# مراجع


1. Zaveri, A., D. Kontokostas, M.A. Sherif, L. Bühmann, M. Morsey, S. Auer, and J. Lehmann. *User-driven quality evaluation of dbpedia*. in *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Semantic Systems*. 2013. ACM.
2. Chen, P. and W. Garcia. *Hypothesis generation and data quality assessment through association mining*. in *Cognitive Informatics (ICCI), 2010 9th IEEE International Conference on*. 2010. IEEE.
3. Hogan, A., A. Harth, A. Passant, S. Decker, and A. Polleres. *Weaving the pedantic web*. in *3rd International Workshop on Linked Data on the Web (LDOW2010)*. 2010. Raleigh, North Carolina.
4. Fürber, C. and M. Hepp, *Using semantic web resources for data quality management*, in *Knowledge Engineering and Management by the Masses*. 2010, Springer. p. 211-225.
5. Hartig, O. and J. Zhao, *Using Web Data Provenance for Quality Assessment.* SWPM, 2009. 526.
6. Lei, Y., A. Nikolov, V. Uren, and E. Motta. *Detecting Quality Problems in Semantic Metadata without the Presence of a Gold Standard*. in *5th International EON Workshop at International Semantic Web Conference (ISWC'07)*. 2007. Busan, Korea.
7. Brüggemann, S. and F. Grüning, *Using ontologies providing domain knowledge for data quality management*, in *Networked Knowledge-Networked Media*. 2009, Springer. p. 187-203.
8. Bizer, C. and R. Cyganiak, *Quality-driven information filtering using the WIQA policy framework.* Web Semantics: Science, Services and Agents on the World Wide Web, 2009. 7(1): p. 1-10.
9. Behkamal, B., M. Kahani, S. Paydar, M. Dadkhah, and E. Sekhavaty. *Publishing Persian linked data; challenges and lessons learned*. in *5th International Symposium on Telecommunications (IST)*. 2010. IEEE.
10. Poels, G. and G. Dedene, *Distance-based software measurement: necessary and sufficient properties for software measures.* Information and Software Technology, 2000. 42(1): p. 35-46.
11. Briand, L.C., S. Morasca, and V.R. Basili, *Property-based software engineering measurement.* Software Engineering, IEEE Transactions on, 1996. 22(1): p. 68-86.
12. Gruser, J.-R., L. Raschid, V. Zadorozhny, and T. Zhan, *Learning Response Time for WebSources Using Query Feedback and Application in Query Optimization.* Very Larg Data base Journal, 2000. 9(1): p. 18-37.
13. Bagheri, E. and D. Gasevic, *Assessing the maintainability of software product line feature models using structural metrics.* Software Quality Journal, 2011. 19(3): p. 579-612.
14. Khoshgoftaar, T.M., P. Rebours, and N. Seliya, *Software quality analysis by combiningmultiple projects and learners.* Software Quality Journal, 2009. 17(1): p. 25-49.
15. Kocaguneli, E., Y. Kultur, and A.B. Bener. *Combining Multiple Learners Induced on Multiple Datasets for Software Effort Prediction*. in *International Symposium on Software Reliability Engineering (ISSRE)*. 2009. Mysuru, India.

16. Liu, Y., T.M. Khoshgoftaar, and N. Seliya, *Evolutionary optimization of software quality modeling with multiple repositories.* IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering, 2010. 36(6): p. 852 - 864
17. ISO, *ISO/IEC 25012- Software engineering - Software product Quality Requirements and Evaluation (SQuaRE)*, in *Data quality model*. 2008.
18. Eppler, M.J. and D. Wittig. *Conceptualizing Information Quality: A Review of Information Quality Frameworks from the Last Ten Years*. in *5th International Conference on Information Quality*. 2000. Boston, MA.
19. Fenton, N.E. and S.L. Pfleeger, *Software metrics: a rigorous and practical approach*. 1.0 ed. 1998: PWS Publishing Co.
20. Batini, C. and M. Scannapieca, *Data quality: concepts, methodologies and techniques*. 1.0 ed. 2006: Springer.
21. Madnick, S.E., R.Y. Wang, Y.W. Lee, and H. Zhu, *Overview and framework for data and information quality research.* Journal of Data and Information Quality (JDIQ), 2009. 1(1): p. 2.
22. Naumann, F. and C. Rolker. *Assessment methods for information quality criteria*. in *5'th Conference on Information Quality* 2000. Cambridge, MA.
23. Jarke, M. and Y. Vassilion. *Data warehouse quality: A review of the DWQ project*. in *2nd Conference on Information Quality*. 1997. Cambridge, MA.
24. Wang, R.Y., *A product perspective on total data quality management.* Communications of the ACM, 1998. 41(2): p. 58-65.
25. Naumann, F., U. Leser, and J.C. Freytag, *Quality-driven integration of heterogeneous information systems*, in *25th International Conference on Very Large Data Bases (VLDB'99)*. 1999: Edinburgh, Scotland, UK. p. 447-458.
26. Chen, Y., Q. Zhu, and N. Wang, *Query processing with quality control in the World Wide Web.* World Wide Web, 1998. 1(4): p. 241-255.
27. Tate, M.A., *Web wisdom: How to evaluate and create information quality on the web*. Second ed. 2010: CRC Press.
28. Kahn, B.K., D.M. Strong, and R.Y. Wang, *Information quality benchmarks: product and service performance.* Communications of the ACM, 2002. 45(4): p. 184-192.
29. Shanks, G. and B. Corbitt. *Understanding data quality: Social and cultural aspects*. in *10th Australasian Conference on Information Systems*. 1999. Citeseer.
30. Dedeke, A. *A Conceptual Framework for Developing Quality Measures for Information Systems*. in *5th International Conference on Information Quality*. 2000. Boston, MA, USA.
31. Helfert, M. *Managing and measuring data quality in data warehousing*. in *World Multiconference on Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics*. 2001. Florida, Orlando.
32. Naumann, F. and C. Rolker. *Do Metadata Models meet IQ Requirements?* in *Iternational Conference on Information Quality (IQ)*. 1999. Cambridge, MA.
33. Su, Y. and Z. Jin. *A Methodology for Information Quality Assessment in Data Warehousing*. in *Communications, 2008. ICC'08. IEEE International Conference on*. 2008. IEEE.
34. Wang, R.Y., D.M. Strong, and L.M. Guarascio, *Beyond accuracy: What data quality means to data consumers.* Journal of Management Information Systems, 1996. 12(4): p. 5-33.

35. Moraga, C., M. Moraga, A. Caro, and C. Calero. *Defining the intrinsic quality of web portal data*. in *8th International Conference on Web Information Systems and Technologies (WEBIST)*. 2012. Porto, Portugal.
36. Piprani, B. and D. Ernst. *A model for data quality assessment*. in *On the Move to Meaningful Internet Systems: OTM 2008 Workshops*. 2008. Springer.
37. Wand, Y. and R.Y. Wang, *Anchoring data quality dimensions in ontological foundations.* Communications of the ACM, 1996. 39(11): p. 86-95.
38. Karr, A.F., A.P. Sanil, and D.L. Banks, *Data quality: A statistical perspective.* Statistical Methodology, 2006. 3(2): p. 137-173.
39. Lee, Y.W., D.M. Strong, B.K. Kahn, and R.Y. Wang, *AIMQ: a methodology for information quality assessment.* Information & management, 2002. 40(2): p. 133-146.
40. Pipino, L.L., Y.W. Lee, and R.Y. Wang, *Data quality assessment.* Communications of the ACM, 2002. 45(4): p. 211-218.
41. Knight, S.-A. and J.M. Burn, *Developing a framework for assessing information quality on the World Wide Web.* Informing Science: International Journal of an Emerging Transdiscipline, 2005. 8(5): p. 159-172.
42. Bobrowski, M., M. Marré, and D. Yankelevich, *A Homogeneous Framework to Measure Data Quality*, in *International Conference on Information Quality (IQ)*. 1999: Cambridge, MA. p. 115-124.
43. Rahm, E. and H.H. Do, *Data cleaning: Problems and current approaches.* IEEE Data Eng. Bull., 2000. 23(4): p. 3-13.
44. Müller, H. and J.-C. Freytag, *Problems, methods, and challenges in comprehensive data cleansing*. 2005: Professoren des Inst. Für Informatik.
45. Hernández, M.A. and S.J. Stolfo, *Real-world data is dirty: Data cleansing and the merge/purge problem.* Data mining and knowledge discovery, 1998. 2(1): p. 9-37.
46. Galhardas, H., D. Florescu, D. Shasha, E. Simon, and C.-A. Saita. *Declarative data cleaning: Language, model and algorithms*. in *27'th International of conference on Very Larg Data Base*. 2001. Roma, Italy.
47. Batini, C., C. Cappiello, C. Francalanci, and A. Maurino, *Methodologies for data quality assessment and improvement*, in *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*. 2009. p. 16.
48. Batini, C., D. Barone, M. Mastrella, A. Maurino, and C. Ruffini. *A Framework And A Methodology For Data Quality Assessment And Monitoring*. in *International Conference on Information Quality*. 2007. Cambridge, MA Citeseer.
49. Bizer, C., T. Heath, and T. Berners-Lee, *Linked data-the story so far.* International journal on semantic web and information systems 2009. 5 (3): p. 1-22.
50. Möller, K., M. Hausenblas, R. Cyganiak, and S. Handschuh, *Learning from linked open data usage: Patterns & metrics.* 2010.
51. Bizer, C., *Quality Driven Information Filtering: In the Context of Web Based Information Systems*. 2007: VDM Publishing.
52. *Vapour online validator*. Available from: http://validator.linkeddata.org/vapour.
53. Porzel, R. and R. Malaka. *A task-based approach for ontology evaluation*. in *ECAI Workshop on Ontology Learning and Population, Valencia, Spain*. 2004. Citeseer.
54. Lozano-Tello, A. and A. Gómez-Pérez, *Ontometric: A method to choose the appropriate ontology.* Journal of Database Management, 2004. 2(15): p. 1-18.

55. Brewster, C., H. Alani, S. Dasmahapatra, and Y. Wilks, *Data driven ontology evaluation*, in *International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC)* 2004: Lisbon, Portugal. p. 24-30.
56. Brank, J., M. Grobelnik, and D. Mladenić, *A survey of ontology evaluation techniques.* 2005.
57. Tartir, S., I.B. Arpinar, M. Moore, A.P. Sheth, and B. Aleman-Meza. *OntoQA: Metric-based ontology quality analysis*. in *IEEE Workshop on Knowledge Acquisition from Distributed, Autonomous, Semantically Heterogeneous Data and Knowledge Sources*. 2005.
58. Gangemi, A., C. Catenacci, M. Ciaramita, and J. Lehmann. *A theoretical framework for ontology evaluation and validation*. in *2nd Italian Semantic Web Workshop*. 2005. Italy.
59. Vrandečić, D., *Ontology evaluation*. 2009: Springer.
60. Ashraf, J., *A semantic framework for ontology usage analysis*, in *School of Information Systems*. 2013, Curtin University.
61. Maedche, A. and S. Staab, *Measuring similarity between ontologies*, in *Knowledge engineering and knowledge management: Ontologies and the semantic web*. 2002, Springer. p. 251-263.
62. Duque-Ramos, A., J.T. Fernández-Breis, R. Stevens, and N. Aussenac-Gilles, *OQuaRE: A SQuaRE-based Approach for Evaluating the Quality of Ontologies.* Journal of Research & Practice in Information Technology, 2011. 43(2).
63. Guarino, N. and C.A. Welty, *An overview of OntoClean*, in *Handbook on ontologies*. 2009, Springer. p. 201-220.
64. Orme, A.M., H. Yao, and L.H. Etzkorn, *Indicating ontology data quality, stability, and completeness throughout ontology evolution.* Journal of Software Maintenance and Evolution: Research and Practice, 2007. 19(1): p. 49-75.
65. Ashraf, J., O.K. Hussain, and F.K. Hussain, *A framework for measuring ontology usage on the web.* The Computer Journal, 2012. 56(9): p. 1083-1101.
66. Antoniou, G. and F. Van Harmelen, *Web ontology language: Owl*, in *Handbook on ontologies*. 2004, Springer. p. 67-92.
67. Agre, J., M. Vassiliou, and C. Kramer, *Science and Technology Issues Relating to Data Quality in C2 Systems*. 2011, Institude for Defense Analyses (IDA). p. 26.
68. Umbrich, J., M. Hausenblas, A. Hogan, A. Polleres, and S. Decker, *Towards dataset dynamics: Change frequency of linked open data sources.* 2010.
69. Bohm, C., F. Naumann, Z. Abedjan, D. Fenz, T. Grutze, D. Hefenbrock, M. Pohl, and D. Sonnabend. *Profiling linked open data with ProLOD*. in *Data Engineering Workshops (ICDEW), 2010 IEEE 26th International Conference on*. 2010. IEEE.
70. Guéret, C., P. Groth, C. Stadler, and J. Lehmann, *Assessing linked data mappings using network measures*, in *The Semantic Web: Research and Applications*. 2012, Springer. p. 87-102.
71. Hogan, A., J. Umbrich, A. Harth, R. Cyganiak, A. Polleres, and S. Decker, *An empirical survey of Linked Data conformance.* Web Semantics: Science, Services and Agents on the World Wide Web, 2012. 14: p. 14-44.
72. Mendes, P.N., H. Mühleisen, and C. Bizer. *Sieve: linked data quality assessment and fusion*. in *Proceedings of the 2012 Joint EDBT/ICDT Workshops*. 2012. ACM.

73. Fürber, C. and M. Hepp. *SWIQA–A Semantic Web information quality assessment framework*. in *ECIS 2011 Proceedings*. 2011.
74. Hartig, O. *Trustworthiness of data on the web*. in *Proceedings of the STI Berlin & CSW PhD Workshop*. 2008. Citeseer.
75. Bonatti, P.A., A. Hogan, A. Polleres, and L. Sauro, *Robust and scalable linked data reasoning incorporating provenance and trust annotations.* Web Semantics: Science, Services and Agents on the World Wide Web, 2011. 9(2): p. 165-201.
76. Basili, V.R., G. Caldiera, and H.D. Rombach, *The goal question metric approach*, in *Encyclopedia of software engineering*. 1994, John Wiley & Sons. p. 528-532.
77. Kurian, R.S., *The benefits to management of using GQM, continuous GQM, and V-GQM in a measurement program*. 2009, Kent State University.
78. Sarcia, S.A. *Is GQM+ Strategies really applicable as is to non-software development domains?* in *ACM-IEEE International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement*. 2010. ACM.
79. Vassiliadis, P., *Data warehouse modeling and quality issues*, in *Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering*. 2000, National Technical University of Athens Athens, GREECE.
80. Behkamal, B., M. Kahani, E. Bagheri, and Z. Jeremic, *A Metrics-Driven approach for quality Assessment of Linked open Data.* Journal of Theoritical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research 2014. 9(2): p. 64-79.
81. Scannapieco, M. and C. Batini. *Completeness in the Relational Model: a Comprehensive Framework*. in *IQ*. 2004.
82. Fisher, C.W., E.J. Lauría, and C.C. Matheus. *In Search Of An Accuracy Metric*. in *International Conference in Information Quality (ICIQ)*. 2007. Cambridge, MA.
83. Peralta, V., *Data freshness and data accuracy: A state of the art*. 2006, Instituto de Computacion, Facultad de Ingenieria, Universidad de la Republica.
84. Hausenblas, M., W. Halb, Y. Raimond, and T. Heath. *What is the Size of the Semantic Web?* in *I-Semantics*. 2008. Graz, Austria: P.
85. Briand, L.C., S. Morasca, and V.R. Basili, *An operational process for goal-driven definition of measures.* Software Engineering, IEEE Transactions on, 2002. 28(12): p. 1106-1125.
86. Calero, C., M. Piattini, and M. Genero, *Empirical validation of referential integrity metrics.* Information and Software technology, 2001. 43(15): p. 949-957.
87. Genero, M., G. Poels, and M. Piattini, *Defining and validating metrics for assessing the understandability of entity–relationship diagrams.* Data & Knowledge Engineering, 2008. 64(3): p. 534-557.
88. Kitchenham, B., S.L. Pfleeger, and N. Fenton, *Towards a framework for software measurement validation.* Software Engineering, IEEE Transactions on, 1995. 21(12): p. 929-944.
89. Finkelstein, L., *Widely, strongly and weakly defined measurement.* Measurement, 2003. 34(1): p. 39-48.
90. Behkamal, B. *The code of metrics calculation tool* 2013; 1.0:[Available from: https://bitbucket.org/behkamal/new-metrics-codes/src.
91. Bland, J.M. and D.G. Altman, *Statistics notes: Cronbach's alpha.* Bmj, 1997. 314(7080): p. 572.