

# Reasoning Through Memorization: Nearest Neighbor Knowledge Graph Embeddings

Ningyu Zhang<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Xin Xie<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Xiang Chen<sup>1,2</sup>, Shumin Deng<sup>1,2</sup>, Chuanqi Tan<sup>4</sup>,  
Fei Huang<sup>4</sup>, Xu Cheng<sup>3</sup>, Huajun Chen<sup>1,2†</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Zhejiang University & AZFT Joint Lab for Knowledge Engine

<sup>2</sup> Hangzhou Innovation Center, Zhejiang University

<sup>3</sup> National Engineering Laboratory for Improving the Government's Governance Capability Big Data  
Application Technology

<sup>4</sup> Alibaba Group

{zhangningyu,xx2020,xiang\_chen,231sm,huajunsir}@zju.edu.cn  
chengxu@pku.edu.cn {chuanqi.tcq,f.huang}@alibaba-inc.com

## Abstract

Previous knowledge graph embedding approaches usually map entities to representations and utilize score functions to predict the target entities, yet they struggle to reason rare or emerging unseen entities. In this paper, we propose  $k$ NN-KGE, a new knowledge graph embedding approach, by linearly interpolating its entity distribution with  $k$ -nearest neighbors. We compute the nearest neighbors based on the distance in the entity embedding space from the knowledge store. Our approach can allow rare or emerging entities to be memorized explicitly rather than implicitly in model parameters. Experimental results demonstrate that our approach can improve inductive and transductive link prediction results and yield better performance for low-resource settings with only a few triples, which might be easier to reason via explicit memory<sup>1</sup>.

## 1 Introduction

Knowledge Graphs (KGs) organize facts in a structured way as triples in the form of  $\langle \text{subject}, \text{predicate}, \text{object} \rangle$ , abridged as  $(s, p, o)$ , where  $s$  and  $o$  denote entities and  $p$  builds relations between entities. Most KGs are far from complete due to the emerging entities and their relations in real-world applications; hence KG completion—the problem of extending a KG with missing triples—has appeal to researchers [Lin *et al.*, 2015; Zhang *et al.*, 2019a; Zhang *et al.*, 2020; Zhang *et al.*, 2021a; Qi *et al.*, 2021; Zhang *et al.*, 2021b].

Most previous KG completion methods, such as TransE [Bordes *et al.*, 2013], ComplEx [Trouillon *et al.*, 2016], and RotatE [Sun *et al.*, 2019], are knowledge embedding techniques that embed the entities and relations into a vec-




Figure 1: Our  $k$ NN-KGE not only leverages entity prediction from softmax (MEM head) but also retrieves the entities from the knowledge store constructed from entity descriptions and training triples.

tor space and then obtain the predicted triples by leveraging a pre-defined scoring function to those vectors. Those methods encode all of the relational knowledge implicitly in the weights of the parametric neural network via end-to-end training. However, a major limitation of these approaches is that they can hardly reason through rare entities evolving in a few triples or emerging entities unseen during training.

Note that human reasoning is facilitated by complex systems interacting together, for example, integration of current knowledge and retrieval from memory. Recent progress in memory-augmented neural networks has given rise to the design of modular architectures that separate computational processing and memory storage. Those memory-based approaches (or non/semi-parametric methods) have been successfully applied to tasks such as language modeling [Khandelwal *et al.*, 2020] and question answering [Kassner and Schütze, 2020], which are expressive and adaptable.

Inspired by this, we propose  $k$ NN-KGE, an approach that extends knowledge graph embedding by linearly interpolating its entity distribution with a  $k$ -nearest neighbors ( $k$ NN) model. As shown in Figure 1, we construct a knowledge store of entities and retrieve nearest neighbors according to distance in the entity embedding space. Given a triple with head or tail entity missing, we utilize the representation of [MASK] output as the predict anchor entity embedding to find the nearest neighbor in the knowledge store and inter-

\* Equal contribution and shared co-first authorship.

† Corresponding author.

<sup>1</sup>Code is available in <https://github.com/zjunlp/KNN-KG>.




Figure 2: Entity Vocabulary Expansion (Figure a), Masked Entity Modeling (Figure b), and Knowledge Store Construction from descriptions and triples (Figure c). Entities in color will be encoded into contextualized entity representation and added to our knowledge store. Examples are taken from [Liu *et al.*, 2021].

polate the nearest-neighbor distribution with the masked entity prediction. Thus, rare entities or emerging triples can be memorized explicitly, which makes reasoning through memorization rather than implicitly in model parameters. Experimental results on FB15k-237 and WN18RR in both transductive and inductive reasoning demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach. Qualitatively, we observe that our approach is particularly beneficial for low-resource knowledge graph embedding, which might be easier to access via explicit memory.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- To the best of our knowledge, this is the first semi-parametric approach for knowledge graph embedding. Our work opens up new avenues for improving knowledge graph reasoning through explicit memory.
- We introduce  $k$ NN-KGE that can explicitly memorize rare or emerging entities, which is essential in practice since KGs are evolving.
- Experimental results on two benchmark datasets show that our model can yield better performance compared with baselines and is particularly beneficial for low-resource reasoning.

## 2 Methodology

### 2.1 Preliminary

We define a knowledge graph with entity descriptions as a tuple  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D})$ , where  $\mathcal{E}$  represents a set of entities,  $\mathcal{R}$  represents relation types,  $\mathcal{T}$  represents a set of triples and  $\mathcal{D}$  represents the entity descriptions. For each triple in  $\mathcal{T}$ , it has the form  $(e_i, r_j, e_k)$  where  $e_i, e_k \in \mathcal{E}$  is the head and tail entity respectively. For each entity  $e_i \in \mathcal{E}$ , there exists a text  $d_i$  to describe  $e_i$ . To complete missing triples in knowledge graphs, link prediction is proposed, which aims at predicting the tail entity given the head entity and the query relation,

denoted by  $(e_i, r, ?)^2$ , where the answer is supposed to be always within the KG.

### 2.2 Framework

In this section, we introduce the general framework of the proposed approach. We first propose masked entity modeling and entity vocabulary expansion in §2.3 which converts link prediction into an entity prediction task. To address the issue of rare or unknown entities, in §2.4 we construct a knowledge store for retrieving the entity by the anchor embedding (the representation of [MASK] output). Lastly, in §2.5 we provide the details of inference which makes reasoning through memorization rather than implicitly in model parameters.

### 2.3 Contextualized KG Representation

**Masked Entity Modeling** For link prediction, given an incomplete triple  $(e_i, r_j, ?)$ , previous studies utilize KG embeddings or textual encoding to represent triple and leverage a pre-defined scoring function to those vectors. With pre-trained encoders, those approaches such as KG-BERT [Yao *et al.*, 2019] are generalizable enough and robust to the incompleteness; however, they have to costly scoring of all possible triples in inference. In this paper, we simply leverage masked entity modeling for link prediction, which makes the model predict the correct entity  $e_k$  like the Masked Language Model (MLM) task. Concretely, masked entity modeling can mitigate scoring all triples with incorrect entities, sophisticated score function designing, and free of negative sampling. In other words, the model only needs to predict the missing entity at the tail or head.

Specifically, given a triple  $(?, r_j, e_k)$  and the entity's description  $d_{e_k}$ , we concatenate this triple and the entity description  $d$  to obtain the input sequence  $x_t$  as follows:

<sup>2</sup>or head entity prediction denoted by  $(?, r, e_i)$

$$x_t = [\text{CLS}] [\text{MASK}] [\text{SEP}] r_j [\text{SEP}] e_k d_{e_k} [\text{SEP}]$$

Inference	Method	Complexity	Speed up
One Triple	StAR	$O( d ^2(1+ \mathcal{E} ))$	$\sim  \mathcal{E}  \times$
	kNN-KGE	$O( d ^2 +  \mathcal{E}  +  \mathcal{T} )$	
Entire Graph	StAR	$O( d ^2 \mathcal{E} (1+ \mathcal{R} ))$	$\sim 5 \times$ because $ \mathcal{E}  \mathcal{R}  \gg  \mathcal{T} $
	kNN-KGE	$O(( d ^2 +  \mathcal{T}  +  \mathcal{E} ) \mathcal{T} )$	

Table 1: Inference efficiency comparison.  $|d|$  is the length of the entity description.  $|\mathcal{E}|$ ,  $|\mathcal{R}|$  and  $|\mathcal{T}|$  are the numbers of all unique entities, relations and triples in the graph respectively. Usually,  $|\mathcal{E}|$  exceeds hundreds of thousands and is much greater than  $|\mathcal{R}|$ .

By masked entity modeling, the model can obtain the correct entity  $e_i$ . Note that the procedure of masked entity modeling is simple yet effective, and the one-pass inference speed is faster than the previous BERT-based model like StAR [Wang *et al.*, 2021]. Detailed comparison of inference time can be found in Table 1.

Since PLMs usually leverage byte-pair encoding to transform sequence into subwords units, making entity representation separated with tokens and challenging to inference. To address this issue, we propose entity vocabulary expansion to utilize embeddings for each unique entity.

**Entity Vocabulary Expansion** Since it is non-trivial to utilize subwords for entity inference, we directly utilize embeddings for each unique entity as common knowledge embedding methods [Bordes *et al.*, 2013] do. Specifically, we represent the entities  $e \in \mathcal{E}$  as **special tokens in language model’s vocabulary**; thus, knowledge graph reasoning can reformulate as a masked entity prediction task as shown in Figure 1 and Figure 2. To obtain those entity embeddings (special tokens in vocabulary), we utilize entity description to design prompts such as “The description of [MASK] is that” to obtain entity embeddings. Given an entity description  $d_{e_i} = (w_1, \dots, w_n)$ , we add tokens [CLS] and [SEP] to the beginning and end of the description to construct the input sequence  $x_d$  as follows:

$$x_d = [\text{CLS}] \text{prompt}([\text{MASK}]) [\text{SEP}] d_{e_i} [\text{SEP}]$$

We optimize those entity embeddings (random initialization) via predicting the entity  $e_i$  at the masked position with the other parameters fixed. Formally, we have:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{|\mathcal{E}|} \sum_{e_j \in \mathcal{E}} \mathbb{1}_{e_j=e_i} \log p([\text{MASK}] = e_j | x_d) \quad (1)$$

Where  $|\mathcal{E}|$  is the number of total entities  $\mathcal{E}$ .

## 2.4 Knowledge Store

Through contextualized KG representation can infer missing triples; they are prone to reason rare or emerging entities. Inspire by recent progress in memory-augmented neural networks [Khandelwal *et al.*, 2020; Kassner and Schütze, 2020], we construct knowledge store to explicit memorize entities.

To be specific, we construct the knowledge store mainly from two parts: entity descriptions that represent semantic information and triples of the entity that represents the structural knowledge.

Notably, we use the model trained by contextualized KG representation to construct our knowledge store from two aspects as shown in Figure 2; thus, rare or emerging entities can explicitly represent in the external memory, which is flexible and adaptable. We introduce the construction details as follows:

**From Descriptions  $\mathcal{D}$**  Let  $f(\cdot)$  be the function that maps the entity  $e$  in the input  $x$  to a fixed-length vector representation computed by the pre-trained LM. We use pre-designed prompts to obtain the entity embedding from entity descriptions. Like the same procedure in §2.3, we use the prompt input  $x_d$  to obtain the entity embedding and add them to the knowledge store. Thus, we can construct the knowledge store  $(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{V})_{\mathcal{D}}$  from descriptions (the set of descriptions  $\mathcal{D}$  of all entities  $\mathcal{E}$  in  $\mathcal{G}$ ).

$$(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{V})_{\mathcal{D}} = \{(f(x_d), e_i) | (d_{e_i}, e_i) \in \mathcal{G}\} \quad (2)$$

**From Triples  $\mathcal{T}$**  Since different relations focus on different aspects of the same entity, it is intuitive to utilize different triples to represent entities. For example, given the triple (Plato, lives, ?), the model can reason through the triple of (Plato, nationality, Greece) in KGs to obtain Greece. Thus, we also construct knowledge store from triples. We add all training triples containing entities to the knowledge store to represent a different aspect of the same entity. To obtain the entity embedding from triples  $\mathcal{T}$ , we follow the same procedure in §2.3 to obtain the entity embedding  $e_i$ . Finally, we can construct the knowledge store  $(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{V})_{\mathcal{T}}$  from triples (the set of all triples  $\mathcal{T}$  in  $\mathcal{G}$ ).

$$(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{V})_{\mathcal{T}} = \{(f(x_t), e_i) | (t, e_i) \in \mathcal{G}\} \quad (3)$$

**Implementation** The knowledge store contains entity embedding constructed from descriptions and triples, which can be up to millions of entity embeddings. Concretely, given the training triple  $t = (e_i, r_j, e_k) \in \mathcal{T}$  as well as the model input  $x_t$ , we define a key-value pair  $(k_i, v_i)$  for the knowledge store inference, where the key  $k_i$  is the vector representation of the entity embedding  $f(x_t)$  and the value  $v_i$  is the target entity  $e_i$ . We utilize the open-source library FAISS [Johnson *et al.*, 2019] for fast nearest neighbor retrieval in high dimensional spaces.

## 2.5 Memorized Inference

For knowledge graph completion tasks, given a triple with head or tail entity missing, we use the representation of [MASK] output as the predict anchor entity embedding to find the nearest neighbor in the knowledge store. To be specific, the model queries the knowledge store with the last hidden output vector  $\mathbf{h}_{[\text{MASK}]}$  to obtain the distribution of  $p_{k\text{NN}}$  according to a distance function  $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ .

$$d(e_i, e_j) = |e_i, e_j|_2, \quad (4)$$

where  $||_2$  refers to the Euclidean distance. Thus, we can obtain the probability distribution over neighbors based on a

Method	WN18RR					FB15k-237				
	Hits@1	Hits@3	Hits@10	MR	MRR	Hits@1	Hits@3	Hits@10	MR	MRR
<i>Graph embedding approach</i>										
TransE [Bordes <i>et al.</i> , 2013] $\diamond$	0.043	0.441	0.532	2300	0.243	0.198	0.376	0.441	323	0.279
DistMult [Yang <i>et al.</i> , 2015] $\diamond$	0.412	0.470	0.504	7000	0.444	0.199	0.301	0.446	512	0.281
ComplEx [Trouillon <i>et al.</i> , 2016] $\diamond$	0.409	0.469	0.530	7882	0.449	0.194	0.297	0.450	546	0.278
RotatE [Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2019]	0.428	0.492	0.571	3340	0.476	0.241	0.375	0.533	177	0.338
TuckER [Balazevic <i>et al.</i> , 2019]	0.443	0.482	0.526	-	0.470	0.226	<u>0.394</u>	0.544	-	<u>0.358</u>
ATTH [Chami <i>et al.</i> , 2020]	<u>0.443</u>	<u>0.499</u>	0.573	-	<u>0.486</u>	<u>0.252</u>	0.384	<u>0.549</u>	-	0.348
<i>Textual encoding approach</i>										
KG-BERT [Yao <i>et al.</i> , 2019]	0.041	0.302	0.524	97	0.216	-	-	0.420	153	-
StAR [Wang <i>et al.</i> , 2021]	0.243	0.491	<b>0.709</b>	<b>51</b>	0.401	0.205	0.322	0.482	<b>117</b>	0.296
<i>k</i> NN-KGE	<b>0.525</b>	<b>0.604</b>	<u>0.683</u>	986	<b>0.579</b>	<b>0.280</b>	<b>0.404</b>	<b>0.550</b>	185	<b>0.370</b>

Table 2: Link prediction results on WN18RR and FB15k-237.  $\diamond$ Resulting numbers are reported by [Nathani *et al.*, 2019] and others are taken from the original papers. The bold numbers denote the best results in each genre while the underlined ones are the second-best performance.

Method	WN18RR ind				FB15k-237 ind			
	Hits@1	Hits@3	Hits@10	MRR	Hits@1	Hits@3	Hits@10	MRR
BE-BOW $\dagger$	0.045	0.244	0.450	0.180	0.103	0.184	<u>0.316</u>	0.173
BE-DKRL $\dagger$	0.031	0.141	0.282	0.139	0.084	0.151	0.263	0.144
BLP-TransE $\dagger$	0.135	<b>0.361</b>	<b>0.580</b>	<u>0.285</u>	<u>0.113</u>	<u>0.213</u>	<b>0.363</b>	<u>0.195</u>
BLP-DistMult $\dagger$	0.135	0.288	<u>0.481</u>	0.248	0.076	0.156	0.286	0.146
BLP-ComplEx $\dagger$	<u>0.156</u>	0.297	0.472	0.261	0.081	0.154	0.283	0.148
<i>k</i> NN-KGE	<b>0.223</b>	<u>0.320</u>	0.431	<b>0.294</b>	<b>0.146</b>	<b>0.214</b>	0.293	<b>0.198</b>

Table 3: Link prediction results on WN18RR and FB15k-237 in inductive setting.  $\dagger$ Resulting numbers are reported by [Daza *et al.*, 2021]. We use WN18RR and FB15k-237 in inductive setting (see text for more details). The bold numbers denote the best results in each genre while the underlined ones are the second-best performance. Following [Daza *et al.*, 2021] we choose baseline models as BERT for Link Prediction (BLP) followed by the employed relational model (e.g. BLP-TransE) and BERT-based (BE) as the encoder for textual models.

softmax of  $k$  – nearest neighbors. For each entity retrieved by the model, we choose only one nearest embedding in the knowledge store to represent the entity since our model may retrieve several embeddings with the same entity<sup>3</sup>.

$$p_{kNN}(y | x) \propto \sum_{(k_i, v_i) \in \mathcal{N}} 1_{y=v_i} \exp(-d(k_i, f(x))) \quad (5)$$

To obtain the target entity, we interpolate the nearest neighbor distribution  $p_{kNN}$  with the model entity prediction  $p_{MEM}$  using parameter  $\lambda$  to produce the final  $k$ NN-KG distribution:

$$p(y | x) = \lambda p_{kNN}(y | x) + (1 - \lambda) p_{MEM}(y | x) \quad (6)$$

### 3 Experiments

**Datasets** We evaluate our method on FB15k-237 [Toutanova *et al.*, 2015] and WN18RR [Dettmers *et al.*, 2018] in both transductive and inductive settings, which are widely used in the link prediction literature. In FB15k-237, descriptions of entities are obtained from the introduction section of the Wikipedia page of each entity. In WN18RR,

<sup>3</sup>We set zero probability for the entities that do not appear in the retrieved targets

each entity corresponds to a word sense, and description is the word definition. More details about datasets are listed in the Appendix.

#### 3.1 Transductive Experiments

**Setting** We adopt BERT-base for the encoder of the model for a fair comparison with other PLM-based KGC methods. Following StAR [Wang *et al.*, 2021], we choose the graph embedding approach and textual encoding approach as our baseline models in the transductive setting. We run a grid search over the datasets and report the results on the test set with hyperparameters of the best performance on the validation set. The detailed hyperparameters are listed in the Appendix for reproducibility.

**Evaluation** We evaluate the test set of triples  $\mathcal{T}'$  disjoint from the set of training triples  $\mathcal{T}$ . For a test triple  $(e_i, r_j, e_k)$ , we make inference for the target by predicting the entity in the candidate set  $\mathcal{E}$ . Ideally, all the probability for incorrect candidates should be lower than the probability of the correct entity. In the transductive setting, the entities in the test triple are assumed to be seen in the set of training entities.

**Main Results** As shown in Table 2, our proposed  $k$ NN-KGE can obtain state-of-the-art or competitive performance on all these datasets, especially significant improvement




Figure 3: Varying the size of the training samples. In the low resource setting, knowledge store monotonically improves performance.

(0.443  $\rightarrow$  0.525 on WN18RR and 0.252  $\rightarrow$  0.280 on FB15k-237) in terms of Hits@1. We hold that the improvement is mainly attributed to better retrieval by our masked entity modeling and knowledge store. Note that our approach can memorize rare entities in KGs, thus, promoting the performance. Further analysis can be seen in the §3.4 below.

### 3.2 Inductive Experiments

**Setting** We also adopt BERT-base for the encoder of our  $k$ NN-KGE in the inductive setting. We reproduce the Bag-Of-Words (BOW) baseline of Daza *et al.* [2021], in which an entity is encoded as the average of embeddings of words. Notably, for the entities in the validation and test set, we construct the knowledge store **only from their descriptions** as shown in §2.3; thus, those triples are unknown during training.

**Evaluation** In the inductive setting, we construct a new test graph  $\mathcal{G}' = (\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{R}', \mathcal{T}', \mathcal{D}')$  where the sets of entities  $\mathcal{E}'$  are disjoint from  $\mathcal{E}$ . While for the relations  $r \in \mathcal{R}'$ , we assume that  $\mathcal{R}' \subseteq \mathcal{R}$ .

**Main Results** From Table 3, we observe that our  $k$ NN-KGE method can yield better or comparable performance compared with the previous state-of-the-art method, which demonstrates the effectiveness of the knowledge store. We notice that our approach  $k$ NN-KGE reaches the best Hits@1, which further validates the advantages of reasoning through memorization. Moreover, our approach is flexible for inductive setting since emerging entities can be directly added into the knowledge store, which is especially relevant in practice since KGs may be extended with triples describing new objects.

### 3.3 Ablation Study with Less Training Data

As shown in §3.1, retrieving neighbors from the knowledge store can improve the model’s performance. When facing the emerging entities, the translation-based model (such as TransE) have to add new entities or new triples to the models

and retrain the entire model, which requires huge computation resource. Thus, we further evaluate our model with only a few training triples and incrementally add new triples step by step, simulating the appearance of new entities. Specifically, we use a fixed untrained knowledge store constructed from all training samples<sup>4</sup> and optimize our  $k$ NN-KGE with from 10% to 90% training triples. We conducted an ablation study compared with the state-of-the-art model TuckER [Balazevic *et al.*, 2019] (red line), and our approach without retrieving knowledge store (w/o KS). From Figure 3, we observe that with 10% training triples, our approach can achieve improvement (MRR 0.18  $\rightarrow$  0.279) when added with nearest neighbors retrieval over knowledge store. Moreover, we notice that our approach with 70% samples can yield comparable performance with the previous SoTA model in MRR. This result suggests that our method can efficiently handle rare and emerging entities via reasoning through memorization.




Figure 4: Effect of the number of nearest neighbors from knowledge store.




Figure 5: Effect of interpolation parameter  $\lambda$  on FB15k-237 dataset.

### 3.4 Analysis

**Impact of Number of Neighbors** To validate the impact of the number of neighbors, we conduct experiments with the different number of  $k$  nearest neighbor entities to retrieve from the knowledge store. From Figure 4, we find that the model performance continues to improve as  $K$  increases until it converges when reaching a threshold ( $k = 64$ ). We think this is because those entities retrieved from the knowledge store are far from the anchor embedding, thus, having a low influence on the knowledge graph reasoning results.

**Impact of Interpolation** Since we use a parameter  $\lambda$  to interpolate between the BERT model distribution and the retrieved distribution from  $k$ NN search over the dataset, we further conduct experiments to analyze the interpolation. From Figure 5, we notice that  $\lambda = 0.2$  is optimal on FB15k-237 dataset. The suitable  $\lambda$  can help correct the model from inferring the wrong entities, which can be seen in Table 4.

### Visualization of Entity Embeddings in Knowledge Store

Since we build our knowledge store by different entity embeddings from different aspects for the same entity, we visualize those embeddings in the knowledge store. Specific, we random sample an input triple ( $?, nationality,$

<sup>4</sup>All entity embeddings are fixed.

America), retrieve and visualize the 20 nearest neighbor entities with their embeddings in the knowledge store. From Figure 6, we notice that those retrieved entities clustered together (we can treat the anchor embedding  $\star$  as the aspect of "American" in knowledge store) with similar semantic concepts while other entities outside the top-20 distance (black circle) focus on other concepts like profession.




Figure 6: 2D t-SNE visualisation of 20 nearest neighbor entities with all their embeddings in knowledge store retrieved by predicting the missing entity in triple (?, nationality, America). Anchor embedding is marked as  $\star$ .

Query: (?, ethnicity, Timothy Spall)		
Rank	$k$ NN-KGE w/o Knowledge Store	$k$ NN-KGE
1	Jewish people (0.285)	<b>English people</b> (0.548)
2	<b>English people</b> (0.202)	Jewish people (0.028)
3	British people (0.132)	British people (0.026)
4	White British (0.080)	Irish people in Great Britain (0.021)
5	Scottish people (0.037)	Irish people (0.018)
Query: (Tom Rosenberg, profession, ?)		
Rank	$k$ NN-KGE w/o Knowledge Store	$k$ NN-KGE
1	Television Director (0.240)	<b>Film Producer-GB</b> (0.319)
2	Television producer-GB (0.163)	Film Director (0.249)
3	Film Director (0.135)	Screenwriter (0.230)
4	<b>Film Producer-GB</b> (0.120)	Television Director (0.200)
5	Screenwriter (0.076)	Writer-GB (0.005)

Table 4: First five entities with their probability predicted by  $k$ NN-KGE w/o Knowledge Store, and its reranking with  $k$ NN-KGE, for two example queries.

**Case Study** We also conduct case studies to analyze the different reasoning results with or without querying knowledge store. From 4, we observe that  $k$ NN-KGE w/o Knowledge Store can infer better entities given head/tail entities and relations. Note that  $k$ NN-KGE can explicitly memorize those entities in Knowledge Store; thus, it can directly reason through memorization.

## 4 Related Work

**Knowledge Graph Embedding Models** Mainstream methods of KGC are based on knowledge graph embeddings

(KGE), which generally leverage an embedding vector in the continuous embedding space to represent each entity and relation and train the embeddings based on the observed fact. One line of KGE methods is *translation-based*, such as TransE [Bordes *et al.*, 2013], TotatE [Sun *et al.*, 2019], ConE [Zhang *et al.*, 2021c], which focus on learning distance-based scoring functions considering relations as the translational operation between entities. The objective of *translation-based* methods is that the translated head entity should be close to the tail entity in real space [Bordes *et al.*, 2013], complex space [Sun *et al.*, 2019], or quaternion space [Zhang *et al.*, 2019b], and have shown state-of-the-art performance on handling multiple relation patterns. Another line of work is *semantic matching* models, where they calculate the semantic similarity by multi-linear or bilinear product to learn the scoring functions. However, these KGE models require a large amount of labeled data to optimize the representation of the entity and relation, thus not applicable when facing rare or emerging entities.

**Pre-trained Language Models for KGC** Recently, Since pre-trained language models, such as BERT [Devlin *et al.*, 2019], have shown significant improvement on several natural language processing tasks. Several works have emerged to leverage PLMs to handle the KGC tasks. KG-BERT [Yao *et al.*, 2019] takes the first step to utilize BERT for KGC by treating a triple as a sequence and turns KGC into a sequence classification problem with the binary cross-entropy optimization. Despite the success of KG-BERT, they perform far behind the state-of-the-art performances in evaluating higher ranks, such as Hits@1 and Hits@3. Kim *et al.* [2020] proposes to adopt the multi-task learning framework with two additional tasks, i.e., relation prediction and relevance ranking, to improve high-rank performance based on KG-BERT. However, it is still non-trivial for those models to handle inductive settings. Our approach is built upon pre-trained models with an explicit knowledge store, which is pluggable, flexible, and adaptive for both transductive and inductive reasoning.

**Utilizing the KNN Classifier in PLMs** Recently,  $k$ -nearest neighbor classifier, which is a non-parametric algorithm that makes the prediction based on representation similarities, has been widely explored in pre-trained language models [Devlin *et al.*, 2019]. Khandelwal *et al.*; He *et al.* [2020; 2021] regard nearest neighbors as the augmentation on the language model predictions by using neighbors of the predictions as targets for language model learning. Kassner and Schütze [2020] applies  $k$ NN as additional predictions to enhance the question answering task. KNN-BERT [Li *et al.*, 2021] extends the  $k$ NN classifier in pre-trained model fine-tuning on text classification tasks. These methods use nearest neighbors to find augmented samples based on the pre-trained language models and have demonstrated that making predictions based on the  $k$ NN can improve model robustness. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first  $k$ NN-based approach for knowledge graph embedding.

## 5 Conclusion

We have introduced  $k$ NN-KGE, which can outperform previous knowledge graph embedding models in both transductive and inductive settings by directly querying entities at test time. Empirical results on two benchmark datasets demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach, especially in low-resource settings. The success of  $k$ NN-KGE suggests that explicitly memorizing entities can be helpful for knowledge graph reasoning. Note that our approach is simple and effective that can be applied to any evolving KGs without further training. Future work should explore how to edit and delete entities from the knowledge store and apply our approach to other tasks such as question answering.

## References

- [Balazevic *et al.*, 2019] Ivana Balazevic, Carl Allen, and Timothy M. Hospedales. Tucker: Tensor factorization for knowledge graph completion. In *Proc. of EMNLP*, 2019.
- [Bordes *et al.*, 2013] Antoine Bordes, Nicolas Usunier, Alberto Garcia-Duran, Jason Weston, and Oksana Yakhnenko. Translating embeddings for modeling multi-relational data. In *Proc. of NeurIPS*, 2013.
- [Chami *et al.*, 2020] Ines Chami, Adva Wolf, Da-Cheng Juan, Frederic Sala, Sujith Ravi, and Christopher Ré. Low-dimensional hyperbolic knowledge graph embeddings. In *Proc. of ACL*, 2020.
- [Daza *et al.*, 2021] Daniel Daza, Michael Cochez, and Paul Groth. Inductive entity representations from text via link prediction. In *Proc. of WWW*, 2021.
- [Dettmers *et al.*, 2018] Tim Dettmers, Pasquale Minervini, Pontus Stenetorp, and Sebastian Riedel. Convolutional 2d knowledge graph embeddings. In *Proc. of AAAI*, 2018.
- [Devlin *et al.*, 2019] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proc. of NAACL*, 2019.
- [He *et al.*, 2021] Junxian He, Graham Neubig, and Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick. Efficient nearest neighbor language models. In *Proc. of EMNLP*, 2021.
- [Johnson *et al.*, 2019] Jeff Johnson, Matthijs Douze, and Hervé Jégou. Billion-scale similarity search with gpus. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data*, 2019.
- [Kassner and Schütze, 2020] Nora Kassner and Hinrich Schütze. Bert-knn: Adding a knn search component to pretrained language models for better QA. In *Findings of EMNLP*, 2020.
- [Khandelwal *et al.*, 2020] Urvashi Khandelwal, Omer Levy, Dan Jurafsky, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis. Generalization through memorization: Nearest neighbor language models. In *Proc. of ICLR*, 2020.
- [Kim *et al.*, 2020] Bosung Kim, Taesuk Hong, Youngjoong Ko, and Jungyun Seo. Multi-task learning for knowledge graph completion with pre-trained language models. In *Proc. of COLING*, 2020.
- [Li *et al.*, 2021] Linyang Li, Demin Song, Ruotian Ma, Xipeng Qiu, and Xuanjing Huang. Knn-bert: Fine-tuning pre-trained models with knn classifier, 2021.
- [Lin *et al.*, 2015] Yankai Lin, Zhiyuan Liu, Maosong Sun, Yang Liu, and Xuan Zhu. Learning entity and relation embeddings for knowledge graph completion. In *Proc. of AAAI*, 2015.
- [Liu *et al.*, 2021] Shuwen Liu, Bernardo Grau, Ian Horrocks, and Egor Kostylev. Indigo: Gnn-based inductive knowledge graph completion using pair-wise encoding. In *Proc. of NeurIPS*, 2021.
- [Nathani *et al.*, 2019] Deepak Nathani, Jatin Chauhan, Charu Sharma, and Manohar Kaul. Learning attention-based embeddings for relation prediction in knowledge graphs. In *Proc. of ACL*, 2019.
- [Qi *et al.*, 2021] Zhiyuan Qi, Ziheng Zhang, Jiaoyan Chen, Xi Chen, Yuejia Xiang, Ningyu Zhang, and Yefeng Zheng. Unsupervised knowledge graph alignment by probabilistic reasoning and semantic embedding. In *Proc. of IJCAI*, 2021.
- [Sun *et al.*, 2019] Zhiqing Sun, Zhi-Hong Deng, Jian-Yun Nie, and Jian Tang. RotatE: Knowledge graph embedding by relational rotation in complex space. In *ICLR*, 2019.
- [Toutanova *et al.*, 2015] Kristina Toutanova, Danqi Chen, Patrick Pantel, Hoifung Poon, Pallavi Choudhury, and Michael Gamon. Representing text for joint embedding of text and knowledge bases. In *Proc. of EMNLP*, 2015.
- [Trouillon *et al.*, 2016] Théo Trouillon, Johannes Welbl, Sebastian Riedel, Éric Gaussier, and Guillaume Bouchard. Complex embeddings for simple link prediction. In *Proc. of ICML*, 2016.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2021] Bo Wang, Tao Shen, Guodong Long, Tianyi Zhou, Ying Wang, and Yi Chang. Structure-augmented text representation learning for efficient knowledge graph completion. In *Proc. of WWW*, 2021.
- [Yang *et al.*, 2015] Bishan Yang, Wen-tau Yih, Xiaodong He, Jianfeng Gao, and Li Deng. Embedding entities and relations for learning and inference in knowledge bases. In *Proc. of ICLR*, 2015.
- [Yao *et al.*, 2019] Liang Yao, Chengsheng Mao, and Yuan Luo. KG-BERT: BERT for knowledge graph completion. *CoRR*, 2019.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2019a] Ningyu Zhang, Shumin Deng, Zhanlin Sun, Guanying Wang, Xi Chen, Wei Zhang, and Huajun Chen. Long-tail relation extraction via knowledge graph embeddings and graph convolution networks. In *Proc. of NAACL*, 2019.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2019b] Shuai Zhang, Yi Tay, Lina Yao, and Qi Liu. Quaternion knowledge graph embeddings. In *Proc. of NeurIPS*, 2019.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2020] Ningyu Zhang, Shumin Deng, Zhanlin Sun, Jiaoyan Chen, Wei Zhang, and Huajun Chen. Relation adversarial network for low resource knowledge graph completion. In *Proc. of WWW*, 2020.

[Zhang *et al.*, 2021a] Ningyu Zhang, Xiang Chen, Xin Xie, Shumin Deng, Chuanqi Tan, Mosha Chen, Fei Huang, Luo Si, and Huajun Chen. Document-level relation extraction as semantic segmentation. In *Proc. of IJCAI*, 2021.

[Zhang *et al.*, 2021b] Ningyu Zhang, Qianghui Jia, Shumin Deng, Xiang Chen, Hongbin Ye, Hui Chen, Huaixiao Tou, Gang Huang, Zhao Wang, Nengwei Hua, and Huajun Chen. Alicg: Fine-grained and evolvable conceptual graph construction for semantic search at alibaba. In *Proc. of KDD*, 2021.

[Zhang *et al.*, 2021c] Zhanqiu Zhang, Jie Wang, Jiajun Chen, Shuiwang Ji, and Feng Wu. Cone: Cone embeddings for multi-hop reasoning over knowledge graphs. *Proc. of NeurIPS*, 2021.

## A Implementation Details

### A.1 Entity As Special Tokens

For each entity that appears in the knowledge graph, we set the unique id to the entity. We use the format of "[ENTITY\_id]" to distinguish different entities with their ids. For example, we treat `Plato` as special token "[ENTITY\_0]", and we feed the input "The description of [ENTITY\_0] is that Plato was an Athenian philosopher." to pre-trained language model to obtain the embedding of `Plato`, and add it to the knowledge store.

### A.2 Settings

We detail the training procedures and hyperparameters for each of the datasets. We utilize Pytorch to conduct experiments with one NVIDIA RTX 3090 GPU. All optimization is performed with the AdamW optimizer with a linear warmup of learning rate over the first 10% of steps, then linear decay over the remainder of the training. Gradients are clipped if their norm exceeds 1.0, and weight decay on all non-bias parameters is set to 1e-2. The grid search is used for hyperparameter tuning (maximum values bolded below), using five random restarts for each hyperparameter setting for all datasets. Early stopping is performed on the development set.

### A.3 Metrics

Given the score for each entity in the candidate set, we sort them to obtain a ranked list. Let  $rank_{head}$  be the position of the correct entity in the rank. The reciprocal rank is calculated by  $1/rank_{head}$ . This procedure is repeated by predicting the tail entity, to obtain the reciprocal rank  $1/rank_{tail}$ . The Mean Reciprocal Rank (MRR) is the mean of these two values, averaged across all triples in the knowledge graph. The Mean Rank (MR) is the mean of  $rank_{head}$  and  $rank_{tail}$  averaged across all triples in the knowledge graph.

$$MRR = \frac{1}{2|\mathcal{T}|} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \left( \frac{1}{rank_{head}} + \frac{1}{rank_{tail}} \right) \quad (7)$$

The Hits at 1 metric (Hits@1) is obtained by counting the number of times the correct triple appears at position 1, and averaging as for the MRR. The Hits@3 and Hits@10 are computed similarly, considering the first 3 and 10 positions, respectively. When scoring candidates for a given triple, we

consider the filtered setting [Bordes *et al.*, 2013] where candidates are in the set  $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$  minus those that would result in a correct triple, according to the training, validation, and test sets.

### A.4 Transductive Setting

**FB15k-237** The FB15k-237 dataset is available in <https://github.com/yao8839836/kg-bert/tree/master/data>.

The hyper-parameter search space is:

- epoch: [8, **12**, 20]
- batch size: [64, **128**, 256]
- accumulate: 1
- bert learning rate: [1e-5, 2e-5, **5e-5**, 1e-4]
- warmup rate: 0.1
- $k$  in Knowledge Store: [8, 16, 32, 64, 128, **256**, 512]
- $\lambda$ : 0.2

**WN18RR** The WN18RR dataset is available in <https://github.com/yao8839836/kg-bert/tree/master/data>.

The hyper-parameter search space is:

- epoch: [8, **12**, 20]
- batch size: [64, **128**, 256]
- accumulate: 1
- learning rate: [1e-5, 2e-5, **5e-5**, 1e-4]
- warmup rate: 0.1
- $k$  in Knowledge Store: [8, 16, 32, **64**, 128, 256, 512]
- $\lambda$ : 0.1

### A.5 Inductive Setting

**FB15k-237 inductive** The FB15k-237 inductive dataset process code is available in <https://github.com/dfdazac/blp/tree/master/data>. The hyper-parameter search space is:

- epoch: [8, **12**, 20]
- batch size: [64, **128**, 256]
- accumulate: 1
- bert learning rate: [1e-5, 2e-5, **5e-5**, 1e-4]
- warmup rate: 0.1
- $k$  in Knowledge Store: [8, **16**, 32, 64, 128, 256, 512]
- $\lambda$ : 0.5

**WN18RR inductive** The WN18RR inductive dataset process code is available in <https://github.com/dfdazac/blp/tree/master/data>. The hyper-parameter search space is:

- epoch: [8, **12**, 20]
- batch size: [64, **128**, 256]
- accumulate: 1
- learning rate: [1e-5, 2e-5, **5e-5**, 1e-4]
- warmup rate: 0.1
- $k$  in Knowledge Store: [8, **16**, 32, 64, 128, 256, 512]
- $\lambda$ : 0.5

### A.6 Dataset Details

The dataset details in transductive and inductive settings can be seen in Table 5.

	WN18RR		FB15k-237	
	Transductive	Inductive	Transductive	Inductive
Relations	11		237	
Training				
Entities	40,943	32,755	14,541	11,633
Triples	86,835	69,585	272,115	215,082
Validation				
Entities	-	4,094	-	1,454
Triples	3,034	11,381	17,535	42,164
Test				
Entities	-	4,094	-	1,454
Triples	3,134	12,087	20,466	52,870

Table 5: Statistics of datasets used in the link prediction task.