

Viewing a World of Annotations through AnnoVIP

Konstantinos Karanasos, Spyros Zoupanos

► **To cite this version:**

Konstantinos Karanasos, Spyros Zoupanos. Viewing a World of Annotations through AnnoVIP. International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE), Mar 2010, Long Beach, California, United States. 2010. <inria-00541114>

HAL Id: inria-00541114

<https://hal.inria.fr/inria-00541114>

Submitted on 29 Nov 2010

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Viewing a World of Annotations through AnnoVIP

Konstantinos Karanasos, Spyros Zoupanos

INRIA Saclay-Île-de-France
4 rue Jacques Monod, 91893 Orsay Cedex, France
firstname.lastname@inria.fr

Abstract—The proliferation of electronic content has notably lead to the apparition of large corpora of interrelated structured documents (such as HTML and XML Web pages) and semantic annotations (typically expressed in RDF), which further complement these documents. Documents and annotations may be authored independently by different users or programs. We present AnnoVIP, a peer-to-peer platform, capable of efficiently exploiting a multitude of annotated documents, based on innovative materialized views.

I. OUTLINE

In recent years, more and more software tools, including the most user-friendly ones, such as text editors, have started to export their contents into some *structured document format*, such as HTML or XML. Moreover, *annotations* have become very popular as a means to add information to a given document. HTML Meta tags, Dublin Core [1] and social networks' tagging are among the most common methods to express annotations. Here, we designate by annotation any simple statement in the style of the RDF standard [2], attaching to a given subject (or resource, such as a document, or a small portion of text) a named property, with a certain value.

Using documents *and* annotations provides the flexibility to handle a variety of application scenarios in which documents or RDF alone would not be suitable. As an example, think of a Web page containing a news item, annotated by a human reader or a text analysis tool to point out the person names appearing in the page, her positions within various institutions etc. or to express subjective opinions regarding the document. One could suggest modifying the Web page to incorporate the additional information of the annotations. However, this is not always feasible, since the author of the annotations may be distinct from, and have no control over, the author of the original document; furthermore, the original document should be readable also to those that are not interested in the extra information. Using only RDF to model all the content, on the other hand, is not appropriate since end users are familiar with, and expect to use structured documents.

Documents and annotations are at the center of the WebContent [3] project, in which we are involved. The project is focused on building and maintaining warehouses of enhanced Web documents on specific topics, e.g., market survey for the EADS european company (with offices in several countries) or an intelligence survey/warehouse concerning news from online media, bloggers etc. concerning a specific area of the world.

Content publication in WebContent applications is inherently distributed. Documents coming from the Web are fetched

by crawlers running at different sites, possibly re-formatted, translated from one language to another, and published by the respective sites. Similarly, documents and annotations authored by domain experts are published from their sites. WebContent applications require that all sites be able to exploit all the published contents. One could have considered uploading all published content to a single site. However, this raises some scalability problems, which may require acquiring dedicated hardware, and introduces a single point of failure.

To address such applications, we have built AnnoVIP, a symmetrical, peer-to-peer platform, based on a distributed hash table (or DHT, in short [4]), which guarantees upper bounds on the number of hops needed in order to route a given message in the peer network. At the core of content sharing in AnnoVIP stand *materialized views over the whole network content*. Each peer may locally store some XML and RDF content, and may also define views, describing patterns of interconnected documents and annotations, that the peer is interested in. These views are stored in a local repository at the peer. Once a view is established, its definition will be indexed in the DHT network. When documents or annotations are published, by looking up in the DHT, the publishing peer learns if its new content may contribute to some view, and if yes, it sends the respective data to the view. After publication, this lookup is repeated periodically to identify contributions to views defined later on. Thus, views are updated over time, in the manner of long-running, de-centralized subscriptions.

A further step in content sharing in AnnoVIP is *materialized view-based query rewriting*. Here, we consider the situation when a peer issues an ad-hoc query, which it has not declared as a local view. The peer then looks up in the DHT the existing view definitions, and may rewrite its query based on the views. From a rewriting, a distributed query plan is derived and evaluated. When available, pre-computed materialized views may lead to efficient query evaluation.

The novelty of AnnoVIP stems from its built-in dual support for documents and annotations at arbitrary granularity (one can annotate a document, an element, or even a text fragment). Maintaining and exploiting materialized views for efficient query processing, over such interconnected corpora of documents and annotations requires new algorithms, further complicated by the distribution on the DHT.

In the sequel, Section II discusses content publishing in AnnoVIP, whereas Section III describes querying. We outline the target demo scenarios in Section IV and relate AnnoVIP to existing works in Section V.




Fig. 1. Architecture overview.

```

<article>
  <publishInfo>
    <author>Alice</author> <year>2009</year>
    <country>...</country> </publishInfo>
    <headline>Financial Crisis</headline>
    <topic>economy</topic> <body>...</body>
  </article>

```

Fig. 2. Sample published document $xml_{article}$.

II. CONTENT PUBLICATION IN ANNOVIP

In this section, we discuss publication of documents, annotations and views in our system. Section II-A describes the contents which one may publish, whereas Section II-B outlines the publication process. To illustrate our explanation, a simple AnnoVIP instance over six peers is depicted in Fig. 1. Next to each peer, the Figure shows its published XML documents (such as xml_1 , xml_2 etc.), annotations (denoted rdf_1 , rdf_2 etc.) and/or materialized views (v_1 , v_2 etc.).

A. Content model

The first kind of content we consider consists of XML documents. Each document d published by peer p has an URI allowing to uniquely determine d inside p and in the whole network. For example, Fig. 2 shows an article on the financial crisis, published by user Alice. This could be the $xml_{article}$ document published by peer p_4 in Fig. 1.

Annotations can target content at very different granularity levels. Thus, one can annotate a document, an element, a text node, or even a fragment of text, e.g., a phrase of particular significance, or a person’s name inside a text. Therefore, we consider that any fragment of a document d , whatever its size, has an URI. Such URIs are implemented by (offset, length) pairs identifying the fragment in the serialization of d . Moreover, the URI of d can be easily obtained from the URI of any fragment of d . This holds in many common URI schemes, such as XPointer [5], where $d.URI$ is a prefix of all the URIs of elements in d .

Our model assumes that any XML element has a child labeled URI , whose value is the actual URI of the element.

```

<rdf:RDF xmlns:rdf="http://www.w3.org/1999-rdf-syntax-ns#"
  xmlns:anno="http://gemo.inria.fr/annotate/">
  <rdf:Description rdf:about="http://gemo.inria.fr/article.xml#body">
    <anno:authName>Bob</anno:authName>
    <anno:authCountry>France</anno:authCountry>
    <anno:date>26-6-2009</anno:date>
    <anno:rating>interesting</anno:rating>
    <anno:seeAlso>"http://gemo.inria.fr/article2.xml"</anno:seeAlso>
  </rdf:Description>
</rdf:RDF>

```

Fig. 3. Sample annotation.

However, URI-labeled nodes are virtual, that is, they do not actually appear in the elements (although as we will explain, they are needed for querying documents and annotations). In a similar manner, any fragment can be seen as a node, endowed with an URI. Without loss of generality, as well as for conciseness, we focus only on elements hereafter.

The second class of content we consider concerns annotations, which may be either produced by human users, possibly with the help of some tools, or by automated modules (e.g. recognizing named entities within a document). For simplicity, we consider that all annotations have been brought to an RDF format. Thus, the basic unit of content here is a triple $t=(s,p,o)$, specifying the value o of property p for the resource s . We assume triples are serialized following the XML syntax for RDF [6]. As customary in RDF, s , p and o range over the set of all URIs, plus the set of String values in the case of o .

For instance, let us consider how user Bob at peer p_1 in Fig. 1 produces the new annotation rdf_{anno} . Assume Bob discovers the $xml_{article}$ published by Alice at p_4 and decides to annotate the *body* of the article as being “interesting”. Bob also suggests another article (*article2.xml*), which he finds related. The corresponding RDF annotation appears in Fig. 3, together with the author’s (i.e., Bob’s) profile.

B. Peer-to-peer views in AnnoVIP

Views and queries are defined in the same language, which can be seen as joins over a specific flavor of tree patterns. Fig. 4 shows some examples.

Each tree pattern node carries a name label, corresponding to an element or attribute name or a word appearing in a text node in some document or annotation (we will use \underline{w} to denote the word w). Pattern edges correspond either to the child ($/$) or the descendant ($//$) relationships between nodes; we assume that a text word is a child of its closest enclosing element or ancestor node. *Due to the special role we attach to URIs, we impose that an URI-labeled view node always appears as a child (not descendant) of another node in the view.* Each node may be decorated with zero or more among the following labels: *id*, standing for *structural identifier*¹; *cont*, standing for the full XML subtree rooted at the node; and *val*, standing for the concatenation of all text descendants of the node, in document order. An *id*, *cont* or *val* label attached to a node denotes the fact that the structural ID, the content or the value,

¹By comparing the structural identifiers of nodes n_1 and n_2 , one can decide n_1 is an ancestor of n_2 or not. Many popular examples exist, e.g. [7], [8].




Fig. 4. Sample queries and views.

respectively, of the node belong to the pattern result. Finally, each node may be labeled with a predicate of the form $[val=c]$ where c is some constant.

In Fig. 4, pattern tp_1 stores the structural ID and the content of all *publishInfo* elements. Pattern tp_2 stores the author’s name, as well as the suggested documents for all annotations, while tp_3 keeps the date, country and rating of annotations. Pattern tp_4 stores the URIs of all articles containing the word “banks”. Observe that although element URIs are not stored in the original document, they must be actually stored in a view such as tp_4 . Finally, tp_5 stores the URI, the headline and the country of the publisher of all articles about the economy.

More complex views can be obtained by joining tree patterns based on some value equality predicates. For instance, a view may require the name of each author having annotated an article which mentions “banks”, by connecting tp_2 and tp_4 using a value join ($rdf:about.val=uri.val$). Observe that the presence of value joins in the language is crucial for capturing the connections between content and annotations on that content, via such equality predicates.

Let us consider how published views are filled with data.

In the simple case of tree pattern views, the tree pattern defining the view is indexed in the DHT by the labels of all its nodes. Assume peer p publishes some new content. Then, p will perform lookups on all the element names and words appearing in this content, to find (possibly a superset of) views to which the new content may contribute. p then evaluates these views against its content. The evaluation leads to a set of tuples, which p sends to the peer which published v . Thus, the extent (tuples) of a view accumulates, and is stored, at the view publishing peer. Given that documents and annotations may also be published after a view to which they may contribute, periodic view lookup is performed to see if some new views have been declared since the last lookup, and possibly contribute to them.

For example, Fig. 1 shows the events taking place when user Bob publishes $rd_{f_{anno}}$ at p_1 . Firstly, he performs a lookup to determine (a possible superset of) the view definitions to which the new annotation may add some tuples (step 1).

In our Figure, p_6 holds a view definition index entry referring to such a view. Upon receiving the view definition, say that of v_2 which p_3 holds, p_1 extracts the tuples corresponding to $v_2(rd_{f_{anno}})$ and sends them to p_3 (step 2), which appends them to the view extent. Observe that the contribution of $rd_{f_{anno}}$ to the view could be evaluated locally at p_1 , assuming the view is a tree pattern.

This resource publication process needs to be extended to accommodate views with joins. Indeed, in such cases, a peer publishing some new content needs to know if and where, in the whole network, some other content may satisfy a value join with its own. One way to implement this is to maintain, in fact, instead of a tree pattern join view, one view per each tree pattern, and compute view tuples incrementally as new tuples are added to each tree pattern, in the style of incremental maintenance for join views [9]. However, this may lead to accumulating an unbound amount of data, if, for instance, many documents matching one view tree pattern are published, which do not join with any other document or annotation. To deal with this shortcoming, we devised more efficient techniques both for the cases when join predicates do and do not involve *URI attributes* [10]. We notice that joins over (possibly virtual) URI attributes are present whenever a view queries documents with annotations.

III. QUERY REWRITING USING VIEWS

We now consider the processing of a query, such as q in Fig. 1, posed at a peer p_2 which has not declared q as a local materialized view. First, p needs to find out which views in the network could possibly be used to answer q . This relies on the same view definition indexing used for view maintenance. Then, p runs a view-based rewriting algorithm to find complete rewritings of q using the existing materialized views. Finally, one rewriting is picked and evaluated over the distributed peers.

For instance, in Fig. 1, query q is posed by user Carole at peer p_2 . To find view definitions relevant to q , p_2 performs a DHT look-up (step 1’). Assume that peers p_1 and p_4 return relevant view definitions. p_2 then tries to rewrite q based on these views (step 2’). The outcome of the algorithm is a logical algebraic plan based on some views, in our example v_3 and v_4 , which are stored in peers p_5 and p_6 respectively. Subsequently, p_2 transforms the rewriting to a distributed physical plan, which is executed in a distributed fashion in the network (step 3’). For instance, v_3 is sent from p_5 to p_6 , where it is joined with the local v_4 and the result is sent back to p_2 .

AnnoVIP’s rewriting algorithm restricted to tree pattern queries is provided in [11], and extended to the general language in [10]; for space reasons, we do not detail it further here. We illustrate it via examples (recall again the sample queries in Fig. 4).

Query q_1 asks for the headlines of articles mentioning banks. A possible rewriting could just use tp_4 to navigate through the content of element *article* and then project the headline. Now consider a more complex query q_2 , demanding the headlines of all articles published in 2009 that were

annotated as interesting today in France. Query q_2 can be rewritten using tp_3 and tp_5 in the obvious way, if these patterns are available as materialized views. The drawback is that this rewriting still requires evaluating one join. However, if view v_1 were available, q_2 could be answered more efficiently, without evaluating any costly joins.

IV. PLATFORM AND DEMONSTRATION SCENARIO

We have implemented AnnoVIP on top of VIP2P [11], a peer-to-peer platform for sharing XML documents using materialized views. The extension we brought concerns the support for annotations, value joins in the query language, and specific techniques for materializing join views and rewriting queries including value joins. The system is completely developed in Java, using the Pastry DHT and BerkeleyDB for storing materialized views; the GUI is based on generic Semantic Web visualization toolkits [12], [13]. VIP2P's scalability has been established in large-scale experiments involving up to 1000 peers in a country-wide WAN [14], thousands of documents and hundreds of views.

During the demonstration, attendees will get a hands-on experience on deploying and running AnnoVIP network. We plan to reserve a few hundreds of machines in the Grid5000 network [14], on which will be deployed (from a single configuration package) a set of documents, views, and annotations to start with. For demonstration purposes, one peer will play the role of the coordinator, to which all others report their events (publishing views, documents or annotations, adding data to views etc.). Demo attendees will then get a chance to provide their own content in the network either from sample files which we will provide, or by importing various Web pages; we will also use a few blogs, whose RSS stream of updates we will wrap as content to be published in the network. At that point, annotations at various granularities could be added on top of the existing or newly published documents. Then, the content of any view could be dynamically inspected via the GUI to see how it changes as new contributions are added to it. A visual representation of the network topology will also be available, enabling demo attendees to trace the distributed resource publication or query processing.

We plan to use data sets derived from the target applications of WebContent. Besides the EADS market survey, we also plan to use an application related to food safety. In both cases, a set of documents is available, and specific semantic indexes analyzing the documents are able to produce annotations which will be published in the network. Dynamically added content during the demo will complement these sources to illustrate how the system works.

V. RELATED WORKS

Our demonstration relates to many works on XML indexing in DHT networks [15], [16], [17], over which it improves by allowing to declare and exploit complex materialized views to speed-up the processing of specific application queries. In [11], we have provided algorithms which handle efficiently tree pattern views in large networks (1000 peers). AnnoVIP is the

first to jointly consider documents and annotations, and as a consequence, as explained in Section II, we add value joins to the views and to the queries. Numerous recent works have targeted efficient RDF querying in a centralized setting [18] and based on DHTs [19]. The specificity of our work is to first, combine documents and annotations and second, focus on view maintenance and view-based rewriting.

Within the WebContent project [3], we have devised a DHT-based platform integrating two types of DHT content indices [20]. However, this still did not provide sufficient leeway to establish efficient data access support structures. Moreover, the biggest performance problems we encountered while using the system [20] were due to the frequent joins generated by document-and-annotations queries.

Acknowledgements We are grateful to Ioana Manolescu for her substantial guidance and support in this work. We are also thankful to Alin Tilea for his contribution in developing the system. This work has been partially funded by *Agence Nationale de la Recherche*, decision ANR-08-DEFIS-004.

REFERENCES

- [1] "Dublin core metadata initiative," <http://www.dublincore.org/>.
- [2] "RDF: Concepts and Abstract Syntax," <http://www.w3.org/TR/rdf-concepts/>, 2004.
- [3] "The WebContent Semantic Web platform," www.webcontent.fr.
- [4] F. Dabek, B. Zhao, P. Druschel, J. Kubiawicz, and I. Stoica, "Towards a common API for structured P2P overlays," in *IPTPS*, 2003.
- [5] "XML Pointer Language," <http://www.w3.org/TR/WD-xptr>, 2001.
- [6] "RDF/XML Syntax Specification," <http://www.w3.org/TR/rdf-syntax-grammar/>, 2004.
- [7] S. Al-Khalifa, H. V. Jagadish, J. M. Patel, Y. Wu, N. Koudas, and D. Srivastava, "Structural joins: A primitive for efficient XML query pattern matching," in *ICDE*, 2002.
- [8] I. Tatarinov, S. Vigiias, K. S. Beyer, J. Shanmugasundaram, E. J. Shekita, and C. Zhang, "Storing and querying ordered XML using a relational database system," in *SIGMOD Conference*, 2002.
- [9] A. Gupta, I. S. Mumick, and V. S. Subrahmanian, "Maintaining views incrementally," in *SIGMOD Conference*, 1993.
- [10] K. Karanasos and I. Manolescu, "P2P Views over Annotated Documents," <http://vip2p.saclay.inria.fr/papers/report.pdf>, 2009, Technical report.
- [11] I. Manolescu and S. Zoupanos, "Materialized views for P2P XML warehousing," <http://vip2p.saclay.inria.fr/papers/paper.pdf>, 2009, submitted for publication.
- [12] E. Pietriga, "Semantic web data visualization with graph style sheets," in *SoftVis*, 2006.
- [13] "The prefuse visualization toolkit," <http://www.prefuse.org/>.
- [14] "Grid'5000 network infrastructure," <https://www.grid5000.fr/>.
- [15] S. Abiteboul, I. Manolescu, N. Polyzotis, N. Preda, and C. Sun, "XML processing in DHT networks," in *ICDE*, 2008.
- [16] L. Galanis, Y. Wang, S. Jeffery, and D. DeWitt, "Locating data sources in large distributed systems," in *VLDB*, 2003.
- [17] P. Rao and B. Moon, "An internet-scale service for publishing and locating XML documents (demo)," in *ICDE*, 2009.
- [18] C. Weiss, P. Karras, and A. Bernstein, "Hexastore: sextuple indexing for semantic web data management," *PVLDB*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2008.
- [19] E. Liarou, S. Idreos, and M. Koubarakis, "Evaluating conjunctive triple pattern queries over large structured overlay networks," in *ISWC*, 2006.
- [20] S. Abiteboul, T. Allard, P. Chatalic, G. Gardarin, A. Ghitescu, F. Goasdoué, I. Manolescu, B. Nguyen, M. Ouazara, A. Somani, N. Travers, G. Vasile, and S. Zoupanos, "Webcontent: efficient P2P warehousing of web data (demo)," *PVLDB*, vol. 1, no. 2, 2008.