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Abstract—This paper presents data annotation models at five levels of granularity (database, relation, column, tuple, and cell) of relational data to address the problem of unsuitability of most relational databases to express annotations. These models do not require any structural and schematic changes to the underlying database. These models are also flexible, extensible, customizable, database-neutral, and platform-independent. This paper also presents an SQL-like query language, named Annotation Query Language (AnQL), to query annotation documents. AnQL is simple to understand and exploits the already-existent wide knowledge and skill set of SQL.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Most relational databases (RDBMSs) utilize their metadata schema to store statistical information for constraint checking and query optimization. The metadata schema provided by most RDBMSs is unsuitable for expressing data annotations. Data annotations are semantically rich metadata applicable to a particular application domain that help further clarify features of interest. A feature of interest is a data item that a user wants to annotate [1]. Types of data annotations include comments, descriptions, definitions, notes, error messages, among several others.

This paper addresses the problem of unsuitability of most RDBMSs’ metadata schema to express semantic data annotations by defining data annotation models that allow the annotation of relational data at five levels of granularity – database, relation, column, tuple, and cell. These data annotation models are structured using Extensible Markup Language (XML). The most important feature of these models is that they do not require any structural or schematic changes to the underlying RDBMS. It is common knowledge that database administrators (DBAs) are resistant to structural and schematic changes to already deployed databases. Thus, the models presented in this paper stand a greater chance of being adopted. In addition, these models are easy to understand, flexible, customizable, extensible, database-neutral, and platform-independent. These models also allow users to cross-reference related annotations. The ability to customize these models stems from the flexibility given to users to define annotations to serve their individual requirements. Specifically, users can name the applicationDomainSpecificTag according to their requirements.

This paper also presents an SQL-like query language, Annotation Query Language (AnQL), to query annotation documents based on these models. AnQL is designed to take advantage of the already-abundant knowledge and skill set of SQL. XPath [3] and XQuery [2] are complex query languages. Learning these languages might present a steep learning curve. SQL-XML [4] engines force RDBMSs to deal with semi-structured data format. Simplicity and ease of understanding are the main motivation factors for the design of the data annotation models and the query language presented in this paper.

Data annotations reduce communication and data exchange hassles and provide almost all types of database users (scientists, customer service providers, banks, corporations) with a more collaborative environment. A scientist, who wants to share the discovery he or she made while investigating an image can utilize annotations to annotate the image. He or she can also seamlessly share these findings with other researchers. In some cases, annotations might also help reduce costs, and save time and effort. As an example, a customer can dispute a charge on his or her bank statement using annotations. The customer need not restrict himself or herself to the customer service hours. A customer service provider can also use annotations to update the customer.

Due to its numeric nature, it is often difficult to interpret the semantics of scientific data, simply by looking at it. As an example, it is difficult to interpret whether the data in the TEMPERATURE column is expressed in Metric or English units. Annotations can help scientists annotate the TEMPERATURE column with the appropriate unit. If the column contains temperature in both Metric and English units, the cell-level data annotation model can be used to annotate each cell individually with its unit. An alternative is to change the data type of the TEMPERATURE column, from DECIMAL to VARCHAR, to accommodate the unit. This might not be desirable since the scientists will lose the ability to manipulate the data mathematically. Moreover, this also requires a change...
to the underlying RDBMS.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows – Section 2 compares and contrasts the work presented in this paper with that presented in Annotea, DBNotes, MONDRIAN, SLIMPad, and few others; Section 3 presents the data annotation models that allow users to annotate relational data at five different levels; Section 4 presents the SQL-like query language, AnQL, and its query processing operations; and conclusions and future work are discussed in Section 5.

II. RELATED WORK

This section compares and contrasts the annotation models presented in this paper with Annotea [5], DBNotes [6], MONDRIAN [7], SLIMPad [8], and with those presented in [1] and [9]. Annotea allows users to annotate documents identified by a URI with or without the knowledge of the authors. Similar to the models presented in this paper, DBNotes and MONDRIAN annotate relational data. The models presented in this paper allow relational data to be annotated at five different levels of granularity – database, relation, column, tuple, and cell. DBNotes focuses on the where-provenance and propagation of annotations. MONDRIAN focuses on biological databases, and allows users to annotate both single values and the association between multiple values. SLIMPad annotates data that resides in a variety of applications, such as databases, spreadsheets, and documents, among several others. SLIMPad addresses annotations in the domain of physicians providing treatment to patients. The system presented in [9] annotates audio-visual documents. The system presented in [1] annotates neuroanatomical images at various levels of granularity.

Annotea and SLIMPad utilize RDF to define annotations. DBNotes and MONDRIAN utilize relational data to express annotations. The annotation system in [9] utilizes LEDA graph structure and XML Document Object Model (DOM) to express annotations. The data annotation models presented in this paper also utilize XML to structure data annotations. The system presented in [1] uses text-based annotations. All annotations, by default, based on the data annotation models presented in this paper, are accompanied with metadata information, such as the author’s name and the creation time stamp. This behavior is common with annotations in Annotea. Both Annota and the data annotation models presented in this paper allow annotations to cross-reference related annotations.

Annotations in Annotea reside in generic RDF databases, accessible through HTTP servers. Annotations presented in [1], [9], and in this paper reside outside the underlying database whose data they annotate. Data annotation documents based on the data annotation models presented in this paper reside on the file system of a computer system. SLIMPad modifies the base layer that it annotates in order to store annotations. DBNotes and MONDRIAN store annotations within the RDBMS. Columns may be added to relations in order to annotate relational data [10]. Annotations at column and tuples levels can be expressed using this scheme. However, by using this scheme, it is difficult to express annotations at the database, relation, and cell levels.

III. DATA ANNOTATION MODELS

Figures 1-5 present data annotation models that allow users to annotate relational data at five different levels of granularity – database, relation, column, tuple, and cell. XML is used to structure these data annotation models. XML was chosen because it provides several advantages over other data formats, such as text, e-mail, or electronic forms. XML is database-neutral and platform-independent. XML’s database-neutrality allows the use of same data annotation models to express data annotations on base data that resides in heterogeneous databases, such as, IBM DB2 UDB [11], Oracle [12], and SQL Server [13] etc. XML’s platform-independence allows users to express, share, and utilize data annotations irrespective of the operating system and platform they use. Since XML supports Unicode, the support for expressing data annotations in several different languages is already built-in [14]. Therefore, it can be used to share data seamlessly regardless of the underlying database and operating system.

Fig. 1 database-level data annotation model

```
<annotationDocument>
  <documentName>uniqueName</documentName>
  <documentId>uniqueId</documentId>
  <annotationAttachedTo>
    <database>databaseName</database>
  </annotationAttachedTo>
  <!-- annotation and annotationMetadata may occur multiple times in a single document -->
  <annotation>
    <applicationDomainSpecificMetatag>
      dataAnnotation
    </applicationDomainSpecificMetatag>
    <annotationAttachedTo>
      <documentId>uniqueId</documentId>
      <documentName>uniqueName</documentName>
    </annotationAttachedTo>
    <!-- recordedXsomeDateAndTime > recorded -->
    <annotationMetadata>
      <author>someone</author>
    </annotationMetadata>
  </annotation>
</annotationDocument>
```

Fig. 2 relation-level data annotation model

```
<annotationDocument>
  <documentName>uniqueName</documentName>
  <documentId>uniqueId</documentId>
  <annotationAttachedTo>
    <database>databaseName</database>
    <relation>relationName</relation>
  </annotationAttachedTo>
  <!-- annotation and annotationMetadata may occur multiple times in a single document -->
  <annotation>
    <applicationDomainSpecificMetatag>
      dataAnnotation
    </applicationDomainSpecificMetatag>
    <annotationAttachedTo>
      <documentId>uniqueId</documentId>
      <documentName>uniqueName</documentName>
      <documentId>uniqueId</documentId>
      <documentName>uniqueName</documentName>
    </annotationAttachedTo>
    <!-- recordedXsomeDateAndTime > recorded -->
    <annotationMetadata>
      <author>someone</author>
    </annotationMetadata>
  </annotation>
</annotationDocument>
```
Each of the data annotation models presented in Figures 1-5 may be further divided into modules, namely, identification, level, annotation, annotation metadata, and cross-reference. These modules are illustrated in Fig. (6). The identification module uniquely identifies a data annotation document. It contains the hierarchy within the documentName and documentId tags. The level module represents the level (database, relation, column, tuple, or cell) that a data annotation document annotates. The level module is identified by the tag annotationAttachedTo. The annotation module contains the actual data annotation, and the annotation metadata module maintains bookkeeping information (creation time stamp and author) on the actual annotation. The annotation module is characterized by the tag applicationDomainSpecificTag, which is enclosed within the annotation tag. The annotation metadata module contains the node hierarchy within the annotationMetadata tag. By default, each annotation is accompanied with the annotation metadata, namely the name of the author of the annotation and the creation time stamp of the annotation. The cross-reference module (characterized by the element hierarchy within the referencedAnnotations tag) allows related annotations to cross-reference each other. Annotations are, in essence, immutable i.e. an annotation that semantically overrides another annotation does not cause the original annotation to be erased.

Data annotation documents based on the models presented above reside on the file system provided by a computer system. When the number of data annotation documents becomes prohibitively large, a smart indexing scheme would become necessary to quickly locate and retrieve annotations. An alternative is to store annotation documents on disks that are being designed specifically to store and efficiently retrieve semi-structured data [15]. Annotation documents may also be stored inside a relational database. XML documents stored in their entirety inside relational databases present a few problems. The first problem is that the storage of annotation documents inside the relational database that contains the base data being annotated would require structural and schematic changes to the database. The second problem is that all
queries that use “select *” might need to be modified. Similarly, “insert into” queries that do not mention the column names explicitly would need to be modified. Thirdly, an SQL-XML parser [4] would be needed to process queries that pertain to annotation documents. XML documents can be shredded and parsed in order to convert them into tabular format suitable for mapping on to relational data [16]. This defeats the whole concept of semi-structured data format – the data to begin with is not suitable for storage into a relational database. Moreover, putting shredded XML documents back together is expensive since it requires the computation of several joins. Annotation documents can also be stored in XML native databases. However, retrieving these annotations from XML native databases requires the knowledge of XQuery. XQuery is a complex query language, and might present users with a steep learning curve.

An alternative to using the data annotation models presented in Figures 1-5 is to keep notes in text documents. However, this approach presents a few problems. First, this alternative does not provide a uniform, consistent mechanism to express annotations. The reason is that each user would use his or her own personal format. Second, sharing text documents across platforms is difficult. Third, keeping annotations in text documents does not automatically maintain metadata information on annotations. The data annotation models presented in this paper not only address all of these problems, but also present useful features, such as, cross-referencing and annotation metadata.

Another alternative to using the data annotation models presented in Figures 1-5 is to declare ANNOTATION columns. An ANNOTATION column may be added for each data column. A single ANNOTATION column per relation can express tuple-level annotations. However, this technique requires the addition of columns to an already deployed database. This might be problematic because it is common knowledge that DBAs are resistant to making any changes to already deployed databases. Secondly, this technique is only effective for annotating data at the column and tuple levels. The third problem with this technique is that all queries with “select *” must be modified to exclude ANNOTATION columns, particularly, if the users want to view data only. Similarly, all data insertion queries that use “insert into” without specifying the columns into which data has to be inserted must also be modified. All applications that retrieve data from the database, and manipulate and process this data must be modified accordingly to accommodate the changes in the underlying database. Such changes to the underlying database, and applications that work in association with the database, can prove to be particularly difficult for production systems that are typically heavily used. Another major disadvantage of this technique is that it might not be possible to cross-reference related annotations since the annotations stored in database columns are no longer uniquely distinguishable.

Although, it might be feasible to utilize ANNOTATION columns to annotate relational data at the column and tuple level, this technique cannot be used effectively to annotate at the database, relation, and cell levels. This is because it is hard to decide which relation should host the column that annotates the entire database. Similarly a column must be added to each relation to store annotations at the relation and cell levels.

**Example Data Annotation Documents.** Assume that the manager of a real estate firm decides to transfer the listings for over a million dollars to a separate database. The manager can utilize the data model presented in Fig. (1) to annotate the existing database in order to communicate with the DBA. Fig. (7) presents this example annotation document. The DBA can review the manager’s annotations, make appropriate changes, and inform the manager regarding the change via an annotation. In this case, data annotations save time and resources by eliminating the need to set up a meeting with the DBA in order to explain a simple change to him or her.  

![Example database-level annotation document](image)

**Fig. 7 example database-level annotation document**

Fig. (8) presents an example data annotation document at the relation level that a paleontologist might use to annotate a relation in a paleontology database with information on topography or habitat existing during a particular period. This document annotates the LateTriassic relation. The LateTriassic relation may contain information on Coelophysis, Cynodont, and Placerias, among others. However, these relations would not contain information on the state of the earth, or the habitat, or the weather during the LateTriassic period.

![Example relation-level annotation document](image)

**Fig. 8 example relation-level annotation document**

Fig. (10) illustrates how a chef can utilize the column-level data annotation model presented in Fig. (3) to annotate the

![Example column-level annotation document](image)
Quantity column in the relation CondimentList (see Fig. (9)). Fig. (11) presents an example cell-level data annotation document that a chef can use to annotate the cell that contains the data value Turmeric in the relation CondimentList.

Fig. 9 relation CondimentList

Fig. (13) presents an example data annotation document at the tuple level. The department secretary uses the tuple-level data annotation model presented in Fig. (4) to inform the graduate coordinator that John Doe has accepted their offer of admission, and therefore, his record must be moved from relation Offered to Accepted (see Fig. (12)). For more details on these models, please refer to [17].

Fig. 10 example column-level annotation document

IV. ANNOTATION QUERY LANGUAGE (ANQL)

AnQL, an SQL-like query language, is used to query data annotation documents based on the models presented in Figures 1-5. AnQL is designed to take advantage of the abundant SQL knowledge and skill set. AnQL query operations include select, project, natural join, and union. A naive, yet clever, storage scheme (see Fig. (14)) is employed to facilitate AnQL query processing. All annotation documents that pertain to one database are kept in a separate directory from the annotation documents that pertain to another database. In other words, annotation documents that pertain to say, an Actors database, are kept in a separate directory from those that pertain to say, a Real Estate database. Within a directory, annotations pertaining to each level are kept in separate subdirectories. In other words, annotations at cell-level and database-level reside in separate subdirectories. An alternative is to use a tagged file format in which all annotations are kept in a single file. Tags uniquely identify the start and end of each annotation. Storing annotations in a tagged file requires an additional access to the index file for each query. Moreover, the index file must be updated for each addition and deletion. Using a tagged file would also make the annotations and their querying system dependent.

AnQL query engine utilizes data annotation graph generation and data annotation graph traversal functions to process AnQL queries. The data annotation graph generation (ϕ) function generates a data annotation graph corresponding to a well-formed and validated data annotation document provided as input. A data annotation graph is a special graph structured especially for AnQL query processing and is modeled in spirit of the XQuery data model. The nodes of a data annotation graph correspond to the elements of a data annotation document, and its edges depict the hierarchical relationship between the elements. Fig. (15) presents the cell-level data annotation graph. The data annotation graphs at the other levels (database, relation, column, and tuple) are similar, but they correspond to their data annotation models. Nodes in
a data annotation graph may be classified as follows –
- **Root** - The root node of a data annotation graph is annotationDocument.
- **Element** - An element node contains an element defined in an annotation document. Nodes of type element include annotationDocument, documentName, documentId, annotationAttachedTo, database, etc.
- **ElementValue** - A node of type ElementValue is a child node of type element, and contains the actual value of an element.
- **TextValue** - A node of type TextValue is also a child of a node of type element, but contains the actual data annotation.

![Fig. 15 cell-level data annotation graph](image)

An example database, RealEstate (see Fig. (16)), is used through the rest of this paper to illustrate AnQL operations. The example RealEstate database maintains records of property listings, real estate agents, and which real estate agent sold which property. Figures (17) and (18) present example data annotation documents that annotate data in the RealEstate database.

![Fig. 16 example RealEstate database](image)
function, corresponding to the input data annotation document. The query engine then traverses the data annotation graph, using the data annotation graph traversal function, in order to find a node that satisfies the boolean predicate. It returns as the result set the node hierarchy that satisfies the boolean predicate. Fig. (20) presents the result set generated by \( \sigma_{\text{element=annotation}} \). This query signifies the selection and retrieval of the part of the annotation document presented in Fig. (18) that occurs within the start and end tags of the annotation element in the document.

AnQL’s project (\( \pi \)) operation accepts as input a non-boolean constraint (a maximum of three keywords), and a project criterion (the level - database, relation, column, tuple, or cell). It returns the node hierarchy that satisfies the non-boolean constraint (keywords joined by and logic) and the project criterion. The processing of project operation is similar to that of a select operation. Fig. (21) presents the result set generated by issuing the query, \( \pi_{\text{sunny}} \text{RealEstate/Features/PptyId/PI2} \), on the data annotation documents of Figures (17) and (18). This query signifies the search for the keyword “sunny” in the example data annotation documents.

Fig. 20 select result set

Fig. 21 project result set

AnQL’s natural join (NJ) operation joins data annotation documents at a specific level based on a natural join criterion (author or creation time stamp) in data annotation graphs corresponding to all documents at the specified level. If the values match, the query engine includes the annotation in the result set. Fig. (22) presents the result set generated by issuing the query, \( \text{NJ}_{\text{author}} \text{(RealEstate/Features/LotSize/PI2)} \), on the example annotation documents of Figures (17) and (18). This query indicates to the AnQL query engine to compare the authors within the cell-level example annotation documents, and join them if their authors are the same.

The union (U) operation generates a consolidated report that groups annotations at a specified level i.e. all data annotations pertaining to a particular cell. The query engine browses through the relevant directory (determined by the union criterion), and groups all data annotations at one level into one large document to provide the users with a comprehensive, consolidated view of annotations at that level. The processing of union operation is inefficient since no indexing mechanism has been employed. Therefore, computation of a union operation can be done routinely during relatively non-busy times. Fig. (23) presents a typical union result set.

The result set of all operations, by default, returns the element hierarchy within annotationMetadata when the hierarchy within the annotation tag is returned. Select, project and natural join operations may be combined to form Select-Project-Join (SPJ) queries, and select, project, and union operations may be combined to form Select-Project-Union (SPU) queries.

A Select-Project-Natural Join Query Example. The example SPJ query – \( \sigma_{\text{element=annotation}} \pi_{\text{water}} \eta_{\text{Rudy Campos}} \text{(RealEstate/Features/Property'/Id/PI2)} \) is issued over an example RealEstate database (see Fig. 16). This query signifies the join of cell-level annotations whose author is Rudy.
AnQL’s query engine first processes the natural join operation. Using the data annotation graph generation function, it generates data annotation graphs corresponding to the input documents. Next, using the data annotation graph traversal function, it traverses to the author node and compares them. If the nodes match, the query engine returns the node hierarchy within the annotation tag.

Next, the query engine processes the project clause by searching for the keyword “water”, in nodes of type elementValue and textValue, within the intermediate result set returned by natural join. The query engine then processes the select clause by traversing through the nodes of type element within the intermediate result set generated by the processing of natural join and project clauses. Fig. (24) presents the result set of the example query. [17] presents detailed discussion on AnQL's operations, along with several examples.

Fig. 23 Typical Union Result Set

Fig. 24 SPJ Query Result Set

V. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

This paper presents data annotation models that can annotate relational data at five different levels of granularity – database, relation, column, tuple, and cell. The motivation for these models is simplicity and ease of understanding. The models are flexible, extensible, customizable, database-neutral, and platform-independent. These models may be extended to other data models, such as hierarchical and object-oriented. This paper also presents an SQL-like query language - AnQL. AnQL is designed to exploit the abundant knowledge and skill set of SQL. The annotation system presented in this paper does not inflict any structural or schematic changes to the underlying database. AnQL's operation may be extended to more keywords, and or and not logic. Cross-referencing can be enhanced with XLink[18] or XInclude[19]. The union operation can benefit from a smart indexing scheme. A system, as a virtualization over the underlying RDBMS, can be developed to incorporate these models and AnQL.
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