PCSG: Pattern-Coverage Snippet Generation for RDF Datasets

ISWC 2021

Xiaxia Wang¹, Gong Cheng¹, Tengteng Lin¹, Jing Xu¹, Jeff Z. Pan², Evgeny Kharlamov^{3,4}, Yuzhong Qu¹

¹ State Key Laboratory for Novel Software Technology, Nanjing University, China
² School of Informatics, University of Edinburgh, UK
³ Bosch Center for Artificial Intelligence, Robert Bosch GmbH, Germany
⁴ Department of Informatics, University of Oslo, Norway









Background

To ease the comprehension of large complex RDF structure:

- RDF summary: representative schema-level elements or patterns
- **RDF snippet**: a connected subgraph containing frequent classes and properties



Motivation and Contribution

Research Questions:

- 1. How to generate pattern-coverage snippets?
- 2. How to jointly consider all connected components?
- 3. How to be biased towards keyword queries?



Motivation and Contribution

Research Questions:

- 1. How to generate pattern-coverage snippets?
- 2. How to jointly consider all connected components?
- 3. How to be biased towards keyword queries?

Contributions:

- Alg. Basic: solving a Group Steiner Tree problem
- Alg. PCSG: merging Basic results among components
- Alg. QPCSG: extending PCSG to keywords



Given a RDF dataset:



Given a RDF dataset:

• Entity Description Pattern (EDP): the set of classes, forward properties and backward properties





Given a RDF dataset:

- Entity Description Pattern (EDP): the set of classes, forward properties and backward properties
- Link Pattern (LP): the property and the two EDPs linked by it



Given a RDF dataset:

- Entity Description Pattern (EDP): the set of classes, forward properties and backward properties
- Link Pattern (LP): the property and the two EDPs linked by it
- Pattern-coverage snippet: a subgraph covering all EDPs and LPs



"3.57e+5 (km²)"



"2.44e+5 (km²)"

A RDF Dataset

9

partOf

area

Methods - Alg. Basic

For a connected RDF graph:

• Each entity is mapped to an EDP, each property (link of two entities) is mapped to a LP



10

Methods - Alg. Basic

For a connected RDF graph:

- Each entity is mapped to an EDP, each property (link of two entities) is mapped to a LP
- Group Steiner Tree Problem: given a set of keys, finding a minimum tree containing all these keys

 \rightarrow Using all EDPs and LPs as keys, to find a GST as snippet



Methods - Alg. Basic

For a connected RDF graph:

- Each entity is mapped to an EDP, each property (link of two entities) is mapped to a LP
- Group Steiner Tree Problem: given a set of keys, finding a minimum tree containing all these keys

 \rightarrow Using all EDPs and LPs as keys, to find a GST as snippet



2. Entity-Link Graph

3. Group Steiner Tree

4. Pattern-Coverage Snippet

Research Questions:

- 1. How to generate pattern-coverage snippets?
 - 2. How to jointly consider all connected components?
 - 3. How to be biased towards keyword queries?

Contributions:

- Alg. Basic: solving a Group Steiner Tree problem
- Alg. PCSG: merging Basic results among components
- Alg. QPCSG: extending PCSG to keywords

Research Questions:

 1
1
1

- How to generate pattern-coverage snippets?
- 2. How to jointly consider all connected components?
 - 3. How to be biased towards keyword queries?

Contributions:

- Alg. Basic: solving a Group Steiner Tree problem
- Alg. PCSG: merging Basic results among components

14

- Alg. QPCSG: extending PCSG to keywords

PCSG:

- Executing Basic on each connected component, then merge results as a Set Cover problem
- Extended to $PCSG-\tau$ for highly heterogeneous graphs as a relaxation to cover only frequent patterns

Component 1:		¢		select snippets to cover all EDPs and LPs	
Component 2:		¢			Snippet result
•••	•••		•••		

Research Questions:

- 1. How to generate pattern-coverage snippets?
 - How to jointly consider all connected components?
 - How to be biased towards keyword queries?

Contributions:

- Alg. Basic: solving a Group Steiner Tree problem
- Alg. PCSG: merging Basic results among components
- Alg. QPCSG: extending PCSG to keywords

QPCSG:

3.

• Apart from EDPs and LPs, also adding query keywords as keys in the Group Steiner Tree



The result tree should not only cover all EDPs and LPs, but also all the keywords

Snippet result

Datasets: 9,544 real-world RDF datasets from two open data portals

Portal	#RDF	#t	riples	#clas	ses	#prope	erties	#E	DPs	#L	Ps
	datasets	Median	Max	Median	Max	Median	Max	Median	Max	Median	Max
DataHub.io	311	$1,\!272$	20,968,879	3	2,030	16	3,982	15	$270,\!224$	27	156,722
Data.gov	$9,\!233$	$4,\!000$	6,343,524	1	2	13	545	3	500	2	$1,\!103$
Overall	$9,\!544$	$4,\!000$	20,968,879	1	2,030	14	3,982	3	$270,\!224$	2	156,722

Datasets: 9,544 real-world RDF datasets from two open data portals

Portal	#RDF	#t	riples	#clas	sses	#prope	erties	#E	DPs	#I	$_{\rm Ps}$
	datasets	Median	Max	Median	Max	Median	Max	Median	Max	Median	Max
DataHub.io	311	1,272	20,968,879	3	2,030	16	3,982	15	$270,\!224$	27	156,722
Data.gov	9,233	4,000	6,343,524	1	2	13	545	3	500	2	$1,\!103$
Overall	$9,\!544$	$4,\!000$	20,968,879	1	2,030	14	3,982	3	$270,\!224$	2	156,722

Exp-1:

• Compare with SOTA snippet generation methods by automatic metrics

Exp-2:

• Compare with SOTA snippet generation methods by human ratings

Exp-3:

• Compare with RDF summaries in assisting human user with SPARQL query completion

Experiment - 1

Compare with SOTA snippets by automatic metrics:

• Baseline:

IlluSnip extracts a connected snippet containing frequent classes, properties and central entities

Results:

• $PCSG(-\tau)$ achieved higher coverage rates, with shorter running time

	Class	Property	EDP	LP	
PCSG	1.000 ± 0.000	1.000 ± 0.000	1.000 ± 0.000	1.000 ± 0.000	
IlluSnip	0.993 ± 0.079	0.999 ± 0.011	0.822 ± 0.285	0.790 ± 0.320	
PCSG-90%	0.999 ± 0.019	0.999 ± 0.006	0.981 ± 0.030	0.976 ± 0.035	
IlluSnip-90%	0.991 ± 0.092	0.999 ± 0.013	0.794 ± 0.310	0.762 ± 0.344	
PCSG-80%	0.999 ± 0.025	0.998 ± 0.010	0.957 ± 0.061	0.947 ± 0.071	
IlluSnip-80%	0.982 ± 0.131	0.998 ± 0.017	0.784 ± 0.317	0.751 ± 0.353	

Table 2: Schema coverage rates (mean \pm SD).



Fig. 6: Cum. distributions of run-time.

Experiment - 2

Compare PCSG with IlluSnip by human ratings:

- Randomly given a dataset with its metadata, classes, properties, EDPs and LPs
- Invite human users to rate two snippets on a 1 5 scale

Results:

• On 200 cases, PCSG got higher average score than IlluSnip



Experiment - 3

Compare PCSG with RDF Summary ABSTAT:

- **ABSTAT**: providing triple patterns as summary
- Task: Completing SPARQL query patterns assisted by the summary or snippet
- Dataset: DBpedia 2016-10

Results:

• With PCSG, users achieved higher accuracy in shorter time, giving higher rating of satisfaction

		Accuracy			Time (seconds	
	Simple Task	Complex Task	Overall	Simple Task	Complex Task	Overall
PCSG-80%	0.900 ± 0.300	0.900 ± 0.300	0.900 ± 0.300	85.9 ± 39.0	164.0 ± 84.6	124.9 ± 76.6
ABSTAT	0.933 ± 0.249	0.833 ± 0.373	0.883 ± 0.321	117.6 ± 51.1	214.3 ± 154.1	166.0 ± 124.6



- 1. Presenting snippet generation methods PCSG and QPCSG
- 2. Demonstrating their effectiveness and timeliness
- 3. Receiving higher scores of user rating and comparison with summary method

In the future:

- Better visualization methods for snippets
- Comprehensive comparison between snippets and summaries

ISWC 2021

Thanks for your time! Q & A

Contact: xxwang@smail.nju.edu.cn