

AutoKG: Constructing Virtual Knowledge Graphs from Unstructured Documents for Question Answering

Seunghak Yu, Tianxing He, and James Glass

MIT Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence Laboratory, Cambridge, MA, USA

{seunghak, cloudygoose, glass}@csail.mit.edu

Abstract

Knowledge graphs (KGs) have the advantage of providing fine-grained detail for question-answering systems. Unfortunately, building a reliable KG is time-consuming and expensive as it requires human intervention. To overcome this issue, we propose a novel framework to automatically construct a KG from unstructured documents that does not require external alignment. We first extract surface-form knowledge tuples from unstructured documents and encode them with contextual information. Entities with similar context semantics are then linked through internal alignment to form a graph structure. This allows us to extract the desired information from multiple documents by traversing the generated KG without a manual process. We examine its performance in retrieval based QA systems by reformulating the WikiMovies and MetaQA datasets into a tuple-level retrieval task. The experimental results show that our method outperforms traditional retrieval methods by a large margin.

1 Introduction

Knowledge graphs (KGs) have been a key component of question-answering (QA) systems (Hao et al., 2017; Chen et al., 2019; Deng et al., 2019; Sun et al., 2019). This is because a KG not only allows the QA system to utilize well-refined information through multi-hop inference, but also provides an interpretability mechanism to inform users about how an answer is extracted. However, using such well-refined structured knowledge has a scalability issue in acquiring information from various domains because of the high cost of constructing a knowledge graph, making it difficult to apply it to solving the problem for the latest emerging domains. To address this issue, many approaches have attempted to build KGs automatically (Dong et al., 2014; Bosselut et al., 2019; Zhao et al., 2020), but the steps required to align extracted knowl-

edge with prior existing knowledge sources are necessary, so expert labor is still required. While there exists large general-purpose knowledge bases such as FreeBase (Bollacker et al., 2008) and Wikidata (Vrandečić and Krötzsch, 2014), these structured knowledge sources can easily become outdated as human knowledge is continually expanding, which makes it unsuitable for recent events.

An attractive way to reduce human labor is applying reading comprehension models on unstructured documents (Chen et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2018; Clark and Gardner, 2018). It has the advantage of being able to understand unstructured documents without human labor, so it is inexpensive and can respond sensitively to the latest information. However, extracting the answer to a given question from a large pool of documents is a difficult task because there is a limit to the length of the context that can be understood by the model due to memory constraints. Most reading comprehension models are combined with a retrieval model because they focus on paragraph-level context and rely on the retrieval model to select candidates (Chen et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2019; Feldman and El-Yaniv, 2019; Karpukhin et al., 2020). Therefore, the overall performance is bounded by the retrieved candidates.

In this work, we aim to build a system combining advantages from both worlds. We build a virtual KG from unstructured documents by extracting surface-form knowledge tuples from unstructured documents first, and then link them through internal alignment to form a graph structure. When given a question, we do multi-hop traversals on the virtual KG to extract desired information. To evaluate our retrieval based QA system, we reformulate two QA benchmark datasets into retrieval QA tasks. We find that our system significantly surpasses the performance of de-facto retrieval models which are used in most QA studies.

Sentence: The Goonies is an American film directed by Richard Donner.		
sf-entity1	sf-relation	sf-entity2
The Goonies	is	an American film
an American film	directed	by Richard Donner

Table 1: Example of the transformation from raw text to entity-relation triples by OpenIE. “sf” stands for “surface”.

2 Approach

We propose a framework to automatically construct a virtual KG from unstructured documents, and during retrieval, traverse it to extract desired information from multiple documents. Given unstructured documents $D = \{D_i\}$, where each document D_i is a sequence of sentences $\{S_j\}$, we first create a KG by extracting a set of knowledge tuples for each sentence S_j and link similar entities via contextual embeddings. Then, when given a query we traverse the generated graph multi-hops to find a tuple containing the answer. Note that it provides more fine-grained information than sentence-level retrievers in that each sentence can have multiple knowledge tuples. Our framework does not require external alignment to existing KB or any human intervention. Each of these two phases is described in detail in the following sections.

2.1 Building a Virtual Knowledge Graph

Creating a graph from raw text is the key of this work. We use a three-step process to do this: *Conversion*, *Encoding*, and *Surface-entity Linking*.

Conversion: We start by applying OpenIE (Saha et al., 2018) to every sentence S to generate a list of entity-relation triples. We will use the terms “surface-entities” (se) and “surface-relation” (sr), because they are not predefined entities/relations. For each document D , we merge all triples extracted from each sentence into a list $T_D = \{(se_i^1, sr_i, se_i^2)\}$. Note that OpenIE extraction is imperfect: In many cases, it extracts something that is not a named entity like “it”, “she”, and extracted named entities contain noise. In Table 1, for example, “by Richard Donner” is extracted instead of the correct entity “Richard Donner”. Moreover, different surface-entities can refer to the same underlying entity. We address these problems in the next two steps.

Encoding: In the second step we utilize BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) to encode each surface-entity or surface-relation from extracted tuples T_D . The

challenge is to incorporate contextualized information into the encoding (e.g., the word “Apple” has different meanings in different contexts). Inspired by (Clark et al., 2019), we adopt the *weighted embedding* technique, where the encoding of each surface-entity or relation is a simple weighted summation of the word embeddings and the embedding of [CLS] token when T_D is fed into BERT. We denote the resulting encoding of se as se^{enc} .

Surface-entity Linking: The third and final KG building step performs surface-entity linking, which creates a graph structure out of the extracted entity-relation triples in a document D . The goal is to link entities with same underlying concept together, for example in Table 1, a new surface-entity “the film” can be referring to “the Goonies” in some follow-up sentence, so the relations with “the film” should also be applied to “the Goonies”. We use an adaptive threshold on the cosine distance between the encodings of surface-entities to decide whether they should be linked. The intuition is that if there exists an se_l that has high similarity to se_i , then the acceptable similarity threshold for se_i should be higher. We denote the set of surface-entities linked to se_i as $Link(se_i) = \{se_j : similarity(se_i^{enc}, se_j^{enc}) \geq \lambda * \max_{l \in E_D} (dist(se_i^{enc}, se_l^{enc}))\}$. Note that E_D denotes the set of all surface-entities existing in document D . λ is a hyper-parameter controlling the adaptive threshold, and we found that a setting of 0.6 works well in our experiments.

To summarize, after the above three steps, each document has a list of extracted entity-relation triples $T_D = \{(se_i^1, sr_i, se_i^2)\}$, and each surface-entity or relation has a contextualized encoding. Within every document, each surface-entity se_i is linked to $Link(se_i)$.

2.2 Multi-hop KG Traversal and Retrieval

We traverse the constructed KG to find relevant information to a given query q . The traversal algorithm is shown in Algorithm 1 and we provide an illustration in Figure 1. To start the traversal, we select a set of *seed* surface-entities in the virtual graphs as the start points. In most cases, we simply use the set of surface-entities that exist in the query q . If that set is empty, we encode q with BERT as q^{enc} , and use the surface-entity whose encoding has the largest cosine-similarity with q^{enc} as the seed entity. In this way, we can traverse in multiple documents that have seed entities.




Figure 1: An illustration of a traversal on the constructed KG. Each node represents a surface entity, dashed arrows represent links between entities that exist in different tuples, and straight lines represent relations within tuples.

The output of the traversal will be a set of paths. We use the traversed triples to represent a *path*: for example, $p = [se_1^1, sr_1, se_2^1, se_2^2, sr_2, se_2^2]$ is a 2-hop path. Starting with the seed surface-entities, we adopt an expand-and-prune strategy. For each hop, we first expand the current set of paths via the surface-entity linking, and then via the entity-relations triples. Since the number of active paths could grow exponentially during this expansion, we design an importance score to rate and prune the paths. For each path p , we first concatenate and feed it to BERT to get an encoding of this path p^{enc} . Then we use the cosine-similarity between p^{enc} and q^{enc} as the importance score. After the expansion of each hop, we only keep B most relevant paths. In our experiments, we find that we only need to set B to 10 to achieve good performance. Finally, we select the final top- k paths as the output.

Algorithm 1 Traversing the KG

Input: A set of seed surface-entities $\{se_i^{seed}\}$ and a query embedding q^{enc}
Output: A set of traversed paths
 For each seed surface-entity se_i^{seed} , initialize an empty path $p_i = []$, and denote the set of paths as P .
for each hop **do**
 set \hat{P} as an empty set
 for each $p \in P$ **do**
 Let se_p^{tail} be the last surface-entity in p
 for each $se_i \in Link(se_p^{tail})$ **do**
 for each triple (se_i, sr', se') in the KG which starts with se_i **do**
 add $\hat{p} = p + [se_i, sr', se']$ to \hat{P}
 end for
 end for
 Prune \hat{P} based on $cos(\hat{p}^{enc}, q^{enc})$ with a beam size B
 set \hat{P} as the new P
end for
 return P

Dataset	Model	H@1	H@3	H@5
WikiM	BM25-sent	12.94	39.55	46.78
	BM25+RM3-tup	15.03	20.98	25.78
	QL+RM3-tup	17.54	23.30	27.63
	QL+RM3-sent	25.71	40.96	47.83
	AutoKG (3-hop)	54.54	61.05	64.48
Meta-2	BM25+RM3-tup	10.77	13.43	16.13
	QL+RM3-tup	12.92	15.96	18.56
	BM25+RM3-sent	13.04	24.39	30.59
	QL+RM3-sent	18.93	30.33	36.15
	AutoKG (3-hop)	36.77	43.47	47.04
Meta-3	BM25-sent	6.28	18.54	24.16
	BM25+RM3-tup	7.58	10.05	11.91
	QL+RM3-tup	9.14	12.58	14.92
	QL+RM3-sent	11.52	20.34	25.64
	AutoKG (3-hop)	25.76	30.22	32.86

Table 2: Comparison of retrieval performance.

Dataset	Model	H@1	H@3	H@5
WikiM	QL-doc	55.46	70.24	75.68
	AutoKG-doc	78.93	85.10	87.12
Meta-2	QL-doc	36.76	53.24	60.11
	AutoKG-doc	57.82	65.40	67.57
Meta-3	QL-doc	21.07	34.79	44.44
	AutoKG-doc	43.72	47.33	48.45

Table 3: Comparison with document-level systems.

3 Experimental Results

3.1 Retrieval Performance Comparison

To quantitatively evaluate our model, we adopt two QA benchmark datasets: WikiMovies (Miller et al., 2016), and MetaQA (Zhang et al., 2018). Since these datasets consist of pairs of questions and answers with related Wikipedia articles, we can leverage the entire set of articles in the dataset to build a KG and use our system to find the information that contains the correct answer to a given question. WikiMovies and MetaQA use the same 18,128 movie domain Wikipedia articles, but have different types of questions. We search the hyperparameter space using WikiMovies dev data (10K), and evaluate the model with the test data¹. The test data consists of 9,952 / 14,872 / 14,274 QA pairs respectively, for WikiMovies (1-hop), MetaQA (2-hop and 3-hop).

Finding a baseline to compare with our model is not straightforward because our system is different from conventional approaches in several ways: (1) Unlike existing automatic knowledge building methods that obtain results using external knowledge, we do not require external knowledge to align extractions. (2) Unlike learning-based retrieval models (Yilmaz et al., 2019; Karpukhin

¹Our framework does not involve training.

et al., 2020) that require large amounts of labeled data to train the model, we do not require supervised training. Therefore, we focus on the retrieval aspect of our system, and compare with de-facto lexical retrieval methods to select candidate contexts, which are widely used in most open-domain QA studies (Chen et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2019; Karpukhin et al., 2020).

We present the main results in Table 2, showing that our model outperforms de-facto retrieval methods by a large margin. AutoKG achieves 54.54 / 36.77 / 25.76 hits@1 for each WikiMovies (1-hop), MetaQA (2-hop and 3-hop) datasets, which is 2 to 3 times better than existing methods: BM25, QL, BM25+RM3, and QL+RM3. Hit@k (Bordes et al., 2013) is the accuracy of top-k predicted paths containing the answer. BM25-tup is the result of applying BM25 at tuple-level after extracting triples through OpenIE for each document, and BM25-sent and -doc are retrieval results of each sentence- and document-level for original documents.

Our system also surpasses the performance of document-level systems, as shown in Table 3. Directly comparing our system to document-level systems is not appropriate, since document-level systems consider a hit when the resulting document contains the answer, whereas our system locates the answer in the tuple. For a fair comparison, we modify AutoKG to be a document-level system. When a tuple is retrieved, the system returns the document associated with that tuple. Additional results and analysis can be found in the Appendix.

3.2 Quality Analysis of AutoKG

Since the retrieval performance of the proposed method is bound by the quality of the resulting KG, we evaluate the coverage of AutoKG by comparing it to the human-annotated KB. Inspired by (Gash-teovski et al., 2018), we evaluate the coverage of AutoKG as follows: for each triple (e_i^1, r_i, e_i^2) in human-annotated KB, we consider the triple is covered by AutoKG, if any triple in AutoKG contains the tail entity e_i^2 . We utilize human-annotated KB (based on OMDb (Fritz, 2016)) included in the WikiMovies dataset. This human-annotated KB contains knowledge that is not present in the documents of the dataset (e.g., IMDB ratings), so we measure all outcomes including or excluding such unreachable knowledge.

Table 4 shows the coverage of AutoKG compared to the human-annotated KB. "Full-KB" is

Method	Full-KB (%)	Filtered-KB (%)
(Miller et al., 2016)	69.35	83.69
AutoKG	75.16	90.00

Table 4: Coverage compared to human-annotated KB.

the result of measuring KB as it is, and "Filtered-KB" is the result excluding them. We observe that the coverage of the proposed method is encouraging compared to the existing method obtained by running an engineered IE pipeline. This is because AutoKG can fully utilize the surface-form triples without external alignment.

4 Related Work

Automatic KG construction: The most prevalent approach to create knowledge graphs from unstructured text involve developing a pipeline of NLP operations such as named entity recognition, entity linking and relationship extraction (Gash-teovski et al., 2018; Wu et al., 2019). These approaches require a predefined knowledge base to align the extracted entities or relationships (Lin et al., 2016; Zhou et al., 2016; Zhang et al., 2019; Cao et al., 2020). Unlike conventional methods, our model can internally align surface-form triples extracted from unstructured documents, so no external knowledge base is required.

Graph based multi-hop retrievers: In order to extract the desired information from multiple documents, Sun et al. (2019) builds a question-relevant sub-graph from the knowledge base or text corpus to gather all the relevant information. This is similar to our approach in that it creates question-related sub-graphs, but differs from us in that it still requires an existing KB. Das et al. (2019); Asai et al. (2019) construct a Wikipedia graph using hyperlinks within the article to extract paragraphs related to the query. Therefore, their method contrasts with ours in that a human-annotated hyperlink is essential and the minimum unit of information to be searched is a paragraph.

5 Conclusion

We propose a novel framework to automatically build a knowledge graph from a pool of unstructured documents, without having to align resulting entities with external information. Our method outperforms existing de-facto retrieval models in retrieval-based QA tasks by a large margin.

Acknowledgments

Research was sponsored by the United States Air Force Research Laboratory and was accomplished under Cooperative Agreement Number FA8750-19-2-1000. The views and conclusions contained in this document are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as representing the official policies, either expressed or implied, of the United States Air Force or the U.S. Government. The U.S. Government is authorized to reproduce and distribute reprints for Government purposes notwithstanding any copyright notation herein.

References

- Asai, Akari, Kazuma Hashimoto, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Richard Socher, and Caiming Xiong. 2019. Learning to retrieve reasoning paths over wikipedia graph for question answering. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Bollacker, Kurt, Colin Evans, Praveen Paritosh, Tim Sturge, and Jamie Taylor. 2008. Freebase: a collaboratively created graph database for structuring human knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 2008 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data*, pages 1247–1250.
- Bordes, Antoine, Nicolas Usunier, Alberto Garcia-Duran, Jason Weston, and Oksana Yakhnenko. 2013. Translating embeddings for modeling multi-relational data. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 2787–2795.
- Bosselut, Antoine, Hannah Rashkin, Maarten Sap, Chaitanya Malaviya, Asli Celikyilmaz, and Yejin Choi. 2019. Comet: Commonsense transformers for automatic knowledge graph construction. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4762–4779.
- Broder, Andrei Z. 1997. On the resemblance and containment of documents. In *Proceedings. Compression and Complexity of SEQUENCES 1997 (Cat. No. 97TB100171)*, pages 21–29. IEEE.
- Cao, Ermei, Difeng Wang, Jiacheng Huang, and Wei Hu. 2020. Open knowledge enrichment for long-tail entities. In *Proceedings of The Web Conference 2020*, pages 384–394.
- Chen, Danqi, Adam Fisch, Jason Weston, and Antoine Bordes. 2017. Reading wikipedia to answer open-domain questions. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1870–1879.
- Chen, Yu, Lingfei Wu, and Mohammed J Zaki. 2019. Bidirectional attentive memory networks for question answering over knowledge bases. In *Proceedings of NAACL-HLT*, pages 2913–2923.
- Clark, Christopher and Matt Gardner. 2018. Simple and effective multi-paragraph reading comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 845–855.
- Clark, Kevin, Urvashi Khandelwal, Omer Levy, and Christopher D. Manning. 2019. What does BERT look at? an analysis of BERT’s attention. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACL Workshop BlackboxNLP: Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP*, pages 276–286, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Das, Rajarshi, Ameya Godbole, Dilip Kavarthapu, Zhiyu Gong, Abhishek Singhal, Mo Yu, Xiaoxiao Guo, Tian Gao, Hamed Zamani, Manzil Zaheer, et al. 2019. Multi-step entity-centric information retrieval for multi-hop question answering. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Machine Reading for Question Answering*, pages 113–118.
- Deng, Yang, Yuexiang Xie, Yaliang Li, Min Yang, Nan Du, Wei Fan, Kai Lei, and Ying Shen. 2019. Multi-task learning with multi-view attention for answer selection and knowledge base question answering. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 33, pages 6318–6325.
- Devlin, Jacob, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Dong, Xin, Evgeniy Gabrilovich, Jeremy Heitz, Wilko Horn, Ni Lao, Kevin Murphy, Thomas Strohmann, Shaohua Sun, and Wei Zhang. 2014. Knowledge vault: A web-scale approach to probabilistic knowledge fusion. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 601–610.
- Feldman, Yair and Ran El-Yaniv. 2019. Multi-hop paragraph retrieval for open-domain question answering. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2296–2309, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Fritz, B. 2016. Omdb api: The open movie database [www document]. URL <http://www.omdbapi.com>.
- Gashteovski, Kiril, Sebastian Wanner, Sven Hertling, Samuel Broscheit, and Rainer Gemulla. 2018. Opiec: An open information extraction corpus. In *Automated Knowledge Base Construction (AKBC)*.
- Hao, Yanchao, Yuanzhe Zhang, Kang Liu, Shizhu He, Zhanyi Liu, Hua Wu, and Jun Zhao. 2017. An end-to-end model for question answering over knowledge base with cross-attention combining global

- knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 221–231.
- Vladimir Karpukhin, Barlas Oğuz, Sewon Min, Patrick Lewis, Ledell Wu, Sergey Edunov, Danqi Chen, and Wen tau Yih. 2020. Dense passage retrieval for open-domain question answering.
- Yankai Lin, Shiqi Shen, Zhiyuan Liu, Huanbo Luan, and Maosong Sun. 2016. Neural relation extraction with selective attention over instances. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2124–2133.
- Alexander Miller, Adam Fisch, Jesse Dodge, Amir-Hossein Karimi, Antoine Bordes, and Jason Weston. 2016. Key-value memory networks for directly reading documents. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1400–1409.
- Swarnadeep Saha et al. 2018. Open information extraction from conjunctive sentences. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 2288–2299.
- Haitian Sun, Tania Bedrax-Weiss, and William Cohen. 2019. Pullnet: Open domain question answering with iterative retrieval on knowledge bases and text. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 2380–2390.
- Denny Vrandečić and Markus Krötzsch. 2014. Wiki-data: a free collaborative knowledgebase. *Communications of the ACM*, 57(10):78–85.
- 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 *Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- 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. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.08167*.
- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, Joe Davison, Sam Shleifer, Patrick von Platen, Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu, Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, Mariama Drame, Quentin Lhoest, and Alexander M. Rush. 2019. Huggingface’s transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing. *ArXiv*, abs/1910.03771.
- Xindong Wu, Jia Wu, Xiaoyi Fu, Jiachen Li, Peng Zhou, and Xu Jiang. 2019. Automatic knowledge graph construction: A report on the 2019 icdm/icbk contest. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*, pages 1540–1545. IEEE.
- Zeynep Akkalyoncu Yilmaz, Shengjin Wang, Wei Yang, Haotian Zhang, and Jimmy Lin. 2019. Applying bert to document retrieval with birch. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP): System Demonstrations*, pages 19–24.
- Yuyu Zhang, Hanjun Dai, Zornitsa Kozareva, Alexander J Smola, and Le Song. 2018. Variational reasoning for question answering with knowledge graph. In *Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Zhengyan Zhang, Xu Han, Zhiyuan Liu, Xin Jiang, Maosong Sun, and Qun Liu. 2019. Ernie: Enhanced language representation with informative entities. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1441–1451.
- Chen Zhao, Chenyan Xiong, Xin Qian, and Jordan Boyd-Graber. 2020. Complex factoid question answering with a free-text knowledge graph. In *Proceedings of The Web Conference 2020*, pages 1205–1216.
- Peng Zhou, Wei Shi, Jun Tian, Zhenyu Qi, Bingchen Li, Hongwei Hao, and Bo Xu. 2016. Attention-based bidirectional long short-term memory networks for relation classification. In *Proceedings of the 54th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics (volume 2: Short papers)*, pages 207–212.

A Retrieval Performance Comparison

Table 5 shows the overall experimental results of retrieval performance comparison. We utilize the open-source information retrieval toolkit Anserini² for all our baseline experiments. All baseline models run with default parameters: BM25 ($k_1 = 0.9, b = 0.4$), Query Likelihood (Dirichlet smoothing parameter $\mu = 1000$), RM3 query expansion (the number of expansion terms $nt = 10$, the number of expansion docs $nd = 10$, original query weight $w = 0.5$).

The evaluation metric hit@k (Bordes et al., 2013) is the accuracy of top-k predicted paths containing the answer. BM25-tup is the result of applying BM25 in tuple-level after extracting triples through OpenIE for each document, BM25-sent is the retrieval results at each sentence-level for the original documents, and BM25+RM3 shows the performance of BM25 with RM3 query expansion applied.

We observe that our model performs much better than all the de-facto retrieval models. In general, applying the RM3 query extension improves performance, and the query likelihood (QL) model performs better than the BM25.

B Comparison with document-level systems

Table 6 shows the results of the overall experiment results comparing retrieval performance with document-level systems. All results are reported using the default parameters of each model as in previous experiments. Our model also outperforms document-level models.

There exist interesting discoveries. First, unlike tuple- and sentence-level experiments, AutoKG (1-hop) performs better than AutoKG (3-hop). Second, RM3 query expansion is generally a factor that degrades performance.

C Hyperparameter Search

We use the WikiMovies development dataset to find the optimal parameters of the proposed model based on hits@10 performance. There are two parameters we need to determine:

- $\lambda = \{x | x \in \mathbb{R} | 0 \leq x \leq 1\}$ in surface-entity linking.
- $B = \{y | y \in \mathbb{Z}^+ | y \geq 1\}$ in KG traversal.

Dataset	Model	H@1	H@3	H@5
WikiM	BM25-tup	5.08	17.97	24.69
	QL-tup	7.89	19.88	26.17
	BM25+RM3-sent	11.71	33.74	42.47
	BM25-sent	12.94	39.55	46.78
	BM25+RM3-tup	15.03	20.98	25.78
	QL+RM3-tup	17.54	23.30	27.63
	QL-sent	19.37	42.95	49.96
	QL+RM3-sent	25.71	40.96	47.83
	AutoKG (1-hop)	43.78	59.40	64.83
	AutoKG (2-hop)	46.24	53.84	57.54
	AutoKG (3-hop)	54.54	61.05	64.48
Meta-2	BM25-tup	9.72	14.09	16.88
	BM25+RM3-tup	10.77	13.43	16.13
	QL-tup	11.36	15.76	18.57
	QL+RM3-tup	12.92	15.96	18.56
	BM25+RM3-sent	13.04	24.39	30.59
	QL+RM3-sent	18.93	30.33	36.15
	BM25-sent	19.76	30.93	35.91
	QL-sent	22.07	33.51	38.45
	AutoKG (1-hop)	21.95	32.42	36.10
	AutoKG (2-hop)	30.73	40.40	45.29
	AutoKG (3-hop)	36.77	43.47	47.04
Meta-3	BM25-tup	2.98	7.10	8.41
	BM25+RM3-sent	5.42	17.67	23.75
	QL-tup	5.72	11.74	15.12
	BM25-sent	6.28	18.54	24.16
	BM25+RM3-tup	7.58	10.05	11.91
	QL+RM3-tup	9.14	12.58	14.92
	QL-sent	10.61	21.37	27.12
	QL+RM3-sent	11.52	20.34	25.64
	AutoKG (1-hop)	18.17	27.39	31.62
	AutoKG (2-hop)	20.86	25.56	27.90
	AutoKG (3-hop)	25.76	30.22	32.86

Table 5: Comparison of retrieval performance.

We select 0.6 for the linking threshold (λ) and 10 for the beam size (B) as the optimal parameters. Such small beam size B effectively addresses the shortcoming of our method of exponentially expanding sub-graphs, making them practically applicable even when complex inference is required in multi-hop traversing. The effect of selecting B on performance is shown in detail in Figure 2. We selected the optimal beam size as 10 considering performance and run time together.

²<https://github.com/castorini/anserini>

Dataset	Model	H@1	H@3	H@5
WikiM	QL+RM3-doc	43.36	60.75	69.93
	BM25+RM3-doc	45.75	60.75	68.00
	BM25-doc	54.80	69.24	74.50
	QL-doc	55.46	70.24	75.68
	AutoKG (1-hop)	78.93	85.10	87.12
	AutoKG (2-hop)	66.97	69.39	70.66
	AutoKG (3-hop)	77.80	78.85	79.54
Meta-2	BM25+RM3-doc	31.52	47.69	55.63
	QL+RM3-doc	33.69	50.03	57.75
	BM25-doc	34.95	51.29	58.19
	QL-doc	36.76	53.24	60.11
	AutoKG (1-hop)	57.82	65.40	67.57
	AutoKG (2-hop)	57.37	60.36	61.97
	AutoKG (3-hop)	57.56	59.02	59.79
Meta-3	QL+RM3-doc	17.60	31.59	42.21
	BM25+RM3-doc	18.07	31.82	41.40
	BM25-doc	20.56	34.10	43.02
	QL-doc	21.07	34.79	44.44
	AutoKG (1-hop)	43.72	47.33	48.45
	AutoKG (2-hop)	35.67	37.05	37.91
	AutoKG (3-hop)	43.49	44.14	44.57

Table 6: Comparison with document-level systems.

D Quantitative Analysis of AutoKG

Table 7 is the result of comparing basic statistics of KG generated by AutoKG with human-annotated KB and conventional pipeline information extraction (IE) method. Based on these statistics, we found some interesting facts.

First, considering the total number of documents (18,127) and the number of topics included in each KG, it can be seen that only the proposed method utilizes all documents in a given document pool to construct a KG. Human-annotated OMDb (Fritz, 2016) has the lowest number of 17,342, showing that manually generated KBs are easy to be outdated, which can cause issues in terms of coverage. In addition, in the existing IE pipeline method, we can see that information is dropped in the process of aligning the extracted tuple to the pre-existing KB.

Second, considering the number of tuples in KG and the average number of tuples for each topic, we can see that the proposed method extracts the most knowledge from unstructured documents. The IE-based model extracts more knowledge that is not in the human-annotated KB, but the proposed method does not filter knowledge with external alignment,

so it can utilize more knowledge.

Finally, comparing the number of words used per tuple, we can see that the average word count in (Miller et al., 2016) is less than human-annotate KB. This indicates that the system from (Miller et al., 2016) could contain many tuples with invalid information due to the loss of information resulting from the filtering process, given that human-annotate KB likely has the most concise tuples.




Figure 2: The effect of selecting beam size (B) on the model performance. Q/s is a measure of how many queries have been processed in a second.

E Qualitative Analysis of AutoKG

Example predictions are shown in Table 8. We chose an example from two QA datasets, WikiMoives and MetaQA respectively. Each example shows the top-3 paths AutoKG predicts through the constructed KG for a given query. In the first example, we can see that AutoKG retrieves knowledge from three different documents and returns the correct answer. In the dataset, *White Palace movie*, *the Kingdom film* and *Very Bad Things* are all separate documents. This shows that even though AutoKG constructs a graph of knowledge for each document, it is possible to extract information from multiple documents by simultaneously exploring multiple graphs using the seed entity present in the query as a starting point.

The second example shows that in a significant number of cases our model actually has the correct answer, but it is considered wrong because the reference label is incomplete. Therefore, we believe that the performance of our model is being underestimated.

F Implementation Details

We remove the duplicate tuples created through OpenIE by using min-wise independent permutation locality sensitive hashing scheme (Broder,

Methods	# of topic	# of tuple	tuple/topic	words/tuple
OMDb	17,342	101,800	5.87	11.64
(Miller et al., 2016)	18,098	270,012	14.92	7.17
AutoKG	18,127	291,275	16.07	13.88

Table 7: Qualitative comparison of KGs.

Dataset	Example
WikiMovies (1-hop)	<p>Question : What does Jeremy Piven act in?</p> <p>Golden Label : So Undercover, Keeping Up with the Steins, Just Write</p> <p>Predicted Paths (top-3) :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. White Palace film: The movie features Jeremy Piven. 2. The Kingdom film: starring Jason Bateman , with Jeremy Piven is fictional. 3. Very Bad Things: (...) stars Christian Slater, with Jeremy Piven in supporting roles.
MetaQA (2-hop)	<p>Question : Who appeared in the same movie with Angie Everhart?</p> <p>Golden Label : Erika Eleniak, Dennis Miller</p> <p>Predicted Paths (top-3) :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bordello of Blood: (...) starring Angie Everhart. a 1996 comedy horror film starring <i>Dennis Miller</i>. 2. Bordello of Blood: (...) starring Angie Everhart. a 1996 comedy horror film starring <i>Erika Eleniak</i>. 3. Bordello of Blood: (...) starring Angie Everhart. a 1996 comedy horror film starring Chris Sarandon.

Table 8: An example where the model found the correct answers but are considered incorrect due to the missing data labels. *Italic* means the ground truth answers, **Bold** represents words that should have been correct.

1997) with Jaccard similarity coefficient. If two sentences have 0.9 or more Jaccard similarity coefficient, it is considered the same and one of them is removed. By doing this, about 3% of the tuples are removed from the extracted tuples. For the BERT model, we use huggingface’s implementation (Wolf et al., 2019). Our method can be handled on a single GPU machine and has average run time as 5.55 query per GPU-second with NVIDIA V100 GPU.