



FRIEDRICH-SCHILLER-  
UNIVERSITÄT  
JENA

**From Metadata to Meaning:  
A Semantic Units Knowledge Graph for  
the Biodiversity Exploratories**

Masterarbeit  
zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades  
Master of Science (M. Sc.)  
im Studiengang Informatik

FRIEDRICH-SCHILLER-UNIVERSITÄT JENA  
Fakultät für Mathematik und Informatik

eingereicht von Tarek Al Mustafa  
geboren am 20.09.1999 in Immenstadt im Allgäu

Themenverantwortliche: Prof. Dr. Birgitta König-Ries

Jena, den 15.09.2025

# Abstract

*Knowledge Graphs* (KGs) bear great potential for ecology and biodiversity researchers in their ability to support synthesis and integration efforts, meta-analyses, reasoning tasks, and overall machine interoperability of research data. However, this potential is yet to be realized as KGs are notoriously difficult to interact with via their query language *SPARQL* for many user groups alike. Additionally, a further hindrance for user–KG interaction is the fundamental disconnect between user requirements and requirements KGs have to fulfill regarding machine-interoperability, reasoning tasks, querying, and further technical requirements. Thus, many statements in a KG are of no semantic significance for end users. In this work, we investigate a potential remedy for this challenge: *Semantic Units* (SUs) are semantically significant, named subgraphs in a KG with the goal to enhance *cognitive interoperability* for users, and to provide responses to common KG modelling challenges. We model and construct a KG from publication and dataset metadata of the *Biodiversity Exploratories* (BE), a research platform for functional biodiversity research across research plots in Germany to contribute to biodiversity research from the perspective of computer science. We contribute further by delivering the first implementation of semantic units on a knowledge graph and investigate how SUs impact KG querying. Finally, we present two implementations of tasks that show how *large language models* (LLMs) can be used to extract structured metadata categories from publication and dataset titles and abstracts, and how embedding models can be used to enrich metadata with latent information, in an effort to support the creation of structured and *FAIR* (findable, accessible, interoperable, and reusable) metadata.

# Zusammenfassung

*Wissensgraphen* bieten großes Potenzial für Ökologie- und Biodiversitätsforschung durch ihre Fähigkeiten, Datensynthese, Datenintegration, Meta-Analysen, logische Schlussfolgerungsanwendungen und die Maschinen-Interoperabilität von Daten zu unterstützen. Derzeit wird dieses Potenzial jedoch nicht ausgeschöpft, da die Interaktion zwischen Menschen und Wissensgraphen bekanntermaßen schwierig ist. Besonders die Abfragesprache *SPARQL* ist für viele Gruppen von Nutzenden nur schwer nutzbar. Ein weiteres Hindernis für diese Interaktion ist die grundlegende Spannung zwischen den Anforderungen von Nutzenden für einfachere Nutzbarkeit und den Anforderungen, die die Ermöglichung von Maschineninteroperabilität, logischen Schlussfolgerungen, Abfragen und weiteren technischen Anforderungen an Wissensgraphen stellen, weswegen viele Aussagen innerhalb eines Wissensgraphen keinen semantischen Mehrwert für Nutzende darstellen. In dieser Arbeit befassen wir uns mit einer möglichen Lösung für dieses Problem in der Form von *Semantischen Einheiten*. Diese sind semantisch signifikante, benannte Subgraphen innerhalb eines Wissensgraphen, die die *kognitive Interoperabilität* von Nutzenden unterstützen und weitere Lösungen für geläufige Modellierungsprobleme von Wissensgraphen liefern sollen. Wir modellieren und konstruieren einen Wissensgraphen über Publikations- und Datensatzmetadaten der *Biodiversitäts-Exploratorien*, einer Forschungsplattform für funktionale Biodiversitätsforschung auf Forschungsflächen in Deutschland, um diese Domäne aus der Perspektive der Informatik zu unterstützen. Einen weiteren Beitrag dieser Arbeit stellt die erste Implementierung von semantischen Einheiten auf einem Wissensgraphen dar und wir untersuchen zusätzlich, wie sich semantische Einheiten auf die Abfrage des Wissensgraphen auswirken. Zuletzt präsentieren wir zwei Anwendungen, die das Potential von *großen Sprachmodellen* für das Extrahieren von strukturierten Metadatenkategorien von Publikations- und Datensatztiteln und Zusammenfassungen aufzeigen und wie Einbettungsmodelle Metadaten mit latenten Informationen aufbereiten können, um die Erstellung von strukturierten und *FAIRen* (auffindbare, zugängliche, interoperable und wiederverwendbare) Metadatensätze zu erleichtern.

# Acknowledgments

I would like to extend my gratitude to Birgitta and Tina for their supervision of this thesis and their continued mentorship and guidance over the past few years.

Further, we thank Lars Vogt for his guidance over the course of this work. Modelling and implementing Semantic Units would not have been possible without help directly from the source.

We also extend our gratitude to the BExIS team, especially Franziska Zander, Andreas Ostrowski, Cornelia Fürstenau, and Eleonora Petzold, for their advice and insights.

Further, we thank the interdisciplinary research project that started as a resident group *Mapping Evidence to Theory in Ecology: Addressing the Challenges of Generalization and Causality* at the Center for Interdisciplinary Research (ZiF: Zentrum für interdisziplinäre Forschung)<sup>1</sup> at Bielefeld University and now continues as Eco-Weaver<sup>2</sup>.

Finally, I extend my deepest gratitude to my friends and family, Without your support I would not be in the position I am in today.

---

<sup>1</sup><https://www.uni-bielefeld.de/einrichtungen/zif/>

<sup>2</sup><https://ecoweaver.github.io/>

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Motivation . . . . .	1
1.2	Problem Statement and Contribution . . . . .	2
1.3	Thesis Overview . . . . .	3
<b>2</b>	<b>The Semantic Web</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	Knowledge Graphs and Ontologies . . . . .	5
2.2	Logical Frameworks and Reasoning . . . . .	6
2.3	Cognitive Interoperability . . . . .	7
2.4	Knowledge Graph and Ontology Engineering . . . . .	8
<b>3</b>	<b>Background and Semantic Units</b>	<b>10</b>
3.1	Literature . . . . .	10
3.2	User Perspective . . . . .	10
3.3	Knowledge Graph Representation and Modelling Challenges . . . . .	11
3.3.1	Modelling Class Axioms that involve triangular Relationships	11
3.3.2	Modelling negations and cardinality restrictions in Knowledge Graphs . . . . .	12
3.3.3	Having to use SPARQL for querying Knowledge Graphs . . . . .	13
3.3.4	Identifying topic-specific subgraphs to provide standardized views on Knowledge Graphs . . . . .	13
3.4	Semantic Units . . . . .	13
<b>4</b>	<b>Related Work</b>	<b>16</b>
4.1	Interfaces . . . . .	16
4.2	From Natural Language to SPARQL Queries . . . . .	17
4.3	SHACL . . . . .	17
4.4	LLMs and Knowledge Graphs . . . . .	17
<b>5</b>	<b>Biodiversity Exploratories, BExIS, and Source Data</b>	<b>19</b>
5.1	Biodiversity Exploratories . . . . .	19
5.2	Exploratories . . . . .	20
5.3	Plots and Plot Types . . . . .	20
5.4	Joint Experiments and Types . . . . .	21
5.4.1	Reduced Land-use intensity Experiment (REX) . . . . .	21
5.4.2	Land-use Experiment (LUX) . . . . .	21
5.4.3	Forest Gap Experiment (FOX) . . . . .	22
5.5	Projects and Infrastructures within the BE . . . . .	22

5.6	BExIS - The Biodiversity Exploratories Information System . . . . .	23
5.7	Abstract Volumes . . . . .	23
5.8	Metadata Presentation . . . . .	23
5.8.1	Publications . . . . .	24
5.8.2	Datasets . . . . .	26
<b>6</b>	<b>Method - Problem Statement, Research Question, and Method Overview</b>	<b>35</b>
6.1	Problem Statement . . . . .	35
6.2	Research Question . . . . .	36
6.3	Method Overview . . . . .	36
6.3.1	Knowledge Graph Engineering . . . . .	37
6.3.2	Information Extraction using Large Language Models . . . . .	37
<b>7</b>	<b>Method - Knowledge Graph and Semantic Unit Modelling</b>	<b>38</b>
7.1	Modelling Approach . . . . .	38
7.1.1	Top-down versus Bottom-up . . . . .	38
7.1.2	Competency Questions . . . . .	39
7.1.3	Connection between competency questions and semantic units	40
7.2	The process of modelling BE Publication and Dataset Metadata . . . . .	40
7.2.1	Ontology Reuse . . . . .	40
7.2.2	First Steps . . . . .	40
7.2.3	Knowledge Graph Schema . . . . .	44
7.3	Modelling Challenges . . . . .	53
7.3.1	BExIS Metadata Schemata . . . . .	53
7.3.2	Negations and the Open World Assumption - Modelling complete information . . . . .	54
7.4	Implementation . . . . .	55
7.4.1	R2RML Mapping Language . . . . .	55
7.4.2	Implementation of Semantic Units . . . . .	55
7.4.3	Schema Validation - SHACL . . . . .	58
<b>8</b>	<b>Method - Extracting Information from Metadata using Large Language Models</b>	<b>61</b>
8.1	Extracting Metadata Categories . . . . .	61
8.1.1	Input Data . . . . .	62
8.1.2	Metadata Categories to extract . . . . .	62
8.1.3	Metadata Reconstruction Schema . . . . .	63
8.1.4	LLM Calls . . . . .	64
8.1.5	Extraction Results . . . . .	64
8.2	Finding Overarching Topics . . . . .	67
8.2.1	Embedding Approach . . . . .	67
8.2.2	Clustering application for the Knowledge Graph . . . . .	68
8.2.3	Linking resources to the main objectives of the BE using embeddings . . . . .	69
8.3	Concluding Remarks . . . . .	74
<b>9</b>	<b>Results</b>	<b>75</b>
9.1	Overview . . . . .	75

9.2	Querying Semantic Units . . . . .	75
9.2.1	First Query Pattern . . . . .	75
9.2.2	Second Query Pattern . . . . .	76
9.3	Evaluation using competency questions . . . . .	77
9.3.1	CQ P1 and CQ D1 . . . . .	78
9.3.2	CQ P2 and CQ D2 . . . . .	80
9.3.3	CQ P3 and CQ D3 . . . . .	82
9.3.4	CQ P4 and CQ D4 . . . . .	84
9.3.5	CQ 5 . . . . .	85
9.4	Semantic Unit Visualization . . . . .	87
<b>10</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>92</b>
10.1	Evaluation of Research Questions . . . . .	92
10.1.1	RQ1: Discussion of Competency questions . . . . .	93
10.1.2	RQ2: Discussion of Metadata Category Extraction . . . . .	94
10.1.3	RQ3: Discussion of Embedding Approach . . . . .	95
10.2	Visualization . . . . .	96
10.3	Remark - Compound Unit Implementation . . . . .	97
10.4	Limitations . . . . .	98
10.4.1	Time constraints . . . . .	98
10.4.2	Hand-written Mappings / Semantic Unit Mappings . . . . .	98
10.4.3	Modelling challenges . . . . .	98
10.4.4	User and Performance Evaluation . . . . .	98
10.4.5	LLM Applications . . . . .	99
10.4.6	Closed Source Data . . . . .	99
10.5	Future Work . . . . .	99
10.5.1	Integration into BE Infrastructure . . . . .	99
10.5.2	Automated Semantic Unit Mappings . . . . .	100
10.5.3	Reasoning Applications . . . . .	100
10.5.4	Further LLM Applications . . . . .	100
<b>11</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>101</b>

# List of Abbreviations I

KG	Knowledge Graph
LLM	Large Language Model
SU	Semantic Unit
FAIR	The FAIR Principles: Findability, accessibility, interoperability, and reusability
DFG	Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (German Research Federation)
GBIF	Global Biodiversity Information Facility
RQ	Research Question
SQ	Sub-question
CQ	Competency Question
BE	Biodiversity Exploratories
BExIS	Biodiversity Exploratories Information System
DOI	Digital Object Identifier
RDF	Resource Description Framework
OWL	Web Ontology Language
BFO	Basic Formal Ontology
SKOS	Simple Knowledge Organization System
UFO	Unified Foundational Ontology
GFO	General Formal Ontology
T-Box	Terminology Box
A-Box	Assertion Box
W3C	World Wide Web Consortium
Def	Definition
GUPRI	Globally Unique Persistent and Resolvable Identifier
UPRI	Unique Persistent and Resolvable
OBI	Ontology of Biomedical Investigations
SHACL	Shapes Constraint Language
XSD	XML Schema Datatypes
GEO	Geospatial Ontology
PCO	Population and Community Ontology
NCBI	National Center for Biotechnology Information Organismal Classification
FABIO	FRBR-aligned Bibliographic Ontology
VIVO	VIVO Ontology
VCARD	vCard Ontology
DCAT	Data Catalog Vocabulary

# List of Abbreviations II

ALB	Schwäbische Alb
HAI	Hainich-Dün
SCH	Schorfheide Chorin
GP	Grid Plot
EP	Experimental Plots
MIP	Medium Intensive Plots
VIP	Very Intensive Plots
REX	Reduced land-use intensity experiment
LUX	Land-use experiment
FOX	Forest gap experiment
PROV	Provenance
NCIT	National Cancer Institute Thesaurus
RO	Relation Ontology
SIO	Semanticscience Integrated Ontology
EnvThes	Environmental Thesaurus Ontology
ENVO	Environment Ontology
AGRO	Agronomy Ontology
MESH	Medical Subject Headings Ontology
METPO	Ontology of ecophysiological traits of microbes
DCTERMS	Dublin Core Terms Ontology
IAO	Information Artifact Ontology
FOAF	Friend-Of-A-Friend Ontology
EFO	Experimental Factor Ontology
ADDICTO	Addiction Ontology
OPMI	Ontology of Precision Medicine and Investigation
TTL	Turtle Syntax
TRIG	TriG Syntax
IRI	Internationalized Resource Identifier
INRAE	French National Research Institute Ontology
CITO	Citation Typing Ontology
STATO	Ontology of Statistical Methods
OMO	OMO Ontology

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

### 1.1 Motivation

*Knowledge graphs* (KGs) have received ever growing attention in recent decades and are used in many applications in industry and science [Peng et al., 2023]. Even though their usage is as wide-spread as it is, knowledge graphs are notoriously difficult to query, even for users with a background in technical fields [Warren and Mulholland, 2020, Vargas et al., 2020, Mishra et al., 2022, Li et al., 2023]. Therefore, they oftentimes stay hidden behind user interfaces for larger applications, and as a result, most users are never asked to interact with one directly.

This work, in line with previous efforts, continues to investigate how the interaction between users and KGs might be simplified to further support users in leveraging the advantages of integrated semantic web technologies. To this end, we view it as the responsibility of computer scientists to deliver solutions for making the systems we develop as useful and usable as possible for different user groups. We focus specifically on interdisciplinary research between computer scientists and researchers from the domains of ecology and biodiversity science, aiming to support researchers in leveraging semantic technologies from computer science in their daily work.

As such, the source data used as the starting point of this thesis consists of publication and dataset metadata of the *Biodiversity Exploratories* (BE)<sup>1</sup>, a DFG-funded Infrastructure Priority Programme (SPP 1374) that presents a research platform for functional biodiversity research on selected research plots across Germany [Fischer et al., 2010].

We estimate that the BE would benefit greatly if this metadata were to be made available in a knowledge graph for several reasons. First, the process of semantification that supplies well defined semantic meanings and definitions to terms in a domain that is inherent in KG creation workflows, bears potential for enriching the metadata schemata for publications and datasets of the BE. This would be beneficial both for researchers uploading metadata about their work and for users interested in reuse. Second, if such metadata were made available in a knowledge graph, it would be more machine-actionable than it currently is. This could enable a variety

---

<sup>1</sup><https://www.biodiversity-exploratories.de/en/>

of KG specific applications that support the *integration* of BE data to other knowledge sources: Connect taxa observed in BE studies to *GBIF*<sup>2</sup> and gain access to trait and occurrence information, link datasets to *DOIs* (Digital Object Identifier), disambiguate authors and organizations with *ORCID*<sup>3</sup> and *ROR*<sup>4</sup> identifiers, and retrieve additional metadata about affiliations or citations. Third, the Biodiversity Exploratories have put much effort into synthesis (the tenth core project of the BE)<sup>5</sup> in recent years, aiming to create new insights from a combination of multiple information sources. As we have outlined before, integrated publications and datasets may contribute to meta-analyses. *'These analyses rely on the synthesis (or in computer science terms: integration) of numerous datasets. Today, this is a labor-intensive task, often requiring months if not years of PostDoc time'* [Al Mustafa et al., 2025]

However, with the potential upsides a knowledge graph may deliver, some challenges arise for users and their interaction with KGs, leading us to formulate the problem statement investigated in this work in the next section.

## 1.2 Problem Statement and Contribution

The upsides of knowledge graphs stem from rigorous semantic modelling and the adherence to their underlying data model, the *Resource Description Framework* (RDF) [Miller, 1998, Pan, 2009], in which data is represented as triples:

**<subject> <predicate> <object>**

With these triples, also called *facts*, it becomes possible to represent minute units of information, such that complex statements about entities and their relationships can be expressed in detail. As a result, simple natural language statements such as '*Apple X has a weight of 204.56 grams*' require many triples to enable reasoning capabilities, query-functionality, machine interpretability, and *FAIR* (findable, reusable, interoperable, and reusable) [Wilkinson et al., 2016] representation. This leads to many graph triples bearing no semantic significance for users, which poses a barrier for user–KG interaction as graph schemata become more difficult to understand and query, which constitutes the main research problem we investigate in this work:

### Problem Statement:

- *There is a fundamental mismatch between the requirements that ontology and knowledge graph engineers must satisfy to comply with best practices regarding data governance, technical requirements, and enabling machine interoperability, and the requirements that users of these technologies impose on their ability to provide semantically meaningful statements to convey information.*

To address this problem, we investigate the theoretical background behind *Semantic Units* [Vogt et al., 2024], a novel approach for semantically meaningful, named sub-graphs in a knowledge graph, and contribute by presenting their first technical im-

---

<sup>2</sup><https://www.gbif.org/>

<sup>3</sup><https://orcid.org/>

<sup>4</sup><https://ror.org/>

<sup>5</sup><https://www.biodiversity-exploratories.de/en/projects/core-project-10-biodiversity-synthesis/>

plementation. As the foundation of this implementation, we model and construct a knowledge graph for publication and dataset metadata of the Biodiversity Exploratories.

The metadata used as basis for the knowledge graph is available on BExIS, the *Biodiversity Exploratories Information System*<sup>6</sup>, where it exists in a semi-structured format, consisting of both structured metadata categories and unstructured free-text fields. As some complexity of knowledge graph creation is alleviated when source data is structured, we additionally investigate *Large Language Model* (LLM) facilitated approaches to extract structured metadata categories from publication and dataset titles and abstracts. This could not only support KG creation workflows, but also aid researchers in creating FAIR-aligned datasets with less effort.

Finally, we investigate a second LLM application that may extract latent information from BE metadata: Using embedding models, we aim to extract latent topics that publications and datasets cluster around, categorize documents by providing topic hierarchies as anchors in an embedding space, and link documents to the overarching research goals of the Biodiversity Exploratories to further enrich BE metadata.

### 1.3 Thesis Overview

In the last section of this introductory chapter, we present an overview of the contents of this thesis:

The work is split into three background and related work chapters, three method chapters, and three further chapters that present results, discuss them, and conclude the thesis.

In Ch. 2, we present core concepts of the semantic web including knowledge graphs, ontologies, description logics and reasoning, the FAIR Guiding Principles, the concept of cognitive interoperability, and review the process of KG and ontology engineering. In the second related work chapter, Ch. 3, we provide context for the user perspective of knowledge graph interaction, review common modelling challenges in KG knowledge representation, and present an introduction to semantic units that aim to provide solutions to these challenges. The final related work chapter, Ch. 4, covers other approaches for simplified knowledge graph interaction and presents literature on the interplay between knowledge graphs and large language models.

To lead into the three method chapters, we first present the Biodiversity Exploratories, their components and research design, BExIS, and the source data used in this work in detail in Ch. 5. Afterwards, we state the research questions investigated in this work and present the two parts of our method and their contents in Ch. 6. In the second method chapter, Ch. 7, we present our modelling approach, state competency questions to evaluate the finished KG, describe the modelling process in detail, present our final knowledge graph schema, discuss modelling challenges, provide implementation details, and describe and approach for schema validation. The final method chapter, Ch. 8, presents our approach for two LLM applications:

---

<sup>6</sup><https://www.bexis.uni-jena.de/>

Extracting metadata categories from publication and dataset titles and abstracts, and embedding methods for latent information extraction.

Following the method chapters, we present our results in Ch. 9, in which we detail how to write SPARQL queries for semantic units, evaluate our approach using competency questions, and present semantic unit visualizations. Ch. 10 contains detailed discussions of the contents and results of this work, addresses our main research questions, lists limitations to our approach, and presents directions for future work. Finally, we conclude the thesis in Ch. 11.

# Chapter 2

## The Semantic Web

To lay a proper foundation for the contents of this work, in this chapter, we provide background information on concepts of and related to the *Semantic Web*. Topics covered range from clarifications on ontology and knowledge graph definitions, logical frameworks and reasoning, to standards like the *FAIR Guiding Principles* [Wilkinson et al., 2016] and an overview of concepts for knowledge graph and ontology engineering.

### 2.1 Knowledge Graphs and Ontologies

One of the core parts of this work is the application of advanced modelling techniques for ontologies and knowledge graphs. As a preliminary, we will first define the meaning of these terms in the context of this work. This is necessary as both terms are frequently used in the literature to describe ideas that point in similar directions, but differ significantly upon closer inspection. Therefore, we will first present common definitions of both ontologies and knowledge graphs before settling on those most appropriate for our purposes.

The term ontology is not a new invention by computer scientists. Consisting of the Greek terms *ontos* and *logos*, translated as *being* and *word* respectively [Breitman et al., 2007], its first mention came in the year of 1613 by two philosophers, *Rudolf Göckel* and *Jacob Lorhard*, who both independently used it in their works *Lexicon philosophicum* and *Theatrum philosophicum* [Smith, 2012]. As such, '*Ontology as a branch of philosophy is the science of what is, of the kinds and structures of objects, properties, events, processes[,] and relations in every area of reality*' [Smith, 2012].

This philosophical definition already encapsulates the essence of what an ontology in computer science aims to achieve: Defining objects and properties that can exist, and what structure they exist in. Thomas Gruber's definition motivates this concept further: '*An ontology is an explicit specification of a conceptualization*' [Gruber, 1993], which Studer et al. later specified as '*a formal, explicit specification of a shared conceptualization*' [Studer et al., 1998]. From this definition it follows that in practice, one goal of an ontology is to explicitly state the shared understanding of people working in the same area about the concepts that exist and how they relate to each

other, such that common definitions can be referenced.

However, not only domain-specific ontologies exist. An ontology may also try to define existing entities and relationships across all fields, or supply definitions of commonly used notions or highly general, domain independent categories such as *continuants* and *occurrents* in *BFO*, the Basic Formal Ontology [Otte et al., 2022]. In this case, we speak of *upper-level ontologies* or *top-level ontologies*, that can be used as a domain-agnostic backbone or starting point to build domain-specific terms on top of [Smith, 2012]. Further examples of top-level ontologies include *SKOS*, the Simple Knowledge Organization System [Miles and Bechhofer, 2009], *UFO*, the Unified Foundational Ontology [Guizzardi et al., 2015, Guizzardi et al., 2022], and *GFO*, the General Formal Ontology [Herre, 2010]. For a comprehensive review of upper-level ontologies and their ontological commitments we refer to [Partridge et al., 2020].

Using these definitions of ontologies as basis, we derive the definition of knowledge graphs as the term is used in this work. Ontologies define the concepts and terms that exist in a domain, and thus represent the *terminology box* (T-Box or TBox) by expressing universal statements. A knowledge graph, however, contains assertions about specific individuals that are instances of ontology classes, and thus also contains the *assertion box* (A-Box or ABox). Therefore, we define a knowledge graph as the combination of a T-Box and A-Box, a definition that is adapted widely across the literature [Paulheim, 2016, Ma, 2022, Simsek et al., 2023, Callahan et al., 2024, Vogt et al., 2025a].

However, many other definitions of knowledge graphs exist that focus on other concepts than the T-Box and A-Box:

Ehrlinger and Wöß collect a variety of KG definitions and define a KG as follows: '*a KG acquires and integrates information into an ontology and applies a reasoner to derive new knowledge*' [Ehrlinger and Wöß, 2016].

In a 2021 survey, KGs are defined as ' $G = \{E, R, F\}$ , where  $E$ ,  $R$  and  $F$  are sets of entities, relations and facts, respectively. A fact is denoted as a triple  $(h, r, t) \in F$ ' [Ji et al., 2021].

Hogan et al. define KGs as '*graph[s] of data intended to accumulate and convey knowledge of the real world, whose nodes represent entities of interest and whose edges represent potentially different relations between these entities. The graph of data (a.k.a. data graph) conforms to a graph-based data model, which may be a directed edge-labelled graph, a heterogeneous graph, a property graph, and so on*' [Hogan et al., 2021].

## 2.2 Logical Frameworks and Reasoning

Ontologies used in this work are based on *The Web Ontology Language* [McGuinness et al., 2004], OWL for short, using RDF, *The Resource Description Framework* [Miller, 1998, Pan, 2009] to represent data. As stated in this excerpt from the introduction of OWL's *W3C* (World Wide Web Consortium) recommendation:

*'The first level above RDF required for the Semantic Web is an ontology language what can formally describe the meaning of terminology used in Web documents. If machines are expected to perform useful reasoning tasks on these documents, the language must go beyond the basic semantics of RDF Schema'* [McGuinness et al., 2004].

The key point is that OWL provides a formal way for description, and aims to perform reasoning tasks on data. In OWL, the logical framework used is that of *Description Logics* [Baader and Nutt, 2003, Baader et al., 2008], to check decidability and solve inference problems [Horrocks, 2005]. These include query-rewriting and rule-based inferences from *owl:sameAs*<sup>1</sup> [Polleres et al., 2013], reasoning over transitive properties, *'concept satisfiability, class subsumption, class consistency, and instance checking'* [Wang et al., 2004]. Also, reasoning can be used when answering queries by expanding over explicit terms written in the query [Fikes et al., 2004].

## 2.3 Cognitive Interoperability

A core motivation of this work is to investigate whether semantic units may enhance the *cognitive interoperability* between users and knowledge graphs. We believe that this term is explained well by presenting definitions of related concepts that cognitive interoperability can be derived. A starting point that is fitting for this purpose are the *FAIR Guiding Principles* [Wilkinson et al., 2016] as they represent perhaps the most commonly known guidelines for scientific data management. (Meta)data should be findable, accessible, interoperable, and reusable to allow for better machine-readability, -interpretability, and -actionability. Weiland et al. define these terms as follows:

**Machine-readability.** Machine-readable *"are those elements in bit-sequences that are clearly defined by structural specifications"* [Weiland et al., 2022].

**Machine-interpretability.** Machine-interpretable *"are those elements that are machine-readable and can be related with semantic artifacts in a given context and therefore have a defined purpose"* [Weiland et al., 2022].

**Machine-actionability.** Machine-actionable *"are those elements in bit-sequences that are machine-interpretable and belong to a type for which operations have been specified in symbolic grammar"* [Weiland et al., 2022].

Vogt et al. develop these ideas further and suggest extensions for the FAIR principles to enhance *semantic interoperability* [Vogt et al., 2025b], which *'requires systems to agree on a shared standard of representing information to enable them to efficiently communicate information without human intervention'* [Maciel et al., 2024]. Next to these machine centric descriptors, the concept of cognitive interoperability is mentioned in [Vogt, 2023] and defined in [Vogt, 2024]:

**Cognitive Interoperability.** *'A critical characteristic of information technology systems and research data infrastructures that plays a central role in facilitating the efficient communication of data and metadata to human users. By providing intuitive tools and functions, these systems enable users to gain an overview of data, locate data of interest, and explore related data points in semantically meaningful and*

---

<sup>1</sup><https://www.w3.org/TR/owl-ref/#sameAs-def>

*intuitive ways. Thereby, the systems must take 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 how they prefer to interact with information (human information interaction)’* [Vogt, 2024].

The concept of cognitive interoperability is the core of what we aim to investigate in this thesis: Using advanced modelling techniques like semantic units, can cognitive interoperability for users of a knowledge graph be enhanced? Before we present more background and information on semantic units in the next chapter, we present advantages of knowledge graphs and give an overview of knowledge graph and ontology engineering in the next section.

## 2.4 Knowledge Graph and Ontology Engineering

In the final section of this chapter, we give an overview of knowledge graph and ontology engineering approaches. We will return to concepts mentioned in this section in Ch. 7, the chapter in which we describe our own modelling approach for the knowledge graph developed in this work.

**The modelling process.** Studer et al. present one perspective in which knowledge engineering has at its center the modelling process. A model is only an approximation of reality, and modelling an incessant activity with the goal of reaching an intended behavior. The process is also cyclic, meaning new observations lead to further model refinement. Finally, the modelling process is also highly subjective as to the interpretations of the engineers [Studer et al., 1998].

**Problem-solving.** Methods with a problem-solving view focus on which actions need to be performed to solve a task and a sequence in which they have to be carried out. This view can inform the main rationale, meaning the main goal of a knowledge base, specifying what questions a knowledge graph is supposed to answer and how [Studer et al., 1998].

**Top-down and bottom-up approaches.** A further distinction is made between top-down and bottom-up approaches, the first concerns itself with the graph schema, the ontology, before building the data graph, while the latter starts by examining data that should appear in the final knowledge graph first and focusing on its representation on a schema level later on [Li et al., 2020].

**Ontology design and construction.** Bravo et al. specify a methodology for the design and construction of ontologies [Bravo et al., 2019]. Of the characteristics of their approach we highlight user centric design and evaluation. An important part of ontology engineering are the requirements of the user group, and involving users *‘in the definition of competency questions from the beginning of the methodology to the evaluation’* [Bravo et al., 2019].

**Constructing ontologies from reusable ontologies.** *‘Assuming that the world is full of well designed modular ontologies, constructing a new ontology is a matter of assembling existing ones’* [Studer et al., 1998]. Ontologies can be reused by including classes, relations, and axioms of other ontologies into a starting ontologies, and resolving naming conflicts. This requires mappings between ontologies [Uschold et al., 1998, Kalfoglou and Schorlemmer, 2003, Choi et al., 2006].

However, since every ontology has as its premise ontological commitments, this process is not straightforward. If two ontologies are committed to contradictory ontological commitments, creating mappings between them will be challenging, or even impossible. Here, upper-level ontologies play another important role: Combining modular ontologies that extend the same upper-level ontology, such as BFO, is easier than mapping between a BFO module and an UFO module.

**Users and user groups.** Li et al. distinguish three knowledge graph practitioner personas from a user study: KG builders, analysts, and consumers [Li et al., 2023]. We quote here the description of KG consumers: *'The KG Consumer is generally an expert in the data domain, business, overarching use case, or the KG's sociocultural context. While Consumers typically do not interact directly with a KG database or its querying language, they are still a stakeholder or end user of the KG, and know what "types" of insights would be valuable to extract. Consumers tend to rely on KG Analysts, query building GUIs, or automated reporting systems to generate those insights'* [Li et al., 2023]. We mention this especially to highlight the relevance of constructing systems with user's needs in mind and we see it as our responsibility to facilitate interaction and usage of a KG for end users [Al Mustafa et al., 2025], further motivating this thesis.

With this short overview of knowledge graph and ontology engineering, we conclude the first of three background and related work chapters. In the following chapter, we present common modelling challenges faced in OWL/RDF knowledge graphs, present background information on semantic units, and motivate their use for this work by showing how they may be used to solve selected modelling challenges.

# Chapter 3

## Background and Semantic Units

In the previous chapter we presented background information on the semantic web and concepts related to it. Our goal in this chapter is to give insights into the knowledge graph user perspective, to list representation and modelling challenges relevant to this work, and introduce semantic units and the purposes we aim to implement them for in our method.

### 3.1 Literature

In the following sections we will introduce the concept of semantic units and present an overview of common challenges in knowledge graph representation. We reference the ideas and prior work of Lars Vogt and reference a series of relevant publications in which these concepts were discussed first:

- FAIR Knowledge Graphs with Semantic Units: a Prototype [Vogt, 2023]
- Semantic Units: Organizing knowledge graphs into semantically meaningful units of representation [Vogt et al., 2024]
- Suggestions for extending the FAIR Principles based on a linguistic perspective on semantic interoperability [Vogt et al., 2025b]
- Rethinking OWL Expressivity: Semantic Units for FAIR and Cognitively Interoperable Knowledge Graphs – Why OWLs don't have to understand everything they say [Vogt, 2025]

### 3.2 User Perspective

The central idea around many challenges in this domain concerns the the loss of human-interpretability of statements modelled in a knowledge graph, as the priority of modelling are reasoning-capabilities, query-functionality, and machine-interpretability, it becomes necessary to make statements about statements in a knowledge graph [Vogt, 2023].

Users, for example experts in ecology and biodiversity research, that want to extract semantically meaningful content from a knowledge graph about a specific domain,

are not concerned with how this knowledge graph is structured and why. Their main concern is the information present in the graph and how to obtain it. The key point lies in what users deem as relevant. A user might want to obtain information about a specific instance of a class, say a specific apple. One statement of possible interest to users might therefore be its weight. Fig. 3.1 shows the fundamental disconnect: Users care about the observation itself – *'Apple X has a weight of 204.56 grams'* – the observational graph however, i.e. the way this observation is modelled in the knowledge graph, must convey considerably more information for precise semantic modelling and to enable machine interoperability. For example, the triple *<scalar measurement datum> <obi:hasValueSpecification> <scalar value specification>* contains no semantic significance for domain experts as they are likely not able to infer its meaning.

### Observation:

*Apple X has a weight of 204.56 grams*

### Observation Graph:




Figure 3.1: 'Comparison of a human-readable statement with its machine-actionable representation as a semantic graph following the RDF syntax. Top: A human-readable statement concerning the observation that a specific apple (X) weighs 204.56 grams. Bottom: The corresponding representation of the same statement as a semantic graph, adhering to RDF syntax and following the established pattern for measurement data from the Ontology for Biomedical Investigations (OBI) [Bandrowski et al., 2016] of the Open Biological and Biomedical Ontology Foundry (OBO) [Smith et al., 2007]'. Adapted from [Vogt et al., 2024], Figure 2.

## 3.3 Knowledge Graph Representation and Modelling Challenges

Vogt distinguishes twelve challenges in knowledge graph representation and modelling [Vogt, 2025]. From these, we will restate those that are relevant to this work and the publication and dataset metadata of the BE:

### 3.3.1 Modelling Class Axioms that involve triangular Relationships

Fig. 3.2 shows the universal statement (class axiom) *'All swans have quality some white'* and how it can be expressed in RDF. This expression relies on the use of a blank node.

### C) OWL universal statement mapped onto RDF




Figure 3.2: . 'C) All swans have quality some white', expressed as a class axiom within an ontology. Adapted from [Vogt et al., 2024], Figure 1 C).

**Definition 3.3.1.** (Blank Node) A blank node is a resource in a knowledge graph that is '*treated as simply indicating the existence of a thing, without using, or saying anything about, the name of that thing*'<sup>1</sup>.

Because of this definition, blank nodes are also referred to as '*existential variables*' [Mallea et al., 2011, Hogan et al., 2014], meaning variables that do not possess their own *IRI* (Internationalized Resource Identifier) and represent a resource for which no IRI exists.

The aspect of anonymity in blank nodes leads to significant issues because they cannot be referenced or identified, especially when they are used in class axioms as in Fig. 3.2. Take as example a class axiom in Manchester Syntax<sup>2</sup> that contains multiple triples referencing a blank node, like this example from [Vogt, 2025], in which an antenna is described that is longer than the eyes of the organism both are part of:

- 'has part some ((antenna part of **some multicellular organism**) and has quality some (length and increased in magnitude relative to some (length and inheres in some (eye part of **some multicellular organism**))))'

The statements marked in bold contain references to blank nodes. While it seems obvious to readers that '**some multicellular organism**' must be the same organism for the class axiom to make sense, this connection does not follow from Def. 3.3.1. Therefore, triangular relationships in class axioms can not be modelled in OWL in a satisfactory fashion.

### 3.3.2 Modelling negations and cardinality restrictions in Knowledge Graphs

A further challenge is posed by the *Open World Assumption* from description logic [Drummond and Shearer, 2006]. From this assumption it follows that in knowledge graphs, we only have information about what is stated, and we have no information about what is not stated, as it could both be true or false. Therefore, from the absence of a statement it does not follow that that statement. If we wanted to assert that a particular swan is not white, it does not suffice to exclude triples *swan hasColor white* from the knowledge graph, because from their absence and the open

<sup>1</sup><https://www.w3.org/TR/rdf-mt/#unlabel>

<sup>2</sup><https://www.w3.org/TR/owl2-manchester-syntax/>

world assumption, we would have to reason that the swan might still be white.

Tools to express that a swan is not white include class expressions as T-Boxes in which we use *owl:complementOf* to exclude an instance from the class of white swans (this, however, needs the class of white swans, and uses blank nodes in its expression), or by including a class axiom that makes it a necessity for instances of the class swan to have a color, then, if a color other than white is stated, it follows that this swan is not white (this also leads to many issues).

A similar issue arises for expressions of cardinality, in which we state that, for example, a swan has exactly two wings. These expressions can be made in OWL TBoxes, but translating the information to RDF results in a cluttered graph with at least one blank node [Vogt, 2025].

In conclusion, while it is possible to express negations and cardinalities in OWL/RDF, the cognitive interoperability of these expressions suffer significantly due to the use of blank nodes and the corresponding information would be contained in the T-Box, not in the A-Box, and therefore out of the proposition space of an OWL-based knowledge graph.

### 3.3.3 Having to use SPARQL for querying Knowledge Graphs

The main way of interacting with knowledge graphs is through query languages, the most common one for OWL/RDF graphs being SPARQL<sup>3</sup>. As we have covered previously [Al Mustafa et al., 2025], the necessity of relying on SPARQL to interact with knowledge graphs is a hindrance, not only for researchers with a computer science background when learning how to use SPARQL efficiently and effectively, but also for non domain experts, who are a central part of the intended users in this case.

### 3.3.4 Identifying topic-specific subgraphs to provide stand-ardized views on Knowledge Graphs

As Vogt et al. [Vogt, 2025] point out, many domains have standardized formats and conventions that data or datasets with specific information follow. For example, we can define a schema that describes how to represent scientific papers, or follow best practices for metadata management and capture provenance data for processes following specified recommendations<sup>4</sup>. These specifications can also be called data sheets that provide a structure for information to be entered into.

Collections of these schemata or data sheets in a knowledge graph could be leveraged as subgraphs about topics, and, if each subgraph was assigned a Globally Unique Persistent and Resolvable Identifier (GUPRI), they could be referenced. This would '*significantly simplify making statements about the corresponding information and increase the overall explorability of the graph*' [Vogt, 2025] by leveraging topic-specific views.

<sup>3</sup><https://www.w3.org/TR/sparql11-query/>


<sup>4</sup><https://www.w3.org/TR/prov-overview/>

### 3.4 Semantic Units

In this section we will present the concept of semantic units proposed in the literature, their different types, and how to apply them in OWL/RDF based knowledge graphs.

The core principle behind semantic units is to structure a knowledge graph into semantically meaningful, identifiable sets of triples. These are subgraphs within the graph *'that represent units of representation possessing semantic significance for human readers'* [Vogt et al., 2024]. Each subgraph is represented by its own resource, a GUPRI and thus its own node in the graph that can be referenced.

#### B) OWL/RDF Graph



#### C) Statement Unit




Figure 3.3: 'B) The corresponding representation of the same statement [Referring to the weight statement of the apple.] as an instance-based semantic graph, adhering to RDF syntax and following the established pattern for measurement data from the Ontology of Biomedical Investigations (OBI). C) The same graph, organized as a statement unit, which is a specific category of semantic unit. The data graph, denoted within the blue box at the bottom, articulates the statement with 'apple X' as its subject and 'gram X' alongside the numerical value 204.56 as its objects. Note, how the graph from B) forms the data graph of this statement unit. The peach-colored box encompasses its semantic-units graph. It explicitly denotes the resource embodying the statement unit (bordered blue box) as an instance of the \*SEMUNIT:weight statement unit\* class and the \*SEMUNIT:assertional statement unit\* class, with 'apple X' identified as the subject. Notably, the GUPRI of the statement unit is also the GUPRI of the semantic unit's data graph (the subgraph in the not bordered blue box). The semantic-units graph also contains various metadata triples, here only indicated by some metadata property and some metadata value as their placeholders. Highlighted in red within the data graph is an example of a triple that is required for modelling purposes but lacks semantic meaningfulness for a domain expert.' Adapted from [Vogt, 2025], Figure 1 B) and C)

For illustrative purposes, we refer to Fig. 3.3 that contains the running example from Fig. 3.1. Fig. 3.3 B) shows the OWL/RDF graph of the statement – 'Apple X has a weight of 204.56 grams' – referred to as the observation graph above. In Fig. 3.3 C), the semantic information of the observation graph is conveyed using a type of semantic unit, a statement unit (to be defined below). As demonstrated in the red box, the triple  $\langle \text{scalarMeasurementDatumX} \rangle \text{ } \langle \text{obi:hasValueSpecification} \rangle \text{ } \langle \text{scalarValueSpecificationX} \rangle$  is a vital component of the knowledge graph but it lacks semantic meaningfulness for most users. The statement unit takes all triples that are relevant and identifies them as a subgraph (blue box), whose subject is 'apple X'. The peach colored box contains all triples relevant to the statement unit. It asserts a type definition  $\text{semunit:weightStatementUnit}$  and possible metadata properties and values. This sets a new layer on top of the data graph called semantic unit layer, containing graphs associated with semantic units and allows for multiple degrees of abstraction. In this example, it now becomes possible to assert that a particular instance of the class apple, 'apple X' has a statement made about its weight.

This illustrates the main idea behind semantic units: They focus on information that has semantic significance for users. Their potential lies in being defined for specific purposes, directly linked to a target domain and the users acting within it.

To this end, different types of semantic units exist to enable the expression of different kinds of statements. Furthermore, new semantic unit types can be defined depending on the use case. Two main semantic unit types can be distinguished from the taxonomy of semantic units: Statement units and compound units. Statement units are concerned with how to express different types of statements (i.e., single propositions), for example, how to identify individuals or instances, how to assert facts or beliefs, or how to make complex statements that reuse other statement units as subjects and/or objects. Compound units serve *'as a higher-level organizational resource that groups together a semantically meaningful collection of semantic units (either statement or compound units). Each compound unit is represented by its own GUPRI [Globally Unique Persistent and Resolvable Identifier] and instantiates a corresponding compound unit class'* [Vogt, 2025].

With compound units, one can imagine a variety of scenarios that can potentially simplify knowledge graph query. For example, questions like *'What are all statements made about a specific dataset?'* can be queried and answered much quicker, which enhances graph exploration. At the same time, queries like *'List all weight measurement statements made about instances of a specific species'* can be formulated quickly. Therefore, in this work, one part of our method concerns itself with what statement and compound units can be useful for publication and dataset metadata of the BE. Before we present this part of our method however, we first cover related approaches for simplified knowledge graph interaction in the next chapter.

# Chapter 4

## Related Work

In the last chapters we expanded upon background on the semantic web, modelling and representation challenges in OWL/RDF based knowledge graphs, and semantic units. Below, we give an overview of other approaches concerned with simplifying the interaction between users and knowledge graphs and present how large language models can assist in this challenge, or contribute to knowledge graph and ontology engineering.

### 4.1 Interfaces

One extensively studied approach is that of layering a user interface on top of a knowledge graph. This allows users to interact with the interface only, and hides querying via SPARQL behind an application.

A popular approach is that of creating faceted search interfaces for knowledge graphs, for example *SemFacet* [Arenas et al., 2014, Arenas et al., 2016] or *Sampo-UI* [Ikkala et al., 2021, Rantala et al., 2023, Hyvönen, 2023].

Further, query builders can be used to forego SPARQL syntax and guide users in assembling queries over the knowledge graph, requiring less prerequisite knowledge. Examples of these query builder interfaces include *SPARKLIS* [Ferré, 2016], *RDF-Explorer* [Vargas et al., 2019], the *Wikidata Query Builder*<sup>1</sup>, and our own prior work [Al Mustafa et al., 2025].

Visualization approaches can also help users interact with knowledge graphs easier, like *Gruff* from *AllegroGraph*<sup>2</sup>, graph visualization in *Ontotext GraphDB*<sup>3</sup>, the *InK Browser* [Christou and Shimizu, 2025].

One further application is the *Open Research Knowledge Graph (ORKG)* [Jaradeh et al., 2019], a large scale knowledge graph of scientific publications with an integrated, embedding based, semantic search component, *ORKG Ask* [Oelen et al., 2024] with which publication contents can be queried with.

---

<sup>1</sup>[https://www.wikidata.org/wiki/Wikidata:Query\\_Builder](https://www.wikidata.org/wiki/Wikidata:Query_Builder)

<sup>2</sup>[https://allegrograph.com/products/gruff/?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://allegrograph.com/products/gruff/?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

<sup>3</sup><https://graphdb.ontotext.com/documentation/11.0/visualize-and-explore.html>

## 4.2 From Natural Language to SPARQL Queries

Another approach next to faceted search and query builders is concerned with the question of how to turn a question formulated in natural language into a SPARQL query. This idea has evolved over the years. Early systems started with rule-based methods [Ngonga Ngomo et al., 2013], query formalization using natural language processing based methods by translating a natural language query into an intermediate *normalized query structure* [Dubey et al., 2016], subgraph matching [Hu et al., 2017], pattern based approaches [Steinmetz et al., 2019], token-level subgraph generation [Jung and Kim, 2020], and incorporating keyword search together with SPARQL translation for better question answering [Hu et al., 2021].

With the rise of large language models, neural models also became more prevalent [Lehmann et al., 2023, Yang et al., 2023, Diallo et al., 2024, Emonet et al., 2024, Zahera et al., 2024, Håkansson, 2025].

Furthermore, a new resource in the form of a dataset containing pairs of natural questions and SPARQL queries has recently been developed [Meloni et al., 2025].

## 4.3 SHACL

The *Shapes Constraint Language (SHACL)*<sup>4</sup> is a language used for schema validation in knowledge graphs. In SHACL, conditions can be defined to ensure adherence of data that is to be instantiated in a knowledge graph to a schema. SHACL shapes can also be defined later for an existing knowledge graph and then a validation check can be run on the KG to ensure integrity of the data. For example, using SHACL we can express that a publication must have a DOI, it must have a citation string, and it must provide author names.

However, SHACL shapes can not only be used for schema validation, but also present the basis for user interface applications. The *Data Shapes Namespace*<sup>5</sup> extends the SHACL vocabulary with terms that pass form information to a user interface, and allows the definition of different views and the display of additional information for users.

## 4.4 LLMs and Knowledge Graphs

A further point of interest is an examination of the interplay between LLMs and knowledge graphs, as LLMs could deliver assistance in a variety of applications related to knowledge graphs, for example by reducing the workload of KG construction or by extracting latent information from data that might enrich the contents of knowledge graphs. In recent times this has been a core question in the domain, examining how LLMs could support KG usage in ways mentioned above, but also assist KG engineering, particularly generation and answering of competency questions, automatic generation of ontologies, automatic instantiation, schema and graph enrichment, and

<sup>4</sup><https://www.w3.org/TR/shacl/>

<sup>5</sup>[https://datashapes.org/forms.html?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://datashapes.org/forms.html?utm_source=chatgpt.com), <https://www.datashapes.org/>

data processing [Meyer et al., 2023, Kommineni et al., 2024, Zhang and Soh, 2024]. One further point of application is the usage of LLMs for text mining that is currently studied extensively [Fink et al., 2023, Wan et al., 2024, Yang et al., 2024, Mukanova et al., 2024, D’Souza et al., 2025] and may be applicable for our purposes.

Although it would certainly be an interesting question whether LLMs could support the schema-level modelling of the KG including creation of semantic units, in the context of this thesis the modelling process is done manually. One aspect we aim to investigate however, is whether LLMs can assist in two applications: The first being a support for researchers entering their publication or dataset metadata, by investigating whether some metadata categories can be extracted from titles and abstracts automatically, and the second one being the extraction of latent information in titles and abstracts, and whether publications and datasets can be linked through the research goals of the Biodiversity Exploratories utilizing embedding methods.

With this overview of related work we conclude the background chapters of this thesis. In the following chapters, we present more background on the Biodiversity Exploratories and the data used as basis for this work, and then proceed by presenting our method in detail.

# Chapter 5

## Biodiversity Exploratories, BExIS, and Source Data

In this chapter we provide explanations and details about the Biodiversity Exploratories, their components, and the data collected about related studies and datasets, available on BExIS, the *Biodiversity Exploratories Information System*. As this thesis is concerned with transforming this metadata into a knowledge graph, and this process requires deep understanding of how experiments and infrastructures of the Biodiversity Exploratories relate to each other, we collect this information in a distinct chapter so it can be referenced at later points of this thesis.

### 5.1 Biodiversity Exploratories

The Biodiversity Exploratories (BE) are a DFG-funded Infrastructure Priority Programme (SPP 1374) that present a research platform for functional biodiversity research<sup>1</sup> on selected research plots across Germany. Fisher et al. explain the structure and rationale behind the BE in the publication '*Implementing large-scale and long-term functional biodiversity research: The Biodiversity Exploratories*' [Fischer et al., 2010]. We compile information from that source and the main websites of the BE<sup>1</sup> below. The BE's main research objectives examine:

- '*how the form and intensities of land use affect biodiversity and ecosystem processes*'<sup>2</sup>,
- '*how different components of biodiversity interact*' and
- '*how different components of biodiversity influence ecosystem processes and ecosystem services.*'<sup>2</sup>

Figure 5.1 presents the conceptual framework and basis of research conducted in the BE<sup>2</sup>. The coloured circles at the centre of the figure show how experiments aim to gain insight on how land use affects biodiversity and ecosystem processes and functioning, and how biodiversity itself affects ecosystems. On the outside,

<sup>1</sup><https://www.biodiversity-exploratories.de/en/>

<sup>2</sup><https://www.biodiversity-exploratories.de/en/about-us/research-objectives-and-background/>




Figure 5.1: 'Conceptual framework and basis of biodiversity exploratories.'<sup>12</sup>

three further research interests are distinguished: How are communities composed; what are ecosystem services and disservices, and what are nature's contributions to people; and thirdly, how does that link back to the anthropogenic and environmental drivers of land use. In the following sections, we present the components of the BE that make this research possible.

## 5.2 Exploratories

Research is conducted on three big regions across Germany. In all three regions, a network of field plots is established in grasslands and forests, and of different land use types and intensities [Fischer et al., 2010]. The collection of all plots within a specific region is called an exploratory [Fischer et al., 2010]. We quote more information about the exploratories below:

*'(1) the UNESCO Biosphere Reserve Schorfheide-Chorin, which is situated in the lowlands of North-eastern Germany, a young glacial landscape with many wetlands, (2) the National Park Hainich and its surrounding areas, situated in the hilly lands of Central Germany, and (3) the UNESCO Biosphere Reserve Schwäbische Alb (Swabian Jura), which is situated in the low mountain ranges of South-western Germany'* [Fischer et al., 2010].

We introduce the following abbreviations for the exploratories for further use in this thesis: Schorfheide-Chorin (SCH), Hainich-Dün (HAI), and Schwäbische Alb (ALB).

## 5.3 Plots and Plot Types

There are four types of plots within each exploratory, and all plot types have a standardized number of plots within each type. We quote the description of plot types below:

*'(1) about 1000 grid plots (GPs), 500 in grasslands and 500 in forests, which are mainly used for large-scale analyses of biodiversity data and their relationships to land use and other environmental factors, (2) 100 experimental plots (EPs), 50 in grasslands and 50 in forests, which are a selected subset of the respective grid plots serving as a platform for more thorough biodiversity assessment and environmental monitoring, as well as for several manipulative experiments, and (3) 18 very intensive plots (VIPs), half in grasslands and half in forests, which are a subset of the experimental plots used for studying biodiversity or ecological processes in extreme detail for requiring very labour-intensive methods, for which the use of the experimental plots is not feasible. In one of the exploratories (Hainich-Dün), where selection forests are an especially important forest type, we established three further very intensive plots in these forests. Altogether, the Biodiversity Exploratories comprise 57 very intensive plots, 300 experimental plots, and some 3000 grid plots'* [Fischer et al., 2010].

The fourth plot type not mentioned in the quote above are plots of medium research intensity (MIPs) that are categorized between the experimental plots, and the very intensive research plots.

## 5.4 Joint Experiments and Types

In addition to the plot categories described above, three new kinds of experiments called joint multi-site experiments were introduced in 2020. These experiments are conducted on experimental plots (EPs).

### 5.4.1 Reduced Land-use intensity Experiment (REX)

The first experiment type is concerned with the question of *'whether biodiversity and ecosystem functions of intensively used grasslands can be restored by reducing land use intensity'*<sup>3</sup>. Subjects of this experiment are a subset of 15 grassland sites per exploratory with a substantial decrease in land use. These 45 sites are part of design one of the REX experiments, REX I.

For the second experiment design, REX II, a subgroup of 16 from the 45 sites was taken to test additional parameters related to the sowing of new and/or old species (or no sowing) and the effects this has on productivity.

### 5.4.2 Land-use Experiment (LUX)

The second experiment type is concerned with the question of *'how changes in land use (mowing, grazing and fertilisation) affect the diversity and functions of the*

---

<sup>3</sup><https://www.biodiversity-exploratories.de/en/about-us/research-design/>

*ecosystem*.<sup>3</sup> For this purpose, additional plots were established. There, fertilization was discontinued while other land use components continued.

### 5.4.3 Forest Gap Experiment (FOX)

The third experiment type aims to *'analyze the effects of creating gaps with and without deadwood enrichment as targeted experimental interventions in 29 forests with different management, biodiversity and ecosystem functions.'*<sup>3</sup> Specifically, they investigate changes in abiotic conditions and the availability of biotic resources through a variety of experiment variants and additional experimental plots.

## 5.5 Projects and Infrastructures within the BE

Research conducted in the Biodiversity Exploratories is categorized into few core and a multitude of contributing projects and cooperation projects. The six original core projects are described as follows:

*'Starting in 2006, six core projects carried out the environmental, soil and land use inventories described above, selected experimental and very intensive plots, and implemented the necessary technical and administrative infrastructure for the project. Moreover, the core projects are ensuring consistent long-term monitoring of the species diversity of selected taxa of plants, fungi, birds, bats and other mammals, selected insect taxa and microorganisms, and they assess genetic diversity of selected taxa of plants and microorganisms. The core projects address selected ecosystem processes and services including pools of biomass and carbon, pollination services, predation, seed dispersal and community stability and are also carrying out experimental studies. These include experiments manipulating deadwood availability in the very intensive forest plots, fencing off subplots of all forest experimental plots to exclude large herbivores, and increasing plant species diversity by seeding in subplots of the grassland experimental plots'* [Fischer et al., 2010].

In the publication and dataset metadata used as a starting point for this work, these core projects are also called *infrastructures*, and six types are distinguished (Note that the core projects have since been expanded to ten projects<sup>4</sup>, but only six are distinguished in the metadata:

- Central Coordination / Local Management
- Data Management
- Inventory / Campaign
- Instrumentation / Remote Sensing
- Synthesis
- Theory / Modeling / Methodological approaches

The core projects of the BE deliver the foundation, such that contributing and cooperation projects can achieve their goals to *'investigate the cause-and-effect rela-*

---

<sup>4</sup><https://www.biodiversity-exploratories.de/en/about-us/infrastructure/further-core-projects/>

*tions in the enlivened nature, both, by monitoring as well as experiments*<sup>5</sup>, and address the genetic and species diversity of many taxa, including soil organisms, ecosystem processes related to nutrients, food webs and pollination webs, and modelling of species interactions and ecosystem processes in relation to land use [Fischer et al., 2010].

## 5.6 BExIS - The Biodiversity Exploratories Information System

To appropriately manage the research data associated with the BE, the core project related to data management conceived the research data management system BExIS, *The Biodiversity Exploratories Information System*<sup>6</sup>. The technical implementation of BExIS2 (a later version of the system) is detailed in [Chamanara et al., 2021].

BExIS not only makes metadata and data for publications and datasets of the BE available and delivers a search interface over its various data sources, but it also delivers functionalities for researchers to upload their data, an API interface, and various helpful tools for researchers.

We pull all publication and dataset metadata from the BExIS API for further processing. In the following sections, we will present the metadata variables and structure in detail.

## 5.7 Abstract Volumes

The Biodiversity Exploratories provide a variety of media to communicate work created within them for outreach and research communication purposes. One part of this material relevant for this thesis are so called abstract volumes:

*'The abstract volume comprises a collection of summaries ('abstracts') of all scientific publications of the Biodiversity Exploratories in German. The texts are subdivided into individual topics. This is intended to provide an overview of the individual projects and their results.'*<sup>7</sup> Three of these volumes exist, ranging from the years of 2013-2016, 2017-2019, and 2020-2022. For each publication contained in a volume, a double page is reserved on which authors are able to communicate their research in simplified german language, and supply relevant photographs or figures.

Originally, the core idea of this thesis was to extract information from the PDF files of these abstract volumes, and create a knowledge graph from these sources, however, upon further inspection, BExIS already provides this data in a convenient fashion, which is why we decided to forego this step and focus on data obtainable via the BExIS API directly.

---

<sup>5</sup><https://www.biodiversity-exploratories.de/en/projects/>

<sup>6</sup><https://www.bexis.uni-jena.de/>

<sup>7</sup><https://www.biodiversity-exploratories.de/en/public-releases/public-relations-material/>

## 5.8 Metadata Presentation

In the final section of this chapter, we present the data used as basis for the knowledge graph in detail. Data and metadata stored in BExIS follow schemata with complete descriptions and definitions for all fields. These metadata schemata were provided by the BExIS developers<sup>8</sup> and the information presented below is quoted from those files.

Metadata for both sources has a hierarchical structure. For Publications, there are three main categories, *Publication Details*, *Exploratory Objects*, and *Domain Objects*. Datasets on the other hand, have the main categories *General*, *Contacts*, *Coverage*, *Keywords*, and *Data Types*.

### 5.8.1 Publications

#### Publication Details:

<b>Title</b>	<code>stringNotEmptyLong</code>	Title of the publication (in English).
<b>Citation</b>	<code>stringNotEmptyLong</code>	Full citation string of the publication.
<b>First Author</b>	<code>stringNotEmptyShort</code>	Main Author
<b>Corresponding E-Mail</b>	<code>stringNotEmptyShort</code>	The email address of the author.
<b>Year</b>	<code>stringNotEmptyShort</code>	Year of publication.
<b>Co-Authors</b>	<code>stringNotEmptyLong</code>	Co-author list.
<b>Institutions</b>	<code>stringNotEmptyLong</code>	Involved institutions.
<b>Project</b>	<code>stringNotEmptyShort</code> <code>minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="unbounded"</code>	Associated project within the DFG-funded joint project Biodiversity Exploratories.
<b>Status</b>	<code>Submitted</code> <code>In press</code> <code>Published</code>	Status of the publication.
<b>Open Access</b>	<code>booleanYesNoUnknown</code>	Information on open access.
<b>Type of Publication</b>	<code>Technical report</code> <code>Paper</code> <code>Book</code> <code>Book section</code> <code>Thesis</code> <code>Conference Proceedings</code> <code>German article</code>	Type of Publication.

<sup>8</sup><https://github.com/BEXIS2>

<b>Published In</b>	<code>stringNotEmptyShort</code>
	Information on where it was published (e.g. journal name).
<b>DOI</b>	<code>stringNotEmptyShort</code>
	DOI link of the publication.
<b>URL</b>	<code>stringEmptyLong</code>
	URL link to the publication.
<b>Keywords</b>	<code>stringEmptyLong</code> <code>minOccurs="1"</code>
	Title of the publication (in English).
<b>Summary</b>	<code>stringEmptyLong</code>
	Summary of the publication (in English).
<b>Metadata Schema</b>	<code>stringEmptyShort</code>
	Name and version of metadata schema.
<b>German Title</b>	<code>stringEmptyLong</code>
	Title of the publication (in German).
<b>German Summary</b>	<code>stringEmptyLong</code>
	Summary of the publication (in German).
<b>Exploratory Objects:</b>	
<b>Exploratory</b>	<code>ALB</code> <code>booleanYesNo</code> <code>SCH</code> <code>booleanYesNo</code> <code>HAI</code> <code>booleanYesNo</code>
	Exploratory covered by the described study.
<b>Plot Level</b>	<code>GP (all)</code> <code>GP (few)</code> <code>EP (all)</code> <code>EP (few)</code> <code>MIP (all)</code> <code>MIP (few)</code> <code>VIP (all)</code> <code>VIP (few)</code> <code>none</code>
	Plot level (none = the study did not take place in the field).
<b>Joint Experiment 2020</b>	<code>REX 1</code> <code>REX 2</code> <code>LUX</code> <code>FOX</code>
	Joint Experiment 2020 includes all experimental plots installed in 2020 in addition to the 300 EPs. Three grassland (REX 1 and 2, and LUX) and one forest experiment (FOX) are distinguished.
<b>Habitats</b>	<code>Grassland</code> <code>booleanYesNo</code> <code>Forest</code> <code>booleanYesNo</code>
	Observed habitat (grassland or forest).
<b>Relative position to ground</b>	<code>Aboveground</code> <code>booleanYesNo</code> <code>Belowground</code> <code>booleanYesNo</code>
	Location of the observations - below or/and above ground.
<b>Data Source</b>	<code>Field</code> <code>booleanYesNo</code> <code>Lab</code> <code>booleanYesNo</code> <code>Review</code> <code>booleanYesNo</code>
	Source of the used data (field, laboratory, review).

**Infrastructures**

Central coordination/LMT	Data management
Instrumentation/Remote sensing	Inventory/Campaign
Synthesis	Theory/Modeling/Methodological approaches
none	

Infrastructure type the publication belongs to.

**Domain Objects:****Biotic Data Taxa**

Animals - Invertebrates	Animals - Vertebrates
Fungi	Microbes
Plants	none

The taxa covered by the publication.

**Biotic Data Types**

Single Species	Multiple Species
Genetic	Total Abundance
None	

Selection of biotic data types (none = biotic data type is not listed or no biotic data described in the publication).

**Environmental Descriptors**

Land use (managed)	Land use (unmanaged)
Soil	Climate
none	

List of environmental descriptions to characterize the observations in the publication (none = no appropriate descriptor listed or publication can not be assigned to an environmental descriptor).

**Processes and Services**

Biogeochemical cycle	Decomposition	Productivity	Herbivory
Pollination	Predation/Parasitism	Dispersal	none

Selection of ecosystem processes and service classes covered by the publication (none = appropriate process or service is not predefined or publication describes no ecosystem processes or services).

## 5.8.2 Datasets

**General:****Title**

stringNotEmptyShort
---------------------

Title of the dataset well describing the data (what, where, when).

**Abstract**

stringNotEmptyLong
--------------------

General description of the dataset including:(i) motivation and background, description of the study or analysis (ii) study site and timeframe (e.g. The 35 study sites are 50 by 50m plots located in the Hainich, Germany. The data were collected monthly from April 2014 to October 2019.) (iii) kind of data (e.g. species occurrence, GIS, OTUs, trait data) (iv) funding resources (e.g. The data collection/analysis was

part of the project BIODIV within the framework of the DFG-funded joint project Biodiversity Exploratories (<https://www.biodiversity-exploratories.de>). Do not use abbreviations and do not include references to publications or methods.

<b>Project Name</b>	<code>stringNotEmptyShort</code>
	<a href="https://www.biodiversity-exploratories.de/en/projects/">https://www.biodiversity-exploratories.de/en/projects/</a> Associated project within the DFG-funded joint project Biodiversity Exploratories.
<b>Consortium</b>	<code>stringEmptyShort</code>
	Name of a group, either consisting of: BE projects collaborating on data collection and analysis or topic-specific datasets. Please contact the BExIS team if you miss a consortium.
<b>Metadata Creation Date</b>	<code>xsd:string</code>
	Entry date of the metadata.
<b>Metadata Last Modification Date</b>	<code>xsd:string</code>
	Date on which the metadata was last modified.
<b>Last Modification Date</b>	<code>xsd:string</code>
	Date on which the data was last modified.
<b>ID</b>	<code>positiveInteger</code>
	Identifier of the dataset.
<b>Version</b>	<code>positiveInteger</code>
	Version of the dataset.
<b>DOI</b>	<code>stringEmptyShort</code>
	DOI (Digital Object Identifier) of the dataset.
<b>License</b>	<code>stringEmptyShort</code>
	License short name, e.g. CC BY 4.0 (Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International).
<b>Funder</b>	<code>minOccurs="1"</code>
	Information about the funder provider.
<b>Funder Name</b>	<code>stringEmptyShort</code>
	Name of the funder provider, e.g. German Research Foundation.
<b>Funder Identifier</b>	<code>stringEmptyShort</code>
	Funder identifier, e.g. <a href="https://ror.org/018mejw64">https://ror.org/018mejw64</a> for the German Research Foundation issued by the Research Organization Registry (ROR).

**Contacts:**

<b>Metadata Creator</b>	<code>stringNotEmptyShort</code>	The person filling out the metadata. They have write permissions.
<b>Data Creator</b>	<code>stringNotEmptyShort</code>	Main person(s) involved in producing the data. They have write permissions. Only they are taken for the citation string.
<b>Data Collector</b>	<code>stringNotEmptyShort</code>	Person(s) responsible for gathering/collecting data under the guidelines of the data creator or PI. The collector and creator can be the same person. In assembled datasets, data collector(s) are the contact person(s) of the dataset(s) contributing data to the new dataset.
<b>Project Leader</b>	<code>stringNotEmptyShort</code>	The PI(s) of the project. They have write permissions. PIs are not part of the citation string.
<b>Contact Person</b>	<code>stringNotEmptyShort</code>	The person managing and granting access to the dataset. In general, the contact person is the PI of the project or a person designated by the PI. They have write permissions.
<b>Contact E-mail</b>	<code>xsd:pattern</code>	The email address of the contact person.
<b>Institute</b>	<code>stringNotEmptyShort</code>	The institute of the contact person.
<b>Street</b>	<code>stringNotEmptyShort</code>	The street of the institute.
<b>Postal Code</b>	<code>stringNotEmptyShort</code>	The postal code of the institute.
<b>City</b>	<code>stringNotEmptyShort</code>	The city of the institute.
<b>Phone</b>	<code>stringEmptyShort</code>	The phone number of the contact person.
<b>Mobile</b>	<code>stringEmptyShort</code>	The mobile phone number of the contact person.
<b>URL</b>	<code>stringNotEmptyLong</code>	The web page of the contact person, the project or the institute.

**Methods:**

<b>Study Design</b>	Description of the study design.
<b>Experimental Manipulation</b>	<p><code>booleanYesNo</code></p> <p>Indicates experiments with manipulations on the study area or site, e.g. fertilization or fencing. Further information should be provided in the section 'Detailed description of study design'.</p>
<b>Temporal Repetitions per Study Site</b>	<p><code>booleanYesNo</code></p> <p>Indicates if measurements were repeated over time, e.g. every day, weekly, or yearly. Further information should be provided in the section 'Detailed description of study design'.</p>
<b>Plot Based Repetitions of Measurements</b>	<p><code>booleanYesNo</code></p> <p>Indicates if measurements were repeated on subplots (within a plot). Further information should be provided in the section 'Detailed description of study design'.</p>
<b>Detailed Description of Study Design</b>	<p><code>stringEmptyLong</code></p> <p>Detailed description of the study design (e.g. number and size of plots or transects) together with details on temporal and spatial repetitions.</p>
<b>Measurements</b>	
<b>Sampling Design</b>	<p><code>stringEmptyLong</code></p> <p>Detailed description of the sampling design at EP level (e.g. location of transects, study plots, soil cores, or devices) and the number of samples taken at an EP. Furthermore, a detailed description of the sampling methods (e.g. size of the soil core) is provided.</p>
<b>Sample Preparation</b>	<p><code>stringEmptyLong</code></p> <p>Description of the further preparation of samples before analysis (e.g. dry biomass, ground soils, freeze samples).</p>
<b>Sample Analysis</b>	<p><code>stringEmptyLong</code></p> <p>Description of all measurements in the field or lab (e.g. pH, sequencing, trait measurements, soil analysis).</p>
<b>Equipment</b>	<p><code>stringEmptyLong</code></p> <p>Equipment used for sample collection, measurements, and analysis (including calibration method of equipment).</p>

<b>Data Processing</b>	Description of the analytical and statistical analysis of the data.
<b>Data Preparation</b>	<b>stringEmptyLong</b> Steps of pre-processing of raw data before data analysis (e.g. data fusion, data cleaning).
<b>Data Analysis</b>	<b>stringEmptyLong</b> Description of the data analysis (e.g. statistical methods, indices, programs used).
<b>References</b>	
<b>Literature References</b>	
	<b>stringEmptyLong</b> List of references mentioned in the method section. Citation sample: First author et al. (year). Title. Journal. DOI.
<b>Data References</b>	<b>stringEmptyLong</b> List of datasets referred to in the method section.
<b>Acronyms</b>	Acronyms used in the method section and their meaning.
<b>Important Notes</b>	<b>stringEmptyLong</b> Very important information concerning the use of the primary data.
<b>Keywords:</b>	
<b>Environmental Descriptors</b>	
	<b>Land Use</b> <b>Soil</b> <b>Climate</b> <b>Habitat structure</b> <b>Spatial</b> <b>Other</b> <b>None</b> List of environmental descriptions to characterize the observations in the dataset (other = no appropriate descriptor listed, none = dataset can not be assigned to an environmental descriptor, e.g. R script).
<b>Processes and Services</b>	
	<b>Productivity</b> <b>Decomposition</b> <b>Biogeochemical cycle - Water</b> <b>Biogeochemical cycle - Carbon</b> <b>Biogeochemical cycle - Nitrogen</b> <b>Biogeochemical cycle - Other nutrients</b> <b>Ecological process - Herbivory</b> <b>Ecological process - Soil aggregation</b> <b>Ecological process - Mycorrhization</b> <b>Ecological process - Pollination</b> <b>Ecological process - Predation/Parasitism</b> <b>Ecological process - Dispersal</b> <b>Function/Service - Pest control</b>

Function/Service - Aesthetic  Other  None

Selection of ecosystem process and service classes covered by the dataset (other = appropriate process or service is not predefined, none = dataset describes no ecosystem process or service).

#### Biotic Data Types

Single species  Multiple species  Abundance  
 Total abundance  Presence/Absence  Aggregated diversity  
 Demographic  Morphological  Chemical  Genetic  Trait  
 Other  None

Selection of biotic data types (other = biotic data type is not listed, none = no biotic data in the dataset).

#### Habitat

Observed habitat (grassland or forest).

#### Grassland

booleanYesNo

.

#### Forest

booleanYesNo

.

#### relativePositionToGround

Location of the observations - below or/and above ground.

#### Aboveground

booleanYesNo

#### Belowground

booleanYesNo

#### Additional Keywords

stringNotEmptyShort

Further keywords describing the dataset.

#### Coverage:

##### Temporal Coverage

Time period covered by the dataset.

##### Start Date

xsd:date

Start date of the time period covered by the dataset.

##### End Date

xsd:date

End date of the time period covered by the dataset.

##### Geographic Coverage

Spatial extent of the whole dataset and/or number of plots included in the dataset.

##### Number of Plots

Number of investigated plots classified by plot level (GP, EP, MIP, VIP).

**Number of GP** positiveInteger  
Number of investigated GPs. Usually, it is equal to the number of EPs. If the entire exploratory is covered, the following numbers apply (all: 3967, ALB: 1150, HAI: 1656, SCH: 1161).

**Number of EP** positiveInteger  
Number of investigated EPs (all: 300). Each exploratory has 100 EPs (50 grassland, 50 forest).

**Number of MIP** positiveInteger  
Number of investigated MIPs (all: 150). Each exploratory has 50 MIPs (25 grassland, 25 forest).

**Number of VIP** positiveInteger  
Number of investigated VIPs (all: 57). Each exploratory has 18 VIPs (9 grassland, 9 forest, but in the Hainich there are 3 additional forest plots).

### Joint Experiment 2020

Joint Experiment 2020 includes all experimental plots installed in 2020 in addition to the 300 EP. Three grassland (REX 1 and 2, and LUX) and one forest experiment (FOX) are distinguished. REX 1: Plots of the restoration experiment I in grassland. REX 2: Plots of the restoration experiment II in grassland. LUX: Plots of the land-use experiment in grassland. FOX: Plots of the gap experiment in the forest. Data-sets can include different joint experiments.

**Experiment Type** REX1 REX2 LUX FOX

.

### Coordinates WGS84

Point locations are provided as longitude and latitude (geographical coordinates) in degree (WGS84).

**Longitude** xsd:decimal

**Latitude** xsd:decimal

**Bounding Box** xsd:decimal  
Covered area described by the four edge coordinates in degree (WGS84).

**Westernmost Longitude** xsd:decimal

**Northernmost Latitude** xsd:decimal

**Easternmost Longitude**`xsd:decimal`**Southernmost Latitude**`xsd:decimal`**Taxonomic Coverage**

Taxonomic groups investigated in this dataset.

**Taxon**`Microbes` `Fungi` `Plants` `Animals - Vertebrates``Animals - Invertebrates` `None`

The taxa covered by the dataset.

**Data Type and Status:****Data Processing Status**`Raw` `Processed` `Assembled`

Status of data processing. Raw = original data without any processing. Processed = data was processed (e.g., validated, aggregated, classified). Assembled data = data is originally part of several datasets.

**Data Upload Status**`Incomplete` `Ongoing` `Complete`

Status of data uploading. Complete = all data is uploaded. Incomplete = more data will be uploaded in the next weeks. Ongoing = dataset contains a time series; data will be continuously uploaded, e.g. yearly.

**Content Type**`Structured Data` `Unstructured Data` `GIS` `Model/Scripts``External Link`

The content type of the data. Structured data= tables. Unstructured data = further data types, e.g. documents, images. GIS = GIS file formats encoding geographical information. Models/Scripts = code of models or scripts (e.g., R scripts). External link = data is stored in an external repository.

**Repository**

Information about the repository hosting the primary data.

**Name of Repository**`stringEmptyShort`

Name of the repository hosting the primary data (For example, NCBI).

**URL**`stringNotEmptyLong`

The URL of the repository.

**Identifier**`stringEmptyLong`

Identifier or DOI link of the described datasets.

#### Additional Information

`stringEmptyLong`

Additional information about finding, accessing, and downloading the data.

# Chapter 6

## Method - Problem Statement, Research Question, and Method Overview

The method section of this work is split into three parts to provide better structure to the different aspects of our approach. In the previous chapter we detailed different aspects of the Biodiversity Exploratories, its associated experiments, projects, infrastructures, BExIS, and the publication and dataset metadata used as a starting point for our methodology. In this chapter, we restate the main research problem, formulate the main research questions, and give an overview of the chapters and sections to follow.

### 6.1 Problem Statement

- *There is a fundamental mismatch between the requirements that ontology and knowledge graph engineers must satisfy to comply with best practices regarding data governance, technical requirements, and enabling machine interoperability, and the requirements that users of these technologies impose on their ability to provide semantically meaningful statements to convey information.*

To address this problem, we first model and construct a knowledge graph of publication and dataset metadata of the Biodiversity Exploratories. Afterwards, we implement semantic units for this knowledge graph that may provide solutions to bridge the gap between requirements, allowing users to query for semantically meaningful information easier.

We also investigate an LLM approach to extract structured metadata categories from publication and dataset titles and abstracts to possibly support KG creation workflows, and aid researchers in creating structured metadata.

Finally, in a second LLM application, we aim to leverage embedding models to extract latent topics from publication and dataset titles and abstracts, categorize documents by providing topic hierarchies as anchors in an embedding space, and link documents to the overarching research goals of the Biodiversity Exploratories to further enrich BE metadata.

## 6.2 Research Question

To operationalize our investigation into solutions of these problems, we formulate three research questions below:

- **RQ1:** Does semantic unit modelling reduce SPARQL query complexity for representative tasks compared to querying the data graph?
- **RQ2:** Can large language models be used to extract metadata categories from publication and dataset titles and abstracts?
- **RQ3:** Can embedding models be used to extract latent information from publication and dataset titles and abstracts to enrich BE metadata?

We further split the research questions into sub-questions:

- **SQ1:** Can SPARQL queries on the constructed knowledge graph answer sets of competency questions?
- **SQ2:** Can the same SPARQL queries be formulated over semantic units to answer the same sets of competency questions?
- **SQ3:** Is SPARQL query complexity lower for queries that answer competency question when querying over semantic units compared to queries on the data graph only?
- **SQ4:** Which metadata categories can the LLM extraction approach predict reliably (F1-score of 0.8 or higher)?
- **SQ5:** Can an embedding approach assign publication and dataset titles and abstracts to the research goals of the BE?

The competency questions mentioned above will be listed in Sec. 7.1.2.

## 6.3 Method Overview

The methodology of this thesis consists of two main parts:

- (1) The modelling and construction of a knowledge graph for publication and dataset metadata associated with the Biodiversity Exploratories and an implementation of semantic units for better cognitive interoperability between users and the knowledge graph.
- (2) An investigation of LLM approaches for information extraction on two tasks: First, the extraction of structured metadata categories from publication and dataset titles and abstracts and second, extraction of latent information on the same titles and abstracts using an embedding model.

In the following sections we will give a short presentation of what contents are included in both parts of the methodology.

### 6.3.1 Knowledge Graph Engineering

The first part of our methodology, which also presents the main contribution of this work, consists of the modelling and construction of a knowledge graph for publication and dataset metadata of the Biodiversity Exploratories. At first, we derive competency questions that will allow evaluation of the resulting knowledge graph. Since we want to explore the potential of semantic units for easier interaction with the knowledge graph, we will show how they can be constructed to answer competency questions directly.

In the next section, we present the process of modelling in detail and show the results and intricacies for publications and datasets, presenting the terms chosen as mappings from BExIS metadata to ontology vocabulary. Thereafter, a discussion of the substantial modelling challenges will follow, which contains challenges for negations, the open world assumption, negations, and challenges derived from the source data.

Following the discussion of modelling challenges, we describe the implementation in detail, covering the mapping language used, how semantic units can be implemented as named subgraphs, and present possible extensions for schema validation.

### 6.3.2 Information Extraction using Large Language Models

The second part of the methodology section covers information extraction using large language models on publication and dataset titles and abstracts for two tasks.

In the first task we investigate if an LLM can predict a list of structured metadata categories if given an extraction schema consisting of the category name, definition, and a list of allowed answers. We present the instructions sent to the LLM, and show the results for multiple sets of categories, those that allow only yes or no answers, and those that allow a selection from multiple keywords. We evaluate the model's predictions using precision, recall, F1-scores, accuracy, and, if applicable, the average jaccard distance.

For the second task, we investigate if an embedding model can be used to extract latent information from the input data for three subtasks. First, we embed all titles and abstracts and attempt to identify clusters of documents in the embedding space, and list the top keywords per cluster. Second, we provide a controlled vocabulary of concepts from outside our input data as anchors in the embedding space, and investigate which clusters emerge around anchor concepts in the embedding space. Third, we attempt to link documents to the overarching research goals of the Biodiversity Exploratories by embedding goals and their descriptions, and applying the same clustering approach as in earlier tasks. Finally, we conclude the chapter by visualizing the results of the final embedding task.

# Chapter 7

## Method - Knowledge Graph and Semantic Unit Modelling

In this chapter, we will present the methodology behind our approach. With the goal of constructing a knowledge graph for publication and dataset metadata of the Biodiversity Exploratories in mind, we first present our approach for knowledge graph modelling and its application on our use case. We then present the modelling process and its results, which leads into a discussion of the substantial modelling challenges faced due to the source data used, and general KG engineering challenges regarding negations and the open world assumption. Afterwards, we present how semantic units can be developed on top of the constructed knowledge graph. Finally, we discuss how SHACL shapes can be used for schema validation.

### 7.1 Modelling Approach

Our modelling approach for the knowledge graph and its schemata developed in this thesis aligns with the knowledge graph and ontology engineering approaches detailed in Sec. 2.4. With knowledge about the Biodiversity Exploratories, their components, and data (Ch. 5) in mind, we approach graph modelling from multiple perspectives, combining insights from a top-down and bottom-up view, the domain the data originates from, and the end users of the graph and their requirements.

#### 7.1.1 Top-down versus Bottom-up

In the top-down approach we focus on the schema level of the knowledge graph first, and consider existing ontologies and their specifications on how to represent data points and processes. On closer inspection, our source data is modular in nature, for example, publication metadata is split onto two main parts: (1) The metadata of the publication itself (who authored it etc.), and (2) Metadata in a schema specific to the Biodiversity Exploratories about the contents of a publication (e.g., is the publication about a grassland, forest, or both?).

Considering these modules, there exist a variety of domain specific and domain agnostic ontologies for the data we want to represent. For example, *The OpenCitations Data Model* [Garcia Castro et al., 2013, Daquino et al., 2020] is a domain agnostic

data model to represent publications, authors, publication parts and institutions, venues, and more. Therefore, it is a prime candidate for reuse for our purposes. However, when reusing an existing data model, the top-down approach must contend with a question: Is it possible to fit source data to the model, and how can that fitting be achieved?

As for the bottom-up approach, our perspective changes. We first look at the data we want to represent in the knowledge graph, and then consider the graph schema in a later step. Questions that arise when looking at the data first are: What are the Biodiversity Exploratories and their components? What is a plot and what are different plot categories? Why do the metadata fields and categories exist in the metadata schemata for publications and datasets, and what information and purpose do these fields represent, and finally, how do we represent this in a knowledge graph? This second step of representing data in a knowledge graph leads to substantial challenges that we discuss in Sec. 7.3.

Both of these modelling perspectives do not take place in isolation, rather, they inform each other and lead to multiple iterations of the graph schema.

### 7.1.2 Competency Questions

As discussed in Sec. 2.4, a knowledge graph is modelled using a problem-solving approach, meaning that it is directed towards an application and solves problems that arise inside this application. For this specific use case, we develop a knowledge graph in the domain of biodiversity research for dataset and publication metadata. To properly evaluate the knowledge graph later, we formulate competency questions in accordance with users that aim to cover a multitude of scenarios of questions users may have for the knowledge graph. We also include competency questions for information that could be extracted using the embedding approach presented in the next chapter to outline application scenarios this extracted information were to be included in the KG:

#### Competency Questions

- **CQ P1:** Who authored the publication  $P$ ?
- **CQ D1:** Who authored dataset  $D$ ?
- **CQ P2:** What datasets is publication  $P$  linked to and what are the types of connections?
- **CQ D2:** What publications is dataset  $D$  linked to and what are the types of connections?
- **CQ P3:** For publication  $P$ , what are the plot levels of the plots it investigated, and what exploratory or multiple exploratories do those plots cover?
- **CQ D3:** For dataset  $D$ , what are the plot levels of the plots it investigated, what exploratory or multiple exploratories do those plots cover, and how many plots per plot level are investigated?
- **CQ P4:** What are all semantic units that have publication  $P$  as subject, or that are associated with it?

- **CQ 4:** What are all semantic units that have dataset  $D$  as subject, or that are associated with it?
- **CQ 5:** List all publications that belong to the infrastructure *Instrumentation/Remote sensing* that investigate pollination of plants on grassland plots. What are the datasets they reference and what projects do those belong to?

### 7.1.3 Connection between competency questions and semantic units

As the central research question of this work aims to investigate how semantic units can be used for simpler interactions between users and a knowledge graph, we observe a link that can be made between competency questions and semantic units: Many of the competency question listed above can be answered simpler and directly with compound units. Once the knowledge graph is able to answer these questions, compound units can be defined to bundle relevant statements.

## 7.2 The process of modelling BE Publication and Dataset Metadata

In this section, we present the process of modelling a knowledge graph for publication and dataset metadata of the Biodiversity Exploratories in detail and show the modelled graph schemata for different modules of the graph. We present not only finished schemata, but also aim to display the process of modelling by showing ideas that were discontinued or changed substantially over the course of this work.

The majority of modelling work took place on a Miro<sup>1</sup> board that we also provide on our GitHub repository<sup>2</sup>.

### 7.2.1 Ontology Reuse

We prioritize reusing existing ontology terms whenever possible. For this we mainly use two search portals to lookup ontology vocabulary: *BioPortal*<sup>3</sup> [Noy et al., 2009], a service to search for biomedical ontologies and terms, and the *Ontology Lookup service*<sup>4</sup> [Jupp et al., 2015]. By searching for terms or browsing specific ontologies, we are able to decide on ontology vocabulary depending on how fitting a term's definition, description, or usage instructions are for our modelling purposes.

### 7.2.2 First Steps

In the first stages of modelling we focused on three core parts of what the knowledge graph should be able to represent: A publication and metadata associated with it, a dataset and metadata associated with it, and the process of extracting information from a free text field via LLM and the products of that extraction.

---

<sup>1</sup><https://miro.com/>

<sup>2</sup><https://github.com/fusion-jena/Biodiversity-Exploratories-Knowledge-Graph>

<sup>3</sup><https://bioportal.bioontology.org/>

<sup>4</sup><https://www.ebi.ac.uk/ols4/>

We present early results for datasets and LLM extracting of the modelling process in Fig. 7.1 and Fig. 7.2 (we leave out publications because of space limitations for figures). For both figures, we refer readers to the left hand side that contains a legend of the colored shapes and what they represent. Yellow rectangles represent OWL class assignments, meaning that we not only model a preliminary version of the RDF graph, but also represent schema information. Green rectangles with crossing lines at the side represent OWL data properties, such as names or timestamps. The rest of the shapes represent OWL instances, meaning actual instances of the knowledge graph. Those colored in blue are instances without any special purpose, brown ovals are locations, orange hexagons are agents from the prov ontology, red rectangles are activities from the prov ontology, and pale cloud shaped objects are blank nodes. Finally, black arrows connecting the shapes are OWL object properties and the text tags on or next to those arrows are specific relations from ontologies, such as *RDF:type* for type assignments between instances and ontology classes.

We chose the PROV<sup>5</sup> vocabulary at the beginning of the modelling process, as it provides a simple but powerful framework to describe our source data with. PROV defines three main types of instances that can exist in the knowledge graph: Entities, activities, and agents. In simple terms, the framework provides us with the tools to represent activities and their inputs and outputs, who started them, and which agents were associated with them. Considering the example from Fig. 7.1, the activity of collecting data (red rectangle) can be started by and attributed to the scientists that conducted some research on behalf of the Biodiversity Exploratories (orange hexagons), and the output of that activity can be the dataset itself (blue rectangle), that has a variety of other data points connected to it like plot information, taxa, or locations.

Similarly, the example Fig. 7.2 presents, shows the activity of extracting information from a free text field from the BE metadata (abstract, detailed description of study design, sampling design, equipment, data preparation), describes the person the activity was started by and that they acted on behalf of the BE, and that the outcome of the activity is an entity called *extractedStatement* with multiple types, data, and metadata. We can also show that the activity was associated with a software agent (a subclass of *prov:agent* named *Mistral-Small-3.1-24B-Instruct-2503*<sup>6</sup> and attach further provenance data to its usage.

<sup>5</sup><https://www.w3.org/TR/prov-overview/>

<sup>6</sup><https://huggingface.co/mistralai/Mistral-Small-3.1-24B-Instruct-2503>




Figure 7.1: Figure of a first attempt at modelling an activity that leads to the generation of a dataset using the prov vocabulary. The left hand side contains a legend explaining the meaning of the different shapes and colors used.




Figure 7.2: Figure of a schema that may be used for an activity that leads to the generation of a statement with a large language model using the prov vocabulary. The left hand side contains a legend explaining the meaning of the different shapes and colors used.

Unfortunately, the use of PROV vocabulary has three limitations:

- (1) As shown in Fig. 7.1 and Fig. 7.2, blank nodes are used at central points for the representations of publications, datasets, and LLM extractions. These are necessary to make a *prov:qualifiedGeneration*<sup>7</sup> or a *prov:qualifiedUsage*<sup>8</sup>, which are used to attach additional information to a generic generation or usage. For possible disadvantage of using blank nodes, we refer to Subsec. 3.3.1 and 3.3.2.
- (2) PROV in itself lacks some expressions necessary to convey nuanced information. For example, the only object properties in PROV-O between two activities are *prov:qualifiedUsage*<sup>9</sup> or *prov:Communication* / *prov:qualifiedCommunication*.<sup>10</sup> This means that native PROV lacks some expressiveness, which could be circumvented by using other vocabularies, but,
- (3) native PROV-O is not BFO compliant. This is not a substantial limitation as PROV activities can be mapped to BFO occurrents, entities to continuants, and agents can be decided on a case by case basis. However, as will be presented in the next section, we rely heavily on BFO compliant ontologies and are able to find expressions outside of the PROV framework.

For these reasons, we decided against using the PROV framework in the final knowledge graph. However, with this first modelling approach we still gained valuable insights for the end result of the graph schema that we present in the next sections.

### 7.2.3 Knowledge Graph Schema

In this section we present the schema of the knowledge graph modelled for this thesis. Below, we explain our modelling choices and provide figures to support visual understanding. Starting from a top-down view, Fig. 7.3 shows our modelling choices for the Biodiversity Exploratories, its projects, infrastructures, and the three exploratories themselves. In the top left corner of the figure, we provide a legend similar to the previous section. A yellow rectangle stands for OWL classes, a blue oval for instances in the knowledge graph, a green rectangle for data properties, and a black arrow between any two objects represent object properties. We will use these shapes and their interpretations for the remainder of the thesis. To further enhance visual interpretability of the schema, we draw bigger boxes around groups of shapes and provide a title in the boxes' top left corner to categorize its contents.

In the top-middle of Fig. 7.3, we instantiate the Biodiversity Exploratories of the type *obi:plannedProcess*<sup>11</sup> and attach a label and description. Below, we instantiate the three exploratories *ALB*, *HAI*, and *SCH* with two types, declaring them as an *ncit:researchInfrastructure*, a class for '*physical structures needed to conduct research*',<sup>12</sup> and as a *bfo:objectAggregate*<sup>13</sup>, as the exploratories are aggregates of plots.

<sup>7</sup><https://www.w3.org/TR/prov-o/#qualifiedGeneration>

<sup>8</sup><https://www.w3.org/TR/prov-o/#qualifiedUsage>

<sup>9</sup><https://www.w3.org/TR/prov-o/#wasInformedBy>

<sup>10</sup><https://www.w3.org/TR/prov-o/#Communication>

<sup>11</sup>[http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/OBI\\_0000011](http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/OBI_0000011)

<sup>12</sup>[http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/NCIT\\_C19158](http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/NCIT_C19158)

<sup>13</sup>[http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/BFO\\_0000027](http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/BFO_0000027)




Figure 7.3: Schema for the Biodiversity Exploratories, its projects and infrastructures, and the exploratories. As the legend on the left hand side suggests, yellow rectangles contain class assignments, blue ovals denote instances, and green rectangles denote data properties.

We also attach labels and notations, and connect the BE to the exploratories via *obi:hasParticipant*<sup>14</sup>, representing that the exploratories as continuants are participating in the planned process of the BE. At the right hand side, we model the BE core, contributing, and cooperation projects as instances of *obi:plannedProcess*. Below, we instantiate the infrastructures of the BE in a similar fashion, as planned processes that are part of the core projects. We connect the BE, its projects, and infrastructures via *obi:hasPart*<sup>15</sup>. Note that this is possible as continuants are allowed to have other continuants as part and also note that whenever object properties are mentioned in this textual description, readers can assume that the inverse relationship also holds even if not mentioned explicitly.




Figure 7.4: Schema of how different plot levels within the BE are modelled and attached to the exploratories.

Fig. 7.4 shows the research plots of the BE and different plot levels. The most appropriate solution to modelling plot level in our view is to consider them object aggregates, and to create one aggregate per exploratory, as, for example, the grid plots located in *ALB* can be viewed as a collection of plots that is characterized by their location. As we will cover in Sec. 7.3, the source data keeps singular plots as anonymous, and does not present us with the means to disseminate what study took place on which exact plots, thus we decide to represent plot levels as collections of plots characterized by being of a specific plot type. Next to being object aggregates, we also assign the type *ncit:researchInfrastructure* to all plot collections. As for the collections and their relationship to each other, grid plots, experimental plots, medium intensive plots, and very intensive plots, form a partonomy, meaning that each lower level is a subset of the one above it, and, as per definition of the plot types, they are proper subsets, allowing us to relate them with *sio:properPart*<sup>16</sup>.

Analogously, in Fig. 7.5, we model experiments as parts of the experimental plots.

<sup>14</sup>[http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/R0\\_0000057](http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/R0_0000057)

<sup>15</sup>[http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/BFO\\_0000051](http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/BFO_0000051)

<sup>16</sup>[http://semanticscience.org/resource/SIO\\_000053](http://semanticscience.org/resource/SIO_000053)




Figure 7.5: Model of the REX1, REX2, LUX, and FOX experiments and how they connect to the exploratories (analogously to the different plot levels).




Figure 7.6: Simplified schema of instantiated plot collections for each publication, how they connect to their source publications, what plots they contain, and how processes and other properties are connected to those plots.

Instead of presenting the schema for the relationship between publication metadata and the research plots in detail, we instead show a simplified version in Fig. 7.6 and list relevant vocabulary below. The core idea is to create a collection of plots (via *bfo:objectAggregate*) for any publication and state that the publication is the source (in a bibliographic sense, therefore *sio:hasSource*<sup>17</sup> is used). This collection has as parts different kinds of plots that are characterized by either being located in a grassland or forest environment. Any taxa, processes, properties, or important keyword mentioned in a publication's metadata can be appended to a plot using appropriate object properties. Instantiated plots are of types *envthes:permanentPlot*<sup>18</sup> and *agro:agriculturalExperimentPlot*<sup>19</sup>. For forest and grassland environments we use *envo:grasslandBiome*<sup>20</sup> and *envo:forestBiome*<sup>21</sup> respectively.

<sup>17</sup>[http://semanticscience.org/resource/SIO\\_000253](http://semanticscience.org/resource/SIO_000253)

<sup>18</sup><http://vocabs.lter-europe.net/EnvThes/20307>

<sup>19</sup>[http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/AGRO\\_00000301](http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/AGRO_00000301)

<sup>20</sup>[http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/ENVO\\_01000177](http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/ENVO_01000177)

<sup>21</sup>[http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/ENVO\\_01000174](http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/ENVO_01000174)

As for publication metadata relevant to the investigated plots, we list ontology classes below in Table 7.1, which leaves only a description of publications and data-sets, and how they are connected to the plots they study. As stated in Sec. 7.1.1, we reuse the *Open Citations Data Model*, shown in Fig. 7.7.

Metadata Slot	Ontology Classes	Object Property
<b>processes/services:</b>		
herbivory	envthes:herbivory <sup>22</sup> , obo:process <sup>23</sup>	obi:hasParticipant
predation/parasitism	envthes:predation <sup>24</sup> /parasitism <sup>25</sup> , obo:process	obi:hasParticipant
biogeochemical cycling	envo:biogeochemicalCycling <sup>26</sup> , obo:process	obi:hasParticipant
productivity	envthes:productivity <sup>27</sup> , obo:process	obi:hasParticipant
pollination	mesh:pollination <sup>28</sup> , obo:process	obi:hasParticipant
dispersal	envthes:dispersal <sup>29</sup> , obo:process	obi:hasParticipant
decomposition	envthes:decomposition <sup>30</sup> , obo:process	obi:hasParticipant
aboveground layer	envo:layer <sup>31</sup>	obi:partOf <sup>32</sup>
belowground layer	envo:layer	obi:partOf
<b>taxa:</b>		
invertebrates	ex:wikidataID <sup>33</sup>	obi:partOf
vertebrates	ex:wikidataID <sup>34</sup>	obi:partOf
fungi	ex:gbifID <sup>35</sup>	obi:partOf
microbes	ex:gbifID <sup>36</sup>	obi:partOf
plants	ex:gbifID <sup>37</sup>	obi:partOf
<b>environmental:</b>		
climate	envo:climate <sup>38</sup>	ro:dispositionOf <sup>39</sup>
soil	envo:soil <sup>40</sup>	obi:partOf
managed land use	envo:landUseProcess <sup>41</sup> , obo:plannedProcess	obi:hasParticipant
unmanaged land use	envo:landUseProcess, obo:process	obi:hasParticipant

Table 7.1: Table of publication metadata slots, ontology classes assigned to them, and the object property they are connected to the plot with.

The publication and its data properties are shown in the center, and around it are different parts concerning authors, venue, publication parts, and, added to the model in our case, the process of how the publication came to be. Attached directly

<sup>22</sup><http://vocab.lter-europe.net/EnvThes/21104>

<sup>23</sup>[http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/BFO\\_0000015](http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/BFO_0000015)

<sup>24</sup><http://vocab.lter-europe.net/EnvThes/21113>

<sup>25</sup><http://vocab.lter-europe.net/EnvThes/21106>

<sup>26</sup>[http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/ENVO\\_02500009](http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/ENVO_02500009)

<sup>27</sup><http://vocab.lter-europe.net/EnvThes/21417>

<sup>28</sup><http://id.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/D054817>

<sup>29</sup><http://vocab.lter-europe.net/EnvThes/21038>

<sup>30</sup><http://vocab.lter-europe.net/EnvThes/20952>

<sup>31</sup>[http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/ENVO\\_01000281](http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/ENVO_01000281)

<sup>32</sup>[http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/BFO\\_0000050](http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/BFO_0000050)

<sup>33</sup><http://www.wikidata.org/wiki/Q43806>

<sup>34</sup><http://www.wikidata.org/wiki/Q25241>

<sup>35</sup><http://www.gbif.org/species/5>

<sup>36</sup><http://www.gbif.org/species/3>

<sup>37</sup><http://www.gbif.org/species/6>

<sup>38</sup>[http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/ENVO\\_01001082](http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/ENVO_01001082)

<sup>39</sup>[http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/R0\\_0000092](http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/R0_0000092)

<sup>40</sup>[http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/ENVO\\_00001998](http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/ENVO_00001998)

<sup>41</sup>[http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/ENVO\\_01001431](http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/ENVO_01001431)

to the publication are several literals regarding publication year, submission date, open access status, and other information that does not require its own resource. Additionally, we attach information about what project a publication belongs to via *obi:partOf* by dynamically instantiating projects as resources, and distinguish those as belonging to either the core or contributing projects. Further, we add the source of data that is discussed in the publication as originating from the field (envthes:fieldStudy<sup>42</sup>), lab (ncit:laboratoryStudy<sup>43</sup>), or a review(vivo:review<sup>44</sup>) and attach this information by specifying that the publication *iao:isAbout*<sup>45</sup> particular study types. We also adopt the category *biotic data types* from the metadata that contains the options listed in Table 7.2 below:

Metadata Slot	Ontology Classes	Object Property
<b>Publications:</b>		
single species	pco:singleSpeciesCollectionOfOrganisms <sup>46</sup>	iao:isAbout
multiple species	pco:multiSpeciesCollectionOfOrganisms <sup>47</sup>	iao:isAbout
total abundance	envthes:abundance <sup>48</sup>	iao:isAbout
genetic	sio:geneticData <sup>49</sup>	iao:isAbout
<b>Additional for Datasets:</b>		
aggregated diversity	envthes:diversity <sup>50</sup>	iao:isAbout
chemical	envthes:chemical <sup>51</sup>	iao:isAbout
demographic	envthes:demography <sup>52</sup>	iao:isAbout
morphological	envthes:morphological <sup>53</sup>	iao:isAbout
presence/absence	envthes:presence <sup>54</sup>	iao:isAbout
trait	envthes:trait <sup>55</sup>	iao:isAbout

Table 7.2: Table of metadata slots from the category '*biotic data types*', their ontology class mappings, and how a publication or dataset connects to them. Note that for datasets the same slots exist as for publications, but that also six more choices are allowed.

<sup>42</sup><http://vocab.lter-europe.net/EnvThes/20224>

<sup>43</sup><http://ncicb.nci.nih.gov/xml/owl/EVS/Thesaurus.owl#C28278>

<sup>44</sup><http://vivoweb.org/ontology/core#Review>

<sup>45</sup>[http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/IAO\\_0000136](http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/IAO_0000136)

<sup>46</sup>[http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/PCO\\_0000052](http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/PCO_0000052)

<sup>47</sup>[http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/PCO\\_0000029](http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/PCO_0000029)

<sup>48</sup><http://vocab.lter-europe.net/EnvThes/21541>

<sup>49</sup>[http://semanticscience.org/resource/SIO\\_010028](http://semanticscience.org/resource/SIO_010028)

<sup>50</sup><http://vocab.lter-europe.net/EnvThes/10087>

<sup>51</sup><http://vocab.lter-europe.net/EnvThes/21964>

<sup>52</sup><http://vocab.lter-europe.net/EnvThes/21670>

<sup>53</sup><http://vocab.lter-europe.net/EnvThes/21995>

<sup>54</sup><http://vocab.lter-europe.net/EnvThes/10080>

<sup>55</sup><http://vocab.lter-europe.net/EnvThes/10023>




Figure 7.7: Representation of the Open Citations Data Model, adapted to the publications of the BE. Publications are depicted in the center and are connected to its authors, the publishing venue, and the parts of the publication itself.

For datasets, modelling follows a similar structure in which a collection of plots is instantiated that has the dataset as its *sio:hasSource*. In the BExIS metadata schemata, datasets have more selection options for various metadata categories than publications. Therefore, we list additional ontology terms used to represent those concepts in Table 7.3.

Metadata Slot	Ontology Classes	Object Property
<b>processes/services:</b>		
carbon cycling	envthes:cabonCycle <sup>56</sup> , obi:process	obi:hasParticipant
nitrogen cycling	envthes:nitrogenCycle <sup>57</sup> , obi:process	obi:hasParticipant
water cycling	envthes:waterCycle <sup>58</sup> , obi:process	obi:hasParticipant
other nutrient cycling	envthes:nutrientCycling <sup>59</sup> , obi:process	obi:hasParticipant
mycorrhization	metpo:mycorrhization <sup>60</sup> , obi:process	obi:hasParticipant
soil aggregation	inrae:soilAggregation <sup>61</sup> , obi:process	obi:hasParticipant
function/service - aesthetic	ex:serviceAesthetic, obi:process	obi:hasParticipant
function/service - pest control	mesh:pestControl <sup>62</sup> , obi:process	obi:hasParticipant
other	ex:serviceOther, obi:process	obi:hasParticipant
<b>environmental:</b>		
habitat structure	envthes:habitatStructure <sup>63</sup>	sio:isPropertyOf <sup>64</sup>
spatial	envthes:spatial <sup>65</sup>	envthes:constrains <sup>66</sup>
other	ex:descriptorsOther	envthes:constrains

Table 7.3: Table of additional dataset metadata slots, ontology classes assigned to them, and the object property they are connected to the plot with.

For people associated with the creation of the dataset, different roles are distinguished: Metadata creator, project leader, data creator, data collector, and contact person. For these we create placeholder roles and use them like the author role for publications (Fig. 7.7), where a person is instantiated as the *dcterms:creator*<sup>67</sup> of a publication, and embodies a specific role like the *iao:authorRole*<sup>68</sup> via *ro:hasRole*<sup>69</sup>. Analogously, funding parties are instantiated as an *foaf:organization*<sup>70</sup> with the *efo:funder*<sup>71</sup> role.

<sup>56</sup><http://vocab.lter-europe.net/EnvThes/21229>

<sup>57</sup><http://vocab.lter-europe.net/EnvThes/21231>

<sup>58</sup><http://vocab.lter-europe.net/EnvThes/21243>

<sup>59</sup><http://vocab.lter-europe.net/EnvThes/20960>

<sup>60</sup><https://w3id.org/metpo/1000198>

<sup>61</sup>[http://opendata.inrae.fr/thesaurusINRAE/c\\_1354](http://opendata.inrae.fr/thesaurusINRAE/c_1354)

<sup>62</sup><http://id.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/D010571>

<sup>63</sup><http://vocab.lter-europe.net/EnvThes/21478>

<sup>64</sup>[http://semanticscience.org/resource/SIO\\_000224](http://semanticscience.org/resource/SIO_000224)

<sup>65</sup><http://vocab.lter-europe.net/EnvThes/22018>

<sup>66</sup><https://w3id.org/iadopt/ont/constrains>

<sup>67</sup><http://purl.org/dc/terms/creator>

<sup>68</sup>[http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/IAO\\_0000442](http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/IAO_0000442)

<sup>69</sup>[http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/RO\\_0000087](http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/RO_0000087)

<sup>70</sup>[http://xmlns.com/foaf/spec/#term\\_Organization](http://xmlns.com/foaf/spec/#term_Organization)

<sup>71</sup>[http://www.ebi.ac.uk/efo/EFO\\_0001736](http://www.ebi.ac.uk/efo/EFO_0001736)




Figure 7.8: Schema for investigations that have as their output datasets of the BE. The metadata categories for datasets align well to the model of the ontology for biomedical investigations (obi), containing study design details, sampling preparation and analysis, as well as data preparation and analysis.

Finally, Fig. 7.8 shows the process of how a dataset is created and the study design followed in its creation. In our modelling process, we match dataset metadata to the scheme *OBI* provides for scientific investigations. An *obi:investigation*<sup>72</sup> is instantiated that has as its part an instance of *obi:studyDesignExecution*<sup>73</sup>. This study design execution has two functions: It connects to study design information via *obi:realizes*<sup>74</sup> and has as its *obi:part* instances of the classes *obi:materialProcessing*<sup>75</sup>, *obi:assay*<sup>76</sup>, *obi:dataTransformation*<sup>77</sup>, and *addicto:statisticalAnalysis*<sup>78</sup>. We also attach the equipment used in the study as *ro:hasParticipant* of the study design execution. The dataset itself is *obi:isSpecifiedOutputOf* of this data preparation and we attach further information as literals such as literature references via *schema:citation*<sup>79</sup> and the data upload status using *opmi:hasStatusContent*<sup>80</sup>.

This concludes the presentation of the knowledge graph's schema and the vocabulary used. In the next sections we present modelling challenges we encountered and present our implementation approach.

## 7.3 Modelling Challenges

We described the process of modelling the knowledge graph in the previous section. Now, we aim to expand upon the five greatest challenges we encountered in developing the graph's schema:

### 7.3.1 BExIS Metadata Schemata

The first and possibly most widely encountered challenge is concerned with the data used as source for the knowledge graph. Several significant hindrances arise from it:

- **Semi-structured input data:** The BE publication and dataset metadata is not fully structured. Although there are type definitions, minimum and maximum lengths, descriptions, and definitions for several metadata fields, the existence of free-text fields for information on study design, data processing, equipment descriptions, etc., leads to significant modelling and/or processing overhead.
- **Metadata schemata for user convenience.** In BExIS, researchers and people associated with publications, datasets, and projects, are required to fill the metadata forms themselves. On one hand, this leads to high information content and completeness of the metadata, however, on the other hand, the online forms are designed to be as accessible and understandable as possible to gain these advantages, which sacrifices correctness and structure of the information within. In disseminating the metadata for this thesis, we encountered

<sup>72</sup>[http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/OBI\\_0000066](http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/OBI_0000066)

<sup>73</sup>[http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/OBI\\_0000471](http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/OBI_0000471)

<sup>74</sup>[http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/BFO\\_0000055](http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/BFO_0000055)

<sup>75</sup>[http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/OBI\\_0000094](http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/OBI_0000094)

<sup>76</sup>[http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/OBI\\_0000070](http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/OBI_0000070)

<sup>77</sup>[http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/OBI\\_0200000](http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/OBI_0200000)

<sup>78</sup>[http://addictovocab.org/ADDICTO\\_0001296](http://addictovocab.org/ADDICTO_0001296)

<sup>79</sup><http://schema.org/citation>

<sup>80</sup>[http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/OPMI\\_0000622](http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/OPMI_0000622)

several issues because of this. For example, some keywords are grouped together in the same category even though they have no relation to each other (for '*Biotic Data Type*', the answers '*none*', '*single species*', '*multiple species*', '*genetic*' and '*total abundance*' are allowed).

- **Missing concept definitions.** In the metadata schemata, all categories have descriptions explaining what information the categories are supposed to contain (sometimes only sparse information is available), but the selection options users have when filling the forms have no definitions. Coming back to the example from the previous point, we may have a general understanding of what is meant by the term '*genetic*', but we can only guess what the intended meaning behind this term is. This ambiguity is not only a challenge for modelling a knowledge graph, as finding proper ontology terms for these concepts becomes more difficult, but it also decreases data quality, as users filling out the metadata forms can also only guess what is meant by certain terms, leading the source categories to contain information blurred from original user intent.
- **Schematic inconsistencies.** Even though the process of filling out both metadata schemata is the same, due to historical implementation details there are several discrepancies between the schemata for publication and dataset metadata. For example, both questionnaires collect information about plots, but only for datasets the exact number of plots per plot type is collected, while for publications, there are only the options *few* or *all*.
- **Anonymous plots.** Due to the points listed above, one considerable challenge we encountered concerned the inability to disseminate distinct plots from the data, therefore, workarounds were necessary to properly represent the information there is, and, unfortunately, some information that could exist in the knowledge graph does not because of it.

### 7.3.2 Negations and the Open World Assumption - Modelling complete information

As stated in Subsec. 3.3.2, the *Open World Assumption* leads to modelling challenges for knowledge graphs. In this case however, the data we instantiate contains complete information. The metadata schemata used for BE publications and datasets contain the selection option '*none*' for relevant categories. For example, if metadata for a publication states that no taxa were investigated, leading to no edge in the graph between any taxon and a plot from a plot collection, from the *OWA* it follows that the publication might have investigated some taxa regardless.

Unfortunately, as we will discuss in the limitations section (Subs. 10.4.3), we were not able to find appropriate solutions to these two challenges due to time constraints.

## 7.4 Implementation

In the previous sections, we described the modelling process and its results in detail. For the next step, we aim to instantiate the developed schemata to populate the knowledge graph. To achieve this, a mapping is required that declares class definitions and properties and assigns them to the data that is supposed to be instantiated. There are many applications that can support developers in writing mappings, even user interfaces like *Ontotext Refine*<sup>81</sup> exist that allow developers to assign mappings using a visual mapper for tabular data. In this work, we choose the *R2RML*<sup>82</sup> mapping language. We detail its application in detail below.

### 7.4.1 R2RML Mapping Language

The main purpose of the R2RML mapping language is to provide mappings that turn relational databases into RDF datasets. Our input data consists of tabular data that, after extensive processing, can be uploaded to a relational database. With the use of an R2RML processing engine<sup>83</sup>, we are able to turn this data into RDF triples by translating the mappings we create from the developed schemata. There are three substantial advantages using this approach: First, the R2RML mapping language is highly expressive and allows us to declare multiple conditionals in the mappings, that are difficult or impossible using other approaches (as we are using a relational database as the data source, R2RML even allows for results of SQL queries to be mapped). Second, R2RML makes virtualized knowledge graphs possible that allow SPARQL queries to be executed on relational database by translating SPARQL to SQL using written mappings (we refer to *ontop*<sup>84</sup>, a system that implements this), this allows integrating knowledge graphs together with relational databases. Third, R2RML allows us to declare mappings for named subgraphs. We will present this functionality in detail in the next section as it is integral for implementing semantic units for the knowledge graph.

### 7.4.2 Implementation of Semantic Units

In order to implement semantic units, a solution for declaring named subgraphs in the knowledge graph is required. Thankfully, the R2RML mapping language and its processing engines allow multiple output formats for mapped files. The standard output option returns *turtle*<sup>85</sup> (ttl) files, an RDF serialization that outputs triples in the form of *<subject> <predicate> <object>*. A further output option that we use for this knowledge graph is *TriG*<sup>86</sup>, a ttl extension that allows for *graph maps*, mappings to declare named subgraphs inside of the main graph, and to declare what graphs specific triples belong to.

We refer to Listing 7.1 below that illustrates an example of how a semantic unit can be built using these graph maps. The listing depicts two mapping entities, denoted

<sup>81</sup><https://www.ontotext.com/products/ontotext-refine/>

<sup>82</sup><https://www.w3.org/TR/r2rml/>

<sup>83</sup><https://github.com/chrdebru/r2rml>

<sup>84</sup><https://ontop-vkg.org/>

<sup>85</sup><https://www.w3.org/TR/turtle/>

<sup>86</sup><https://www.w3.org/TR/trig/>

by the notation <#...> in lines 1 and 26. The first entity is a named individual identification unit for the second entity, the publication. Each mapping declares a logical table (lines 3 and 29). These depict the table in the relational database that the data originates from. Afterwards, a subject map is declared (lines 4 and 31). This is used to assign ontology classes to mapping entities. In line 6, a graph map statement is declared in the subject mapping of the semantic unit. This results in the creation of a new subgraph in the final knowledge graph with the IRI:

```
http://example.com/base/semunit/namedindividualidentificationunit/-
Publication_{id}
```

This creates a new supgraph for each entry in the {id} column of the logical table. Furthermore, when a graph map statement is used inside of a subject map, all triples belonging to the mapping entity will automatically be assigned to the graph map. Below the graph map statement, object and data properties are declared using predicate object maps. For example, the semantic unit has another type assignment (line 8), a label (line 13), and a *semanticUnitSubject* property that connects it to the publication (line 21).

As for the publication itself, important declarations related to the semantic unit are its label (line 37) and its type assignment (line 55). These statements are assigned to the semantic units named subgraph via graph map statements (line 42 and 61).

```

1  <#NamedIndividualIdentificationUnit_publication>
2  a rr:TriplesMap ;
3  rr:logicalTable [ rr:tableName "be_publication_metadata" ] ;
4  rr:subjectMap [
5    rr:template "http://example.com/base/semunit/
6      namedindividualidentificationunit/Publication_{id}" ;
7    rr:graphMap [ rr:template "http://example.com/base/semunit/
8      namedindividualidentificationunit/Publication_{id}" ] ;
9    ] ;
10   rr:predicateObjectMap [
11     rr:predicate rdf:type ;
12     rr:objectMap [ rr:constant semunit:
13       namedindividualidentificationunit] ;
14   ] ;
15   rr:predicateObjectMap [
16     rr:predicate rdfs:label ;
17     rr:objectMap [
18       rr:template "Publication {id} a fabio:{typeofpublication
19       }" ;
20       rr:termType rr:Literal ;
21     ] ;
22   ] ;
23   rr:predicateObjectMap [
24     rr:predicate ex:semanticUnitSubject ;
25     rr:objectMap [ rr:parentTriplesMap <#Publication_id> ] ;
26   ] .

```

```

26 <#Publication_id>
27 a rr:TriplesMap ;
28
29     rr:logicalTable [ rr:tableName "be_publication_metadata" ] ;
30
31     rr:subjectMap [
32         rr:template "http://example.com/base/Publication_{id}" ;
33         rr:class iao:publication ;
34         rr:termType rr:IRI;
35     ] ;
36
37     rr:predicateObjectMap [
38         rr:predicate rdfs:label ;
39         rr:objectMap [
40             rr:template "Publication {id}, {title}" ;
41             rr:language "en" ;
42         ] ;
43         rr:graphMap [
44             rr:template "http://example.com/base/semunit/
45             namedindividualidentificationunit/Publication_{id}"
46         ] ;
47     ] ;
48
49     rr:predicateObjectMap [
50         rr:predicate obi:isSpecifiedOutputOf ;
51         rr:objectMap [
52             rr:template "http://example.com/base/Documenting_{id}" ;
53         ] ;
54     ] ;
55
56     rr:predicateObjectMap [
57         rr:predicate rdf:type ;
58         rr:objectMap [
59             rr:template "fabio:{typeofpublication}" ;
60             rr:termType rr:IRI ;
61         ] ;
62         rr:graphMap [
63             rr:template "http://example.com/base/semunit/
64             namedindividualidentificationunit/Publication_{id}"
65         ] ;
66     ] ;
67
68     rr:predicateObjectMap [
69         rr:predicate obi:partOf ;
70         rr:objectMap [
71             rr:template "http://example.com/base/BE_Infrastructure_{
72                 infrastructureclass}" ;
73             rr:termType rr:IRI ;
74         ] ;
75     ] .

```

---

Listing 7.1: Excerpt of an R2RML mapping depicting mappings for publications and named individual identification units for publications.

### 7.4.3 Schema Validation - SHACL

Finally, we present an example of a SHACL shape that can be used for schema validation on the instantiated knowledge graph. We use the same example as in Listing 7.1, publications and their named individual identification units. Listing 7.2 shows the SHACL shapes that could be used for validating these triples. Lines one, two, and three, declare an entity that is a node shape, specifying that it is a SHACL shape, for the class *semunit:namedIndividualIdentificationUnit*. In lines five to thirteen, a SPARQL query is used to check for the validity of the IRI of the resource. Further, two property validations follow in lines 15-20 and 22-28. The first states that there must be exactly one outgoing property that declares a publication resource as the *ex:semanticUnitSubject* and the second checks the validity of the label using a customized pattern.

The second SHACL shape begins in line 30, specifying that it targets entities of type *iao:publication*. The remaining node shape contains multiple property checks, one for additional type assignments (lines 42-57), for specifying that it is the specified output of a documenting process (lines 59-72), and that it is part of an infrastructure type (lines 74-87).

```
1  ex:NamedIndividualIdentificationUnitShape
2    a sh:NodeShape ;
3    sh:targetClass semunit:namedindividualidentificationunit ;
4
5    sh:spqrql [
6      sh:message "Semunit node IRI must start with /semunit/
7        namedindividualidentificationunit/Publication_ " ;
8      sh:select """
9        SELECT $this WHERE {
10          FILTER ( !STRSTARTS(STR($this),
11            "http://example.com/base/semunit/
12              namedindividualidentificationunit/Publication_") )
13        }
14        """
15    ] ;
16
17    sh:property [
18      sh:path ex:semanticUnitSubject ;
19      sh:minCount 1 ;
20      sh:maxCount 1 ;
21      sh:node ex:PublicationShape ;
22    ] ;
23
24    sh:property [
25      sh:path rdfs:label ;
26      sh:minCount 1 ;
```

```

25      sh:datatype xsd:string ;
26      sh:pattern "^\w+Publication\w+\d+\w+\w+fabio:.\+$" ;
27      sh:message "Label should look like: 'Publication {id} a fabio
28          :{typeofpublication}'." ;
29      ] .
30
31  ex:PublicationShape
32      a sh:NodeShape ;
33      sh:targetClass iao:publication ;
34
35      sh:property [
36          sh:path rdfs:label ;
37          sh:minCount 1 ;
38          sh:languageIn ("en") ;
39          sh:uniqueLang true ;
40          sh:message "Publication must have an English rdfs:label." ;
41      ] ;
42
43      sh:property [
44          sh:path rdf:type ;
45          sh:minCount 1 ;
46          sh:nodeKind sh:IRI ;
47          sh:sparql [
48              sh:message "At least one rdf:type must be a FABIO IRI." ;
49              sh:select """
50                  SELECT $this WHERE {
51                      FILTER NOT EXISTS {
52                          $this rdf:type ?t .
53                          FILTER ( isIRI(?t) && STRSTARTS(STR(?t), "http://purl.
54                                          org/spar/fabio/") )
55                      }
56                  }
57              """
58          ] ;
59
60          sh:property [
61              sh:path obi:isSpecifiedOutputOf ;
62              sh:minCount 1 ;
63              sh:nodeKind sh:IRI ;
64              sh:sparql [
65                  sh:message "obi:isSpecifiedOutputOf must point to an IRI
66                      starting with /Documenting_." ;
67                  sh:select """
68                      SELECT $this WHERE {
69                          $this obi:isSpecifiedOutputOf ?v .
70                          FILTER ( !STRSTARTS(STR(?v), "http://example.com/base/
71                                          Documenting_") )
72                      }
73                  """
74          ] ;

```

```
72      ] ;
73
74      sh:property [
75          sh:path obi:partOf ;
76          sh:minCount 1 ;
77          sh:nodeKind sh:IRI ;
78          sh:sparql [
79              sh:message "obi:partOf must point to an IRI starting with /
80                          BE_Infrastructure_." ;
81              sh:select """
82                  SELECT $this WHERE {
83                      $this obi:partOf ?v .
84                      FILTER ( !STRSTARTS(STR(?v), "http://example.com/base/
85                          BE_Infrastructure_") )
86                  }
87                  """
88          ] ;
89      ] ;
```

Listing 7.2: Two SHACL shapes that could be used to validate triples for publications and for semantic units identifying them.

# Chapter 8

## Method - Extracting Information from Metadata using Large Language Models

In the first part of our method, we presented how structured metadata may be used as a starting point for knowledge graph construction. One big advantage of the use case discussed in this thesis is that the publication and dataset metadata provided by the Biodiversity Exploratories already exists in a structured format. Therefore, knowledge graph construction is simplified considerably, as a measure of quality control and structure has already been introduced as a result of human effort. Another upside of this level of data quality is that it is not only useful for knowledge graph construction, but also necessary to publish FAIR-aligned datasets, simplify overall reuse, and enable further functionalities in BExIS like structured search.

Unfortunately, these considerable advantages come with a cost: The human effort required to provide structured metadata of high quality is immense, and includes many people at different points of the data processing pipeline. Therefore, in the second part of our method, we aim to investigate two avenues at which large language models may contribute to either reduce the effort in creating structured metadata, or to extract latent information.

### 8.1 Extracting Metadata Categories

One point of interest in providing FAIR metadata for the Biodiversity Exploratories could be to lessen the human effort required in metadata curation or entry to BExIS by extracting metadata categories from the titles and abstracts/summaries of publications and datasets automatically with the assistance of LLMs.

Therefore, in this section we conduct small experiments to test the feasibility of this approach. We first describe the input data and its format, select a list of relevant metadata categories that we believe could be extracted automatically, and then describe our approach in detail.

### 8.1.1 Input Data

The input data consists of publication and dataset titles and abstracts, concatenated in the form:

```
Title: {titlecolumn}\n Abstract: {abstractcolumn}
```

We test publications and datasets separately as their metadata schemata used in BExIS differ from each other.

### 8.1.2 Metadata Categories to extract

For this experiment, we identify a set of promising metadata categories for publications and datasets. To identify these categories, we manually investigated a sample of titles and abstracts, and analyzed which metadata categories we were able to fill from information contained within them. For example, as a result we leave out categories that include personal information as this kind of information does not generally exist in titles or abstracts. Therefore, we identify the following categories of interest:

#### Publications:

- Keywords
- Exploratory: ALB, SCH, HAI
- Plot Level
- Grassland, Forest
- Aboveground, Belowground
- Field, Laboratory, Review
- Infrastructure
- Biotic Data Taxon
- Biotic Data Type
- Processes and Services
- Environmental Descriptors
- Experiment Type: REX1, REX2, LUX, FOX

#### Datasets:

- Project
- Number of GP/EP/MIP/VIP
- Experimental manipulation
- Temporal repetitions per study site
- Plot based repetitions of measurements
- Study design

- Sampling design
- Sample preparation
- Sample analysis
- Equipment
- Data preparation
- Data analysis
- Content type

Note: Datasets contain all metadata (except 'infrastructure') categories that are listed for publications as well and are extracted as well.

For all of these categories, we either allow short, free text entries from the LLM, or allow a selection of answers depending on the category definitions in the BExIS metadata schemata. For example, keywords may contain arbitrary text entries, while the forest and grassland categories only allow *yes/no*.

### 8.1.3 Metadata Reconstruction Schema

For metadata reconstruction, we aim to supply a large language model with not only the titles and abstracts, but also with a schema to guide the extraction. We write two csv files for the respective inputs, each containing three columns: *category name*, *category definition*, and *allowed answers*. In Table 8.1 below, we show an excerpt of the publication extraction schema:

category name	category definition	allowed answers
keywords	Keywords that describe the publication and its content	any
grassland	Did the study take place in grasslands?	yes, no
environmental descriptors	What environmental descriptors can be used to describe the study? Possible answers are: 'managed land use', 'unmanaged land use', 'soil', 'climate', 'none'	'managed land use', 'unmanaged land use', 'soil', 'climate', 'none'

Table 8.1: Table that shows an excerpt of the schema used for metadata reconstruction for publication.

We allow four types of answers: *any*, *yes or no*, a list of selectable keywords, and *any long* for free text answers. If applicable, we also append the selectable keywords to the category definition to supply more context to the model.

### 8.1.4 LLM Calls

For this experiment we host an instance of *Mistral-Small-3.2-24B-Instruct-2506*<sup>1</sup>, an instruction fine-tuned model that is capable at processing both english and german texts. We leverage this model's instruction-following capabilities by providing a system prompt that includes rules for data processing and output format in Listing 8.1:

```

1 You are an expert metadata curator for the Biodiversity
   Exploratories (BE) project.
2 Your task: given a TITLE and ABSTRACT, propose metadata as JSON.
3 RULES
4 - Output STRICTLY valid JSON (no comments). Do not include any text
   before or after the JSON.
5 - Choose ALL applicable values for multi-select-like fields.
6 - Free-text style fields are marked with "any".
7 - For free-text style fields: return an array of short phrases (e.g
   ., ["soil biodiversity", "grassland"]). Avoid hallucinations.
8 - For free-text style fields marked with "any long", longer phrases
   are allowed like "All species data have been standardized. This
   was done by dividing the recorded cover value of each species
   through the sum of all species cover values of a subplot. ..."
9 - If information is missing, you MAY return empty arrays [] or
   nulls. Do not invent specifics.
10 SCHEMA KEYS:
11 {schema_keys}
12 MULTI-SELECT FIELDS & ENUMS (if a list is provided below, prefer
   those exact labels; otherwise use short phrases):
13 {enum_block}
14 Return only a single JSON object with keys drawn from the schema
   keys above. Do NOT include any explanation.

```

Listing 8.1: System prompt for metadata reconstruction.

### 8.1.5 Extraction Results

We first convert the model's output from JSON back to csv, and then compare with the ground truth metadata. In this experiment, we took 100 publications and 100 datasets, and present the evaluation results in four tables, two each for publications (Table 8.2 and Table 8.3) and datasets (Table 8.4 and Table 8.5), one for *yes/no* fields and one for *multi-label* fields.

For *yes/no* fields, we collect the metrics precision (when the model predicts yes, how often was it correct?), recall (of the times the model should have returned yes, did it actually return yes?), F1-score (harmonic mean of precision and recall), and accuracy (overall proportion of model predictions that were correct). Regarding publications, the highest precision was achieved when predicting whether the publication was related to the *Schwäbische Alb* repository. Highest recall was achieved when predicting belowground, highest F1-score for predicting a laboratory study, and best accuracy when predicting a review study. The most expressive metric is

<sup>1</sup><https://huggingface.co/mistralai/Mistral-Small-3.2-24B-Instruct-2506>

Publications (yes/no)				
category	precision	recall	f1	accuracy
alb	<b>.879</b>	.630	.734	.79
sch	.643	.486	.554	.71
hai	.818	.509	.628	.68
grassland	.84	.84	.84	.84
forest	.628	.871	.73	.8
aboveground	.705	.878	.782	.76
belowground	.761	<b>.972</b>	.854	.88
field	.653	.904	.758	.7
laboratory	.824	.955	<b>.884</b>	.89
review	.556	.455	.5	<b>.9</b>

Table 8.2: Table of precision, recall, F1-score, and accuracy scores for *yes/no* fields for a test run of 100 publications.

the F1-score as it balances precision and recall. The mean F1-score across all ten *yes/no* categories is  $\sim 0.7264$  which is a surprisingly good result and suggests some categories may be extracted automatically, while some categories should not.

Publications (multi-label fields)					
category	precision	recall	f1	accuracy	avg jaccard
biotic data	.452	.555	.498	<b>.43</b>	.521
taxon					
biotic data	<b>.551</b>	<b>.609</b>	<b>.579</b>	.42	<b>.552</b>
type					
environmental	.210	.285	.242	.08	.206
descriptors					
infrastructure	.349	.409	.377	.29	.361
keywords	.103	.207	.137	0	.076
plot level	.348	.4	.372	.4	.4
processes	.269	.397	.321	.24	.332

Table 8.3: Table of precision, recall, F1-score, accuracy, and jaccard similarity scores for *multi-label* fields for a test run of 100 publications.

Regarding *multi-label* fields, we evaluate across precision, recall, F1-score, accuracy, and the average jaccard similarity that is used to determine the similarity between sets. For Publications, the best performing category seems to be biotic data types, with an F1-score of 0.579 and average jaccard similarity of 0.552. As we can see in Table 8.3, only biotic data taxon and type come close to  $\geq 0.5$  and the keyword category presents a clear outlier, which we will discuss further in Ch. 10.

As for the *yes/no* fields of dataset metadata, we note an interesting trend where the model seems to predict the *alb*, *sch*, and *hai* categories very sparsely, attaining precision scores of 1 with low recall. We assume that this stems from dataset titles and descriptions being less descriptive than those of publications. However, effectiveness for the remaining categories is very high, regularly reaching F1-scores in the 0.80 or 0.90 range.

For *multi-label* fields of dataset metadata, scores are generally low with two outliers:

Datasets (yes/no)				
category	precision	recall	f1	accuracy
alb	<b>1</b>	.09	.148	.08
sch	<b>1</b>	.05	.095	.05
hai	<b>1</b>	.21	.347	.21
grassland	.966	.757	.848	.9
forest	.955	.851	.9	.86
aboveground	.961	.88	.918	.87
belowground	.938	<b>.882</b>	<b>.909</b>	<b>.97</b>
temporal	.776	.59	.67	.59
repetitions				
plot repetitions	.934	.71	.807	.71

Table 8.4: Table of precision, recall, F1-score, and accuracy scores for *yes/no* fields for a test run of 100 datasets.

Datasets (multi-label fields)					
category	precision	recall	f1	accuracy	avg jaccard
biotic data	.571	.619	.594	.53	.565
taxon					
biotic data	.221	.438	.294	.22	.22
type					
content	<b>.978</b>	<b>.88</b>	<b>.926</b>	<b>.88</b>	<b>.88</b>
type					
environmental	.041	.07	.052	.06	.065
descriptors					
keywords	.034	.289	.062	0	.045
plot level	.148	.236	.181	.24	.245
processes	.051	.068	.058	.04	.048
project	.012	.01	.011	.01	.01

Table 8.5: Table of precision, recall, F1-score, accuracy, and jaccard similarity scores for *multi-label* fields for a test run of 100 datasets.

The content type category reaches an F1-score of 0.926 and an average jaccard similarity of 0.88 and the biotic data taxon category has an F1-score of 0.594 and an average jaccard similarity of 0.565. The worst performing category contains project names, achieving scores close to zero for all metrics.

Finally, for datasets we attempted to extract information for free-text metadata categories as well (for example study design and sample preparation). However, for these categories our evaluation did not seem to return meaningful scores, as the value zero was returned across the board. We believe that this is due to generally low coverage of these categories in the test set (and the dataset as a whole) and difficulty in evaluating such answers with this approach, as predictions containing free-text answers are difficult to capture with these metrics.

## 8.2 Finding Overarching Topics

Another possible application of large language models on the source data, that might also be useful for a knowledge graph in its usage and application, leverages text embeddings to find latent, overarching topics of datasets and publications via their titles and abstracts/summaries.

Oftentimes, titles and abstracts do not explicitly state every concept or keyword a publication or dataset is about. Therefore, it might be possible to find latent concepts using text embeddings that group meaningful texts together or move them apart, depending how semantically related their content is. Additionally, this allows us to investigate whether there are any clusters of publications and datasets in the embedding space, and what topics these clusters may be about.

In a further investigation, we provide anchor concepts in the embedding space, and investigate how publications and datasets group around them. We use concepts from the *NASA Earthdata Global Change Master Directory (GCM) Keywords*<sup>2</sup>, a controlled vocabulary about earth science, earth science services, platforms, and more. We choose this vocabulary as it provides a wide range of terms that have a higher probability to cover latent concepts. Additionally, its hierarchical structure allows us to embed anchors on different levels of granularity.

### 8.2.1 Embedding Approach

Our input data consists of publication and dataset titles and abstracts, concatenated in the form:

```
Title: {titlecolumn}\n Abstract: {abstractcolumn}
```

For the anchor concepts, we export Keywords in RDF format from the keyword viewer<sup>3</sup>, SPARQL query for concept labels and definitions, export as csv, and concatenate them as:

```
Label: {labelcolumn}\n Definition: {definitioncolumn}
```

We split this task into five different steps:

- (1) Concatenate dataset and publication input data
- (2) Embed documents using an embedding model
- (3) Cluster points in the embedding space and label clusters
- (4) Embed anchor concepts
- (5) Assign documents to anchors

We use the *BGE-M3* embedding model [Chen et al., 2024] available on Hugging Face<sup>4</sup>, which is particularly useful in this case because of its multilingual capabilities, as titles and abstracts are written in either german or english and self host

<sup>2</sup><https://gcmd.earthdata.nasa.gov/KeywordViewer/>

<sup>3</sup><https://gcmd.earthdata.nasa.gov/KeywordViewer/>

<sup>4</sup><https://huggingface.co/BAAI/bge-m3>

the model on *Draco*<sup>5</sup>, one of the computing clusters of the *Friedrich Schiller Universiy Jena*. We cluster documents in the embedding space using *HDBSCAN*<sup>6</sup> [Campello et al., 2013] using a minimum cluster size of 20 and compute *c-tf-idf*, the tf-idf per cluster, to label each cluster.

n docs	id	top terms
194	6	soil; use; land; land use; plant; biodiversity exploratories; intensity; an; grassland; biodiversity
70	4	effects; use; land use; land; vegetation; grassland; eps; all; diversity; dataset
37	2	soil; grassland; community; the data; community composition; composition; dataset; we; specific; can be
28	1	effects; biodiversity exploratories; diversity and; diversity; was; study; biodiversity; plant; the data; tree
22	5	biodiversity exploratories; tree; diversity and; duen; forests; hainich duen; the data; eps; collected; study
22	3	plant; soil; eps; all; on all; community; community composition; composition; land; within
21	7	soil; diversity and; community; eps; composition; also; community composition; diversity; on all; within
20	0	vegetation; alb; data of; 2011; 2017; 2021; 2021 and; 150; all forest; abundance

Table 8.6: Table of topic clusters from embedded publication and dataset titles and abstracts. Column one contains the number of documents per cluster, the second column contains the cluster ID, and the third contains the top terms that occur within the clusters via c-tf-idf.

The resulting clusters are shown in Table 8.6. There are eight clusters with 20 or more documents belonging to them. The biggest cluster contains 194 documents, which is about five percent of the ~4000 input documents. Unfortunately, there are no cluster labels, which makes it difficult to distinguish the clusters from each other. For this reason, we choose to include a range of possible concepts as anchors in the embedding space (GCMD Keywords). When clustering around these anchors, we get the following results, shown in Table 8.7. Using adaptive clustering, an approach that allows a clustering algorithm to discover clusters of varying shape and densities, yields the clusters shown in Table 8.8.

### 8.2.2 Clustering application for the Knowledge Graph

In this subsection we expand upon the possible upside of this embedding based clustering of publications and datasets for the knowledge graph.

First, due to these results it becomes possible to filter resources in the KG depending on the cluster they belong to. This introduces a further facet of how data in the KG can be viewed through, and may assist users in getting an overview of the contents of the KG. Thus, it also may assist users in their ability to search for topic-specific literature for a synthesis effort or meta study.

<sup>5</sup><https://www.uni-jena.de/en/22210/scientific-computing-and-data-science>

<sup>6</sup><https://hdbSCAN.readthedocs.io/en/latest/index.html>

n docs	anchor label
563	nutritional constraints
442	species distribution models
142	morphological adaptation
128	metagenomics
95	plant characteristics
82	soil salinity/soil sodicity
78	land use/land cover change
78	microfossil
71	silviculture
51	biodiversity functions
50	forest mensuration
39	fungi
35	microclimate

Table 8.7: Table of clusters around anchor concepts.

n docs	anchor label
113	nutritional constraints
89	species distribution models
33	tree rings
29	morphological adaptation
26	metagenomics
24	soil rooting depth
19	carbon dioxide
19	fatty acid desaturase
19	plant characteristics
18	pollinator species
18	mushrooms

Table 8.8: Table of clusters around anchor concepts with adaptive clustering that allows clusters of varying shapes and densities, leading to an overall smaller number of points per cluster.

Second, these clusters form around concepts, keywords, or topics, that are latent in the input data, or are provided from outside of the original input data. On the one hand, this may discover research avenues of the Biodiversity Exploratories that are not mentioned explicitly in the title or abstract of publications and datasets. On the other hand this introduces the possibility to compare topic clusters to those of other taxonomies, ontologies, or other concept hierarchies, contributing to matching efforts between hierarchies, or the integration of BE data to existing sources.

To this end, semantic units can be included in the knowledge graph that represent clustered concepts. By implementing a compound unit for every concept, publications and datasets, along with their relatedness score to that concept, can be associated and queried for in the knowledge graph.

### 8.2.3 Linking resources to the main objectives of the BE using embeddings

Taking the idea of using anchors in the embedding space further, we can chose concepts more related to the Biodiversity Exploratories as well. As stated in Sec. 5.1 (see Fig. 5.1) the research goals of the BE investigate the interactions between land use types and intensities, biodiversity and community composition, and ecosystem processes and functioning. In this section we investigate the idea of using these research goals as anchors in the embedding space:

- **G1:** How does land use type and intensity affect biodiversity?
- **G2:** How does land use type and intensity affect ecosystem process?
- **G3:** How do different components of biodiversity interact?
- **G4:** How does biodiversity influence ecosystem processes and services?

For better coverage across these goals we reformulate these goals with *GPT-5*<sup>7</sup> as follows:

- **G1':** Investigate how land-use configuration and management intensity shape species richness and community composition. Quantify biodiversity responses along gradients of land-use type and use intensity. Determine how different land-use practices and their intensity alter the diversity of taxa and functional groups. Assess the effects of landscape structure and land-use pressure on biodiversity patterns. Examine how the form and degree of land use drive changes in organisms and their diversity.
- **G2':** Evaluate how land-use types and their intensity influence key ecosystem processes such as productivity and nutrient cycling. Test how management regime and land-use configuration modify rates of decomposition, carbon fluxes, and energy flow. Analyse process-level responses (e.g., soil respiration, primary production) along land-use intensity gradients. Determine how spatial arrangement and intensity of land use affect ecosystem functioning. Examine the sensitivity of ecosystem processes to differences in land-use form and management intensity.
- **G3':** Explore interactions among biodiversity components (genes, species, functional traits, trophic levels) within ecosystems. Investigate how species, functional groups, and trophic guilds influence each other through competition, facilitation, and predation. Determine the network structure of biodiversity interactions and how they vary across contexts. Analyse cross-component linkages (taxonomic, functional, phylogenetic) and their ecological consequences. Assess how changes in one biodiversity facet propagate to others through biotic interactions.
- **G4':** Quantify how biodiversity drives ecosystem functioning and the delivery of services such as pollination, carbon storage, and water regulation. Test the relationships between biodiversity (richness, evenness, trait diversity) and ecosystem process rates and service provision. Determine how losses or gains in

---

<sup>7</sup><https://openai.com/index/introducing-gpt-5/>

biodiversity alter ecosystem processes and the benefits people receive. Evaluate the pathways by which biodiversity affects ecosystem functioning and service outcomes. Examine biodiversity–function relationships and their implications for ecosystem services across landscapes.

We embed these anchors and compare their cosine similarity scores to those of the document embeddings. This method allows us to define a threshold score: If a document candidate has a higher similarity to one of the goals than the threshold, then we assign it to that goal. Therefore, the threshold represents a minimum acceptance barrier that allows us to fine-tune the tradeoff between overall coverage (of all documents, how many get assigned to atleast one goal) and absolute cosine similarity values (how confident we are in the assignments).

Another important metric is the margin between the top two candidates regarding similarity score. This metric quantifies for a For an embedded document, this metric quantifies how close the top candidate research goals are to each other regarding cosine similarity, an important metric as for many documents in our data, the cosine similarities of the highest scoring research goals have a margin between 0 and 0.05.

The clustering, goal assignment, and analysis can be run with a variety of settings. Below, we compile the results with the following parameters: cosine similarity  $> 0.3$ , no adaptive clustering, multiple goal assignments when top candidates are  $\leq 0.03$  apart, and a maximum of two labels per document.

First, in Fig. 8.1 we compile an overview of top-1 similarity scores (cosine similarity) on the x axis, the margin between top-1 and top-2 results on the y axis, and colored hexes on the plot for the number of documents, lighter colors referring to more occurrences. As the figure shows, most documents score between 0.4 and 0.7, and the margin between the top candidates is more abundant at lower margin values, leading to our decision to allow multiple labels per document. Also, a hot spot seems to emerge between similarity 0.5 - 0.55 and margin 0.00 - 0.005. Further, the distribution of similarity scores and document numbers per research goal is shown in Fig. 8.2, in which we observe that research goals **G2** and **G4** have less total documents assigned to them as the other goals, with **G4** being a clear outlier. This means that considerably less publications and datasets investigate the influences of biodiversity on ecosystem processes/services.

Finally, in Fig. 8.3 we can observe the tradeoff between coverage and threshold values for similarity scores on the collection of documents. We note a sharp decrease in coverage when the threshold is raised to  $>0.4$ . These results may be used to infer what threshold may be best if labels resulting from this analysis were to included in the knowledge graph.

With this analysis we conclude our investigation of embedding based methods for topic discovery, keyword clustering, and concept assignment.




Figure 8.1: Plot of cosine similarity scores (x-axis) of the top candidates and the margin between top1 and top2 candidates (y-axis). Instead of dots, colored hexes are used to represent the number of documents per coordinate, with darker colors (purple) representing lower number of documents, and lighter colors (yellow) representing higher number of documents. The light blue dotted line on the left side of the plot represents the cosine similarity threshold set for our runs of the scripts, accepting candidates at a score of  $\geq 0.3$ .




Figure 8.2: Collection of plots for the four research goals of the Biodiversity Exploratories. Plots show the distribution of cosine similarity scores (x-axis) and total number of documents per score (y-axis).




Figure 8.3: Plot showing the tradeoff between threshold of cosine similarity scores to assign candidates to research goals (x-axis) and the overall document coverage (y-axis). The blue vertical line represents the threshold of  $\geq 0.3$  used in our runs.

### 8.3 Concluding Remarks

In this chapter, we presented our investigations of information extraction methods utilizing large language models that may be used to lessen the workload of creating FAIR and structured metadata, aid researchers of the Biodiversity Exploratories in entering metadata to BExIS, and the use of embeddings to find latent information in publication and dataset titles and abstracts to enrich the metadata further.

While these experiments may have only scratched the surface of what could be achieved with these methods, we believe that these preliminary results can still lead to actionable insights that we will discuss in the following chapters, containing the presentations of our results, evaluation of the research questions, and their discussion.

# Chapter 9

## Results

In this chapter we present the knowledge graph as the result of the modelling process detailed in Ch. 7. We will first give an overview of the graph, explain how it can be queried using SPARQL, present queries to answer the competency questions, and present visualizations of the semantic units constructed on the KG.

### 9.1 Overview

To fill the developed knowledge graph schema with data, we wrote three main R2RML mapping files, for publications, datasets, and links between the two. These mappings span ~11000 lines total, and are used to turn the contents of three *PostgreSQL*<sup>1</sup> database tables into RDF files. The database tables consist of SQL exports from Ontotext Refine projects that contain raw data from the BExIS API, and hundreds of transformation steps, for which provenance data is saved in the project files. We upload the RDF files to the graph store *Ontotext GraphDB*<sup>2</sup>. The final knowledge graph submitted as the result of this work contains 763987 triples total.

### 9.2 Querying Semantic Units

Before presenting the results for the competency questions, we believe there is an advantage in explaining the patterns that can be used to query semantic units such that the following sections can be understood easier.

#### 9.2.1 First Query Pattern

In the first pattern, shown in Listing 9.1 below, shows a simple pattern that lists all triples that are contained in a specific semantic unit. Via the **GRAPH** keyword (line 3), we are able to specify the IRI of a semantic unit, and query over all triples via `?s ?p ?o` as with other known graph queries.

```
1 SELECT ?s ?p ?o
2 WHERE {
```

<sup>1</sup><https://www.postgresql.org/>

<sup>2</sup><https://www.ontotext.com/products/graphdb/>

```

3   GRAPH <SU_IRI> { ?s ?p ?o }
4 }
```

Listing 9.1: SPARQL query to retrieve all triples contained in a specific semantic unit.

	s	p	o
1	ex:semunit/locationStatementUnit/grassland_Plot_31499	rdf:type	ex:semanticunits/assertionalStatementUnit
2	ex:semunit/locationStatementUnit/grassland_Plot_31499	rdf:type	ex:semanticunits/locationStatementUnit
3	ex:semunit/locationStatementUnit/grassland_Plot_31499	ex:semanticUnitSubject	ex:grassland_Plot_31499
4	ex:grassland_Plot_31499	ro:locatedIn	ex:grassland_31499

Figure 9.1: Results for the first semantic unit query pattern.

Inputting the IRI of a specific semantic unit in this pattern, for example a location statement unit that states that a resource is located in a different resource, returns results as shown in Fig. 9.1. The location statement unit for grassland plots of Publication 31499 contains two type triples (the semantic unit assignments), has a semantic unit subject triple, and the semantically meaningful information from the data graph: grassland\_Plot\_31499 is located in grassland\_31499.

### 9.2.2 Second Query Pattern

We introduce a second query pattern in Listing 9.2 that is useful for graph exploration when inspecting compound units. The only difference to the first query pattern is that instead of returning all triples contained within a semantic unit, we only retrieve triples over the hasAssociatedSemanticUnit property.

```

1 PREFIX rdfs: <http://www.w3.org/2000/01/rdf-schema#>
2 SELECT ?Links
3 WHERE {
4   GRAPH <Compound_IRI> {
5     ?s <http://example.com/base/semanticunits/
       hasAssociatedSemanticUnit> ?o .
6   }
7 }
```

Listing 9.2: SPARQL query to retrieve all semantic units that are associated with a compound unit.

Fig. 9.2 shows the results for the second query pattern. The subject in the result list is a compound unit for the links to or from Dataset 20907, and the objects are semantic units, that contain single links. For example, in result two we can observe that Publication 30879 is supplement to Dataset 20907, and in result six we observe that Dataset 31150 is derived from Dataset 20907.

	s	o
1	ex:semunit/linksCompoundUnit/Dataset_20907	ex:semunit/link/Dataset_27746_link_Dataset_20907
2	ex:semunit/linksCompoundUnit/Dataset_20907	ex:semunit/link/Publication_30870_IsSupplementTo_Dataset_20907
3	ex:semunit/linksCompoundUnit/Dataset_20907	ex:semunit/link/Publication_30742_IsSupplementTo_Dataset_20907
4	ex:semunit/linksCompoundUnit/Dataset_20907	ex:semunit/link/Dataset_20907_link_Dataset_11603
5	ex:semunit/linksCompoundUnit/Dataset_20907	ex:semunit/link/Publication_30858_IsSupplementTo_Dataset_20907
6	ex:semunit/linksCompoundUnit/Dataset_20907	ex:semunit/link/Dataset_31150_IsDerivedFrom_Dataset_20907

Figure 9.2: Excerpt of the results for **CQ D2**, queried with semantic units.

### 9.3 Evaluation using competency questions

In this section we evaluate whether the competency questions for the knowledge graph can be answered, and the queries necessary to do so. For better readability, we restate the competency questions:

#### Competency Questions

- **CQ P1:** Who authored the publication  $P$ ?
- **CQ D1:** Who authored dataset  $D$ ?
- **CQ P2:** What datasets is publication  $P$  linked to and what are the types of connections?
- **CQ D2:** What publications is dataset  $D$  linked to and what are the types of connections?
- **CQ P3:** For publication  $P$ , what are the plot levels of the plots it investigated, were they forest or grassland plots, what experiment do they belong to, and what exploratory or multiple exploratories do those plots cover?
- **CQ D3:** For dataset  $D$ , what are the plot levels of the plots it investigated, were they forest or grassland plots, what experiment do they belong to, what exploratory or multiple exploratories do those plots cover, and how many plots per plot level are investigated?
- **CQ P4:** What are all semantic units that have publication  $P$  as subject, or that are associated with it?
- **CQ D4:** What are all semantic units that have dataset  $D$  as subject, or that are associated with it?
- **CQ 5:** List all publications that belong to the infrastructure *Instrumenta-*

*tion/Remote sensing* that investigate plant productivity on grassland plots. What are the datasets they reference and what are their reference types?

### 9.3.1 CQ P1 and CQ D1

To answer the first set of questions, the knowledge graph has to be able to connect publications and datasets to the people involved in their creation and assign appropriate roles to them. We represent this information using several semantic units:

- (1) Named individual identification units for all entities involved,
- (2) several statement units that declare individual people as either first authors or co-authors of a publication, *creator statement units* that link authors to publications, and
- (3) a compound unit that bundles this information together

We then answer the questions using SPARQL queries, and list queries without and with semantic units below in Listings 9.3 and 9.4, and the results of those queries in Fig. 9.3 and 9.4. Regarding the first query, we select persons, roles, and labels, and filter for roles that belong to the publication with the ID 31709. For this we must know the IRI of the first author and co-author roles.

The second query searches for all creator and role statements made inside of the authors and role compound unit of Publication 31709. This returns authors and roles, but not labels (we can however include labels in compound units).

```

1 PREFIX rdfs: <http://www.w3.org/2000/01/rdf-schema#>
2 PREFIX ro: <https://www.ebi.ac.uk/ols4/ontologies/ro>
3
4 SELECT ?person ?label ?role
5 WHERE {
6   ?person ro:hasRole ?role ;
7   rdfs:label ?label .
8   VALUES ?role {
9     <http://example.com/base/Role/FirstAuthor_31709>
10    <http://example.com/base/Role/CoAuthor_31709>
11  }
12 }
13 ORDER BY ?role ?label

```

Listing 9.3: SPARQL query to answer *Who authored the publication  $P$ ?* without using semantic units.

```

1 PREFIX rdfs: <http://www.w3.org/2000/01/rdf-schema#>
2 SELECT ?author ?role
3 WHERE {
4   GRAPH <http://example.com/base/semunit/authorsAndRolesCompoundUnit
5   /Publication_31709> {
6     ?publication <http://purl.org/dc/terms/creator> ?author .
7     ?role <https://www.ebi.ac.uk/ols4/ontologies/roroleOf> ?author .
8   }
9 }
10 ORDER BY ?author ?role

```

8 }

Listing 9.4: SPARQL query to answer *Who authored the publication  $P$ ?* utilizing semantic units.

	person	role	label
1	ex:Author/c7a9cef43a198c762ffe6b89960624c0ac7b07d5	ex:Role/CoAuthor_31709	"Ayasse M."
2	ex:Author/ad9a37783d8927b8cce2260df03bfde37d260e5b	ex:Role/CoAuthor_31709	"Birkenbach M."
3	ex:Author/81c4561e6b0a87360a4699bdbed2dc83bf2de08b	ex:Role/CoAuthor_31709	"Boesing A. L."
4	ex:Author/755d89648a4dc2dd7b01418a79ab92668f11e095	ex:Role/CoAuthor_31709	"Kuppler J."
5	ex:Author/a637631cb562abfa1b21a05c4848f4f723f8cb00	ex:Role/CoAuthor_31709	"Manning P."
6	ex:Author/9bf2a83f6dad388c6668c2a6a60dc27f8c6ce481	ex:Role/CoAuthor_31709	"Olsson O."
7	ex:Author/60b7d80d686ce993bf75b0497b5b77614fb1ea82	ex:Role/CoAuthor_31709	"Wilfert L."
8	ex:Author/794e29c9fd53595c3882027f3e94048f58bf0f01	ex:Role/FirstAuthor_31709	"Florian Straub"

Figure 9.3: Results for **CQ P1**, queried without semantic units.

	author	role
1	ex:Author/794e29c9fd53595c3882027f3e94048f58bf0f01	ex:Role/FirstAuthor_31709
2	ex:Author/ad9a37783d8927b8cce2260df03bfde37d260e5b	ex:Role/CoAuthor_31709
3	ex:Author/c7a9cef43a198c762ffe6b89960624c0ac7b07d5	ex:Role/CoAuthor_31709
4	ex:Author/a637631cb562abfa1b21a05c4848f4f723f8cb00	ex:Role/CoAuthor_31709
5	ex:Author/9bf2a83f6dad388c6668c2a6a60dc27f8c6ce481	ex:Role/CoAuthor_31709
6	ex:Author/81c4561e6b0a87360a4699bdbed2dc83bf2de08b	ex:Role/CoAuthor_31709
7	ex:Author/755d89648a4dc2dd7b01418a79ab92668f11e095	ex:Role/CoAuthor_31709
8	ex:Author/60b7d80d686ce993bf75b0497b5b77614fb1ea82	ex:Role/CoAuthor_31709

Figure 9.4: Results for **CQ P1**, queried with semantic units.

### 9.3.2 CQ P2 and CQ D2

For the second set of competency questions, we investigate links and link types between datasets and publication. We take as example the Dataset 20907, that is connected to various other datasets and publications through various link types. Listing 9.5 shows how we query for this information without semantic units. We query over the predicates *ex:linksTo* and *ex:linksFrom* to return all targets and sources, and then query for predicates that further specify the connection type.

To make the semantic unit approach possible for this competency question, we create identification units for all publications and datasets, create statement units for all types of links that are possible (*linksTo*, *linksFrom*, *isSupplementTo*, *link*, etc.), and create compound units that collect all link statement units for a given subject. Once the semantic units are created, we can query the knowledge graph as shown in Listing 9.6 to return an overview of all connections, and are able to query those units for further information. We omit the results for the query without semantic units because the result table is very large, but show the results of the associated semantic unit approach in Fig. 9.5. Note that we are also able to query for the exact same results with semantic units as without them, if we query for link properties as shown in Listing 9.5, but gain the upside of querying for associated semantic units first to gain an overview.

```

1 PREFIX ex: <http://example.com/base/>
2 select * where {
3   ex:Dataset_20907 ex:linksTo ?target .
4   ex:Dataset_20907 ?propertyTarget ?target .
5   FILTER(?propertyTarget != ex:linksTo)
6   FILTER(?propertyTarget != ex:linksFrom)
7
8   ex:Dataset_20907 ex:linksFrom ?source .
9   ex:Dataset_20907 ?propertySource ?source .
10  FILTER(?propertySource != ex:linksFrom)
11  FILTER(?propertySource != ex:linksTo)
12 } limit 100

```

Listing 9.5: SPARQL query without semantic units that returns all links and link types coming to and from Dataset 20907.

```

1 PREFIX rdfs: <http://www.w3.org/2000/01/rdf-schema#>
2 SELECT ?Links
3 WHERE {
4   GRAPH <http://example.com/base/semunit/linksCompoundUnit/
5       Dataset_20907> {
6     ?dataset <http://example.com/base/semanticunits/
7       hasAssociatedSemanticUnit> ?Links.
8   }
9 }

```

Listing 9.6: SPARQL query with semantic units that returns all links and link types coming to and from Dataset 20907.

	Links
1	<a href="#">ex:semunit/link/Dataset_27746_link_Dataset_20907</a>
2	<a href="#">ex:semunit/link/Publication_30870_IsSupplementTo_Dataset_20907</a>
3	<a href="#">ex:semunit/link/Publication_30742_IsSupplementTo_Dataset_20907</a>
4	<a href="#">ex:semunit/link/Dataset_20907_link_Dataset_11603</a>
5	<a href="#">ex:semunit/link/Publication_30858_IsSupplementTo_Dataset_20907</a>
6	<a href="#">ex:semunit/link/Dataset_31150_IsDerivedFrom_Dataset_20907</a>
7	<a href="#">ex:semunit/link/Publication_30001_IsSupplementTo_Dataset_20907</a>
8	<a href="#">ex:semunit/link/Dataset_20907_link_Dataset_20826</a>
9	<a href="#">ex:semunit/link/Dataset_20826_link_Dataset_20907</a>
10	<a href="#">ex:semunit/link/Dataset_1000_IsDerivedFrom_Dataset_20907</a>
11	<a href="#">ex:semunit/link/Publication_30801_IsSupplementTo_Dataset_20907</a>
12	<a href="#">ex:semunit/link/Dataset_11540_link_Dataset_20907</a>
13	<a href="#">ex:semunit/link/Publication_31014_IsSupplementTo_Dataset_20907</a>
14	<a href="#">ex:semunit/link/Dataset_11541_link_Dataset_20907</a>

Figure 9.5: Results for **CQ D2**, queried with semantic units.

### 9.3.3 CQ P3 and CQ D3

To answer the third set of competency questions, information covering multiple edges in the knowledge graph must be retrieved. We need to query for the publication or dataset that is the source of a plot collection, retrieve what plots are parts of the plot collection and whether they are located in forest or grassland plots, and find the plot levels of the plot collection and the exploratory it belongs to.

For these purposes, we once again construct named individual identification units for all entities in the knowledge graph, and define three types of statement units: source statement units that connect plots collections to publications and datasets, location statement units that contain the information that certain plots are located in forest or grassland environments, and parthood statement units, that convey that plots are parts of plot collections and that plot collections are parts of plot levels and exploratories. Finally, we create a compound unit that is associated with all listed statement units and has as its subject a plot collection.

We list the SPARQL query that retrieves this information without querying semantic units in Listing 9.7 and the query using semantic units is shown in Listing 9.8.

The retrieved results are shown Fig. 9.6, where we observe that Publication 31499 investigates grassland plots across experimental plots of all exploratories, and is part of the LUX experiment.

```

1 PREFIX ex: <http://example.com/base/>
2 PREFIX iao: <http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/iao.owl>
3 PREFIX dcterms: <http://purl.org/dc/terms/>
4 PREFIX obi: <http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/OBI/>
5 PREFIX ro: <https://www.ebi.ac.uk/ols4/ontologies/ro>
6 select * where {
7   <http://example.com/base/Publication_31499> a iao:publication .
8   ?plotcollection dcterms:source <http://example.com/base/
     Publication_31499> .
9   ?plots obi:partOf ?plotcollection .
10  ?plots ro:locatedIn ?environment .
11  ?plotcollection obi:partOf ?plotLevel .
12 } limit 100

```

Listing 9.7: SPARQL query without semantic units that returns the plot collection, plots and the environments they are located in, and the plot level and exploratory the plot collection is part of for Publication 31499.

```

1 PREFIX rdfs: <http://www.w3.org/2000/01/rdf-schema#>
2 PREFIX obi: <http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/OBI/>
3 PREFIX dcterms: <http://purl.org/dc/terms/>
4 PREFIX ro: <https://www.ebi.ac.uk/ols4/ontologies/ro>
5
6 SELECT ?plotCollection ?plots ?plotLevel ?environment WHERE {
7   GRAPH <http://example.com/base/semunit/
     Exploratory_PlotLevel_Collection_Plots_Environment_
     Publication_CompoundUnit/Publication_31499> {
8     ?plotCollection obi:partOf ?plotLevel .
9     ?plots obi:partOf ?plotCollection .

```

```

10      ?plots ro:locatedIn ?environment .
11      ?plotCollection dcterms:source ?publication .
12  }
13 }

```

Listing 9.8: SPARQL query using a compound unit that returns the plot collection, plots and the environments they are located in, and the plot level and exploratory the plot collection is part of for Publication 31499.

	plotcollection	plots	environment	plotLevel
1	ex:PublicationPlotCollection_31499	ex:grassland_Plot_31499	ex:grassland_31499	ex:HAI
2	ex:PublicationPlotCollection_31499	ex:grassland_Plot_31499	ex:grassland_31499	ex:SCH
3	ex:PublicationPlotCollection_31499	ex:grassland_Plot_31499	ex:grassland_31499	ex:ALB
4	ex:PublicationPlotCollection_31499	ex:grassland_Plot_31499	ex:grassland_31499	ex:EPSCH
5	ex:PublicationPlotCollection_31499	ex:grassland_Plot_31499	ex:grassland_31499	ex:LUXSCH
6	ex:PublicationPlotCollection_31499	ex:grassland_Plot_31499	ex:grassland_31499	ex:EPHAI
7	ex:PublicationPlotCollection_31499	ex:grassland_Plot_31499	ex:grassland_31499	ex:LUXHAI
8	ex:PublicationPlotCollection_31499	ex:grassland_Plot_31499	ex:grassland_31499	ex:EPALB
9	ex:PublicationPlotCollection_31499	ex:grassland_Plot_31499	ex:grassland_31499	ex:LUXALB

Figure 9.6: Results for **CQ D3**, queried without semantic units.

### 9.3.4 CQ P4 and CQ D4

To answer the fourth set of competency questions, we return all semantic units that have a specific publication or dataset as its subject, and also return all semantic units that the results of this query are associated with. Listing 9.9 contains this SPARQL query. We first query via the semantic unit subject property in line four, and then append further optional associations in line five. This query returns a list of nine results that we present in Fig. 9.7, containing an identification unit, statement units related to creators, authors, links between datasets and publications, and the compound unit created to answer the previous competency question.

```

1 PREFIX ex: <http://example.com/base/>
2 PREFIX iao: <http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/iao.owl>
3 select * where {
4     ?semUnits <http://example.com/base/semanticUnitSubject> <http://
            example.com/base/Publication_31149> .
5     OPTIONAL{?compounds <http://example.com/base/semanticunits/
            hasAssociatedSemanticUnit>+ ?semUnits .}
6 } limit 100

```

Listing 9.9: SPARQL query that returns all semantic units that have the Publication 31149 as its subject, and all further associated semantic units.

	semUnits	compounds
1	ex:semunit/namedindividualidentificationunit/Publication_31149	
2	ex:semunit/creatorStatementUnit/Publication_31149	ex:semunit/authorsAndRolesCompoundUnit/Publication_31149
3	ex:semunit/authorsAndRolesCompoundUnit/Publication_31149	
4	ex:semunit/linksCompoundUnit/Publication_31149	
5	ex:semunit/link/Publication_31149_IsSupplementTo_Dataset_31136	ex:semunit/linksCompoundUnit/Publication_31149
6	ex:semunit/link/Publication_31149_IsSupplementTo_Dataset_31136	ex:semunit/linksCompoundUnit/Dataset_31136
7	ex:semunit/link/Publication_31149_IsSupplementTo_Dataset_31133	ex:semunit/linksCompoundUnit/Publication_31149
8	ex:semunit/link/Publication_31149_IsSupplementTo_Dataset_31133	ex:semunit/linksCompoundUnit/Dataset_31133
9	ex:semunit/Exploratory_PlotLevel_Collection_Plots_Environment_Publication_CompoundUnit/Publication_31149	

Figure 9.7: Results for **CQ P4**.

### 9.3.5 CQ 5

To answer the final competency question we must arrange a variety of information across the knowledge graph, querying for both publications, datasets, links, infrastructures, plots, environments, species, and processes and services. The SPARQL query necessary to return this information therefore is more complicated than previous queries. We list the query that does not utilize semantic units in Listing 9.10, and omit prefixes in this listing to save space.

```

1 select DISTINCT ?publication ?title ?titleTo ?linkPropTo ?
      projectToLabel ?titleFrom ?linkPropFrom ?projectFromLabel where
      {
2     ?publication a iao:publication .
3     ?publication obi:hasPart ?titleEntity .
4     ?titleEntity a iao:documentTitle .
5     ?titleEntity dcterms:description ?title .
6     ?publication obi:partOf <http://example.com/base/
          BE_Infrastructure_Instrumentation_RemoteSensing> .
7     OPTIONAL{
8       ?linkTo a iao:dataset .
9       ?publication ex:linksTo ?linkTo .
10      ?linkTo dcterms:title ?titleTo .
11      ?publication ?linkPropTo ?linkTo .
12      FILTER(?linkPropTo != ex:linksTo)
13    }
14    OPTIONAL{
15      ?linkFrom a iao:dataset .
16      ?publication ex:linksFrom ?linkFrom .
17      ?linkFrom dcterms:title ?titleFrom .
18      ?publication ?linkPropFrom ?linkFrom .
19      FILTER(?linkPropFrom != ex:linksFrom) .
20    }
21    ?plotcollection dcterms:source ?publication .
22    ?plots obi:partOf ?plotcollection .
23    ?plots ro:locatedIn ?env .
24    ?env a envo:grasslandBiome .
25    ?plots obi:hasPart <http://www.gbif.org/species/6> .
26    ?process ro:hasParticipant ?plots .
27    ?process a ?processType .
28    ?process a <http://vocab.lter-europe.net/EnvThes/21417> .
29 } limit 100

```

Listing 9.10: SPARQL query to answer CQ5 that does not query over semantic units.

Further, the query over the compound unit implemented for this competency question is shown in Listing 9.11 below. Unfortunately, this query is considerably longer than its counterpart and does not utilize the compound units well as we still have to fetch a lot of information from outside the named subgraph, as not all necessary triples are contained within it. The query consists of four blocks, the first (lines 2 to 9) collect all compound units created for this competency question and collect outside information while the second and third (lines 10 to 27) collect the titles of

linked datasets. The final fourth block (lines 36 to 44) contains a GRAPH query over the compound unit, that collects triples that are contained within it. This functions similarly to the query without semantic units and uses the same triple patterns.

To fetch all information from the compound unit alone, it would have to be added to the compound unit in its entirety, including publication and dataset titles of linked resources, or various type information. We believe that the semantic unit query is subpar than its counterpart in this example because we are searching for a list of publications instead of returning information for a resource that is already known (we can query using its IRI).

```

1 select DISTINCT ?publication ?title ?titleTo ?linkPropTo ?titleFrom
      ?linkPropFrom where {
2   ?compoundUnit a <http://example.com/base/semanticunits/
      InfrastructureProcessAndServiceEnvironmentPublication
      LinkProjectsCompoundUnit> .
3   ?compoundUnit <http://example.com/base/semanticUnitSubject> ?
      publication .
4   ?publication obi:hasPart ?titleEntity .
5   ?titleEntity a iao:documentTitle .
6   ?titleEntity dcterms:description ?title .
7   ?env a envo:grasslandBiome .
8   ?process a ?processType .
9   ?process a <http://vocabs.lter-europe.net/EnvThes/21417> .
10  OPTIONAL {
11    GRAPH ?compoundUnit { ?publication ex:linksTo ?linkTo . }
12    ?linkTo a iao:dataset ;
13    dcterms:title ?titleTo .
14  OPTIONAL {
15    GRAPH ?compoundUnit { ?publication ?linkPropTo ?linkTo .
16      }
17    FILTER(?linkPropTo NOT IN (ex:linksTo, ex:linksFrom))
18  }
19  OPTIONAL {
20    GRAPH ?compoundUnit { ?publication ex:linksFrom ?linkFrom .
21      }
22    ?linkFrom a iao:dataset ;
23    dcterms:title ?titleFrom .
24  OPTIONAL {
25    GRAPH ?compoundUnit { ?publication ?linkPropFrom ?
26      linkFrom . }
27    FILTER(?linkPropFrom NOT IN (ex:linksTo, ex:linksFrom))
28  }
29  GRAPH ?compoundUnit {
30    ?publication obi:partOf <http://example.com/base/
      BE_Infrastructure_Instrumentation_RemoteSensing> .
31    ?plotcollection dcterms:source ?publication .
32    ?process ro:hasParticipant ?plots .
33    ?plots obi:partOf ?plotcollection .

```

```

33      ?plots ro:locatedIn ?env .
34      ?plots obi:hasPart <http://www.gbif.org/species/6> .
35
36      OPTIONAL{
37          ?publication ex:linksTo ?linkTo .
38          ?publication ?linkPropTo ?linkTo .
39          FILTER(?linkPropTo != ex:linksTo)
40      }
41      OPTIONAL{
42          ?publication ex:linksFrom ?linkFrom .
43          ?publication ?linkPropFrom ?linkFrom .
44          FILTER(?linkPropFrom != ex:linksFrom) .
45      }
46  }
47 } limit 100

```

Listing 9.11: SPARQL query to answer CQ5 that queries over semantic units.

We present an excerpt of the results from this query in Fig. 9.8 that shows the first two results in which Publication 31084 fits the query requirements and is supplement to a dataset about vegetation records and two further datasets that are derived from the publication about predicted grassland biomass and predicted plant species richness in grasslands. In total this query returns 24 results.

	publication	title	titleTo	linkPropTo	titleFrom	linkPropFrom
1	ex:Publication_31084	"Predicting plant biomass and species richness in temperate grasslands across regions, time, and land management with remote sensing and deep learning"	"Vegetation Records for 150 Grassland EPs in 2018, Header Data without Species Identities (incl. biomass)"	<a href="http://example.com/prop/IsSupplementTo">http://example.com/prop/IsSupplementTo</a>	"Predicted grassland biomass 2020-2021"	<a href="http://example.com/prop/IsDerivedFrom">http://example.com/prop/IsDerivedFrom</a>
2	ex:Publication_31084	"Predicting plant biomass and species richness in temperate grasslands across regions, time, and land management with remote sensing and deep learning"	"Vegetation Records for 150 Grassland EPs in 2018, Header Data without Species Identities (incl. biomass)"	<a href="http://example.com/prop/IsSupplementTo">http://example.com/prop/IsSupplementTo</a>	"Predicted plant species richness in grasslands 2017-2021"	<a href="http://example.com/prop/IsDerivedFrom">http://example.com/prop/IsDerivedFrom</a>

Figure 9.8: Results for CQ 5.

## 9.4 Semantic Unit Visualization

An advantage of semantic units we discovered when testing different SPARQL queries to answer the competency questions, is the visualization of their data graphs, which differs from the visualization of the whole data graph as it contains only relevant triples and is less cluttered as a result. We believe this might be of great use for users, especially for graph exploration and result representation. In this section

we present visualizations of the compound units used to answer the competency questions.

We are able to create these visualizations through simple CONSTRUCT queries of compound units, as presented in Listing 9.12:

```

1 CONSTRUCT { ?s ?p ?o }
2 WHERE {
3   GRAPH <http://example.com/base/semunit/linksCompoundUnit/
        Dataset_20907> { ?s ?p ?o }
4 }
5 LIMIT 100

```

Listing 9.12: Listing of a SPARQL CONSTRUCT query that returns a visualization of a links compound unit.

In the first example, shown in Fig. 9.9, we visualize the compound unit that contains authors of a publication and their roles. The right hand side of the figure contains the compound unit as a red node. Attached to it are its types and associated semantic units, and its subject, the Publication 30000 on the left hand side. Linked to the publication are all creators of it, and the first author or co-author role, depending on their involvement. The visual representation even attaches the resource labels dynamically instead of displaying raw IRIs, so users can gain a better understanding of a nodes contents.




Figure 9.9: Visual representation of the authors and roles compound unit for Publication 30000.

The second example (Fig. 9.10), shows Dataset 20907 and all of its links and link types (masked in the figure by the '2 predicates' statements to other publications




Figure 9.10: Visual representation of the links compound unit for Dataset 20907.

and datasets, as well as all semantic units that are associated to the dataset links compound unit.




Figure 9.11: Visual representation of the compound unit developed for the third competency question.

The final two visualizations (Fig. 9.11 and Fig. 9.12) present the contents of the compound units used to answer competency questions CQ P4, CQ D4, and CQ5.

While the former has a smaller amount of nodes and edges, containing information about plot levels and exploratories, plot collections, grassland plots and environments, and Publication 31499 as the semantic unit subject, the latter shows the path lengths covered to answer the competency question. As in previous figures, the right hand side contains information related to semantic units and the seven associated semantic units necessary to answer the competency question. The center contains Publication 31084 as the semantic unit subject, its infrastructure types, information about the publications content (productivity of plants in grassland environments), and links to other datasets.

With this presentation of semantic unit visualizations, we conclude the results chapter of this thesis in which we covered the constructed knowledge graph, semantic unit querying, and competency question evaluation. We will discuss these results and the insights we can gain from them in the following chapter, and include further discussions about the limitations of our approach, and present ideas for future work.




Figure 9.12: Visual representation of the compound unit developed for the fifth competency question.

# Chapter 10

## Discussion

In the previous chapter we presented the knowledge graph that is the main contribution of this work and evaluated whether the competency questions can be answered by querying the knowledge graph with and without the use of semantic units. We also presented visualizations of compound units that we believe may support users in some application scenarios.

In this chapter, we evaluate whether we are able to answer the research questions with the results gathered in this work, discuss the impact of the competency questions we were able to answer using semantic units and present visualization scenarios for users. Further, we discuss the limitations of our work and end the chapter with directions for future work.

### 10.1 Evaluation of Research Questions

Below, we list the research questions and their corresponding sub-questions once more and evaluate whether we are able to answer them using the methods employed in this thesis.

- **RQ1:** Does semantic unit modelling reduce SPARQL query complexity for representative tasks compared to querying the data graph?
- **RQ2:** Can large language models be used to extract metadata categories from publication and dataset titles and abstracts?
- **RQ3:** Can embedding models be used to extract latent information from publication and dataset titles and abstracts to enrich BE metadata?

We further split the research questions into sub-questions:

- **SQ1:** Can SPARQL queries on the constructed knowledge graph answer sets of competency questions?
- **SQ2:** Can the same SPARQL queries be formulated over semantic units to answer the same sets of competency questions?
- **SQ3:** Is SPARQL query complexity lower for queries that answer competency question when querying over semantic units compared to queries on the data

graph only?

- **SQ4:** Which metadata categories can the LLM extraction approach predict reliably (F1-score of 0.8 or higher)?
- **SQ5:** Can an embedding approach assign publication and dataset titles and abstracts to the research goals of the BE?

### 10.1.1 RQ1: Discussion of Competency questions

We were able to successfully answer all competency questions with the knowledge graph created in this work by querying the base graph and by querying semantic units. What we aim to discuss further in this section however, is how both query types compare and whether the introduction of semantic units impacts queries. For this purpose we distinguish two query types: In the first, we query information about a known resource as in the first four sets of competency questions and in the second, we are searching for resources that fit a specific description like in the last competency question, where we query for all publications of a specific infrastructure, environment type, etc.

Regarding the first query type, we notice that the queries arguably do not differ much or at all. Using the first set of competency questions as an example, in which we query for authors and their roles in relation to a publication or dataset, we require the IRI of the first and co-author roles for a specific Publication to filter their roles and labels. When querying for this information using the authors and roles compound unit, we need the IRI of the compound unit itself, and can then retrieve relevant triples without requiring more specific information. Additionally, besides the use of a GRAPH keyword in the SPARQL query, the actual query inside that subgraph is rather simple, stating (1) ?publication dcterms:creator ?author and (2) ?role ro:roleOf ?author. A further result of this is that the semantic unit query is shorter than the data graph query, which is noteworthy but does not allow for any conclusions about actual query complexity.

For the second query type however, we notice substantial difference between the two approaches. From the perspective of a researcher that created the knowledge graph's schema and its data graph, answering the fifth competency question that connects information across the whole knowledge graph, was rather simple and its complexity derives mostly from two OPTIONAL statements for possible links to and from datasets, which an experienced SPARQL user may already be able to solve without much difficulty.

The experienced difficulty for the query using semantic units however, was much higher. In fact it was even more difficult than we expected beforehand, exposing limitations of the semantic unit approach implemented for this knowledge graph. The approach to answering the competency question follows the same intuition: Filter for publications that fit certain criteria and then retrieve further information from them. However, as the semantic units are implemented in the graph currently, it was impossible to retrieve all information via the compound unit without accessing the data graph directly, as not all information that we expected to require to answer the question was contained in the compound unit. This resulted in a data graph query with the same complexity as the query without semantic units, that has

additional complexity via the GRAPH statement, and added OPTIONAL queries to bind variables reliably.

We argue this complexity derives from two sources, the first being the actual difficulty of answering this query when semantic units are supposed to be used in its query due to the current implementation, and the second being a result of the learning curve that is to be expected when introducing new concepts. We expect difficulties from the first source to be alleviated by adding additional triples to compound units, such as labels or type definitions to leverage them in the query, but we are currently unsure if this would contradict either the intentions behind or explicit definitions for semantic units.

We believe the learning curve introduced when querying a knowledge graph that contains semantic units should be investigated properly with a user evaluation, which we describe further in the limitations section below. However, we assume that the experienced query difficulty for users for the first query type should be about even when comparing queries with and without semantic units. For the second type of queries, we believe that in their current implementation, information should be queried without semantic units, or that query templates should be provided (a functionality of GraphDB).

To conclude, the answers to both **SQ1** and **SQ2** is yes on the basis that all competency questions could be answered on the constructed knowledge graph with and without semantic units. Regarding the third sub-question, **SQ3**, our findings suggest that for questions to retrieve information about a known resource, experienced SPARQL query complexity is comparable to conventional queries. For the second query type however, our findings suggest that query complexity is higher compared to conventional queries for the reasons listed above, which leads us to the following answer: No, SPARQL query complexity when querying over semantic units is likely not lower than the complexity of conventional queries. (**Important Note:** As we will discuss in the limitations section below, we were not able to conduct a proper user evaluation, leading these results to not be indicative, but not conclusive, as the sample size for experienced query complexity is only  $n=1$ .)

Therefore, our answer to **RQ1**, the first research question, is that while semantic unit modelling produces a knowledge graph that is able to answer all competency questions for representative tasks, SPARQL query complexity is not reduced compared to conventional queries on the data graph.

### 10.1.2 RQ2: Discussion of Metadata Category Extraction

In the method chapter that details our implementation of the extraction approach (Ch. 8), we list the F1-scores for all extracted categories. There, we observe that extraction quality differs between categories that only have two possible answers (yes or no), and those categories that allow multiple answers from a selection of keywords. To answer **SQ4**, we list the following categories with F1-Scores above 0.8 below. We choose F1-scores as the threshold metric as it represents a balance between precision and recall, and choose the value of 0.8 as we deem this to be a sufficient indicator for the feasibility of this approach if it were to be improved further in the future.

- Publications (yes/no): belowground, laboratory
- Datasets (yes/no): grassland, forest, aboveground, belowground, plot repetitions
- Publications (multi-label): N/A
- Datasets (multi-label): content type

The extraction method we implemented in this work leaves much room for improvement as we implemented a zero-shot approach. Therefore, with fine-tuning on test, validation, and evaluation data, and further improvements to the prompting strategy, the results of this extraction could be improved further. We also anticipate that the evaluation strategy could be enhanced further. At this point, we would also like to note that for datasets, coverage for many metadata fields and especially dataset abstracts/summaries is rather low, which will make it more difficult to improve this approach further in the future.

This leads us to answer yes to the second research question, **RQ2**, because we were able to find at least nine metadata categories we were able to extract with an F1-score above 0.8 using the implemented approach. This however only covers a small amount of total metadata categories, leading us to the conclusion that the approach should be developed further before its used in practice.

To conclude, our results show that this extraction approach has the potential to create structured metadata from publication and dataset titles and abstracts, and support workflows to creating FAIR-aligned metadata, and reduce human effort in creating structured metadata.

### 10.1.3 RQ3: Discussion of Embedding Approach

The final research question is concerned with the third part of the implemented method: Utilizing an embedding model to extract latent information from publication and dataset titles and abstracts.

In the first embedding task we investigated, we were able to find two latent topic clusters that were highly populated: *land use intensity of grassland soil* (194 documents), and the *effects of land use on vegetation and diversity on grassland experimental plots* (70 documents).

Regarding the second task, clustering documents around anchor concepts, we were able to find a variety of clusters, with non-adaptive clustering showing more promising results than adaptive clustering. The biggest clusters formed around the concepts *nutritional constraints* (563), *species distribution models* (442), *morphological adaptation* (142), *metagenomics* (128), *plant characteristics* (95), *soil salinity/soil sodicity* (82), *land use/land cover change* (78), *microfossils* (78), and more.

In the third task, we embed the main research goals of the Biodiversity Exploratories in the embedding space and compute the cosine similarity of documents to the embedded research goals. The implementation allows us to tune the results of the assignments using a variety of metrics. We are able to specify a percentage of coverage for the documents, for example 80%, to adaptively assign a cosine similarity threshold to enforce 80% of documents to be assigned to a research goal. We can

also specify an acceptance threshold for cosine similarity independent of percentage coverage, and we can allow multi-label assignments depending on a specified margin between top candidate research goals.

We believe that these approaches can be improved further, mainly by fine-tuning the embedding model. By creating datasets of positive and negative pairs, we would be able to train the embedding model to place related concepts and documents closer together in the embedding space, and pull unrelated ones further apart. Also, an evaluation is necessary to judge how accurate the cluster, concept, and research goal assignments are.

Considering these results, we conclude that the answer to both **SQ5** and **RQ3** is yes. The embedding approach is able to assign publication and datasets titles and abstracts to the research goals of the Biodiversity Exploratories (though further evaluation is necessary to judge how good the assignments are), and embedding models can be used to extract latent information from publication and dataset titles and abstracts to enrich BE metadata.

## 10.2 Visualization

A noteworthy finding in this work regarding semantic units is their ability to provide a basis for visualization of semantically meaningful triples from the knowledge graph, that can be implemented for multiple use cases and integrated easily in an application or user interface.

We demonstrate this point by comparing visualizations. Fig. 10.1 shows the visual graph for all nodes and edges that are connected to Publication 30030 in the center of the figure. Including data properties, there are 52 connections to or from the publication that when visualized at the same time, are difficult to understand for users. Compare this to the visualizations from the previous chapter, for example Fig. 9.11 and Fig. 9.12. Even though both visualizations, especially the latter, contain many nodes and edges, we believe that they are still easier to understand than the conventional visualization in the first figure. This approach also has the added benefit of showing semantically meaningful connections across the knowledge graph, relating information across publications, datasets, plots, environments, etc., and additionally isolating only those connections that are relevant for a given scenario (for example queries relating to competency questions). As an added benefit, GraphDB allows users to save these visualizations for themselves or share them with other users as graph *snapshots*.

These snapshots of compound units could be used in applications and user interfaces to give users greater understanding of the knowledge graph and its contents. One can also imagine a scenario in which these visualizations are created dynamically next to a SPARQL query interface. In such an application, users could write SPARQL queries using semantic units, and have visualizations of the semantic units on the side to assist in navigating queries, or to gain an overview of information that can be queried within a semantic unit.

For a further application scenario, we refer to [Vogt, 2025]. In the eighth modelling challenge, Vogt presents an approach to creating topic-specific subgraphs using com-




Figure 10.1: Visual of all nodes and edges connected to Publication 30030.

ound units called *standard information units* that can be used to retrieve semantically coherent subgraphs, create views for domain-specific information expectations, support modular graph construction, and more [Vogt, 2025].

### 10.3 Remark - Compound Unit Implementation

At this point in the discussion we add a remark regarding the technical implementation of compound units for readers that might implement a semantic unit approach in a knowledge graph:

We encountered a technical issue at the stage of triple generation in which mappings are executed on the source data that is specific to compound units or those semantic units, that reuse content from others. When assigning graph maps from one semantic unit to a compound unit, not all triples from the data graph are added to the data graph of the compound unit as expected, as the mappings are not executed transitively. This leads to the mappings requiring the specific triples that should appear in the compound unit to be assigned separately, introducing additional implementation overhead, as specific triples must be mapped to each semantic

unit they should appear in.

## 10.4 Limitations

In this section we discuss the shortcomings of this work and the reasons behind them. We encountered many difficulties at various points during modelling and implementation, and believe that there are insights and directions for future work to be gained by examining them further.

### 10.4.1 Time constraints

The possibly largest limitation we faced in this work were time constraints. We discuss many different ideas in this thesis, for example general KG modelling, semantic unit modelling, and two LLM tasks, and believe that especially the second part of our method regarding large language models only scratches the surface of what may be possible to achieve for the tested applications, but also for other tasks.

### 10.4.2 Hand-written Mappings / Semantic Unit Mappings

The R2RML mappings for the knowledge graph and semantic units developed in this thesis were entirely written by hand. This results in  $\sim$ 11000 lines of mappings, an immense effort that is currently not scalable in any way and is prone to errors. Further, the semantic units we implemented for the graph to answer the competency questions were implemented for this specific purpose, and therefore, semantic unit coverage on the graph is low. If semantic units are supposed to be implemented on larger knowledge graphs in the future, although the application in this work already surfaced significant application complexities and challenges, an automated way for mapping generation or significant aids for mapping writing are necessary.

### 10.4.3 Modelling challenges

As we described in Sec. 7.3, we encountered several modelling challenges regarding the source data, the open world assumption and how to model complete information, and negations. We were able to solve most modelling challenges that derive from the source data, resulting in a knowledge graph that is able to answer all competency questions and contains as much knowledge from the publication and dataset metadata as possible, however, the other challenges remain open questions as we were not able to find further answers due to time limitations.

### 10.4.4 User and Performance Evaluation

One goal of semantic units are to enhance cognitive interoperability for users of the knowledge graph, which we were not able to evaluate as we did not have the time necessary to conduct a user evaluation. However, we still want to provide a plan for how semantic units could be evaluated using the graph developed in this work:

The evaluation should focus on multiple points, the first being reported query complexity by users when comparing queries with and without semantic units. The

second should focus on graph exploration and is concerned with the question whether semantic units can support users in navigating the knowledge graph, or to get a grasp on the contents of the knowledge graph and the existing connection between data points contained within it. Further points for a general performance evaluation should focus on actual query performance, meaning how many triples are evaluated per query with and without semantic unit queries, and how that impacts query execution times. Another important point regards scalability: Scaling knowledge graphs from thousands to millions to billions of triples is already a difficult technical task and semantic units introduce new triples to a knowledge graph, the impacts of which have not been evaluated previously.

#### 10.4.5 LLM Applications

The two LLM applications covered in this work present valuable insights, but can be improved further from many different perspectives as time limitations did not allow us to improve upon the first results shown in Ch. 8 further. We outlined possible improvements in the discussion of their respective research questions above (Subsections 10.1.2 and 10.1.3).

#### 10.4.6 Closed Source Data

Currently, publication and dataset metadata of the Biodiversity Exploratories is not available publicly. Therefore, the instantiated knowledge graph presented in this work can not be made available online. When the data becomes available, we provide access to the graph in this GitHub repository<sup>1</sup>.

### 10.5 Future Work

To close out the discussion of the contents and results of this thesis, we discuss directions for future work we believe have potential to contribute to the research field further.

#### 10.5.1 Integration into BE Infrastructure

One point of interest is the integration of this knowledge graph into existing infrastructures and workflows of the Biodiversity Exploratories. For this the knowledge graph would need complete semantic unit coverage, a SPARQL query interface, and an application to facilitate usage of the graph.

Further, we believe that the challenges and issues we have encountered with the source publication and dataset metadata can provide valuable insights for BExIS and the metadata schemata used within it. The T-Box developed for this knowledge graph may be used to provide semantic meaning for metadata categories, and the modelling challenges may inform possible adaptations to BE metadata schemata.

---

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/fusion-jena/Biodiversity-Exploratories-Knowledge-Graph>

### 10.5.2 Automated Semantic Unit Mappings

As we discussed in the limitations section, semantic unit mappings as implemented in this work require immense manual effort and are therefore prone to include errors. Further research to support the creation of R2RML mappings and semantic unit mappings might therefore be of value.

### 10.5.3 Reasoning Applications

Unfortunately, we were not able to explore reasoning applications both on the data graph and the semantic unit graph developed in this work. Therefore, applications of reasoning and SHACL validation could contribute to enhance the quality of the knowledge graph. Further, reasoning applications on semantic units have not been investigated before and may contribute to arguments for including semantic units in a knowledge graph.

### 10.5.4 Further LLM Applications

As discussed above, the two LLM applications we implemented in this work can be improved further. Additionally, LLMs bear great potential for other knowledge graph applications, for example, assisting KG construction workflows, SPARQL query support, and knowledge graph embeddings.

# Chapter 11

## Conclusion

Knowledge graphs bear great potential as a tool to support biodiversity research, especially the creation of FAIR datasets, their integration with existing knowledge bases, and assistance in synthesis efforts and meta studies. Their biggest disadvantage however, is how challenging their usage is. Querying knowledge graphs and understanding the way they represent knowledge is especially difficult for many user groups, and in most cases, also the researchers we aim to support by providing knowledge graphs for their domains.

In this thesis, we modelled and constructed a knowledge graph for publication and dataset metadata of the Biodiversity Exploratories, and contribute the first implementation of semantic units. We evaluate how they can be used in SPARQL queries to answer sets of competency questions of different complexities, show how semantic units can be visualized to support the cognitive interoperability for users, and outline how the visualizations may be utilized for knowledge graph applications.

Additionally, we implemented two applications using large language models on the source data. The first investigates how and which structured metadata categories can be constructed from publication and dataset titles and abstracts to alleviate the workloads of this time consuming task. The second utilizes embeddings to find latent concepts in titles and abstracts, clusters publications and datasets around anchor concepts, and assigns entries to the research goals of the Biodiversity Exploratories to further enrich the metadata.

The results of our competency question evaluation suggest that semantic unit query complexity is comparable to traditional queries for competency questions in which information about a known entity must be retrieved. For queries that retrieve all entities that fit a specific pattern (environment type, experiment type, etc.) however, query complexity with this semantic unit implementation seems to grow considerably, leading us to conclude that further user evaluation and implementation changes are necessary.

Results for the LLM extraction task suggest that LLMs bear potential to extract structured metadata categories from titles and abstracts when fine-tuned correctly, especially for metadata categories that only have two possible values. Multi-label categories however, are more difficult to predict. Further, the results for embedding tasks suggest that there is potential for enriching BE metadata using anchor

clustering and research goal linking approaches, while more tuning is necessary for latent topic discovery.

In conclusion, this work advances research on semantic units and paves the way for further investigations into their potential to enhance cognitive interoperability and to reduce query difficulty for non-domain experts. We also demonstrate the potential of LLMs for metadata curation and latent information extraction, pointing to promising directions for future work. Overall, this thesis contributes to FAIRer research data representation and brings knowledge graphs closer to becoming tools to support biodiversity research.

# Appendix A

## Use of Generative AI

Generative AI (model: *OpenAI GPT-5 Thinking*) was used as a programming assistant for the code and figures underlying Chapter 8, *Method - Extracting Information from Metadata using Large Language Models*, the third part of the method section. Below, we supply a list of scripts and figures that were created with the use of generative AI. We also provide a link to the GitHub repository that contains a text file with conversation links and a mapping to which scripts were generated in which conversation<sup>1</sup>. The raw scripts can also be found in the GitHub repository.

### Figures:

- Fig 8.1: Plot of cosine similarity scores (x-axis) of the top candidates and the margin between top1 and top2 candidates (y-axis). Instead of dots, colored hexes are used to represent the number of documents per coordinate, with darker colors (purple) representing lower number of documents, and lighter colors (yellow) representing higher number of documents. The light blue dotted line on the left side of the plot represents the cosine similarity threshold set for our runs of the scripts, accepting candidates at a score of  $>=0.3$ .
- Fig 8.2: Collection of plots for the four research goals of the Biodiversity Exploratories. Plots show the distribution of cosine similarity scores (x-axis) and total number of documents per score (y-axis).
- Fig 8.3: Plot showing the tradeoff between threshold of cosine similarity scores to assign candidates to research goals (x-axis) and the overall document coverage this results in (y-axis). The blue vertical line represents the threshold of  $>= 0.3$  used in our runs.

### Scripts:

- SLURM scripts
- Scripts for metadata reconstruction
- Script to generate figures
- Embedding and Clustering workflow scripts

---

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/fusion-jena/Biodiversity-Exploratories-Knowledge-Graph/tree/main/GenAI>

# Bibliography

[Al Mustafa et al., 2025] Al Mustafa, T., Zander, F., Schellenberger Costa, D., Kleinstuber, E., Wirth, C., and König-Ries, B. (2025). Semantic technologies for interdisciplinary research: A case study on improving data synthesis and integration in the biodiversity domain. In *Datenbanksysteme für Business, Technologie und Web-Workshopband (BTW 2025)*, pages 151–164. Gesellschaft für Informatik, Bonn.

[Arenas et al., 2014] Arenas, M., Cuenca Grau, B., Kharlamov, E., Marciuska, S., Zheleznyakov, D., and Jimenez-Ruiz, E. (2014). Semfacet: semantic faceted search over yago. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on World Wide Web*, pages 123–126.

[Arenas et al., 2016] Arenas, M., Grau, B. C., Kharlamov, E., Marciuška, Š., and Zheleznyakov, D. (2016). Faceted search over rdf-based knowledge graphs. *Journal of Web Semantics*, 37:55–74.

[Baader et al., 2008] Baader, F., Horrocks, I., and Sattler, U. (2008). Description logics. *Foundations of Artificial Intelligence*, 3:135–179.

[Baader and Nutt, 2003] Baader, F. and Nutt, W. (2003). Basic description logics. In *The description logic handbook: theory, implementation, and applications*, pages 43–95.

[Bandrowski et al., 2016] Bandrowski, A., Brinkman, R., Brochhausen, M., Brush, M. H., Bug, B., Chibucos, M. C., Clancy, K., Courtot, M., Derom, D., Dumontier, M., et al. (2016). The ontology for biomedical investigations. *PloS one*, 11(4):e0154556.

[Bravo et al., 2019] Bravo, M., Hoyos Reyes, L. F., and Reyes Ortiz, J. A. (2019). Methodology for ontology design and construction. *Contaduría y administración*, 64(4).

[Breitman et al., 2007] Breitman, K., Casanova, M., and Truszkowski, W. (2007). *Ontology in Computer Science*, pages 17–34. Springer London, London.

[Callahan et al., 2024] Callahan, T. J., Tripodi, I. J., Stefanski, A. L., Cappelletti, L., Taneja, S. B., Wyrwa, J. M., Casiraghi, E., Matentzoglu, N. A., Reese, J., Silverstein, J. C., et al. (2024). An open source knowledge graph ecosystem for the life sciences. *Scientific Data*, 11(1):363.

[Campello et al., 2013] Campello, R. J., Moulavi, D., and Sander, J. (2013). Density-based clustering based on hierarchical density estimates. In *Pacific-Asia conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 160–172. Springer.

[Chamanara et al., 2021] Chamanara, J., Gaikwad, J., Gerlach, R., Algergawy, A., Ostrowski, A., and König-Ries, B. (2021). Bexit2: A fair-aligned data management system for biodiversity, ecology and environmental data. *Biodiversity Data Journal*, 9:e72901.

[Chen et al., 2024] Chen, J., Xiao, S., Zhang, P., Luo, K., Lian, D., and Liu, Z. (2024). Bge m3-embedding: Multi-lingual, multi-functionality, multi-granularity text embeddings through self-knowledge distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03216*.

[Choi et al., 2006] Choi, N., Song, I.-Y., and Han, H. (2006). A survey on ontology mapping. *ACM Sigmod Record*, 35(3):34–41.

[Christou and Shimizu, 2025] Christou, A. and Shimizu, C. (2025). Improving knowledge graph understanding with contextual views. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.02413*.

[Daquino et al., 2020] Daquino, M., Peroni, S., Shotton, D., Colavizza, G., Ghavimi, B., Lauscher, A., Mayr, P., Romanello, M., and Zumstein, P. (2020). The opencitations data model. In *International semantic web conference*, pages 447–463. Springer.

[Diallo et al., 2024] Diallo, P. A. K. K., Reyd, S., and Zouaq, A. (2024). A comprehensive evaluation of neural SPARQL query generation from natural language questions. *IEEE Access*.

[Drummond and Shearer, 2006] Drummond, N. and Shearer, R. (2006). The open world assumption. In *eSI workshop: the closed world of databases meets the open world of the semantic web*, volume 15, page 1.

[Dubey et al., 2016] Dubey, M., Dasgupta, S., Sharma, A., Höffner, K., and Lehmann, J. (2016). Asknow: A framework for natural language query formalization in sparql. In *European Semantic Web Conference*, pages 300–316. Springer.

[D’Souza et al., 2025] D’Souza, J., Laubach, Z., Al Mustafa, T., Zarrieß, S., Frühstückl, R., and Illari, P. (2025). Mining for species, locations, habitats, and ecosystems from scientific papers in invasion biology: A large-scale exploratory study with large language models. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Ecology, Environment, and Natural Language Processing (NLP4Ecology2025)*, pages 16–23.

[Ehrlinger and Wöß, 2016] Ehrlinger, L. and Wöß, W. (2016). Towards a definition of knowledge graphs. *SEMANTiCS (Posters, Demos, SuCCESS)*, 48(1-4):2.

[Emonet et al., 2024] Emonet, V., Bolleman, J., Duvaud, S., de Farias, T. M., and Sima, A. C. (2024). Llm-based sparql query generation from natural language over federated knowledge graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.06062*.

[Ferré, 2016] Ferré, S. (2016). Sparklis: An expressive query builder for SPARQL endpoints with guidance in natural language. *Semantic Web*, 8(3):405–418.

[Fikes et al., 2004] Fikes, R., Hayes, P., and Horrocks, I. (2004). Owl-ql—a language for deductive query answering on the semantic web. *Journal of Web Semantics*, 2(1):19–29.

[Fink et al., 2023] Fink, M. A., Bischoff, A., Fink, C. A., Moll, M., Kroschke, J., Dulz, L., Heußel, C. P., Kauczor, H.-U., and Weber, T. F. (2023). Potential of chatgpt and gpt-4 for data mining of free-text ct reports on lung cancer. *Radiology*, 308(3):e231362.

[Fischer et al., 2010] Fischer, M., Bossdorf, O., Gockel, S., Hänsel, F., Hemp, A., Hessenmöller, D., Korte, G., Nieschulze, J., Pfeiffer, S., Prati, D., et al. (2010). Implementing large-scale and long-term functional biodiversity research: The biodiversity exploratories. *Basic and applied Ecology*, 11(6):473–485.

[Garcia Castro et al., 2013] Garcia Castro, L. J., McLaughlin, C., and Garcia, A. (2013). Biotea: Rdfizing pubmed central in support for the paper as an interface to the web of data. *Journal of biomedical semantics*, 4(Suppl 1):S5.

[Gruber, 1993] Gruber, T. R. (1993). A translation approach to portable ontology specifications. *Knowledge acquisition*, 5(2):199–220.

[Guizzardi et al., 2022] Guizzardi, G., Botti Benevides, A., Fonseca, C. M., Porello, D., Almeida, J. P. A., and Prince Sales, T. (2022). Ufo: Unified foundational ontology. *Applied ontology*, 17(1):167–210.

[Guizzardi et al., 2015] Guizzardi, G., Wagner, G., Almeida, J. P. A., and Guizzardi, R. S. (2015). Towards ontological foundations for conceptual modeling: The unified foundational ontology (ufo) story. *Applied ontology*, 10(3-4):259–271.

[Håkansson, 2025] Håkansson, D. (2025). Natural Language to SPARQL over Scattered Engineering Data: Ensuring Verifiability through a Hybrid KG-LLM Architecture.

[Herre, 2010] Herre, H. (2010). General formal ontology (gfo): A foundational ontology for conceptual modelling. In *Theory and applications of ontology: computer applications*, pages 297–345. Springer.

[Hogan et al., 2014] Hogan, A., Arenas, M., Mallea, A., and Polleres, A. (2014). Everything you always wanted to know about blank nodes. *Journal of Web Semantics*, 27:42–69.

[Hogan et al., 2021] Hogan, A., Blomqvist, E., Cochez, M., d’Amato, C., Melo, G. D., Gutierrez, C., Kirrane, S., Gayo, J. E. L., Navigli, R., Neumaier, S., et al. (2021). Knowledge graphs. *ACM Computing Surveys (Csur)*, 54(4):1–37.

[Horrocks, 2005] Horrocks, I. (2005). Owl: A description logic based ontology language. In *International conference on principles and practice of constraint programming*, pages 5–8. Springer.

[Hu et al., 2017] Hu, S., Zou, L., Yu, J. X., Wang, H., and Zhao, D. (2017). Answering natural language questions by subgraph matching over knowledge graphs. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 30(5):824–837.

[Hu et al., 2021] Hu, X., Duan, J., and Dang, D. (2021). Natural language question answering over knowledge graph: the marriage of sparql query and keyword search. *Knowledge and Information Systems*, 63(4):819–844.

[Hyvönen, 2023] Hyvönen, E. (2023). Digital humanities on the semantic web: Sampo model and portal series. *Semantic Web*, 14(4):729–744.

[Ikkala et al., 2021] Ikkala, E., Hyvönen, E., Rantala, H., and Koho, M. (2021). Sampo-ui: A full stack javascript framework for developing semantic portal user interfaces. *Semantic Web*, 13(1):69–84.

[Jaradeh et al., 2019] Jaradeh, M. Y., Oelen, A., Farfar, K. E., Prinz, M., D’Souza, J., Kismihók, G., Stocker, M., and Auer, S. (2019). Open research knowledge graph: Next generation infrastructure for semantic scholarly knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 10th international conference on knowledge capture*, pages 243–246.

[Ji et al., 2021] Ji, S., Pan, S., Cambria, E., Marttinен, P., and Yu, P. S. (2021). A survey on knowledge graphs: Representation, acquisition, and applications. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 33(2):494–514.

[Jung and Kim, 2020] Jung, H. and Kim, W. (2020). Automated conversion from natural language query to SPARQL query. *Journal of Intelligent Information Systems*, 55(3):501–520.

[Jupp et al., 2015] Jupp, S., Burdett, T., Leroy, C., and Parkinson, H. E. (2015). A new Ontology Lookup Service at EMBL-EBI. *SWAT4LS*, 2:118–119.

[Kalfoglou and Schorlemmer, 2003] Kalfoglou, Y. and Schorlemmer, M. (2003). Ontology mapping: the state of the art. *The knowledge engineering review*, 18(1):1–31.

[Kommineni et al., 2024] Kommineni, V. K., König-Ries, B., and Samuel, S. (2024). From human experts to machines: An llm supported approach to ontology and knowledge graph construction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.08345*.

[Lehmann et al., 2023] Lehmann, J., Gattogi, P., Bhandiwad, D., Ferré, S., and Vahdati, S. (2023). Language models as controlled natural language semantic parsers for knowledge graph question answering. In *ECAI 2023-26th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 372, pages 1348–1356. IOS Press.

[Li et al., 2020] Li, F., Xie, W., Wang, X., and Fan, Z. (2020). Research on optimization of knowledge graph construction flow chart. In *2020 IEEE 9th Joint International Information Technology and Artificial Intelligence Conference (ITAIC)*, volume 9, pages 1386–1390. IEEE.

[Li et al., 2023] Li, H., Appleby, G., Brumar, C. D., Chang, R., and Suh, A. (2023). Knowledge graphs in practice: Characterizing their users, challenges, and visualization opportunities. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 30(1):584–594.

[Ma, 2022] Ma, X. (2022). Knowledge graph construction and application in geosciences: A review. *Computers & Geosciences*, 161:105082.

[Maciel et al., 2024] Maciel, R. S. P., Valle, P. H. D., Santos, K. S., and Nakagawa, E. Y. (2024). Systems interoperability types: A tertiary study. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 56(10):1–37.

[Mallea et al., 2011] Mallea, A., Arenas, M., Hogan, A., and Polleres, A. (2011). On blank nodes. In *International semantic web conference*, pages 421–437. Springer.

[McGuinness et al., 2004] McGuinness, D. L., Van Harmelen, F., et al. (2004). Owl web ontology language overview. *W3C recommendation*, 10(10):2004.

[Meloni et al., 2025] Meloni, A., Reforgiato Recupero, D., Osborne, F., salatino, a., Motta, E., Vahadati, S., and Lehmann, J. (2025). Exploring Large Language Models for Scientific Question Answering via Natural Language to SPARQL Translation. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*.

[Meyer et al., 2023] Meyer, L.-P., Stadler, C., Frey, J., Radtke, N., Junghanns, K., Meissner, R., Dziwis, G., Bulert, K., and Martin, M. (2023). Llm-assisted knowledge graph engineering: Experiments with chatgpt. In *Working conference on artificial intelligence development for a resilient and sustainable tomorrow*, pages 103–115. Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden Wiesbaden.

[Miles and Bechhofer, 2009] Miles, A. and Bechhofer, S. (2009). Skos simple knowledge organization system reference.

[Miller, 1998] Miller, E. (1998). An introduction to the resource description framework. *D-lib Magazine*.

[Mishra et al., 2022] Mishra, D. S., Agarwal, A., Swathi, B., and Akshay, K. C. (2022). Natural language query formalization to SPARQL for querying knowledge bases using Rasa. *Progress in Artificial Intelligence*, 11(3):193–206.

[Mukanova et al., 2024] Mukanova, A., Milosz, M., Dauletkaliyeva, A., Nazyrova, A., Yelibayeva, G., Kuzin, D., and Kussepova, L. (2024). Llm-powered natural language text processing for ontology enrichment. *Applied Sciences (2076-3417)*, 14(13).

[Ngonga Ngomo et al., 2013] Ngonga Ngomo, A.-C., Bühmann, L., Unger, C., Lehmann, J., and Gerber, D. (2013). Sorry, i don't speak SPARQL: translating SPARQL queries into natural language. In *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on World Wide Web*, pages 977–988.

[Noy et al., 2009] Noy, N. F., Shah, N. H., Whetzel, P. L., Dai, B., Dorf, M., Griffith, N., Jonquet, C., Rubin, D. L., Storey, M.-A., Chute, C. G., et al. (2009). Bioportal: ontologies and integrated data resources at the click of a mouse. *Nucleic acids research*, 37(suppl\_2):W170–W173.

[Oelen et al., 2024] Oelen, A., Jaradeh, M. Y., and Auer, S. (2024). Orkg ask: a neuro-symbolic scholarly search and exploration system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.04977*.

[Otte et al., 2022] Otte, J. N., Beverley, J., and Ruttenberg, A. (2022). Bfo: Basic formal ontology. *Applied ontology*, 17(1):17–43.

[Pan, 2009] Pan, J. Z. (2009). Resource description framework. In *Handbook on ontologies*, pages 71–90. Springer.

[Partridge et al., 2020] Partridge, C., Mitchell, A., Cook, A., Sullivan, J., and West, M. (2020). A survey of top-level ontologies-to inform the ontological choices for a foundation data model.

[Paulheim, 2016] Paulheim, H. (2016). Knowledge graph refinement: A survey of approaches and evaluation methods. *Semantic web*, 8(3):489–508.

[Peng et al., 2023] Peng, C., Xia, F., Naseriparsa, M., and Osborne, F. (2023). Knowledge graphs: Opportunities and challenges. *Artificial intelligence review*, 56(11):13071–13102.

[Polleres et al., 2013] Polleres, A., Hogan, A., Delbru, R., and Umbrich, J. (2013). Rdfs and owl reasoning for linked data. In *Reasoning Web International Summer School*, pages 91–149. Springer.

[Rantala et al., 2023] Rantala, H., Ahola, A., Ikkala, E., and Hyvönen, E. (2023). How to create easily a data analytic semantic portal on top of a SPARQL endpoint: introducing the configurable Sampo-UI framework. In *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, volume 3508, pages 28–39. RWTH Aachen University.

[Simsek et al., 2023] Simsek, U., Kärle, E., Angele, K., Huaman, E., Opdenplatz, J., Sommer, D., Umbrich, J., and Fensel, D. (2023). A knowledge graph perspective on knowledge engineering. *SN Computer Science*, 4(1):16.

[Smith, 2012] Smith, B. (2012). Ontology. In Hurtado, G. and Nudler, O., editors, *The Furniture of the World: Essays in Ontology and Metaphysics*. Editions Rodopi.

[Smith et al., 2007] Smith, B., Ashburner, M., Rosse, C., Bard, J., Bug, W., Ceusters, W., Goldberg, L. J., Eilbeck, K., Ireland, A., Mungall, C. J., et al. (2007). The obo foundry: coordinated evolution of ontologies to support biomedical data integration. *Nature biotechnology*, 25(11):1251–1255.

[Steinmetz et al., 2019] Steinmetz, N., Arning, A.-K., and Sattler, K.-U. (2019). From natural language questions to SPARQL queries: a pattern-based approach. In *BTW 2019*, pages 289–308. Gesellschaft für Informatik, Bonn.

[Studer et al., 1998] Studer, R., Benjamins, V., and Fensel, D. (1998). Knowledge engineering: Principles and methods. *Data & Knowledge Engineering*, 25(1-2):161–197.

[Uschold et al., 1998] Uschold, M., Healy, M., Williamson, K., Clark, P., and Woods, S. (1998). Ontology reuse and application. In *Formal ontology in information systems*, volume 179, page 192. IOS Press Amsterdam.

[Vargas et al., 2019] Vargas, H., Buil-Aranda, C., Hogan, A., and López, C. (2019). RDF explorer: A visual SPARQL query builder. In *International Semantic Web Conference*, pages 647–663. Springer.

[Vargas et al., 2020] Vargas, H., Buil-Aranda, C., Hogan, A., and López, C. (2020). A user interface for exploring and querying knowledge graphs. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence.

[Vogt, 2023] Vogt, L. (2023). Fair knowledge graphs with semantic units: a prototype. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.04761*.

[Vogt, 2024] Vogt, L. (2024). Semantic units: Increasing expressivity and simplicity of formal representations of data and knowledge in knowledge graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.10720*.

[Vogt, 2025] Vogt, L. (2025). Rethinking OWL Expressivity: Semantic Units for FAIR and Cognitively Interoperable Knowledge Graphs: Why OWLs don't have to understand everything they say. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.10720*.

[Vogt et al., 2025a] Vogt, L., König-Ries, B., Alamenciak, T., Brian, J. I., Arnillas, C. A., Korell, L., Frühstückl, R., and Heger, T. (2025a). A framework for fair and clear ecological data and knowledge: Semantic units for synthesis and causal modelling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.08959*.

[Vogt et al., 2024] Vogt, L., Kuhn, T., and Hoehndorf, R. (2024). Semantic units: organizing knowledge graphs into semantically meaningful units of representation. *Journal of biomedical semantics*, 15(1):7.

[Vogt et al., 2025b] Vogt, L., Strömert, P., Matentzoglu, N., Karam, N., Konrad, M., Prinz, M., and Baum, R. (2025b). Suggestions for extending the fair principles based on a linguistic perspective on semantic interoperability. *Scientific Data*, 12(1):688.

[Wan et al., 2024] Wan, M., Safavi, T., Jauhar, S. K., Kim, Y., Counts, S., Neville, J., Suri, S., Shah, C., White, R. W., Yang, L., et al. (2024). Tnt-llm: Text mining at scale with large language models. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 5836–5847.

[Wang et al., 2004] Wang, X. H., Zhang, D. Q., Gu, T., and Pung, H. K. (2004). Ontology based context modeling and reasoning using owl. In *IEEE annual conference on pervasive computing and communications workshops, 2004. Proceedings of the second*, pages 18–22. Ieee.

[Warren and Mulholland, 2020] Warren, P. and Mulholland, P. (2020). A comparison of the cognitive difficulties posed by SPARQL query constructs. In *International Conference on Knowledge Engineering and Knowledge Management*, pages 3–19. Springer.

[Weiland et al., 2022] Weiland, C., Islam, S., Broder, D., Anders, I., and Wittenburg, P. (2022). FDO Machine Actionability-Version 2.1-FDO Forum Proposed Recommendation 19 August 2022. In *FDO Machine Actionability-Version 2.1-FDO Forum Proposed Recommendation*, volume 19.

[Wilkinson et al., 2016] Wilkinson, M. D., Dumontier, M., Aalbersberg, I. J., Appleton, G., Axton, M., Baak, A., Blomberg, N., Boiten, J.-W., da Silva Santos, L. B., Bourne, P. E., et al. (2016). The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship. *Scientific data*, 3(1):1–9.

[Yang et al., 2024] Yang, J. et al. (2024). Integrated application of llm model and knowledge graph in medical text mining and knowledge extraction. *Soc. Med. Health Manag*, 5:56–62.

[Yang et al., 2023] Yang, S., Teng, M., Dong, X., and Bo, F. (2023). Llm-based sparql generation with selected schema from large scale knowledge base. In *China conference on knowledge graph and semantic computing*, pages 304–316. Springer.

[Zahera et al., 2024] Zahera, H. M., Ali, M., Sherif, M. A., Moussallem, D., and Ngomo, A.-C. N. (2024). Generating SPARQL from Natural Language Using Chain-of-Thoughts Prompting. In *SEMANTICS*, pages 353–368.

[Zhang and Soh, 2024] Zhang, B. and Soh, H. (2024). Extract, define, canonize: An llm-based framework for knowledge graph construction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.03868*.

# List of Figures

3.1	'Comparison of a human-readable statement with its machine-actionable representation as a semantic graph following the RDF syntax. Top: A human-readable statement concerning the observation that a specific apple (X) weighs 204.56 grams. Bottom: The corresponding representation of the same statement as a semantic graph, adhering to RDF syntax and following the established pattern for measurement data from the Ontology for Biomedical Investigations (OBI) [Bandrowski et al., 2016] of the Open Biological and Biomedical Ontology Foundry (OBO) [Smith et al., 2007]'. Adapted from [Vogt et al., 2024], Figure 2. . . . .	11
3.2	'C) All swans have quality some white', expressed as a class axiom within an ontology. Adapted from [Vogt et al., 2024], Figure 1 C). . .	12
3.3	'B) The corresponding representation of the same statement [Referring to the weight statement of the apple.] as an instance-based semantic graph, adhering to RDF syntax and following the established pattern for measurement data from the Ontology of Biomedical Investigations (OBI). C) The same graph, organized as a statement unit, which is a specific category of semantic unit. The data graph, denoted within the blue box at the bottom, articulates the statement with 'apple X' as its subject and 'gram X' alongside the numerical value 204.56 as its objects. Note, how the graph from B) forms the data graph of this statement unit. The peach-colored box encompasses its semantic-units graph. It explicitly denotes the resource embodying the statement unit (bordered blue box) as an instance of the *SEMUNIT:weight statement unit* class and the *SEMUNIT:assertional statement unit* class, with 'apple X' identified as the subject. Notably, the GUPRI of the statement unit is also the GUPRI of the semantic unit's data graph (the subgraph in the not bordered blue box). The semantic-units graph also contains various metadata triples, here only indicated by some metadata property and some metadata value as their placeholders. Highlighted in red within the data graph is an example of a triple that is required for modelling purposes but lacks semantic meaningfulness for a domain expert.' Adapted from [Vogt, 2025], Figure 1 B) and C) . . . . .	14
5.1	'Conceptual framework and basis of biodiversity exploratories.' <sup>2</sup> . . .	20

7.1	Figure of a first attempt at modelling an activity that leads to the generation of a dataset using the prov vocabulary. The left hand side contains a legend explaining the meaning of the different shapes and colors used. . . . .	42
7.2	Figure of a schema that may be used for an activity that leads to the generation of a statement with a large language model using the prov vocabulary. The left hand side contains a legend explaining the meaning of the different shapes and colors used. . . . .	43
7.3	Schema for the Biodiversity Exploratories, its projects and infrastructures, and the exploratories. As the legend on the left hand side suggests, yellow rectangles contain class assignments, blue ovals denote instances, and green rectangles denote data properties. . . . .	45
7.4	Schema of how different plot levels within the BE are modelled and attached to the exploratories. . . . .	46
7.5	Model of the REX1, REX2, LUX, and FOX experiments and how they connect to the exploratories (analogously to the different plot levels). . . . .	47
7.6	Simplified schema of instantiated plot collections for each publication, how they connect to their source publications, what plots they contain, and how processes and other properties are connected to those plots. . . . .	47
7.7	Representation of the Open Citations Data Model, adapted to the publications of the BE. Publications are depicted in the center and are connected to its authors, the publishing venue, and the parts of the publication itself. . . . .	50
7.8	Schema for investigations that have as their output datasets of the BE. The metadata categories for datasets align well to the model of the ontology for biomedical investigations (obi), containing study design details, sampling preparation and analysis, as well as data preparation and analysis. . . . .	52
8.1	Plot of cosine similarity scores (x-axis) of the top candidates and the margin between top1 and top2 candidates (y-axis). Instead of dots, colored hexes are used to represent the number of documents per coordinate, with darker colors (purple) representing lower number of documents, and lighter colors (yellow) representing higher number of documents. The light blue dotted line on the left side of the plot represents the cosine similarity threshold set for our runs of the scripts, accepting candidates at a score of $>=0.3$ . . . . .	72
8.2	Collection of plots for the four research goals of the Biodiversity Exploratories. Plots show the distribution of cosine similarity scores (x-axis) and total number of documents per score (y-axis). . . . .	73
8.3	Plot showing the tradeoff between threshold of cosine similarity scores to assign candidates to research goals (x-axis) and the overall document coverage this results in (y-axis). The blue vertical line represents the threshold of $>= 0.3$ used in our runs. . . . .	73
9.1	Results for the first semantic unit query pattern. . . . .	76
9.2	Excerpt of the results for <b>CQ D2</b> , queried with semantic units. . . . .	77

9.3	Results for <b>CQ P1</b> , queried without semantic units. . . . .	79
9.4	Results for <b>CQ P1</b> , queried with semantic units. . . . .	79
9.5	Results for <b>CQ D2</b> , queried with semantic units. . . . .	81
9.6	Results for <b>CQ D3</b> , queried without semantic units. . . . .	83
9.7	Results for <b>CQ P4</b> . . . . .	84
9.8	Results for <b>CQ 5</b> . . . . .	87
9.9	Visual representation of the authors and roles compound unit for Publication 30000. . . . .	88
9.10	Visual representation of the links compound unit for Dataset 20907. .	89
9.11	Visual representation of the compound unit developed for the third competency question. . . . .	89
9.12	Visual representation of the compound unit developed for the fifth competency question. . . . .	91
10.1	Visual of all nodes and edges connected to Publication 30030. . . . .	97

# Listings

7.1	Excerpt of an R2RML mapping depicting mappings for publications and named individual identification units for publications. . . . .	56
7.2	Two SHACL shapes that could be used to validate triples for publications and for semantic units identifying them. . . . .	58
8.1	System prompt for metadata reconstruction. . . . .	64
9.1	SPARQL query to retrieve all triples contained in a specific semantic unit. . . . .	75
9.2	SPARQL query to retrieve all semantic units that are associated with a compound unit. . . . .	76
9.3	SPARQL query to answer <i>Who authored the publication <math>P</math>?</i> without using semantic units. . . . .	78
9.4	SPARQL query to answer <i>Who authored the publication <math>P</math>?</i> utilizing semantic units. . . . .	78
9.5	SPARQL query without semantic units that returns all links and link types coming to and from Dataset 20907. . . . .	80
9.6	SPARQL query with semantic units that returns all links and link types coming to and from Dataset 20907. . . . .	80
9.7	SPARQL query without semantic units that returns the plot collection, plots and the environments they are located in, and the plot level and exploratory the plot collection is part of for Publication 31499. . . . .	82
9.8	SPARQL query using a compound unit that returns the plot collection, plots and the environments they are located in, and the plot level and exploratory the plot collection is part of for Publication 31499. . . . .	82
9.9	SPARQL query that returns all semantic units that have the Publication 31149 as its subject, and all further associated semantic units. .	84
9.10	SPARQL query to answer CQ5 that does not query over semantic units. .	85
9.11	SPARQL query to answer CQ5 that queries over semantic units. . .	86
9.12	Listing of a SPARQL CONSTRUCT query that returns a visualization of a links compound unit. . . . .	88

## List of Tables

7.1	Table of publication metadata slots, ontology classes assigned to them, and the object property they are connected to the plot with. . . . .	48
7.2	Table of metadata slots from the category ' <i>biotic data types</i> ', their ontology class mappings, and how a publication or dataset connects to them. Note that for datasets the same slots exist as for publications, but that also six more choices are allowed. . . . .	49
7.3	Table of additional dataset metadata slots, ontology classes assigned to them, and the object property they are connected to the plot with. . . . .	51
8.1	Table that shows an excerpt of the schema used for metadata reconstruction for publication. . . . .	63
8.2	Table of precision, recall, F1-score, and accuracy scores for <i>yes/no</i> fields for a test run of 100 publications. . . . .	65
8.3	Table of precision, recall, F1-score, accuracy, and jaccard similarity scores for <i>multi-label</i> fields for a test run of 100 publications. . . . .	65
8.4	Table of precision, recall, F1-score, and accuracy scores for <i>yes/no</i> fields for a test run of 100 datasets. . . . .	66
8.5	Table of precision, recall, F1-score, accuracy, and jaccard similarity scores for <i>multi-label</i> fields for a test run of 100 datasets. . . . .	66
8.6	Table of topic clusters from embedded publication and dataset titles and abstracts. Column one contains the number of documents per cluster, the second column contains the cluster ID, and the third contains the top terms that occur within the clusters via c-tf-idf. . . . .	68
8.7	Table of clusters around anchor concepts. . . . .	69
8.8	Table of clusters around anchor concepts with adaptive clustering that allows clusters of varying shapes and densities, leading to an overall smaller number of points per cluster. . . . .	69

# Eigenständigkeitserklärung

1. Hiermit versichere ich, dass ich die vorliegende Arbeit selbstständig verfasst und keine anderen als die angegebenen Quellen und Hilfsmittel benutzt habe. Ich trage die Verantwortung für die Qualität des Textes sowie die Auswahl aller Inhalte und habe sichergestellt, dass Informationen und Argumente mit geeigneten wissenschaftlichen Quellen belegt bzw. gestützt werden. Die aus fremden oder auch eigenen, älteren Quellen wörtlich oder sinngemäß übernommenen Textstellen, Gedankengänge, Konzepte, Grafiken etc. in meinen Ausführungen habe ich als solche eindeutig gekennzeichnet und mit vollständigen Verweisen auf die jeweilige Quelle versehen. Alle weiteren Inhalte dieser Arbeit ohne entsprechende Verweise stammen im urheberrechtlichen Sinn von mir.
2. Ich weiß, dass meine Eigenständigkeitserklärung sich auch auf nicht zitierfähige, generierende KI Anwendungen (nachfolgend „generierende KI“) bezieht. Mir ist bewusst, dass die Verwendung von generierender KI unzulässig ist, sofern nicht deren Nutzung von der prüfenden Person ausdrücklich freigegeben wurde (Freigabeerklärung). Sofern eine Zulassung als Hilfsmittel erfolgt ist, versichere ich, dass ich mich generierender KI lediglich als Hilfsmittel bedient habe und in der vorliegenden Arbeit mein gestalterischer Einfluss deutlich überwiegt. Ich verantworte die Übernahme der von mir verwendeten maschinell generierten Passagen in meiner Arbeit vollumfänglich selbst. Für den Fall der Freigabe der Verwendung von generierender KI für die Erstellung der vorliegenden Arbeit wird eine Verwendung in einem gesonderten Anhang meiner Arbeit kenntlich gemacht. Dieser Anhang enthält eine Angabe oder eine detaillierte Dokumentation über die Verwendung generierender KI gemäß den Vorgaben in der Freigabeerklärung der prüfenden Person. Die Details zum Gebrauch generierender KI bei der Erstellung der vorliegenden Arbeit inklusive Art, Ziel und Umfang der Verwendung sowie die Art der Nachweispflicht habe ich der Freigabeerklärung der prüfenden Person entnommen.
3. Ich versichere des Weiteren, dass die vorliegende Arbeit bisher weder im In- noch im Ausland in gleicher oder ähnlicher Form einer anderen Prüfungsbehörde vorgelegt wurde oder in deutscher oder einer anderen Sprache als Veröffentlichung erschienen ist.
4. Mir ist bekannt, dass ein Verstoß gegen die vorbenannten Punkte prüfungsrechtliche Konsequenzen haben und insbesondere dazu führen kann, dass meine Prüfungsleistung als Täuschung und damit als mit „nicht bestanden“ bewertet werden kann. Bei mehrfachem oder schwerwiegendem Täuschungsversuch kann ich befristet oder sogar dauerhaft von der Erbringung weiterer Prüfungsleistungen in meinem Studiengang ausgeschlossen werden.

.....  
Ort und Datum

.....  
Unterschrift