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Basic Integration Situation 1: Schema Mapping

Goal: Translate data from a set of source schemata into a given target schema.

- Top-down integration situation
- Triggered by concrete information need (= target schema)
The Schema Mapping Process

1. Find Correspondences

2. Interpretation

3. Query Generation

Transformation Queries (Transformation Program)

Source Data

Target Schema

Materialized Target Data

Source Schema

Logical Mapping

Correspondences
Basic Integration Situation 2: Schema Integration

Goal: Create a new **integrated schema** that can represent **all data** from a given set of source schemata.

- Bottom-up integration situation
- Triggered by the goal to fulfill different information needs based on data from all sources.
2. Correspondences

A **correspondence** relates a set of elements in a schema S to a set of elements in schema T.

- **Mapping** = Set of **all** correspondences that relate S and T

- Correspondences are **easier to specify** than transformation queries
  - domain expert does not need technical knowledge about query language
  - specification can be supported by user interface
  - step-by-step process with separate local decisions

- Correspondences can be annotated with **transformation functions**
  - normalize units of measurement (€ to US$, cm and km to meters)
  - calculate or aggregate values (salary * 12 = yearly salary)
  - cast attribute data types (integer to real)
  - translate values using a translation table (area code to city name)
Types of Correspondences

- **One-to-One Correspondences**
  - Movie.title → Item.name
  - Product.rating → Item.classification
  - Movie ≡ Film (equivalence: Same semantic intention)
  - Athlete ⊆ Person (inclusion: All athletes are also persons)

- **One-to-Many Correspondences**
  - Person.Name → split() → FirstName (Token 1)
    → Surname (Token 2)

- **Many-to-One Correspondences**
  - Product.basePrice * (1 + Location.taxRate) → Item.price

- **Higher-Order Correspondences**
  - relate different types of data model elements
  - for example: Relations (classes) and attributes, see next slide
Examples of Higher-Order Correspondences

Relation-to-Value Correspondences

Man
Firstname
Surname
Woman
Firstname
Surname

Person
Firstname
Surname
Sex

Value-to-Relation Correspondences

Person
Firstname
Surname
Sex

Man
Firstname
Surname
Woman
Firstname
Surname

Types of Schema Heterogeneity that can be Captured

- Naming of
  - Relations
  - Attributes
- Normalized vs. Denormalized
- Nesting vs. Foreign Keys
- Alternative Modelling
  - Relation vs. Value
  - Relation vs. Attribute
  - Attribute vs. Value

\[ \{ \text{1:1, 1:n, n:1 Correspondences} \} \]

\[ \{ \text{Higher-order Correspondences} \} \]
Defining Correspondences
Schema Matching

Various schema matching methods exist (we will cover them later).

Automatically finding a complete high-quality mapping is not possible in most real-world cases. Halevy: „It‘s plain hard.“ :-(

In practice, schema matching is used to create candidate correspondences that are verified by domain experts afterwards.

Realistic goal: Reduce the effort required from domain experts.
Create a new integrated schema that can represent all data from a given set of source schemata.

- **Goals:**
  - **Completeness:** All elements of the source schemata should be covered
    - not always necessary
  - **Correctness:** All data should be represented semantically correct
    - cardinalities, integrity constraints, …
  - **Minimality:** The integrated schema should be minimal in respect to the number of relations and attributes
    - redundancy-free
  - **Understandability:** The schema should be easy to understand

- Various schema integration „procedures“ have been proposed in literature (see Leser/Naumann, Chapter 5.6)
Schema Integration Steps

1. **Pre-Integration**
   - Convert sources into single data model (relational, XML, RDF, object-oriented)
   - If more than two schemata, decide in which order to integrate the schemata

2. **Schema Comparison**
   - Find correspondences (manually or using schema matching)
   - Identity conflicts (normalization, nesting, relation vs. attribute vs. value, …)

3. **Schema Normalization**
   - Change structure of individual schemata in order to resolve conflicts
     (normalization, nesting, relation vs. attribute vs. value, …)

4. **Schema Fusion**
   - Generate integrated schema that can represent all data
     - Merge equivalent relations and attributes
     - Add relations and attributes that only exist in a single schema to integrated schema
Example of a Schema Integration Method

- Spaccapietra, et al.: Model Independent Assertions for Integration of Heterogeneous Schemas. VLDB 1992

- Input
  1. Two source schemata in **Generic Data Model**
     - classes, attributes, and relationships
     - similar to Entity Relationship Model
  2. **Correspondence Assertions**
     - correspondences between classes, attributes, and relationships
     - correspondences between paths of relationships

- Output: Integrated Schema
Integration Rules

Include into the target schema S:

1. Classes with their attributes that are not part of any class-class correspondence (classes without direct equivalent)

2. Equivalent classes and merge their attribute sets
   - Pick class / attribute names of your choice for equivalent classes / attributes

3. Direct relationships between equivalent classes
   - If \( A \equiv A' \), \( B \equiv B' \), \( A-B \equiv A'-B' \) then include \( A-B \)

4. Paths between equivalent attributes and classes
   a) If \( A\equiv A' \), \( B \equiv B' \), \( A-B \equiv A'-A_1'-\ldots-A_m'-B' \) then include the longer path
      - as the length one path is subsumed by the longer path
      - as the longer one is more expressive with respect to cardinality
   b) If \( A\equiv A' \), \( B \equiv B' \), \( A-A_1-\ldots-A_n-B \equiv A'-A_1'-\ldots-A_m'-B' \) then include both paths
      - as they represent different relationships to \( B \)

5. Equivalences between classes and attributes are included as relationships
   - again, prefer more expressive solution with respect to cardinality
Example: Two Schemata about Films

Different focus and level of detail

- **Schema 1**: Who are the directors of a movie?
- **Schema 2**: What are the details about the studio in which the movie was shot?
Example: Class and Attribute Correspondences

- Film ≡ Movie
  - id ≡ movie_id
  - titel ≡ name
- dir_name ≡ director
- studio ≡ s_name
Example: Relationship Path Correspondence 1

- **studio-Directs-Film ≡ s_name-Studio-Movie**

- **Film ≡ Movie**
- **studio ≡ s_name**
- \text{dir\_name-Director-Directs-Film} \equiv \text{director-Movie}

- \text{Film} \equiv \text{Movie}

- \text{dir\_name} \equiv \text{director}
Correspondences

- **Film** ≡ **Movie**
  - id ≡ movie_id
  - titel ≡ name

Integration Steps

1. **Rule 2**: Equivalent classes **Film** and **Movie** are merged to **Film**. Attributes are either merged (id, titel) or simply copied (turnover, director, studio_id).

2. **Rule 1**: Classes without direct equivalent are included into the integrated schema (Director, Directs, Studio)
Correspondence

- $\text{dir\_name-Director-Directs-Film} = \text{director-Movie}$

Integration Steps

3. Rule 4a: The path $\text{dir\_name-Director-Directs-Film}$ is included. The path $\text{director-Movie}$ is left out as it is less expressive (allows only one director per movie)

4. Thus, $\text{dir\_name}$ is kept and $\text{director}$ removed.
Creation of the Integrated Schema 3

- Correspondence
  - \textbf{studio-Directs-Film} = \textbf{s_name-Studio-Movie}

- Integration Step
  5. Rule 4b: Both paths are included.
     - \textbf{Studio} and \textbf{studio} are not merged as they have a different relationship to the surrounding classes and might thus mean different things.
Final Integrated Schema

- **Schema Integration Goals**
  - **Completeness:** All elements of the source schemata covered
  - **Correctness:** All data can be represented semantically correct
  - **Minimality:** The integrated schema is minimal in respect to the number of relations and attributes
  - **Understandability:** The schema is easy to understand

- **Schema Integration Rules of Thumb**
  1. Merge all classes with equivalent classes in other schema (Film)
  2. Add all classes without equivalent (other classes)
  3. Add relationships with highest cardinality in order to be expressive (multiple directors per film)
4. Data Translation

Source Schema

- filmDB
  - directors
    - director
  - films
    - film
      - regieID
      - filmID
      - producer
      - titel

Target Schema

- movieDB
  - studios
  - studio
  - directors
    - director
      - dirID
      - dirname
  - producers
    - producer
      - prodID
      - name

Find Correspondences

Interpretation

Logical Mapping

Query Generation

Source Data

Transformation Queries (Transformation Program)

Materialized Target Data

We are here

Target schema was available or has been created.
Interpretation and Query Generation

Goal: Interpret correspondences in order to generate suitable data translation queries (or programs).

- Query types: SQL Select Into, SPARQL Construct, XSLT
- Example of a data translation query:

```
SELECT artPK AS pubID, heading AS title, null AS date
INTO PUBLICATION
FROM ARTICLE
```

- Challenges for more complex schemata
  - Correspondences are not isolated but embedded into context (tables, relationships)
  - How to join tables in order to overcome different levels of normalization?
  - Which join paths to choose if there are different possibilities?
  - How to combine data from multiple source tables (horizontal partitioning)?
Normalized $\rightarrow$ Denormalized

**ARTICLE**
- artPK
- title
- pages

**AUTHOR**
- artFK
- name

**PUBLICATION**
- pubID
- title
- date
- author

Naïve approach with one query per source table does not work.

```
SELECT artPK AS pubID, title AS title, null AS date, null AS author
FROM ARTICLE
UNION
SELECT null AS pubID, null AS title, null AS date, name AS author
FROM AUTHOR
```
Normalized ➔ Denormalized

**ARTICLE**
- artPK
- title
- pages

**AUTHOR**
- artFK
- name

**PUBLICATION**
- pubID
- title
- date
- author

Better approach: Use foreign key relationship to join tables.

```
SELECT artPK AS pubID, title AS title, null AS date, name AS author
FROM ARTICLE, AUTHOR
WHERE ARTICLE.artPK = AUTHOR.artFK
```
INNER JOIN vs. OUTER JOIN

ARTICLE
- artPK
- title
- pages

AUTHOR
- artFK
- name

PUBLICATION
- pubID
- title
- date
- author

Interpretation: Do we want publications without author?

SELECT artPK AS pubID
  title AS title
  null AS date
  name AS author
FROM ARTICLE LEFT OUTER JOIN AUTHOR
ON ARTICLE.artPK = AUTHOR.artFK
Denormalized → Normalized

PUBLICATION
• title
• date
• author

ARTICLE
• artPK
• title
• pages

AUTHOR
• artFK
• name

SELECT SK(title) AS artPK
  title AS title
  null AS pages
FROM PUBLICATION

SELECT SK(title) AS artFK
  author AS name
FROM PUBLICATION

DISTINCT

SK(): Skolem function used to generate unique keys from distinct values.
Which Join Path to Choose?

Source Schema:

Target Schema:

* LectureStudentList

Interpretation: Do we only want students that took the exam in the list?
Horizontal Partitioning

Professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>id</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>name</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Yr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

PayRate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>HrRate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

WorksOn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>name</th>
<th>Proj</th>
<th>hrs</th>
<th>ProjRank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Sal

\[ c1: \text{Professor(Sal)} \rightarrow \text{Personnel(Sal)} \]
\[ c2: \text{PayRate(HrRate)} \times \text{WorksOn(Hrs)} = \text{Personnel(Sal)} \]
UNION the Salaries of Professors and Students

```
SELECT P.HrRate * W.hrs
FROM PayRate P, WorksOn W
WHERE P.Rank = W.ProjRank

UNION

SELECT salary
FROM Professor
```
Complete Algorithms for Generating Translation Queries

- **Relational Case**

- **XML Case**

- **MapForce**
  - implements another one which we will try out in the exercise.

The algorithms can not do the interpretation and thus need to be guided by the user.
5. Schema Matching

Schema Matching: Automatically or semi-automatically discover correspondences between schemata.

- Automatically finding a complete high-quality mapping (= set of all correspondences) is not possible in many real-world cases.

- In practice, schema matching is used to create candidate correspondences that are verified by domain experts afterwards.

- Schema matching methods focus on finding 1:1 correspondences.
  - we restrict ourselves to 1:1 for now and speak about 1:n and n:1 later.
Schema Matching

We are here

Source Schema

Source Data

Target Schema

Materialized Target Data

Find Correspondences

Transformation Queries (Transformation Program)

Logical Mapping

Query Generation

Interpretation

Correspondences

movieDB

studios

studio

directors

director

dirID

dirname

 producers

producer

prodID

name

filmDB

directors

director

personID

name

studio

films

film

regieID

filmID

producer

titel

Correspondences
Outline: Schema Matching
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5.1 Challenges to Finding Correspondences

1. Large schemata
   • >100 tables and >1000 attributes

2. Esoteric naming conventions and different languages
   • 4 character abbreviations: SPEY
   • city vs. ciudad vs. مدينه

3. Generic, automatically generated names
   • attribute1, attribute2, attribute3 (used for product features in Amazon API)

4. Missing documentation

5. „Strange“ schemata
   • denormalization, redundancies, …

6. Semantic heterogeneity
   • synonyms, homonyms, …
Problem Space: Large Schemata
### Problem Space: Different Languages and Strange Names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vorname</th>
<th>Nachname</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felix</td>
<td>Naumann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jens</td>
<td>Bleiholder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vorname</th>
<th>Nachname</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melanie</td>
<td>Weis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jana</td>
<td>Bauckmann</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>firstname</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How do humans know?

- We recognize **naming conventions** and different **languages**
- use **table context**
- values look like first names and surnames
- values look similar
- if there is a first name, there is usually also a surname
- persons have first- and surnames
- man are persons

→ Recognizing these clues is hard for the computer.
5.2. Schema Matching Methods

1. **Label-based Methods**: Rely on the names of schema elements
2. **Instance-based Methods**: Compare the actual data values
3. **Structure-based Methods**: Exploit the structure of the schema
4. **Combined Approaches**: Use combinations of above methods
Classification of Schema Matching Methods

5.2.1 Label-based Schema Matching Methods

- Given two schemata with the attribute (class) sets A and B
  - A={ID, Name, Vorname, Alter}, B={No, Name, First_name, Age}

- Approach
  1. Generate cross product of all attributes (classes) from A and B
  2. For each pair calculate the similarity of the attribute labels
     - using some similarity function: Edit distance, Jaccard, Soundex, etc.
     - we will cover similarity functions in detail in the chapter on identity resolution
  3. The most similar pairs are the matches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vorname</th>
<th>Alter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First_name</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Levenshtein Distance (aka Edit Distance)

- Measures the dissimilarity of two strings
- Measures the **minimum number of edits** needed to transform one string into the other
- Allowed edit operations
  - insert a character into the string
  - delete a character from the string
  - replace one character with a different character
- Examples
  - `levensthein('Table', 'Cable') = 1` (1 Substitution)
  - `levensthein('Table', 'able') = 1` (1 Deletion)
- Converting Levenshtein distance into a similarity

\[
\sim_{\text{Levenshtein}} = 1 - \frac{\text{Levenshtein } n\text{Dist}}{\max(|s_1|, |s_2|)}
\]
Problems of Label-based Schema Matching

1. Semantic heterogeneity is not recognized
   • the labels of schema elements only partly capture their semantics
   • synonyms and homonyms

2. Problems with different naming conventions
   • Abbreviations: pers = person, dep = department
   • Combined terms and ordering: id_pers_dep vs. DepartmentPersonNumber
   • Different languages: city vs. ciudad vs. مدينة

   - We need to apply smart, application-specific tweaks:
     1. Preprocessing: Normalize labels in order to prepare them for matching
     2. Matching: Employ data-specific similarity functions
Pre-Processing of Labels

- Case and Punctuation Normalization
  - ISBN, IsbN, and I.S.B.N \(\rightarrow\) isbn

- Explanation Removal
  - GDP (as of 2014, US$) \(\rightarrow\) gdp

- Stop Word Removal
  - in, at, of, and, …
  - ex1:locatedIn \(\rightarrow\) ex1:located

- Stemming
  - ex1:located, ex2:location \(\rightarrow\) both stemmed to ‘located’
  - but: ex1:locationOf, ex2:locatedIn (Inverse Properties!)

- Tokenization
  - ex1:graduated_from_university \(\rightarrow\) {graduated, from, university}
  - ex2:isGraduateFromUniversity \(\rightarrow\) {is, Graduate, from, University}
  - tokens are then compared one-by-one using for instance Jaccard similarity
Use Linguistic Resources for Pre-Processing

- Translate labels into target language
  - ciudad and مدينه → city

- Expand known abbreviations or acronyms
  - loc → location, cust → customer
  - using a domain-specific list of abbreviations or acronyms

- Expand with synonyms
  - add cost to price, United States to USA
  - using a dictionary of synonyms

- Expand with hypernyms (is-a relationships)
  - expand product into book, dvd, cd

- Use taxonomy/ontology containing hypernyms for matching
  - similarity = closeness of concepts within taxonomy/ontology
Useful External Resources

- **Google Translate**
  - recognizes languages and translates terms

- **WordNet**
  - provides synonyms and hypernyms for English words

- **Wikipedia/DBpedia**
  - provides synonyms, concept definitions, category system, cross-language links
  - see Paulheim: WikiMatch. 2012.

- **The Web**
  - google for terms, if result are similar then terms are similar
  - see Paulheim: WeSeE-Match. 2012.
5.2.2 Instance-based Schema Matching Methods

- Given two schemata with the attribute sets A and B and
  - all instances of A and B or
  - a sample of the instances of A and B

- Approach
  - Determine correspondences between A and B by examining which attributes in A and B contain similar values
  - as values often better capture the semantics of an attribute than its label

- Concrete Methods
  1. Use Attribute Recognizers
  2. Calculate Value Overlap
  3. Feature-based Methods
  4. Duplicate-based Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felix</td>
<td></td>
<td>Naumann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jens</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bleiholder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table B</th>
<th>VN</th>
<th>NN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felix</td>
<td></td>
<td>Naumann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jens</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bleiholder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attribute Recognizers and Value Overlap

1. Attribute Recognizers
   - employ dictionaries, regexes or rules to recognize values of a specific attribute
     - Dictionaries fit attributes that only contain a relatively small set of values (e.g. age classification of movies (G, PG, PG-13, R), country names, US states
     - Regexes or rules fit attributes with regular values (e.g. area code – phone number).
     - similarity = fraction of the values of attribute B that match dictionary/rule of attribute A

2. Value Overlap
   - calculate the similarity of attribute A and B as the overlap of their values using the Jaccard similarity measure (or Generalized Jaccard):
     \[
     J(A, B) = \frac{|A \cap B|}{|A \cup B|}
     \]
Feature-based Methods

- Given two schemata with the attribute sets A and B and instances of A and B

- Approach
  1. For each attribute calculate interesting features using the instance data, e.g.
     - attribute data type
     - average string length of attribute values
     - average maximal and minimal number of words
     - average, maximal and minimal value of numbers
     - standard derivation of numbers
     - does the attribute contain NULL values?
  2. generate the cross product of all attributes from A and B
  3. for each pair compare the similarity of the features
Example: Feature-based Matching

- Features: Attribute data type, average string length
  - Table1 = {(ID, NUM, 1), (Name, STR, 6), (Loc, STR, 18)}
  - Table2 = {(Nr, NUM, 1), (Adresse, STR, 16), (Telefon, STR, 11)}

- Similarity measure: Euclidean Distance (NUM=0, STR=1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Loc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Müller</td>
<td>Danziger Str, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Meyer</td>
<td>Boxhagenerstr, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Schmidt</td>
<td>Turmstr, Köln</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr</th>
<th>Adresse</th>
<th>Telefon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Seeweg, Berlin</td>
<td>030-3324566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Aalstr, Schwedt</td>
<td>0330-1247765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rosenallee, Kochel</td>
<td>0884-334621</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr</th>
<th>Adresse</th>
<th>Telefon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>d(&lt;0,1&gt;,&lt;0,1&gt;)</td>
<td>d(&lt;1,6&gt;,&lt;0,1&gt;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adresse</td>
<td>d(&lt;0,1&gt;,&lt;1,16&gt;)</td>
<td>d(&lt;1,6&gt;,&lt;1,16&gt;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telefon</td>
<td>d(&lt;0,1&gt;,&lt;1,11&gt;)</td>
<td>d(&lt;1,6&gt;,&lt;1,11&gt;)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion: Feature-based Methods

1. Requires decision which features to use
   • good features depend on the data type and application domain

2. Requires decision how to compare and combine values
   • e.g. Cosine similarity, Euclidian distance (of normalized values), …
   • different features should have different weights

3. Similar attribute values do not always imply same semantics
   • phone number versus fax number
   • employee name versus customer name
Duplicate-based Methods

- **Classical instance-based matching in** vertical
  - Comparison of complete columns
  - Ignores the relationships between instances

- **Horizontal duplicate-based matching**
  1. Find (some)** potential duplicates** or use previous knowledge about duplicates
  2. Check which attribute values **closely match** in each duplicate
  3. Result: Attribute correspondences per duplicate
  4. Final matching: Use **majority voting**
Example: Vote of Two Duplicates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Michel</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>601-4839204</td>
<td>601-4839204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>541-8127100</td>
<td>541-8121164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vote of the two duplicates:
Using Duplicates for Cross-Language Infobox Matching

Source: Felix Naumann, ICIQ 2012 Talk
Discussion: Duplicate-based Methods

- Work well if duplicates are known or easy to find
  - owl:sameAs statements in LOD cloud
  - shared IDs like ISBN or GenID
- Can correctly distinguish very similar attributes
  - Telephone number <> fax number, Surname<>Maiden name
- In general, duplicate detection is tricky and computationally expensive
  - we will discuss this later in the chapter on identity resolution
```
5.2.3 Structure-based Schema Matching Methods

- Addresses the following problem:

```

```

```

```

```

```

- Attribute-Attribute-Matching
  - Instance-based: Values of all attributes rather similar
  - Label-based: Labels of all attributes rather similar
  - All matchings are about equally good 😊

```

Better approach: Exploit the Attribute Context

- Attributes that co-occur in one relation often (but not always) also co-occur in other relations.
Approach: Spread Similarity to Neighbors

- Idea: High similarity of neighboring attributes and/or name of relation increases similarity of attribute pair
- Base similarities: Label-based and/or instance-based
- Simple calculation: Weight attribute similarity with average similarity of all other attributes in same relation and similarity of relation names
- Alternative calculation: Similarity Flooding algorithm (see references)
5.2.4 Combined Approaches

- Hybrid Approaches
  - integrate different clues into single similarity function
  - clues: labels, structure, instance data

- Ensembles
  1. apply different base matchers
  2. combine their results
Example of the Need to Exploit Multiple Types of Clues

### realestate.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>listed-price</th>
<th>contact-name</th>
<th>contact-phone</th>
<th>office</th>
<th>comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$250K</td>
<td>James Smith</td>
<td>(305) 729 0831</td>
<td>(305) 616 1822</td>
<td>Fantastic house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$320K</td>
<td>Mike Doan</td>
<td>(617) 253 1429</td>
<td>(617) 112 2315</td>
<td>Great location</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- If we use only labels
  - contact-agent matches either contact-name or contact-phone

- If we use only data values
  - contact-agent matches either contact-phone or office

- If we use both labels and data values
  - contact-agent matches contact-phone

### homes.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sold-at</th>
<th>contact-agent</th>
<th>extra-info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$350K</td>
<td>(206) 634 9435</td>
<td>Beautiful yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$230K</td>
<td>(617) 335 4243</td>
<td>Close to Seattle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How to Combine the Predictions of Multiple Matchers?

- Simple approaches: Use \texttt{avg()}, \texttt{min()}, or \texttt{max()} function.
- When to use which combiner?
  - average combiner: when we do not have any reason to trust one matcher over the others
  - maximum combiner: when we trust a strong signal from matchers, i.e., if a matcher outputs a high value, we are relatively confident that the two elements match
  - minimum combiner: when we want to be more conservative
More complex Types of Combiners

- Weighted-sum combiners
  - give weights to each matcher, according to its quality
  - you may learn the weights using
    - known correspondences as training data
    - linear regression or decision tree learning algorithms
    - we will cover learning weights in detail in chapter on identity resolution

- Use hand-crafted rules
  - e.g., if $s_i$ is address, return the score of the data-based matcher
  - otherwise, return the average score of all matchers
5.3 Generating Correspondences from the Similarity Matrix

- Input: Matrix containing attribute similarities
- Output: Set of correspondences

**Local Single Attribute Strategies:**

1. **Thresholding**
   - all attribute pairs with sim above a threshold are returned as correspondences
   - domain expert checks correspondences afterwards and selects the right ones

2. **TopK**
   - give domain expert TopK correspondences for each attribute

3. **Top1**
   - directly return the best match as correspondence
   - very optimistic, errors might frustrate domain expert
Alternative: Global Matching

- Looking at the complete mapping (all correct correspondences between A and B) gives us the additional restriction that one attribute in A should only be matched to one attribute in B.

- **Goal of Global Matching**
  - Find optimal set of disjunct correspondences
  - avoid correspondence pairs of the form \( A \equiv C \) and \( B \equiv C \)

- **Approach:**
  - find set of bipartite pairs with the maximal sum of their similarity values

- **Example:**
  - \( A \equiv D \) and \( B \equiv C \) have the maximal sum of their similarity values
  - Ignores that \( \text{sim}(A,C) = 1 \)
Elements of $S = \text{men}$, elements of $T = \text{women}$

$\text{Sim}(i,j) =$ degree to which $A_i$ and $B_j$ desire each other

Goal: Find a stable match combination between men and women

A match combination would be unstable if

- there are two couples $A_i = B_j$ and $A_k = B_l$ such that $A_i$ and $B_l$ want to be with each other, i.e., $\text{sim}(i,l) > \text{sim}(i, j)$ and $\text{sim}(i,l) > \text{sim}(k,l)$

Algorithm to find stable marriages

1. Let $\text{match} = \{\}$
2. Repeat
   - Let $(i,j)$ be the highest value in $\text{sim}$ such that $A_i$ and $B_j$ are not in match
   - Add $A_i = B_j$ to match

Example: $A = C$ and $B = D$ form a stable marriage
Up till now all methods only looked for 1:1 correspondences

But real-world setting might require n:1 and 1:n or even n:m correspondences

Question:
- How to combine values?
- Lots of functions possible.

Problem:
- Should we test $1.2 \times A + 2 \times B - 32 \equiv C$
- … unlimited search space!

5.4 Finding Many-to-One and One-to-Many Correspondences
Search for Complex Correspondences


- Employs specialized searchers:
  - text searcher: uses only concatenations of columns
  - numeric searcher: uses only basic arithmetic expressions
  - date searcher: tries combination of numbers into dd/mm/yyyy pattern

- Key challenge: Control the search.
  - start searching for 1:1 correspondences
  - add additional attributes one by one to sets
  - consider only top k candidates at every level of the search
  - termination based on diminishing returns
An Example: Text Searcher

- Best match candidates for **address**
  - (agent-id,0.7), (concat(agent-id,city),0.75), (concat(city,zipcode),0.9)
5.5. Example Matching System: COMA V3.0

Developed by Database Group at University of Leipzig since 2002
- provides wide variety of matchers (label, instance, structure, hybrid)
- provides user interface for editing correspondences.
- provides data translation based on the correspondences.

http://dbs.uni-leipzig.de/de/Research/coma.html
5.6. Summary

- Schema Matching is an active research area with lots of approaches
  - Yearly competition: Ontology Alignment Evaluation Initiative (OAEI)

- Quality of found correspondences depends on difficulty of problem
  - Many approaches work fine for toy-problems, but fail for larger schemas
  - Hardly any commercial implementations of the methods

- Thus it is essential to keep the domain expert in the loop.
  - Active Learning
    - learn from user feedback while searching for correspondences
  - Leveraging the Crowd
    - mechanical turk
    - click log analysis of query results
    - DBpedia Mapping Wiki
  - Spread the manual integration effort over time
    - pay-as-you-go integration in data spaces (see next slide)
The Dataspace Vision

Alternative to classic data integration systems in order to cope with growing number of data sources.

Properties of dataspaces

- may contain any kind of data (structured, semi-structured, unstructured)
- require no upfront investment into a global schema
- provide for data-coexistence
- provide give best effort answers to queries
- rely on pay-as-you-go data integration


6. Schema Heterogeneity on the Web

1. Role of Standards
   1. RDFa/Microdata/Microformats
   2. Linked Data

2. Self-Descriptive Data on the Web
6.1 Role of Standards

For publishing data on the Web, various communities try to avoid schema-level heterogeneity by agreeing on standard schemata (also called vocabularies or ontologies).

- **Schema.org**
  - 600+ Types: Event, local business, product, review, person, place, ...

- **Open Graph Protocol**
  - 25 Types: Event, product, place, website, book, profile, article

- **Linked Data**
  - various widely used vocabularies.
  - FOAF, SKOS, Music Ontology, …
Microdata Vocabularies (CC 2012)

Only two vocabularies are used!

1. schema: Schema.org
2. datavoc: Google’s Rich Snippet Vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>PLDs Total #</th>
<th>PLDs in Alexa #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  <code>schema:BlogPosting</code></td>
<td>25,235</td>
<td>1,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  <code>datavoc:Breadcrumb</code></td>
<td>21,729</td>
<td>5,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  <code>schema:PostalAddress</code></td>
<td>19,592</td>
<td>1,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  <code>schema:Product</code></td>
<td>16,612</td>
<td>3,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  <code>schema:LocalBusiness</code></td>
<td>16,383</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  <code>schema:Article</code></td>
<td>15,718</td>
<td>3,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  <code>datavoc:Review-aggregate</code></td>
<td>8,517</td>
<td>2,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  <code>schema:Offer</code></td>
<td>8,456</td>
<td>1,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  <code>datavoc:Rating</code></td>
<td>7,711</td>
<td>1,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 <code>schema:AggregateRating</code></td>
<td>7,029</td>
<td>1,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 <code>schema:Organization</code></td>
<td>7,011</td>
<td>1,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 <code>datavoc:Product</code></td>
<td>6,770</td>
<td>1,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 <code>schema:WebPage</code></td>
<td>6,678</td>
<td>2,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 <code>datavoc:Organization</code></td>
<td>5,853</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 <code>datavoc:Address</code></td>
<td>5,559</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 <code>schema:Person</code></td>
<td>5,237</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 <code>schema:GeoCoordinates</code></td>
<td>4,677</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 <code>schema:Place</code></td>
<td>4,131</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 <code>schema:Event</code></td>
<td>4,102</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 <code>datavoc:Person</code></td>
<td>2,877</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 <code>datavoc:Review</code></td>
<td>2,816</td>
<td>783</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only a small set of the defined classes and properties is actually used.

Heterogeneity on schema level is manageable.
Vocabularies in the LOD Cloud (2014)

Data sources mix terms from commonly used and proprietary vocabularies.

- Idea
  - Use common, easy-to-understand vocabularies wherever possible.
  - Define proprietary vocabularies terms only if no common terms exist.

- LOD Cloud Statistics
  - 378 (58.24%) proprietary vocabularies, 271 (41.76%) are non-proprietary

- Common Vocabularies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Number of Datasets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>foaf</td>
<td>701 (69.13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dcterms</td>
<td>568 (56.02%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sioc</td>
<td>179 (17.65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skos</td>
<td>143 (14.10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>void</td>
<td>137 (13.51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cube</td>
<td>114 (11.24%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: http://linkeddatacatalog.dws.informatik.uni-mannheim.de/state/
6.2 Self-Descriptive Data

Data sources in the LOD context try to increase the usefulness of their data and ease data integration by making it self-descriptive.

Aspects of self-descriptiveness

1. Reuse terms from common vocabularies / ontologies
2. Enable clients to retrieve the schema
3. Properly document terms
4. Publish correspondences on the Web
5. Provide provenance metadata
6. Provide licensing metadata
1. Common Vocabularies
   - **Friend-of-a-Friend** for describing people and their social network
   - **SIOC** for describing forums and blogs
   - **SKOS** for representing topic taxonomies
   - **Organization Ontology** for describing the structure of organizations
   - **GoodRelations** provides terms for describing products and business entities
   - **Music Ontology** for describing artists, albums, and performances
   - **Review Vocabulary** provides terms for representing reviews

2. Common sources of identifiers (URIs) for real world objects
   - **LinkedGeoData** and **Geonames** locations
   - **GeneID** and **UniProt** life science identifiers
   - **DBpedia** wide range of things
Enable Clients to retrieve the Schema

Clients can resolve the URIs that identify vocabulary terms in order to get their RDFS or OWL definitions.

Some data on the Web

```
<http://richard.cyganiak.de/foaf.rdf#cygri>
    foaf:name "Richard Cyganiak"  ;
    rdf:type <http://xmlns.com/foaf/0.1/Person> .
```

Resolve unknown term

```
http://xmlns.com/foaf/0.1/Person
```

RDFS or OWL definition

```
<http://xmlns.com/foaf/0.1/Person>
    rdf:type owl:Class  ;
    rdfs:label "Person";
    rdfs:subClassOf <http://xmlns.com/foaf/0.1/Agent>  ;
    rdfs:subClassOf <http://xmlns.com/wordnet/1.6/Agent> .
```
The documentation of a vocabulary is published on the Web in machine-readable form and can be used as a clue for schema matching.

- Name of a Vocabulary Term
  - ex1:name rdfs:label "A person's name"@en .
  - ex2:hasName rdfs:label "The name of a person"@en .
  - ex2:hasName rdfs:label „Der Name einer Person"@de .

- Additional Description of the Term
  - ex1:name rdfs:comment "Usually the family name"@en .
  - ex2:name rdfs:comment "Usual order: family name, given name"@en .
Vocabularies are (partly) connected via vocabulary links.

Vocabulary Link

<http://dbpedia.org/ontology/Person>
owl:equivalentClass
<http://xmlns.com/foaf/0.1/Person> .

- Terms for representing correspondences
  - owl:equivalentClass, owl:equivalentProperty,
  - rdfs:subClassOf, rdfs:subPropertyOf
  - skos:broadMatch, skos:narrowMatch
Deployment of Vocabulary Links

Vocabulary links:
- Vocabularies referencing "foaf" (119)
- Vocabularies referenced by "mo" (17)

Source: Linked Open Vocabularies, https://lov.linkeddata.es/dataset/lov/
Summary: Structuredness and Standard Conformance

Structuredness of Web Content

- DB Dump
- Classic HTML
- LOD
- RDFa
- HTML

Schema Standard Conformance
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