

A Comparative Evaluation of Visual and Natural Language Question Answering Over Linked Data

Gerhard Wohlgenannt¹^a, Dmitry Mouromtsev¹^b, Dmitry Pavlov², Yury Emelyanov² and Alexey Morozov²

¹*Faculty of Software Engineering and Computer Systems, ITMO University, St. Petersburg, Russia*

²*Vismart Ltd., St. Petersburg, Russia*

gwohlg@corp.ifmo.ru, mouromtsev@mail.ifmo.ru,
{dmitry.pavlov, yury.emelyanov, alexey.morozov}@vismart.com

Keywords: Diagrammatic Question Answering, Visual Data Exploration, Knowledge Graphs, QALD

Abstract: With the growing number and size of Linked Data datasets, it is crucial to make the data accessible and useful for users without knowledge of formal query languages. Two approaches towards this goal are knowledge graph visualization and natural language interfaces. Here, we investigate specifically question answering (QA) over Linked Data by comparing a diagrammatic visual approach with existing natural language-based systems. Given a QA benchmark (QALD7), we evaluate a visual method which is based on iteratively creating diagrams until the answer is found, against four QA systems that have natural language queries as input. Besides other benefits, the visual approach provides higher performance, but also requires more manual input. The results indicate that the methods can be used complementary, and that such a combination has a large positive impact on QA performance, and also facilitates additional features such as data exploration.

1 INTRODUCTION

The Semantic Web provides a large number of structured datasets in form of Linked Data. One central obstacle is to make this data available and consumable to lay users without knowledge of formal query languages such as SPARQL. In order to satisfy specific information needs of users, a typical approach are natural language interfaces to allow question answering over the Linked Data (QALD) by translating user queries into SPARQL (Diefenbach et al., 2018; López et al., 2013).

As an alternative method, (Mouromtsev et al., 2018) propose a visual method of QA using an iterative diagrammatic approach. The diagrammatic approach relies on the visual means only, it requires more user interaction than natural language QA, but also provides additional benefits like intuitive insights into dataset characteristics, or a broader understanding of the answer and the potential to further explore the answer context, and finally allows for knowledge sharing by storing and sharing resulting diagrams.

In contrast to (Mouromtsev et al., 2018), who

present the basic method and tool for diagrammatic question answering (DQA), here we evaluate DQA in comparison to natural language QALD systems. Both approaches have different characteristics, therefore we see them as complementary rather than in competition.

The basic research goals are: i) Given a dataset extracted from the QALD7 benchmark¹, we evaluate DQA versus state-of-the-art QALD systems. ii) More specifically, we investigate if and to what extent DQA can be complementary to QALD systems, especially in cases where those systems do not find a correct answer. iii) Finally, we want to present the basic outline for the integration of the two methods.

In a nutshell, users that applied DQA found the correct answer with an F1-score of 79.5%, compared to a maximum of 59.2% for the best performing QALD system. Furthermore, for the subset of questions where the QALD system could not provide a correct answer, users found the answer with 70% F1-score with DQA. We further analyze the characteristics of questions where the QALD or DQA, respectively, approach is better suited.

^a <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7196-0699>

^b <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0644-9242>

¹<https://project-hobbit.eu/challenges/qald2017>




Figure 1: After placing the Wikidata entity *Van Gogh* onto the canvas, searching properties related to his “style” with Ontodia DQA tool.

The results indicate, that aside from the other benefits of DQA, it can be a valuable component for integration into larger QALD systems, in cases where those systems cannot find an answer, or when the user wants to explore the answer context in detail by visualizing the relevant nodes and relations. Moreover, users can verify answers given by a QALD system using DQA in case of doubt.

This publication is organized as follows: After the presentation of related work in Section 2, and a brief system description of the DQA tool in Section 3, the main focus of the paper is on evaluation setup and results of the comparison of DQA and QALD, including a discussion, in Section 4. The paper concludes with Section 5.

2 RELATED WORK

As introduced in (Mouromtsev et al., 2018) we understand diagrammatic question answering (DQA) as the process of QA relying solely on visual exploration using diagrams as a representation of the underlying knowledge source. The process includes (i) a model for diagrammatic representation of semantic data which supports data interaction using embedded queries, (ii) a simple method for step-by-step construction of diagrams with respect to cognitive boundaries and a layout that boosts understandability of diagrams, (iii) a library for visual data exploration and sharing based on its internal data model, and (iv) an evaluation of DQA as knowledge understanding and knowledge sharing tool. (Eppler and Burkhard, 2007) propose a framework of five perspectives of knowledge visualization, which can be used to describe certain aspects of the DQA use cases, such as its goal to provide an iterative exploration

method, which is accessible to any user, the possibility of knowledge sharing (via saved diagrams), or the general purpose of knowledge understanding and abstraction from technical details.

Many tools exist for visual consumption and interaction with RDF knowledge bases, however, they are not designed specifically towards the question answering use case. (Dudáš et al., 2018) give an overview of ontology and Linked Data visualization tools, and categorize them based on the used visualization methods, interaction techniques and supported ontology constructs.

Regarding language-based QA over Linked Data, (Kaufmann and Bernstein, 2007) discuss and study the usefulness of natural language interfaces to ontology-based knowledge bases in a general way. They focus on usability of such systems for the end user, and conclude that users prefer full sentences for query formulation and that natural language interfaces are indeed useful.

(Diefenbach et al., 2018) describe the challenges of QA over knowledge bases using natural languages, and elaborate the various techniques used by existing QALD systems to overcome those challenges. In the present work, we compare DQA with four of those systems using a subset of questions of the QALD7 benchmark. Those systems are: gAnswer (Zou et al., 2014) is an approach for RDF QA that has a “graph-driven” perspective. In contrast to traditional approaches, which first try to understand the question, and then evaluate the query, in gAnswer the intention of the query is modeled in a structured way, which leads to a subgraph matching problem. Secondly, QAKiS (Cabrio et al., 2014) is QA system over structured knowledge bases such as DBpedia that makes use of relational patterns which capture different ways to express a certain relation in a natural language in




Figure 2: Answering the question: *Who is the mayor of Paris?*

order to construct a target-language (SPARQL) query. Further, Platypus (Pellissier Tanon et al., 2018) is a QA system on Wikidata. It represents questions in an internal format related to dependency-based compositional semantics which allows for question decomposition and language independence. The platform can answer complex questions in several languages by using hybrid grammatical and template-based techniques. And finally, also the WDAqua (Diefenbach et al., 2018) system aims for language-independence and for being agnostic of the underlying knowledge base. WDAqua puts more importance on word semantics than on the syntax of the user query, and follows a processes of query expansion, SPARQL construction, query ranking and then making an answer decision.

For the evaluation of QA systems, several benchmarks have been proposed such as WebQuestions (Berant et al., 2013) or SimpleQuestions (Bordes et al., 2015). However, the most popular benchmarks in the Semantic Web field arise from the QALD evaluation campaign (López et al., 2013). The recent QALD7 evaluation campaign includes task 4: “English question answering over Wikidata”² which serves as basis to compile our evaluation dataset.

3 SYSTEM DESCRIPTION

The DQA functionality is part of the Ontodia³ tool. The initial idea of Ontodia was to enable the exploration of semantic graphs for ordinary users. Data exploration is about efficiently extracting knowledge from data even in situations where it is unclear what is being looked for exactly (Idreos et al., 2015).

The DQA tool uses an incremental approach to exploration typically starting from a very small number of nodes. With the context menu of a particular node, relations and related nodes can be added until the diagram fulfills the information need of the user. Figure 1 gives an example of a start node, where a user wants to learn more about the painting style of *Van Gogh*.

To illustrate the process, we give a brief example here. More details about the DQA tool, the motivation

for DQA and diagram-based visualizations are found in previous work (Mouromtsev et al., 2018; Wohlgenannt et al., 2017).

As for the example, when attempting to answer a question such as “Who is the mayor of Paris?” the first step for a DQA user is finding a suitable starting point, in our case the entity *Paris*. The user enters “Paris” into the search box, and can then investigate the entity on the tool canvas. The information about the entity stems from the underlying dataset, for example Wikidata⁴. The user can – in an incremental process – search in the properties of the given entity (or entities) and add relevant entities onto the canvas. In the given example, the property “head of government” connects the mayor to the city of Paris, *Anne Hidalgo*. The final diagram which answers the given question is presented in Figure 2.

4 EVALUATION

Here we present the evaluation of DQA in comparison to four QALD systems.

4.1 Evaluation Setup

As evaluation dataset, we reuse questions from the QALD7 benchmark task 4 “QA over Wikidata”. Question selection from QALD7 is based on the principles of question classification in QA (Moldovan et al., 2000). Firstly, it is necessary to define question types which correspond to different scenarios of data exploration in DQA, as well as the type of expected answers and the question focus. The question focus refers to the main information in the question which help a user find the answer. We follow the model of (Riloff and Thelen, 2000) who categorize questions by their question word into WHO, WHICH, WHAT, NAME, and HOW questions. Given the question and answer type categories, we created four questionnaires with nine questions each⁵ resulting in 36 questions from the QALD dataset. The questions were picked in equal number for five basic question categories.

²<https://project-hobbit.eu/challenges/qald2017/qald2017-challenge-tasks/#task4>

³<http://ontodia.org>

⁴<https://www.wikidata.org>

⁵<https://github.com/ontodia-org/DQA/wiki/Questionnaires1>

Table 1: Overall performance of DQA and the four QALD tools – measured with precision, recall and F1 score.

	DQA	WDAqua	askplatyp.us	QAKiS	gAnswer
Precision	80.1%	53.7%	8.57%	29.6%	57.5%
Recall	78.5%	58.8%	8.57%	25.6%	61.1%
F1	79.5%	56.1%	8.57%	27.5%	59.2%

20 persons participated in the DQA evaluation – 14 male and six female from eight different countries. The majority of respondents work within academia, however seven users were employed in industry. 131 diagrams (of 140 expected) were returned by the users.

The same 36 questions were answered using four QALD tools: WDAqua⁶ (Diefenbach et al., 2018), QAKiS⁷ (Cabrio et al., 2014), gAnswer⁸ (Zou et al., 2014) and Platypus⁹ (Pellissier Tanon et al., 2018).

For the QALD tools, a human evaluator pasted the questions as is into the natural language Web interfaces, and submitted them to the systems. Typically QALD tools provide a distinct answer, which may be a simple literal, or a set of entities which represent the answer, and which can be compared to the gold standard result. However, the WDAqua system, sometimes, additionally to the *direct answer* to the question, provides links to documents related to the question. We always chose the answer available via *direct answer*.

To assess the correctness of the answers given both by participants in the DQA experiments, and by the QALD system, we use the classic information retrieval metrics of precision (P), recall (R), and F1. *P* measures the fraction of relevant (correct) answer (items) given versus all answers (answer items) given. *R* is the fraction of correct answer (parts) given divided by all correct ones in the gold answer, and *F1* is the harmonic mean of *P* and *R*. As an example, if the question is “Where was Albert Einstein born?” (gold answer: “Ulm”), and the system gives two answers “Ulm” and “Bern”, then $P = \frac{1}{2}$, $R = 1$ and $F1 = \frac{2}{3}$.

For DQA four participants answered each question, therefore we took the average *P*, *R*, and *F1* values over the four evaluators as the result per question. The detailed answers by the participants and available online¹⁰.

⁶<http://qanswer-frontend.univ-st-etienne.fr>

⁷<http://qakis.org>

⁸<http://qanswer.gstore-pku.com>

⁹<https://askplatyp.us>

¹⁰<https://github.com/ontodia-org/DQA/wiki/Experiment-I-results>

4.2 Evaluation Results and Discussion

Table 1 presents the overall evaluation metrics of DQA, and the four QALD tools studied. With the given dataset, WDAqua (56.1% F1) and gAnswer (59.2% F1) clearly outperform askplatyp.us (8.6% F1) and QAKiS (27.5% F1). Detailed results per question including the calculation of *P*, *R* and *F1* scores are available online¹¹. DQA led to 79.5% F1 (80.1% precision and 78.5% recall).

In further evaluations, we compare DQA results to WDAqua in order to study the differences and potential complementary aspects of the approaches. We selected WDAqua as representative of QALD tools, as it provides state-of-the-art results, and is well grounded in the Semantic Web community.¹²

Comparing DQA and WDAqua, the first interesting question is: To what extent is DQA helpful on questions that could not be answered by the QALD system? For WDAqua the overall F1 score on our test dataset is 56.1%. For the subset of questions where WDAqua had no, or only a partial, answer, DQA users found the correct answer in 69.6% of cases. On the other hand, the subset of questions that DQA users (partially) failed to answer, were answered correctly by WDAqua with an F1 of 27.3%. If DQA is used as a backup method for questions not correctly answered with WDAqua, then overall F1 can be raised to 85.0%. The increase from 56.1% to 85.0% demonstrates the potential of DQA as complementary component in QALD systems.

As expected, questions that are difficult to answer with one approach are also harder for the other approach – as some questions in the dataset or just more complex to process and understand than others. However, almost 70% of questions not answered by WDAqua could still be answered by DQA. As examples of cases which are easier to answer for one approach than the other, a question that DQA users could answer, but where WDAqua failed is: “What is the name of the school where Obama’s wife studied?”. This complex question formulation is hard to

¹¹https://github.com/gwohlgen/DQA_evaluations/blob/master/nlp_eval.xlsx

¹²Furthermore, at the time of paper writing the gAnswer online demo was not available any more, support for this tools seems limited.




Figure 3: Answering the question: *Who is the son of Sonny and Cher?* with DQA.

interpret correctly for a machine. In contrast to DQA, QALD systems also struggled with “Who is the son of Sonny and Cher?”. This question needs a lot of real-world knowledge to map the names *Sonny* and *Cher* to their corresponding entities. The QALD system needs to select the correct *Cher* entity from multiple options in Wikidata, and also to understand that “Sonny” refers to the entity *Sonny Bono*. The resulting answer diagram is given in Figure 3. More simple questions, like “Who is the mayor of Paris?” were correctly answered by WDAqua, but not by all DQA users. DQA participants in this case struggled to make the leap from the noun “mayor” to the *head-of-government* property in Wikidata.

Regarding the limits of DQA, this method has difficulties when the answer can be obtained only with joins of queries, or when it is hard to find the initial starting entities related to question focus. For example, a question like “Show me the list of African birds that are extinct.” typically requires an intersection of two (large) sets of candidate entities, ie. all *African birds* and *extinct birds*. Such a task can easily be represented in a SPARQL query, but is hard to address with diagrams, because it would require placing, and interacting with, a huge amount of nodes on the exploration canvas.

Overall, the experiments indicate, that additionally to the use cases where QALD and DQA are useful on their own, there is a lot of potential in combining the two approaches, especially by providing a user the opportunity to explore the dataset with DQA if QALD did not find a correct answer, or when a user wants to confirm the QALD answer by checking in the underlying knowledge base. Furthermore,

visually exploring the dataset provides added benefits, like understanding the dataset characteristics, sharing of resulting diagrams (if supported by the tool), and finding more information related to the original information need.

For the integration of QALD and DQA, we envision two scenarios. The first scenario addresses plain question answering, and here DQA can be added to a QALD system for cases where a user is not satisfied with a given answer. The QALD Web interface can for example have a *Explore visually with diagrams* button, which brings the user to a canvas on which the entities detected by the QALD system within the question and results (if any) are displayed on the canvas as starting nodes. The user will then explore the knowledge graph and find the answers in the same way as the participants in our experiments. The first scenario can lead to a large improvement in answer F1 (see above).

The second scenario of integration of QALD and DQA focuses on the exploration aspect. Even if the QALD system provides the correct answer, a user might be interested to explore the knowledge graph to validate the result and to discover more interesting information about the target entities. From an implementation and UI point of view, the same *Explore visually with diagrams* button and pre-population of the canvas can be used. Both scenarios also provide the additional benefits of potentially saving and sharing the created diagrams, which elaborate the relation between question and answer.

5 CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we compare two approaches to answer questions over Linked Data datasets: a visual diagrammatic approach (DQA) which involves iterative exploration of the graph, and a natural language-based (QALD). The evaluations show, that DQA can be a helpful addition to pure QALD systems, both regarding evaluation metrics (precision, recall, and F1), and also for dataset understanding and further exploration. The contributions include: i) a comparative evaluation of four QALD tools and DQA with a dataset extracted from the QALD7 benchmark, ii) an investigation into the differences and potential complementary aspects of the two approaches, and iii) the proposition of integration scenarios for QALD and DQA.

In future work we plan to study the integration of DQA and QALD, especially the aspect of automatically creating an initial diagram from a user query, in order to leverage the discussed potentials. We envision an integrated tool, that uses QALD as basic method to find an answer to a question quickly, but also allows to explore the knowledge graph visually to raise answer quality and support exploration with all its discussed benefits.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by the Government of the Russian Federation (Grant 074-U01) through the ITMO Fellowship and Professorship Program.

REFERENCES

- Berant, J., Chou, A., Frostig, R., and Liang, P. (2013). Semantic parsing on freebase from question-answer pairs. In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1533–1544.
- Bordes, A., Usunier, N., Chopra, S., and Weston, J. (2015). Large-scale simple question answering with memory networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.02075*.
- Cabrio, E., Sachidananda, V., and Troncy, R. (2014). Boosting qakis with multimedia answer visualization. In Presutti, V. e. a., editor, *ESWC 2014*, pages 298–303. Springer.
- Diefenbach, D., Both, A., Singh, K., and Maret, P. (2018). Towards a question answering system over the semantic web.
- Dudáš, M., Lohmann, S., Svátek, V., and Pavlov, D. (2018). Ontology visualization methods and tools: a survey of the state of the art. *The Knowledge Engineering Review*, 33.
- Eppler, M. J. and Burkhard, R. A. (2007). Visual representations in knowledge management: framework and cases. *Journal of knowledge management*, 11(4):112–122.
- Idreos, S., Papaemmanouil, O., and Chaudhuri, S. (2015). Overview of data exploration techniques. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data*, pages 277–281, Melbourne, Australia.
- Kaufmann, E. and Bernstein, A. (2007). How useful are natural language interfaces to the semantic web for casual end-users? In *The Semantic Web*, pages 281–294. Springer.
- López, V., Unger, C., Cimiano, P., and Motta, E. (2013). Evaluating question answering over linked data. *J. Web Sem.*, 21:3–13.
- Moldovan, D., Harabagiu, S., Pasca, M., Mihalcea, R., Girju, R., Goodrum, R., and Rus, V. (2000). The structure and performance of an open-domain question answering system. In *Proceedings of the 38th annual meeting on association for computational linguistics*, pages 563–570. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mouromtsev, D., Wohlgenannt, G., Haase, P., Pavlov, D., Emelyanov, Y., and Morozov, A. (2018). A diagrammatic approach for visual question answering over knowledge graphs. In *ESWC (Posters and Demos Track)*, volume 11155 of *CEUR-WS*, pages 34–39.
- Pellissier Tanon, T., Dias De Assuncao, M., Caron, E., and Suchanek, F. M. (2018). Demoing Platypus – A Multilingual QA Platform for Wikidata. In *ESWC*.
- Riloff, E. and Thelen, M. (2000). A rule-based question answering system for reading comprehension tests. In *Proceedings of the 2000 ANLP/NAACL Workshop on Reading comprehension tests as evaluation for computer-based language understanding systems-Volume 6*, pages 13–19. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wohlgenannt, G., Klimov, N., Mouromtsev, D., Razdyakonov, D., Pavlov, D., and Emelyanov, Y. (2017). Using word embeddings for visual data exploration with ontodia and wikidata. In *BLINK/NLIWoD3@ISWC, ISWC*, volume 1932. CEUR-WS.org.
- Zou, L., Huang, R., Wang, H., Yu, J. X., He, W., and Zhao, D. (2014). Natural language question answering over rdf: A graph data driven approach. In *Proc. of the 2014 ACM SIGMOD Conf. on Management of Data, SIGMOD '14*, pages 313–324. ACM.