

Out-of-Vocabulary Entities in Benchmarks for Link Prediction

Caglar Demir

Data Science Research Group, Paderborn University

Axel-Cyrille Ngonga Ngomo

Data Science Research Group, Paderborn University

ABSTRACT

Knowledge graph embedding techniques are key to making knowledge graphs amenable to the plethora of machine learning approaches based on vector representations. Link prediction is often used as a proxy to evaluate the quality of these embeddings. Given that the creation of benchmarks for link prediction is a time-consuming endeavor, most work on the subject matter uses only a few benchmarks. As benchmarks are crucial for the fair comparison of algorithms, ensuring their quality is tantamount to providing a solid ground for developing better solutions to link prediction and ipso facto embedding knowledge graphs. First studies of benchmarks pointed to limitations pertaining to information leaking from the development to the test fragments of some benchmark datasets. We spotted a further common limitation of three of the benchmarks commonly used for evaluating link prediction approaches: out-of-vocabulary entities in the test and validation sets. We provide an implementation of an approach for spotting and removing such entities and provide corrected versions of the datasets WN18RR, FB15K-237, and YAGO3-10. Our experiments on the corrected versions of WN18RR, FB15K-237, and YAGO3-10 suggest that the measured performance of state-of-the-art approaches is altered significantly with p-values $< 1\%$, $< 1.4\%$, and $< 1\%$, respectively. Overall, state-of-the-art approaches gain on average absolute $3.29 \pm 0.24\%$ in all metrics on WN18RR. This means that some of the conclusions achieved in previous works might need to be revisited. We provide an open-source implementation of our experiments and corrected datasets at <https://github.com/dice-group/OOV-In-Link-Prediction>.

KEYWORDS

Link Prediction, Knowledge Graph Embedding

ACM Reference Format:

Caglar Demir and Axel-Cyrille Ngonga Ngomo. 2021. Out-of-Vocabulary Entities in Benchmarks for Link Prediction. In *Proceedings of the 2021 World Wide Web Conference (WWW '21)*, April 19–23, 2021, Ljubljana, Slovenia. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 7 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1122445.1122456>

1 INTRODUCTION

Knowledge Graphs (KGs) represent structured collections of facts modelled in typed relationships between entities [13]. These collections of facts have been used in a wide range of applications,

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

WWW '21, April 19–23, 2021, Ljubljana, Slovenia

© 2021 Association for Computing Machinery.

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06.

<https://doi.org/10.1145/1122445.1122456>

including web search [12], cancer research [26], and even entertainment [18]. However, most KGs on the Web are far from being complete [21]. For instance, birthplaces for 71% of people in Freebase and 66% of people in DBpedia are not found in the respective KGs. Additionally, more than 58% of scientists in DBpedia are not linked to the predicate that describes what they are known for [17]. Link prediction on KGs refers to identifying such missing information [11]. Knowledge Graph Embedding (KGE) approaches have been particularly successful at tackling the link prediction task [21]. Hence, link prediction is often used as a proxy to measure the quality of KGE approaches.

To quantify link prediction performances of KGE approaches, the KGE research community often relies on the datasets WN18, WN18RR, FB15K, FB15K-237, and YAGO3-10. Tautanova and Chen [30] note the test leakage problem of FB15K and WN18, i.e., a large number of triples in the test sets can be derived by inverting triples in the train set [11]. Tautanova and Chen [30] construct FB15K-237 via removing near-duplicate and inverse-duplicate relations from FB15K. Dettmers et al. [11] investigate the severity of this problem and show that a simple rule-based model exploiting the test leakage problem of FB15K and WN18 achieves state-of-the-art link prediction performance on both datasets. Dettmers et al. [11] create WN18RR that cannot be exploited using a single rule and caution against using FB15K and WN18. Two recent studies point out that the same benchmark datasets may suffer from another problem: the validation and test sets of WN18RR, FB15K-237, and YAGO3-10 contain entities that do not occur during training [6, 10].

The goal of this paper is two-fold: first, we aim to provide new, corrected versions of all three datasets. We dub these corrected versions WN18RR*, FB15K-237* and YAGO3-10*. Second, we investigate the impact of out-of-vocabulary entities (entities that do not occur in the train set) on the link prediction performance of a selection of state-of-the-art KGE techniques. Our experiments indicate that discrepancies in link prediction performances of approaches are statistically significant with p-values $< 1\%$, $< 1.4\%$, and $< 1\%$ on WN18RR, FB15K-237, and YAGO3-10 (see Section 6). For instance, approaches achieve absolute gains of $3.29 \pm 0.24\%$ on average, in all metrics on WN18RR*, while the link prediction performance of TransE on FB15K-237* is increased by absolute 9% in all metrics. During our experiments, we observed that out-of-vocabulary entities often occur with particular relations (e.g., hypernym on WN18RR). Hence, previously reported link prediction per relation results do not fully reflect actual performances of approaches. In turn, we observe that the impact of out-of-vocabulary entities is not as severe in ranking missing relations as in ranking missing head and tail entities.

2 RELATED WORK

A wide range of works have investigated KGE to address various tasks such as type prediction, relation prediction, link prediction,

question answering, item recommendation and knowledge graph completion [8, 9, 14, 23]. We refer to [7, 15, 21, 24, 34] for recent surveys and briefly overview selected KGE techniques.

RESCAL [23] is a bilinear model that computes a three-way factorization of a third-order adjacency tensor representing the input KG. RESCAL captures various types of relations in the input KG but is limited in its scalability as it has quadratic complexity in the factorization rank [31]. DistMult [35] can be seen as an efficient extension of RESCAL with a diagonal matrix per relation to reduce the complexity of RESCAL [3]. DistMult performs poorly on antisymmetric relations while performing well on symmetric relations [31]. Note that through applying the reciprocal data augmentation technique, this incapability of DistMult is alleviated [25]. TuckER [3] performs a Tucker decomposition on the binary tensor representing the input KG which enabling multi-task learning through parameter sharing between different relations via the core tensor. ComplEx [33] extends DistMult by learning representations in a complex vector space. ComplEx can infer both symmetric and antisymmetric relations via a Hermitian inner product of embeddings that involves the conjugate-transpose of one of the two input vectors. ComplEx yields state-of-the-art performance on the link prediction task while leveraging the linear space and time complexity of the dot products. Trouillon et al. [32] showed that ComplEx is equivalent to HoLE [22]. ConvE [11] is a convolutional neural model that relies on a 2D convolution operation to capture the interactions between entities and relations. Through interactions captured by 2D convolution, ConvE yields a state-of-the-art performance in link prediction. ConEx [10] combines a 2D convolution followed by an affine transformation with a Hermitian inner product of complex-valued embeddings to generate scores of triples. Hence, ConEx can be considered a multiplicative inclusion of ConvE into ComplEx.

3 PRELIMINARIES

Knowledge Graphs. Let \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{R} represent the set of entities and relations, respectively. Then, a KG $\mathcal{G} = \{(h, r, t) \in \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{E}\}$ can be formalised as a set of triples where each triple contains two entities $h, t \in \mathcal{E}$ and a relation $r \in \mathcal{R}$.

Link Prediction. The link prediction task addresses the problem of predicting whether unseen triples (i.e., triples not found in \mathcal{G}) are true [15]. The task is often formalised by learning a parameterised scoring function $\phi_\Theta : \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{E} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ [15, 21] ideally characterised by $\phi_\Theta(h, r, t) > \phi_\Theta(x, y, z)$ if (h, r, t) is true and (x, y, z) is not. An approach's link prediction performance is evaluated using its ranking of missing entities in unseen triples as a proxy [11, 21, 23, 33]. Consequently, benchmark datasets for link prediction consist of disjoint three sets of triples denoted by $\mathcal{G}^{\text{Train}}$, \mathcal{G}^{Val} , and $\mathcal{G}^{\text{Test}}$. Vocabulary of entities for the training phase can be defined as $\mathcal{E}^{\text{Train}} = \{x | (x, r, t) \vee (h, r, x) \in \mathcal{G}^{\text{Train}}\}$. Similarly, the vocabulary of relations can be defined as $\mathcal{R}^{\text{Train}} = \{r | (h, r, t) \in \mathcal{G}^{\text{Train}}\}$. Analogously, vocabulary of entities and relations for validation and test phases can be obtained.

Evaluation metrics. Link prediction performances of approaches are often measured via the filtered mean reciprocal rank (MRR) and Hits@N metrics based on missing head and tail entity rankings [11,

21, 33]. Formally, the filtered MRR is defined as

$$\text{MRR} = \frac{1}{2|\mathcal{G}^{\text{Test}}|} \sum_{(h,r,t) \in \mathcal{G}^{\text{Test}}} \left(\frac{1}{\text{rank}(t|h,r)} + \frac{1}{\text{rank}(h|r,t)} \right), \quad (1)$$

where $\text{rank}(t|h,r)$ (equivalently $\text{rank}(h|r,t)$) is computed in three consecutive steps. (a) Scores are computed $\forall x \in \mathcal{E} : \phi_\Theta(h, r, x)$. (b) Scores of triples that occurred in train, validation, and test sets are filtered except for the input test triple (h, r, t) . (c) Entities are ranked in descending order of corresponding scores. Given $(h, r, t) \in \mathcal{G}^{\text{Test}}$, $\text{rank}(t|h,r)$ denotes the rank of missing t in the ordered entities. To further investigate link prediction performances of approaches, link prediction per relation performances are often measured as

$$\text{MRR}_{r_i} = \frac{1}{2|\mathcal{G}^{\text{Test}}|} \sum_{(h,r_i,t) \in \mathcal{G}^{\text{Test}}} \left(\frac{1}{\text{rank}(t|h,r_i)} + \frac{1}{\text{rank}(h|r_i,t)} \right). \quad (2)$$

Equation (2) categorises Mean Reciprocal Rank (MRR) scores per relation [1, 27, 36]. Similarly, the filtered Hits@N is defined as

$$\frac{1}{2|\mathcal{G}^{\text{Test}}|} \sum_{(h,r,t) \in \mathcal{G}^{\text{Test}}} \left(\mathcal{I}(\text{rank}(t|h,r) \leq N) + \mathcal{I}(\text{rank}(h|r,t) \leq N) \right), \quad (3)$$

where the binary function \mathcal{I} returns 1 if the condition is true, otherwise 0. Link prediction performances can also be measured in terms of missing relation prediction [34]. To this end, Equation (1) is altered as

$$\text{MRR} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{G}^{\text{Test}}|} \sum_{(h,r,t) \in \mathcal{G}^{\text{Test}}} \left(\frac{1}{\text{rank}(r|h,t)} \right). \quad (4)$$

Analogous to Equation (4), Equation (3) is modified to quantify relation prediction performances [8].

4 PROBLEM

Learning a scoring function. To tackle the link prediction problem, the common practice is to learn a parameterized scoring function $\phi_\Theta : \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{E} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, where Θ corresponds to parameters of the scoring function. Θ involves embeddings of entities and relations and may involve additional parameters depending on the architecture of the scoring function, e.g., kernels in convolution operation, affine transformations, linear transformations or even tensors [2, 3, 8, 10, 11, 20, 23]. The standard workflow of learning ϕ_Θ to tackle the link prediction problem consists of three parts:

- (1) learning Θ by minimizing a set loss function (e.g., a margin or entropy-based loss functions) on $\mathcal{G}^{\text{Train}}$,
- (2) determining hyperparameters of ϕ_Θ on \mathcal{G}^{Val} , and
- (3) measuring the link prediction performance of ϕ_Θ on $\mathcal{G}^{\text{Test}}$.

This workflow entails that $\mathcal{E}^{\text{Train}}$ and $\mathcal{R}^{\text{Train}}$ are *known a priori* since Θ must involve embeddings of all entities and relations seen during the training phase. Hence, Θ can be learned as a byproduct of minimizing the set loss function through an optimizer (e.g. ADAM [16], RMSprop [28]). In this workflow, the following two conditions must hold:

- (1) $\mathcal{E}^{\text{Val}} \subseteq \mathcal{E}^{\text{Train}} \wedge \mathcal{E}^{\text{Test}} \subseteq \mathcal{E}^{\text{Train}}$ and
- (2) $\mathcal{R}^{\text{Val}} \subseteq \mathcal{R}^{\text{Train}} \wedge \mathcal{R}^{\text{Test}} \subseteq \mathcal{R}^{\text{Train}}$.

An OOV-entity is an entity $e \in (\mathcal{E}^{\text{Val}} \setminus \mathcal{E}^{\text{Train}} \cup \mathcal{E}^{\text{Test}} \setminus \mathcal{E}^{\text{Train}})$. OOV relations are defined analogously. If these two conditions

Table 1: Overview of WN18RR, FB15K-237 and YAGO3-10 benchmark datasets. $|\mathcal{G}|$, $|\mathcal{E}|$, and $|\mathcal{R}|$ denote number of triples, entities, and relation. Indegr. and Outdegr. (M \pm SD) \mathcal{G} stand for mean and standard deviation of node indegrees and node outdegrees, respectively.

	WN18RR	FB15K-237	YAGO3-10
$ \mathcal{G}^{\text{Train}} $	86,835	272,115	1,079,040
$ \mathcal{E}^{\text{Train}} $	40,559	14,505	123,143
$ \mathcal{R}^{\text{Train}} $	11	237	37
Indegr. (M \pm SD) $\mathcal{G}^{\text{Train}}$	2.72 \pm 7.74	20.34 \pm 98.54	22.51 \pm 293.96
Outdegr. (M \pm SD) $\mathcal{G}^{\text{Train}}$	2.19 \pm 3.56	19.746 \pm 30.10	9.56 \pm 8.67
$ \mathcal{G}^{\text{Val}} $	30,34	17,535	5000
$ \mathcal{E}^{\text{Val}} $	5,173	9,809	7948
$ \mathcal{R}^{\text{Val}} $	11	223	33
Indegr. (M \pm SD) \mathcal{G}^{Val}	1.18 \pm 0.87	3.02 \pm 11.76	1.59 \pm 5.25
Outdegr. (M \pm SD) \mathcal{G}^{Val}	1.06 \pm 0.41	2.29 \pm 2.75	1.03 \pm 0.19
$ \mathcal{G}^{\text{Test}} $	3,134	20,466	5000
$ \mathcal{E}^{\text{Test}} $	5,323	10,348	7937
$ \mathcal{R}^{\text{Test}} $	11	224	34
Indegr. (M \pm SD) $\mathcal{G}^{\text{Test}}$	1.20 \pm 0.95	3.21 \pm 12.91	1.57 \pm 5.06
Outdegr. (M \pm SD) $\mathcal{G}^{\text{Test}}$	1.06 \pm 0.44	2.50 \pm 3.20	1.04 \pm 0.21

Table 2: Overview of out-of-vocabulary entities in WN18RR, FB15K-237 and YAGO3-10 benchmark datasets. OOV in \mathcal{G} denotes number of triples containing at least an out-of-vocabulary entity and its percentage in the respective set.

	WN18RR	FB15K-237	YAGO3-10
$ \mathcal{E}^{\text{Test}} - \mathcal{E}^{\text{Train}} $	209	29	18
OOV in $\mathcal{G}^{\text{Test}}$	210 (6.70%)	28 (0.14%)	18 (0.36%)
$ \mathcal{E}^{\text{Val}} - \mathcal{E}^{\text{Train}} $	198	8	22
OOV in \mathcal{G}^{Val}	210 (6.92%)	9 (0.05%)	22 (0.44%)

do not hold, then approaches may not be able to compute the score of triples $(h, r, t) \in \mathcal{G}^{\text{Test}}$, as an embedding of an OOV-entity or OOV-relation is not learned. Surprisingly, the former condition does not hold on WN18RR, FB15K-237 and YAGO3-10. To the best of our knowledge, this issue is only recently mentioned [6, 10]. However, the impact of OOV-entities has not been investigated. In this work, we are interested in the impact of OOV-entities in link prediction and relation prediction. Table 1 provides an overview of benchmark datasets. Table 2 reports statistics of out-of-vocabulary entities on WN18RR, FB15K-237 and YAGO3-10 benchmark datasets. Results indicate that (1) 7% **validation and test splits of WN18RR dataset contain OOV-entities**, and (2) the number of OOV-entities increases as the out-degree of node/entity in $\mathcal{G}^{\text{Train}}$ increases.

The publicly available implementations of state-of-the-art KGE approaches often mitigate the issue of OOV-entities by constructing \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{R} using the train, validation and test sets [1–3, 10, 11, 33]. This entails that link prediction performances of KGE approaches

are quantified using embeddings of OOV-entities that are **not learned but solely initialized**. OOV-entities may lead the following undesired situations:

- (1) previously reported link prediction performances do not reflect actual performances,
- (2) link prediction per relation results biased towards relations do not occur with OOV entities, and
- (3) the impact of initialization of embeddings is unintentionally magnified.

In our experiments, we are interested in quantifying the severity of these situations.

5 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

Baselines. In our experiments, we relied on pretrained RESCAL, TransE, DistMult, ComplEx, ConvE, ConEx, and TuckER approaches provided in [6, 10, 25]. This decision stems from the fact that Ruffinelli et al. [25] conducted an extensive analysis on the impact of hyperparameter optimization and training strategies in link prediction performances. Their findings indicate that the relative performance differences between various approaches often shrink and sometimes even reverse when compared to prior results, provided that approaches are optimized properly. Hence, we alleviated the impact of different training strategies in our experiments by relying on the results of [25].

Datasets. Bordes et al. [5] construct WN18 and FB15K datasets to quantify the link prediction performance of KGE approaches. WN18 is a subset of WordNet [19] that contains lexical relations, while FB15K is a subset of Freebase [4]. Toutanova and Chen [29] highlight the test leakage problem of benchmark datasets and construct the FB15K-237 dataset by removing triples containing near-duplicate and inverse-duplicate relations from the FB15K dataset. The FB15K-237 dataset is constructed by limiting the set of relations in FB15K to the most frequent 401 relations. Next, near-duplicate and inverse relations are detected and removed from the train set of FB15K. This process detects many inverse relationships in relations, e.g., `award_nominee/award` is inverse of `award/award_nominee`. Similarly, Dettmers et al. [11] created WN18RR, on which link prediction cannot easily be exploited by using a single rule.

Evaluation metrics. We employ the standard metrics *filtered* MRR and hits at N ($H@N$) for link prediction and relation prediction [8, 11, 33].

6 EVALUATION

Tables 3 to 5 report link prediction results on WN18RR, FB15K-237, YAGO3-10 and their respective corrected versions. Our results on WN18RR* indicate that state-of-the-art approaches achieve on average absolute $3.29 \pm 0.24\%$ gains in all metrics. Such a distinct difference is not observed on FB15K-237* and YAGO3-10*.

These results also indicate that shallow models (e.g., DistMult and ComplEx) perform particularly well on FB15K-237, YAGO3-10,

Table 3: Link prediction results on WN18RR and WN18RR★.

	WN18RR				WN18RR★			
	MRR	Hits@1	Hits@3	Hits@10	MRR	Hits@1	Hits@3	Hits@10
RESCAL	.467	.439	.480	.517	.499	.470	.513	.552
TransE	.175	.044	.227	.484	.187	.047	.243	.517
DistMult	.452	.413	.466	.530	.483	.442	.499	.566
ComplEx	.475	.438	.490	.547	.509	.470	.525	.587
ConvE	.442	.411	.451	.504	.472	.440	.482	.538
ConEx	.481	.448	.493	.550	.512	.477	.525	.584
TuckER	.466	.441	.476	.515	.488	.471	.509	.550

Table 4: Link prediction results on FB15K-237 and FB15K-237★.

	FB15K-237				FB15K-237★			
	MRR	Hits@1	Hits@3	Hits@10	MRR	Hits@1	Hits@3	Hits@10
RESCAL	.351	.260	.387	.531	.354	.262	.391	.537
TransE	.150	.090	.148	.284	.246	.175	.263	.390
DistMult	.343	.249	.378	.531	.343	.249	.379	.532
ComplEx	.348	.253	.384	.536	.348	.253	.384	.536
ConvE	.329	.244	.359	.501	.334	.246	.364	.501
ConEx	.366	.271	.403	.555	.366	.271	.403	.555
TuckER	.363	.268	.400	.553	.363	.268	.400	.553

Table 5: Link prediction results on YAGO3-10 and YAGO3-10★.

	YAGO3-10				YAGO3-10★			
	MRR	Hits@1	Hits@3	Hits@10	MRR	Hits@1	Hits@3	Hits@10
DistMult	.543	.466	.590	.683	.545	.467	.592	.686
ComplEx	.547	.468	.594	.690	.549	.470	.596	.692
ConEx	.553	.474	.601	.696	.555	.476	.603	.698
TuckER	.427	.331	.476	.609	.429	.332	.477	.611

Table 6: Relation prediction results on WN18RR and WN18RR★.

	WN18RR				WN18RR★			
	MRR	Hits@1	Hits@3	Hits@10	MRR	Hits@1	Hits@3	Hits@10
RESCAL	.578	.335	.784	.892	.587	.343	.797	.891
TransE	.547	.360	.682	.865	.525	.328	.669	.859
DistMult	.671	.539	.759	.869	.687	.553	.780	.889
ComplEx	.785	.705	.822	.989	.820	.749	.857	.994
ConvE	.353	.143	.405	.857	.358	.148	.414	.853

Table 7: Relation prediction results on FB15K-237 and FB15K-237★.

	FB15K-237				FB15K-237★			
	MRR	Hits@1	Hits@3	Hits@10	MRR	Hits@1	Hits@3	Hits@10
RESCAL	.192	.021	.140	.823	.192	.021	.141	.824
TransE	.672	.589	.733	.800	.673	.589	.734	.801
DistMult	.568	.425	.660	.823	.569	.425	.661	.824
ComplEx	.632	.506	.717	.855	.633	.507	.718	.856
ConvE	.667	.562	.732	.874	.667	.562	.732	.874

and their corrected versions. These results hence do not corroborate the claim that shallow models do not perform well on knowledge graphs having high node in-degree [11]. In turn, we conjecture that this claim might have to be reconsidered. Although on average in-degree of nodes in FB15K-237 is circa 7.5 times larger than WN18RR, ComplEx and DistMult outperform ConvE in all metrics. In FB15K-237*, the link prediction performances of RESCAL, TransE, and ConvE are increased in all metrics, whereas link prediction performances of DistMult and ComplEx did not change.

Link Prediction per Relation. During our evaluation, we were interested in quantifying the impact of OVV-entities in the link prediction per relation task. Tables 8 to 10 report link prediction per relation results on all datasets. Results indicate that performances of approaches improve particularly well on hypernym, instance_hypernym, member_meronym, synset_domain_topic_of, has_part and member_of_domain_usage on WN18RR*, whereas such distinct improvements are not observed on the remaining relations.

Statistical Hypothesis Testing. We carried out a Wilcoxon signed-rank test to check whether the impact of OOV entities in link prediction performances is significant. Our null hypothesis was that the link prediction performances of state-of-the-art approaches on the datasets with and without OOV entities and relations come from the same distribution. The alternative hypothesis was that these results come from different distributions, i.e., removing triples containing OOV entities from the test set has a significant impact on link prediction performances. To perform the Wilcoxon signed-rank test (two-sided), we used the MRR, Hits@1, Hits@3, and Hits@10 performances on a benchmark dataset and its corrected version (e.g. WN18RR-WN18RR*, FB15K-237-FB15K-237*, and YAGO3-10-YAGO3-10*). We were able to reject the null hypothesis with p -values $< 1\%$, $< 1.4\%$, and $< 1\%$, on all three tests.

7 CONCLUSION

In this work, we investigated the impact of out-of-vocabulary entities in the link prediction and relation prediction problem. Our analysis shows that 6.70% and 6.92% triples in the test and validation splits of the WN18RR benchmark dataset do not serve for benchmarking link prediction performances of approaches. Our experiments also showed that state-of-the-art approaches gain on average absolute $3.29 \pm 0.24\%$ in all metrics on WN18RR. Findings of our statistically hypothesis test indicates that link prediction performances of state-of-the-art approaches are significantly altered. In turn, the impact of out-of-vocabulary entities in ranking missing relations is not as distinct as in ranking missing entities.

We provide an open-source implementation of our experiments along with corrected datasets in the project page.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ivana Balažević, Carl Allen, and Timothy Hospedales. 2019. Multi-relational Poincaré graph embeddings. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. 4465–4475.
- [2] Ivana Balažević, Carl Allen, and Timothy M Hospedales. 2019. Hypernetwork knowledge graph embeddings. In *International Conference on Artificial Neural Networks*. Springer, 553–565.
- [3] Ivana Balažević, Carl Allen, and Timothy M Hospedales. 2019. Tucker: Tensor factorization for knowledge graph completion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.09590* (2019).
- [4] Kurt Bollacker, 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*. 1247–1250.
- [5] Antoine Bordes, 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*. 2787–2795.
- [6] Samuel Broscheit, Daniel Ruffinelli, Adrian Kochsiek, Patrick Betz, and Rainer Gemulla. 2020. LibKGE - A Knowledge Graph Embedding Library for Reproducible Research. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*. 165–174. <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/2020.emnlp-demos.22>
- [7] Hongyun Cai, Vincent W Zheng, and Kevin Chen-Chuan Chang. 2018. A comprehensive survey of graph embedding: Problems, techniques, and applications. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 30, 9 (2018), 1616–1637.
- [8] Caglar Demir, Diego Moussallem, and Axel-Cyrille Ngonga Ngomo. 2021. A shallow neural model for relation prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.09090* (2021).
- [9] Caglar Demir and Axel-Cyrille Ngonga Ngomo. 2019. A physical embedding model for knowledge graphs. In *Joint International Semantic Technology Conference*. Springer, 192–209.
- [10] Caglar Demir and Axel-Cyrille Ngonga Ngomo. 2021. Convolutional Complex Knowledge Graph Embeddings. In *Eighteenth Extended Semantic Web Conference - Research Track*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=6T45-4TFqaX>
- [11] Tim Dettmers, Pasquale Minervini, Pontus Stenetorp, and Sebastian Riedel. 2018. Convolutional 2d knowledge graph embeddings. In *Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [12] Jeffrey Scott Eder. 2012. Knowledge graph based search system. US Patent App. 13/404,109.
- [13] Aidan Hogan, Eva Blomqvist, Michael Cochez, Claudia d’Amato, Gerard de Melo, Claudio Gutierrez, José Emilio Labra Gayo, Sabrina Kirrane, Sebastian Neumaier, Axel Polleres, et al. 2020. Knowledge graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.02320* (2020).
- [14] Xiao Huang, Jingyuan Zhang, Dingcheng Li, and Ping Li. 2019. Knowledge graph embedding based question answering. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*. 105–113.
- [15] Shaoxiong Ji, Shirui Pan, Erik Cambria, Pekka Martinen, and Philip S Yu. 2020. A Survey on Knowledge Graphs: Representation, Acquisition and Applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.00388* (2020).
- [16] Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2014. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980* (2014).
- [17] Denis Krompaß, Stephan Baier, and Volker Tresp. 2015. Type-constrained representation learning in knowledge graphs. In *International semantic web conference*. Springer, 640–655.
- [18] Stanislav Malyshev, Markus Krötzsch, Larry González, Julius Gonsior, and Adrian Bielefeldt. 2018. Getting the most out of Wikidata: semantic technology usage in Wikipedia’s knowledge graph. In *International Semantic Web Conference*. Springer, 376–394.
- [19] George A Miller. 1995. WordNet: a lexical database for English. *Commun. ACM* 38, 11 (1995), 39–41.
- [20] Dai Quoc Nguyen, Tu Dinh Nguyen, Dat Quoc Nguyen, and Dinh Phung. 2018. A Novel Embedding Base Model for Knowledge Base Completion Based on Convolutional Neural Network. In *NAACL*. 327–333.
- [21] Maximilian Nickel, Kevin Murphy, Volker Tresp, and Evgeniy Gabrilovich. 2015. A review of relational machine learning for knowledge graphs. *Proc. IEEE* 104, 1 (2015), 11–33.
- [22] Maximilian Nickel, Lorenzo Rosasco, and Tomaso Poggio. 2015. Holographic embeddings of knowledge graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.04935* (2015).
- [23] Maximilian Nickel, Volker Tresp, and Hans-Peter Kriegel. 2011. A Three-Way Model for Collective Learning on Multi-Relational Data.. In *ICML*, Vol. 11. 809–816.
- [24] Chuan Qin, Hengshu Zhu, Fuzhen Zhuang, Qingyu Guo, Qi Zhang, Le Zhang, Chao Wang, Enhong Chen, and Hui Xiong. [n.d.]. A survey on knowledge graph based recommender systems. *SCIENTIA SINICA Informationis* ([n. d.]).
- [25] Daniel Ruffinelli, Samuel Broscheit, and Rainer Gemulla. 2019. You CAN teach an old dog new tricks! on training knowledge graph embeddings. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [26] Muhammad Saleem, Maulik R Kamdar, Aftab Iqbal, Shanmukha Sampath, Helena F Deus, and Axel-Cyrille Ngonga Ngomo. 2014. Big linked cancer data: Integrating linked tcga and pubmed. *Journal of web semantics* 27 (2014), 34–41.
- [27] Zhiqing Sun, Zhi-Hong Deng, Jian-Yun Nie, and Jian Tang. 2019. Rotate: Knowledge graph embedding by relational rotation in complex space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.10197* (2019).
- [28] T. Tieleman and G. Hinton. 2012. Lecture 6.5—RmsProp: Divide the gradient by a running average of its recent magnitude. COURSE: Neural Networks for Machine Learning.

Table 8: MRR link prediction per relation results on WN18RR and WN18RR*.

	RESCAL	TransE	DistMult	ComplEx	ConvE	ConEx	TuckER
WN18RR							
hypernym	.149	.071	.117	.157	.090	.150	.121
instance_hyponym	.349	.246	.377	.385	.352	.392	.375
member_meronym	.225	.168	.148	.232	.198	.171	.181
synset_domain_topic_of	.325	.301	.348	.335	.311	.373	.344
has_part	.164	.095	.155	.212	.146	.192	.171
member_of_domain_usage	.295	.328	.308	.215	.299	.319	.212
member_of_domain_region	.193	.228	.365	.120	.367	.354	.284
derivationally_related_form	.956	.276	.957	.957	.953	.986	.985
also_see	.595	.209	.613	.616	.656	.647	.658
verb_group	.974	.337	.975	.974	.974	1.00	.987
similar_to	.585	.285	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
WN18RR*							
hypernym	.173	.083	.135	.184	.105	.169	.140
instance_hyponym	.375	.259	.407	.419	.376	.423	.408
member_meronym	.231	.173	.152	.238	.203	.176	.186
synset_domain_topic_of	.333	.312	.355	.347	.318	.376	.350
has_part	.167	.097	.158	.216	.148	.191	.169
member_of_domain_usage	.303	.329	.308	.234	.307	.319	.232
member_of_domain_region	.193	.229	.365	.120	.367	.354	.284
derivationally_related_form	.956	.276	.957	.957	.953	.986	.985
also_see	.594	.209	.613	.616	.656	.647	.658
verb_group	.974	.337	.975	.974	.974	1.00	.987
similar_to	.585	.285	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

Table 9: MRR link prediction per relation results based on some person related relations.

	RESCAL	TransE	DistMult	ComplEx	ConvE	ConEx	TuckER
FB15K-237							
people/person/profession	.371	.134	.388	.402	.386	.374	.375
people/person/gender	.585	.452	.528	.518	.505	.593	.605
people/person/nationality	.461	.370	.444	.439	.442	.468	.469
people/person/languages	.386	.322	.430	.429	.420	.441	.431
people/person/religion	.306	.264	.301	.302	.304	.309	.325
FB15K-237*							
people/person/profession	.377	.340	.388	.402	.386	.374	.375
people/person/gender	.586	.452	.528	.518	.505	.593	.605
people/person/nationality	.466	.399	.444	.439	.442	.468	.469
people/person/languages	.422	.401	.430	.429	.421	.441	.431
people/person/religion	.307	.283	.301	.302	.304	.309	.325

- [29] Kristina Toutanova and Danqi Chen. 2015. Observed versus latent features for knowledge base and text inference. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Continuous Vector Space Models and their Compositionality*. 57–66.
- [30] Kristina Toutanova, Danqi Chen, Patrick Pantel, Hoifung Poon, Pallavi Choudhury, and Michael Gamon. 2015. Representing text for joint embedding of text and knowledge bases. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 1499–1509.
- [31] Théo Trouillon, Christopher R Dance, Éric Gaussier, Johannes Welbl, Sebastian Riedel, and Guillaume Bouchard. 2017. Knowledge graph completion via complex tensor factorization. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 18, 1 (2017), 4735–4772.
- [32] Théo Trouillon and Maximilian Nickel. 2017. Complex and holographic embeddings of knowledge graphs: a comparison. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.01475* (2017).
- [33] Théo Trouillon, Johannes Welbl, Sebastian Riedel, Éric Gaussier, and Guillaume Bouchard. 2016. Complex embeddings for simple link prediction. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. 2071–2080.
- [34] Quan Wang, Zhendong Mao, Bin Wang, and Li Guo. 2017. Knowledge graph embedding: A survey of approaches and applications. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 29, 12 (2017), 2724–2743.
- [35] Bishan Yang, Wen-tau Yih, Xiaodong He, Jianfeng Gao, and Li Deng. 2015. Embedding entities and relations for learning and inference in knowledge bases. In *ICLR*.
- [36] Shuai Zhang, Yi Tay, Lina Yao, and Qi Liu. 2019. Quaternion knowledge graph embeddings. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. 2731–2741.

Table 10: MRR link prediction per relation results based on some person and place related relations.

	DistMult	ComplEx	ConEx	TuckER
YAGO3-10				
isLocatedIn	.293	.289	.354	.368
happenedIn	.505	.499	.473	.434
directed	.509	.504	.527	.480
hasWonPrize	.245	.237	.281	.269
isMarriedTo	.985	.985	.985	.936
hasCapital	.483	.481	.564	.442
hasNeighbor	1.00	1.00	1.00	.406
YAGO3-10*				
isLocatedIn	.302	.297	.365	.379
happenedIn	.505	.499	.473	.434
directed	.509	.504	.528	.480
hasWonPrize	.247	.237	.282	.271
isMarriedTo	.985	.985	.985	.936
hasCapital	.571	.568	.667	.523
hasNeighbor	1.00	1.00	1.00	.406