

Discussion of Bernstein Integration Strategies

Clare Llewellyn
University of Liverpool Library

Dr. Robert Sanderson
Dept. of Computer Science
University of Liverpool

clare.llewellyn@liv.ac.uk, azaroth@liv.ac.uk

Overview

- ▶ Use Cases
- ▶ Overall Integration Strategy
- ▶ Architectural Options
 - ▶ Topic 1: Metadata Enhancement
 - ▶ Topic 2: Extent of Description
 - ▶ Topic 3: Administration of Databases
- ▶ Summary

Use Cases

- ▶ **Integration**

Methods and data sources for integration

- ▶ **Search**

Types of search to be supported by the system

- ▶ **Display**

Ways of displaying the results of Search

- ▶ **Statistics**

Options for post processing the results of Search

- ▶ **Other**

Non use cases or other very specific scenarios

Use Cases: Integration

- ▶ DbSearchSpeed
- ▶ IncunabularLinkUseCase
- ▶ ExternalInterconnectivityUseCase
- ▶ DatabasesUniformImageScaling
- ▶ DbErrorTreatment
- ▶ BriquetSearch

Use Cases: Search

- ▶ MultilingualSupportUseCase
- ▶ DbSearchReliability
- ▶ DbSearchAmbiguity
- ▶ DbSearchMissingData
- ▶ DbSearchSynonymy
- ▶ DbSearchShapeAmbiguity
- ▶ DbSearchByElements
- ▶ DbSearchIncompleteWatermarks
- ▶ DbSearchMulticriteriaAndLogicalOperators
- ▶ DbSearchHeterogeneousContent
- ▶ WmTerminologyUseCase
- ▶ CartographyUseCase
- ▶ DatingManuscriptByWatermark
- ▶ MappingOfSynonyms
- ▶ DbSearchByMeasurement
- ▶ SymbolSearch

Use Cases: Display

- ▶ SearchAllResource
- ▶ MultilingualSupportCase
- ▶ DatabaseUniformImageScaling
- ▶ BookmarkFunction

Use Cases: Statistics

- ▶ DbSearchStatistics
- ▶ DbAnswerExport
- ▶ PaperDatingUseCase
- ▶ PaperAuthenticationUseCase
- ▶ CartographyUseCase
- ▶ CartographyBibliographyIntegrationUseCase
- ▶ BibliographicalUseCase

Use Cases: Other

- ▶ DbSearchWaterMarkandCounterMark
- ▶ DbSearchWaterMarkTwins
- ▶ ImageProcessingUseCase
- ▶ DataPullSchema
- ▶ DoiUse

Integration Strategy

Primary Consideration:

It is not possible to support all of the use cases provided without additional metadata describing the components that make up each watermark.

Primary Decision:

- a) There will be some additional description done
- or b) Not all use cases will be supported

Integration Strategy 2

You are thinking: ?!?!>:(!!!

- ▶ First step is always to analyse existing work:
 classification in terms of concept and terminology
- ▶ Need terminology mapping for interfaces and textual search
- ▶ Possibility of automatic construction from existing descriptions
- ▶ Mapping to (for example) IconClass easier if already harmonized internally

Suggested Architecture

- ▶ Each watermark would have a description in terms of components (cross, bull's head, circle) rather than a hierarchy
- ▶ Components have their own descriptions (as appropriate) and relationships to other components (eg above, left-of, within)
- ▶ Component fields to be decided by watermark experts
- ▶ Type of component (cross vs circle vs shield) to be referenced by a number for language independence
- ▶ Descriptions linked to original databases and images, or integrated into them as desired

Search and Display

- ▶ By searching for numeric components with fields defined by domain experts, rather than free or structured text, we achieve language and description methodology independence.
- ▶ Also for display: 'shield' vs 'escutcheon', 'cross' vs 'croix'
- ▶ Allows for incomplete search, boolean searching, ambiguous shape matching and searching for individual elements
- ▶ Increases accuracy of matching and preciseness of searches expressed
- ▶ Makes manipulation of cross-database results easier and more reliable

Search Interfaces

▶ Textual Search:

By translation into the numeric representation depending on language and type of user (expert vs lay person), we do not sacrifice precision for multilingualism

▶ User Constructed Image:

Using recent web technology, it is possible to graphically construct searches rather than relying on language. This would allow easy setting of known search attributes per component

▶ Hybrid Text/Image Search:

The graphical query could be constructed automatically from textual input, giving the user options to then correct the generated image

Topic 1: Metadata Enhancement

- ▶ Status Quo (no additional description)
- ▶ Components automatically extracted from existing descriptions
- ▶ Components manually described

- ▶ High level component description (snake, bull's head)
- ▶ Detailed components (horns/no horns, eyes, tongue)
- ▶ Very detailed components (lines, hooks, letter shapes)

- ▶ No additional attributes
- ▶ Additional attributes deemed important
- ▶ All additional attributes deemed useful

- ▶ Spatial relationships between components or not

Topic 2: Extent of Enhancement

- ▶ Status Quo (no additional description)
- ▶ Some databases extended
- ▶ All databases extended
- ▶ Some watermarks in database described
- ▶ All watermarks in database described
- ▶ Some watermarks described in detail
- ▶ All watermarks described in detail
- ▶ All descriptions done centrally (by same person/team)
- ▶ All descriptions done distributedly (by database provider)

Topic 3: Database Administration

- ▶ All descriptions held in one central database
- ▶ Descriptions held centrally in multiple databases
- ▶ Descriptions held centrally and distributed
- ▶ All descriptions held in distributed databases

- ▶ Descriptions completely separate from original
- ▶ Descriptions linked to original database
- ▶ Descriptions integrated into original database

- ▶ Proxy server(s) to act as gateway to database
- ▶ Direct connection to database

Summary

- ▶ Use Cases analysed
- ▶ In order to fulfil use cases, additional description needed
- ▶ 1: Types of description enhancement
- ▶ 2: Extent of description enhancement
- ▶ 3: Administration of enhanced data
- ▶ Construction Interface "Demo"