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Abstract: Diagrams are often studied as visual languages with an abstract and a concrete syntax (concrete syntax is often referred to as visual syntax), where the latter contains the visual representations of the concepts in the former. A formal specification of the concrete syntax is useful in diagram processing applications as well as in achieving unambiguous understanding of diagrams. Unified Modeling Language (UML) is a commonly used modeling language to represent software models using its diagrams. Class and package diagrams are two diagrams of UML. The motivation for this work is twofold: UML lacks a formal visual syntax specification and ontologies are under-explored for visual syntax specifications. The work in this paper, therefore, explores using ontologies for visual syntax specifications by specifying the visual syntax of a set of UML class and package diagram constructs as an ontology in the Web ontology language, OWL. The reasoning features of the ontology reasoners are then used to verify the visual syntax specification. Besides formally encoding the visual syntax of numerous UML constructs, the work also demonstrates the general value of using OWL for visual syntax specifications.

1 INTRODUCTION

The prevalence of diagrams in our day-to-day lives has led to much research interest in studying diagrams (Peter Cheng and Haarslev, 2000). Formal specifications of the syntax and semantics of diagrams are considered valuable in promoting unambiguous understanding of diagrams between humans and computers, and computers and computers (Marriott et al., 1998). As a knowledge representation tool, ontologies have been successfully used to model domain knowledge (Wyner and Hoekstra, 2012). However an investigation of the current literature indicates a gap in the use of ontologies for the concrete syntax specification of diagrams. This work tries to address this gap by exploring the use of ontologies for the concrete syntax specification of diagrams.

The concrete syntax of a visual language describes the visual layout of the diagrams that are part of the language (Drewes and Kljempe-Hinrichs, 2000), where diagrams may have both graphical and textual elements (Marriott et al., 1998) (Minas, 2006). This syntax is essential for describing the visual language (Minas, 2006) and it can be useful for applications that support the automated generation and interpretation of diagrams in such visual languages (Marriott et al., 1998) (Minas, 2006). Such applications are particularly useful for visually impaired users who rely on text instead of graphics for understanding and generating diagrams.

Unified Modeling Language (UML) is a visual language that uses both text and graphical elements (uml, 2012a). Class and package diagrams are two types of UML diagrams (Moody and van Hillegersberg, 2009) used to represent a static structure of an object oriented model (uml, 2012b). The constructs of UML are standardized with a specification, the current version being UML 2.4.1 (uml, 2012a) (uml, 2012b). Although UML 2.4.1 specification includes the syntax and semantics of its constructs, it lacks a formal representation of the visual syntax of its diagrams. Evidence of this lack is that the concrete syntax (hereafter referred to as visual syntax) of UML constructs is specified as textual descriptions of accepted notations along with sample figures only (uml, 2012a) (uml, 2012b). The lack of a formal visual syn-
tax representation is another motivation for considering UML class and package diagrams for visual syntax specification in this work.

A drawback with a lack of formal visual syntax specification is that even UML compliant tools could generate UML diagrams differently, which can cause confusion when users interpret them (Elaasar and Labiche, 2011). As a visual representation tool, the visual syntactical structure of UML diagrams should be consistent irrespective of the tools that generated it. The use of a formal visual syntax specification in UML tools is one way to ensure consistent rendering of its diagrams. Moreover, given that non-compliant UML tools can also generate visually valid UML diagrams, such tools can also make use of a formal visual syntax specification to promote consistent view of these diagrams.

Numerous techniques in different formalisms such as grammatical, logical and algebraic have been used for visual syntax specifications. Within the logical formalism, Description Logics (DL) have also been explored for visual syntax specifications (Marriott et al., 1998). Although DL have influenced the Web ontology language, OWL, (Horrocks et al., 2003), the use of OWL ontologies itself for visual language specifications is under-explored.

Given the fact that ontologies are under-explored for visual syntax specifications and UML lacks a formal visual syntax representation, the work in this paper addresses these gaps by specifying the visual syntax of selected constructs of UML class and package diagrams as an OWL ontology. In particular, it specifies the visual syntax of a selected number of UML constructs that are typically used in class and package diagrams (uml, 2012b). The reasoning features of the ontology reasoners are then examined to see how they can be utilized to verify such a visual syntax specification.

The contribution of this research is threefold; it provides a formal encoding of the visual syntax of selected UML class and package diagram constructs, it explores OWL for visual syntax specifications and it explores the value of OWL reasoners to verify visual syntax specifications. The latter two aspects entail a generic contribution to the field of visual language specification.

This paper is structured as following: section 2 provides background information to the work presented in the paper. This includes a brief introduction to the research on visual languages, UML class and package diagram constructs used in this paper, OWL and qualitative spatial relationships used in this paper. Section 3 briefly presents related work to this research study. Section 4 describes the visual syntax ontology, which is the visual syntax specification of the selected UML class and package diagram constructs. Section 5 explores the reasoning features of the ontology reasoners that can be used to verify the visual syntax specification given in section 4. A possible enhancement for the developed visual syntax specification is discussed in section 6. Section 7 concludes with a summary, a reflection and the value of this work, and future research.

2 BACKGROUND

This section includes brief background information on various topics covered in this paper and places this work within the existing work on visual languages.

2.1 Visual Languages

In Computer Science (CS), diagrams are studied as visual languages, where diagrams in a given visual language follow a common syntactical structure (Drewes and Klemplien-Hinrichs, 2000). When studying a visual language in CS, researchers are faced with two main tasks; symbolic specification of its visual syntax and semantics in a suitable formalism, and the study of the use of such specifications in technical applications (Marriott et al., 1998). The work in this paper only focuses on the specification of the visual syntax of a selected set of UML class and package diagram constructs.

Although the visual syntax specification prescribes the visual structure of valid diagrams, more than one correct specification is possible for a given visual language. These variations occur because a spatial structure can be modeled in different ways (G Costagliola and Tortora, 1997) based on the chosen spatial relationships and the granularity of primitive elements. Thus in view of these variations there can be numerous visual syntax specifications for a visual language like UML.

Numerous techniques in grammatical, logical, algebraic formalisms have been explored for visual language specifications. Such specifications have also been used in numerous diagram processing applications as well. The paper by (Marriott et al., 1998) includes an overview of the various visual syntax specification techniques and applications. The specification formalism used in this work is logic with ontology as the specification technique.
2.2 UML Class and Package Diagram Constructs

UML is a widely used modeling language for representing software models (Moody and van Hillegersberg, 2009), overseen by the standards consortium Object Management Group (OMG) (uml, 2012a). UML provides thirteen diagrams (Moody and van Hillegersberg, 2009) for representing structural and dynamic aspects of software systems (Javed et al., 2005) and it can be used in the design, analysis, implementation and documentation of software applications (uml, 2012b) (uml, 2012a). UML has an internationally accepted standard (uml, 2012b) (uml, 2012a) that specifies its syntax and semantics.

UML class and package diagram constructs are specified in the Classes package of the UML 2.4.1 specification. Classes package includes fifty six constructs that can be used to represent an object oriented (OO) model using class, package and object diagrams. These UML constructs include both OO constructs (example: Class) as well as non-OO concepts (example: Comment). Some of these UML constructs are represented exclusively using text (example: MultiplicityElement), some using only graphical elements (example: Generalization) and majority uses both graphical and text elements (example: Interface). Some UML constructs do not have their own distinct notations (example: DirectedRelationship) as the notations are meant to be defined using specializations of these constructs (example: ElementImport) (uml, 2012b).

The set of UML class and package diagram constructs that are considered in this work are Class, Interface, Package, Association, Aggregation, Composition, Dependency, Generalization, Usage, Realization, InterfaceRealization, PackageMerge and PackageImport. These thirteen constructs were chosen because they are the typical constructs used in class and package diagrams and similarly the notations considered are the notations used for these constructs as indicated on pages 147 to 150 in the UML 2.4.1 specification (uml, 2012b). Based on these selected notations, Association, Interface and PackageImport have two notations each while the other ten constructs have one notation each. Figure 1 lists the UML constructs and their notations (uml, 2012b) used in this paper.

The chosen notations are not the only notations for the selected UML constructs. For example a Class can be represented using a rectangle with three compartments and additional strings to represent data members and methods in addition to the class name. However, such variations are intentionally excluded from this paper to limit the scope of the notations.

2.3 OWL

OWL is a prominent ontology language (Motik et al., 2008) for the Semantic Web (Parreiras and Staab, 2010). OWL makes use of DL for its logical foundations, which allow reasoners to infer aspects based on what is specified in an ontology (Motik et al., 2008). Ontologies are used for knowledge representation in numerous disciplines such as biology, medicine, geography, astronomy and agriculture (Motik et al., 2008).

An OWL ontology models a domain using classes, properties, instances and data values (Horrocks et al., 2010). A class represents a set of objects, a property describes a possible relationship between objects, instances describe the objects themselves and a data value links an instance to a specific data type (Horridge et al., 2009). OWL provides a rich set of constructs such as union, intersection and negation to describe classes and characteristics such as transitivity, symmetry and reflexivity to describe properties. Due to the compositional nature of OWL, complex classes can be described using other classes in the ontology (Horridge et al., 2009) (Parreiras and Staab, 2010).

An ontology reasoner can be used to check the correctness as well as to infer new knowledge based on what is described in the ontology. In other words, it helps in detecting inconsistencies in the ontology as well as maintaining the class hierarchies by inference based on the explicitly stated information in the ontology. The automated reasoning capabilities of an ontology reasoner are vital in maintaining correct ontologies (Horridge et al., 2009).

There are numerous OWL ontology development editors (examples include Protégé and SWOOP) and reasoners (examples include HermiT, RacerPro and Pellet) available (Bock et al., 2008). This work uses Protégé as the ontology development editor and HermiT as the ontology reasoner.
2.4 Spatial Relationships

A spatial layout can be described using spatial relationships between objects in a given space. Spatial relationships can be classified into categories of direction, distance, topology, alignment and size (Zhang, 2007). A spatial relationship in general can be described qualitatively without any reference to the quantitative (example: geometric) information that is required to establish these relationships (Renz, 2002). In this study spatial relationships are expressed qualitatively with the assumption that the mapping of these relationships to the quantitative information or vice versa is dealt separately, which is beyond the scope of this paper.

In this work four topological relationships, disconnected, contains, overlapping and touching, are used to describe the spatial relationship between two visual objects (Zhang, 2007). A visual object \( x \) can be described using three sets of points: a set of interior points \( I(x) \), a set of boundary points \( B(x) \) and a set of all its points \( D(x) = I(x) \cup B(x) \). Then for two visual objects \( a \) and \( b \) the four topological relationships mean the following:

- \( disconnected(a, b) \) if \( D(a) \cap D(b) = \emptyset \) (Zhang, 2007)
- \( contains(a, b) \) if \( D(b) \subseteq D(a) \) (Zhang, 2007)
- \( overlapping(a, b) \) if \( B(a) \cap B(b) \neq \emptyset \) and \( I(a) \cap I(b) \neq \emptyset \)
- \( touching(a, b) \) if \( B(a) \cap B(b) \neq \emptyset \) and \( I(a) \cap I(b) = \emptyset \)

The visual representations of these four spatial relationships are given in figure 2 (Zhang, 2007).

![Figure 2: Visual representations of four topological spatial relationships (Zhang, 2007).](image)

3 RELATED WORK

Numerous techniques for and applications of visual syntax specification are reported in the literature. Examples of visual syntax specification techniques include graph grammars and DL. Visual syntax specifications have been used in technical applications that interpret images of diagrams and drawing tools that support users in creating syntactically correct diagrams (Mariott et al., 1998). The work in (Mariott et al., 1998) includes a survey of different specification techniques and applications of visual syntax specifications.

Since DL provide the logical foundations for OWL (Motik et al., 2008), a brief summary of DL for visual languages is included in this section. A general DL formalism has been successfully used for the formal specification of entity-relationship diagrams and a visual programming language, Pictorial Janus (Mariott et al., 1998). The visual syntax specification of entity-relationship diagrams was then used in DL systems CLASSIC and LOOM to automate diagram reasoning to realize a syntax-directed diagram editor that can validate diagrams (Haarslev, 1996). The visual syntax of Pictorial Janus was used to formalize its semantics, which was also used to realize a diagram editor that verifies the semantics of diagrams of Pictorial Janus (Haarslev, 1995).

An investigation of the current literature indicates a lack with regards to publications on the use of OWL ontologies for visual syntax specifications. A visual syntax specification in this context refers to a symbolic encoding of the visual syntax of diagrams that are part of a visual language. On the other hand there exists ontologies that model shapes and graphical concepts in general; the ontology presented in (Niknam and Kemke, 2011) is one such ontology. Note that such generic ontologies do not capture visual syntax of diagrams in specific visual languages.

The lack of studies exploring OWL ontologies for visual language specification and the lack of formal visual syntax specification for UML class and package diagram constructs, provide sufficient motivation for this study.

4 VISUAL SYNTAX SPECIFICATION OF UML CONSTRUCTS

The visual syntax of the selected UML constructs is modeled using primitive elements and spatial relationships as in (Haarslev, 1996) and (Haarslev, 1995). A discussion on the primitive elements and the spatial relationships and how they are modeled in the OWL ontology is included in the next two subsections, followed by the visual syntax definitions of the thirteen UML constructs in section 4.3.

4.1 Primitive Elements

The primitive elements for the thirteen UML constructs are arrow, circle, filled diamond, unfilled diamond, double rectangle, line, dotted line, rectangle, triangle and string. The visual representations of these ten primitive elements are illustrated in figure 3.
The ten primitive elements are modeled as ten OWL classes namely Arrow, Circle, DiamondFilled, DiamondUnfilled, DoubleRectangle, Line, DottedLine, Rectangle, Triangle and String, as subclasses of an OWL class Primitives.

4.2 Spatial Relationships

The four spatial relationships discussed in section 2.4 are included as object properties in the OWL ontology. The OWL object properties disconnected, contains, overlapping and touching represent these four spatial relationships in the ontology.

4.3 UML Class and Package Diagram Constructs

In this section, the visual syntax of the selected UML class and package diagram constructs is specified using the primitive elements and spatial relationships given in sections 4.1 and 4.2. The thirteen UML constructs are defined as thirteen OWL classes namely UMLClass, Interface, Package, Association, Aggregation, Composition, Dependency, Generalization, Realization, InterfaceRealization, Usage, PackageImport and PackageMerge. These thirteen classes are defined as subclasses of an OWL class, UMLConstructs, a sibling class of Primitives (see section 4.1). The visual syntax of the UML constructs is specified as class definitions as given below.

4.3.1 Class

The UML construct Class is represented using a rectangle and a string to represent the class name. An OWL class named UMLClass to represent this Class construct is specified as:

Class: UMLClass 
EquivalentTo: 
Rectangle 
and (contains some String)

4.3.2 Interface

As shown in Figure 1, an Interface can be represented using two different notations. The first notation uses a circle, a line and a string to represent the interface name. The second notation is similar to that of a Class construct except that it contains two strings. Thus the OWL class Interface is specified as:

Class: Interface 
EquivalentTo: 
Line and (disconnected some String)  
and (touches some Circle), 
Rectangle and (contains min 2 String)

4.3.3 Package

A Package is represented using a double rectangle and a string to represent the package name. The visual syntax of Package is specified in the OWL class Package as given below:

Class: Package 
EquivalentTo: 
DoubleRectangle and (contains some String)

4.3.4 Association

Similar to the UML construct Interface, Association also has two notations; one using a line and the other one using a line and an open arrow. The presence of an arrow in an association indicates navigability while the absence of an arrow indicates undetermined navigability between two Classes (uml, 2012b). An OWL class named Association to specify the visual syntax of Association is given as:

Class: Association 
EquivalentTo: 
Line 
and (touches min 2 UMLClass), 
Line and (touches some UMLClass) 
and (touches some (Arrow and 
(touches some UMLClass)))

Note that the definition of the class Association makes use of the class UMLClass.

4.3.5 Aggregation

An Aggregation relationship between two Classes, is represented using an unfilled diamond and a line. Thus an OWL class named Aggregation is specified as:

Class: Aggregation 
EquivalentTo: 
Line and (touches some UMLClass) 
and (touches some (DiamondUnfilled 
and (touches some UMLClass)))

Similar to the OWL class Association, Aggregation also makes use of the class UMLClass.
4.3.6 Composition

The UML construct Composition, a type of relationship between two Classes, is represented using a filled diamond and a line. Thus an OWL class named Composition is specified as:

Class: Composition
EquivalentTo:
Line and (touches some UMLClass)
and (touches some (DiamondFilled
and (touches some UMLClass)))

Similar to the OWL class Aggregation, Composition is also defined in terms of the class UMLClass.

4.3.7 Dependency

Dependency is represented using a dotted line and an arrow either between two Classes or two Packages. In order to distinguish between package level and class level dependency, two subclasses of an OWL class Dependency namely ClassDependency and PackageDependency are defined as follows:

Class: ClassDependency
EquivalentTo:
LineDotted and (touches some UMLClass)
and (touches some (Arrow
and (touches some UMLClass)))
SubClassOf: Dependency

Class: PackageDependency
EquivalentTo:
LineDotted and (touches some Package)
and (touches some (Arrow
and (touches some Package)))
SubClassOf: Dependency

ClassDependency and PackageDependency are composed of the OWL classes UMLClass and Package respectively.

4.3.8 Generalization

Generalization, a type of relationship between two Classes, is represented using a triangle and a line. The visual syntax of Generalization is specified in the OWL class named Generalization as follows:

Class: Generalization
EquivalentTo:
Line and (touches some UMLClass)
and (touches some (Triangle
and (touches some UMLClass)))

Again the definition of Generalization is composed of the OWL class UMLClass.

4.3.9 Realization

Realization is represented using a triangle and a dotted line between two Classes. The visual syntax of Realization is specified in the OWL class named Realization as follows:

Class: Realization
EquivalentTo:
LineDotted and (touches some UMLClass)
and (touches some (Triangle
and (touches some UMLClass)))

Again the definition of Realization is composed of the OWL class UMLClass.

4.3.10 InterfaceRealization

The UML construct, InterfaceRealization, is specified between an Interface and a Class using a triangle and a dotted line. Thus an OWL class named InterfaceRealization is defined as:

Class: InterfaceRealization
EquivalentTo:
LineDotted and (touches some UMLClass)
and (touches some (Triangle
and (touches some Interface)))

The class definition of InterfaceRealization is also defined in terms of the OWL classes UMLClass and Interface.

4.3.11 Usage

Usage is a type of Dependency represented using the keyword use placed next to the visual representation of Dependency. Similar to Dependency, Usage exists either between two Classes or between two Interfaces. Thus using the selected four spatial relationships, two subclasses of an OWL class Usage namely ClassUsage and PackageUsage are specified as follows:

Class: PackageUsage
EquivalentTo:
PackageDependency and (disconnected
some String)
SubClassOf: Usage

Class: ClassUsage
EquivalentTo:
ClassDependency and (disconnected
some String)
SubClassOf: Usage

The definitions of PackageUsage and ClassUsage are defined in terms of PackageDependency and ClassDependency respectively.
4.3.12 PackageImport

Similar to Usage, PackageImport is also a type of Dependency that can exist between two Packages. PackageImport is represented using the keyword import or access near to the Dependency representation. Thus using the four spatial relationships, an OWL class named PackageImport is defined as:

Class: PackageImport
EquivalentTo: PackageDependency and (disconnected some String)

The definition of PackageImport is also defined in terms of PackageDependency.

4.3.13 PackageMerge

Similar to PackageImport, PackageMerge is also a kind of Dependency between two Packages represented using the keyword merge. The OWL class for the visual syntax of PackageMerge is defined as the following:

Class: PackageMerge
EquivalentTo: PackageDependency and (disconnected some String)

The definition of PackageMerge is also defined in terms of PackageDependency.

Although these thirteen UML constructs were individually defined in terms of the selected primitives and spatial relationships, no verification is performed on the ontology. The verification of the visual syntax of the UML constructs is discussed in the next section.

5 REASONER FEATURES FOR VISUAL SYNTAX VERIFICATION

All notations illustrated in figure 1 are distinct, meaning that all the selected UML constructs have distinct notations. It should be noted that even though the notations for InterfaceRealization and Realization are the same in figure 1, the former UML construct connects an Interface to a Class but the latter construct connects two Classes resulting in two distinct visual representations. This distinction in notations means that the visual syntax definitions of these constructs must be also distinct. In this section, various OWL reasoner features are applied to verify the distinctness of the visual syntax definitions. This section also highlights how various features in Protégé can be used for visual syntax verification.

5.1 Class Equivalence

When two OWL classes are equivalent the sets of objects represented by these classes are the same (Horrocks et al., 2012). Class equivalence between two OWL classes can be explicitly stated or inferred by the reasoner based on the class descriptions. In the context of a visual syntax ontology, identification of equivalent classes based on its class descriptions is significant.

When the visual syntax is specified as an OWL ontology, class equivalence can be used to check whether the syntax definitions of any two visual constructs are the same. If two OWL classes are inferred to be equivalent based on its definitions, it means that the syntax definitions are not distinct. When a distinct mapping is required between a visual language concept and its visual syntax, then class equivalency is not desirable. Detecting class equivalency between two OWL classes representing two concepts that do not have the same visual structure prompts a redefinition of their visual syntax definitions.

Detecting equivalent classes, in other words, detecting visual concepts with the same syntax definitions can be achieved by invoking the reasoner in Protégé, which highlights equivalent classes in the Class hierarchy (inferred) tab as well as in individual class definitions specified in EquivalentTo description.

For the ontology given in section 4, three classes, PackageImport, PackageMerge and PackageUsage were reported to be equivalent, meaning that the syntax definitions of these UML constructs are not distinct. Although this inferred equivalency is valid based on their class definitions, it is not desired based on the notations in figure 1. These incorrect visual syntax definitions indicate that the selected spatial relationships are not sufficient to describe the syntax of these constructs. As the differences in these constructs are in the content of the strings placed next to the graphical objects, we redefine these three OWL classes to make use of three different data properties of type string as given below:

Class: PackageUsage
EquivalentTo: PackageDependency and (disconnected some StringUse)
SubClassOf: Usage

where the OWL class StringUse is defined as:
Class: StringUse  
EquivalentTo:  
hasStringValue some  
xsd:string[pattern "use"]  
SubClassOf:  
String

Class: PackageImport  
EquivalentTo:  
PackageDependency  
and (disconnected some  
(StringAccess or StringImport))

where the OWL classes StringAccess and StringImport are defined as:

Class: StringImport  
EquivalentTo:  
hasStringValue some  
xsd:string[pattern "import"]  
SubClassOf:  
String

Class: StringAccess  
EquivalentTo:  
hasStringValue some  
xsd:string[pattern "access"]  
SubClassOf:  
String

Class: PackageMerge  
EquivalentTo:  
PackageDependency  
and (disconnected some StringMerge)

where the OWL class StringMerge is defined as:

Class: StringMerge  
EquivalentTo:  
hasStringValue some  
xsd:string[pattern "merge"]  
SubClassOf:  
String

After the redefinitions of the OWL classes, PackageImport, PackageMerge and PackageUsage as described above, no more equivalent classes are reported in the class hierarchy inferred by the reasoner.

5.2 Class Subsumption

If an OWL class A is subsumed by B, it means an instance of A is also an instance of B (Horrocks et al., 2012). Class subsumption is a reasoner service (Horrocks et al., 2012), which is key in inferring the class relationships in an OWL ontology.

Class subsumption can be used to verify the inferred class hierarchy to ensure that the visual syntax definitions in an ontology do indeed model the relationships between the modeled visual constructs correctly. For example, although both UMLClass and Interface use Rectangle and String, semantically a Class is not an Interface or vice versa.

In Protégé, after invoking the reasoner on an ontology, the class subsumptions can be read in the Class hierarchy (inferred) tab as well as in the SubClass Of section of individual class definitions.

Invoking the reasoner on the ontology in section 4, which has been updated in section 5.1, highlights two undesired subsumption relationships. One is where Interface is subsumed by UMLClass and the second one is InterfaceRealization, which is subsumed by Realization. These two inferred subsumptions are semantically incorrect for UML class diagrams since an object cannot be an InterfaceRealization and a Realization. Similarly an object, if relevant, has to be either an Interface or a Class.

The OWL class Interface is inferred to be a subclass of UMLClass because the class Interface contains at least 2 strings where as UMLClass contains at least 1 string, which means the former class is a specialization of the latter class. This subsumption relationship between UMLClass and Interface also leads to the undesired subsumption relationship between InterfaceRealization and Realization. The OWL class InterfaceRealization is specified in terms of UMLClass and Interface. Since UMLClass subsumes Interface, the OWL class InterfaceRealization is inferred to be a subclass of Realization.

A possible solution to eliminate these undesired subsumption relationships is discussed in section 5.4.

5.3 Class Disjointness

When two OWL classes are disjoint no object is common between the sets of objects represented by these classes. Class disjointness is not a reasoner service but an OWL class descriptor that needs to be explicitly stated for the classes in an ontology (Horrocks et al., 2012).

In a visual syntax ontology, disjointness between OWL classes is another check that can be used to ensure that the visual syntax definitions are distinct. It also ensures that two disjoint visual constructs cannot have an instance in common. If disjointness between OWL classes results in inconsistency in OWL classes, it will be highlighted in both the tabs Class hierarchy and Class hierarchy (inferred) in Protégé.

For the ontology given in section 4, which has been updated in section 5.1, no two classes can have a common object except between Dependency and Usage, PackageImport and PackageMerge because the...
latter three concepts are defined in terms of the first concept. So, for example, an instance of PackageImport can be an instance of Dependency as well. However, enforcing disjointness among the set of thirteen OWL classes as described above highlights unsatisfiable definitions of the classes Interface and InterfaceRealization, which is incorrect because these are two distinct concepts. The problem arises because of the contradictions introduced by disjointness between Interface and UMLClass, and InterfaceRealization and Realization, when subsumption relationships are inferred between Interface and UMLClass, and InterfaceRealization and Realization.

A possible solution to eliminate these unsatisfiable class definitions is discussed in section 5.4.

5.4 Class Satisfiability

If an OWL class is unsatisfiable then an object of the class cannot exist (Horrocks et al., 2012). Checking for class satisfiability is an automated reasoner service (Horrocks et al., 2012), which can be used for checking the correctness of the class descriptions in an ontology.

As discussed in section 5.3, the classes Interface and the class InterfaceRealization are not satisfiable. Unsatisfiable classes are highlighted in red in both the tabs Class hierarchy and Class hierarchy (inferred) in Protégé.

One solution to resolve these two unsatisfiable classes is to redefine the OWL class UMLClass as:

\[
\text{Rectangle and (contains min 1 (String and not StringInterface))}
\]

where the OWL class StringInterface is defined as:

\[
\text{Class: StringInterface}
\text{EquivalentTo:}
\text{hasStringValue some xsd:string[pattern "interface"]}
\text{SubClassOf:}
\text{String}
\]

This redefinition is based on the fact that an Interface contains the keyword interface but a UMLClass does not use the keyword interface (refer to figure 1). This redefinition of UMLClass makes all classes defined under UMLConstructs (see section 4.3) satisfiable and removes the undesired subsumption relationships (described in section 5.2) between UMLClass and Interface, and InterfaceRealization and Realization.

5.5 Instance Checking

\( a \) is inferred to be an instance of class \( A \) if \( a \) satisfies the class description of \( A \) (Horrocks et al., 2012). Instance checking is an automated reasoner service (Horrocks et al., 2012), which makes use of the explicitly stated and inferred information about the classes and instances to determine whether an instance belongs to a class.

Instance checking can be used to check whether the syntax definitions indeed capture the visual structure of concepts by comparing the instances inferred by the reasoner to the concepts identified by a human expert for a given diagram. For example, the simple class diagram given in figure 4 depicts the UML concept Class twice (Account and SavingsAccount) and the UML concept Generalization once (relationship between Account and SavingsAccount).

![Figure 4: A sample class diagram with two UML Classes namely Account and SavingsAccount where Account inherits from SavingsAccount (Generalization).](image)

In order to check whether the reasoner infers the UML concepts in figure 4 correctly, the UML class diagram has to be described using the primitive elements and spatial relationships given in sections 4.1 and 4.2. Ideally one topological spatial relationship should be specified between each pair of primitive elements. However, the given list of spatial relationships is not an exhaustive list of spatial relationships for a given space. For example, the spatial relationship of a visual object to itself and the spatial relationship between a contained object to the container object cannot be described using the selected four spatial relationships. Nevertheless, the UML class diagram in figure 4 is added to the visual syntax ontology as follows:

Individual: account
Types: String, not (StringInterface)
Facts: disconnected savingsaccount, disconnected rectanglea, disconnected triangle, disconnected line

Individual: savingsaccount
Types: String, not (StringInterface)
Facts: disconnected account, disconnected rectanglea, disconnected triangle, disconnected line

Individual: rectanglea
Types: Rectangle
Facts: disconnected savingsaccount, disconnected line, disconnected rectangles, contains account, touching triangle

Individual: rectangles
Types: Rectangle
Facts: disconnected account, disconnected triangle, disconnected rectangle, contains savingsaccount, touching line

Individual: line
Types: Line
Facts: disconnected account, disconnected savingsaccount, disconnected rectangle, touching rectangle, touching line

Individual: triangle
Types: Triangle
Facts: disconnected account, disconnected savingsaccount, disconnected rectangle, touching rectangle, touching line

For ease of reference, the UML class diagram in figure 5 is annotated with the relevant instance names used in the ontology.

Figure 5: UML class diagram in figure 4 annotated with instance names used in the ontology.

After invoking the reasoner on an ontology in Protégé, the instances can be read in the Class hierarchy in the Members section of individual class descriptions. The DL Query facility in Protégé can also be used for querying instances.

For the visual syntax ontology with the instances, the reasoner infers two instances of UMLClass (rectangleA and rectangleSA) and one instance of Generalization (line), which is the correct interpretation of UML concepts for the class diagram in figure 4.

Note that the translation of figure 4 to OWL elements is done manually here. This is not ideal as it becomes cumbersome and error-prone when the number of constructs in the diagram increases. Ideally there should be a tool that the modeler can use to draw or import the diagram, which automatically generates the OWL entries. An investigation of such tools is not done for this work.

6 POSSIBLE ENHANCEMENT OF THE UML VISUAL SYNTAX SPECIFICATION

UML constructs generally follow accepted guidelines for its notations, which are not explicitly stated in the UML specification. For example, figure 6 demonstrates an uncommon notation of Generalization, which can be compared to the generally followed notation in figure 4.

Figure 6: An uncommon representation of Generalization.

The visual syntax ontology in sections 4 and 5 does not take into account such general presentation guidelines. Thus using the developed visual syntax ontology, the Generalization notation in figure 6 will indeed be classified by the reasoner as an instance of the OWL class Generalization because the triangle and line are touching although it does not follow the general presentation guideline of Generalization where the line should touch a triangle opposite to the point where the triangle touches the super class (here Account). The correctness of such an instance classification of Generalization is debatable among UML users.

A possible enhancement for the given visual syntax specification is to capture such general presentation guidelines to align it closely to the real-world representations of UML constructs without contradicting the UML specification.

7 CONCLUSION, REFLECTION AND FUTURE WORK

In this work visual syntax of a subset of notations of thirteen UML class and package constructs were modeled using primitive graphical elements and spatial relationships. As a novel approach, an OWL ontology was successfully used to specify the visual syntax of the selected UML constructs. Furthermore it is demonstrated that numerous automated reasoning services of the ontology reasoners can be used to verify a visual syntax specification.

Based on the work presented in this paper, it can be concluded that an OWL ontology can indeed be used for visual syntax specification provided that the visual constructs can be modeled using classes, properties, objects and data types as required by OWL. The main advantage of using an OWL ontology is the
use of ontology reasoners to verify the syntax specification. Using OWL is of value because it allows the reuse of mature software artifacts including OWL ontology editors and reasoners for visual syntax specification.

Although this work focuses on UML as the visual language, it is also of value to the broader field of visual syntax specification. The process of modeling visual constructs, specifying the visual syntax in an OWL ontology and utilizing the ontology reasoners as demonstrated in this work can be equally applied to another visual language as well.

It should be noted that this work focused on a limited number of UML constructs and notations, and hence no claim on the completeness of the visual syntax can be made. Needless to say that how well the automated reasoning features can be utilized, depends on the number of constructs encoded in the ontology and how the constructs are modeled. As stated in section 2.1, the same set of UML notations can be modeled differently, which may result in a different visual syntax ontology. Similarly, the applications of the given visual syntax are also not considered in this paper. It is envisaged that a technical application that processes the visual layout of diagrams can make use of such a visual syntax ontology. Such applications generally perform an interpretation to produce a literal translation or a semantic interpretation of diagrams. As discussed in the introduction, such applications can be valuable for visually impaired users to improve the accessibility of diagrams.

Future research would include expanding the developed ontology to incorporate all the UML concepts in the Classes package of UML specification and general presentation guidelines (as discussed in section 6), conducting an in-depth study of the automated reasoner services for the verification of visual syntax specifications and analyzing the computational efficiency of reasoning services based on the number of classes and instances in a visual syntax ontology.
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