

Cooperative Reasoning on Knowledge Graph and Corpus: A Multi-agent Reinforcement Learning Approach

Yunan Zhang,¹ Xiang Cheng,¹ Heting Gao,¹ Chengxiang Zhai¹

¹University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
{yunanz2, xiangc2, hgao17, czhai}@illinois.com

Abstract

Knowledge-graph-based reasoning has drawn a lot of attention due to its interpretability. However, previous methods suffer from the incompleteness of the knowledge graph, namely the interested link or entity that can be missing in the knowledge graph (explicit missing). Also, most previous models assume the distance between the target and source entity is short, which is not true on a real-world KG like Freebase (implicit missing). The sensitivity to the incompleteness of KG and the incapability to capture the long-distance link between entities have limited the performance of these models on large KG. In this paper, we propose a model that leverages the text corpus to cure such limitations, either the explicit or implicit missing links. We model the question answering on KG as a cooperative task between two agents, a knowledge graph reasoning agent and an information extraction agent. Each agent learns its skill to complete its own task, hopping on KG or select knowledge from the corpus, via maximizing the reward for correctly answering the question. The reasoning agent decides how to find an equivalent path for the given entity and relation. The extraction agent provides shortcut for long-distance target entity or provides missing relations for explicit missing links with messages from the reasoning agent. Through such cooperative reward design, our model can augment the incomplete KG strategically while not introducing much unnecessary noise that could enlarge the search space and lower the performance.

Introduction

Recently, knowledge graph reasoning has made a lot of progress. Previous methods can be categorized into three directions, namely, path-ranking based, embedding based and reinforcement learning. However, all these methods share similar weaknesses. The incompleteness of KG. We categorized the incompleteness into two kinds. The first one is the explicit incompleteness. We define this condition as when there's no path between the target entity and the source entity or when the target entity itself is missing. The random walk based methods and RL based methods are extremely prone to this kind of incompleteness because they certainly can't sample the right path. For example,

Copyright © 2020, Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (www.aaai.org). All rights reserved.




Figure 1: An example of implicit incompleteness on WikiData. To get the attribute from the the class river, we need to do 6 hops of jumping., river → watercourse → land waters → body of water → physico-geographical object → geographic location → specific attribute.

we are interested in finding Obama's grandfather. But if there's no path between Obama and Stanley Armour Dunham, either one hop path like 'grand father of' or multi-hop path like 'father of -> father of', or the Stanley Armour Dunham entity itself doesn't exist, walking based model would naturally fail. The second one is the implicit incompleteness, which we refer to the condition when there's a path between the target entity and source entity, but the path is so long that it's hard for models to infer. For example, given the query, "Which river is in Urbana?". To answer the query in WikiData (Vrandečić 2012), we need to conduct six hops. However, in experiments, most existing models won't be able to infer an equivalent path that is longer than 4 steps for a given source entity and relation. This also explains why so far, most knowledge graph models can only work on relative small datasets but usually fail on real-world industry-scale datasets like Freebase (Mille et al. 2012) and Wikidata where there are millions of entities and there's no guarantee on the assumed short distance between entities. One solution to such incompleteness is knowledge base population, which is the task of building or extending a knowledge base from text. However, this line of methods has its limitations. The enrichment is conducted on a static knowledge graph. It's hard to say whether such extension is optimal for a specific task, e.g., answering certain kinds of questions. This can be seen in two aspects. First, the specific

knowledge can still be missing for a given sample because the KBP is not optimized dynamically for each question. The enriched graph can be larger than necessary while still missing interesting triples. Second, such enrichment introduces a lot of noise that is much beyond the amount needed to answer a specific question, thus unnecessarily increasing the search space of the model.

To handle these limitations, we design a principled way to dynamically enrich the KG corresponding to the reasoning state of the model via cooperative multi-agent reinforcement learning (Tan 1993). Our framework defines two types of agents that are expected to learn their skills, reasoning, and extraction, to jointly maximize the reward of the whole system. The reasoning agent decides which outgoing edge and the end side entity of the current entity it should hop to. This path-finding is similar to previous KG reasoning models. The extraction agent decides which extra triple to add to the KG given the current state of the system. The triple to add depends on the current query solving the state of the system, which could dynamically assist the reasoning agent with timely missing information on the KG. The two agents use a communication channel to share their observations and fuse the message with its local state to decide what action to take. In this way, the model dynamically decides when and how to enrich the KG to realize good performance and efficient operations.

We explore credit assignment of the collaboration along several modes. (1) Only a final reward is given to both the agents upon the task completion. (2) A final reward is given to the reasoning agent if it reaches the correct target entity. But the extraction agent only receives reward when the correct path includes the proposed extracted triple, namely when the reasoning agent adopts the added triples. Though such reward design is actually not cooperative and there's no guarantee that the extraction policy would converge. (3) A reward shaping approach for the failed path. If it failed, we still assign a reward based on the distance between the target entity and end entity. (4) A game-theoretic setting, where the reasoner tries to minimize its number of hops to the target entity and the extractor tries to minimize the number of rejected proposals. Both agents are only rewarded when the correct answer is found.

To conclude, our contributions are three-fold:

1. Study the dynamic knowledge graph completion task.
2. Propose a novel framework based on cooperative reinforcement learning for this task.
3. Experiment and analysis shows the potential of this direction.

Related Work

We now review related work in the directions of knowledge graph reasoning, multi-agent reinforcement learning, and fusion of KB and texts for question answering.

Knowledge Graph Reasoning

There have been many attempts in this area over the past few years. This task is motivated by the fact that though a relation in the query $\langle e_s, r, e_t \rangle$ can be missing in the KG, but there's an equivalent path that leads to e_t , e.g., grandfather relation is missing between e_s and e_t but there is two father of and an intermediate entity between them. In this case, the incompleteness is alleviated via finding equivalent paths. They can be generally categorized into three parts. First, Path-Ranking Algorithm (PRA) method (Lao, Mitchell, and Cohen 2011; Gardner et al. 2013; Gardner et al. 2014; Wang and Cohen 2015), which is based on random walk with restart to aggregate features of neighborhood of nodes to make predictions. One issue with the method is combinatorially increasing space which slows down the inference and affects the accuracy. The second line of approach is embedding-based methods. These works learn embeddings of entities and relations using neural networks or tensor factorization methods and use the embedding to predict how likely two entities are connected via a certain relation (Guu, Miller, and Liang 2015; Nickel, Rosasco, and Poggio 2016; Schlichtkrull et al. 2018; Dettmers et al. 2018). The third line is reinforcement learning-based approaches (Wang et al. 2019; Das et al. 2018; Lin, Socher, and Xiong 2018; Godin, Kumar, and Mittal 2019; Shen et al. 2018), which is the state-of-the-art method in this task. It models the multi-hop path completion as a Markov decision process (MDP) and uses RL to optimize the strategy of choosing the entity and relation pair to jump to given current entity and query.

Multi-agent Reinforcement Learning

Multi-agent systems have been explored broadly over the years. Relevant algorithms can be categorized via several features, (i) centralized or decentralized control (Pape 1990), which mainly differs in whether there's an agent control all other agents, (ii) cooperative or competitive environment (Galliers 1988), which mainly differs in whether each agent shares a common target to maximize or then compete with each other to maximize one's own reward. Early attempts apply relevant algorithms to predator-prey game, grid-maze games and other syntactic environments. Recently, it has been used in visual navigation (Jain et al. 2019; Çelikyilmaz et al. 2018), object detection (Kong et al. 2017), dialogue (Kottur et al. 2017), and summarization. Recent progress in its application mainly focuses on the communication protocol, which demonstrates superior performance to non-communicating counterparts. In this work, we mainly focus on the benefits of a decentralized, fully observable, cooperative environment.

Combination of KB and Texts for Question Answering

There are several attempts for developing hybrid of text-based and KB-based QA systems (Das et al. 2017), which store text and KB information into the same structure based on the universal schema (Riedel et al. 2013). Such systems are also used to augment language models (Ahn et al. 2016), natural language inference (Annervaz, Chowd-

hury, and Dukkupati 2018) and question answering(Sun et al. 2018). There are mainly two style fusion. One is early fusion, the other is late fusion(Gunes and Piccardi 2005). Early fusion fuse the two sources of information before the inference, namely the it fuses the feature vector of different sources before doing inferences, while late fusion first conduct inferences on models trained via different features and then combines the prediction of them. Follow up work

Approach

In this section, we introduce our model in details. Our framework jointly trains two agents, a KG reasoning agent on a KG \mathbf{G} and a information extraction agent on a corpus \mathbf{C} . Given a structured query (e_s, r_q) , where e_s is the start entity and r_q is the interested relation, our model outputs the e_t which is the entity connected to e_s via r_q , and the path to e_t if r_q doesn't exist in the given KG. The KG reasoning agent decides which outgoing edge/relation from the current entity it should go to and reach the new entity and repeat such process until it stops via self-loop or reaches the maximum step limit. The IE agent ranks the knowledge in a given corpus \mathbf{C} and adds the highest ranking (e_i, r_i, e_{ti}) to \mathbf{G} . We design four different reward mechanics for the agents. (1) Fully cooperative, where agents receives the same reward upon successful completion of the task, (2) Cooperative but the extraction's reward also depends on whether the reasoner's adopt its proposal, (3) Cooperative with reward shaping, which is same as (2) but we assign soft reward even if the agent doesn't get the golden answer, (4) game-theoretic, where two agents have a shared task of correctly answering question, but each agent wants to minimize their cost. For the reasoner, it's the number of hops it reaches the answer. For the extractor, it's the number of rejected proposals by the reasoner.

The KG Reasoning Agent

In this section, we formally define the reasoning agent. A knowledge graph can be represented as $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{R}\}$, where \mathcal{E} is the set of entities and \mathcal{R} is the set of relations. A KB fact, or triple, is stored as, $(e_1, r, e_2) \in \mathcal{G}$, where e_1 is the source entity, e_2 is the target entity, r is the relation connecting e_1 and e_2 , which is a directed edge pointing from e_1 to e_2 .

The reasoning agent tries to answer query $(e_s, r_q, ?)$ via path finding, where e_s is the source entity and r_q is the relation of interest. Answering here means find the entity that is connected to e_s by r_q . Find a path means finding a path to ? so that even $(e_s, r_q, ?) \notin \mathcal{G}$ due to incompleteness, we still find the set of answers $E_o = \{e_o\}$.

Action The action space can be written as:

$$A_t = \{(e_{t-1}, \hat{r}_t, e_t) | (e_{t-1}, \hat{r}_t, e_t) \in \mathcal{G}\},$$

namely choosing a triple whose starting from source entity e_s . We have a self-loop action for every node to indicate the answer. \hat{r}_t, e_t is outgoing edge of e_s and the reached entity.

State We represent state as $st = (et, (e_s, r_q)) \in S$, where e_t is the entity visited at step t and (e_s, r_q) are the source entity and relation in the original query. In experiment, we uses

ConvE for their representation. One issue though, is when r_q never appears in any path of the graph and in the training set of ConvE. We adopt a simple zero-shot learning approach to handle this situation.

Transition Transition can be represented as a probability matrix:

$$P(s_{t+1} = s' | s_t = s, a_t = a).$$

Reward We design four kinds of reward, which we will elaborate in section 3.4.2 and discuss their pros and cons in the experiment section.

The Information Extraction Agent

In this section, we formally define the IE agent. The IE agents learns how to rank the most useful knowledge from corpus to help the reasoning agent. Given the reasoning agent is at e_t at timestep t, the IE agent will rank all the triple it extracted from corpus of form $\mathcal{K} = \{(e_t, r, e_d) \cup (e_d, r^{-1}, e_t)\}$ and add the highest ranking triple to \mathbf{G} .

Action The action space is all the extracted triples:

$$\mathcal{K} = \{(e_t, r, e_d) \cup (e_d, r^{-1}, e_t)\},$$

namely choosing the highest ranked triple and to e_s in \mathbf{G} .

State The extraction receives a message from the reasoning agent, which is its state representation. We then fuse the representation with the concatenation of all the extracted feasible triples. We want the state to aware of what the reasoning agent can get and can't get in its neighborhood, so we pass a message from reasoning agent to the IE agent.

Transition Transition can be represented as a probability matrix:

$$P(s_{t+1} = s' | s_t = s, a_t = a).$$

Reward We also design four kinds of reward, which we will also elaborate in section 3.4.2 and discuss their pros and cons in the experiment section.

Policy Learning

Typical MARL usually encounter non-stationary environment which makes training process quite challenging due to difficulty in converge to a fixed optimal strategy for a moving target. In our setting, we adopt the Forget Algorithm and Respond to Target Opponents Algorithm to handle this challenge.

Handling non-stationary environment For the Forget algorithm, we use R-max(Brafman and Tennenholtz 2002) to handle the changing environment, which conduct a drift exploration to detect changes that happened in the opponent and continually revisit states that have not been visited recently. In this way, the model is guarantee to fit to the newly added triples by the IE agent. This handing is used for the first three reward designs.

For the Respond to Target Opponents Algorithm, we use Minimax game(Littman 1994) specifically for the game-theoretic reward setting.

Reward Design We design 4 kinds of reward. The first is the most simple setting, namely both agents receive a +1 reward for correctly returning the answer.

The second reward setting does the same thing to the KG reasoning agent but only assigns a reward to the extraction agent when the reasoning agent adopt its proposal.

The third setting is similar to the second one, but we assign a soft reward to the agents when they stop at the wrong answer. The soft reward is given by the similarity between the output entity and the golden entity, which is measured by distance between their embeddings.

The fourth reward setting is a game theoretic one. It's similar to the third one but each agent has its own target. The reasoning agent wants to minimize the number of hops it takes to reach the correct the answer while the extraction agent wants to minimize the number of unused added triples.

Discussion

In this paper, we explore and discuss the potential of using MARL to effectively and efficiently solve the knowledge graph reasoning issue. We propose several possible framework that may or may not useful to solve some bottlenecks of this task. One of my concern is how to represent the state of the agent. As we mentioned earlier, the node embedding used for state is trained on the KG before update. However, every time we add triples to the KG, the corresponding embedding should also change via re-training it on the updated graph. Such pipeline would be computation heavy. But on the other hand, it's not easy to find a representation method that is better than node embedding to work well on large graphs.

Acknowledgements

This work is a manuscript of Yunan Zhang. The work is devoted to Makise Kurisu, despite its limited novelty. We thank Suhansanu Kumar for insightful discussions.

References

- [Ahn et al. 2016] Ahn, S.; Choi, H.; Pärnamaa, T.; and Bengio, Y. 2016. A neural knowledge language model. *CoRR* abs/1608.00318.
- [Annervaz, Chowdhury, and Dukkipati 2018] Annervaz, K. M.; Chowdhury, S. B. R.; and Dukkipati, A. 2018. Learning beyond datasets: Knowledge graph augmented neural networks for natural language processing. In Walker et al. (2018), 313–322.
- [2002] Brafman, R. I., and Tennenholtz, M. 2002. R-MAX - A general polynomial time algorithm for near-optimal reinforcement learning. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 3:213–231.
- [2018] Çelikyilmaz, A.; Bosselut, A.; He, X.; and Choi, Y. 2018. Deep communicating agents for abstractive summarization. In Walker et al. (2018), 1662–1675.
- [2017] Das, R.; Zaheer, M.; Reddy, S.; and McCallum, A. 2017. Question answering on knowledge bases and text using universal schema and memory networks. In Barzilay, R., and Kan, M., eds., *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2017, Vancouver, Canada, July 30 - August 4, Volume 2: Short Papers*, 358–365. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [2018] Das, R.; Dhuliawala, S.; Zaheer, M.; Vilnis, L.; Durugkar, I.; Krishnamurthy, A.; Smola, A.; and McCallum, A. 2018. Go for a walk and arrive at the answer: Reasoning over paths in knowledge bases using reinforcement learning. In *6th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2018, Vancouver, BC, Canada, April 30 - May 3, 2018, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net.
- [2018] Dettmers, T.; Minervini, P.; Stenetorp, P.; and Riedel, S. 2018. Convolutional 2d knowledge graph embeddings. In McIlraith, S. A., and Weinberger, K. Q., eds., *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-18), the 30th innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence (IAAI-18), and the 8th AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence (EAAI-18), New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, February 2-7, 2018*, 1811–1818. AAAI Press.
- [1988] Galliers, J. R. 1988. A strategic framework for multi-agent cooperative dialogue. In Kodratoff, Y., ed., *8th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence, ECAI 1988, Munich, Germany, August 1-5, 1988, Proceedings*, 415–420. Pitmann Publishing, London.
- [2013] Gardner, M.; Talukdar, P. P.; Kisiel, B.; and Mitchell, T. M. 2013. Improving learning and inference in a large knowledge-base using latent syntactic cues. In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2013, 18-21 October 2013, Grand Hyatt Seattle, Seattle, Washington, USA, A meeting of SIGDAT, a Special Interest Group of the ACL*, 833–838. ACL.
- [2014] Gardner, M.; Talukdar, P. P.; Krishnamurthy, J.; and Mitchell, T. M. 2014. Incorporating vector space similarity in random walk inference over knowledge bases. In Moschitti, A.; Pang, B.; and Daelemans, W., eds., *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2014, October 25-29, 2014, Doha, Qatar, A meeting of SIGDAT, a Special Interest Group of the ACL*, 397–406. ACL.
- [2019] Godin, F.; Kumar, A.; and Mittal, A. 2019. Learning when not to answer: a ternary reward structure for reinforcement learning based question answering. In Loukina, A.; Morales, M.; and Kumar, R., eds., *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2019, Minneapolis, MN, USA, June 2-7, 2019, Volume 2 (Industry Papers)*, 122–129. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [2005] Gunes, H., and Piccardi, M. 2005. Affect recognition from face and body: early fusion vs. late fusion. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man and Cybernetics, Waikoloa, Hawaii, USA, October 10-12, 2005*, 3437–3443. IEEE.
- [2015] Guu, K.; Miller, J.; and Liang, P. 2015. Traversing knowledge graphs in vector space. In Márquez, L.; Callison-Burch, C.; Su, J.; Pighin, D.; and Marton, Y., eds., *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Nat-*

- ural Language Processing, EMNLP 2015, Lisbon, Portugal, September 17-21, 2015, 318–327. The Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [2019] Jain, U.; Weihs, L.; Kolve, E.; Rastegari, M.; Lazebnik, S.; Farhadi, A.; Schwing, A. G.; and Kembhavi, A. 2019. Two body problem: Collaborative visual task completion. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2019, Long Beach, CA, USA, June 16-20, 2019*, 6689–6699. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE.
- [2017] Kong, X.; Xin, B.; Wang, Y.; and Hua, G. 2017. Collaborative deep reinforcement learning for joint object search. In *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2017, Honolulu, HI, USA, July 21-26, 2017*, 7072–7081. IEEE Computer Society.
- [2017] Kottur, S.; Moura, J. M. F.; Lee, S.; and Batra, D. 2017. Natural language does not emerge ‘naturally’ in multi-agent dialog. In Palmer, M.; Hwa, R.; and Riedel, S., eds., *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2017, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 9-11, 2017*, 2962–2967. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [2011] Lao, N.; Mitchell, T. M.; and Cohen, W. W. 2011. Random walk inference and learning in A large scale knowledge base. In *Proceedings of the 2011 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2011, 27-31 July 2011, John McIntyre Conference Centre, Edinburgh, UK, A meeting of SIGDAT, a Special Interest Group of the ACL*, 529–539. ACL.
- [2018] Lin, X. V.; Socher, R.; and Xiong, C. 2018. Multi-hop knowledge graph reasoning with reward shaping. In Riloff et al. (2018), 3243–3253.
- [1994] Littman, M. L. 1994. Markov games as a framework for multi-agent reinforcement learning. In Cohen, W. W., and Hirsh, H., eds., *Machine Learning, Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, USA, July 10-13, 1994*, 157–163. Morgan Kaufmann.
- [2012] Mille, A.; Gandon, F. L.; Misselis, J.; Rabinovich, M.; and Staab, S., eds. 2012. *Proceedings of the 21st World Wide Web Conference, WWW 2012, Lyon, France, April 16-20, 2012 (Companion Volume)*. ACM.
- [2016] Nickel, M.; Rosasco, L.; and Poggio, T. A. 2016. Holographic embeddings of knowledge graphs. In Schuurmans, D., and Wellman, M. P., eds., *Proceedings of the Thirtieth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, February 12-17, 2016, Phoenix, Arizona, USA*, 1955–1961. AAAI Press.
- [1990] Pape, C. L. 1990. A combination of centralized and distributed methods for multi-agent planning and scheduling. In *Proceedings of the 1990 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation, Cincinnati, Ohio, USA, May 13-18, 1990*, 488–493. IEEE.
- [2013] Riedel, S.; Yao, L.; McCallum, A.; and Marlin, B. M. 2013. Relation extraction with matrix factorization and universal schemas. In Vanderwende, L.; III, H. D.; and Kirchhoff, K., eds., *Human Language Technologies: Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association of Computational Linguistics, Proceedings, June 9-14, 2013, Westin Peachtree Plaza Hotel, Atlanta, Georgia, USA*, 74–84. The Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [2018] Riloff, E.; Chiang, D.; Hockenmaier, J.; and Tsujii, J., eds. 2018. *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Brussels, Belgium, October 31 - November 4, 2018*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [2018] Schlichtkrull, M. S.; Kipf, T. N.; Bloem, P.; van den Berg, R.; Titov, I.; and Welling, M. 2018. Modeling relational data with graph convolutional networks. In Gangemi, A.; Navigli, R.; Vidal, M.; Hitzler, P.; Troncy, R.; Hollink, L.; Tordai, A.; and Alam, M., eds., *The Semantic Web - 15th International Conference, ESWC 2018, Heraklion, Crete, Greece, June 3-7, 2018, Proceedings*, volume 10843 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 593–607. Springer.
- [2018] Shen, Y.; Chen, J.; Huang, P.; Guo, Y.; and Gao, J. 2018. M-walk: Learning to walk over graphs using monte carlo tree search. In Bengio, S.; Wallach, H. M.; Larochelle, H.; Grauman, K.; Cesa-Bianchi, N.; and Garnett, R., eds., *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2018, NeurIPS 2018, 3-8 December 2018, Montréal, Canada*, 6787–6798.
- [2018] Sun, H.; Dhingra, B.; Zaheer, M.; Mazaitis, K.; Salakhutdinov, R.; and Cohen, W. W. 2018. Open domain question answering using early fusion of knowledge bases and text. In Riloff et al. (2018), 4231–4242.
- [1993] Tan, M. 1993. Multi-agent reinforcement learning: Independent versus cooperative agents. In Utgoff, P. E., ed., *Machine Learning, Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA, USA, June 27-29, 1993*, 330–337. Morgan Kaufmann.
- [2012] Vrandečić, D. 2012. Wikidata: a new platform for collaborative data collection. In Mille et al. (2012), 1063–1064.
- [2018] Walker, M. A.; Ji, H.; and Stent, A., eds. 2018. *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2018, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, June 1-6, 2018, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [2015] Wang, W. Y., and Cohen, W. W. 2015. Joint information extraction and reasoning: A scalable statistical relational learning approach. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 7th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing of the Asian Federation of Natural Language Processing, ACL 2015, July 26-31, 2015, Beijing, China, Volume 1: Long Papers*, 355–364. The Association for Computer Linguistics.
- [2019] Wang, D.; Wang, Z.; Fang, C.; Chen, Y.; and Chen, Z. 2019. DeepPath: Path-driven testing criteria for deep neural networks. In *IEEE International Conference On Artificial Intelligence Testing, AITest 2019, Newark, CA, USA, April 4-9, 2019*, 119–120. IEEE.