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Abstract
In the question answering (QA) task, multi-hop reasoning framework has been extensively studied in recent years to perform more efficient and interpretable answer reasoning on the Knowledge Graph (KG). However, multi-hop reasoning is inapplicable for answering n-ary fact questions due to its linear reasoning nature. We discover that there are two feasible improvements: 1) upgrade the basic reasoning unit from entity or relation to fact; and 2) upgrade the reasoning structure from chain to tree. Based on these, we propose a novel fact-tree reasoning framework, through transforming the question into a fact tree and performing iterative fact reasoning on it to predict the correct answer. Through a comprehensive evaluation on the n-ary fact KGQA dataset introduced by this work, we demonstrate that the proposed fact-tree reasoning framework has the desired advantage of high answer prediction accuracy. In addition, we also evaluate the fact-tree reasoning framework on two binary KGQA datasets and show that our approach also has a strong reasoning ability compared with several excellent baselines. This work has direct implications for exploring complex reasoning scenarios and provides a preliminary baseline approach.

1 Introduction
The task of Question Answering over Knowledge Graphs (KGQA) has provided new avenues to the recent development of QA systems by utilizing advantages of KGs (Dubey et al., 2019; Huang et al., 2019; Yu et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2021). One can map a natural language (NL) question onto KGs to infer the correct answer. Current KGQA techniques are mainly designed to perform multi-hop reasoning on KGs (Das et al., 2018; Qiu et al., 2020; Saxena et al., 2020) for its high efficiency and interpretability. The reasoning process can be expressed as a chain, which starts with an entity extracted from the question, followed by a walk through the connected relations and entities until arriving at the answer entity. For example, to answer the question “what is the address of the arena of the Golden State Warriors?”, the reasoning chain starts from “e:Golden State Warriors”, to walk through “r:arena→e:Chase Center→r:address”, and it ends at “e:1 Warriors Way” (i.e., the answer)1.

Although the multi-hop reasoning has been commonly used for answering questions involving binary facts, it is yet to be studied in complex reasoning scenarios. We refer to a complex reasoning scenario as answering a question involving n-ary facts (n is more than two). The “n-ary fact” contains n entities and an n-ary relation, e.g., the ternary fact “Golden State Warriors won the NBA championship in 2018”. Compared with answering binary fact questions, answering n-ary fact questions is more challenging because multiple entities must be considered at the same time to infer the correct answer. For instance, in the reasoning process of “which team won the NBA championship in 2018?”, the NBA champion and 2018 need to be considered together in order to arrive at the correct answer. In this work, we aim to explore the reasoning techniques suitable for n-ary question answering over KGs (i.e., n-ary KGQA).

We have first tried to perform multi-hop reasoning for our task, but we have found that it is not directly applicable on n-ary facts. The essence of multi-hop reasoning is to construct a reasoning chain by treating the relation as the translation between two entities (Bordes et al., 2013; Ren and Leskovec, 2020). However, a transition from binary to n-ary facts is similar to the transition from a line to plane. For a single n-ary fact, the reasoning chain could only include two entities and a relation involving them. Of course, one could construct multiple reasoning chains to cover the entire n-ary fact. But this would inevitably lead to

1“e” and “r” are the abbreviations of an entity and relation, respectively.
an exponential increase in the reasoning difficulty and computational complexity. We discover that upgrading the basic reasoning unit from an entity or relation to fact can eliminate the challenges caused by differing numbers of entities.

Nevertheless, multi-hop reasoning would still be inapplicable to some more complex reasoning scenarios where a question contains multiple $n$-ary facts. Take the question in Figure 1 as an illustration. This question is composed of three facts (see Figure 1 (a)). After mapping these three facts into KG (see Figure 1 (b)), we observe that when using fact as the basic reasoning unit, the whole reasoning process can be represented by a tree structure (see Figure 1 (c)). In the fact tree, the entities (Los Angeles Lakers and 2018) which are missing in the two leaf nodes (fact 2 and fact 3) are first inferred and then passed to the root node (fact 1). The root node can then finally infer the correct answer entity LeBron James. Obviously, the chain structure used in the multi-hop reasoning is evidently inapplicable to the tree structure. A more effective reasoning framework is required to be designed.

In this work, we propose a novel fact-tree reasoning framework, i.e., FacTree, which pipelines the answer reasoning process into three steps: 1) fact tree construction, which transforms an input question into an NL fact tree; 2) fact distillation, which maps the facts into KG; and 3) fact reasoning, which is an iterative process of intra-fact and inter-fact reasoning. During the intra-fact reasoning, an existing KG completion model (Guan et al., 2020) is plugged in to predict missing entities, which can alleviate the deficiency of KG incompleteness. In addition, we develop a new dataset called WikiPeopleQA to foster research on $n$-ary KGQA. We then conduct comprehensive experiments on WikiPeopleQA dataset to show that FacTree has the desired ability of performing effective reasoning on $n$-ary fact questions, and can serve as a preliminary foundation for the $n$-ary KGQA. Besides, on the two binary KGQA datasets, FacTree also shows strong ability to accurately infer answers compared with several competitive baselines.

To sum up, the contributions of our work are as follows:

- We highlight a more challenging task: $n$-ary KGQA (answering $n$-ary fact questions over KG) than a standard KGQA task setting. We further observe that the multi-hop reasoning framework popular in binary KGQA is no longer applicable to $n$-ary KGQA.

- We propose a novel fact-tree reasoning framework, which pipelines the $n$-ary KGQA into three steps: fact tree construction, fact distillation, and fact reasoning to infer the correct answer.

- We conduct comprehensive experiments to show that our framework has the desired reasoning ability and can serve as a preliminary foundation for $n$-ary KGQA. In addition, we develop an $n$-ary KGQA dataset: WikiPeopleQA to foster research on $n$-ary KGQA.
2 Fact-tree Reasoning

We illustrate the fact-tree reasoning framework for \( n \)-ary KGQA in Figure 2. It takes the question (Q) as an input, passes through a three-stage pipeline processing, and finally finds the answer entity (A). In the first stage (Sec. 2.1), we construct the NL fact tree from the question. Second (Sec. 2.2), we distill the NL fact tree to a KG fact tree, i.e., map the question to the KG. This helps to bridge the semantic gap between the analysis of NL and the reasoning on KG. In the last stage (Sec. 2.3), based on the background KG, we perform intra-fact and inter-fact reasoning iteratively on the KG fact tree to infer the answer entity.

Following (Guan et al., 2020), we represent the \( n \)-ary fact as

\[
\text{fact} = (s, p, o), \{a_1 : v_1, a_2 : v_2, \ldots, a_m : v_m\},
\]

where \((s, p, o)\) denotes the subject-predicate-object information in the fact, named primary triple; each \(a_i : v_i (i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\})\) is an attribute value pair, a.k.a., the auxiliary description to the primary triple. For example, the ternary fact “Los Angeles Lakers won the NBA championship in 2018” is formalized as \((\text{Los Angeles Lakers}, \text{win}, \text{NBA championship }), \{\text{time:2018}\}\).

2.1 NL Fact tree construction

We define the NL fact tree as a hierarchical representation of Q that abstracts the facts and the associations among them. Further, we design two rules to constrain this tree: 1) the leaf nodes are words or phrases; and 2) if the leaf nodes share the same parent, they belong to the same fact. The challenge is how to build such NL fact tree from the NL question.

We observe that the composition of \( n \)-ary facts always contains subject-predicate-object information with auxiliary descriptions, and it is very related to the syntax structure of the NL sentence. Let’s look at Figure 3 (a), which is part of the syntax tree\(^2\). The subject (the Warriors), predicate (won) and object (the NBA championship) correspond to NP, VBD and NP nodes respectively, and form a subtree with SBAR node as the root. We further observe that the combination of multiple facts can also be reflected in syntax structures, such as some compound syntactic structures. These observations motivate us to construct the NL fact tree by pruning the syntax tree of Q.

We summarize the construction of NL fact tree in Algorithm 1. The input is the NL question and two empty node stacks. The output is the NL fact tree. We initialize the NL fact tree as a syntex tree, which is parsed from Q (Line 2). One of the empty node stack \(\mathcal{V}\) stores the nodes of FT in the order of breadth first searching (Line 3). The other stack \(\mathcal{V}'\) reverse this order in Line 4-10, so that the pruning (Line 12-22) is from the the bottom to the top as well as from the right to the left. It is worth mentioning that two semantically different questions may be parsed into the same syntax structure except for the word nodes and their parents. Therefore, we don’t eliminate these exceptional nodes (Line 6-10).

\(^2\)We use the Stanford Parser to generate the syntax tree. Note that, if all the grandchildren of a “noun phrase (NP)” node are leaf nodes, we prune the parents, and combine the grandchildren to a unified leaf node, whose parent is changed to the “NP” node. For example, the, the, NBA and championship in Figure 3 (a) are combined as the NBA championship, whose parent is “NP”. Besides, if a node has only one child and only one grandchild, which is a leaf node, we remove the child node and let the leaf node be the only child of this node.

\(^3\)Due to the space limitation, only part of the syntax tree is shown here.
Algorithm 1: NL Fact Tree Construction

**Input:** The question Q, empty node stacks V, V'

**Output:** The NL fact tree FT

1. **Initialization**
   - FT = Parse(Q), V = BFS(FT);

2. **while** V **do**
   - v = V.pop();
   - if v.isLeaf() or v.children.isLeaf() then
     - continue;
   - else
     - V'.push(v);
   - end
   - while v ≠ FT.root do
     - v = V'.pop();
     - T_v = {v} ∪ {v.parent} ∪ {v.children} ∪ {v.siblings};
     - if f(T_v) == eliminate then
       - for each child in v.children do
         - child.set_parent(v.parent, FT)
       - end
       - FT.delete(v)
     - end
   - end

Figure 3 shows an example of how to eliminate nodes from the syntax tree and finally construct the NL fact tree. As shown in (a), the pruning starts from the node VP (1, colored in red). To decide whether to eliminate this node or not, we extract a subtree that contains the node and its neighbor nodes (colored in blue). This subtree is fed into a classifier \( f(\cdot) \), which is composed of a Graph Convolutional Network (GCN) as embedding layer and a fully-connected layer. If \( f(\cdot) \) outputs “eliminate”, the node will be eliminated and its children will be directly connected to its parent, as shown in (b). Otherwise, this central node will be retained. The eliminations continue until the iteration meets the root node, and the remaining tree is the NL fact tree, as shown in (c).

Specifically, for the GCN, we use the propagation rule for calculating the node embedding update for each layer as follows:

\[
h_v^{(i+1)} = \sigma_i(h_v^{(i)} W_0^{(i)} + \sum_{u \in T_v \setminus v} h_u^{(i)} W_1^{(i)}) \tag{2}
\]

where \( v, T_v \) follow the definitions in Algorithm 1, \( u \) is one of the neighbors of \( v \), \( h_v^{(i)} \) represents the the hidden layer activations of nodes in the \( i \)-th layer, \( \sigma_i(\cdot) \) is the activation function, \( W_{0,1}^{(i)} \) are the \( i \)-layer weight matrices. The classifier is trained in a supervised manner.

2.2 Fact Distillation

There is still a large gap from the NL fact tree to actually performing reasoning on KG, because the facts in the NL fact tree are still equivalent to natural language sequences. Therefore, in the second stage, each fact in the NL fact tree will be distilled, that is, transformation from natural language to symbolic representation will be performed. Note that in the NL fact tree, there is overlap between facts. In order to alternate the subsequent fact distillation, if the overlapping part belongs to the primary triple, it will be maintain in the lower-layer fact, and if the overlapping part belongs to the auxiliary description, it will be maintain in the upper-layer fact. For example, take a look at Figure 2, the overlapping part of fact 1 and fact 2 “an NBA team” belongs to the primary triple, so it is maintain in the fact 2. Conversely, “in the year” is the auxiliary description and maintain in the fact 3.

The key to this stage is how to locate the subject, predicate, object, attribute and value in the sentence and how to match the word sequence with the entities and relations in the KG. When combining the syntax structure of the sentence, the subject-predicate-object structure is easy to be recognized, while the attribute value pairs always act as modifiers. For example, in the fact **who joined an NBA team in the year**, the subject-predicate-object is **who joined an NBA team** and the attribute value pair is **in the year**. Next, we match entities in KG
to words (phrases) mentioned in the fact sentence. In most cases, these items are in the form of nouns (noun phrases), and can be easily mapped to KG through semantic similarity matching.

After entity matching, relation matching seems simple, however, we note that our facts are incomplete. Therefore, we divide facts into three categories based on the number and location of entities in the facts. The following are three types of incomplete facts and their symbolic representations:\(^4\):

- One entity in the primary triple (\(\{\Box, p, o\}\) or \((s, p, \Box)\)), e.g., a team in Los Angeles;

- More than one entity and the primary triple is complete (\(\{s, p, o\}\) \(\{a_i: \Box, \ldots\}\)), e.g., the Warriors won the NBA championship in the year;

- More than one entity and the primary triple is incomplete (\(\Box, p, o\)) or \((s, p, \Box)\) \(\{a_1: v_1, \ldots\}\), e.g., who joined Los Angeles Lakers in the year 2018.

Based on this taxonomy, we will locate the word sequences related to the relations in the fact, and then calculate the semantic similarity between them and the relations in KG to realize relation assigning. Note that in the second incomplete fact type, the attribute \(a_i\) needs to be obtained from the higher-layer facts, e.g., in the year; For the non-leaf nodes of the NL fact tree, the position of the missing entity was naturally occupied by a node during the fact tree construction process. Take the NL fact tree in Figure 2 as an example, the blue and purple nodes in the 1-st layer fact are placeholders for the two entities.

Similar to (Saxena et al., 2020), we learn a scoring function \(s(e; \{w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_n\}\)) which calculates the semantic similarity between entity and a word sequence:

\[
s(e; \{w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_n\}) = \sigma_2(e^\top GRU(w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_n)),
\]

(3)

where \(\sigma_2(\cdot)\) is the activation function, \(e\) and \(w_i\) are the embeddings of the entity and word \(w_i\), respectively. We use pretrained word embeddings (BERT (Devlin et al., 2018)) here. Similarly, we calculate the semantic similarity between relation \(r\) and a word sequence denoted as \(s(r; \{w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_n\}\)).

\(^4\Box\) denotes the missing entity.

2.3 Fact Reasoning

In the third stage, the question has been transformed into a KG fact tree ready for reasoning on KG. We will perform the inter-fact and intra-fact reasoning iteratively based on the tree to find the answer entity.

**Inter-fact Reasoning** In the fact tree, the missing entities of the upper-layer facts need to be provided through the lower-layer facts. So we need to complete the facts of the lower-layer first, and then transfer the missing entities found to the higher-layer facts. Therefore, the whole reasoning process follows the bottom-up rule. As shown in Figure 4, the process is as follows: first, performing intra-fact reasoning on fact 3, getting the missing entity and sending it to fact 1; then performing intra-fact reasoning on fact 2, getting the missing entity and sending it to fact 1; finally fact 1 has only one missing entity, i.e., answer, which will also be obtained by intra-fact reasoning.

**Intra-fact Reasoning** The intra-fact reasoning aims to find the missing entity of each incomplete fact. This process can be seen as the KG completion task, which has been widely researched in the KG field. Popular KG completion methods (Bordes et al., 2013; Dettmers et al., 2018; Guan et al., 2020, 2019) firstly learn the KG embeddings, then adopt a scoring function to calculate the validation of all candidate entities, finally select the entity with the highest score to complete the fact. In this work, we adopt the existing approach called Neulfner (Guan et al., 2020) to perform intra-fact reasoning. This work has achieved the state-of-the-art in the n-ary KG completion task.

We observe that unlike the traditional KG completion task, the intra-fact reasoning can not only focus on the current facts, but the found entities also need to meet the upper-layer facts. For example, when we complete the fact \(2 (\Box, located in, Los Angeles), Sunset Boulevard and Los Angeles Lakers are...\)

![Figure 4: Examples of iterative reasoning processes: inter- and intra-facts.](Image 311x674 to 520x771)
Table 1: Dataset statistics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th># Question-Answer Pair</th>
<th>Background KG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WikiPeopleQA</td>
<td>4,491</td>
<td>3855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC2014</td>
<td>10,162</td>
<td>8,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PathQuestion</td>
<td>7,106</td>
<td>5,685</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

all located in Los Angeles. While, considering the upper-layer fact (fact 1), the missing entity needs to satisfy the fact that the predicate is join. Therefore, we introduce a score amplification mechanism. For the alternative entity, if it can satisfy the upper-layer fact, the corresponding score will be magnified $\lambda$ times.

2.4 Training
The classifier in the fact tree construction and the scoring function in the fact distillation are all trained in a supervised manner on the manually labeled training data. The KG completion method used in the fact reasoning stage is pre-trained.

3 Experiments
3.1 Dataset
The current popular datasets with their underlying KGs contain almost no n-ary facts. This makes it difficult to evaluate the model’s ability to answer questions containing n-ary facts. Therefore, we develop an n-ary KGQA dataset: WikiPeopleQA, in which questions involve multiple n-ary facts and the background KG is also composed of n-ary facts. We selected WikiPeople (Guan et al., 2019) as the background KG to construct the WikiPeopleQA. Specifically, we extracted fact tree from the KG and then generated natural language questions with templates. Inspired by the construction process of PathQuestion (Zhou et al., 2018), in order to enrich the problematic syntactic structure and surface wording, we replaced the phrases and words in the question with synonyms.

In addition to WikiPeopleQA, we also select two datasets that contain only binary facts: WC2014 (Zhang et al., 2016) and PathQuestion (Zhou et al., 2018). Following (Qiu et al., 2020), according to the number of hops required for reasoning about the question, WC2014 is divided into WC-1H and WC-2H, as well as a conjunctive question set WC-C. PathQuestion is divided into PQ-2H and PQ-3H. Note that according to statistics, the number of hops is equal to the number of facts. The detailed statistics are shown in Table 1.

3.2 Experimental Setup
3.2.1 Training Details
During training the classifier in the fact tree construction stage, the embedding size of node is 50, the learning rate is $10^{-5}$, and the number of GCN layers is 3. During training the scoring function in the fact distillation stage, we use pretrained BERT embedding whose size is 100. The learning rate is $2 \times 10^{-5}$ and the batch size is 32. We use Adam optimizer for optimization for above training process. The hyper-parameter $\lambda$ is set to 1.5. The training process of the KG completion method used in the fact reasoning stage is following (Guan et al., 2020). The experimental results of our framework are averaged across three training repetitions.

3.2.2 Baselines
We compare our framework with a series of multi-hop reasoning baseline approaches. According to the form of the reasoning chain, these baselines can be divided into two categories. The first category baseline builds an explicit reasoning chain through training an agent to walk in the KG: IRN-weak (Zhou et al., 2018), MINERVA (Das et al., 2018) and SRN (Qiu et al., 2020); the second category baseline builds an implicit reasoning chain through memory network or vector space: MemNN (Sukhbaatar et al., 2015a) and KV-MemNN (Miller et al., 2016).

3.3 Main Results
Effectiveness of FacTree We test the performance of FacTree and six baseline methods on one n-ary dataset, WikiPeopleQA, and two binary datasets, WC2014 and Path Question. Table 2 shows the overall results. As it can be clearly seen, our
Table 2: Model Performance on WikiPeopleQA, WC2014 and PathQuestion under the accuracy metric. The best performance scores are shown in **bold** (pairwise t-test at 5% significance level).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>WP-M</th>
<th>WP-1F</th>
<th>WP-2F</th>
<th>WP-3F</th>
<th>WC-M</th>
<th>WC-1H</th>
<th>WC-2H</th>
<th>WC-C</th>
<th>PQ-M</th>
<th>PQ-2H</th>
<th>PQ-3H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MemNN (Sukhbaatar et al., 2015a)</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KV-MemNN (Miller et al., 2016)</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EmbedKGQA (Saxena et al., 2020)</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRN-weak (Zhou et al., 2018)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINERVA (Das et al., 2018)</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRN (Qiu et al., 2020)</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td><strong>97.8</strong></td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>89.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FacTree</td>
<td><strong>54.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>63.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.9</strong></td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td><strong>99.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>92.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>98.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>90.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FacTree significantly outperforms other methods both on n-ary KGQA and general binary KGQA. Specifically, the results on n-ary KGQA show the superiority of the fact-tree reasoning framework over the multi-hop reasoning framework. Compared with the best performing multi-hop reasoning baseline MemNN, FacTree improves accuracy by 21.5% (WP-M). The explicit multi-hop reasoning methods (MINERVA and SRN) are obviously weaker than implicit methods (MemNN, KV-MemNN and EmbedKGQA), because they rely more on the structure of binary facts to build reasoning chains. During testing all the baselines, except for MemNN method, the dummy entity was added to divide n-ary facts into binary facts. MemNN directly stores the facts in the memory module without distinguishing whether they are binary or n-ary. The good performance of MemNN indicates that dividing n-ary facts into binary facts will break the relevance of the internal information of n-ary facts. EmbedKGQA relaxes the requirement that entities and relations must be connected when constructing a reasoning chain, which makes it more flexible in dealing with n-ary facts. Besides, fact-tree reasoning also achieves a good performance on binary KGQA. We observe that explicit multi-hop reasoning methods that perform well in binary facts do not perform well in n-ary facts. This also proves the complexity of reasoning about n-ary facts is much higher than that of binary facts. It is worthwhile and valuable to explore a method suitable for reasoning about n-ary facts.

**Ablation Study** In order to understand the capability of each stage of the fact-tree reasoning framework, we conduct an ablation study. Because the fact-tree reasoning framework is a pipeline structure, the answer reasoning error always occurs in cascade. We turn off the components on the pipeline from the beginning to see the impact on the overall effect. “Turn off a component” means to replace the real output with the ground truth, that is, the component is perfect by default. In the fact-tree reasoning framework, there are four components that can be examined: fact tree construction, fact distillation, fact reasoning (intra-fact and inter-fact). Since most of the questions in the current datasets are transformed based on templates, there are not many types of corresponding fact trees. The GCN we designed can almost perfectly transform the questions into fact trees. Therefore, we test the effect of turning off the last three components. As shown in Figure 5, we can see that turning off the last three components in turn will lead to an accuracy increase of 22.3%, 18.2% and 5.1% respectively (w.r.t., WP-M). It can be seen that accurately mapping the question to KG and KG completion are the two keys that affect the reasoning accuracy. The more facts in the question, the greater the influence of inter-fact reasoning component. This is because an entity that satisfies the lower-layer facts may not be able to satisfy the upper-layer facts. For examples of errors in each stage, please see Section 3.4.

![Figure 5: Ablation study. FD* and intraFR* denote turning off the FD and intraFR components respectively.](image-url)
Table 3: Performance of different subtree size w.r.t. fact construction stage. “F”, “S” and “C” denote the father, sibling and child nodes of the central node “O”, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O+F</th>
<th>O+C</th>
<th>O+F+C</th>
<th>O+F+C+S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Analysis of FacTree

Effectiveness of GCN In the fact tree construction stage, we use a GCN in the classifier to transform the question into an NL fact tree. The size of GCN execution is a subtree of the syntax tree containing the central node to be eliminated and its neighbor nodes. The size of the subtree directly affects the effect of GCN. Here, we conduct an experiment to explore the influence of different subtree sizes on the accuracy of fact tree construction. As shown in Table 3, we tested a total of five size types according to whether the father, sibling and child of the central node are included. Since the effect of GCN on a single dataset is almost perfect, we perform the test on the mixed dataset combined with three datasets (WikiPeopleQA, WC2014 and PathQuestion). The results show that the optimal subtree size includes the central node and its father and child nodes. And, including father or child alone does not work. The addition of sibling nodes did not bring significant effect improvement. Moreover, on this mixed dataset, we can also achieve 91.4% construction accuracy. We also design a zero-shot learning experiment to test the capability of our proposed fact construction component though a 5-fold cross validation. The mixed dataset is divided into five parts according to the fact tree classes. For each fold, the fact tree classes in the testing set do not appear in the training set. Based on this setting, our component can reach 81.2% accuracy with a standard deviation of 0.098. This indicates that our component also has a certain ability to construct unseen fact trees.

QA on KG with missing links Current large-scale KGs are generally incomplete, so we hope that QA systems can also handle questions despite the KG being incomplete. Our framework use a KG completion method to perform intra-fact reasoning. Because the KG completion task is to deal with the incomplete facts in KG, our framework also has the ability to deal with incomplete KG. We designed an experiment to test this capability. From all the facts in background KG, we randomly remove half facts of the full KG. Next, we test our framework and two baselines in such an incomplete background KG. As shown in Table 4, our framework can also answer a certain percentage of questions correctly, while the performance of the other two baselines decrease sharply. In particular, SRN can hardly work because it explicitly constructs the reasoning chain. As long as one fact on the chain is incomplete, the chain is broken.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>WP-M</th>
<th>WP-50%</th>
<th>WC-M</th>
<th>WC-50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRN</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EmbedKGQA</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FacTree</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Error Analysis We conducted a quantitative study on the occurrence of errors in each stage of the pipeline in the “ablation study” section. In addition, we performed also a qualitative study on these errors. In Figure 6 we show examples of errors that occurred in three stages. In the fact distillation stage, the wrong relation matching will directly affect the subsequent fact reasoning stage. In the intra-fact reasoning stage, there are two types of errors for the facts completed by the KG completion method. One kind of error here is that the completed fact is indeed incorrect. Another kind of error is when the fact actually exists, but is not included in the background KG. For example, the fact (Liu Cang, sibling, Liu Yan) is real, but does not exist in KG. So it was judged as an error during the evaluation. However, this indicates that our framework has the ability to deal with the issue of KG incompleteness. In the inter-fact reasoning stage, errors occur in the process of transferring entities between facts. Therefore, such errors often occur in questions that contain multiple facts.

4 Related Work

There were two lines of literature of KGQA before the multi-hop reasoning became popular. The first one aims at converting an unstructured question into its structured representation (e.g., logic forms and query graphs) (Berant et al., 2013; Lan and Jiang, 2020; Liang et al., 2011; Sun et al., 2020; Yih et al., 2014). This type of methods highly depend on the degree of matching between the structured representation and the KG. The other literature line aims at encoding the question and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage (error occurred) &amp; Proportion</th>
<th>Question &amp; Answer</th>
<th>Instance</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fact Distillation (22.3%)</strong></td>
<td>Which political party does William’s father join in?</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Fact Distillation" /></td>
<td>The true relation is member of political party.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intra-Fact Reasoning (18.2%)</strong></td>
<td>Who is sibling of Liu Yan?</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Intra-Fact Reasoning" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Intra-Fact Reasoning" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inter-Fact Reasoning (5.1%)</strong></td>
<td>Who win award Best Female Athlete ESPY Award in the time when Dwight Howard win the NBA Defensive Player of the Year Award</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inter-Fact Reasoning" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Inter-Fact Reasoning" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Conclusion

Our work highlights a more challenging task: \( n \)-ary KGQA and it advocates the observation that the multi-hop reasoning framework popular in binary KGQA is no longer applicable to \( n \)-ary KGQA. Based on this observation, we have proposed a novel fact-tree reasoning framework, which pipelines the \( n \)-ary KGQA into three steps: fact tree construction, fact distillation, and fact reasoning to infer the correct answer. The quantitative and qualitative experimental results have demonstrated that our framework has the superior reasoning ability both on \( n \)-ary and binary fact questions.

This work broadens the boundary of the reasoning scenarios that the KGQA system can handle, i.e., from binary to \( n \)-ary. Many downstream applications, e.g., task-oriented dialogue systems, can benefit from the techniques introduced in this work. The limitation is that the effectiveness of our framework is dependent on the output of the upstream tasks, such as the KG completion. We plan to deploy our framework to other task scenarios involving \( n \)-ary fact reasoning, such as reading comprehension. We also plan to introduce more advanced technologies to improve the scalability of fact tree construction, such as the reinforcement learning technique.
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