is an  
increasingly need for serious engagement with ontol-  
ogy, understood as a general theory of the types of en-  
tities and relations making up their respective domains  
of inquiry. However, there is still little interaction be-  
tween the communities, despite the fact that they share  
common ambitions in terms of knowledge understand-  
ing. This goes beyond the matching task as discussed  
in this paper in the sense that it has to take into account  
the data being described by the ontologies.

## Acknowledgments

Renata Vieira is funded by the Portuguese Founda-  
tion for Science and Technology, project UIDB-00057-  
2020.

## References

- [1] JPA Almeida, G Guizzardi, RA Falbo, and TP Sales. gufo: a  
lightweight implementation of the unified foundational ontology  
(ufo). <https://nemo-ufes.github.io/gufo/>, 2019.

- [2] Robert Arp, Barry Smith, and Andrew Spear. *Building Ontologies with Basic Formal Ontology*. MIT Press, 2015.
- [3] Luigi Asprino, Valerio Basile, Paolo Ciancarini, and Valentina Presutti. Empirical analysis of foundational distinctions in linked open data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.09840*, 2018.
- [4] Alessandro Benevides, Jean-R emia Bourguet, Giancarlo Guizzardi, Rafael Penaloza, and Joao Paulo Almeida. Representing a reference foundational ontology of events in sroiq. *Applied Ontology*, 14(3):293–334, 2019.
- [5] Mike Bennett and Kenneth Baclawski. The role of ontologies in linked data, big data and semantic web applications. *Applied Ontology*, 12(3-4):189–194, 2017.
- [6] Christoph Benzm uller and Adam Pease. Progress in automating higher-order ontology reasoning. In *Workshop on Practical Aspects of Automated Reasoning*. 2010.
- [7] Francis Bond, Christiane Fellbaum, Shu-Kai Hsieh, Chu-Ren Huang, Adam Pease, and Piek Vossen. A Multilingual Lexico-Semantic Database and Ontology. In *Towards the Multilingual Semantic Web*, pages 243–258, 2014.
- [8] Boyan Brodaric and Florian Probst. DOLCE ROCKS: Integrating Geoscience Ontologies with DOLCE. In *Semantic Scientific Knowledge Integration, Papers from the 2008 AAAI Spring Symposium, Technical Report SS-08-05, Stanford, California*, pages 3–8, 2008.
- [9] Anita Burgun and Olivier Bodenreider. Mapping the umls semantic network into general ontologies. In *Proceedings of the AMIA Symposium*, page 81. American Medical Informatics Association, 2001.
- [10] Carmen Chui and Michael Gr uninger. Mathematical foundations for participation ontologies. In Pawel Garbacz and Oliver Kutz, editors, *Formal Ontology in Information Systems - Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference, FOIS 2014, September, 22-25, 2014, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil*, volume 267 of *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*, pages 105–118. IOS Press, 2014.
- [11] Carmen Chui and Michael Gr uninger. Merging the DOLCE and PSL upper ontologies. In *KEOD 2014 - Proceedings of the International Conference on Knowledge Engineering and Ontology Development, Rome, Italy, 21-24 October, 2014*, pages 16–26, 2014.
- [12] Mariana Damova, Atanas Kiryakov, Kiril Simov, and Svetoslav Petrov. Mapping the central LOD ontologies to PROTON upper-level ontology. In *Workshop on Ontology Matching*, 2010.
- [13] Mariana Damova, Atanas Kiryakov, Maurice Grinberg, Michael K Bergman, Fr ed eric Giasson, and Kiril Simov. Creation and integration of reference ontologies for efficient lod management. In *Semi-automatic ontology development: Processes and resources*, pages 162–199. IGI Global, 2012.
- [14] Jerome David, Jerome Euzenat, Francois Scharffe, and Cassia Trojahn. The alignment api 4.0. *Semantic web*, 1(2):3–10, 2011.
- [15] Ricardo de Almeida Falbo, Monalessa Perini Barcellos, Julio Cesar Nardi, and Giancarlo Guizzardi. Organizing ontology design patterns as ontology pattern languages. In *Extended Semantic Web Conference*, pages 61–75. Springer, 2013.
- [16] Sergio de Cesare and Chris Partridge. BORO as a Foundation to Enterprise Ontology. *Journal of Information Systems*, 30(2):83–112, 02 2016.
- [17] Gerard de Melo, Fabian Suchanek, and Adam Pease. Integrating YAGO into the Suggested Upper Merged Ontology. *Proc. 20th IEEE International Conference on Tools with Artificial Intelligence*, 2008.
- [18] J er ome Euzenat and Pavel Shvaiko. *Ontology Matching, Second Edition*. Springer, 2nd edition, 2013.
- [19] Claudenir Fonseca, Daniele Porello, Giancarlo Guizzardi, Joao Paulo AlmeidaN, and Nicola Guarino. Relations in ontology-driven conceptual modeling. In *International Conference on Conceptual Modeling*, pages 28–42. Springer, 2019.
- [20] Giancarlo G., G. Wagner, P. Almeida, and R. Guizzardi. Towards Ontological Foundations for Conceptual Modeling: The Unified Foundational Ontology (UFO) Story. *Applied Ontology*, 10(3-4):259–271, 2015.
- [21] Aldo Gangemi and Peter Mika. Understanding the semantic web through descriptions and situations. In Robert Meersman, Zahir Tari, and Douglas C. Schmidt, editors, *On The Move to Meaningful Internet Systems 2003: CoopIS, DOA, and ODBASE*, pages 689–706. Berlin, Heidelberg, 2003. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [22] A. Gangemi, N. Guarino, C. Masolo, A. Oltramari, and L. Schneider. Sweetening Ontologies with DOLCE. In *Proc. of the 13th Intern. Conf. on Knowledge Engineering and Knowledge Management*, pages 166–181, 2002.
- [23] Aldo Gangemi, Nicola Guarino, Claudio Masolo, and Alessandro Oltramari. Restructuring WordNet’s Top-Level. *AI Magazine*, 40:235–244, 2002.
- [24] Aldo Gangemi, Nicola Guarino, Claudio Masolo, Alessandro Oltramari, and Luc Schneider. Sweetening WORDNET with DOLCE. *AI Magazine*, 24(3):13–24, 2003.
- [25] Aldo Gangemi, Roberto Navigli, and Paola Velardi. The OntoWordNet Project: Extension and Axiomatization of Conceptual Relations in WordNet. In *On The Move to Meaningful Internet Sys.*, pages 820–838, 2003.
- [26] Aldo Gangemi, Andrea Giovanni Nuzzolese, Valentina Presutti, Francesco Draicchio, Alberto Musetti, and Paolo Ciancarini. Automatic typing of dbpedia entities. In *ISWC 2012*, 2012.
- [27] Michael R Genesereth, Richard E Fikes, et al. Knowledge interchange format-version 3.0: Reference manual.
- [28] P Grenon. *BFO in a Nutshell: A Bi-categorical Axiomatization of BFO and Comparison with DOLCE*. Leipzig, 2003.
- [29] Michael Gr uninger and Christopher Menzel. The process specification language (psl) theory and applications. *AI Mag.*, 24(3):63–74, September 2003.
- [30] Michael Gruninger, Carmen Chui, and Megan Katsumi. Upper ontologies in colore. In *JOWO*, 2017.
- [31] Nicola Guarino and Christopher Wely. An overview of ontoclean. In Steffen, editor, *Handbook on Ontologies*, pages 151–159. Germany, 2004. Springer.
- [32] Nicola Guarino. *Formal Ontology in Information Systems: Proc. of the 1st Conf.* 1998.
- [33] V. Guha and D. Lenat. Cyc: A Midterm Report. In *Readings in Knowledge Acquisition and Learning*, pages 839–866, 1993.
- [34] G. Guizzardi. *Ontological foundations for structural conceptual models*. PhD thesis, University of Twente, Enschede, The Netherlands, Enschede, 2005.
- [35] Giancarlo Guizzardi. The role of foundational ontologies for conceptual modeling and domain ontology representation. In *7th DB&IS Conf.*, pages 17–25, 2006.
- [36] G. et al. Guizzardi. Towards ontological foundations for conceptual modeling: The unified foundational ontology (ufo) story. *Applied ontology*, 10(3-4):259–271, 2015.
- [37] G. Guizzardi. Endurant types in ontology-driven conceptual modeling: Towards ontouml 2.0. In *International Conference on Conceptual Modeling*, pages 136–150, 2018.

- [38] Giancarlo Guizzardi. Ontology, ontologies and the “i” of fair. *Data Intelligence*, pages 181–191, 2020.
- [39] H. Herre, B. Heller, P. Burek, R. Hoehndorf, F. Loebe, and H. Michalek. General Formal Ontology (GFO): A Foundational Ontology Integrating Objects and Processes. In *Res. Group Ontologies in Medicine*, 2007.
- [40] P. Jain, P. Yeh, K. Verma, R. Vasquez, M. Damova, P. Hitzler, and A. Sheth. Contextual Ontology Alignment of LOD with an Upper Ontology: A Case Study with PROTON. In *ESWC*, pages 80–92, 2011.
- [41] Mouna Kamel, Daniela Schmidt, Cássia Trojahn, and Renata Vieira. Hypernym relation extraction for establishing subsumptions: Preliminary results on matching foundational ontologies. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Workshop on Ontology Matching co-located with the 18th International Semantic Web Conference (ISWC 2019), Auckland, New Zealand, October 26, 2019*, pages 36–40, 2019.
- [42] C. Keet. The use of foundational ontologies in ontology development: An empirical assessment. In *ESWC*, pages 321–335, 2011.
- [43] Z. Khan and C. Keet. ONSET: Automated Foundational Ontology Selection and Explanation. In *Proc. of the 18th Intern. Conf. on Knowledge Engineering and Knowledge Management*, pages 237–251, 2012.
- [44] Z. Khan and C. Keet. Addressing issues in foundational ontology mediation. In *Proc. of the Inter. Conf. on Knowledge Engineering and Ontology Development*, pages 5–16, 2013.
- [45] Z. Khan and C. Keet. Feasibility of Automated Foundational Ontology Interchangeability. In *Proc. of the 19th Conf. on Knowledge Engineering and Knowledge Management*, pages 225–237, 2014.
- [46] F. Leao, K. Revoredo, and F. Baiao. Extending WordNet with UFO Foundational Ontology. *Journal of Web Semantics*, 2019.
- [47] Douglas B Lenat and Ramanathan V. Guha. The evolution of cycl, the cyc representation language. *ACM SIGART Bulletin*, 2(3):84–87, 1991.
- [48] Michael Lesk. Automatic sense disambiguation using machine readable dictionaries: how to tell a pine cone from an ice cream cone. In *Proceedings of the 5th Annual International Conference on Systems Documentation*, pages 24–26, 1986.
- [49] John Li. Lom: A lexicon-based ontology mapping tool. In *Proceedings of the Performance Metrics for Intelligent Systems (PerMIS)*, 2004.
- [50] Xiulei Liu, Bo Cheng, Jianxin Liao, Payam Barnaghi, Li Wan, and Jingyu Wang. Omi-dl: an ontology matching framework. *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, 9(4):580–593, 2015.
- [51] V. Mascardi, V. Cordì, and P. Rosso. A Comparison of Upper Ontologies. In *8th AI\*IA/TABOO Workshop on Agents and Industry*, pages 55–64, 2007.
- [52] V. Mascardi, A. Locoro, and P. Rosso. Automatic Ontology Matching via Upper Ontologies: A Systematic Evaluation. *IEEE Trans. on Knowl. and Data Eng.*, 22(5):609–623, 2010.
- [53] P. Mika, D. Oberle, A. Gangemi, and M. Sabou. Foundations for Service Ontologies: Aligning OWL-S to DOLCE. In *Proc. of the 13th Conf. on World Wide Web*, pages 563–572, 2004.
- [54] Tomas Mikolov, Ilya Sutskever, Kai Chen, Greg S Corrado, and Jeff Dean. Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 3111–3119, 2013.
- [55] George A Miller. Wordnet: a lexical database for english. *Communications of the ACM*, 38(11):39–41, 1995.
- [56] Riichiro Mizoguchi. Yamato: Yet another more advanced top-level ontology. In *Proceedings of the Sixth Australasian Ontology Workshop*, pages 1–16, 2010.
- [57] L. Muñoz and M. Grüninger. Verifying and mapping the mereotopology of upper-level ontologies. In *Proc. of the Inter. Conf. on Knowledge Discovery*, pages 31–42, 2016.
- [58] I. Niles and A. Pease. Towards a Standard Upper Ontology. In *Conf. on Formal Ontology in Information Systems*, pages 2–9, 2001.
- [59] I. Niles and A. Pease. Linking Lexicons and Ontologies: Mapping WordNet to the Suggested Upper Merged Ontology. In *Proc. of the Inter. Conf. on Knowledge Engineering*, pages 412–416, 2003.
- [60] D. et al. Oberle. Dolce ergo sumo: On foundational and domain models in the smartweb integrated ontology (swinto). *Web Semantics*, 5(3):156–174, 2007.
- [61] N. Padilha, F. Baião, and K. Revoredo. Alignment Patterns based on Unified Foundational Ontology. In *Proc. of the Brazilian Ontology Research Seminar*, pages 48–59, 2012.
- [62] H. Paulheim and A. Gangemi. Serving DBpedia with DOLCE - More than Just Adding a Cherry on Top. In *Proc. of the 14th Intern. Conf. on The Semantic Web*, pages 180–196, 2015.
- [63] Adam Pease and Christoph Benzmüller. Sigma: An Integrated Development Environment for Logical Theories. *AI Comm.*, 26:9–97, 2013.
- [64] Adam Pease, Geoff Sutcliffe, Nick Siegel, and Steven Trac. Large Theory Reasoning with SUMO at CASC. *AI Communications, Special issue on Practical Aspects of Automated Reasoning*, 23(2-3):137–144, 2010.
- [65] Adam Pease. *Ontology: A Practical Guide*. Articulate Software Press, Angwin, CA, 2011.
- [66] E. Prestes, J. Luis Carbonera, S. R. Fiorini, et al. Towards a core ontology for robotics and automation. *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, 61(11):1193 – 1204, 2013.
- [67] Florian Probst. Ontological analysis of observations and measurements. In Martin Raubal, Harvey J. Miller, Andrew U. Frank, and Michael F. Goodchild, editors, *Geographic Information Science*, pages 304–320, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [68] S. Reed and D. Lenat. Mapping Ontologies into Cyc. In *Proc. of the Workshop on Ontologies For The Semantic Web*, pages 1–6, 2002.
- [69] Ansgar Scherp, Carsten Saathoff, Thomas Franz, and Steffen Staab. Designing core ontologies. *Appl. Ontology*, 6(3):177–221, 2011.
- [70] Daniela Schmidt, Cassia Trojahn, and Renata Vieira. Analysing Top-level and Domain Ontology Alignments from Matching Systems. In *Workshop on Ontology Matching*, pages 1–12, 2016.
- [71] Daniela Schmidt, Cassia Trojahn, Renata Vieira, and Mouna Kamel. Validating Top-level and Domain Ontology Alignments using WordNet. In *Proc. of the Brazilian Ontology Research Seminar*, pages 1–12, 2016.
- [72] Daniela Schmidt, Rafael Basso, Cassia Trojahn, and Renata Vieira. Matching Domain and Top-level Ontologies via OntoWordNet. In *Workshop on Ontology Matching*, pages 1–2, 2017.
- [73] Daniela Schmidt, Rafael Basso, Cassia Trojahn, and Renata Vieira. Matching domain and top-level ontologies exploring word sense disambiguation and word embedding. In *Emerging Topics in Semantic Tech.*, pages 27–38, 2018.



- [74] Daniela Schmidt, Adam Pease, Cássia Trojahn, and Renata Vieira. Aligning conference ontologies with SUMO: A report on manual alignment via wordnet. In *Proceedings of the Joint Ontology Workshops 2019 Episode V: The Styrian Autumn of Ontology, Graz, Austria, September 23-25, 2019*, 2019.
- [75] Daniela Schmidt, Cássia Trojahn, and Renata Vieira. Matching bfo, dolce, GFO and SUMO: an evaluation of OAEI 2018 matching systems. In João Paulo A. Almeida, Marcello Bax, Rita Berardi, and Fernanda Araujo Baião, editors, *Proceedings of the XII Seminar on Ontology Research in Brazil and III Doctoral and Masters Consortium on Ontologies, Porto Alegre, Brazil, September 2nd-5th, 2019*, volume 2519 of *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*. CEUR-WS.org, 2019.
- [76] Stefan SCHULZ. The role of foundational ontologies for preventing bad ontology design. In *Joint Ontology Workshops*, 2018.
- [77] S. Semy, M. Pulvermacher, and L. Obrst. Toward the use of an upper ontology for U.S. government and U.S. military domains: An evaluation. Technical report, MTR 04B0000063, The MITRE Corporation, 2004.
- [78] S. Seppälä, B. Smith, and W. Ceusters. Applying the realism-based ontology-versioning method for tracking changes in the basic formal ontology. In *Proc. of FOIS*, pages 227–240, 2014.
- [79] S. Seppälä. Mapping WordNet to Basic Formal Ontology using the KYOTO ontology. In *Proc. of the Conf. on Biomedical Ontology*, pages 1–2, 2015.
- [80] A. Seyed. BFO/DOLCE Primitive Relation Comparison. In *Nature proceedings*, 2009.
- [81] Pavel Shvaiko and Jérôme Euzenat. Ten challenges for ontology matching. In Robert Meersman and Zahir Tari, editors, *On the Move to Meaningful Internet Systems: OTM 2008*, pages 1164–1182, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2008. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [82] V. Silva, M. Campos, J. Silva, and M. Cavalcanti. An Approach for the Alignment of Biomedical Ontologies based on Foundational Ontologies. *Information and Data Management*, 2(3):557–572, 2011.
- [83] V. Silva, A. Freitas, and S. Handschuh. Word Tagging with Foundational Ontology Classes: Extending the WordNet-DOLCE Mapping to Verbs. In *Know. Eng. and Know. Man.*, pages 593–605. 2016.
- [84] Gem Stapleton, John Howse, Adrienne Bonnington, and Jim Burton. A vision for diagrammatic ontology engineering. In Valentina Ivanova, Tomi Kauppinen, Steffen Lohmann, Suvodeep Mazumdar, Catia Pesquita, and Kai Xu, editors, *Proceedings of the International Workshop on Visualizations and User Interfaces for Knowledge Engineering and Linked Data Analytics co-located with 19th International Conference on Knowledge Engineering and Knowledge Management, VISUAL@EKAW 2014, Linköping, Sweden, November 24, 2014*, volume 1299 of *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, pages 1–13. CEUR-WS.org, 2014.
- [85] R. Stevens, P. Lord, J. Malone, and N. Matentzoglou. Measuring expert performance at manually classifying domain entities under upper ontology classes. *Journal of Web Semantics*, 2018.
- [86] L. Temal, A. Rosier, O. Dameron, and A. Burgun. Mapping BFO and DOLCE. In *Proc. of the World Cong. on Medical Inf.*, pages 1065–1069, 2010.
- [87] I. Terziev, A. Kiryakov, and D. Manov. Base Upper-level Ontology (BULO) Guidance. Deliverable 1.8.1, sekt project, 2005.
- [88] Élodie Thiéblin, Ollivier Haemmerlé, Nathalie Hernandez, and Cássia Trojahn. Survey on complex ontology matching. *Semantic Web*, 11(4):689–727, 2020.
- [89] Cássia Trojahn. Is your data 6-star? In *Proceedings of the ISWC 2020 Demos and Industry Tracks: From Novel Ideas to Industrial Practice co-located with 19th International Semantic Web Conference (ISWC 2020), Globally online, November 1-6, 2020 (UTC)*, pages 286–290. CEUR-WS.org, 2020.
- [90] Michael Uschold and Dave McComb. Introduction to gist, 2013.
- [91] Michaël Verdonck, Tiago Prince Sales, and Frederik Gailly. A comparative illustration of foundational ontologies: Boro and ufo. In *10th International Conference on Formal Ontology in Information Systems (FOIS 2018)*, volume 2205. CEUR, 2018.