ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ VOLUME 5 ISSUE 7 JULY 2026

COMMUNICATIVE AND PRAGMATIC FEATURES OF COMPUTATIONAL LINGUISTICS TERMINOLOGY IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Begjanova A
Karakalpak State University named after Berdakh

DOI: 10.67620/sai.57c0002

ABSTRACT

This study investigates how computational linguistics terminology performs communicative and pragmatic functions in English and Uzbek scientific discourse. It adopts an exploratory qualitative comparative design and analyzes 21 English-Uzbek term entries representing core concepts in natural language processing, machine translation, corpus linguistics, and contemporary language-model research. The terms are classified according to their principal transfer strategy—international borrowing, calque or hybrid formation, and descriptive or competing translation—and are then interpreted in relation to precision, economy, audience accessibility, conceptual transparency, and compatibility with international research. The analysis shows that the contrast between the two languages is not adequately described as a simple opposition between concise English terms and explanatory Uzbek terms. Instead, Uzbek terminology operates through a layered system in which internationalisms such as token, parser, and transformer coexist with transparent formations such as tabiiy tilni qayta ishlash and so‘z turkumlarini belgilash. First-mention glossing, parallel use of English forms, and hybrid constructions function as pragmatic resources for managing differences in specialist knowledge. The paper argues that future standardization should be evidence-based, concept-oriented, and sensitive to actual disciplinary usage. It also proposes practical principles for building a stable Uzbek terminology resource for computational linguistics.

ACCEPTED

24.07.26

Keywords: *computational linguistics; terminology; English; Uzbek; scientific communication; pragmatics; terminology standardization.*

CC BY

1. Introduction

Computational linguistics has developed into a rapidly changing interdisciplinary field that connects linguistics, computer science, artificial intelligence, cognitive science, and information engineering. Its terminology therefore carries more than a naming function. Terms identify concepts, organize relationships among those concepts, enable researchers to compare methods, and signal membership in a professional community. Expressions such as corpus, parser, token, language model, part-of-speech tagging, named entity recognition, and transformer architecture provide compact access to complex bodies of knowledge. Their effectiveness, however, depends on whether writers and readers share the conceptual background required to interpret them.

The communicative value of terminology is particularly visible when specialized knowledge moves between languages. English currently supplies a large proportion of the vocabulary used in computational linguistics and natural language processing (NLP). Uzbek researchers, teachers, translators, and students must

consequently decide whether to borrow an English form, adapt it phonologically or orthographically, construct an Uzbek equivalent, combine both forms, or explain the concept descriptively. Each choice has consequences. A borrowed term may preserve international recognizability but remain opaque to non-specialists. A transparent Uzbek equivalent may support learning but become long or unstable. A hybrid form may offer a compromise, although uncontrolled variation can weaken searchability and terminological consistency.

These choices are communicative because they affect the efficient transfer of disciplinary information, and they are pragmatic because their appropriateness depends on the audience, purpose, genre, and stage of concept introduction. A specialist article, a university textbook, a classroom explanation, and a public-facing technology report do not require identical terminological practices. The same term can therefore be presented differently without changing its underlying concept. For example, a specialist may use token without explanation, whereas an introductory Uzbek text may present token together with a brief definition or an English equivalent. The difference reflects audience design rather than a defect in either language.

Against this background, the present study defines an explicit term sample, specifies a transparent analytical procedure, and limits its conclusions to an exploratory qualitative analysis. It addresses three research questions: (1) Which transfer strategies are visible in a selected set of English-Uzbek computational linguistics terms? (2) What communicative and pragmatic functions do those strategies perform? (3) What principles can support the future standardization of Uzbek computational linguistics terminology?

2. Theoretical Background and Related Research

2.1 Terminology as a communicative system

Classical and contemporary terminology studies treat terms as units located at the intersection of concepts, linguistic forms, and specialized communication. Sager (1990) explicitly includes a communicative dimension in terminology processing, while Cabré (1999) describes terminology as an interdisciplinary field connected with linguistics, communication, documentation, and computer science. ISO 1087:2019 distinguishes concepts from their designations and defines terminology work as the systematic collection, description, processing, and presentation of concepts and their designations. ISO 704:2022 further emphasizes concept analysis, concept relations, definitions, and the assignment of designations. These frameworks are important for the present study because they prevent a term from being evaluated only as an isolated word. A suitable equivalent must represent the intended concept, fit the relevant concept system, and function effectively in use.

Terminological communication involves both economy and explicitness. Specialists often prefer short, conventional forms because repeated explanation would interrupt disciplinary communication. At the same time, excessive compression can create barriers for students, adjacent disciplines, and general audiences. Lucy et al. (2023) show that discipline-specific words and senses can facilitate in-group communication while limiting interdisciplinary accessibility. The communicative success of a term is therefore relational: it depends not only on linguistic brevity but also on the knowledge shared by participants.

2.2 Context, variation, and pragmatic adaptation

Traditional terminology theory frequently prioritized univocity and standardization, but later approaches placed greater emphasis on variation, categorization, and actual discourse. Temmerman (2000) argues for a sociocognitive approach that recognizes the role of perspective, function, and intention in terminological description. Kageura (2002) similarly demonstrates that term formation is systematic and dynamic rather than static. Pearson (1998) and Bowker and Pearson (2002) show how specialized corpora can reveal terms, definitions, contextual patterns, and variation in authentic texts. Taken together, these works support a usage-based analysis in which competing forms are documented before one form is prescribed.

Pragmatics concerns the interpretation of linguistic forms in relation to users, contexts, intentions, and communicative goals. In computational research, context is also a technical object: systems model linguistic context, dialogue history, shared tasks, and environmental information. Fried et al. (2023) demonstrate that pragmatic interpretation in language technologies depends on multiple kinds of context and communicative affordances. For terminology, the relevant implication is that a designation should not be judged independently of its setting. The use of an English borrowing may be entirely appropriate in a research paper addressed to

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

specialists but insufficient in a first-year textbook unless it is defined. Conversely, replacing every international term with a lengthy descriptive phrase may reduce compatibility with software interfaces, indexing systems, and international publications.

2.3 Computational linguistics as a rapidly developing domain

Computational linguistics terminology changes quickly because the underlying technologies change quickly. Foundational textbooks established terms for corpora, tokenization, parsing, tagging, statistical models, and speech processing (Manning & Schütze, 1999; Bird et al., 2009; Jurafsky & Martin, 2009). More recent language-model research has expanded the active vocabulary with transformer, embedding, prompt, context window, fine-tuning, and related expressions. New terms can enter Uzbek discourse through research articles, software documentation, courses, news media, and translation practice at different times. As a result, several equivalents may circulate before a stable convention develops.

Bilingual terminology also has practical consequences for language technology. Arcan et al. (2014) showed that extracting and integrating bilingual domain terminology can improve machine translation in computer-assisted translation settings. Antia (2000) connects terminology planning with access to specialized knowledge and argues that sustainable terminology work must consider texts, technology, knowledge representation, and language planning. For Uzbek computational linguistics, standardization is therefore not only a linguistic concern; it affects education, translation, search, data annotation, software localization, and the development of language resources.

3. Materials and Methods

3.1 Research design

The study uses an exploratory qualitative comparative design. It does not claim to represent the complete English or Uzbek terminology of computational linguistics, nor does it estimate frequencies across a large corpus. Its purpose is to identify recurring communicative and pragmatic patterns in a transparent, limited sample and to formulate hypotheses for larger corpus-based and expert-validation studies.

3.2 Term sample

The analytical sample contains 21 English terms and corresponding Uzbek forms. The starting items were the terms explicitly discussed in the original manuscript, including parser, corpus, token, machine translation, part-of-speech tagging, neural language model, transformer architecture, model, and context window. The list was expanded with closely related concepts that are established in standard NLP literature, such as natural language processing, named entity recognition, neural network, training data, embedding, prompt, and fine-tuning. English conceptual usage was cross-checked against established NLP textbooks and current terminology literature. The Uzbek forms are treated as documented analytical candidates and common formations, not as officially approved national standards.

This distinction is essential. The present paper evaluates how the forms work communicatively and pragmatically; it does not assert that every Uzbek equivalent is universally accepted. Where more than one form is plausible or already visible in professional use, both are retained in the analysis. Such variation is itself relevant evidence because it indicates that a concept has not yet reached full terminological stabilization.

3.3 Analytical categories

Each term pairing was coded according to its dominant transfer strategy. International borrowing includes forms transferred with little or no structural translation, including established internationalisms. Calque or hybrid formation includes terms whose components are translated or combined with international elements. Descriptive or competing translation includes longer explanatory forms and cases in which a borrowing coexists with a more transparent Uzbek alternative. The categories are heuristic rather than absolute: a form such as transformer arxitekturasi is simultaneously a borrowing and a calque, and annotatsiya/belgilash presents competition between an internationalism and a native explanatory form.

The communicative analysis considered precision, brevity, conceptual differentiation, compatibility with international scholarship, and retrievability in digital environments. The pragmatic analysis considered audience expertise, first-mention explanation, pedagogical transparency, genre, and the likelihood that a form

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

would require an English gloss. Coding was conducted at the level of the term pairing and its likely use in academic and educational discourse. Because the study is interpretive, no inferential statistics were applied.

4. Results

4.1 Distribution of transfer strategies

The sample reveals three broad patterns. Six items are dominated by borrowing or established internationalism, eight are primarily calques or hybrid formations, and seven involve descriptive or competing translations. This distribution indicates that Uzbek computational linguistics terminology does not rely on one uniform strategy. Instead, it combines internationally recognizable forms with locally transparent expressions. The strategy selected is related to the morphological structure of the English term, the degree to which its components already have established Uzbek equivalents, and the expected familiarity of the target audience.

Table 1. Communicative and pragmatic analysis of selected English-Uzbek computational linguistics terms

English term	Uzbek form	Transfer strategy	Communicative-pragmatic observation
corpus	*korpus*	Internationalism / transliteration	Compact and searchable; normally transparent to specialists but may require definition for beginners.
token	*token*	Direct borrowing	Preserves compatibility with software and research; its technical sense differs from general-language meanings and should be defined initially.
parser	*parser*	Direct borrowing	Provides precise professional reference; efficient in specialist discourse but relatively opaque outside the field.
algorithm	*algoritm*	Established internationalism	Highly conventional across technical domains; requires little additional explanation in academic contexts.
model	*model*	Established internationalism	Economical but polysemous; pragmatic interpretation depends on modifiers such as language, statistical, or neural.
chatbot	*chatbot*	Direct borrowing	Immediately links the Uzbek text to a globally recognizable technology; an explanatory gloss may help general audiences.
computational linguistics	*kompyuter lingvistikasi*	Hybrid calque	Combines an international technical modifier with an established linguistic term; supports both recognition and local readability.
machine translation	*mashinali tarjima*	Calque	Transparent to Uzbek readers and closely aligned with the English concept; suitable across specialist and educational genres.
neural network	*neyron tarmoq*	Hybrid calque	Retains the international scientific element neyron while translating network; conceptually accessible with moderate background knowledge.
language model	*til modeli*	Calque	Short and transparent, but the technical meaning of model must be supplied by context.
context window	*kontekst oynasi*	Hybrid calque	Concise and structurally parallel to English; metaphorical meaning may require explanation at first use.
speech recognition	*nutqni tanish*	Calque	Communicates the task clearly to non-specialists, though technical implementations remain context-dependent.
training data	*o'qitish ma'lumotlari*	Calque	Pedagogically transparent; may compete with borrowed machine-learning phrasing in highly technical communities.
transformer architecture	*transformer arxitekturasi*	Borrowing + calque	Maintains the fixed model-family name while translating the generic head; supports international retrieval.
neural language model	*neyron til modeli*	Hybrid calque	Preserves compact conceptual structure and allows easy comparison with related model terms.
natural language processing	*tabiiy tilni qayta ishlash*	Descriptive calque	Highly transparent for Uzbek readers but longer than NLP; abbreviation and English gloss improve specialist usability.
part-of-speech tagging	*so'z turkumlarini belgilash*	Descriptive translation	Explains the linguistic operation directly; English abbreviation POS tagging may be retained for software and literature searches.
named entity recognition	*nomlangan obyektlarni aniqlash*	Descriptive translation	Conceptually informative for learners; terminology for entity/obyekt may vary and therefore requires standardization.
embedding	*embedding / vektorli ifoda*	Competing borrowing and explanation	Borrowing supports international compatibility; the descriptive alternative improves conceptual access but may not cover every technical use.
prompt	*prompt / so'rov yoki ko'rsatma matni*	Competing borrowing and explanation	The English form dominates specialist usage; an explanatory Uzbek phrase clarifies that a prompt may contain instructions rather than a simple question.
fine-tuning	*nozik sozlash / qo'shimcha moslashtirish*	Competing descriptive forms	Both forms make the adaptation process visible; consistent definition is needed because fine-tuning covers several technical procedures.

4.2 Borrowing and international recognizability

Borrowed terms are most effective when the English form is already highly stable, short, and closely connected with software interfaces or model names. Token and parser illustrate this pattern. Translating them

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

differently in every text could reduce searchability and make it difficult for students to connect Uzbek explanations with English-language documentation. Transformer is even more resistant to replacement because it identifies a specific architecture family and appears in model names, repositories, diagrams, and code. In these cases, borrowing performs a communicative function of intertextual alignment: it allows the Uzbek text to remain connected to the international technical environment.

Borrowing nevertheless creates pragmatic obligations. A form can be internationally recognizable to specialists while remaining semantically inaccessible to novice readers. Token is a clear example because its technical meaning varies according to the tokenization procedure and cannot be inferred safely from ordinary language. Parser similarly identifies a component or procedure whose operation depends on the grammatical formalism and system architecture. The appropriate solution is not necessarily replacement with a long native phrase. First-mention definition, parenthetical explanation, or a bilingual glossary may preserve both precision and accessibility.

4.3 Calques and hybrid formations

Calques and hybrid terms form the largest group in the sample. Their communicative advantage is structural transparency. Mashinali tarjima, til modeli, neyron tarmoq, and nutqni tanish reproduce the conceptual relationships of the English expressions while using elements that are familiar in Uzbek academic language. These forms are comparatively economical and can be extended systematically: til modeli can combine with neyron, statistik, ko‘p tilli, or katta to produce related terms. Such productivity is important because a terminology system must support concept families rather than isolated equivalents.

Hybrid constructions also reflect a pragmatic compromise. In transformer arxitekturasi, the fixed international label transformer is preserved, while the generic category architecture is adapted as arxitektura. In kompyuter lingvistikasi and neyron til modeli, internationally shared scientific elements coexist with Uzbek grammatical structure. These forms reduce the distance between local and global discourse without requiring readers to process a fully English phrase. However, hybridization should remain consistent. Competing spellings, inconsistent word order, and unnecessary alternation between borrowed and translated heads can obstruct indexing and teaching.

4.4 Descriptive translation and audience accessibility

Descriptive translations are especially useful when the English term compresses an operation that Uzbek readers may not immediately recognize. Tabiiy tilni qayta ishlash, so‘z turkumlarini belgilash, and nomlangan obyektlarni aniqlash explain what the process does. Their pragmatic strength is pedagogical: they activate familiar linguistic concepts and lower the entry barrier for students. They are also suitable in titles, abstracts, policy documents, and public communication where unexplained English jargon would restrict access.

The limitation is length and potential conceptual imprecision. Part-of-speech tagging is often abbreviated as POS tagging in international literature and implemented under that label in libraries and datasets. An Uzbek text that uses only the descriptive form may be understandable locally but difficult to connect with external resources. The most functional practice is therefore paired presentation at first mention—for example, so‘z turkumlarini belgilash (part-of-speech tagging, POS tagging)—followed by a consistent short form. This is a pragmatic strategy of staged introduction: maximum explanation is provided when the concept first appears, and economy increases after shared understanding has been established.

4.5 Competing forms and unstable concepts

Embedding, prompt, and fine-tuning illustrate a different problem: the English terms have entered professional communication faster than stable Uzbek equivalents have developed. Vektorli ifoda can help explain embedding, but it may not capture all uses of embeddings as learned representations located in a vector space. So‘rov matni can explain one type of prompt, yet prompt may also include instructions, demonstrations, system messages, images, or multimodal inputs. Nozik sozlash is concise and increasingly interpretable, whereas qo‘shimcha moslashtirish may communicate the process more clearly in introductory texts. These cases show why terminology standardization must begin with concept analysis rather than literal translation.

Competing forms should initially be documented rather than suppressed. Corpus evidence can reveal which forms specialists actually use, in which genres, and with what meanings. Expert panels can then evaluate

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

conceptual accuracy, linguistic acceptability, derivational potential, and compatibility with related terms. Premature prescription risks approving an elegant translation that practitioners do not adopt, while unrestricted borrowing can produce an inaccessible technical register. The pragmatic objective is controlled variation: preferred terms should be identified, but admitted synonyms and English equivalents may remain visible where they support communication.

5. Discussion

The findings revise the binary claim that English terminology is communicative whereas Uzbek terminology is pragmatic. Both systems perform both functions. English terms are not automatically precise merely because they are short; their precision depends on disciplinary convention and contextual specification. Model, context, and token are highly economical, but each has multiple possible interpretations. Uzbek descriptive forms are not automatically imprecise merely because they are longer; they can make conceptual operations explicit and thereby improve communication. The relevant difference lies in the distribution of communicative burdens. English often assumes a larger body of shared international convention, whereas Uzbek texts more frequently need to establish that convention for local audiences.

This interpretation is consistent with the communicative theory of terminology and with corpus-based approaches that treat terms as textual units. Terms participate in definitions, explanations, classifications, examples, and argumentation. Their meaning is reinforced by recurring collocations and by their position in a concept system. A national terminology resource should therefore record more than one-word equivalents. Each entry should include a definition, English and Uzbek designations, abbreviations, grammatical information, admitted variants, context examples, source information, and relations to broader, narrower, and associated concepts. ISO 704:2022 and ISO 1087:2019 provide an appropriate conceptual foundation for such work.

The analysis also has implications for academic writing. First, authors should introduce potentially unfamiliar terms through bilingual or definitional support rather than alternating randomly between forms. Second, the selected form should remain consistent throughout a paper unless variation itself is under discussion. Third, English abbreviations should be retained when they are required for connection with established datasets, evaluation tasks, or software libraries. Fourth, translators should verify the underlying concept before selecting an equivalent; formal similarity alone is insufficient. Finally, editors should distinguish between an approved term, an attested variant, and an explanatory paraphrase.

For education, a layered presentation model is recommended. At the introductory level, an Uzbek preferred term can be followed by the English term and abbreviation. At intermediate levels, bilingual glossaries and concept maps can show relations among terms such as token, tokenization, vocabulary, embedding, model, and training data. At advanced levels, English and Uzbek forms can be used flexibly according to genre, while students are trained to identify conceptual differences and terminological variation. This progression preserves access without isolating students from international scholarship.

For terminology planning, the study suggests a five-stage workflow. The first stage is corpus construction using Uzbek research articles, theses, textbooks, course materials, software documentation, and professionally edited translations. The second is automatic and manual term extraction. The third is concept-oriented comparison with authoritative English sources and existing multilingual resources. The fourth is expert validation involving computational linguists, Uzbek linguists, translators, software developers, and educators. The fifth is publication in an openly accessible, versioned terminology database. Because the domain changes rapidly, each entry should record its validation date and revision history. This approach would transform isolated translation decisions into a sustainable terminology infrastructure.

6. Limitations and Directions for Further Research

The study has several limitations. The sample is small and purposive, so the numerical distribution of strategies cannot be generalized to the entire field. The Uzbek forms were analyzed as candidates and common formations rather than as results from a balanced national corpus. No user experiment was conducted to measure comprehension, preference, or processing speed among specialists and students. The categories also overlap: hybrid terms may contain borrowing and calquing simultaneously, while descriptive forms may become conventionalized and lose their explanatory character over time.

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

Further research should build a comparable English-Uzbek corpus and examine term frequency, variant competition, first-mention practices, collocations, and changes over time. A comprehension study could compare borrowed, translated, and paired forms among undergraduate students, language specialists, and NLP practitioners. Expert validation should assess conceptual equivalence and derivational productivity. Research is also needed on terminology in Uzbek-language software interfaces, datasets, annotation guidelines, and machine-translated technical texts. Such evidence would allow future recommendations to move from exploratory interpretation to empirically supported standardization.

7. Conclusion

Computational linguistics terminology in English and Uzbek performs interconnected communicative and pragmatic functions. English terms provide access to an international professional code, but their economy depends on shared specialist knowledge. Uzbek terminology combines borrowings, calques, hybrids, and descriptive translations in order to maintain international compatibility while supporting local comprehension. The most effective forms are not necessarily the shortest or the most fully translated; they are the forms that represent concepts accurately, fit their discourse context, and allow readers to connect local explanations with international research.

The analysis of 21 term entries shows that borrowing is useful for stable model names and software-linked concepts, calques and hybrid formations support productive concept systems, and descriptive translations improve pedagogical transparency. First-mention bilingual glossing is a particularly valuable pragmatic practice because it combines explanation with retrievability. Future standardization should be based on corpus evidence, concept analysis, multidisciplinary expert validation, and versioned terminology resources. Through such a process, Uzbek computational linguistics terminology can develop as a precise, accessible, and internationally connected system of scientific communication.

Data and Ethical Statement

This article is based on qualitative analysis of published terminology and contains no human-participant or personally identifiable data. The analyzed term entries are reproduced in Table 1. The study makes no claim that the listed Uzbek forms have official standard status; they are presented for scholarly analysis and future validation.

REFERENCES

1. Antia, B. E. (2000). Terminology and language planning: An alternative framework of practice and discourse. John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/tlrp.2
2. Arcan, M., Turchi, M., Topelli, S., & Buitelaar, P. (2014). Enhancing statistical machine translation with bilingual terminology in a CAT environment. In Y. Al-Onaizan & M. Simard (Eds.), Proceedings of the 11th Conference of the Association for Machine Translation in the Americas: MT Researchers Track (pp. 54–68). Association for Machine Translation in the Americas. https://aclanthology.org/2014.amta-researchers.5/
3. Bird, S., Klein, E., & Loper, E. (2009). Natural language processing with Python: Analyzing text with the Natural Language Toolkit. O'Reilly Media.
4. Bowker, L., & Pearson, J. (2002). Working with specialized language: A practical guide to using corpora. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203469255
5. Cabré, M. T. (1999). Terminology: Theory, methods and applications (J. A. DeCesaris, Trans.). John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/tlrp.1
6. Fried, D., Tomlin, N., Hu, J., Patel, R., & Nematzadeh, A. (2023). Pragmatics in language grounding: Phenomena, tasks, and modeling approaches. In Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023 (pp. 12619–12640). Association for Computational Linguistics. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.findings-emnlp.840
7. International Organization for Standardization. (2019). ISO 1087:2019: Terminology work and terminology science—Vocabulary. https://www.iso.org/standard/62330.html

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

8. International Organization for Standardization. (2022). ISO 704:2022: Terminology work—Principles and methods. https://www.iso.org/standard/79077.html
9. Jurafsky, D., & Martin, J. H. (2009). Speech and language processing: An introduction to natural language processing, computational linguistics, and speech recognition (2nd ed.). Pearson Prentice Hall.
10. Kageura, K. (2002). The dynamics of terminology: A descriptive theory of term formation and terminological growth. John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/tlrp.5
11. Lucy, L., Dodge, J., Bamman, D., & Keith, K. A. (2023). Words as gatekeepers: Measuring discipline-specific terms and meanings in scholarly publications. In Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023 (pp. 6929–6947). Association for Computational Linguistics. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.findings-acl.433
12. Manning, C. D., & Schütze, H. (1999). Foundations of statistical natural language processing. MIT Press.
13. Pearson, J. (1998). Terms in context. John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.1
14. Sager, J. C. (1990). A practical course in terminology processing. John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/z.44
15. Temmerman, R. (2000). Towards new ways of terminology description: The sociocognitive approach. John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/tlrp.3

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ