MANCHESTER 1824

The University of Manchester

Ontology Evolution and Regression Analysis

Insights into Ontology Regression Testing

Maria Copeland
Rafael Goncalvez
Robert Stevens
Bijan Parsia
Uli Sattler

MANCHESTER 1824

The University of Manchester

Motivation

Current studies of Ontology Evaluation tend to:

- Focus on individual ontology versions
- Focus on shifts in the gross statistics

In either case we don't get objective and systematic evaluations of the life span of the ontology

MANCHESTER 1824

The University of Manchester

Our goal is to extract insightful and useful information out of all the existing versions of an ontology

MANCHESTER 1824

The University of Manchester

Ontology Testing Challenge

- How do we systematically identify test areas?
- How do we systematically analyse change impacts to the ontology?

How can we effectively minimise testing efforts and cost and still achieve adequate testing coverage

MANCHESTER 1824

The University of Manchester

Software Testing

MANCHESTER 1824

The University of Manchester

Software Regression Testing
What is it?

- It is a test activity to systematically re-test existing components after software changes

- It test against current and updated requirements

Software Regression Testing
Testing Aspects

- Testing at the functional requirements
  - Unit Level
  - System Level
- Testing at the non-functional requirements

Software Regression Testing
Testing Plan

- Defines testing criteria
- Identifies test area or components
- Test execution strategy
- Test evaluation strategy
- Updates test and other relevant documentation

MANCHESTER 1824

The University of Manchester

Software Regression Testing Process



MANCHESTER 1824

The University of Manchester

Ontology Regression Testing?



Change Detection

- Explicit Changes
  - Asserted logical and annotation axioms
  - Properties
  - Classes
- Implicit Changes?
  - Subsumption changes
  - Entailment changes



Impact Analysis

- Previous Version or all versions?
  - Intentional Difference analysis?
  - Justifications analysis?
- Information Content?
  - Asserted content?
  - Entailed content?
- Requirements Impact?
  - Functional and Non-functional?
  - Which ones do we test?



Define Test Plan

- Test criteria?
- Test area? Do we have test areas?
- How can the test be systematically run?
- Can results be interpreted?



Can we systematically:

- Build test suites?
- Run tests?
- Evaluate results?
- Re-run tests if necessary?



Manual vs. Automated Test Suites

- Manually test cases
  - Check against a methodology
  - Eyeballing

- Automated test cases
  - Satisfiability
  - Inconsistency



Manual vs. Automated Test Suites

- Manually test cases
  - Time consuming
  - Subjective
  - Unsystematic
- Automated test cases
  - Reasoner based
  - Limited in scope

MANCHESTER 1824

The University of Manchester

Can we expand the range of automatic test suites?

MANCHESTER 1824

The University of Manchester

YES

By Analysing Ontology Dynamics

MANCHESTER 1824

The University of Manchester

What are Ontology Dynamics?

- Periods of growth, decline, and stability
- Axioms presence
- Types of axioms presence (e.g. continual, interrupted)
- Sequence editing types and patterns

Axiom Life Span - We expect:
Axioms with Constant Unchanged Presence



MANCHESTER 1824

The University of Manchester

Axiom Life Span - We expect: Axioms that are Modified



Axiom Life Span - We expect: Axioms that Enter and Leave the Ontology



MANCHESTER 1824

The University of Manchester

NCIt Ontology Dynamics

MANCHESTER 1824

The University of Manchester

National Cancer Institute Thesaurus (NCIt)

- The National Cancer Institute (NCI) is a U.S. government funded organisation for the research of causes, treatment, and prevention of cancer
- The NCIt is an ontology written in the Web Ontology Language (OWL) which supports the development and maintenance of a controlled vocabulary about cancer research
- Multiple publications about process, quality control, usage, and critiques
- Publicly available monthly releases and concept change logs

Rich source of ontology evolution data

MANCHESTER 1824

The University of Manchester

NCIt Dynamics – Axioms Life Span Analysis



MANCHESTER 1824

The University of Manchester

NCIt Change Dynamics – Detailed View of Axiom Life Span

Frequency	Axiom Count	Appearing in version 103	Consecutive Appearance	Non-consecutive Apperance
11	20,520	358	99.67%	0.33%
5	14,586	831	99.99%	0.01%
2	13,680	445	76.80%	TBC
3	12,806	664	99.98%	0.02%
87	12,689	12,669	99.86%	0.14%
1	12,219	47 version 102; 2,084 version 103	N/A	N/A
79	10,910	10,866	99.93%	0.07%
8	10,662	599	99.93%	0.07%
103	8,933	8,933	100.00%	0.00%

Top Ten Frequency Distributions

MANCHESTER 1824

The University of Manchester

NCIt Axiom Life Span: Axioms with Constant Unchanged Presence



NCIt 2003 – 2012
103 Versions

Frequency	Axiom Count	Appearing in version 103	Consecutive Appearance	Non-consecutive Apperance
11	20,520	358	99.67%	0.33%
5	14,586	831	99.99%	0.01%
2	13,680	445	76.80%	TBC
3	12,806	664	99.98%	0.02%
87	12,689	12,669	99.86%	0.14%
1	12,219	47 version 102; 2,084 version 103	N/A	N/A
79	10,910	10,866	99.93%	0.07%
8	10,662	599	99.93%	0.07%
103	8,933	8,933	100.00%	0.00%

NCIt Axiom Life Span: Axioms that Enter and Leave the Ontology



NCIt 2003 – 2012
103 Versions

Frequency	Axiom Count	Appearing in version 103	Consecutive Appearance	Non-consecutive Apperance
11	20,520	358	99.67%	0.33%
5	14,586	831	99.99%	0.01%
2	13,680	445	76.80%	TBC
3	12,806	664	99.98%	0.02%
87	12,689	12,669	99.86%	0.14%
1	12,219	47 version 102; 2,084 version 103	N/A	N/A
79	10,910	10,866	99.93%	0.07%
8	10,662	599	99.93%	0.07%
103	8,933	8,933	100.00%	0.00%

MANCHESTER 1824

The University of Manchester

NCIt Axiom Life Span: Axioms with Gaps between Unchanged Presence



NCIt 2003 – 2012
103 Versions

Frequency	Axiom Count	Appearing in version 103	Consecutive Appearance	Non-consecutive Apperance
11	20,520	358	99.67%	0.33%
5	14,586	831	99.99%	0.01%
2	13,680	445	76.80%	TBC
3	12,806	664	99.98%	0.02%
87	12,689	12,669	99.86%	0.14%
1	12,219	47 version 102; 2,084 version 103	N/A	N/A
79	10,910	10,866	99.93%	0.07%
8	10,662	599	99.93%	0.07%
103	8,933	8,933	100.00%	0.00%

MANCHESTER 1824

The University of Manchester

NCIt Axiom Life Span: Axioms with Gaps between Unchanged Presence



NCIt 2003 – 2012
103 Versions

Frequency	Axiom Count	Appearing in version 103	Consecutive Appearance	Non-consecutive Apperance
11	20,520	358	99.67%	0.33%
5	14,586	831	99.99%	0.01%
2	13,680	445	76.80%	TBC
3	12,806	664	99.98%	0.02%
87	12,689	12,669	99.86%	0.14%
1	12,219	47 version 102; 2,084 version 103	N/A	N/A
79	10,910	10,866	99.93%	0.07%
8	10,662	599	99.93%	0.07%
103	8,933	8,933	100.00%	0.00%

NCIt Axiom Life Span: Axioms with Gaps between Unchanged Presence



NCIt 2003 – 2012
103 Versions

Frequency	Axiom Count	Appearing in version 103	Consecutive Appearance	Non-consecutive Apperance
11	20,520	358	99.67%	0.33%
5	14,586	831	99.99%	0.01%
2	13,680	445	76.80%	TBC
3	12,806	664	99.98%	0.02%
87	12,689	12,669	99.86%	0.14%
1	12,219	47 version 102; 2,084 version 103	N/A	N/A
79	10,910	10,866	99.93%	0.07%
8	10,662	599	99.93%	0.07%
103	8,933	8,933	100.00%	0.00%

NCIt Dynamics – Editing Patterns

Frequency rate	Axiom IDs	First version in NCIt	Effectual addition version	Effectual removal version	Ineffectual addition version	Ineffectual removal version	Last version in NCIt
11	57506, 58364	4	4, 7	5, 17			16
	103206, 105069	7	7	26	25	17	25
	110594	10			10, 31	20, 32	31
	210295	40	40, 51	47, 55			54
	215592, 215897	50	50		98	55	103
5	157661	20	20		45	24, 46	45
2	49544, 50602	2	2, 4	3, 5			4
	50858	2	2, 18	3, 19			18
	99659	6	6	17	16	7	16
	120551	12	12, 16	13, 17			16
	127241	16	16		21	17, 22	21
	172613, 172917	25	25, 62	26, 63			62
3	159025	21	21, 27	22		29	28
	257839	83	83, 93, 103	84, 94			103
87	3241	1	1		23	7	103
	12085	1	1		33	17	103
	30433	1	1, 14, 89	12, 75			103
	39267	1	1, 18	2			103
	68617	5	5, 18	6			103
	106537, 106569, 106569, 107407, 107860, 107952, 108468	9	9		25	17	103
	111380, 114579	10	10		24	17	103
	118516, 119326	12	12, 79	74			103
	121919, 122832	13	13, 51	47			103
79	6838, 44135	1	1	86	23	17	85
	8905	1	1, 30	6			103
	42533	1	1		41	17	103
	44135	1	1	86	23	17	85
	125718, 125895	15	15, 29	19			103
	162303	23	23, 94	93, 103			102
	162304	23	23, 36	34			103
8	22465	1	1	52	45	2	51
	67505	5	5, 10	6, 17			16
	153578	17			17, 20	18, 27	26
	215709	50	50		99	53	103
	238416, 238488	72	72, 103	79			103
	262226	87	87, 94	93, 96			95

MANCHESTER 1824

The University of Manchester

NCIt Regression Analysis – Main Finding

This means that we are able to identify 'bugs', the sequence pattern of these bugs, and their location!

NCIt Regression Analysis: Indicative of Faults In Sequence of Changes





MANCHESTER 1824

The University of Manchester

NCIt Regression Analysis: Suggestive of Faults In Sequence of Changes



Refactoring

MANCHESTER 1824

The University of Manchester

NCIt Regression Analysis: Suggestive of Faults In Sequence of Changes



?



MANCHESTER 1824

The University of Manchester

From Change Dynamics to Ontology Regression Testing



Systematically Build Test Suites



Indicative of Faults In Sequence of Changes



Automated Test Suites - Fault Detection

- It provides systematic regression test for all version of the ontology
- It conclusively identifies content regression and content refactoring
- It suggests other faults based on regression sequence

It is efficient and cheap to run

MANCHESTER 1824

The University of Manchester

And there are still more potential benefits …



Automated Test Suites - Fault Detection

- Entailment Set Studies
- Sub Domain Dynamics
- Ontology Classes Dynamics

...

MANCHESTER 1824

The University of Manchester

Thanks