

Rosetta Statements: Lowering the Barrier for Semantic Parsing and Increasing the Cognitive Interoperability of Knowledge Graphs

Vogt, Lars¹  orcid.org/0000-0002-8280-0487;

Konrad, Marcel¹  orcid.org/0000-0002-2452-3143

Farfar, Kheir Eddine¹  orcid.org/0000-0002-0366-4596

Prinz, Manuel¹  orcid.org/0000-0003-2151-4556

Oelen, Allard¹  orcid.org/0000-0001-9924-9153

¹ *TIB Leibniz Information Centre for Science and Technology, Welfengarten 1B, 30167 Hanover, Germany*

Corresponding Author: lars.m.vogt@googlemail.com

Abstract

Background: Machines need data and metadata to be machine-actionable and FAIR (findable, accessible, interoperable, reusable) to support researchers in managing exponentially increasing amounts of data. Knowledge graphs, ontologies, and semantic graph patterns are promising technologies for achieving that. However, they are also known to have a high access barrier for their effective use, as they require substantial prior knowledge of semantics and data modelling in order to be used.

Results: Based on the notion that knowledge graph construction is a modelling task and that every model serves a purpose against which it is optimized, we question the central paradigm of modelling a mind-independent reality. Instead, we suggest the Rosetta Statement approach to modelling semantic content in a knowledge graph, which models English natural language statements. We suggest a metamodel for Rosetta Statement patterns, from which data schema patterns for any type of simple English statement can be derived. We provide a light version and a full version, the latter of which supports versioning of Rosetta Statements, providing a detailed editing history for each statement. Each Rosetta Statement pattern has an associated dynamic label that can be used for displaying the statement as a natural language sentence in a user interface. The Rosetta Statement approach has been implemented recently in the Open Research Knowledge Graph (ORKG), an open and community-driven knowledge graph for documenting the semantic contents of scholarly publications that has a cross-domain scope. Its statement type editor enables domain experts without prior knowledge in semantics to define data schema patterns for new types of Rosetta Statements. We plan to combine the Rosetta Statements approach with the concept of semantic units to organize the ORKG into semantically meaningful subgraphs to further improve the explorability and overall cognitive interoperability of the graph, benefitting from all the additional expressivity that semantic units provide. We also plan to develop an easy-to-use Rosetta Statement search interface that allows domain experts to query Rosetta Statements without requiring knowledge of SPARQL or Cypher. Finally, we want to utilize the structural proximity of Rosetta Statement patterns to natural language statements to develop supporting tools for data entry and display using Large Language Models and Natural Language Processing tools.

Conclusions: With the Rosetta Statement metamodel, we introduce a framework that supports a two-step procedure for knowledge graph construction. The first level can be reached by domain experts without requiring support by ontology engineers, using the Rosetta Statement approach for modelling semantic content for a knowledge graph. This substantially lowers the entry barrier for knowledge graph use and increases the cognitive interoperability of its data. The second level requires the development of semantic graph patterns that support reasoning and corresponding schema crosswalks from their corresponding Rosetta Statement patterns, and can only be reached by closely cooperating with ontology engineers.

Introduction

We are experiencing an exponential increase in both data generation and consumption, with the overall data volume doubling every three years (1). At the same time, the scholarly field is seeing a significant rise in publications, with an annual output of over 7 million academic papers (2). These numbers emphasize the **urgency of harnessing machine support**, as without the assistance of machines, the sheer volume of data, information, and knowledge threatens to overwhelm and **impede meaningful insights and fact-based decision-making**.

Most research data are generated within projects with project-specific objectives and are subsequently stored in project-specific databases or general repositories. The machine-actionability of these data is typically confined to a set of operations required by the project's objectives, resulting in datasets that are interoperable only within the context of these operations. Consequently, each project-specific database or dataset in a repository tends to become a data silo—while the data of a given project are interoperable for project-specific operations, with each project applying their own data structures and terminologies, they are likely **not interoperable across projects**.

Considering that major global challenges such as biodiversity loss, zoonotic diseases, and climate change (3) require a truly interdisciplinary approach (4), where data and metadata must be collected, integrated, and analyzed from various sources and research fields, efficient machine-support can only be provided if both data and metadata are **machine-actionable** and **FAIR**, i.e., if they are readily **F**indable, **A**ccessible, **I**nteroperable, and **R**eusable for machines and humans alike (see the **FAIR Guiding Principles** (5)).

Unfortunately, conventional data management methods and techniques struggle to cope with the increasing volume, velocity, variety, and complexity of research data, making it challenging to retrieve, store, manage, handle, process, integrate, and analyze (meta)data efficiently within a reasonable timeframe (6). Also, they lack the conceptual and technical requirements to efficiently support the generation of machine-actionable and FAIR (meta)data. However, based on their transparent semantics, highly structured syntax, and standardized formats (7,8), semantic technologies such as knowledge graphs, semantic graph patterns, and ontologies can significantly contribute to the needed technical solution for creating machine-actionable and FAIR (meta)data.

An **ontology** is composed of a set of resources representing classes (i.e., types of entities) and properties (i.e., relations and attributes) with commonly accepted definitions, aiming to provide a lexical or taxonomic framework for knowledge representation, with each resource being a Globally Unique Persistent and Resolvable Identifier (GUPRI) (9). Ontologies are used like dictionaries for creating formal, machine-actionable representations of a specific reality, formulated in a highly formalized canonical syntax and standardized format, such as the Web Ontology Language¹ (OWL) serialized to the Resource Description Framework² (RDF). Ontologies typically contain knowledge about types of entities relevant to a particular domain in the form of class axioms that specify the attributes and relations to other types of entities that every instance of the class necessarily possesses (**terminology box; TBox**). In other words, they contain universal statements such as “*Every swan is white*” for defining a class ‘swan’.

Assertional statements (e.g., “*Swan Anton is white*”), contingent statements (e.g., “*Swans can be white*”), and prototypical statements (e.g., “*Swans are typically white*” or “*Most swans are white*”)

¹ <https://www.w3.org/OWL/>

² <https://www.w3.org/RDF/>

relate instances and thus individuals to each other (**assertion box; ABox**) and are usually not covered in an ontology (10), but can be represented in a **knowledge graph** using OWL and the GUPRIs of respective ontology resources (i.e., classes and properties). We thus understand knowledge graphs to consist of a combination of empirical data in the form of ABox expressions and general domain knowledge in the form of TBox expressions and distinguish them from ontologies, which primarily contain general domain knowledge in the form of TBox expressions and lexical statements (i.e., statements about linguistic entities, such as synonyms or preferred labels for a given term), but not empirical data.

However, the use of OWL and RDF alone does not guarantee compliance with the FAIR principles and does not automatically result in ontologies and knowledge graphs with interoperable terms and machine-actionable and interoperable statements. The same ontology class or property must be used for referring to the same type of entity across different knowledge graphs to guarantee **terminological interoperability**. For example, when referring to apples in different statements in a knowledge graph, the same ontology class should be referred to (e.g., [apple](#) (NCIT:C71985)). The same applies for the interoperability of statements. For a given type of statement, the same semantic graph pattern must be used for representing it in a knowledge graph to guarantee their **propositional interoperability** (for a discussion of machine-actionability, semantic interoperability, and the need for additional criteria for FAIR, see (11)).

A **semantic graph pattern** is a graph pattern that describes relations between entities in a graph using resources and following the RDF syntax of *Subject-Predicate-Object*. In ontologies, they take the form of **ontology design patterns** and are used for describing the relations between entities within a TBox expression. And in knowledge graphs, they take the form of **data schema patterns**, which are used for describing the relations between entities within an ABox expression. Tools for describing semantic graph patterns that enforce a standardized way of modelling and representing data of the same type exist, such as the Shapes Constraint Language SHACL³ and Data Shapes DASH⁴ (12), Shape Expressions ShEx⁵ (13,14), or the Reasonable Ontology Templates OTTR⁶ (15,16).

In this paper, we introduce the Rosetta Statement⁷ semantic parsing and modelling approach to increase the cognitive and semantic interoperability of semantic content in open knowledge graphs with a cross-domain scope. The *problem statement* section identifies four challenges of knowledge graphs relating to cognitive interoperability, graph querying, semantic parsing, and dynamic knowledge graph construction. In the *result* section, we introduce the notion of semantic parsing as a modelling activity and argue that assertional statements in the form of natural language statements are models that share structural similarities with data structures, and that formalized natural language statements can be compared to table structures of relational data and data schema patterns of semantic data. We argue that semantic parsing involves a choice between different possible modelling approaches, with each model serving a specific purpose and being optimized for a specific data use.

³ <https://www.w3.org/TR/shacl/>

⁴ <https://datashapes.org/forms.html>

⁵ <https://shex.io/>

⁶ <https://ottr.xyz/>

⁷ The term refers to the Rosetta Stone, an ancient slab of black basalt containing the same text in three scripts: Ancient Greek, Egyptian hieroglyphs, and Demotic. It was instrumental in deciphering Egyptian hieroglyphs, as it provided a key to understanding their meanings. The Rosetta Stone is since a symbol of the power of decipherment and cross-cultural understanding.

Based on these findings, we develop the Rosetta Statement approach to semantic parsing, which models natural language statements instead of a mind-independent reality. The emphasis lies on a modelling paradigm that enables machine-interpretability of (meta)data, prioritizing their findability and interoperability over reasoning capabilities. This prioritization opens up new avenues for modelling by shifting away from the paradigm frequently applied in science that focuses on modelling a mind-independent reality. Instead, the Rosetta Statement approach models the structure of English natural language statements to enhance efficient and reliable communication of information. We introduce a light and a full version of the Rosetta Statement metamodel, with the difference that the latter supports versioning of statements and tracking the detailed editing history for each Rosetta Statement. We also describe the implementation of the Rosetta Statement approach in the [Open Research Knowledge Graph \(ORKG\)](#) as an example use case. The *future work* section describes some of the plans we have for further integrating the Rosetta Statement approach within the ORKG, adding further services to it that support users in adding and finding semantic content in the ORKG. In the *discussion* section, we discuss some of the benefits and potential issues we anticipate with applying the Rosetta Statement approach to knowledge graphs in general.

Box 1 | Conventions

Throughout the paper, we use the term *triple* to denote a triple statement, and *statement* to refer to a natural language statement. Also, when we talk about *schemata*, we explicitly include schemata for statements and for collections of statements and not only schemata for individual triples.

When we use the term *resource*, we mean something that is uniquely designated, such as through a Uniform Resource Identifier (URI), and that serves as an object of discussion. A resource thus stands for something and represents something someone wants to talk about. It thus represents something of interest. In the context of RDF, both the *Subject* and the *Predicate* in a triple are always considered resources, while the *Object* can be a resource or a literal. Resources can represent properties, instances, or classes. Properties are used in the *Predicate* position, instances denote individuals (i.e., instances), and classes represent general categories, universals, or types.

To ensure clarity, both in the text and in all figures, we represent resources using human-readable labels instead of their GUPRIs. It is implicitly assumed that each property, instance, and class possesses its own GUPRI.

Problem statement

Cognitive interoperability challenge: Understanding machine-actionable data schema patterns requires knowledge and experience in semantics

The requirement of **machine-actionability** is often mentioned in the context of FAIR (meta)data, without clearly defining what that means and leaving the impression that it is a Boolean property—data are either machine-actionable or not. Considering the definition in Box 2, however, machine-actionability comes in degrees and depends on the number of available and readily applicable operations for a given datum (11). Consequently, labeling data as machine-actionable is not very meaningful. Instead, one should specify the set of operations that can be applied to a given datum along with corresponding tools and code that can readily be applied.

Box 2 | Machine-Readability, Machine-Interpretability, Machine-Actionability (17,18)

Machine-readable are those elements in bit-sequences that are clearly defined by structural specifications, such as data formats like CSV, JSON, or XML, or resources and literals in the Resource Description Framework (RDF).

Machine-interpretable are those elements in bit-sequences that are **machine-readable** and can be related with semantic artefacts in a given context and therefore have a defined purpose, such as referencing defined and registered ontology terms that provide **meaning** to a resource in an RDF triple following the triple syntax of *Subject-Predicate-Object*.

Machine-actionable are those elements in bit-sequences that are **machine-interpretable** and belong to a type of element for which **operations** have been specified in symbolic grammar, thus linking types of data statements to operations such as logical reasoning based on description logics for OWL-based data and other rule-based operations such as unit conversion or other data conversions.


Interoperability is directly dependent on machine-actionability, and thus also exists in a continuum. We say, datasets *A* and *B* are *X*-interoperable if a common operation *X* exists that can be applied to both *A* and *B* (11).

Humans are experts in efficiently communicating information by omitting background knowledge, employing vague statements that allude to general figures of thought, and utilizing metaphors and metonymies. We are adept at minimizing the amount of information needed to be conveyed, relying on the context for others to infer the missing details. However, machines require explicit presentation of all relevant information, resulting in the challenge arising from the conflict between machine-actionability and human-actionability of (meta)data representations: **as data representations become more geared towards machine-actionability, they become more complex and less readily understandable for humans (i.e., less human-actionable)** (18). From a machine and data management perspective, the formal semantic representation of the statement “*This apple has a weight of 212.45 grams, with a 95% confidence interval of 212.44 to 212.47 grams*” in a knowledge graph (Fig. 1, middle) makes sense. It complies with the commonly applied modelling paradigm of truthfully representing the relations between real entities, thus, attempting to model a mind-independent reality. At the same time, it takes into account the need for a modular approach to structure data in a knowledge graph and the need for reusing data schema patterns to reduce the variety and overall complexity of patterns used within a knowledge graph. From the perspective of most domain experts, however, the graph is overly complex, hard to understand, and includes information that is not relevant and often even incomprehensible to a human reader. In short: domain experts do not like to look at graphs like that in Figure 1, middle. This impedance mismatch has the potential to frustrate humans when communicating (meta)data with machines.

Observation:

This apple has a weight of 212.45 grams, with a 95% conf. int. of 212.44 to 212.47 grams.

Machine-Actionable RDF Graph:



Human-Actionable Mind-Map like Graph:




Figure 1: Comparison of a human-readable statement with its machine-actionable representation and its human-actionable representation. Top: A human-readable statement about the observation that a particular apple weighs 212.45 grams, with a 95% confidence interval of 212.44 to 212.47 grams. **Middle:** A machine-actionable representation of the same statement as an ABox semantic graph, using RDF syntax and following the general pattern for measurement data from the [Ontology for Biomedical Investigations](#) (OBI) (19) of the [Open Biological and Biomedical Ontology](#) (OBO) Foundry. Marked in red is a triple that is not semantically meaningful and thus difficult to comprehend to a domain expert. **Bottom:** A human-actionable representation of the same statement as a mind-map like graph, reducing the complexity of the RDF graph to the information that is actually relevant to a human reader. [Figure taken from (18)]

We think that data structures should be easily comprehensible for domain experts to support them in correctly interpreting and reusing them. Moreover, understanding the underlying data schema patterns is key to writing queries for efficiently finding all relevant data in a knowledge graph (see next challenge). Therefore, we argue that, at its core, interoperability is about facilitating reliable exchange of information between machines and between humans and machines. The **Interoperability Framework** of the [European Open Science Cloud](#) (EOSC) distinguishes, in accordance with the FAIR Guiding Principles, technical, semantic, organizational, and legal interoperability as four distinct layers of interoperability for scientific data management (20). We suggest adding **cognitive interoperability**, as characterized in Box 3, as another layer of interoperability to the EOSC Interoperability Framework.

Box 3 | Cognitive Interoperability

Cognitive interoperability is “a characteristic of an information technology system to communicate its information with human users in the most efficient ways, providing them with tools and functions that intuitively support them in getting an overview of the data, find the data they are interested in, and allow them to explore other data points from a given data point in semantically meaningful and intuitive ways, thereby taking into account the general cognitive conditions of human beings—not only in terms of **how humans prefer to interact with technology** (human-computer interaction) but also in terms of **how they interact with information** (human-information interaction). In the context of [knowledge graphs], the tools should make the user aware of their contents, help to understand their meaning, support communicating their contents, provide means that increase the trustworthiness of their contents, support their integration in other workflows and software tools, and make transparent what actions can be taken. Additionally, cognitive interoperability of an information technology system can also be understood as the system’s characteristic to be easily implemented and employed by developers and easily managed by operators” (p. 8-9) (18).

Cognitive interoperability focuses on enhancing the usability of data structures and knowledge management systems for human users and developers, an aspect that has been somewhat neglected, particularly in the domain of knowledge graphs and semantic technologies. Moreover, cognitive interoperability also takes the typical communication patterns of humans into account.

If we want to store (meta)data in a knowledge graph in a machine-actionable format and at the same time present them in an easily understandable, human-readable way in a user interface (UI), we need to either (i) decouple the data storage in the graph from the data presentation in the UI, so that information that is only necessary for machines but irrelevant for humans is only accessed by machines but not displayed in the UI (see Fig. 1, bottom), or (ii) create data structures that are easily comprehensible to a domain expert.

Graph query challenge: Writing queries for a knowledge graph requires knowledge of graph query languages

As a domain expert using a knowledge graph, it is one thing to comprehend a given data structure, and it is another thing to actually find (meta)data that interests you. **Findability** is the most important aspect of any tool that stores and documents (meta)data. If relevant (meta)data cannot be found, no other operations can be performed on it, and interoperability issues become secondary. In the context of knowledge graphs, specific query endpoints have been established along with corresponding **graph query languages** to interact with the graph. These are [SPARQL](#) for RDF- and OWL-based knowledge graphs and [Cypher](#) for labeled property graphs such as [Neo4J](#). Querying a knowledge graph requires, either directly or indirectly through a UI, writing queries with such a graph query language. Our personal experience is that most users and software developers have no experience with graph-based

databases, are not familiar with graph query languages and their benefits, and therefore do not see the need to learn them. And even those who are familiar with them report that writing more complex queries can be demanding and is time-consuming and error-prone, requiring knowledge about the underlying data schema patterns used in the knowledge graph. **Domain experts are usually not familiar with graph query languages** and do not know how to write queries. They cannot take advantage of the full search-capabilities of a knowledge graph if no intermediate interface is used that translates a natural language question into a SPARQL or Cypher query. **Apparently, the need to write SPARQL or Cypher queries is a barrier to interacting with knowledge graphs and hinders their wider use (21).**

Semantic parsing burden challenge: Semantic parsing requires expertise and experience in semantics and semantic modelling

Semantic parsing is the task of translating a natural language utterance, a data structure from a relational database, or data from a CSV file into a machine-interpretable representation of its meaning in a knowledge graph. It typically involves the use of a formal language such as OWL and follows the triple syntax of *Subject—Predicate—Object*. As such, it is an essential part of constructing a knowledge graph and is usually carried out by someone with experience in semantics and semantic data modelling. It involves the development of data schema patterns and is a major challenge for rapidly building knowledge graphs with FAIR machine-actionable (meta)data.

Especially, if the semantic parsing follows the paradigm that the output graph should **represent a mind-independent reality** that can be **reasoned about**. Depending on the context and the complexity of the system-of-interest to be modelled, the development of data schema patterns that truthfully represent the relationships between real entities can be very time-consuming and overall demanding, even for someone who is experienced in semantics and has done it before.

Unfortunately, the **typical domain** expert who produces the data to be parsed, and who therefore has the best understanding of the data, **is usually not an expert in semantics and semantic parsing**. They do not know how to model the data in terms of formal semantics and the *Subject—Predicate—Object* syntax. And they do not know how to create logically consistent data schema patterns using existing ontology terms. Consequently, domain experts need to work closely with semantics experts to create such patterns, which is time-consuming and often not feasible due to limited funding and a shortage of semantics experts (→ **semantic parsing burden**). This is particularly critical in the context of community-driven dynamic knowledge graph construction (see next *challenge*).

Dynamic knowledge graph constructions challenge: knowledge graph construction and semantic interoperability

The overall expressive power of the *Subject—Predicate—Object* triple structure of a knowledge graph allows for a wide range of modelling possibilities for any given information, with the same information likely being modelled in numerous and fundamentally different ways. If a knowledge graph does not restrict the modelling choices for a specific type of information to a single data schema pattern and if it does not restrict the choice of ontology terms to be used in this pattern through semantic slot-constraints, substantial problems with semantic interoperability will arise that will affect

terminological as well as propositional interoperability, ultimately impacting the findability, interoperability, and reusability of the information (11).

Most knowledge graphs follow the abovementioned modelling paradigm of truthfully representing a mind-independent reality. They typically focus on a specific scope and restrict their content to a fixed set of different types of information. For each type of information, they pre-define a corresponding data schema pattern together with a specification of its semantic slot-constraints. Respective knowledge graphs employ a **static knowledge graph construction approach** based on **static information extraction**. The restriction on the use of only one data schema pattern for each type of information and the specification of semantic slot-constraints for each pattern ensures the logical consistency and semantic interoperability (both terminological and propositional) of the graph's content, resulting in a truly FAIR knowledge graph that supports reasoning. By closely collaborating with domain experts, it is a feasible task for ontology engineers to define the limited set of data schema patterns and semantic slot constraints required for such a knowledge graph.

With their **open, cross-domain scope**, knowledge graphs such as [Wikidata](#) or the [Open Research Knowledge Graph \(ORKG\)](#) (22,23), however, cannot adhere to this conventional static information extraction approach. Instead, they follow a **community-driven dynamic knowledge graph construction (DKGC) approach**, where the graph's coverage of different types of information is continuously evolving. Knowledge graphs following the DKGC approach face unique challenges. It is not feasible to pre-define all data schema patterns and ontology terms required for modelling all possible types of information users may want to add to the graph. As a result, users must handle semantic parsing themselves, and usually without the support of ontology engineers. This creates a significant barrier to data entry, likely leads to semantic ambiguities, logical inconsistencies across the graph, general data quality issues, and a lack of semantic interoperability and FAIRness of information in the graph, all of which limits the findability of information within the graph (see *Semantic parsing burden challenge*). Moreover, due to their community-driven data entry procedures, DKGC approaches usually require versioning of the graph, as users can make modifications at any time. Ideally, the versioning includes a detailed editing history to ensure transparency and build trust.

A further consequence of the DKGC approach in cross-domain knowledge graphs is the practical and theoretical impossibility of supporting reasoning over the entire graph. Practically, it is impossible to pre-define all data schema patterns and accompanying ontology terms that are required to model information across all possible domains. Theoretically, it is impossible to create ontologies that are both logically consistent with each other and that meet the specific needs of every domain — consider the inconsistency between Newtonian physics and quantum physics, both of which are essential to physicists. Also, it is impossible to develop data schema patterns that are optimized for all possible operations, meeting all the different usage needs of the various users of the knowledge graph.

Result

We believe that the introduction of a new modelling paradigm that focuses on modelling natural language statements can contribute significantly to solving the four challenges discussed above. Before introducing the Rosetta Statement approach to semantic parsing, we first discuss semantic parsing as a modelling approach.

Semantic parsing—a modelling approach

In general, a model can be described as a representation of information on something (i.e., meaning), created by a sender for a receiver, with a specific purpose and usage context in mind (24). The model's purpose is to act as a surrogate for the system-of-interest that it represents—its responses should be consistent with those of the actual system, however, focusing only on the properties relevant to its intended use (25). For a model to be effective, it must possess the following three features (26):

1. **Mapping feature:** The model is derived from and attempts to represent a system-of-interest.
2. **Reduction feature:** The model includes only a relevant subset of the system's properties—abstraction is essential for modelling.
3. **Pragmatic feature:** The model must be usable as a substitute for the system-of-interest in relation to its specific purpose.

With this understanding, both the structures underlying assertional natural language statements and data structures can be seen as models. We can differentiate between token models and type models (25).

Assertional statements and empirical data are token models

A **token model** (also known as *snapshot model*, *representation model*, or *instance model*) captures specific properties of elements from the system it represents, maintaining a one-to-one correspondence with the system. It reflects individual attribute values, such as the weight of a particular apple. **Token models therefore represent the relationships between individual entities** (i.e., instances) belonging to the modelled system. The creation of a token model involves selecting which properties to include (**projection**) and converting these properties into elements of the model (**translation**). Elements within a token model align with and correspond to specific elements of the system—for instance, a particular apple and its weight. Consequently, different token models of the same system-of-interest, representing the same set of properties, are connected through a transitive token-model-of relationship. This relationship can be organized into sequences of designators, each sequentially representing its corresponding element across all token models, ultimately pointing back to the original element in the system-of-interest (25).

According to this definition, assertional statements in the form of natural language sentences and empirical data both can be understood as token models. Figure 2 shows examples of different token models of the same system-of-interest, including the sentence at the top (Fig. 2A) and the tabular and graph-based data structures at the bottom (Fig. 2D, E). Whereas natural language token models primarily serve the purpose of communicating information about the system-of-interest, data structures additionally serve analytical purposes.

Understanding natural language statements as token models aligns with the **predicate-argument-structure** framework in linguistics (27,28), where the main verb of a statement and its auxiliaries form the predicate. The predicate's **valence** specifies the number and types of subjects and objects needed to complete its meaning (called **arguments**). Additional objects (called **adjuncts**) that provide optional information, such as a time specification in a parenthood statement, may also be related to the predicate. Every statement, thus, includes a subject phrase as one of its arguments and can have, depending on the underlying predicate, one or more object phrases as further arguments and additional adjuncts.


In the syntactic structure of a statement, each argument and adjunct occupies a specific **syntactic position**, with each position having its own **semantic role** (Fig. 2B; see also Kipper et al.'s (29) verb

lexicon [VerbNet](#), which extends Levin verb classes (30); see also *thematic roles* sensu (29)). Each position can be described using a **thematic label** that reflects the position’s semantic role (e.g., OBJECT, QUALITY, VALUE, UNIT in Fig. 2). The syntactic structure of a given statement can then be represented as a **syntactic frame** of a sequential order of thematic labels forming a formalized statement (Fig. 2C) ((29), see also [PropBank](#) (31)).

A) Natural Language Statement

This apple has a weight of 212.45 grams.

B) Syntax Tree with Syntactic Positions and associated Semantic Roles



C) Formalized Statement with Syntactic Positions and associated Semantic Roles

OBJECT HAS a QUALITY of VALUE UNIT.

D) Tabular Data Schema with Slots and Constraints

OBJECT	QUALITY	VALUE	UNIT
apple	weight	212.45	gram

E) Graph Data Schema with Slots and Constraints




Figure 2: Parallels between natural language statements and data schemata. The natural language statement in **A)** is structured by syntactical and grammatical conventions into syntactic positions of phrases of a syntax tree as shown in **B)** or a formalized statement as is shown in **C)**, where each position having a specific semantic role associated with it that can be described by a thematic label. Data schemata, both tabular as in **D)** and graphical as in **E)**, must represent these syntactic positions in the form of slots, and each slot must specify its associated semantic role in the form of a constraint specification.

Assertional natural language statements such as “*This apple has a weight of 212.45 grams*” can be understood to be token models, with the apple’s weight property modelled via corresponding syntactic positions. Each (tabular and graph-based) data model of the same apple modelling the same property via corresponding slots is also a token model, and all these token models relate to each other via a transitive token-model-of relationship. Consequently, we can understand each empirical datum as the formalized representations of the same system-of-interest as is represented in the corresponding assertional natural language statement, where slots of the data structure can be aligned with and compared to syntactical positions, with the semantic constraints of a slot mapping to the position’s associated semantic role (11). The main difference between these models is their purpose, with natural language statements being used for human communication whereas data structures are designed to be easily read and operationalized by machines.

Formalized assertional statements, table structures, and data schema patterns are type models

A **type model** (also known as *schema model* or *universal model*) can be derived from a token model by **classification** of its properties. The formalized statement in Figure 2C, for example, is the type model of the corresponding natural language token model (Fig. 2A) and can be obtained from the latter via the corresponding syntax tree (Fig. 2B) by classifying the individual entities in the subject and object positions (e.g., the individual entity “*this apple*” to the class ‘*apple*’). By further generalizing the identified classes, one can then obtain the semantic role of each position (e.g., the semantic role *OBJECT* from the class ‘*apple*’), resulting in a metamodel. A **metamodel** is a model of a model that can be obtained by **generalizing** over a given type model (25). Metamodels represent a specific kind of type model and are more broadly applicable than other type models. By generalization, the formal statement type model “*APPLE HAS a WEIGHT of VALUE GRAM-BASED-UNIT*” can be transformed into the formal statement metamodel “*OBJECT HAS a QUALITY of VALUE UNIT*” (Fig. 2C).

The structures used for organizing a datum as a row in a table (Fig. 2D) or a subgraph in a knowledge graph (Fig. 2E) are metamodels as well, and correspond with their related formal statement metamodel, with the constraints for a column in the table or a slot in the graph specifying the ontology class of allowed instances, aligning with the semantic role of the corresponding syntactic position. A given datum is thus a token model that is typically created by instantiating a corresponding data schema that is its metamodel. The dependency of data token models from their underlying metamodels serves the purpose of supporting machine-actionability and semantic interoperability across data of the same type.

In terms of cognitive interoperability, we can conclude that a data metamodel (e.g., a data schema pattern) must provide a functionally and semantically similar structure, involving the same elements as the syntax tree of the corresponding natural language token model, in order to be intelligible to a human reader. The metamodel must thus cover all relevant syntactic positions as slots, with their associated semantic roles modelled as constraint specifications. Only if this **minimum requirement** is met, humans will be able to understand data created based on a metamodel by translating it into a corresponding natural language statement (11). When creating data metamodels such as tables in a relational database or data schema patterns for a knowledge graph, we should always understand them as attempts of translating the structure of natural language statements into machine-actionable data structures, because only if human readers can easily translate them back into natural language statements, they can make sense out of the corresponding data.

Semantic parsing: Choosing between different type models

When modelling a system-of-interest to capture specific aspects of reality, we create **representational artifacts** and thus entities that carry meaning and that we use for communicating about that reality (32,33). Two kinds of representational artifacts can be distinguished. Iconic representational artifacts carry **perceptual non-conceptual content** such as images, videos, 3D models, physical objects in a collection, audio recordings, or diagrams, in which meaning is contained via a natural relation of resemblance to the part of reality that it reproduces (*natural meaning* (34,35)). Textual representational artifacts, on the other hand, carry **semantic conceptual content** by using words and symbols which, in turn, convey meaning based on common agreement (*non-natural meaning* (34)).

Only semantic content can be analyzed and processed by a computer⁸, and only to semantic content logical reasoning can be applied. Nevertheless, both kinds of representational artifacts represent models of reality that play an essential role in scientific communication. In this paper, we focus on semantic content and its representation in a knowledge graph⁹.

For representing a given semantic content, there usually exist many possible natural language token models. The content of the sentence “*This apple has a weight of 212.45 grams*” could have equally been modelled as “*The weight of this apple is 212.45 grams*” or “*212.45 grams is the weight of this apple*”. The same applies to data structures (e.g., Fig. 3).

In the context of knowledge graph construction, the semantic parsing task thus involves the choice between all possible models, with the goal to ideally apply only one data schema pattern for representing a given type of data. Models, however, are typically designed with a specific purpose and usage context in mind, against which they are optimized. Consequently, the model choice should be based on the purpose and thus the anticipated usage of the content in the knowledge graph, since no data schema can be optimal across all different usage contexts but is always context and format dependent (11). However, if more than one usage is anticipated, it is very likely that more than one data schema must be used for modelling them, resulting in schema interoperability issues. We can deal with this in a knowledge graph and establish schema interoperability by defining schema crosswalks between data schema patterns that model the same semantic content and thus the same system-of-interest (see Fig. 3) (11).

Given that in many cases the purposes and potential uses of the semantic content of a knowledge graph are difficult to predict in advance, and that the uses often depend on a particular research question, and that the tools and methods used for data analysis typically vary, it would not be feasible to provide data schema patterns that support all possible purposes. However, we believe that two main cross-domain purposes can be identified that apply to all knowledge graphs: reasoning and FAIRness.

⁸ perceptual content must be translated into semantic content before a computer can analyze it

⁹ Attempts to represent perceptual contents in a knowledge graph exist (i.e., multi-modal knowledge graphs; e.g., (36,37)), but are based on semantically annotating iconic representational artifacts so that they can be integrated with the semantic content of the knowledge graph.

OBI Schema




Figure 3: Crosswalk from one schema to another for a weight measurement statement. The same weight measurement statement is modeled using two different schemata. **Top:** The weight measurement according to the schema of the [Ontology for Biomedical Investigations](#) (OBI) (19) of the [Open Biological and Biomedical Ontology](#) (OBO) Foundry, which is often used in the biomedical domain. **Bottom:** The same weight measurement according to the schema of the [Extensible Observation Ontology](#) (OBOE), which is often used in the ecology community. The arrows indicate the alignment of slots that share the same constraint specification, i.e., the same semantic role. The corresponding semantic roles include the *OBJECT*, the *QUALITY*, and the *VALUE* that has been measured together with its *UNIT*. The slots carry the semantic content that actually conveys the meaning of the weight measurement statement to a human reader. Blue arrows indicate slots with resources as values, and green arrows those with values. Slots with purple borders indicate problems with terminological interoperability: OBO uses an instance of the class ‘`pato:weight`’, while OBOE, in this example, uses an instance of the class ‘`ncit:weight`’. However, since ‘`pato:weight`’ and ‘`ncit:weight`’ are synonymous terms and can therefore be mapped to establish terminological interoperability between them, this is not a problem.

Reasoning is applied in a knowledge graph to test the graph’s logical consistency, to automatically classify instances within the graph, and to infer implicit knowledge that can be derived from TBox expressions (e.g., class axioms, logical characteristics of a given property) and be applied to the graph to complement the graph by adding triples to it. Reasoning is based on a logical framework. In knowledge graphs, this framework is usually description logic and requires data to be formally semantically modelled using a formal language such as OWL. When designing data schema patterns that support reasoning, usually the semantic parsing paradigm of representing a mind-independent reality is applied. Applying this paradigm comes with a high cost, as:

- it results in issues with cognitive interoperability,
- it is a resource intensive approach,
- it often results in overly complex and incomprehensible graphs,
- domain experts cannot do the semantic parsing themselves, but must closely work together with ontology engineers,
- experienced ontology engineers are hard to find (see challenges in *Problem statement*).

Moreover, with an increasing size and interconnectivity of the graph, it becomes increasingly difficult to keep all semantic content in the graph logically consistent for reasoning. In other words, modelling a mind-independent reality for the purpose of reasoning puts a high barrier on the semantic parsing task, which has a negative effect on the overall acceptance of knowledge graphs, especially for documenting information produced from and knowledge gained in smaller research projects. Furthermore, as we have argued in the *dynamic knowledge graph construction challenge* above, community-driven and open cross-domain knowledge graphs cannot pursue this semantic parsing paradigm for practical and theoretical reasons and thus serve purposes different from reasoning.

Whereas supporting reasoning is a valuable purpose for a research knowledge graph, other purposes can be valuable as well. We think that supporting **FAIRness of (meta)data with a high cognitive interoperability** is even more important for research graphs. Finding relevant data is a precondition of using it and for the various usages of data, adequate data schema patterns with corresponding schema crosswalks can always be defined where required. However, if reasoning is not the main purpose of modelling information and knowledge in a knowledge graph, semantic parsing can be freed from this painstaking requirement and other pathways of representing semantic content can be explored.

The Rosetta Statement approach to semantic parsing

With the Rosetta Statement approach, we want to specify a metamodel in the form of a general data schema pattern that serves the specific purpose and usage context of supporting communication of semantic content between machines and domain experts. The resulting representations should meet all criteria of the FAIR Principles and provide high cognitive interoperability that manifests itself in representations of semantic content in the graph that are easily comprehensible for domain experts.

Humans typically communicate semantic content using natural language expressions. Therefore, we suggest that the general data schema pattern models the structure of natural language statements. The main idea underlying the Rosetta Statement approach is thus to model simple natural language statements. A Rosetta Statement represents a smallest semantic-content-carrying unit of information that is semantically meaningful to a human reader (cf. *statement unit* in (38); for an example of triples in the graph that are not semantically meaningful, see Fig. 1 middle). The main purpose of this approach to semantic parsing is to support the communication of semantic content in a knowledge graph with domain experts and to reduce the burden of semantic parsing and with it lowering the barrier for the use of knowledge graphs by domain experts.

While terms carry meaning through their ontological definitions, statements carry meaning through their terms and the syntactic positions in which they are placed. Unfortunately, when looking at the predicate-argument-structure and comparing the structure of triples with that of natural language statements, we see that they are quite different and therefore do not properly align: the *Predicate* of a triple is always and necessarily **binary**, i.e., triples always have exactly one subject and one object argument. This is not the case for natural language statements. Although binary natural language predicates exist, as for example in the statement “*This tree has part an apple*”, not every natural language predicate is necessarily binary. The statements “*This apple has a weight of 212.45 grams*” and “*Anna travels by train from Berlin to Paris on the 21st of April 2023*” provide examples of statements with **n-ary** predicates. Therefore, ontology properties (i.e., the *Predicate* resources used in triples) do not map in a one-to-one relation to natural language predicates, and we often need to model natural language statements using multiple triples (cf. Fig. 1 and Fig. 2E). Modelling n-ary

statements using the *Subject—Predicate—Object* triple structure is possible in principle, but requires the construction of a subgraph consisting of multiple triples.

In the following, we introduce a modelling paradigm that reflects the structure of English natural language statements and provides a generic pattern for modelling n-ary statements in RDF. In all of this, we are trying to take a **pragmatic approach** that may not satisfy all the requirements for knowledge management that one would wish for in an ideal world, but from which we hope to achieve practical improvements.

Specifications for a Rosetta Statement metamodel

At the heart of our Rosetta Statement approach is a particular **modelling paradigm for statement types**. To meet the requirements of cognitive interoperability, we follow the basic idea that this modelling paradigm should be as generic and simple as possible, reflecting as much as possible the structures we are already familiar with from a natural language like English. In addition, the paradigm must support the specification of new Rosetta Statement schemata so that it becomes a straightforward task that does not require any background in semantics—it should allow **the semantic parsing step to be automated**. This can only be achieved, if we come up with a **very generic structure for the metamodel**. This structure must be applicable to any type of statement, regardless of its **n-aryness**. To be lean, it should store only what is necessary to recover the meaning of the statement, which should be the same as storing only the information a user needs to provide for creating a new statement. For example, instead of creating the entire subgraph as shown in Figure 2E, for a weight measurement statement it should be sufficient to store only the resources for the measured object and the quality, together with the value and the unit, with the emphasis on **always being able to reconstruct the original user input or data import for a given statement by storing only the semantically constitutive entities**, i.e., those objects and relations that preserve the core semantics of the statement, and thus those entities that align with all syntactic positions required to translate the semantic content into a natural language statement. Another criterion that the generic model must meet is that it must facilitate the seamless derivation of queries from it (see *graph query challenge*). Each one of these criteria is important, because, in the end, the metamodel and all data schema patterns derived from it must support semantically interoperable (meta)data statements with which not only machines but also humans can interact. But how do we get there?

We need to abstract the structure of syntax trees from natural language statements to their syntactic positions and associated semantic roles. Since we do not need to be able to represent the full expressiveness of natural language statements when documenting (meta)data statements, we can restrict ourselves to statements with a rather simple structure of subject, transitive verb or predicate, and a number of objects. In this first attempt to develop machine-actionable Rosetta Statements, we do not consider passive forms, no tenses, and we do not distinguish between different possible syntactic alternations in which a verb or predicate can express its arguments. **The metamodel underlying our modelling paradigm is thus similar to a highly simplified syntactic frame, i.e., a formalized statement** (see Fig. 2 C), **specifying a subject-position and a number of required and optional object-positions, each with its associated semantic role in the form of a thematic label and a corresponding constraint specification**. Its structure is thus an abstraction of the structure of a syntax tree.

Different types of statements can be distinguished on the basis of their underlying predicates (i.e., relations), resulting in a **predicate-based classification of types of statements**. A statement like ‘Sarah met Bob’ is a statement with a **binary relation**, where we refer to ‘Sarah’ as the subject of the

statement and ‘Bob’ as its object. If we add a date to the statement, such as in ‘Sarah met Bob on 4th of July 2021’, it becomes a **ternary relation** with two objects¹⁰. If we add a place, it even becomes a **quaternary relation**, as in ‘Sarah met Bob on 4th of July 2021 in New York City’. This is open-ended in principle, although it is limited by the dimensionality of the human reader’s ability to comprehend n-ary relations¹¹. Regardless of this limitation, statements can be distinguished based on their n-aryness. Furthermore, based on the distinction between arguments and adjuncts, we can, if that is required, distinguish **objects** that are necessary and thus **required** to complete the meaning of the statement’s predicate from **objects** that are **optional**.

Looking again at the example above, if we were to model the statement ‘Sarah met Bob on 4th of July 2021’ in a knowledge graph, the objects ‘Bob’ and ‘4th of July 2021’ would be modeled differently. Whereas ‘Bob’ is likely to be modeled as a resource that instantiates a class ‘person’ (wikidata:Q215627), ‘4th of July 2021’ is likely to be modeled as a literal associated with the datatype [xsd:date](#). Therefore, in addition to distinguishing arguments and adjuncts, each with their associated semantic roles and thematic labels, one can distinguish objects by their type into resources via their respective UPRIs and literals and specify **class/datatype constraints based on their associated semantic roles**. Resources, in turn, can be either named-individuals, classes, or properties. We shall refer to them as **resource-objects** and to literal-based objects as **literal-objects**.

After having identified the different subject and object positions within a statement, we must classify and generalize each position to identify its semantic role and to be able to specify its constraints. This results in the specification of a formalized statement and thus a natural language metamodel that we can translate into our Rosetta Statement schema pattern. For instance, the statement ‘Sarah met Bob on 4th of July 2021 in New York City’ turns into the natural language metamodel ‘PERSON met PERSON on DATE in LOCATION’. With resource-subjects, resource-objects, and literal-objects, we now have the different elements that each Rosetta Statement schema pattern must cover. The next step is to work out how best to relate them to each other and to the statement.

The light version of the Rosetta Statement metamodel

The Rosetta Statement modelling approach needs to relate the subject-resource to the different types of object-resources and object-literals of a given type of statement. To avoid the problems of modelling statements that have n-ary predicates, and to reflect as closely as possible the structure of simple natural language statements in English—statements that consist of only one verb or predicate—we define an ontology class for each type of statement based on its predicate, and use instances of the respective class to link the subject and object-resources, as well as the object-literals (Fig. 4). So the statement ‘This apple has a weight of 212.45 grams’ would instantiate a ‘weight measurement statement’ class, and the corresponding data schema pattern would link an instance of ‘apple’ (wikidata:Q89) as the statement’s subject-resource via a ‘subject’ property to an instance of this statement class.

¹⁰ Many properties of the Basic Formal Ontology2020 are actually ternary relations because they are time-dependent (39,40). For example, “subject located in object_A at t”.

¹¹ Humans can hold only 5–9 items in memory (41).




Figure 4: From the structure of a natural language statement to the structure of a Rosetta Statement schema pattern. A) A natural language statement with the predicate *has_a_weight*. B) The corresponding formalized statement, with the syntactic positions and their associated semantic roles highlighted in color. C) The Rosetta Statement schema pattern for the weight measurement statement.

The schema would also require two additional arguments to be added: (i) a value of 212.45 with datatype `xsd:float` as the object-literal and (ii) a named-individual resource ‘gram’ (wikidata:Q41803) as the object-resource. The schema links the statement instance resource to these object-arguments via a sequentially numbered ‘*required object position #*’ property (Fig. 4). To simplify this pattern even more, one could not distinguish between object-argument and object-adjuncts and just link the statement instance resource via ‘*object position #*’ to the respective objects.

When comparing this schema with the weight measurement schemata from OBO and OBOE (cf. Fig. 3), it is immediately apparent that, on the one hand, fewer triples are required to model the statement—i.e., three instead of five or six—and on the other hand, much fewer classes are required. The Rosetta Statement schema pattern is simpler and contains only input slots and no additional positions such as ‘*scalar measurement datum*’ and ‘*scalar value specification*’ in the OBO schema or ‘*observation*’ and ‘*measurement*’ in the OBOE schema. A human reader is not interested in these additional positions and their resources—they only want to see the information from the input slots. The additional positions are also not relevant for translating the semantic content back into a natural language statement that is semantically meaningful to a domain expert.

The same modelling approach can be applied to any simple English statement consisting of a single verb or predicate. We therefore chose this modelling approach as the Rosetta modelling paradigm for reference schemata (see Figure 5).

As each instance of a Rosetta Statement class represents the statement as a whole, including its verb or predicate, one can use this resource to make statements about that statement, including about (i) the provenance of the statement, such as creator, creation date, curator, imported from, etc., (ii) the UPRI of the Rosetta Statement schema pattern that the statement instantiates (which can be specified as a SHACL shape), (iii) the copyright license for the statement, (iv) access/reading restrictions for specific user roles and rights for the statement, (v) whether the statement can be edited and by whom, (vi) a specification of the confidence level of the statement, which is very important, especially in the scientific context (42,43), where lack of it can cause problems such as citation distortion (44), (vii) a specification of the time interval for which the statement is valid, and (viii) references as source evidence for the statement, to name some possibilities. In other words, following the Rosetta Statement modelling paradigm, one always gets statements, each represented by its own dedicated resource. Consequently, one can make statements about each of these statements without having to apply RDF reification (45) or RDF-star (46,47), which are feasible for referring to individual triples but not for larger subgraphs such as a measurement datum with a 95% confidence interval (see Fig. 1, middle), for which the latter two approaches are inefficient and complicated to query. Named Graphs

seem to be another solution for such larger subgraphs (45), and one could always organize all triples belonging to a statement into their own Named Graph using the UPRI of the statement instance resource as the UPRI of the Named Graph.

Each argument in a given Rosetta Statement schema pattern can be understood as a particular syntactic position, which we model in the schema as a slot, for which we can specify the corresponding semantic role in the form of a constraint specification — either as XML Schema datatype specification for an object-literal, which can be supplemented with a specific pattern or range constraint, or as an ontology class specification for a subject or an object-resource, which restricts the type of resources that can be located in a particular slot to that class or any of its subclasses. Corresponding Rosetta Statement schema patterns can be specified as **SHACL shapes**, for example. Statements modeled according to the same shape are **machine-interpretable statements**.

A given Rosetta Statement schema pattern can be extended to include more object adjuncts. Adding new object adjuncts to a pattern is not problematic because any statement instance that was created using an older version of the pattern will still be compatible with the updated pattern, since object adjuncts are only optional objects and thus are not required to comply with a reference schema.

A) Formalized Statement with Syntactic Positions and associated Semantic Roles

SUBJECT verb/predicate preposition *OBJECT_1* preposition *OBJECT_2* ...

B) Corresponding Rosetta Statement Metamodel (light version)




Figure 5: From a formalized natural language statement to the corresponding light version of the Rosetta Statement metamodel. A) A formalized statement with its syntactic positions and associated semantic roles highlighted in color. **B)** The light version of the Rosetta Statement metamodel from A). The statement instance resource indirectly indicates the verb or predicate of the statement, shown in orange. Object arguments (*'required object position #'*) and adjuncts (*'optional object position #'*) can be either object-resources (in blue) or object-literals (in green).

The Rosetta Statement approach to semantic parsing basically takes the idea of RDF reification and applies it to natural language statements instead of reifying a triple. This makes modelling n-ary statements straightforward, as well as making statements about n-ary statements. In contrast, with the mind-independent reality modelling approach, n-ary statements are often a real modelling challenge. The same applies to statements about statements using RDF reification. If the statement consists of several triples (cf. Fig. 1), reification over several triples is required.

The full version of the Rosetta Statement metamodel, supporting versioning and the tracking of an editing history

As discussed in the problem statement, some knowledge graphs such as the Open Research Knowledge Graph ([ORKG](#)) have an open, cross-domain scope and follow the DKGK, where the graph is

rapidly evolving, and its content is the result of collaborative or even crowdsourced editing, where any user can edit any statement in the graph, including statements created by other users. For such knowledge graphs in particular, it is important to be able to track the editing history at the level of individual statements to ensure transparency and build trust. And if the knowledge graph were to allow its users to cite one or more of its statements, thus making the knowledge graph a valuable resource for scholarly communication, it would also require a versioning mechanism that provides a citable resource for sustaining the cited content. With such a mechanism, the knowledge graph can evolve continuously through user input, while still being citable. The statement versioning mechanism of the full version of the Rosetta Statement metamodel supports this, and it also supports tracking the editing history for each individual statement and each particular object-position¹². However, this requires certain adaptations to the light version of the Rosetta Statement metamodel.

In the full version of the Rosetta Statement metamodel (Fig. 6), subject-resources, object-resources, and object-literals are not directly linked to the statement instance, but indirectly through instances of a subject-position class and object-position classes. Whereas the subject-position class can be reused in any Rosetta Statement, independent of the statement type, the object-position classes are defined for each object argument and adjunct of each Rosetta Statement class. Consequently, each particular Rosetta Statement of a given statement type has, in addition to an instance of the corresponding Rosetta Statement class, an instance of each object-position class, to which the actual object-resources and object-literals are linked, and an instance of the general subject-position class to which the subject-resource is linked. The number of object-position classes that a given Rosetta Statement pattern distinguishes depends on the n-aryness of the underlying statement type. The dependency of object-position classes on their corresponding statement type is documented within the respective Rosetta Statement class as a class axiom that points to the required and optional object-position classes.

This structure also supports having more than one subject-resource and object-resource or -literal in a given position with the same semantic role, allowing to make statements such as '*Sarah and Anna met Bob and Christopher on 4th of July 2021 in New York City*' or '*Anna and Bob travel by train from Berlin to Paris via Osnabrück, Hengelo, Utrecht, and Rotterdam on the 21st of April 2023*'. The order of the object and subject resources aligning with the same semantic role is specified via an '*order*' property, followed by a sequentially increasing integer.

By introducing the notion of an anchor statement resource to which different statement versions can be linked via a '*version*' property, the metamodel supports both the versioning of statements and tracking the editing history for each object position (Fig. 6). The **anchor statement resource** represents the statement independent of its version and is always resolved to the newest statement version available. Like any of its statement version resources, it instantiates the respective Rosetta Statement class (e.g., travelling statement class). It points to the Rosetta Statement pattern specification that it instantiates via the property '*schema pattern*'. Via the property '*context*' (inverse relation: '*has statement*'), the statement can be linked to other content in the knowledge graph, such as the scholarly publication from which the statement has been taken. Various metadata can be associated with the anchor statement resource, indicating the creator, creation date, the extraction method (e.g., if the statement has been extracted from text by machines), from where the statement

¹² The editing history does not cover any edits of individual resources, though, such as changing the label of a named-individual resource, which would affect every Rosetta Statement that has this resource in its subject or object position. The editing history of individual resources is not within the scope of the Rosetta Statement approach and requires its own solution.

Each **statement version resource** represents a complete Rosetta Statement, together with accompanying metadata for this version, indicating the creator, creation date, a specification of the statement's certainty, and a version identifier. If single versions should be deletable, '*deleted at*' and '*deleted by*' metadata would be linked to the statement version resource as well. The combined metadata of each individual version of the Rosetta Statement forms the contributor metadata for the latest version of the Statement, and the creation date of the latest version is its last update date. Based on this information, gathered from all versions of a given Rosetta Statement, all information necessary for providing the editing history of that statement is available, even for the editing history of individual object positions. The version identifier, which could be a DOI, allows citing this specific version, while the Rosetta Statement may continue to evolve in the knowledge graph due to users updating it. Whenever a user updates a statement, a new version of the statement is created and linked to the anchor statement resource, with each statement version resource having its own consecutive version number. The version with the highest version number is the latest and the refore current version of the statement.

If the distinction between object arguments and adjuncts and thus between required and optional objects is not desired, the metamodel can be simplified, using only the property '*object*' to link a version statement resource to its object-position resources.

Moreover, if some basic rule-based reasoning should be supported, one can also specify that a particular **logical property** of the verb or predicate of the statement applies to a particular object-position by using a corresponding Boolean annotation property (e.g., '*transitive*') with the object-position instance. This way, it would be possible, for example, to document that the transitivity of a has-part statement applies to the resource specified for the PART object-position.

The versioning and editing history, like it is defined for the full version of the Rosetta Statements, provides semantically structured information that can be used by humans and machines to monitor the "evolution" of a dynamic knowledge graph, identifying typical change-chains and hot topics, trends etc. The information can also be utilized for optimizing the UI and knowledge graph structure.

It is important to note that **the Rosetta Statement approach does not claim to model and represent a human-independent reality**, as other approaches to semantic modelling attempt to do, such as the [Open Biological and Biomedical Ontology](#) (OBO) Foundry, with the Basic Formal Ontology (BFO) (48) as its top-level ontology. Instead, it follows a **pragmatic approach with a focus on the efficient and reliable communication of information of all kinds** between humans and machines and across machines, including but not restricted to (meta)data statements. For the time being, the approach is limited to terms and statements as meaning-carrying units of information, but can be extended to larger units in the future (see discussion below).

And as an aside, due to the generic structure of the Rosetta Statement metamodel, its application for representing semantic content is not limited to knowledge graphs, but can also be applied to relational databases.

Rosetta Statement display templates

Humans usually do not want to see the semantic content of a knowledge graph in the form of triples — they do not want to read them in any of the RDF serializations, nor do they want to visualize them as an RDF/OWL graph (see *Cognitive interoperability challenge*). In order to display semantic content that is modeled according to the Rosetta Statement approach in a human-actionable way, a frontend application needs a **display template** that specifies how a rendering function can translate semantic content in the knowledge graph into a human-readable statement. Display templates organize

information from a Rosetta Statement graph along with additional pre- and postpositions to be presented in the UI.

For example, if the weight measurement statement with 95% confidence interval from Figure 1 were stored according to a corresponding Rosetta Statement pattern, the pattern would specify four literal-object-positions (*MAIN_VALUE*, *UPPER_VALUE*, *LOWER_VALUE*, *INTERVAL_VALUE*) and one resource-object-position (*UNIT*). The textual display template could specify that this information should be displayed in the frontend as '*SUBJECT* has a weight of *MAIN_VALUE UNIT (INTERVAL_VALUE% conf. interval: LOWER_VALUE-UPPER_VALUE UNIT)*'. In the case of the weight measurement statement from Figure 1, this would read "*This apple* has a weight of *212.45 grams (95% conf. interval: 212.44-212.47 grams)*". Another example is a travel statement where the corresponding Rosetta Statement pattern specifies one required resource-object-position (*DESTINATION_LOCATION*), two optional resource-object-positions (*DEPARTURE_LOCATION*, *TRANSPORTATION*), and one optional literal-object-position (*DATETIME*). The corresponding display template would display a travel statement in the frontend as '*PERSON* travels by *TRANSPORTATION* from *DEPARTURE_LOCATION* to *DESTINATION_LOCATION* on the *DATETIME*'. In other words, the subject-position and the various object-positions (i.e., the syntactic positions with their associated semantic roles) are mapped to corresponding variables within a string to form a human-readable statement (see Fig. 7, top). We call such **textual display templates dynamic labels**.

In addition to textual display templates, it is also possible to specify graphical display templates for a **mind-map-like representation of a statement** using **dynamic mind-map patterns**. Dynamic mind-map patterns use a label for the predicate underlying the corresponding statement type and, if there is more than one object-position, labels for relating the various objects to the predicate. As a result, the statement can be visualized as a mind-map like graph, where each subject and object is represented as a node with the label of the corresponding resource from the underlying Rosetta Statement graph (see Fig. 7, bottom). Such graphical representations of statements can also be combined to form a mind-map of larger contexts and interrelationships that connect the dynamic mind-map patterns of multiple statements. Mind-map-like representations of complex interrelationships between different entities are often easier to understand than form-based textual representations, thus increasing the human-actionability of a knowledge graph—users do not want to read about family relationships but rather see the family tree.

Semantic content from the knowledge graph can be communicated to the presentation layer in the UI, with the templates filtering the complex data structure for the information relevant to a human user, using **dynamic labels and dynamic mind-map patterns** to present statements, **decoupling human-readable data display from machine-actionable data storage**.

A given Rosetta Statement pattern can have multiple dynamic labels and dynamic mind-map patterns associated with it. It can be beneficial to be able to choose between different display templates depending on the context in which the semantic content of a knowledge graph is accessed (PC vs. smartphone, expert user vs. layperson, etc.). The specifications of each display template should be associated with its corresponding Rosetta Statement class and pattern specification.

Dynamic Label (Textual Display)




Figure 7: Textual and graphical displays of a statement based on its reference schema. Middle: The reference schema of a traveling statement (here, applying the light version of the Rosetta Statement approach). **Top:** A textual display of the traveling statement, i.e., a dynamic label that is associated with the Rosetta Statement pattern. Note how the subject-position and the object-positions from the pattern align (arrows) with variable-positions (i.e., positions with associated semantic roles) in the dynamic label template. **Bottom:** A graphical display of the traveling statement, i.e., a dynamic mind-map pattern that is associated with the Rosetta Statement pattern. The alignment of the subject-position and the object-positions from the Rosetta Statement pattern to nodes in the dynamic mind-map pattern is similar to the alignment for the dynamic label template (arrows not shown here for clarity).

Rosetta Statements and semantic interoperability: Specifying schema crosswalks

Different controlled vocabularies and ontologies may contain terms that have the same referent and sometimes even the same meaning, in which case they would be strict synonyms. Unfortunately, if their UPRI's differ, a machine will not be able to recognize them as synonyms, and statements using such terms will not be interoperable because the terms they use are not terminologically interoperable. In such cases, entity mappings between the UPRI's of terms that share the same referent and ideally also the same meaning can establish terminological interoperability (11,49).

Analog to entity mappings for establishing terminological interoperability, **schema crosswalks** can be specified between any given Rosetta Statement pattern and other data schema patterns to establish **schema interoperability**. As type models that serve a specific purpose, data schemata are usually optimized towards a specific data use, with the uses depending on specific research questions. Consequently, no general optimal schema exists for any given type of data statement and different data schemata will be used in research (11). By specifying different schema crosswalks for a given Rosetta Statement pattern, researchers can use a schema that is optimized for the set of operations and tools relevant to their particular project and research topic, while making the semantic content

they document schematically interoperable with all other statements created with that Rosetta Statement pattern and all schemata for which schema crosswalks have been specified (Fig. 8).




Figure 8: Schema crosswalks from the light version Rosetta Statement schema pattern for a weight measurement statement to three other schemata. Middle: The light version Rosetta Statement schema pattern for a weight measurement statement. **Top:** The OBI schema. **Bottom left:** The schema of the Quantity, Units, Dimensions, and Types Ontology (**QUDT**) (model transferred from (50)). **Bottom right:** The OBOE schema. Blue arrows indicate the alignment of object-resource slots, green arrows of object-literal slots, and orange arrows of the verb or predicate slots. When operationalizing crosswalks, entity mappings are often required to satisfy the constraint specifications of the target schema. For example, if the OBI schema requires a class resource from the Units of Measurement Ontology (**UO**) for its UNIT slot, the Wikidata resource of the source must be translated into a corresponding UO resource, while for the QUDT schema it would have to be translated into a corresponding QUDT resource.

In addition to specifying schema crosswalks between different data schema patterns, they can also be specified between different formats such as RDF/OWL, GraphQL, Python or Java data classes, JSON, and CSV. Since all of these formats must provide data slots for a given statement type that map to their positions and their associated semantic roles, mapping to non-graph-based formats should be analogous to mapping to graph-based formats (e.g., Fig. 2D). This takes the observation into account that FAIRness is not sufficient as an indicator of high (meta)data quality—the use of (meta)data often depends on its **fitness-for-use**, i.e., data must be available in appropriate formats that comply with established standards and protocols that allow their direct use, e.g., when a specific analysis software requires data in a specific format.

The ability to specify schema crosswalks that convert, for example, weight measurement statements that comply with a corresponding Rosetta Statement pattern into data graphs that comply with the corresponding OBI schema also opens up the possibility for knowledge graph applications to establish workflows in which statements that meet certain criteria, such as having a certain confidence level or having a documented reference to a relevant source of evidence for the statement, are then converted into data graphs that comply with the OBI schema for weight measurements, thereby converting information from a schema that models statements into a schema that models a human-independent reality.

Rosetta Statement use case: Open Research Knowledge Graph

We are implementing the Rosetta Statement approach in the [Open Research Knowledge Graph](#) (ORKG). The ORKG is an open and cross-domain knowledge graph infrastructure that supports the structured description of scholarly semantic content that was originally published in articles and books and thus expressed as narrative texts, tables, figures, and diagrams. The ORKG follows the goal to provide the semantic content of scholarly publications in a FAIR and machine-actionable format to support its reuse (22,23). To reach this goal, it applies the DKGC approach, complemented with semi-automated Large Language Model (LLM) and Natural Language Processing (NLP) approaches that guide users in the semantic parsing task of transforming and representing semantic content from scholarly articles in the knowledge graph (51). It also applies NLP tools for suggesting relevant pre-defined input templates to users (52).

Currently, users can add content to the ORKG by either (1) selecting a pre-defined data graph pattern, i.e. an ORKG template, from which an import form is generated that the user completes, or by (2) creating individual triples following the RDF syntax of *Subject-Predicate-Object* by specifying properties and linking to them a resource or literal as their objects. A 'contribution' resource, which is linked to the respective publication resource in the graph, serves as the subject for the initial triples. Additional triples can be created by linking to these initial triples, using resources from their *Object* position as the subject, and so forth. These two approaches can also be combined. Whereas the second approach imposes the task of semantic parsing and thus the parsing burden on the user (see *Problem statement*), the first approach requires the pre-definition of ORKG templates for any type of semantic content users possibly want to add to the ORKG, which is practically impossible.

By implementing the Rosetta Statement approach, we provide users of the ORKG a third option for entering semantic content to the graph. We implemented the full version that supports versioning and tracking the editing history, but we distinguish between required and optional objects (i.e., object arguments and adjuncts) via the object position resources. For now, we included only the dynamic label as a textual display of Rosetta Statements, but not the dynamic mind-map patterns for their graphical display.

When a user wants to add semantic content to the ORKG, instead of having to choose from one of the pre-defined ORKG templates, creating a new template, or adding a triple by choosing an existing or creating a new property, the user now can add a statement by choosing a Rosetta Statement pattern from the list of existing patterns or define a new pattern.

The ORKG UI guides a user who wants to create a new Rosetta Statement pattern and its accompanying Rosetta Statement class through a step-by-step procedure. This procedure lowers the barrier and significantly reduces the semantic parsing burden for the users of ORKG (see *Semantic parsing burden challenge*).

Panel A: Statement type editor. A progress bar is at the top. Below, a question asks for the label of the new statement type. The input field contains "has measurement statement". Buttons for "Cancel", "Previous", and "Next" are at the bottom.

Panel B: Statement type editor. A progress bar is at the top. Below, a description field contains: "The measurement statement covers all kinds of statements in which a specific quality or disposition of a given object has been measured, resulting in a value and a possible unit. The measurement may also include the specification of a confidence interval, with an upper and a lower value with unit and a confidence level (in %).". Buttons for "Cancel", "Previous", and "Next" are at the bottom.

Panel C: Statement type editor. A progress bar is at the top. Below, there are "Subject" and "Verb" buttons. A text area contains example sentences: "This apple has a weight of 212.45 grams (95% conf. interv.: 212.44 - 212.47 grams). The sample has a mean blood pressure of 120 mmHg. The lake has a pH of 7.5." Below this is a "Positions" list with "Subject" and "Verb" items. A "+ Add object position" button is at the bottom. Buttons for "Cancel", "Previous", and "Create and insert statement type" are at the bottom.

Panel D: Confidence Level (in %) configuration. A "Placeholder" field contains: "Confidence Level (in %)". Below, a "Preposition/Postposition" field contains: "{ Confidence Level (in %) % conf. interv.:". A "Type" dropdown is set to "Decimal". A "Count of values" dropdown is set to "Optional [0,1]". A "Description" field contains: "Specifies the level (in %) of the confidence interval."

Panel E: Statement type editor. A progress bar is at the top. Below, a dynamic label is shown: "Object has [2] Quality/Disposition [of] (Mean) Value Unit [Confidence Level (in %) % conf. interv.: Upper Confidence Value Lower Confidence Value Confidence Interval Unit]". Below this is a "Provide some example sentences" field with the same text as in Panel C. Below that is a "Positions" list with "Object", "has", "Quality/Disposition", "(Mean) Value", and "Unit" items. Buttons for "Cancel", "Previous", and "Create and insert statement type" are at the bottom.

Figure 9: Procedure of specifying a new Rosetta Statement pattern and accompanying Rosetta Statement class. Users provide a label (A) and a definition or description (B) for the corresponding Rosetta Statement class. In the next step, example sentences for the Rosetta Statement class can be provided. Also, an overview of the editing progress is provided, with only the subject position and the verb being specified so far, but object positions can be added at the bottom (C). Each position is represented in the item list and can be expanded to add more information, specifying its placeholder label, pre- and postposition labels, type restrictions (i.e., input constraints), specification of number of values allowed for the position, and additional text that describes what information is expected for this position (D). How the information provided for each position influences the dynamic label textual display is directly shown at the top, and users can change the order of the object positions by drag and drop of the items in the list below (required object positions are displayed in darker and optional object positions in lighter color) (E).

In the first step, the user is asked to provide example statements (Fig. 9A). The examples will be documented in the Rosetta Statement class. In the next two steps, the statement type editor asks for a label (Fig. 9B) and a description (Fig. 9C) for the new statement type, which provides the label and the definition of the new Rosetta Statement class. In the final step, the editor provides two views on the information gathered so far (Fig. 9D). At the top, it provides a visualization of the dynamic label of the Rosetta Statement pattern, based on the information available so far. At the bottom, it lists the subject position and the verb or predicate as expandable items, with the possibility to add object positions. By expanding any of the items, further editing possibilities for each position become available. For the

verb position, only the label can be specified for how the verb is displayed in the dynamic label. For all other positions, the following information can be entered (Fig. 9E):

- a placeholder text, which is displayed in the corresponding input field when a user wants to add a new statement of this type;
- a pre- and postposition text that specifies the text that the dynamic label will display directly before and after the subject or object position, in case the position is not empty;
- the type of input that is allowed for the given position and thus its constraint specification (e.g., *resource*, *integer*, *decimal*, *URL*, *Boolean*, *date*, or *text*)—currently, the ORKG templating system does not support restricting the input of a position to a specific ontology class and all of its subclasses;
- the count of values allowed for each position, providing the possibility to allow multiple objects or subjects for a given subject and object position;
- and a description for the position that provides additional information relating to this position that is shown to users when they enter a statement using this Rosetta Statement pattern.

All information relating to the display label that is entered during this editing step is directly visualized at the top, so that users can see how their editing progress influences the dynamic label and thus how Rosetta Statements of that type will be displayed in the ORKG UI (Fig. 9F). Users can also change the order of the object positions during this editing step via drag and drop of position headers. The Rosetta Statement pattern along with the corresponding Rosetta Statement class can be saved by clicking the button ‘*Create and insert statement type*’.

Now, whenever a user wants to add a measurement statement, the UI creates a corresponding input form based on the newly created Rosetta Statement pattern (Fig. 10A). In the view mode, instead of having to explore a complex representation of the semantic content represented in the measurement statement (either visualized as graph, or as a hierarchy of triples transformed into triple-based statements), the Rosetta Statement is displayed as a natural language statement using the dynamic label associated with the respective Rosetta Statement pattern (Fig. 10B). The display label also adapts to whether some positions are empty and does not display corresponding information (Fig. 10C).

Consequently, due to the specification of the dynamic labels, all Rosetta Statements are displayed in the ORKG UI as easily comprehensible natural language statements, thus meeting the requirement of cognitive interoperability.

The use of the Rosetta Statement semantic parsing paradigm results in Rosetta Statement patterns that are easily understood by domain experts because the underlying general data structure reflects the structure of natural language statements in English. Furthermore, specifying Rosetta Statement patterns for new types of statements is not as demanding when following the Rosetta Statement modelling paradigm. Not only developers, but also domain experts (and anyone else) who want to use knowledge graph applications and who are experts in a research domain other than semantics and knowledge modelling in particular, or computer science in general, will be able to specify new Rosetta Statement patterns. With the ORKG statement type editor, the need to develop semantic data graph patterns to establish FAIR (meta)data within the RDF framework will no longer be a barrier (i.e., the semantic parsing burden), and we expect that the development of supporting tools will be more straightforward due to the general abstract data structure shared across all Rosetta Statement types.




Figure 10: Display of a Rosetta Statement in the ORKG UI in the edit and view mode. A: The input form for a *measurement with confidence interval* Rosetta Statement in the ORKG. The subject-position ('Object') and each object-position defined in the corresponding Rosetta Statement pattern aligns with an input field in the ORKG UI when creating or editing the corresponding Rosetta Statement. B: The representation of a weight measurement statement of a particular apple using the *measurement with confidence interval* Rosetta Statement pattern. The apple weight measurement has all positions that are specified in the pattern filled, whereas the weight measurement of a particular orange has no confidence interval specified. Empty object positions of a Rosetta Statement are not displayed in the view mode.

As each Rosetta Statement is represented in the graph with its own resource and as an instance of a particular statement class, it is straightforward to make statements about these statements. This includes, in addition to the above-mentioned possibility to link all kinds of metadata to the statement resource, also the possibility to indicate the **editability** of each statement as a Boolean property. It also allows specifying the **degree of certainty** of a given statement, which represents important information that may contribute to preventing citation distortion (43,44). Both are supported by default in the ORKG.

However, since each Rosetta Statement is represented in the graph with its own resource, ORKG users can now also relate semantic content across different scholarly publications. They can, for instance, relate an observation stated in one paper to a hypothesis stated in another paper, specifying that the observation contradicts the hypothesis. Such cross-document referencing tasks form a significant part of reading and writing activities in scholarly research (53), and associating such information across different papers is challenging without the aid of digital tools (54).

Every Rosetta Statement is instantiating a corresponding Rosetta Statement class. In addition to this basic classification of Rosetta Statements, we introduced the possibility to classify any given Rosetta Statement as an instance of the '*negation*' class, indicating that its semantic content is negated. This can be used to express typical **negations**, but also **absence statements**, which are often needed when describing specific objects, situations, or events. In OWL, following the Open World assumption, modelling negations, including absences such as '*This swan is not white*', requires the specification of appropriate class axioms and blank nodes. By classifying statement resources as instances of a class '*negation*', we follow the suggestion made in the context of semantic units (38,55), to model any statement as a negation by classifying it as a negation and without having to model it as a TBox expression. Modelling negations in this way is considerably simpler and easier to comprehend by domain experts than modelling them as TBox expressions, and would thus increase their cognitive interoperability (see (55,56) for more details).

Modelling natural language statements instead of a mind-independent reality offers several advantages. We expect the Rosetta Statement approach will simplify the semantic parsing task, lowering the barrier for adding semantic content to the ORKG. It also provides a universal and generally applicable graph data structure against which functions can be programmed without having to consider the various peculiarities of domain-specific data graph patterns, as it would be the case when modelling a mind-independent reality. Furthermore, the structural proximity of Rosetta Statements to

natural language statements facilitates the involvement of LLMs in developing services and functions to support users in any task that involves interacting with the graph (see [LLM-based support for creating Rosetta Statements and summarizing them](#)). And although graphs based on the Rosetta Statement approach are not capable of reasoning, reasoning capability can still be achieved for parts of the ORKG graph by defining schema crosswalks between selected Rosetta Statement patterns and data schema patterns that support reasoning.

Future work

We have several ideas for future improvements to the ORKG on the basis of the Rosetta Statement approach. In the following, we briefly discuss some of them.

Rosetta Statement forms

In many cases, users want to describe a specific type of entity always using the same set of statement types, and they want the respective semantic content to be organized in such a way that the corresponding Rosetta Statements are displayed in a specific order and grouped according to specific topics, e.g., for describing a specific type of process, organizing all materials going into the process in one group, all materials resulting from the process in another, the participants and their roles in one group, and all devices used in the process in another. In other cases, information is standardized and consists of a specific collection of statements, some of which are required and others are optional according to the standard, e.g., for a material property sheet or a disease report sheet.

To support cases like these, we need an editor for specifying Rosetta Statement forms, which are templates of ordered collections of Rosetta Statement patterns. Each Rosetta Statement form specifies the types of Rosetta Statements it covers by referencing their pattern identifiers together with a specification of their cardinality (i.e., whether they are required and how many statements of that type are allowed) and their position in the form. The Rosetta Statement types listed in a given form can be organized into several groups, each with their own header phrase that will be displayed in the UI of the ORKG when accessing the semantic content associated with the form.

Rosetta Statement forms must also include the specification of links between slots across different Rosetta Statements so that for instance the object resource of statement *A* is automatically set to be the subject resource of statement *B*, resulting in connected statements that form a connected graph.

When a form is meant to be used to describe a specific type of entity, the respective ontology class should be referenced in the form as well. This allows the ORKG UI to suggest users that form whenever they add an instance of that ontology class, enabling them to describe the entity following the form.

Rosetta Statements and semantic units:

Rosetta Statement forms result in collections of semantically related Rosetta Statements. Just like a Rosetta Statement is represented in the graph with its own UPRI that instantiates a specific Rosetta Statement class, each such collection of statements can be also represented by its own UPRI, instantiating a corresponding Rosetta Statement collection. The semantic content modelled by such a

collection would be represented in the graph by its own resource, with the corresponding form providing the data schema pattern. Different collection classes can be distinguished and utilized for organizing the overall ORKG graph into various semantically meaningful subgraphs, enhancing the structure and navigability of the graph, facilitating context-dependent graph exploration. This would implement the concept of semantic units to the ORKG and would allow utilizing all the applications of semantic units discussed so far (18,18,38,55).

The semantic unit framework introduces some-instance, most-instances, and every-instance resources as three new types of resources in addition to named-individuals, classes, and properties. This allows, besides specifying negations and cardinality restrictions without having to use blank nodes and enabling their representation in a knowledge graph by modelling them as instance graphs, the formal representation and distinction of the following basic categories of statements in a knowledge graph (for a discussion, see (55)):

1. **Assertional statement:** Statements such as “*Swan Anton is white*” describe the attributes of and relationships between individual entities. The referent of an assertional statement is a particular known individual (i.e., named-individual) that takes the subject-position of the statement. Assertional statements are taken to be true for that particular individual entity. Examples for assertional statements are observations and measurements, and thus empirical data. Instance graphs and ABox expressions are examples of assertional statements (57).
2. **Contingent statement:** Statements such as “*Swans can be white*” are contingent statements. The referent of a contingent statement is a some-instance resource of a particular class which takes the subject-position of the statement. Contingent statements are taken to be true for at least one instance of that class—in the given example, for at least one swan
3. **Prototypical statement:** Statements such as “*Swans are typically white*” or “*Most swans are white*” are prototypical statements. The referent of a prototypical statement is the most-instances resource of a particular class, indicating that the statement is true for most, but not necessarily all, instances of the class.
4. **Universal statement:** Statements such as “*All swans are white*” or “*Every swan is white*” are universal statements. The referent of a universal statement is the every-instance resource of a particular class. A universal statement is necessarily true for every instance of that class. Class axioms of ontology classes, and thus TBox expressions, are examples of universal statements (57).

The conventional OWL modelling only enables the formal representation and distinction of assertional and universal statements, but not of contingent and prototypical statements. Moreover, it does not allow the representation of universal statements in a knowledge graph (55). Semantic units, however, support their formal representation and distinction. The ORKG would benefit from supporting all four categories, as they play an essential role in scientific communication.

By implementing semantic units in the ORKG, many more classification criteria can be applied, leading to a sophisticated classification of different types of statements based on their meaning, their epistemic value and function, their referents, and their context, including time-indexed and geo-indexed statements, conditional if-then statements, granularity trees, disagreement, logical arguments (deduction, induction, abduction), cardinality restrictions, directive statements, and questions (38,55).

A Rosetta Statement Query-Builder

As mentioned above, the semantic unit framework introduces some-instance, most-instances, and every-instance resources. This allows representing questions as statements in the graph (for a discussion, see (55)). Instead of using named-individuals in an assertional Rosetta Statement in the subject and object positions, one can use some-instance resources of a particular class, therewith underdetermining the respective position, allowing for several answers¹³. When asking about universal statements or prototypical statements, respective every-instance or most-instances resources must be used.

The resulting statement can be stored as a Rosetta question within the knowledge graph, by classifying its statement resource to instantiate the '*question unit*' semantic unit class (Fig. 11). Since all Rosetta questions in the ORKG will reflect the structure of their corresponding Rosetta Statement pattern, and since all Rosetta Statement patterns have been created according to the same Rosetta Statement metamodel, we will develop a **Rosetta Query-Builder** that converts the Rosetta question into a query that returns a Boolean *true/false* answer if the subject and object positions contained fully specified inputs (i.e., named-individual, most-instances, every instance resources), or a list of statements as the answer that match the specifications provided by the Rosetta question if one or more of these positions contained underdetermined input (i.e., some-instance resources).

As a next step, we plan to use the Rosetta Query-Builder as the basis for developing a query interface for all Rosetta Statements in the ORKG, allowing users to create their own queries with the input forms for creating Rosetta Statements using named-individual, some-instances, most-instances, and every-instance resources as inputs for subject and object positions **without the users of the ORKG having to know and use any graph query languages**. The Query-Builder translates the Rosetta questions into actual graph queries. The generic structure of the Rosetta Statement metamodel greatly facilitates the development of procedures for this translation step. By using Boolean operators (AND and OR) and by reusing object resources as subject resources across several Rosetta questions, more complex questions can be described.

We expect that the combination of an easily comprehensible data structure provided by the Rosetta Statement metamodel, the possibility to use the same input form for specifying Rosetta questions as for creating corresponding Rosetta Statements, and the fact that the Rosetta questions can be stored in the ORKG and that they are readily executable as queries, will support ORKG users in finding the semantic content they are interested in within the ORKG. Moreover, Rosetta questions can also be used by users to specify SPARQL or Cypher queries for visualizing semantic content of interest within the ORKG using dashboards such as [redash](#)), where having the proper SPARQL or Cypher queries is a central prerequisite.

¹³ One could also take a fully determined assertional statement and phrase it as a question, in which case the answer will be a Boolean *true* or *false*.

A) Natural Language Question

Which apple has a weight between 200 and 300 grams?

B) Rosetta Statement Question Graph




Figure 11: Example of a Rosetta question. A: A natural language question. B: The representation of A) as a Rosetta question.

LLM-based support for creating Rosetta Statements and summarizing them

The structure of the Rosetta Statement metamodel aligns well with the structure of simple English natural language sentences. This results from the underlying semantic parsing approach to model natural language statements instead of a mind-independent reality. Since every Rosetta Statement pattern instantiates the metamodel, all semantic content in the ORKG modelled as Rosetta Statements will be structured following the general structure. This not only supports in general the development of tools and services against that structure, but in particular tools that utilize LLMs and NLP approaches. We plan to explore possibilities to provide support for ORKG users for entering Rosetta Statements to the ORKG and for presenting the results of queries in the UI.

For adding statements to the ORKG, we envision the following LLM-supported workflow:

- 1) User input: ORKG user provides some natural language text as the input through some text field
- 2) Simplify complex sentences: complex sentences from the input text are simplified using NLP and LLM tools.
- 3) Analyze sentence structure: NLP and LLM tools analyze the grammatical sentence structure and tokenize it.
- 4) Semantic Parsing Step (*a* and *b* are alternative pathways)
 - a) Identify candidate Rosetta Statement patterns: NLP and LLM tools identify the main verb or predicate of each sentence and search through the list of already specified Rosetta Statement types based on their respective verbs or predicates (including comprehensive synonymy lists). If one or more candidates have been identified, the tools align tokenized grammatical positions to the corresponding positions in the candidate Rosetta Statement pattern and report the result back to the user for evaluation. Then go to 5)

- b) If no candidate Rosetta Statement has been found for some input sentence: NLP and LLM tools take the input sentence and create suggestions for all the information required for specifying a new Rosetta Statement pattern (see Fig. 9) and will present this information to the user to evaluate and complement. After this evaluation, a new Rosetta Statement pattern with accompanying Rosetta Statement class is added to the ORKG and the workflow proceeds with 4a).
- 5) The user evaluates the resulting Rosetta Statements against the input text and, where needed, makes corrections and then saves them to the ORKG.

This is, of course, experimental, and we will have to evaluate how much of support this will create for ORKG users. Regarding the presentation of semantic content from Rosetta Statements in the ORKG as a result of a query, we want to experiment with LLM's capability of summarizing collections of statements (i.e., Rosetta Statements) into a cohesive and well readable text, but also plan to consider other approaches (58).

Discussion

Thinking about possible criticisms of the Rosetta Statement semantic parsing approach, one could mention its underlying idea to consider statements as minimum information units and to organize the knowledge graph accordingly. To structure a knowledge graph into statements, each statement can be organized in a nanopublication (59–61) and as a FAIR Digital Object, and semantically meaningful collections of Rosetta Statements as semantic units (see also discussion in the context of semantic units (38,55)). As a consequence, however, the Rosetta Statement approach requires the specification of a Rosetta Statement class with associated schema pattern for each type of statement needed in a knowledge graph. This limitation results from the fact that in the Rosetta Statement approach, the set of statement classes and associated schema patterns defines the possible **proposition-space** of the knowledge graph. While this criticism is valid, we want to respond that for a truly FAIR knowledge graph, every data and metadata statement must be FAIR. For a statement to be FAIR, it must be interoperable, and we explained above why this requires the specification of a schema pattern for each statement type. To guarantee schema interoperability and thus to be truly FAIR, each statement must also reference the identifier of the schema pattern against which it was modeled, and ideally also which statement type it instantiates (11). Thus, the need to model each statement type is not unique to the Rosetta Statement approach, but applies to FAIR knowledge graphs in general.

Regardless, since it is ultimately essential that the communication of semantic content between machines and humans is efficient and reliable, and since humans communicate semantic content using natural language statements, semantically meaningful statements should be the smallest units of information in any knowledge graph. With the Rosetta Statements approach, we suggest a framework for creating such knowledge graph building blocks that meet the cognitive requirements of humans and their ways of communication, and with the concept of semantic units we can combine Rosetta Stone building blocks to form larger, semantically meaningful collections of statements.

The difference with other knowledge graph frameworks, especially those that follow the semantic parsing paradigm of modelling a mind-independent reality, is that Rosetta editors such as the one developed for the ORKG provide substantial support for creating schemata for new statement types and do not require experience with Semantics, RDF, OWL, or any graph query language. Consequently, the barrier of developing a knowledge graph is being lowered significantly. Open knowledge graphs

with a cross-domain scope and that use the DKGC approach for entering semantic content to the graph, particularly benefit from the Rosetta Statement approach, as applying the static approach to dynamic scenarios or domains usually falls short when a new type of statement needs to be added to the graph.

We, of course, do not expect that the Rosetta Statement approach solves all semantic interoperability issues that result from a DKGC approach. There will be cases of two or more Rosetta Statement patterns having been created for the same type of statement. For instance, the statement *“Peter travels by bus from Berlin to Paris”* could also be expressed as *“Peter took a bus to get from Berlin to Paris”*. We think that a combination of providing sufficient synonymous predicates and verbs to define the underlying Rosetta Statement class and the description of a general statement theme could potentially reduce the number of such semantically overlapping Rosetta Statement classes. Anyhow, since every pattern complies with the same underlying metamodel, curating the corresponding semantic content in a knowledge graph becomes considerably easier than when such a common underlying data structure is missing. Also, the Rosetta Statement approach reduces the number of properties that have to be defined to model semantic content to the ones used in the metamodel. Combined with the fact that the Rosetta Statement patterns all comply with the general Rosetta Statement metamodel significantly reduces interoperability issues that otherwise most certainly would occur and also supports the development of curation workflows to manage them. One could for instance identify Rosetta Statements that have been created using different patterns but still have a significant overlap in specific subject and object positions. They would be candidates for curators to take a look at and possibly merge to a single pattern.

Another criticism is that the Rosetta Statement semantic parsing paradigm does not relate to a logical framework, so you cannot apply reasoning to statements created with it. We agree that it would be desirable to be able to apply reasoning, but we consider it as more important to ensure first the findability and then the general FAIRness and cognitive interoperability of the semantic content of a knowledge graph. We have therefore chosen the Rosetta Statement semantic parsing approach to model natural statements rather than some mind-independent reality. If reasoning is required, you can always convert Rosetta Statements into a structure that enables reasoning using corresponding schema crosswalks. With the Rosetta Statement approach, we can now follow a two-step procedure for semantic parsing. In the first step, all semantic content to be represented in a knowledge graph is modelled according to the Rosetta Statement approach. This comes with the benefit that the semantic parsing task does not come with the entry barrier that it would represent when attempting to model a mind-independent reality. Instead, modelling natural language statements in the Rosetta Statement approach is straightforward. In the second step, statement types for which reasoning support is desired are identified. Only for this part of the knowledge graph, respective data schema patterns must be defined, which requires the expertise of ontology engineers. By specifying schema crosswalks between the respective Rosetta Statement patterns and reasoning-supporting data schema patterns, all semantic content that should be reasoned about can be exported into reasoning-supporting graph structures.

The Rosetta Statement approach supports cognitive interoperability, not only by modelling natural language statements but also by providing easy-to-use tools that remove some layers of complexity and requirements such as having to be proficient in (graph) query languages, since a Rosetta Query-Builder will derive generic CRUD queries based on Rosetta Statement patterns—no need for developers and operators to define schemata and write queries themselves. Moreover, all Rosetta Statement patterns, when made available in a schema repository along with any associated

schema crosswalks and operational functions, can be reused by anyone developing their own knowledge graph applications.

By applying the Rosetta Statement approach in the ORKG, we also lower the barrier of reusing its semantic content within third-party applications, following the notion of a *System of Systems*, i.e., a collaborative and interactive ecosystem that is continually evolving with its building blocks being defined functionally rather than concretely and for which new applications can be created at any time (62). Rosetta Statements with their patterns represent the building blocks of that system that can be created, shared, and discovered, that can collaboratively evolve and that guarantee a high degree of interoperability.

Conclusion

To enable meaningful insights and fact-based decision-making, we need to harness machine support to integrate disparate datasets that are hidden in project-specific data silos. This requires the datasets to be interoperable across the projects. We have argued that only truly FAIR and machine-actionable data and metadata can support this objective, with ontologies, knowledge graphs, and semantic graph patterns being promising candidate concepts and technologies to achieve it. Without a way to make project-specific dataset interoperable, we will have a hard time coming up with practicable solutions for the major global challenges of biodiversity loss, zoonotic diseases, and climate change, all of which require a truly interdisciplinary approach.

In the *problem statement*, we identify four main challenges that we think represent major obstacles for achieving true FAIRness and machine-actionability across different projects. With the Rosetta Statement approach to semantic parsing, we introduce a metamodel for modelling semantic content in a knowledge graph that reflects the structure of natural language statements. Based on this approach and in combination with the concept of semantic units (38,55), we think we can contribute to solutions for these challenges.

When modelling a mind-independent reality using the RDF syntax of *Subject-Predicate-Object*, we end up with representations of semantic content that may be machine-actionable in the sense that they support reasoning, but they are not readily comprehensible anymore to those people who produce the data and who want to use the data—they lack cognitive interoperability (see *cognitive interoperability challenge*; Fig. 1). With Rosetta Statements, semantic content is represented in a way that reflects the structure of English natural language statements and, thus, should be significantly easier to comprehend and reuse. In addition, with the dynamic labels, Rosetta Statements provide a way to display their semantic content in natural language sentences.

When domain experts want to search for a particular (type of) semantic content within a knowledge graph, they are often asked to engage with a SPARQL or Cypher endpoint, through which they can write graph queries using the respective graph query language. The need to write such queries is a barrier to interacting with the knowledge graph, thus limiting the practical findability of its content (see *graph query language*). By introducing some-instance, most-instances, and every-instance resources and the concept of question units from semantic units, Rosetta Statements can be used to represent questions in the graph. Due to the shared general data schema pattern derived from the Rosetta Statement metamodel, scripts can be written that translate Rosetta Statement questions into readily executable SPARQL and Cypher queries. Input forms derived from Rosetta Statement

patterns can be used for specifying Rosetta Statement questions without the domain experts having to write SPARQL or Cypher queries themselves.

To guarantee the semantic interoperability of semantic content represented in a knowledge graph, domain experts must closely collaborate with ontology engineers to develop the proper ontology terms and all semantic graph patterns required for the respective proposition-space of the knowledge graph. This is very time-consuming and not practically achievable, especially for smaller projects. We called it the semantic parsing burden (see *semantic parsing burden challenge*). With the ORKG use case of a knowledge graph that employed the Rosetta Statement approach, we can show that domain experts without any experience in semantics and data modelling can create their own Rosetta Statement patterns, guided by the ORKG statement type editor. This provides a first level of structured representations of semantic content in a knowledge graph, which can be further improved upon by defining schema crosswalks for those Rosetta Statement types for which reasoning capability is desired. Due to their structural similarity to natural language statements, we expect NLP and LLM approaches to provide a promising framework for developing supporting tools for adding semantic content to knowledge graphs using Rosetta Statement patterns, to create new Rosetta Statement patterns, and to display and also summarize semantic content from larger collections of Rosetta Statements.

Finally, we are convinced that open knowledge graphs with a cross-domain scope such as the ORKG that, as a consequence, follow a community-driven DKG approach, will significantly benefit from employing the Rosetta Statement approach (see *dynamic knowledge graph construction challenge*). A Rosetta Statement pattern editor like the one employed in the ORKG allows any user to specify a new Rosetta Statement pattern on the basis of the here proposed general Rosetta Statement metamodel. No knowledge and experience in semantic parsing is required, and thus the users are freed from the semantic parsing burden, and the knowledge graph service providers do not have to pre-define all data schema patterns that could possibly be required by a user, which is, as we argued, not feasible.

We argued that the Rosetta Statement approach provides a framework in which the entry barrier for adding and finding semantic content in a knowledge graph is substantially lowered. Furthermore, it allows for a two-level strategy towards developing digital twins, with the first level being semantic content in the form of Rosetta Statements. For the second level, any content relevant for reasoning can be transformed into reasoning-supporting data schema patterns by specifying respective schema crosswalks.

With the Rosetta Statement approach, we attempt to put cognitive interoperability as an essential criterion at the center of our design. We attempt to provide solutions that are usable for all kinds of knowledge graph users and thus for knowledge graph builders (e.g., domain experts with project data, developers of databases), data analysts (e.g., data scientists attempting to integrate various datasets, machine-learning experts searching for high-quality training data), and consumers (e.g., domain experts searching for data relevant to their research question) (63). We are aware of the fact that this approach ends up being a different way of thinking and building knowledge graphs than what is the norm, but we believe it is essential for achieving true FAIRness and machine-actionability of data and metadata to think together the societal, cognitive, and interdisciplinary barriers and requirements for using knowledge graphs and find appropriate pragmatic solutions. Intermediate steps must be taken towards the overall goal of research to create models of the world that are real enough to be useful. In knowledge graph design, we tend to focus on the problem to be solved—providing a model of the world that can be reasoned over—when working on the solutions, but often do that outside of the

context in which the problem is embedded, which includes the domain experts that we expect to use the knowledge graph, which sometimes results in us providing solutions that may solve the focus problem but create new problems down the line with cognitive interoperability. When creating solutions, we have to take into account the whole picture, including the practical problems that domain experts face when using knowledge graph or developers have when setting up new knowledge graphs. With the Rosetta Statement approach, we want to contribute to solutions that support cognitive interoperability of knowledge graphs and their semantic content so that they can have an impact on research.

Acknowledgements

We thank Philip Strömert and Peter Grobe for discussing some of the presented ideas. We are solely responsible for all the arguments and statements in this paper. Lars Vogt received funding by the ERC H2020 Project ‘ScienceGraph’ (819536) and by the project DIGIT RUBBER funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF), Grant no. 13XP5126B (TIB).

References

1. Henke N, Bughin J, Chui M, Manyika J, Saleh T, Wiseman B, u. a. The age of analytics: Competing in a data-driven world | McKinsey & Company [Internet]. McKinsey&Company; 2016. Report No.: December. Verfügbar unter: <http://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/mckinsey-analytics/our-insights/the-age-of-analytics-competing-in-a-data-driven-world>
2. Fire M, Guestrin C. Over-optimization of academic publishing metrics: observing Goodhart’s Law in action. *GigaScience*. Juni 2019;8(6):1–20.
3. General Assembly UN. Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. 2015 S. 1–35.
4. International Science Council (ISC). Science as a global public good: ISC Action Plan, 2019-2021 [Internet]. International Science Council; 2019 Aug. Verfügbar unter: <https://council.science/publications/science-as-a-global-public-good-isc-action-plan-2019-2021>
5. Wilkinson MD, Dumontier M, Aalbersberg IJ, Appleton G, Axton M, Baak A, u. a. The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship. *Sci Data*. Dezember 2016;3(1):160018.
6. Idrees SM, Alam MA, Agarwal P. A study of big data and its challenges. *Int J Inf Technol*. April 2018;11(4):841–6.
7. Hogan A, Blomqvist E, Cochez M, D’amato C, Melo GD, Gutierrez C, u. a. Knowledge Graphs. *ACM Comput Surv*. Juli 2021;54(4):1–37.
8. Meid S, Baum R, Bhatta P, Grobe P, Köhler C, Quast B, u. a. SOCCOMAS: A Self-Describing and Content-Independent Application for Semantic Ontology-Controlled Web-Content-Management-Systems. *Biodivers Inf Sci Stand*. August 2017;1:e20033.
9. Smith B. Ontology. In: Floridi L, Herausgeber. *Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of Computing and Information*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing; 2003. S. 155–66.
10. Schulz S, Jansen L. Formal ontologies in biomedical knowledge representation. *IMIA Yearb Med Inform* 2013. Januar 2013;8(1):132–46.
11. Vogt L, Strömert P, Matentzoglou N, Karam N, Konrad M, Prinz M, u. a. FAIR 2.0: Extending the FAIR Guiding Principles to Address Semantic Interoperability [Internet]. Bd. arXiv:2405, arXiv. 2024. Verfügbar unter: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.03345>
12. Knublauch H, Kontokostas D. Shapes Constraint Language (SHACL) - W3C Recommendation 20 July 2017 [Internet]. 2017. Verfügbar unter: <https://www.w3.org/TR/shacl/>

13. Staworko S, Boneva I, Gayo JEL, Prud'hommeaux EG, Solbrig H. Complexity and Expressiveness of ShEx for RDF. :18.
14. Gayo JEL, Prud'hommeaux E, Staworko S, Solbrig H. Towards an RDF validation language based on regular expression derivatives. *CEUR Workshop Proc.* 2015;1330:197–204.
15. Lupp DP, Hodkiewicz M, Skjæveland MG. Template Libraries for Industrial Asset Maintenance: A Methodology for Scalable and Maintainable Ontologies. In: 13th International Conference on Scalable Semantic Web Knowledge Base Systems (SSWS 2020), colocated with the International Semantic Web Conference (ISWC 2020). 2020. S. 49–64.
16. Skjæveland MG, Lupp DP, Karlsen LH, Forssell H. Practical Ontology Pattern Instantiation, Discovery, and Maintenance with Reasonable Ontology Templates. In: Vrandečić D, Bontcheva K, Suárez-Figueroa MC, Presutti V, Celino I, Sabou M, u. a., Herausgeber. *The Semantic Web – ISWC 2018* [Internet]. Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2018 [zitiert 26. März 2020]. S. 477–94. (Lecture Notes in Computer Science; Bd. 11136). Verfügbar unter: http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-030-00671-6_28
17. Weiland C, Islam S, Broder D, Anders I, Wittenburg P. FDO Machine Actionability - Version 2.1 - FDO Forum Proposed Recommendation 19 August 2022 [Internet]. 2022 S. 10. Report No.: August. Verfügbar unter: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1hbCRJvMTmEmpPcYb4_x6dv1OWrBtKUUW5CEXB2gqsRo/edit#
18. Vogt L. Extending FAIR to FAIRer: Cognitive Interoperability and the Human Explorability of Data and Metadata [Internet]. *ResearchGate*; 2023. Verfügbar unter: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/361341263_Extending_FAIR_to_FAIRer_Cognitive_Interoperability_and_the_Human_Explorability_of_Data_and_Metadata
19. Bandrowski A, Brinkman R, Brochhausen M, Brush MH, Bug B, Chibucos MC, u. a. The Ontology for Biomedical Investigations. *PLoS ONE.* 2016;11(4):1–19.
20. European Commission. Directorate General for Research and Innovation., EOSC Executive Board. EOSC interoperability framework: report from the EOSC Executive Board Working Groups FAIR and Architecture. [Internet]. LU: Publications Office; 2021 [zitiert 20. August 2021]. Verfügbar unter: <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2777/620649>
21. Booth D, Wallace E. Session X: EasyRDF [Internet]. 2nd U.S. Semantic Technologies Symposium 2019. 2019. Verfügbar unter: <https://us2ts.org/2019/posts/program-session-x.html>
22. Auer S, Oelen A, Haris M, Stocker M, D'Souza J, Farfar KE, u. a. Improving Access to Scientific Literature with Knowledge Graphs. 2020;17.
23. Stocker M, Oelen A, Jaradeh MY, Haris M, Oghli OA, Heidari G, u. a. FAIR scientific information with the Open Research Knowledge Graph. *Magagna B*, Herausgeber. *FAIR Connect.* Januar 2023;1(1):19–21.
24. Steinmüller W. *Informationstechnologie und Gesellschaft: Einführung in die Angewandte Informatik.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft; 1993.
25. Kühne T. Matters of (Meta-) Modeling. *Softw Syst Model.* November 2006;5(4):369–85.
26. Stachowiak H. *Allgemeine Modelltheorie.* Wien: Springer; 1973.
27. Luuk E. The noun/verb and predicate/argument structures. *Lingua.* November 2009;119(11):1707–27.
28. Luuk E. The origins of linguistic predicate/argument structure. In: *The Evolution of Language* [Internet]. *WORLD SCIENTIFIC*; 2012. S. 204–11. Verfügbar unter: http://www.worldscientific.com/doi/abs/10.1142/9789814401500_0027
29. Kipper K, Dang HT, Palmer M. Class-based construction of a verb lexicon. *Proc 17th Natl Conf Artif Intell AAAI-2000.* 2000;
30. Levin B. *English Verb Classes and Alterations: A Preliminary Investigation.* The University of Chicago Press; 1993. 366 S.
31. Palmer M, Gildea D, Kingsbury P. The Proposition Bank: An Annotated Corpus of Semantic Roles. *Comput Linguist.* März 2005;31(1):71–106.

32. Vogt L. Signs and terminology: science caught between language and perception. *Bionomina*. 2011;4:1–41.
33. Smith B, Kusnierczyk W, Schober D, Ceusters W. Towards a Reference Terminology for Ontology Research and Development in the Biomedical Domain. In: Bodenreider O, Herausgeber. *Proceedings of KR-MED 2006, Studies in Health Technology and Informatics, Vol 124*. IOS Press; 2006. S. 57–66.
34. Grice HP. Meaning. *Philos Rev*. 1957;66(3):377–88.
35. Hanna R. Kant and Nonconceptual Content. *Eur J Philos*. August 2005;13(2):247–90.
36. Zhu X, Li Z, Wang X, Jiang X, Sun P, Wang X, u. a. Multi-Modal Knowledge Graph Construction and Application: A Survey. Februar 2022;1–21.
37. Peng J, Hu X, Huang W, Yang J. What Is a Multi-Modal Knowledge Graph: A Survey. *Big Data Res*. 2023;32:100380.
38. Vogt L, Kuhn T, Hoehndorf R. Semantic units: organizing knowledge graphs into semantically meaningful units of representation. *J Biomed Semant*. Mai 2024;15(7):1–18.
39. Otte JN, Beverley J, Ruttenberg A. Basic Formal Ontology: Case Studies [Internet]. 2021. Verfügbar unter: <https://philpapers.org/archive/OTTBBF.pdf>
40. 32 IJ 1/SC. ISO/IEC 21838-2:2021 Information technology — Top-level ontologies (TLO) Part 2: Basic Formal Ontology (BFO) [Internet]. 2021. Verfügbar unter: <https://www.iso.org/standard/74572.html>
41. Miller GA. The magical number seven plus or minus two: some limits on our capacity for processing information. *Psychol Rev*. 1956;63(2):81–97.
42. de Waard A, Labs E, Maat HP. Epistemic Modality and Knowledge Attribution in Scientific Discourse : A Taxonomy of Types and Overview of Features. In: *Proceedings of the Workshop on Detecting Structure in Scholarly Discourse*. 2012. S. 47–55.
43. Prieto M, Deus H, de Waard A, Schultes E, García-Jiménez B, Wilkinson MD. Data-driven classification of the certainty of scholarly assertions. *PeerJ*. 21. April 2020;8:e8871.
44. Greenberg SA. How citation distortions create unfounded authority: Analysis of a citation network. *BMJ Online*. 2009;339(7714):210–3.
45. Frey J, Müller K, Hellmann S, Rahm E, Vidal ME. Evaluation of metadata representations in RDF stores. Ngonga Ngomo AC, Fundulaki I, Krithara A, Ngonga Ngomo AC, Fundulaki I, Krithara A, Herausgeber. *Semantic Web J*. Januar 2019;10(2):205–29.
46. Hartig O. Foundations of RDF* and SPARQL*. In: *CEUR Workshop Proceedings 1912*. 2017.
47. Arndt D, Broekstra J, DuCharme B, Lassila O, Patel-Schneider PF, Prud'hommeaux E, u. a. RDF-star and SPARQL-star Draft Community Group Report 01 July 2021 [Internet]. Verfügbar unter: <https://w3c.github.io/rdf-star/cg-spec/2021-07-01.html>
48. Smith B, Almeida M, Bona J, Brochhausen M, Ceusters W, Courtot M, u. a. Basic Formal Ontology 2.0. 2015; Verfügbar unter: <https://github.com/BFO-ontology/BFO/raw/master/docs/bfo2-reference/BFO2-Reference.pdf>
49. Matentzoglou N, Balhoff JP, Bello SM, Bizon C, Brush M, Callahan TJ, u. a. A Simple Standard for Sharing Ontological Mappings (SSSOM). *Database [Internet]*. Dezember 2021;2022(Dezember 2021). Verfügbar unter: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2112.07051>
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/database/baac035>
50. Rijgersberg H, Van Assem M, Top J. Ontology of units of measure and related concepts. *Semantic Web*. 2013;4(1):3–13.
51. Oelen A, Auer S. Leveraging Large Language Models for Realizing Truly Intelligent User Interfaces. In: *Extended Abstracts of the 2024 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems [Internet]*. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery; 2024. (CHI EA '24). Verfügbar unter: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3613905.3650949>
52. Arab Oghli O. Information Retrieval Service Aspects of the Open Research Knowledge Graph. [PhD Thesis]. Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Universität; 2022.
53. Adler A, Gujar A, Harrison BL, O'Hara K, Sellen A. A diary study of work-related reading: design

- implications for digital reading devices. In: Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems - CHI '98 [Internet]. Los Angeles, California, United States: ACM Press; 1998 [zitiert 11. Mai 2020]. S. 241–8. Verfügbar unter: <http://portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?doid=274644.274679>
54. Tayeh AAO, Signer B. An Analysis of Cross-Document Linking Mechanisms. In: Proceedings of the 18th ACM/IEEE on Joint Conference on Digital Libraries [Internet]. Fort Worth Texas USA: ACM; 2018 [zitiert 8. Mai 2020]. S. 69–78. Verfügbar unter: <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3197026.3197053>
 55. Vogt L. Semantic Units: Increasing Expressivity and Simplicity of Formal Representations of Data and Knowledge in Knowledge Graphs [Internet]. 2024. Verfügbar unter: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.10720>
 56. Vogt L, Kuhn T, Hoehndorf R. Semantic Units: Organizing knowledge graphs into semantically meaningful units of representation [Internet]. ResearchGate; arXiv; 2023. Verfügbar unter: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/361209259_Semantic_Units_Organizing_knowledge_graphs_into_semantically_meaningful_units_of_representation/stats; <https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.01227>
 57. Vogt L. FAIR data representation in times of eScience: a comparison of instance-based and class-based semantic representations of empirical data using phenotype descriptions as example. *J Biomed Semant.* Dezember 2021;12(1):20.
 58. Colas A, Ma H, He X, Bai Y, Wang DZ. Can Knowledge Graphs Simplify Text? [Internet]. 2023. Verfügbar unter: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.06975>
 59. Mons B, Velterop J. Nano-Publication in the e-science era Nano-Publication in the e-science era. In: Workshop on Semantic Web Applications in Scientific Discourse (SWASD 2009). 2009.
 60. Groth P, Gibson A, Velterop J. The Anatomy of a Nano-publication. *Inf Serv Use.* 2010;30(1–2):51–6.
 61. Kuhn T, Taelman R, Emonet V, Antonatos H, Soiland-Reyes S, Dumontier M. Semantic micro-contributions with decentralized nanopublication services. *PeerJ Comput Sci.* 8. März 2021;7:e387.
 62. Sadeghi M, Carenini A, Corcho O, Rossi M, Santoro R, Vogelsang A. Interoperability of heterogeneous Systems of Systems: from requirements to a reference architecture. *J Supercomput* [Internet]. 2. Dezember 2023; Verfügbar unter: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11227-023-05774-3>
 63. Li H, Appleby G, Brumar CD, Chang R, Suh A. Knowledge Graphs in Practice: Characterizing their Users, Challenges, and Visualization Opportunities. *IEEE Trans Vis Comput Graph.* April 2023;PP:1–11.