arXiv:1911.03868v2 [cs.CL] 13 Apr 2020

Knowledge Guided Text Retrieval and Reading for Open Domain Question Answering

Sewon Min[1], **Danqi Chen**[2], **Luke Zettlemoyer**[1,3], **Hannaneh Hajishirzi**[1,4]
[1]University of Washington, Seattle, WA [2]Princeton University, Princeton, NJ
[3]Facebook AI Research, Seattle, WA [4]Allen Institute for AI, Seattle, WA
{sewon,lsz,hannaneh}@cs.washington.edu danqic@cs.princeton.edu

Abstract

We introduce an approach for open-domain question answering (QA) that retrieves and reads a passage graph, where vertices are passages of text and edges represent relationships that are derived from an external knowledge base or co-occurrence in the same article. Our goals are to boost coverage by using knowledge-guided retrieval to find more relevant passages than text-matching methods, and to improve accuracy by allowing for better knowledge-guided fusion of information across related passages. Our graph retrieval method expands a set of seed keyword-retrieved passages by traversing the graph structure of the knowledge base. Our reader extends a BERT-based architecture and updates passage representations by propagating information from related passages and their relations, instead of reading each passage in isolation. Experiments on three open-domain QA datasets, WEBQUESTIONS, NATURAL QUESTIONS and TRIVIAQA, show improved performance over non-graph baselines by 2-11% absolute. Our approach also matches or exceeds the state-of-the-art in every case, without using an expensive end-to-end training regime.

1 Introduction

Open-domain question answering systems aim to answer any question a user can pose, with evidence provided by either factual text such as Wikipedia (Chen et al., 2017; Yang et al., 2019) or knowledge bases (KBs) such as Freebase (Berant et al., 2013; Kwiatkowski et al., 2013; Yih et al., 2015). Textual evidence, in general, has better coverage but KBs more directly support making complex inferences. It remains an open question how to best make use of KBs without sacrificing coverage in text-based open domain QA. Previous work has converted KB facts to sentences to provide extra evidence (Weissenborn et al., 2017; Mihaylov and Frank, 2018), but do not explicitly use the KB graph structure. In this paper, we show that such structure can be highly beneficial for both retrieving text passages and fusing information across them in open-domain text-based QA, for example as shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1: An example from NATURAL QUESTIONS. A graph of passages is constructed based on Wikipedia and Wikidata, where the edges represent relationships between passages. The baseline model which uses TF-IDF and reads each passage in isolation outputs the wrong answer (red) by selecting a person name from the passage about the song. Our model which leverages relations (e.g. *part of*) synthesizes the context over related passages and predicts the correct answer (blue) by choosing a singer of the album.

We introduce a general approach for text-based open-domain QA that is knowledge guided: it retrieves and reads a passage graph, where vertices are passages of text and edges represent relationships that are derived either from an external knowledge base or co-occurrence in the same article. Our goal is to combine the high coverage of textual corpora with the structural information in knowledge bases, to improve both the retrieval coverage and accuracy of the resulting model. Unlike standard approaches that retrieve and read a set of pas-

sages (Chen et al., 2017), our approach integrates graph structure at every stage to construct, retrieve and read a graph of passages.

Our approach first retrieves a passage graph by expanding a set of seed passages based on the graph structure of the knowledge base and the co-occurrence in text corpus (Figure 1). We then introduce a reader model that extends BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) and propagates information from related passages and their relations, enabling knowledge-rich cross-passage representations. Together, this approach allows for better coverage (e.g. the graph contains many passages that text-match retrieval would miss) and accuracy (e.g. by better combining information across related passages to find the best answer).

Experiments demonstrate significant improvements on three popular open-domain QA datasets: WEBQUESTIONS (Berant et al., 2013), NATURAL QUESTIONS (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019) and TRIVIAQA (Joshi et al., 2017). Our graph-based retrieval and reader models, together, improve accuracy consistently and significantly, outperforming the non-graph baselines by 2–11% and matching or exceeding the state-of-the-art in every case without an expensive end-to-end training regime. Through extensive ablations, we show that both graph-based retrieval and reader models substantially contribute to the performance improvements, even when we fix the other component.

2 Related Work

Text-based Question Answering. Text-based open-domain QA is a long standing problem (Voorhees et al., 1999; Ferrucci et al., 2010). Recent work has focused on two-stage approaches that combine information retrieval with neural reading comprehension (Chen et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2018; Das et al., 2019; Yang et al., 2019). We follow this tradition but introduce a new framework which retrieves and reads a graph of passages.

Other graph retrieval methods have been developed, either using entity name matching (Ding et al., 2019; Xiong et al., 2019b; Godbole et al., 2019) or hyperlinks (Asai et al., 2020). However, we are not aware of work integrating external knowledge bases or tightly coupling the approach with a graph reader, as we do in this paper. Moreover, most previous graph-based approaches evaluate on questions that are explicitly written to encourage reasoning based on a chain of entities, such as WIKIHOP (Welbl et al., 2017) or HOTPOTQA (Yang et al., 2018). In this work, we instead focus on naturally gathered questions which require much more diverse types of cross paragraph reasoning.

After retrieving evidence passages, most pipeline systems use a reading comprehension model to extract the answer. Previous work either concatenates retrieved passages into a single sequence (Swayamdipta et al., 2018; Yang et al., 2018; Song et al., 2018) with no explicit model of how they are related, or reads each passage in parallel (Clark and Gardner, 2018; Alberti et al., 2019; Min et al., 2019b; Wang et al., 2019) with no ability to fuse the information they contain. To the best of our knowledge, reading passages by incorporating structural information across passages has not been studied previously. The most related models are Song et al. (2018) and Cao et al. (2019), which fuse information through entities detected by entity linking and coreference resolution on WIKIHOP. In contrast, our model fuses information across passages, to better model the overall relationships between the different blocks of text.

Other lines of research in open-domain QA include joint learning of retrieval and reader components (Lee et al., 2019) or direct phrase retrieval in a large collection of documents (Seo et al., 2019). Although end-to-end training can further improve the performance of our approach, this paper only focuses on pipeline approaches since end-to-end training is computationally and memory expensive.

Knowledge Base Question Answering. Question answering over knowledge bases has also been well studied (Berant et al., 2013; Kwiatkowski et al., 2013; Yih et al., 2015), typically without using any external text collections. However, recent work has augmented knowledge bases with text from Wikipedia (Das et al., 2017; Sun et al., 2018, 2019; Xiong et al., 2019a), to increase factual coverage when a given knowledge base is incomplete. In this paper, we study what can be loosely seen as an inverse problem. The model answers questions based on a large set of documents, and the knowledge base is used to better model relationships between different passages of text.

3 Approach

We present a new general approach for text-based open-domain question answering, which consists of a retrieval model GRAPHRETRIEVER and




Figure 2: A diagram of our approach, consisting of GRAPHRETRIEVER (left) and GRAPHREADER (right). First, GRAPHRETRIEVER constructs a graph of passages by obtaining seed passages through either entity linking or TF-IDF, and expanding the graph based on Wikidata and Wikipedia (Section 3.1). GRAPHREADER then takes this graph as an input, obtains initial passage representations, and updates them with respect to the graph, using M fusion layers (Section 3.2).

a neural reader model GRAPHREADER. The overall approach is illustrated in Figure 2. GRAPHRETRIEVER retrieves a graph of passages in which vertices are passages and edges denote relationships between passages (Section 3.1). GRAPHREADER reads the input passage graph and returns the answer (Section 3.2).

Setup. The goal is to answer the question based on a text corpus $\mathcal{C}$, which consists of a large collection of articles and each of them can be divided into multiple passages. We also assume an external knowledge base $\mathcal{K} = \{(e_1, r, e_2)\}$ exists where e_1, e_2 are entities and r is a relation, and there is a 1-1 mapping between the KB entities and articles in the text corpus. Specifically, we use Wikipedia as the text corpus $\mathcal{C}$ and Wikidata (Vrandečić and Krötzsch, 2014) as the knowledge base $\mathcal{K}$, as there exists an alignment between the two resources and Wikipedia has been widely used before in open-domain question answering research (Chen et al., 2017; Seo et al., 2019).

3.1 GRAPHRETRIEVER

Our retrieval approach takes a question as input and uses the knowledge base $\mathcal{K}$ to construct a graph of passages in $\mathcal{C}$. It obtains seed passages and expands the passage graph through M_{ret} iterations, until it reaches the maximum number of passages n. We denote $\mathcal{P}^{(m)}$ as the passages obtained in the m-th iteration, and describe how to obtain $\mathcal{P}^{(0)}$ (seed passages) and update the graph in the m-th iteration ($1 \leq m \leq M_{\text{ret}}$).

Seed passages. GRAPHRETRIEVER starts with a set of Wikipedia articles by taking the union of (1) articles corresponding to the entities which are identified by an entity linking system (Ferrucci et al., 2010) on the input question; (2) the top K_{TFIDF} articles returned by a TF-IDF based retrieval system. We choose the first passage of these articles as seed passages $\mathcal{P}^{(0)}$.

Graph expansion. Starting from seed passages $\mathcal{P}^{(0)}$, GRAPHRETRIEVER expands the passage graph from $\mathcal{P}^{(m-1)}$ to $\mathcal{P}^{(m)}$ by iterating over the following two methods, until it includes n passages.

First, the passage graph is updated by adding passages that are related to $\mathcal{P}^{(m-1)}$ according to a relation present in Wikidata. Specifically, if $p_i \in \mathcal{P}^{(m-1)}$ and p_j are the first passages of Wikipedia articles that correspond to KB entities e_{p_i} and e_{p_j} such that $(e_{p_i}, r_{i,j}, e_{p_j}) \in \mathcal{K}$, p_j is added to the passage graph, being connected to p_i through $r_{i,j}$.[1]

Second, supporting passages for $\mathcal{P}^{(m-1)}$ are added to the passage graph. Specifically, non-first passages of Wikipedia articles that are associated with $\mathcal{P}^{(m-1)}$ are ranked by BM25 (Robertson et al.,

[1] Although this may include some entities that are not closely related to the question, it still increases the coverage of entities related to the answer, as shown in Section 4.4.

2009) and the top K_{BM25} passages are chosen. We construct relations between passages if they belong to the same Wikipedia article: $r_{i,j}$ is `child` and $r_{j,i}$ is `parent` if p_i is the *first passage* of the article and p_j is another passage from the same article.

Final graph. Finally, we retrieve a passage graph consisting of n passages: $\{p_1, \ldots, p_n\}$. The relations between the passages are denoted by $\{r_{i,j} \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq n\}$, where $r_{i,j}$ is either a KB relation, `child`, `parent` or `no_relation`, indicating the relationship between a passage pair (p_i, p_j).

3.2 GRAPHREADER

Our GRAPHREADER takes a question q and n retrieved passages $p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_n$ (and their relations $r_{i,j}$) and aims to output an answer to the question as a text span in one of retrieved passages. Instead of processing each passage independently, our approach obtains knowledge-rich representations of passages by fusing information from linked passages across the graph structure.

3.2.1 Initial Passage Representation

Formally, given the question q and a passage p_i, GRAPHREADER first obtains a question-aware passage representation:

$$\mathbf{P}_i = \text{TextEncode}(q, p_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times h},$$

where L is the maximum length of each passage, and h is the hidden dimension. We use BERT (Devlin et al., 2019), although the approach could be applied with many other encoders.

Additionally, GRAPHREADER encodes a relation $r_{i,j}$ through a relation encoder:

$$\mathbf{r}_{i,j} = \text{RelationEncode}(r_{i,j}) \in \mathbb{R}^h.$$

We consider the most frequent 98 relations and group the other relations as `unk_releation`, total to be 100 including `no_relation`. We directly learn an an embedding matrix to get a vector representation for each relation, which works well in practice since we have relatively few relations and many examples of each.

3.2.2 Fusing Passage Representations

GRAPHREADER builds M graph-aware fusion layers to update passage representations by propagating information through the edges of the graph, as depicted in the right side of Figure 2. Specifically, GRAPHREADER initializes passage representation with $\mathbf{z}_i^{(0)} = \text{MaxPool}(\mathbf{P}_i)$. It then obtains new passage representation $\mathbf{z}_i^{(m)}$ for each fusion layer $1 \leq m \leq M$, based on its previous representation, all the adjacent passages and their relations. Largely inspired by Graph Convolution Networks (GCN) (Kipf and Welling, 2017; Marcheggiani and Titov, 2017), we investigate two methods to obtain $\mathbf{z}_i^{(m)}$ from $\{\mathbf{z}_j^{(m-1)}\}_{j=1}^n$ and $\{\mathbf{r}_{i,j}\}_{j=1}^n$ as follows.

Binary. We first consider binary relations which encodes whether a passage pair is related or not, without incorporating relations. Specifically,

$$\begin{aligned} G_i &= \{j \mid r_{i,j} \neq \texttt{no_relation}\}, \\ \mathbf{z}_i^{(m+1)} &= \frac{1}{|G_i|} \sum_{j \in G_i} \left(\mathbf{W}_f [\mathbf{z}_i^{(m)} \oplus \mathbf{z}_j^{(m)}] + \mathbf{b}_f\right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{W}_f$ and $\mathbf{b}_f$ are learnable parameters, and $\oplus$ is a concatenation.

Relation-aware. We then consider a relation-aware composition function:

$$\mathbf{z}_i^{(m+1)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(\mathbf{W}_f [\mathbf{z}_i^{(m)} \oplus f(\mathbf{r}_{i,j}, \mathbf{z}_j^{(m)})] + \mathbf{b}_f\right),$$

where f is a composition function, $\oplus$ is a concatenation, and $\mathbf{W}_f$ and $\mathbf{b}_f$ are learnable parameters. We use concatenation for the composition function, $f(\mathbf{r}_{i,j}, \mathbf{z}_j^{(m)}) = \text{CONCAT}(\mathbf{r}_{i,j}, \mathbf{z}_j^{(m)})$, for simplicity because it worked as well as more complex functions such as element-wise multiplication and bilinear mappings in our early experiments.

3.2.3 Answering Questions

GRAPHREADER uses the updated passage representations $\mathbf{z}_1^{(M)}, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_n^{(M)}$ to compute the probability of p_i being an evidence passage. Denote $\mathbf{Z} = [\mathbf{z}_1^{(M)}, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_n^{(M)}] \in \mathbb{R}^{h \times n}$, we define

$$P_{\text{sel}}(i) = \text{softmax}\left(\mathbf{Z}^\intercal \mathbf{w}_{\text{sel}}\right)_i,$$

where $\mathbf{w}_{\text{sel}} \in \mathbb{R}^h$ is a learnable vector. Once the evidence passage is chosen by $i^* = \text{argmax}_{1 \leq i \leq n} P_{\text{sel}}(i)$, the probability of a span $1 \leq j \leq k \leq L$ in the passage p_{i^*} being an answer is computed as $P_{\text{start},i^*}(j) \times P_{\text{end},i^*}(k)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\text{start},i^*}(j) &= \text{softmax}\left(\mathbf{P}_{i^*} \mathbf{w}_{\text{start}}\right)_j, \\ P_{\text{end},i^*}(k) &= \text{softmax}\left(\mathbf{P}_{i^*} \mathbf{w}_{\text{end}}\right)_k, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{w}_{\text{start}}, \mathbf{w}_{\text{end}} \in \mathbb{R}^h$ are learnable vectors.

Dataset	Statistics			Graph density		
	Train	Dev	Test	Cross	Inner	Total
WEBQ	3417	361	2032	1.53	0.88	2.41
NATURALQ	79168	8757	3610	1.26	0.90	2.16
TRIVIAQA	78785	8837	11313	1.28	0.88	2.16

Table 1: Dataset statistics and density of the graph (# of relations per a passage). Cross, Inner and Total denote cross-document relations (KB relations), inner-document relations (`child`, `parent`) and their sum.

For training, we use the maximum marginal likelihood objective by maximizing:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{I}[|\mathcal{S}_i| > 0] \log P_{\text{sel}}(i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log \left(\sum_{(s_i,e_i)\in\mathcal{S}_i} (P_{\text{start},i}(s_i) \times P_{\text{end},i}(e_i)) \right)$$

where $\mathcal{S}_i$ is a set of spans which correspond to the answer text in p_i. We tried using $\mathbf{Z}$ for span predictions, but did not see meaningful improvements. We hypothesize it is because span prediction given the correct passage is an easier task compared to choosing the right evidence passage.[2]

4 Experiments

4.1 Datasets

We evaluate our model on three open-domain question answering datasets, where the evaluation metric is Exact Match. (1) **WEBQUESTIONS** (Berant et al., 2013) is originally a QA dataset designed to answer questions based on Freebase; the questions were collected through Google Suggest API. We follow Chen et al. (2017) and frame the problem as a span selection task over Wikipedia. (2) **NATURAL QUESTIONS** (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019) consists of questions collected using the Google search engine; questions with short answers up to 5 tokens are taken following Lee et al. (2019). (3) **TRIVIAQA** (Joshi et al., 2017) consists of questions from trivia and quiz-league websites. For all datasets, we only use question and answer pairs for training and testing, and discard the provided evidence documents which are part of reading comprehension tasks. We follow the data splits from Chen et al. (2017) for WEBQUESTIONS and Min et al. (2019a) on NATURAL QUESTIONS and TRIVIAQA.[3] Table 1 shows the statistics of the datasets and the density of the graph (number of relations per passage) retrieved by GRAPHRETRIEVER.

4.2 Baselines

For retrieval, we compare our GRAPHRETRIEVER to a pure text-match based retrieval method which retrieves Wikipedia articles based on TF-IDF scores (Chen et al., 2017) and ranks their passages through BM25 (Robertson et al., 2009). This is to investigate if leveraging the knowledge base actually improves the retrieval component.

For reader, we compare our GRAPHREADER with two competitive baselines which read each passage in parallel, **PARREADER** and **PARREADER++**. Both baselines obtain question-aware passage representations $\mathbf{P}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{P}_n$ as described in Section 3.2 with a different way of calculating $P_{\text{sel}}(i)$. **PARREADER** computes $P_{\text{sel}}(i)$ using a binary classifier:

$$P_{\text{sel}}(i) = \text{softmax}\big(\mathbf{W}_{\text{sel}} \text{maxpool}(\mathbf{P}_i)\big)_1,$$

where $\mathbf{W}_{\text{sel}} \in \mathbb{R}^{2\times h}$ is a learnable matrix (Alberti et al., 2019; Min et al., 2019b). **PARREADER++** is similar to PARREADER but takes a softmax across passages, inspired by Clark and Gardner (2018)[4]:

$$P_{\text{sel}}(i) = \text{softmax}\big(\hat{\mathbf{P}}^\intercal \mathbf{w}_{\text{sel}}\big)_i,$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{P}} = [\text{MaxPool}(\mathbf{P}_1), \ldots, \text{MaxPool}(\mathbf{P}_n)] \in \mathbb{R}^{h\times n}$ and $\mathbf{w}_{\text{sel}} \in \mathbb{R}^h$ is learned. Note that PARREADER++ is exactly the same as GRAPHREADER with no fusion layer. Finally, for both baselines, the probability of the span is computed in the same way as described in Section 3.2.

4.3 Implementation Details

We use the Wikipedia dump from 2018-12-20 and the Wikidata dump from 2019-06-01[5]. We use TAGME (Ferragina and Scaiella, 2011)[6] as an entity linking system. We split the article into passages with natural breaks and merge consecutive ones with up to a maximum length of 300 tokens.

[2] We observed that over 80% of the error cases the baseline model made are due to the incorrect passage selection on all datasets.

[3] https://bit.ly/2q8mshc and https://bit.ly/2HK1Fqn.

[4] Our preliminary result indicates this variant slightly outperforms the original model, S-Norm.

[5] archive.org/download/enwiki-20181220 and dumps.wikimedia.org/Wikidatawiki/20190601

[6] github.com/gammaliu/tagme

Retriever	Reader	WebQuestions		Natural Questions		TriviaQA	
		Dev	Test	Dev	Test	Dev	Test
Text-match	ParReader	23.6	25.2	26.1	25.8	52.1	52.1
Text-match	ParReader++	19.9	20.8	28.9	28.7	54.5	54.0
GraphRetriever	ParReader	33.2	33.0	30.2	29.3	54.8	54.7
GraphRetriever	ParReader++	33.7	31.8	33.1	33.5	55.5	55.0
GraphRetriever	GraphReader (binary)	34.0	**36.4**	34.2	34.1	55.2	54.2
GraphRetriever	GraphReader (relation)	34.0	36.0	**34.7**	**34.5**	**55.8**	**56.0**
Previous best (pipeline)		-	18.5[a]	31.7[b]	32.6[b]	50.7[c]	50.9[c]
Previous best (end-to-end)		**38.5**[d]	**36.4**[d]	31.3[d]	33.3[d]	45.1[d]	45.0[d]

Table 2: Overall results on the development and the test set of three datasets. We also report the previous best results, both with pipeline and end-to-end: [a]Lin et al. (2018), [b]Asai et al. (2020), [c]Min et al. (2019a), [d]Lee et al. (2019). Note that the development sets used in Lin et al. (2018) and Lee et al. (2019) are slightly different but the test sets are the same; Asai et al. (2020) uses a better pretrained model (a whole word masking $\text{BERT}_{\text{LARGE}}$).

We use $K_{\text{TFIDF}} = 5, K_{\text{BM25}} = 40$ for WebQuestions and $K_{\text{TFIDF}} = 10, K_{\text{BM25}} = 80$ for the rest two, which empirically set M_{ret} as 2 and 1, respectively.

We use the uncased version of $\text{BERT}_{\text{BASE}}$ (Devlin et al., 2019) for question-aware passage representations TextEncode. When training GraphReader, we cannot feed the full passage graph in the same batch due to the memory constraints. Therefore, for every parameter update, we sample at most 20 passages where one of them contains the answer text, either uniformly at random or by taking a subgraph. For each model, we experiment with fusion layers of $M = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and two sampling methods, and choose the number that gives the best result on the development set. More details can be found in Appendix A.

4.4 Main Results

Model Comparisions The main results are given in Table 2. We observed three overall trends: (1) GraphRetriever offers significant performance gains over text-match retrieval when we compare within the same reader across all datasets, e.g., 1–11% absolute gains with ParReader++. This indicates that graph-based retrieval provides passages with significantly better evidence to answer the question. (2) GraphReader outperforms two ParReader baselines consistently across all datasets, achieving 1–5% absolute gains. This result demonstrates that fusing information across passages is more effective than reading each passage in isolation. (3) GraphReader using relations offers some improvement over GraphReader with binary relations. The gains are smaller than expected, likely because the relations are inferred based from the text.[7]

State-of-the-art results. We also compare our results to the previous best models, both pipeline and end-to-end approaches for open-doman QA, in Table 2. Our best-performing model outperforms previously published pipeline models by 6–18%, showcasing the benefit of our graph retrieval and reader models. In particular, our models with GraphRetriever (both baseline and GraphReader) outperform the previous best graph-based retrieval model (Asai et al., 2020)[8] by a large margin, despite the fact that they used a stronger BERT model than ours as the base model. Our model also outperforms or matches the end-to-end model (Lee et al., 2019) which is expensive to train as it uses an extra pretraining strategy. Although not explored in this paper, our framework can be trained end-to-end as well, which has a great potential to further advance the state-of-the-art.

5 Analyses

To better understand model performance, we report a number of ablation studies (Section 5.1) and a qualitative analysis (Section 5.2).

5.1 Ablation Studies

Effect of different retrieval methods. Table 3 compares text-match retrieval and GraphRetriever with 'Text-match + Wikidata', a variant of GraphRetriever where we take the union of

[7] In order to verify this hypothesis, we modify our reader to have an output layer for relation classification, and observe that the accuracy is over 80% for all datasets.

[8] To the best of our knowledge, Asai et al. (2020) (1) is the only graph-based approach evaluated on naturally found questions and (2) also outperforms other graph-based approaches on HotpotQA.

Retriever	WebQ	Natural Q
Reader: **PARREADER++**		
Text-match	19.9	28.9
Text-match + Wikidata	29.4	30.5
GRAPHRETRIEVER	**33.7**	**33.1**
Reader: **GRAPHREADER** ***(binary)***		
Text-match + Wikidata	30.8	32.6
GRAPHRETRIEVER	**34.0**	**34.2**

Table 3: **Effect of different retrieval methods**. We compare text-match retrieval and GRAPHREADER with 'Text-match + Wikidata' (described in Section 5.1).

	WEBQUESTIONS	Natural Q
Fully connected	33.7	33.6
Empty	33.7	33.6
Cross-doc	**34.2**	33.7
Inner-doc	33.4	33.7
Cross+Inner	34.0	**34.2**

Table 4: **Effects of different relation types in GRAPHREADER**. We compare input graphs containing different sets of edges, where we use GRAPHRETRIEVER and GRAPHREADER (binary).

text-match retrieval and Wikidata-based retrieval, each computed in isolation. Specifically, the text-match retrieval is the baseline described in Section 4.2, and Wikidata-based retrieval is done by obtaining seed passages through entity linking and updating the passage graph only through Wikidata. This variant can be seen as *late* combination between the text-match and Wikidata-based retrieval, whereas GRAPHRETRIEVER provides *early* combination. Although 'Text-match + Wikidata' outperforms text-match retrieval by a large margin, our GRAPHRETRIEVER significantly outperforms this method, showing the importance of jointly leveraging text-match and Wikidata for graph construction.

Effect of different relation types in GRAPHREADER. Table 4 compares the effect of using different relation types in the constructed graph of passages for GRAPHREADER, showing results for the following settings: (a) *fully connected,* which connects all pairs of passages, (b) *empty*, which does not include any edges between passages, (c) *cross-doc*, which only includes edges between passages according to the Wikidata relations, (d) *inner-doc*, which only includes `child` and `parent`, and (e) *cross+inner*, which includes both cross-doc and inner-doc, corresponding to the graph constructed by our approach. Results indicate that cross-doc and inner-doc relations

	WebQ	Natural Q
PARREADER++	33.7	33.1
PARREADER++ (pairs from graph)	31.3	29.8
PARREADER++ (all pairs)	25.7	20.5
GRAPHREADER (binary)	**34.0**	34.2
GRAPHREADER (relation)	**34.0**	**34.7**

Table 5: **Comparison to passage concatenation**. For all rows, GRAPHRETRIEVER is used.

achieve good performance across two datasets. In particular, using relation information is better than ignoring relation information (fully connected, empty), demonstrating the importance of selecting a good set of graph edges.

Comparison to passage concatenation. Table 5 compares the performance of our graph-based method with two baseline readers where a concatenation of passage pairs is included as input, and PARREADER++ reads each of them in isolation. First, PARREADER++ (pairs from graph) concatenates passage pairs that are related in the input graph, along with the relation text. Second, PARREADER++ (all pairs) concatenates all passage pairs. For these baselines, the concatenated passages are up to 300 tokens.[9] For PARREADER++ (pairs from graph), we use $n = 20$ instead of $n = \{40, 80\}$.[10] It is worth noting that concatenating more passages into a single input is non-trivial due to the fixed input length of BERT. Details are provided in Appendix A. Results show that concatenating passages is not competitive, potentially because truncating each passage causes significant information loss.

5.2 Qualitative Results

Figure 3 shows a few examples from NATURAL QUESTIONS and WEBQUESTIONS. Appendix B lists additional examples. They include cases where our method incorporates knowledge-rich relationships between passages to find the correct evidence and answer the question.

Knowledge helps retrieving evidence passages. In Example 1, text-match retrieval does not retrieve the article 'Director of the United States Mint' and fails to retrieve any passage about the director of the US Mint. However, GRAPHRETRIEVER retrieves

[9] We split each passage up to 145 tokens and set the relation text to be up to 10 tokens.

[10] This restrition is needed because there are too many passage pairs: even $n = 20$ gives $20 + 190 = 210$ passages.




Figure 3: Examples from NATURAL QUESTIONS and WEBQUESTIONS where predictions from PARREADER++ and GRAPHREADER (both with GRAPHRETRIEVER) are denoted by red and blue text, respectively. Subsets of the retrieved graphs are reported. Detailed analyses in Section 5.2.

the correct evidence passage by using the relationship between 'United States Mint' and 'Director of the United States Mint', enabling GRAPHREADER to successfully predict the answer. Similarly, in Example 3, Wikidata enables GRAPHRETRIEVER to retrieve 'Toyota Motor Sales, USA' which contains the evidence to the question, whereas text-match retrieval fails to do so.[11]

Relation information explicitly supports the answer. Although Example 2 appears to be easy to humans since the passage from 'Saint Louis Park' alone provides the enough evidence, PARREADER++ with no relation information makes a wrong prediction, 'St. Louis County', potentially because of the similarity in names. However, Wikidata relation in Example 2, *is located in*, explicitly supports the evidence to answer the question, therefore, GRAPHREADER which leverages graph information easily predicts the right answer.

Relation information enables the model to synthesize across related passages. In Example 3, PARREADER++ makes a wrong prediction from the passage 'Toyota', potentially because this passage seems more related to the company. GRAPHREADER, however, leverages the relationship between 'Toyota' and 'Toyota Motor Sales, USA', and predicts the correct answer. Similarly in Example 4, PARREADER++ predicts "Ben Feldman" as an answer potentially due to the word "judged by". However, leveraging relations in the graph *has part* and *part of the series*, GRAPHREADER infers that two passages belong to the same series and 'Drop Dead Diva (Season 3)' mentions the judge more explicitly.

[11] For both Example 1 and 3, initial retrieved articles include some passages containing the evidence, but BM25 passage ranking misses them.

6 Conclusion

We proposed a general approach for text-based open-domain question answering that integrates graph structure at every stage to construct, retrieve and read a graph of passages. Our retrieval method leverages both text corpus and a knowledge base to find a relevant set of passages and their relations. Our reader then propagates information according to the input graph, enabling knowledge-rich cross-passage representations. Our approach consistently outperforms competitive baselines on three open-domain QA datasets, WEBQUESTIONS, NATURAL QUESTIONS and TRIVIAQA. We also included a detailed qualitative analysis to illustrate which components contribute the most to the overall system performance.

References

Chris Alberti, Kenton Lee, and Michael Collins. 2019. A BERT baseline for the Natural Questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.08634*.

Akari Asai, Kazuma Hashimoto, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Richard Socher, and Caiming Xiong. 2020. Learning to retrieve reasoning paths over wikipedia graph for question answering. In *ICLR*.

Jonathan Berant, Andrew Chou, Roy Frostig, and Percy Liang. 2013. Semantic parsing on Freebase from question-answer pairs. In *EMNLP*.

Nicola De Cao, Wilker Aziz, and Ivan Titov. 2019. Question answering by reasoning across documents with graph convolutional networks. In *NAACL*.

Danqi Chen, Adam Fisch, Jason Weston, and Antoine Bordes. 2017. Reading Wikipedia to answer open-domain questions. In *ACL*.

Christopher Clark and Matt Gardner. 2018. Simple and effective multi-paragraph reading comprehension. In *ACL*.

Rajarshi Das, Shehzaad Dhuliawala, Manzil Zaheer, and Andrew McCallum. 2019. Multi-step retriever-reader interaction for scalable open-domain question answering. In *ICLR*.

Rajarshi Das, Manzil Zaheer, Siva Reddy, and Andrew McCallum. 2017. Question answering on knowledge bases and text using universal schema and memory networks. In *ACL*.

Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *NAACL*.

Ming Ding, Chang Zhou, Qibin Chen, Hongxia Yang, and Jie Tang. 2019. Cognitive graph for multi-hop reading comprehension at scale. In *ACL*.

Paolo Ferragina and Ugo Scaiella. 2011. Fast and accurate annotation of short texts with wikipedia pages. *IEEE software*.

David Ferrucci, Eric Brown, Jennifer Chu-Carroll, James Fan, David Gondek, Aditya A Kalyanpur, Adam Lally, J William Murdock, Eric Nyberg, John Prager, et al. 2010. Building Watson: An overview of the DeepQA project. *AI magazine*, 31(3):59–79.

Ameya Godbole, Dilip Kavarthapu, Rajarshi Das, Zhiyu Gong, Abhishek Singhal, Hamed Zamani, Mo Yu, Tian Gao, Xiaoxiao Guo, Manzil Zaheer, et al. 2019. Multi-step entity-centric information retrieval for multi-hop question answering. In *Workshop on Machine Reading for Question Answering EMNLP*.

Mandar Joshi, Eunsol Choi, Daniel S Weld, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2017. TriviaQA: A large scale distantly supervised challenge dataset for reading comprehension. In *ACL*.

Thomas N Kipf and Max Welling. 2017. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. In *ICLR*.

Tom Kwiatkowski, Eunsol Choi, Yoav Artzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2013. Scaling semantic parsers with on-the-fly ontology matching. In *EMNLP*.

Tom Kwiatkowski, Jennimaria Palomaki, Olivia Redfield, Michael Collins, Ankur Parikh, Chris Alberti, Danielle Epstein, Illia Polosukhin, Jacob Devlin, Kenton Lee, Kristina Toutanova, Llion Jones, Matthew Kelcey, Ming-Wei Change, Andrew M. Dai, Jakob Uszkoreit, Quoc Le, and Slav Petrov. 2019. Natural questions: a benchmark for question answering research. *TACL*.

Kenton Lee, Ming-Wei Chang, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. Latent retrieval for weakly supervised open domain question answering. In *ACL*.

Yankai Lin, Haozhe Ji, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2018. Denoising distantly supervised open-domain question answering. In *ACL*.

Diego Marcheggiani and Ivan Titov. 2017. Encoding sentences with graph convolutional networks for semantic role labeling. In *EMNLP*.

Todor Mihaylov and Anette Frank. 2018. Knowledgeable reader: Enhancing cloze-style reading comprehension with external commonsense knowledge. In *ACL*.

Sewon Min, Danqi Chen, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2019a. A discrete hard EM approach for weakly supervised question answering. In *EMNLP*.

Sewon Min, Eric Wallace, Sameer Singh, Matt Gardner, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2019b. Compositional questions do not necessitate multi-hop reasoning. In *ACL*.

Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Soumith Chintala, Gregory Chanan, Edward Yang, Zachary DeVito, Zeming Lin, Alban Desmaison, Luca Antiga, and Adam Lerer. 2017. Automatic differentiation in PyTorch.

Stephen Robertson, Hugo Zaragoza, et al. 2009. The probabilistic relevance framework: BM25 and beyond. *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval*.

Minjoon Seo, Jinhyuk Lee, Tom Kwiatkowski, Ankur P Parikh, Ali Farhadi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2019. Real-time open-domain question answering with dense-sparse phrase index. In *ACL*.

Linfeng Song, Zhiguo Wang, Mo Yu, Yue Zhang, Radu Florian, and Daniel Gildea. 2018. Exploring graph-structured passage representation for multi-hop reading comprehension with graph neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.02040*.

Nitish Srivastava, Geoffrey E Hinton, Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2014. Dropout: a simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting. *Journal of machine learning research*.

Haitian Sun, Tania Bedrax-Weiss, and William W Cohen. 2019. Pullnet: Open domain question answering with iterative retrieval on knowledge bases and text. In *EMNLP*.

Haitian Sun, Bhuwan Dhingra, Manzil Zaheer, Kathryn Mazaitis, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and William W Cohen. 2018. Open domain question answering using early fusion of knowledge bases and text. In *EMNLP*.

Swabha Swayamdipta, Ankur P Parikh, and Tom Kwiatkowski. 2018. Multi-mention learning for reading comprehension with neural cascades. In *ICLR*.

Ellen M Voorhees et al. 1999. The TREC-8 question answering track report. In *Trec*.

Denny Vrandečić and Markus Krötzsch. 2014. Wikidata: a free collaborative knowledge base.

Shuohang Wang, Mo Yu, Xiaoxiao Guo, Zhiguo Wang, Tim Klinger, Wei Zhang, Shiyu Chang, Gerry Tesauro, Bowen Zhou, and Jing Jiang. 2018. R^3: Reinforced ranker-reader for open-domain question answering. In *AAAI*.

Zhiguo Wang, Patrick Ng, Xiaofei Ma, Ramesh Nallapati, and Bing Xiang. 2019. Multi-passage BERT: A globally normalized BERT model for open-domain question answering. In *ACL*.

Dirk Weissenborn, Tomáš Kočiskỳ, and Chris Dyer. 2017. Dynamic integration of background knowledge in neural NLU systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.02596*.

Johannes Welbl, Pontus Stenetorp, and Sebastian Riedel. 2017. Constructing Datasets for Multi-hop Reading Comprehension Across Documents. In *TACL*.

Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, R'emi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, and Jamie Brew. 2019. HuggingFace's Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.03771*.

Wenhan Xiong, Mo Yu, Shiyu Chang, Xiaoxiao Guo, and William Yang Wang. 2019a. Improving question answering over incomplete kbs with knowledge-aware reader. In *ACL*.

Wenhan Xiong, Mo Yu, Xiaoxiao Guo, Hong Wang, Shiyu Chang, Murray Campbell, and William Yang Wang. 2019b. Simple yet effective bridge reasoning for open-domain multi-hop question answering. In *2nd Workshop on Machine Reading for Question Answering*.

Wei Yang, Yuqing Xie, Aileen Lin, Xingyu Li, Luchen Tan, Kun Xiong, Ming Li, and Jimmy Lin. 2019. End-to-end open-domain question answering with BERTserini. In *NAACL (Demonstrations)*.

Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William W Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D Manning. 2018. HotpotQA: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering. In *EMNLP*.

Scott Wen-tau Yih, Ming-Wei Chang, Xiaodong He, and Jianfeng Gao. 2015. Semantic parsing via staged query graph generation: Question answering with knowledge base. In *ACL*.

A Training details

A.1 Details & Hyperparameters

All experiments are done in Python 3.5 and PyTorch 1.1.0 (Paszke et al., 2017). For BERT, we use the uncased version of $\text{BERT}_{\text{BASE}}$ and PYTORCH-TRANSFORMERS (Wolf et al., 2019)[12]. Specifically, given a question Q and a passage P_i where the title of the originated article is T_i, we form a sequence $S_i = Q : [\texttt{SEP}] : < \texttt{t} > : T_i : < /\texttt{t} > : P_i$, where : indicates a concatenation and [SEP] is a special token. This sequence is then fed into BERT and the hidden representation of the sequence from the last layer is chosen as a question-aware passage representation. For the embedding matrix for the relation encoder, we keep 100 relations (`no_relation`, `UNK` and top 98 relations), which cover over 95% of all relations on all datasets.

For PARREADER, we use a batch size of 10 on WEBQUESTIONS and 60 on NATURAL QUESTIONS and TRIVIAQA. For PARREADER++ and GRAPHREADER, we use a batch size of 8 on WEBQUESTIONS and 16 on the rest two. For each fusion layer, we apply dropout (Srivastava et al., 2014) with a probability of 0.3. For training, we evaluate the model on the development set periodically, and stop training when Exact Match score does not improve 10 times. For all other hyperparameters not mentioned, we follow the default settings from PYTORCH-TRANSFORMERS.

As mentioned in Section 4.3, for each model, we experiment with $M = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and two sampling methods, and choose the number that gives the best result on the development set. The chosen hyperparameters for each model is reported in Table 6.

For inference, we experiment with the number of input passages $n = \{40, 80\}$ and choose the best one on the development set for testing. We restrict the predicted span to be a Freebase entity string on WEBQUESTIONS, following Chen et al. (2017).

A.2 Details for baselines with passage concatenation.

We design two baselines which concatenate a passage pair.

First, PARREADER++ (pairs from graph) concatenates passage pairs that are related in the input graph, along with the relation text. Specifically, if p_i and p_j are connected through $r_{i,j}$, all of p_i, p_j, $p_i : [\texttt{SEP}] : r_{i,j} : [\texttt{SEP}] : p_j$ are included as input passages of PARREADER++. We limit the length of the passages and the relation text to be 145 and 10, respectively, so that the total length to be up to 300. The number of the final input passages to the model will be $n + |\{r_{i,j} | r_{i,j} \neq \text{none}\}|$, where $0 \leq |\{r_{i,j} | r_{i,j} \neq \text{none}\}| \leq \frac{n(n-1)}{2}$ (but typically much smaller than $\frac{n(n-1)}{2}$ as the input graph is very sparse).

Similarly, PARREADER++ (all pairs) concatenate all passage pairs. For all $1 \leq i < j \leq n$, p_i, p_j, $p_i : [\texttt{SEP}] : p_j$ are included as input passages of PARREADER++. As p_i and p_j may not have a relation, the relation text $r_{i,j}$ is omitted as an input. Again, the length limit for p_i and p_j is 145. The number of the final input passages to the model will be $n + \frac{n(n-1)}{2}$. As there are too many input passages for this baseline, we use $n = 20$ instead of $n = \{40, 80\}$.

For both baselines, as the limit for a single passage is different from other baselines (145 vs. 300), we run the retrieval again by following the same method but just split the article into passages with a different length limit.

Dataset	GRAPHREADER	M	sample
WEBQUESTIONS	binary	1	U
	relation, concat	1	U
	relation, elm-wise	1	G
	relation, bilinear	1	U
NATURAL Q.	binary	1	G
	relation, concat	3	G
	relation, elm-wise	1	U
	relation, bilinear	2	G
TRIVIAQA	binary	1	G
	relation, concat	1	G
	relation, elm-wise	1	U
	relation, bilinear	2	U

Table 6: Hyperparameters used for experiments. M denotes the number of fusion layers, and 'sample' denotes a sampling method for training, where 'U' and 'G' indicate an uniform sampling and a subgraph sampling, respectively.

B More qualitative analyses

Figure 4 depict more examples where our model predicts the correct answer. We describe how our model outperforms baselines for each of retrieval and reading component.

Retrieval through entity linking. In Example 1, text-match retrieval fails to retrieve the evi-

[12] github.com/huggingface/transformers




Figure 4: Examples from NATURAL QUESTIONS and WEBQUESTIONS where predictions from PARREADER++ and GRAPHREADER (both with GRAPHRETRIEVER) are denoted by red and blue text, respectively. Subsets of graph information are reported. Detailed analyses in Section B.

dence passages because it fails to capture 'All That' as a key entity. GRAPHRETRIEVER, on the other hand, retrieves the article "All That" by entity linking. It is worth to note that this was particularly common, when the key entities are composed of common words that TF-IDF does not capture its importance, e.g., "Who plays letty in bring it on all or nothing?" or "Who sings does he love you with Reba?".

Retrieval through knowledge. In Example 1, entity linking was not enough for evidence to answer the question, because the article "All That" does not contain the singer of the theme song. Meanwhile, WikiData contains a triple <"All That", *composer*, "TLC">, allowing the retrieval of the passage "TLC".

Reading by synthesizing across passages. In Example 1, although GRAPHRETRIEVER retrieves the evidence passage, PARREADER++ which does not leverage the graph information predicts the wrong span by choosing the first person name in the passage from "All That". GRAPHREADER, however, leverages the relation *composer* and predicts the correct answer.

In Example 2, although the question appears to by easy for humans, PARREADER++ retrieves "China" as an answer, potentially because it is the only country name mentioned in retrieve passages from the article "Nike, Inc." However, GRAPHREADER leverages the relation *country* and predicts the correct answer.

Example 3 requires to reason across multiple passages, as it asks about the first advent of the movie series that have similar titles. PARREADER++, which reads each passage in isolation, predicts "2010" from the wrong passage. GRAPHREADER, however, incorporates relations *followed by* and *follows* and successfully distinguishes the first movie.