

1. In a separate report, write 4 paragraphs about what your team has done: (1) a description of the modifications to the OWL ontology and why they were done, (2) any new technical learnings from this challenge, (3) what you could put together as a small revision testing set of questions to check against any ontology updates (5 points)

One modification that we made to the ontology was that we added descriptions and labels to everything in the ontology. This was needed because descriptions are important to clarify the exact meaning of certain terms, especially ones that do not have exact names (tea, for example, which is often used to mean tisane as well) or if the ontology is to be used by other people or by ourselves in the future.

We also changed the way that brewing temperatures, plant parts, and tisanes are related. Because the brewing temperature of a tisane depends mostly on what part of the plant it comes from, originally I (Cara) had given the plant parts the `hasBrewingTemperature` property and subclassed the relevant tisane under that plant part. Katie pointed out that this was not the best way to organize our classes, so instead we used different properties and a property chain to encode this information instead.

Adding the `dc` terms vocabulary and the most relevant nanopublications classes was relatively easy, following the examples presented in class. Doing it by hand was straightforward, and it was helpful to see the raw RDF file we have been working on, as a different view from what Protege provides.

For revision testing, it would be fairly easy to make a diverse group of teas, made from different plant parts or from different types of tea, with very different flavors, etc. While the resulting judgements about flavor compatibilities would change as new sources are added, there are also some things that should definitely not change (caffeine, brewing temperature).