Abstract

The OWL 2 Web Ontology Language, informally OWL 2, is an ontology language for the Semantic Web with formally defined meaning. OWL 2 ontologies provide classes, properties, individuals, and data values and are stored as Semantic Web documents. OWL 2 ontologies can be used along with information written in RDF, and OWL 2 ontologies themselves are primarily exchanged as RDF documents. The OWL 2 Document Overview describes the overall state of OWL 2, and should be read before other OWL 2 documents.

This document provides the direct model-theoretic semantics for OWL 2, which is compatible with the description logic SROIQ. Furthermore, this document defines the most common inference problems for OWL 2.
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1 Introduction

This document defines the direct model-theoretic semantics of OWL 2. The semantics given here is strongly related to the semantics of description logics [Description Logics] and it extends the semantics of the description logic SROIQ [SROIQ]. As the definition of SROIQ does not provide for datatypes and punning, the semantics of OWL 2 is defined directly on the constructs of the structural...
specification of OWL 2 [OWL 2 Specification] instead of by reference to SROIQ. For the constructs available in SROIQ, the semantics of SROIQ trivially corresponds to the one defined in this document.

Since each OWL 1 DL ontology is an OWL 2 ontology, this document also provides a direct semantics for OWL 1 Lite and OWL 1 DL ontologies; this semantics is equivalent to the direct model-theoretic semantics of OWL 1 Lite and OWL 1 DL [OWL Abstract Syntax and Semantics]. Furthermore, this document also provides the direct model-theoretic semantics for the OWL 2 profiles [OWL 2 Profiles].

The semantics is defined for OWL 2 axioms and ontologies, which should be understood as instances of the structural specification [OWL 2 Specification]. Parts of the structural specification are written in this document using the functional-style syntax.

OWL 2 allows ontologies, anonymous individuals, and axioms to be annotated; furthermore, annotations themselves can contain additional annotations. All these types of annotations, however, have no semantic meaning in OWL 2 and are ignored in this document. OWL 2 declarations are used only to disambiguate class expressions from data ranges and object property from data property expressions in the functional-style syntax; therefore, they are not mentioned explicitly in this document.

2 Direct Model-Theoretic Semantics for OWL 2

This section specifies the direct model-theoretic semantics of OWL 2 ontologies.

2.1 Vocabulary

A datatype map, formalizing datatype maps from the OWL 2 Specification [OWL 2 Specification], is a 6-tuple $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{NDT}, \mathcal{NLS}, \mathcal{NFS}, \cdot_{DT}, \cdot_{LS}, \cdot_{FS})$ with the following components:

- $\mathcal{NDT}$ is a set of datatypes (more precisely, names of datatypes) that does not contain the datatype $\text{rdfs:Literal}$.
- $\mathcal{NLS}$ is a function that assigns to each datatype $DT \in \mathcal{NDT}$ a set $\mathcal{NLS}(DT)$ of strings called lexical forms. The set $\mathcal{NLS}(DT)$ is called the lexical space of $DT$.
- $\mathcal{NFS}$ is a function that assigns to each datatype $DT \in \mathcal{NDT}$ a set $\mathcal{NFS}(DT)$ of pairs $\langle F, v \rangle$, where $F$ is a constraining facet and $v$ is an arbitrary data value called the constraining value. The set $\mathcal{NFS}(DT)$ is called the facet space of $DT$.
- For each datatype $DT \in \mathcal{NDT}$, the interpretation function $\cdot_{DT}$ assigns to $DT$ a set $(DT)^{DT}$ called the value space of $DT$.
- For each datatype $DT \in \mathcal{NDT}$ and each lexical form $LV \in \mathcal{NLS}(DT)$, the interpretation function $\cdot_{LS}$ assigns to the pair $\langle LV, DT \rangle$ a data value $(\langle LV, DT \rangle)^{LS} \in (DT)^{DT}$.
For each datatype $DT \in N^{DT}$ and each pair $\langle F, v \rangle \in N^{FS}(DT)$, the interpretation function $\cdot^{FS}$ assigns to $\langle F, v \rangle$ the set $(\langle F, v \rangle)^{FS} \subseteq (DT)^{DT}$.

A vocabulary $V = (V_C, V_OP, V_DP, V_I, V_DT, V_LT, V_FA)$ over a datatype map $D$ is a 7-tuple consisting of the following elements:

- $V_C$ is a set of classes as defined in the OWL 2 Specification [OWL 2 Specification], containing at least the classes $owl:Thing$ and $owl:Nothing$.
- $V_OP$ is a set of object properties as defined in the OWL 2 Specification [OWL 2 Specification], containing at least the object properties $owl:topObjectProperty$ and $owl:bottomObjectProperty$.
- $V_DP$ is a set of data properties as defined in the OWL 2 Specification [OWL 2 Specification], containing at least the data properties $owl:topDataProperty$ and $owl:bottomDataProperty$.
- $V_I$ is a set of individuals (named and anonymous) as defined in the OWL 2 Specification [OWL 2 Specification].
- $V_DT$ is a set containing all datatypes of $D$, the datatype $rdfs:Literal$, and possibly other datatypes; that is, $N^{DT} \cup \{rdfs:Literal\} \subseteq V^{DT}$.
- $V_LT$ is a set of literals $L^V^{\Delta DT}$ for each datatype $DT \in N^{DT}$ and each lexical form $LV \in N^{LS}(DT)$.
- $V_FA$ is the set of pairs $\langle F, lt \rangle$ for each constraining facet $F$, datatype $DT \in N^{DT}$, and literal $lt \in V_{LT}$ such that $\langle F, (\langle LV, DT_1 \rangle)^{LS} \rangle \in N^{FS}(DT)$, where $LV$ is the lexical form of $lt$ and $DT_1$ is the datatype of $lt$.

Given a vocabulary $V$, the following conventions are used in this document to denote different syntactic parts of OWL 2 ontologies:

- $OP$ denotes an object property;
- $OPE$ denotes an object property expression;
- $DP$ denotes a data property;
- $DPE$ denotes a data property expression;
- $C$ denotes a class;
- $CE$ denotes a class expression;
- $DT$ denotes a datatype;
- $DR$ denotes a data range;
- $a$ denotes an individual (named or anonymous);
- $lt$ denotes a literal; and
- $F$ denotes a constraining facet.

### 2.2 Interpretations

Given a datatype map $D$ and a vocabulary $V$ over $D$, an interpretation $I = (\Delta_I, \Delta_D, \cdot_C, \cdot_{OP}, \cdot_{DP}, \cdot_I, \cdot_{DT}, \cdot_{LT}, \cdot_{FA})$ for $D$ and $V$ is a 9-tuple with the following structure:

- $\Delta_I$ is a nonempty set called the object domain.
- $\Delta_D$ is a nonempty set disjoint with $\Delta_I$ called the data domain such that $(DT)^{DT} \subseteq \Delta_D$ for each datatype $DT \in V^{DT}$.
• \(C\) is the class interpretation function that assigns to each class \(C \in VC\) a subset \((C)^C \subseteq \Delta_I\) such that
  - \((\text{owl:Thing})^C = \Delta_I\) and
  - \((\text{owl:Nothing})^C = \emptyset\).

• \(OP\) is the object property interpretation function that assigns to each object property \(OP \in VOP\) a subset \((OP)^{OP} \subseteq \Delta_I \times \Delta_I\) such that
  - \((\text{owl:topObjectProperty})^{OP} = \Delta_I \times \Delta_I\) and
  - \((\text{owl:bottomObjectProperty})^{OP} = \emptyset\).

• \(DP\) is the data property interpretation function that assigns to each data property \(DP \in VDP\) a subset \((DP)^{DP} \subseteq \Delta_I \times \Delta_D\) such that
  - \((\text{owl:topDataProperty})^{DP} = \Delta_I \times \Delta_D\) and
  - \((\text{owl:bottomDataProperty})^{DP} = \emptyset\).

• \(I\) is the individual interpretation function that assigns to each individual \(a \in VI\) an element \((a)^I \in \Delta_I\).

• \(DT\) is the datatype interpretation function that assigns to each datatype \(DT \in VDT\) a subset \((DT)^{DT} \subseteq \Delta_D\) such that
  - \((\text{rdf:Literal})^{DT} = \Delta_D\).

• \(LT\) is the literal interpretation function that is defined as \((lt)^L = (\langle LV, \text{DT}\rangle)^L)\) for each \(lt \in VLT\), where \(LV\) is the lexical form of \(lt\) and \(DT\) is the datatype of \(lt\).

• \(FA\) is the facet interpretation function that is defined as \((\langle F, lt\rangle)^F = (\langle F, (lt)^L\rangle)^F)\) for each \(\langle F, lt\rangle \in VFA\).

The following sections define the extensions of \(\cdot \)OP, \(\cdot \)DT, and \(\cdot \)C to object property expressions, data ranges, and class expressions.

2.2.1 Object Property Expressions

The object property interpretation function \(\cdot \)OP is extended to object property expressions as shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object Property Expression</th>
<th>Interpretation (\cdot )OP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ObjectInverseOf( OP )</td>
<td>{ \langle x, y \rangle \mid \langle y, x \rangle \in (OP)^{OP} }</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.2 Data Ranges

The datatype interpretation function \(\cdot \)DT is extended to data ranges as shown in Table 3. All datatypes in OWL 2 are unary, so each datatype \(DT\) is interpreted as a unary relation over \(\Delta_D\) — that is, as a set \((DT)^{DT} \subseteq \Delta_D\). OWL 2 currently does not define data ranges of arity more than one; however, by allowing for \(n\)-ary data ranges, the syntax of OWL 2 provides a "hook" allowing implementations to introduce extensions such as comparisons and arithmetic. An \(n\)-ary data range \(DR\)
is interpreted as an $n$-ary relation $(DR)^{DT}$ over $\Delta_D$ — that is, as a set $(DT)^{DT} \subseteq (\Delta_D)^n$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Range</th>
<th>Interpretation · $^{DT}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DataIntersectionOf( DR$_1$ ... DR$_n$ )</td>
<td>$(DR_1)^{DT} \cap ... \cap (DR_n)^{DT}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DataUnionOf( DR$_1$ ... DR$_n$ )</td>
<td>$(DR_1)^{DT} \cup ... \cup (DR_n)^{DT}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DataComplementOf( DR )</td>
<td>$(\Delta_D)^n \setminus (DR)^{DT}$ where $n$ is the arity of DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DataOneOf( lt$_1$ ... lt$_n$ )</td>
<td>${ (lt_1)^{LT}, ..., (lt_n)^{LT} }$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DatatypeRestriction( DT F$_1$ lt$_1$ ... F$_n$ lt$_n$ )</td>
<td>$(DT)^{DT} \cap \langle F_1, lt_1 \rangle^{FA} \cap ... \cap \langle F_n, lt_n \rangle^{FA}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3. Interpreting Data Ranges**

### 2.2.3 Class Expressions

The class interpretation function $\cdot^C$ is extended to class expressions as shown in Table 4. For $S$ a set, $\#S$ denotes the number of elements in $S$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Expression</th>
<th>Interpretation · $^C$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ObjectIntersectionOf( CE$_1$ ... CE$_n$ )</td>
<td>$(CE_1)^C \cap ... \cap (CE_n)^C$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObjectUnionOf( CE$_1$ ... CE$_n$ )</td>
<td>$(CE_1)^C \cup ... \cup (CE_n)^C$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObjectComplementOf( CE )</td>
<td>$\Delta_I \setminus (CE)^C$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObjectOneOf( a$_1$ ... a$_n$ )</td>
<td>${ a_1^I, ..., a_n^I }$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObjectSomeValuesFrom( OPE CE )</td>
<td>${ x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObjectAllValuesFrom( OPE CE )</td>
<td>${ x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObjectHasValue( OPE a )</td>
<td>${ x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObjectHasSelf( OPE )</td>
<td>${ x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4. Interpreting Class Expressions**
2.3 Satisfaction in an Interpretation

An interpretation \( I = ( \Delta_I, \Delta_D, \cdot^C, \cdot^{OP}, \cdot^{DP}, \cdot^I, \cdot^{DT}, \cdot^{LT}, \cdot^{FA} ) \) satisfies an axiom w.r.t. an ontology \( O \) if the axiom satisfies the relevant condition from the
following sections. Satisfaction of axioms in $I$ is defined w.r.t. $O$ because satisfaction of key axioms uses the following function:

$$\text{ISNAMED}_O(x) = \text{true} \text{ for } x \in \Delta I \text{ if and only if } (a)^I = x \text{ for some named individual } a \text{ occurring in the axiom closure of } O$$

### 2.3.1 Class Expression Axioms

Satisfaction of OWL 2 class expression axioms in $I$ w.r.t. $O$ is defined as shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Satisfaction of Class Expression Axioms in an Interpretation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Axiom</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SubClassOf( $CE_1$ $CE_2$ )</td>
<td>$(CE_1)^C \subseteq (CE_2)^C$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EquivalentClasses( $CE_1$ ... $CE_n$ )</td>
<td>$(CE_j)^C = (CE_k)^C \text{ for each } 1 \leq j \leq n \text{ and each } 1 \leq k \leq n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DisjointClasses( $CE_1$ ... $CE_n$ )</td>
<td>$(CE_j)^C \cap (CE_k)^C = \emptyset \text{ for each } 1 \leq j \leq n \text{ and each } 1 \leq k \leq n \text{ such that } j \neq k$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DisjointUnion( $C$ $CE_1$ ... $CE_n$ )</td>
<td>$(C)^C = (CE_1)^C \cup ... \cup (CE_n)^C \text{ and } $(CE_j)^C \cap (CE_k)^C = \emptyset \text{ for each } 1 \leq j \leq n \text{ and each } 1 \leq k \leq n \text{ such that } j \neq k$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.3.2 Object Property Expression Axioms

Satisfaction of OWL 2 object property expression axioms in $I$ w.r.t. $O$ is defined as shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Satisfaction of Object Property Expression Axioms in an Interpretation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Axiom</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SubObjectPropertyOf( $OPE_1$ $OPE_2$ )</td>
<td>$(OPE_1)^{OP} \subseteq (OPE_2)^{OP}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SubObjectPropertyOf( $OPE_1$ ... $OPE_n$ )</td>
<td>$\forall y_0, ..., y_n : \langle y_0, y_1 \rangle \in (OPE_1)^{OP} \text{ and } ... \text{ and } \langle y_{n-1}, y_n \rangle \in (OPE_n)^{OP} \text{ imply } \langle y_0, y_n \rangle \in (OPE)^{OP}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EquivalentObjectProperties( $OPE_1$ ... $OPE_n$ )</td>
<td>$(OPE_1)^{OP} = (OPE_k)^{OP} \text{ for each } 1 \leq j \leq n \text{ and each } 1 \leq k \leq n$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.3.3 Data Property Expression Axioms

Satisfaction of OWL 2 data property expression axioms in \( I \) w.r.t. \( O \) is defined as shown in Table 7.

**Table 7. Satisfaction of Data Property Expression Axioms in an Interpretation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Axiom</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SubDataPropertyOf( DPE₁, DPE₂ )</td>
<td>((DPE₁)<em>{DP} \subseteq (DPE₂)</em>{DP})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.4 Datatype Definitions

Satisfaction of datatype definitions in I w.r.t. O is defined as shown in Table 8.

Table 9. Satisfaction of Datatype Definitions in an Interpretation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Axiom</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DatatypeDefinition( DT DR )</td>
<td>(DT)DT = (DR)DT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.5 Keys

Satisfaction of keys in I w.r.t. O is defined as shown in Table 9.

Table 9. Satisfaction of Keys in an Interpretation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Axiom</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| HasKey( CE ( OPE1 ... OPEm ) ( DPE1 ... DPEn ) ) | ∀ x, y, z1, ..., zm, w1, ..., wn:  
  if x ∈ (CE)C and ISNAMEDO(x) and  
  y ∈ (CE)C and ISNAMEDO(y) and  
  ⟨x, zi⟩ ∈ (OPEi)OP and ⟨y, zi⟩ ∈  
  (OPEi)OP and ISNAMEDO(zi) for each 1 ≤ i ≤ m and  
  ⟨x, wi⟩ ∈ (DPEj)DP and ⟨y, wi⟩ ∈  
  (DPEj)DP for each 1 ≤ j ≤ n  
  then x = y |
2.3.6 Assertions

Satisfaction of OWL 2 assertions in $I$ w.r.t. $O$ is defined as shown in Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Axiom</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SameIndividual( $a_1$ ... $a_n$ )</td>
<td>$(a_j)^I = (a_k)^I$ for each $1 \leq j \leq n$ and each $1 \leq k \leq n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DifferentIndividuals( $a_1$ ... $a_n$ )</td>
<td>$(a_j)^I \neq (a_k)^I$ for each $1 \leq j \leq n$ and each $1 \leq k \leq n$ such that $j \neq k$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ClassAssertion( CE $a$ )</td>
<td>$(a)^I \in (CE)^C$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObjectPropertyAssertion( OPE $a_1$ $a_2$ )</td>
<td>$\langle (a_1)^I, (a_2)^I \rangle \in (OPE)^{OP}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NegativeObjectPropertyAssertion( OPE $a_1$ $a_2$ )</td>
<td>$\langle (a_1)^I, (a_2)^I \rangle \notin (OPE)^{OP}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DataPropertyAssertion( DPE $a$ $lt$ )</td>
<td>$\langle (a)^I, (lt)^{LT} \rangle \in (DPE)^{DP}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NegativeDataPropertyAssertion( DPE $a$ $lt$ )</td>
<td>$\langle (a)^I, (lt)^{LT} \rangle \notin (DPE)^{DP}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.7 Ontologies

An interpretation $I$ satisfies an OWL 2 ontology $O$ if all axioms in the axiom closure of $O$ (with anonymous individuals standardized apart as described in Section 5.6.2 of the OWL 2 Specification [OWL 2 Specification]) are satisfied in $I$ w.r.t. $O$.

2.4 Models

Given a datatype map $D$, an interpretation $I = (\Delta_I, \Delta_D, \cdot^C, \cdot^{OP}, \cdot^{DP}, \cdot^I, \cdot^{DT}, \cdot^{LT}, \cdot^{FA})$ for $D$ is a model of an OWL 2 ontology $O$ w.r.t. $D$ if an interpretation $J = (\Delta_J, \Delta_D, \cdot^C, \cdot^{OP}, \cdot^{DP}, \cdot^J, \cdot^{DT}, \cdot^{LT}, \cdot^{FA})$ for $D$ exists such that $\cdot^I$ coincides with $\cdot^J$ on all named individuals and $J$ satisfies $O$.

Thus, an interpretation $I$ satisfying $O$ is also a model of $O$. In contrast, a model $I$ of $O$ may not satisfy $O$ directly; however, by modifying the interpretation of anonymous individuals, $I$ can always be coerced into an interpretation $J$ that satisfies $O$. 
2.5 Inference Problems

Let \( D \) be a datatype map and \( V \) a vocabulary over \( D \). Furthermore, let \( O \) and \( O_1 \) be OWL 2 ontologies, \( CE \), \( CE_1 \), and \( CE_2 \) class expressions, and \( a \) a named individual, such that all of them refer only to the vocabulary elements in \( V \). Furthermore, variables are symbols that are not contained in \( V \). Finally, a Boolean conjunctive query \( Q \) is a closed formula of the form

\[ \exists x_1, \ldots, x_n, y_1, \ldots, y_m : [ A_1 \land \ldots \land A_k ] \]

where each \( A_i \) is an atom of the form \( C(s) \), \( OP(s,t) \), or \( DP(s,u) \) with \( C \) a class, \( OP \) an object property, \( DP \) a data property, \( s \) and \( t \) individuals or some variable \( x_j \), and \( u \) a literal or some variable \( y_j \).

The following inference problems are often considered in practice.

**Ontology Consistency**: \( O \) is consistent (or satisfiable) w.r.t. \( D \) if a model of \( O \) w.r.t. \( D \) and \( V \) exists.

**Ontology Entailment**: \( O \) entails \( O_1 \) w.r.t. \( D \) if every model of \( O \) w.r.t. \( D \) and \( V \) is also a model of \( O_1 \) w.r.t. \( D \) and \( V \).

**Ontology Equivalence**: \( O \) and \( O_1 \) are equivalent w.r.t. \( D \) if \( O \) entails \( O_1 \) w.r.t. \( D \) and \( O_1 \) entails \( O \) w.r.t. \( D \).

**Ontology Equisatisfiability**: \( O \) and \( O_1 \) are equisatisfiable w.r.t. \( D \) if \( O \) and \( O_1 \) are satisfiable w.r.t. \( D \) if and only if \( O_1 \) is satisfiable w.r.t. \( D \).

**Class Expression Satisfiability**: \( CE \) is satisfiable w.r.t. \( O \) and \( D \) if a model \( I = ( \Delta I, \Delta_D, \cdot, C, \cdot, OP, \cdot, DP, \cdot, I, \cdot, DT, \cdot, LT, \cdot, FA ) \) of \( O \) w.r.t. \( D \) and \( V \) exists such that \( (CE)^C \neq \emptyset \).

**Class Expression Subsumption**: \( CE_1 \) is subsumed by a class expression \( CE_2 \) w.r.t. \( O \) and \( D \) if \( (CE_1)^C \subseteq (CE_2)^C \) for each model \( I = ( \Delta I, \Delta_D, \cdot, C, \cdot, OP, \cdot, DP, \cdot, I, \cdot, DT, \cdot, LT, \cdot, FA ) \) of \( O \) w.r.t. \( D \) and \( V \).

**Instance Checking**: \( a \) is an instance of \( CE \) w.r.t. \( O \) and \( D \) if \( (a)^I \in (CE)^C \) for each model \( I = ( \Delta I, \Delta_D, \cdot, C, \cdot, OP, \cdot, DP, \cdot, I, \cdot, DT, \cdot, LT, \cdot, FA ) \) of \( O \) w.r.t. \( D \) and \( V \).

**Boolean Conjunctive Query Answering**: \( Q \) is an answer w.r.t. \( O \) and \( D \) if \( Q \) is true in each model of \( O \) w.r.t. \( D \) and \( V \) according to the standard definitions of first-order logic.

In order to ensure that ontology entailment, class expression satisfiability, class expression subsumption, and instance checking are decidable, the following restriction w.r.t. \( O \) needs to be satisfied:
Each class expression of type `MinObjectCardinality`, `MaxObjectCardinality`, `ExactObjectCardinality`, and `ObjectHasSelf` that occurs in \(O_1\), \(CE\), \(CE_1\), and \(CE_2\) can contain only object property expressions that are simple in the axiom closure \(Ax\) of \(O\).

For ontology equivalence to be decidable, \(O_1\) needs to satisfy this restriction w.r.t. \(O\) and vice versa. These restrictions are analogous to the first condition from Section 11.2 of the OWL 2 Specification [OWL 2 Specification].

3 Independence of the Direct Semantics from the Datatype Map in OWL 2 DL (Informative)

OWL 2 DL has been defined so that the consequences of an OWL 2 DL ontology \(O\) do not depend on the choice of a datatype map, as long as the datatype map chosen contains all the datatypes occurring in \(O\). This statement is made precise by the following theorem, and it has several useful consequences:

- One can apply the direct semantics to an OWL 2 DL ontology \(O\) by considering only the datatypes explicitly occurring in \(O\).
- When referring to various reasoning problems, the datatype map \(D\) need not be given explicitly, as it is sufficient to consider an implicit datatype map containing only the datatypes from the given ontology.
- OWL 2 DL reasoners can provide datatypes not explicitly mentioned in this specification without fear that this will change the meaning of OWL 2 DL ontologies not using these datatypes.

**Theorem DS1.** Let \(O_1\) and \(O_2\) be OWL 2 DL ontologies over a vocabulary \(V\) and \(D = (N_{DT}, N_{LS}, N_{FS}, \cdot_{DT}, \cdot_{LS}, \cdot_{FS})\) a datatype map such that each datatype mentioned in \(O_1\) and \(O_2\) is `rdfs:Literal`, a datatype defined in the respective ontology, or it occurs in \(N_{DT}\). Furthermore, let \(D' = (N_{DT}', N_{LS}', N_{FS}', \cdot_{DT}', \cdot_{LS}', \cdot_{FS}')\) be a datatype map such that \(N_{DT} \subseteq N_{DT}', N_{LS}(DT) = N_{LS'}(DT),\) and \(N_{FS}(DT) = N_{FS'}(DT)\) for each \(DT \in N_{DT}, \cdot_{DT}, \cdot_{LS},\) and \(\cdot_{FS}\) are extensions of \(\cdot_{DT}', \cdot_{LS}',\) and \(\cdot_{FS}'\), respectively. Then, \(O_1\) entails \(O_2\) w.r.t. \(D\) if and only if \(O_1\) entails \(O_2\) w.r.t. \(D'\).

**Proof.** Without loss of generality, one can assume \(O_1\) and \(O_2\) to be in negation-normal form [Description Logics]. Furthermore, since datatype definitions in \(O_1\) and \(O_2\) are acyclic, one can assume that each defined datatype has been recursively replaced with its definition; thus, all datatypes in \(O_1\) and \(O_2\) are from \(N_{DT} \cup \{rdfs:Literal\}\). The claim of the theorem is equivalent to the following statement: an interpretation \(I\) w.r.t. \(D\) and \(V\) exists such that \(O_1\) is, and \(O_2\) is not satisfied in \(I\) if and only if an interpretation \(I\) w.r.t. \(D'\) and \(V\) exists such that \(O_1\) is, and \(O_2\) is not satisfied in \(I\). The \((\Rightarrow)\) direction is trivial since each interpretation \(I\) w.r.t. \(D'\) and \(V\) is also an interpretation w.r.t. \(D\) and \(V\). For the \((\Leftarrow)\) direction, assume that an interpretation \(I = (\Delta_I, \Delta_D, \cdot_C, \cdot_{OP}, \cdot_{DP}, \cdot_I, \cdot_{DT}, \cdot_{LT}, \cdot_{FA})\) w.r.t. \(D\) and \(V\) exists such that \(O_1\) is, and \(O_2\) is not satisfied in \(I\). Let \(I' = (\Delta_I, \Delta_D', \cdot_C', \cdot_{OP}, \cdot_{DP}, \cdot_I, \cdot_{DT}, \cdot_{LT}, \cdot_{FA})\) be an interpretation such that
• $\Delta^D$ is obtained by extending $\Delta D$ with the value space of all datatypes in $N_{DT} \setminus N_{DT}$,

• $\mathcal{C}^D$ coincides with $\mathcal{C}$ on all classes, and

• $\cdot^DP$ coincides with $\cdot^DP$ on all data properties apart from $\text{owl:topDataProperty}$.

Clearly, $\text{DataComplementOf}( DR )^{DT} \subseteq \text{DataComplementOf}( DR )^{DT'}$ for each data range $DR$ that is either a datatype, a datatype restriction, or an enumerated data range. The $\text{owl:topDataProperty}$ property can occur in $O_1$ and $O_2$ only in tautologies. The interpretation of all other data properties is the same in $I$ and $I'$, so $(CE)^C = (CE)^C'$ for each class expression $CE$ occurring in $O_1$ and $O_2$. Therefore, $O_1$ is and $O_2$ is not satisfied in $I'$. QED
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