

# Assessing the Quality of RDF Mappings with EvaMap

Benjamin Moreau<sup>1,2</sup> and Patricia Serrano-Alvarado<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> OpenDataSoft `{Name.Lastname}@opendatasoft.com`

<sup>2</sup> Nantes University, LS2N, CNRS, UMR6004, 44000 Nantes, France  
`{Name.Lastname@}univ-nantes.fr` \*

**Abstract.** Linked Data (LD) is a set of best practices to publish reusable data on the web in RDF format. Despite the benefits of LD, many datasets are not published as RDF. Transforming structured datasets into RDF datasets is possible thanks to RDF Mappings. But, for the same dataset, different mappings can be proposed. We believe that a tool capable of evaluating the quality of an RDF mapping would make the creation of mappings easier. In this paper, we present EvaMap, a framework to assess the quality of RDF mappings. The demonstration shows how EvaMap can be used to evaluate and improve RDF mappings.

## 1 Introduction and Motivation

Linked Data (LD) is a set of best practices to publish reusable data on the web in RDF format. Despite the benefits of LD, many datasets are not published as RDF. Transforming structured datasets into RDF datasets is possible thanks to *RDF Mappings*.

An RDF mapping consists in a set of rules that maps data from an input dataset to RDF triples. Languages like R2RML<sup>3</sup> and RML<sup>4</sup> are widely used to define machine-readable mappings. In this work, we use YARRRML, a human-readable representation of RDF mappings.

Making a relevant RDF mapping for a dataset is a challenging task because it requires to answer several questions:

1. What are the different resources described in the dataset (e.g., cars, persons, cities, places, etc.)?
2. What are the attributes of these resources (e.g., price, age, etc.)?
3. How should the IRI of resources be defined?
4. What are the possible relations between the different resources (e.g., the city is the birthplace of the person)?
5. Which ontology, classes, and properties should be used?

---

\* Copyright © 2020 for this paper by its authors. Use permitted under Creative Commons License Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0).

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.w3.org/TR/r2rml/>


<sup>4</sup> <https://rml.io/specs/rml/>

In addition to possible errors by the user, different answers are possible for some of these questions and, thus, different RDF mappings are possible for the same dataset.

For example, Figure 1 represents two possible mappings for the dataset in Table 1. Unlike mapping 1(a), mapping 1(b) does not include a class description in resource IRIs and does not reference the *Birth Province* column.

Name	Birth	Birth City	Birth Province
Augustus	0062-09-23	Rome	
Caligula	0012-08-31	Antitum	
Claudius	0009-08-01	Lugdunum	Gallia Lugdunensis
...	...	...	...

**Table 1.** Excerpt from a structured dataset describing Roman emperors.



**Fig. 1.** Two RDF mappings for the Roman emperors dataset. Bold text starting with \$ are references to a column in the dataset.

Given a structured dataset, how to help users to create RDF mappings without errors automatically, and how to choose the best mapping from a set of RDF mappings?

We believe that a tool capable of evaluating the quality of an RDF mapping would make the creation and the choice of RDF mappings easier. [1] proposes a framework that assesses and refines RML mappings. However, authors focus on logical errors due to incorrect usage of ontologies (e.g., violation of domain, range, disjoint classes, etc.). [3] proposes a framework to assess the quality of RDF datasets through metrics. Metrics are organized in dimensions evaluating different aspects of a dataset (e.g., availability, interlinking, etc.). But, [3] does not propose to assess the quality of an RDF mapping. In our work, like in [1], we evaluate metrics on the RDF mapping instead of on the resulting RDF dataset. This choice allows us to identify errors at the beginning of the publishing process and saves time.

Based on the framework proposed in [3], we propose **EvaMap**. EvaMap is a framework to **Evaluate RDF Mappings**. The goal is to control the quality of

the resulting dataset through its mapping without having to generate the RDF dataset.

## 2 EvaMap: A Framework to Evaluate RDF Mappings

EvaMap uses a set of metrics organized in 7 dimensions. Each metric is evaluated on the RDF mapping or on the resulting RDF dataset when instances are needed. For example, the *available resource IRIs* metric needs RDF dataset to check if generated IRIs are dereferenceable. In this case, EvaMap generates a sample such that applying each mapping rule to the entire input dataset is not necessary. Table 2 describes each dimension of EvaMap. These dimensions are based on [3]. From these dimensions, we propose the *Coverability* one that detects the lose of data between the input dataset and the resulting RDF dataset. We also introduce four new metrics described in Table 3.

Dimension	Description
Availability	Checks if IRIs are dereferenceable
Clarity	Checks human-readability of the mapping and the resulting dataset
Conciseness	Checks if the mapping and the resulting dataset is minimal while being complete
Consistency	Checks if the mapping is free from logical errors
Metadata	Checks metadata quality (license, date, creator, etc.)
Connectability	Checks if links exist between local and external resources
Coverability	Checks if the RDF mapping is exhaustive compared to the initial dataset

**Table 2.** Dimensions used by EvaMap.

Dimension	Metric	Description
Conciseness	Redundant rule	Checks if multiple rules generate the same triples
Connectability	Local links	Checks if resources described in the mapping are connected
Consistency	Datatype inheritance	Checks if datatypes in the mapping correspond to datatypes in the initial dataset
Metadata	License compatibility	Checks if the license of the initial dataset is compatible with the license of the resulting dataset

**Table 3.** New metrics proposed in EvaMap.

In order to compute the quality of a mapping,  $M_i$  applied on a raw dataset  $D$ , we propose a function  $q(M_i, D) \in [0, 1]$  that is the weighted mean of the quality of each metric  $m_j(M_i, D)$ :

$$q(M_i, D) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n w_j \cdot m_j(M_i, D)}{\sum_{j=1}^n w_j}$$

We use the same function to compute the score for a specific dimension. To do that, we only consider the subset of metrics for the corresponding dimension.

Weights  $w_j$  associated with metrics can be used to give more or less importance to each metric. For example, the user does not always want to generate

RDF triples for all data in the input dataset. Thus, weights associated with *coverability* metrics can be lowered or set to zero.

### 3 Demonstration

We implemented EvaMap to evaluate YARRRML [2] mappings for datasets of the OpenDataSoft’s data network<sup>5</sup>. Our tool is available as a web service at <https://evamap.herokuapp.com/>. The source code of our tool<sup>6</sup> and web service<sup>7</sup> are available on GitHub under the MIT license.

During the demonstration, attendees will be able to select different mappings and use EvaMap to compare them. For each mapping, the global quality score will be computed as well as the quality score for each dimension. Our tool will also give feedback to improve RDF mapping.

In our tool, users can assess two mappings for the dataset *football-ligue*. Users can see that the mapping *football-ligue* obtains a worse global score than the mapping *football-ligue-fixed*. In the detailed report, users can analyze by dimension why these scores are different.

*Acknowledgments* Authors thank Chanez Amri, Alan Baron, and Marion Hurnault (Master students of the University of Nantes) for their participation in this work.

### References

1. Dimou, A., Kontokostas, D., Freudenberg, M., Verborgh, R., Lehmann, J., Manens, E., Hellmann, S., Van de Walle, R.: Assessing and Refining Mappings to RDF to Improve Dataset Quality. In: International Semantic Web Conference (ISWC) (2015)
2. Heyvaert, P., De Meester, B., Dimou, A., Verborgh, R.: Declarative Rules for Linked Data Generation at Your Fingertips! In: Extended Semantic Web Conference (ESWC), Poster&Demo (2018)
3. Zaveri, A., Rula, A., Maurino, A., Pietrobon, R., Lehmann, J., Auer, S.: Quality Assessment for Linked Data: a Survey. Journal of Semantic Web (2016)

<sup>5</sup> <https://data.opendatasoft.com>

<sup>6</sup> <https://github.com/benjimor/EvaMap>

<sup>7</sup> <https://github.com/benjimor/EvaMap-Web>