

SQUIRE: A Sequence-to-sequence Framework for Multi-hop Knowledge Graph Reasoning

Yushi Bai¹, Xin Lv¹, Juanzi Li¹, Lei Hou¹, Yincen Qu², Zelin Dai², Feiyu Xiong²

¹Tsinghua University, ²Alibaba Group

{bys18, lv-x18}@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn,
{lijuanzi, houlei}@tsinghua.edu.cn

Abstract

Multi-hop knowledge graph (KG) reasoning has been widely studied in recent years to provide interpretable predictions on missing links. Given a triple query, multi-hop reasoning task aims to give an evidential path that indicates the inference process. Most previous works use reinforcement learning (RL) based method that learns to navigate the path towards the target entity. However, these methods suffer from slow and poor convergence, and they may fail to infer a certain path when there is a missing edge along the path. Here we present SQUIRE, the first **Sequence-to-sequence** based multi-hop reasoning framework, which utilizes an encoder-decoder structure to translate the query to a path. Our model design brings about two benefits: (1) It can learn and predict in an end-to-end fashion, which gives better and faster convergence; (2) Our model does not rely on existing edges to generate the path, and has the flexibility to complete missing edges along the path, especially in sparse KGs. Experiments on standard and sparse KGs show that our approach yields significant improvement over prior methods, while converging 4x-7x faster.

1 Introduction

Knowledge graph (KG) provides structural knowledge about entities and relations in real world in the form of triples. Each edge in the graph, connecting two entities with a relation, represents a triple fact (h, r, t) . Knowledge graph supports a variety of downstream tasks, such as question answering [Hao *et al.*, 2017], information retrieval [Xiong *et al.*, 2017a] and hierarchical reasoning [Bai *et al.*, 2021]. However, practical KGs often suffer from incompleteness, thus proposing the task of KG completion, such as predicting the tail entity t given (h, r) . A popular approach for such a challenge is knowledge graph embedding (KGE) [Bordes *et al.*, 2013; Dettmers *et al.*, 2018], which infer a missing edge in a complete black-box manner.

To strengthen the interpretability of KG completion, [Das *et al.*, 2018] proposes *multi-hop knowledge graph reasoning*. Given a triple query (h, r) , the task aims not only to predict




Figure 1: Training time (in hour) for KGE model, RL-based multi-hop reasoning model and our multi-hop reasoning model under varying graph sizes (measured by the number of edges).

the tail entity t , but to give the evidential path from h to t that indicates the inference process.

Most previous works use *walk-based method* [Das *et al.*, 2018; Lin *et al.*, 2018; Lv *et al.*, 2019; Lei *et al.*, 2020] to tackle such problem, where an agent is trained under the reinforcement learning (RL) framework to learn to “walk” from the head entity to the tail entity. One major drawback of these RL-based methods is that they suffer from slow and poor convergence, since the reward can be temporally delayed during the training process of RL [Woergoetter and Porr, 2008]. In Fig. 1, we show the training time of KGE model (TransE by [Bordes *et al.*, 2013], blue curve) and RL-based multi-hop reasoning model (MultiHopKG by [Lin *et al.*, 2018], brown curve) under different graph sizes. Though multi-hop reasoning is a harder task than KG completion, for RL-based model, the trade-off on time is still unbearable as the size of the graph grows. Moreover, as [Lv *et al.*, 2020] points out, previous approaches suffer from missing path problem, i.e., the model fails to infer evidential path between pair of entities due to missing edges along the path, especially in *sparse KGs*.

Motivated by the recent advances in sequence modeling methods, we propose a *Sequence to sequence framework for multi-hop reasoning* (SQUIRE). SQUIRE models query and path as sequences, and uses Transformer [Vaswani *et al.*, 2017] as the encoder-decoder to “translate” a query to a path. For model learning, each triple induces a supervised training

sample consisting of a source sequence, i.e., query (h, r) , and a target path sequence, which can be obtained by sampling from all paths between h and t . Hence, SQUIRE framework learns and predicts in a complete end-to-end fashion, giving faster and more stable convergence than RL-based methods. The training time of our model is shown as the green curve in Fig. 1. We see that it is much more efficient than RL-based methods and can scale to larger KGs. Furthermore, the missing path problem can be naturally overcome by our approach, since the Transformer does not explicitly rely on existing edges in the graph to generate the path sequence. That is, our proposed method has the flexibility to “walk and complete”: automatically infer missing edges along the path.

Meanwhile, multi-hop reasoning poses particular challenges to our sequence-to-sequence framework. **(a) Noisy sample:** Unlike in language modeling where we have a groundtruth target sequence, in our case, there is no such supervision on the target path. A naive way to obtain the target path is randomly sampling from all paths between h and t , but this might introduce noise into model learning since the random path may be spurious. To address this, we propose *rule-enhanced learning*, where we search groundtruth path by logical rules mined from the KG. Compared with randomly sampled paths, rule-guided paths are less noisy thus more reliable. **(b) History gap:** During training, the path history that the model attends to make the next prediction is fed with the groundtruth tokens. Yet, during inference the history is generated by the model from scratch, resulting in a distortion from its training distribution. In language modeling, this is also known as exposure bias [Ranzato *et al.*, 2016], a common challenge faced in auto-regressive models. To narrow such gap, we propose *iterative training* that iteratively aggregates new paths to the training set based on the model’s previous predictions, training it to adapt to the distribution of history tokens it induces.

We evaluate the performance of SQUIRE on link prediction over six benchmark KGs. SQUIRE achieves state-of-the-art results across all datasets. Moreover, on two sparse KGs, our model outperforms DackGR [Lv *et al.*, 2020], which is specifically designed to handle the sparse setting. SQUIRE takes **4x-7x** less time to converge on larger KG datasets while obtaining better performance. To the best of our knowledge, SQUIRE is the first sequence-to-sequence framework for multi-hop reasoning, and may provide a new paradigm for future studies.

2 Related Work

2.1 Knowledge graph embedding

Knowledge graph embedding (KGE) methods map entities to vectors in a low-dimensional embedding space, and model relations as transformations between entity embeddings. Prominent examples include TransE [Bordes *et al.*, 2013], ConvE [Dettmers *et al.*, 2018], RotatE [Sun *et al.*, 2019] and TuckER [Balažević *et al.*, 2019]. Each of these KGE models is equipped with a scoring function that maps any triple to a scalar score, which measures the likelihood of the triple. The embeddings of entities and relations are learnt by optimizing the scoring function such that the likelihood

score is high for true triples while low for false triples.

2.2 Multi-hop Reasoning

Multi-hop reasoning aims not only on answering the target entity to the query $(h, r, ?)$, but also the multi-hop reasoning path $h, r_1, t_1, \dots, r_n, t$ from h to t to support the prediction.

DeepPath [Xiong *et al.*, 2017b] is the first approach to adopt RL framework for multi-hop reasoning. Following this work, MINERVA [Das *et al.*, 2018] introduces the REINFORCE algorithm to this task. Considering the incomplete KG environment that might give low-quality rewards, MultiHopKG [Lin *et al.*, 2018] proposes reward shaping from a pretrained KGE model. DackGR [Lv *et al.*, 2020] further applies dynamic anticipation and completion in sparse KGs.

In addition to the above RL-based approaches, several symbolic rule-based models are proposed to improve interpretability for KG completion, including NTP [Rocktäschel and Riedel, 2017], NeuralLP [Yang *et al.*, 2017] and AnyBURL [Meilicke *et al.*, 2019]. Most of these methods offer evidence from automatically learnt logic rules, which is, to some degree, weaker in interpretability than RL-based methods that give the evidential path.

2.3 Reinforcement Learning via Transformer

Interestingly, recent works [Chen *et al.*, 2021; Janner *et al.*, 2021] have shown the feasibility to treat RL as a sequence modeling problem. They use Transformer to model the trajectory including states, actions and rewards, and their architectures achieve promising results on offline RL tasks. On our multi-hop reasoning task, these findings suggest the potential of substituting previous RL pipeline with Transformer.

3 Methodology

3.1 Preliminaries

knowledge graph. We denote the set of entities and relations in knowledge graph as \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{R} . Each directed edge in the graph can be formalized as a triple (h, r, t) , where $h, t \in \mathcal{E}$ and $r \in \mathcal{R}$. Let \mathcal{T} denote the set of all such triple facts.

Multi-hop reasoning. Given triple query $(h, r, ?)$, multi-hop reasoning aims to find an evidential path $h, r_1, t_1, \dots, r_n, t$ towards the target entity t , where n suggests that it is an n -hop path (we say the length of the path is n).

3.2 SQUIRE Framework

Our end-to-end SQUIRE approach frames multi-hop reasoning as a sequence-to-sequence task. The query is treated as source sequence and the path as target sequence. As shown in Fig. 2, we utilize Transformer encoder to map query and previous path sequence to a contextualized representation, and further use such representation to autoregressively decode the output path, token by token. Formally, Let q, τ denote the query and the path:

$$q := (h, r), \tau := (r_1, t_1, \dots, r_n, t, \langle \text{eos} \rangle) \quad (1)$$

and τ_k denote the k -th token in the output path. We model the probability

$$p(\tau | q) = \prod_{k=1}^{|\tau|} p(\tau_k | q, \tau_{<k}) \quad (2)$$




Figure 2: SQUIRE model overview: We use Transformer encoder to compute a contextualized representation from query tokens and history path tokens (the mask makes sure only previous tokens in the path can be attended to), and decode the next token through MLP and Softmax layer. The generated sequence corresponds to a path in KG.

where $|\tau|$ is the number of tokens in the path.

The model learns a token embedding matrix $\mathbf{E} \in \mathbb{R}^{V \times d}$ under embedding dimension of d . The vocabulary size $V = |\mathcal{E}| + |\mathcal{R}| + |\mathcal{S}|$, since the token vocabulary includes the set of entities \mathcal{E} , the set of relations \mathcal{R} and the set of special tokens \mathcal{S} .¹ We use $\text{Enc}(\cdot)$ to denote the encoder in our model (marked in Fig. 2). When decoding τ_k , the mask, shown in Fig. 2, only allows the encoder to attend to the query tokens h, r and previous tokens $\tau_{<k}$ in the output path, preventing revelation of future information. Then our model computes the distribution on the k -th token as

$$p(\cdot | q, \tau_{<k}) = \text{Softmax}(\text{MLP}(\text{Enc}(h, r, \tau_{<k})) \times \mathbf{E}) \quad (3)$$

where the $\text{MLP}(\cdot)$ learns a mapping $\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$.

During training, for each triple fact $(h, r, t) \in \mathcal{T}$, we sample a path from all paths with maximum length $N = 3$ between h and t and treat it as the target path τ . If such a path cannot be found, we simply take $\tau := (r, t, \text{<eos>})$ to force the model to memorize the edge. After obtaining the set \mathcal{U} of all query-path pairs, we optimize the parameters to maximize $\sum_{(q, \tau) \in \mathcal{U}} p(\tau | q)$. We use cross-entropy loss and further add label-smoothing to avoid overfitting, resulting in the following loss function for each sample $(q, \tau) \in \mathcal{U}$:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{|\tau|} \sum_{k=1}^{|\tau|} \sum_{i=1}^V \alpha_i \log p(i | q, \tau_{<k}) \quad (4)$$

where $\alpha_i = \epsilon$ for the target token $i = \tau_k$ and $\alpha_i = \frac{1-\epsilon}{V-1}$ for other tokens. ϵ is the label-smoothing hyperparameter ranging from 0 to 1. Furthermore, to avoid overdependence of future predictions on path history, we mask out (by substituting with <mask> token) every entity token in τ with probability p , and exclude the loss on masked tokens.

For multi-hop KG reasoning task, given query $(h, r, ?)$, we use beam search to generate reasoning path τ of maximum length N from $q = (h, r)$.

¹Special tokens include start (<bos>), end (<eos>) and mask (<mask>).

Our sequence-to-sequence framework brings two challenges. **(a) Noisy sample:** Notice that during training, we randomly sample path from h to t as target path, for there is no golden standard for a “groundtruth” reasoning path. This might result in low-quality paths and introduce noise into model learning. **(b) History gap:** There is a gap between the history path token during training and inference, where the former one is drawn from groundtruth data distribution while the latter one is induced by the model. The gap between two distributions may be even larger with longer history sequence, and the generated path may further deviate, leading to a false target entity. To address these challenges, we propose *rule-enhanced learning* and *iterative training*, which will be described in detail in the following sections.

3.3 Rule-enhanced Learning

To address noisy sample challenge, we propose rule-enhanced learning that uses mined rules to guide path searching and obtain high quality path-query pairs. Inspired by the recent advances in rule-based multi-hop reasoning methods [Yang *et al.*, 2017; Sadeghian *et al.*, 2019], we utilize AnyBURL [Meilicke *et al.*, 2019], which is the Sota method for rule mining on KG, to efficiently mine logical rules. Each rule decomposes a single relation into the composition of multiple relations (including inverse relations).² A confidence score is given along with each rule, and we choose the rules with confidence scores larger than some threshold and treat them as “golden rules”. Then we use these rules to find the evidential path between h and t . For example, if one rule for relation r is $r(X, Y) \rightarrow r_1(X, A_1) \wedge r_2(A_1, A_2) \wedge \dots \wedge r_n(A_{n-1}, Y)$, we traverse the path from h to t along the relational edges r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n . If none of the rules lead to a valid path in the graph, we obtain the path by random sampling.

²These rules are a subset of rules in [Meilicke *et al.*, 2019], referred to as C rules in their paper.

Algorithm 1 Iterative Training

```
1:  $\mathcal{T} \leftarrow$  set of all triples in the graph
2: Initialize query-path training set  $\mathcal{U}$  by random sampling or rule-
   enhanced searching
3: Initialize model  $M$ 
4: Train  $M$  for  $n$  epochs
5: for  $k = 2$  to  $N$  do
6:   for each triple  $(h, r, t)$  in  $\mathcal{T}$  do
7:      $q \leftarrow (h, r)$ 
8:      $\tau_1 \leftarrow$  first  $(k - 1)$  hops of  $M(q)$ 
9:      $\tau_2 \leftarrow$  subsequent path of  $\tau_1$  towards  $t$ , at most
        $(N - k + 1)$  hops
10:    if  $\tau_2 \neq null$  then
11:       $\tau \leftarrow \tau_1 + \tau_2$ 
12:    else ▷ No valid subsequent path
13:       $\tau \leftarrow$  search for an entire path from  $h$  to  $t$ 
14:      Add  $(q, \tau)$  to  $\mathcal{U}$ 
15:   Train  $M$  for  $n/k$  epochs
16: Return trained model  $M$ 
```

3.4 Iterative Training

Our history gap challenge is also a commonly faced problem in autoregressive models (known as exposure bias in language modeling), where the core idea behind the solutions [Venkattraman *et al.*, 2015; Zhang *et al.*, 2019] is to train the model to predict under the same condition during inference. With similar intuition in mind, we propose a novel training strategy that iteratively aggregates new training data based on model’s prediction to help the model adapt to its induced distribution of history tokens. Our data aggregation idea is enlightened by the DAgger algorithm [Ross *et al.*, 2011], which is designed to boost RL performance in sequential prediction problem.

Our algorithm proceeds as follows. At the first iteration, we generate query-path training set \mathcal{U} as illustrated before and train the model for several epochs. At k -th iteration ($k > 1$), for each triple in the graph, we partially utilize the current model to find the path and add a new training sample to \mathcal{U} . Specifically, our algorithm uses the current model to predict the first $(k - 1)$ -hops, and search the path following previously predicted tokens, with maximum length N . If the subsequent path cannot be found, it may be due to model’s failure on predicting the first $(k - 1)$ -hops, then we search the entire path again to strengthen model’s learning on this sample. After data aggregation at k -th iteration, the size of the training set becomes k times the initial size, and we continue to train the model on the new training set for the same number of steps before the next iteration. The total number of iterations would be N , which is the maximum hops of the path. A detailed algorithm is shown in Alg. 1.

4 Experiments

4.1 Experimental Setup

Datasets. We experiment on six KG benchmarks that capture common knowledge. Two standard datasets include FB15K237 [Toutanova and Chen, 2015] which is extracted from Freebase, and NELL995³ [Xiong *et al.*, 2017b]

³We apply a new training/valid/test split on the whole NELL995

Dataset	#Ent	#Rel	#Fact	#Degree	
				mean	median
FB15K237	14,505	237	272,115	18.71	13
NELL995	62,706	198	117,937	1.88	1
FB15K237-20%	13,166	237	54,423	4.13	3
NELL23K	22,925	200	25,445	1.11	1
KACC-M	99,615	209	642,650	6.45	4
FB100K	100,030	471	1,013,470	10.13	7

Table 1: Dataset statistics.

that is constructed from NELL. Two sparse datasets include FB15K237-20% [Lv *et al.*, 2020] which is constructed by randomly retaining 20% triples in the training set of FB15K237, and NELL23K [Lv *et al.*, 2020], constructed by randomly sampling a small proportion of edges in a subgraph of NELL. For efficiency studies, we also consider two larger KGs, KACC-M [Zhou *et al.*, 2021] that is constructed based on Wikidata, and FB100K that we extract from Freebase. Detailed statistics of the four datasets⁴ are listed in Table 1.

Baselines. For embedding-based models, we compare with TransE [Bordes *et al.*, 2013], ConvE [Dettmers *et al.*, 2018], RotatE [Sun *et al.*, 2019], TuckER [Balažević *et al.*, 2019] and ConE [Bai *et al.*, 2021]. For rule-based reasoning models, we compare with AnyBURL⁵ [Meilicke *et al.*, 2019]. For multi-hop reasoning models, we take MINERVA [Das *et al.*, 2018], MultiHopKG [Lin *et al.*, 2018], RuleGuider [Lei *et al.*, 2020] and DacKGR [Lv *et al.*, 2020] as baseline models.

Evaluation Protocol. We follow the evaluation protocol in most multi-hop reasoning works [Das *et al.*, 2018; Lin *et al.*, 2018]. For every triple (h, r, t) in the test set, we convert it to a triple query $(h, r, ?)$ and obtain a ranking list of the tail entity from the model. We compute the metrics, including Mean Reciprocal Rank (MRR) and Hits at N (H@N) under filtered setting [Bordes *et al.*, 2013].

Implementation Details. We use Adam [Kingma and Ba, 2015] as the optimizer to train our model. We search hyperparameters including batch size, embedding dimension, learning rate, label smoothing factor, mask probability and warmup steps (see training details and best hyperparameters in Appendix A). During evaluation, we perform beam search to obtain a list of multi-hop paths, along with log-likelihood as their scores. To prevent the model from giving higher scores to shorter paths, we further divide the log-likelihood score by the length of the path, and obtain a final score for each path. Finally, we sort the target entities according to the maximum score among all paths that lead to it.

4.2 Results

Table 2 reports the link prediction results on the first four datasets. We observe that KGE models attain better results

graph (without inverse relations), since there is an inconsistency in evaluation in previous studies.

⁴NELL995 is, in fact, sparse (according to the statistic in Table 1), but we consider it a standard KG benchmark as previous multi-hop reasoning studies do.

⁵During inference, we only include C rules mined by AnyBURL, as our model only utilize these rules during rule-enhanced learning.

	FB15K237				NELL995				FB15K237-20%				NELL23K			
	MRR	H@1	H@3	H@10	MRR	H@1	H@3	H@10	MRR	H@1	H@3	H@10	MRR	H@1	H@3	H@10
<i>Embedding-based methods</i>																
TransE [Bordes <i>et al.</i> , 2013]	.425	.320	.475	.635	.371	.209	.473	.654	.263	.178	.288	.434	.179	.076	.208	.379
ConvE [Dettmers <i>et al.</i> , 2018]	.438	.342	.483	.627	.542	.449	.594	.709	.264	.187	.284	.422	.279	.193	.301	.467
RotatE [Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2019]	.426	.321	.474	.635	.513	.411	.570	.708	.265	.185	.286	.430	.217	.141	.232	.368
TuckER [Balažević <i>et al.</i> , 2019]	<u>.451</u>	<u>.357</u>	<u>.495</u>	.635	.511	.422	.556	.682	.246	.178	.261	.384	.207	.143	.224	.338
ConE [Bai <i>et al.</i> , 2021]	.446	.345	.490	<u>.645</u>	<u>.543</u>	.448	<u>.602</u>	<u>.715</u>	<u>.274</u>	<u>.193</u>	<u>.298</u>	<u>.437</u>	.234	.158	.249	.400
<i>Rule-based methods</i>																
AnyBURL [Meilicke <i>et al.</i> , 2019]	-	.300	.405	.544	-	.389	.521	.628	-	.159	.240	.359	-	.140	.203	.292
<i>RL-based methods</i>																
MINERVA [Das <i>et al.</i> , 2018]	.275	.199	.306	.433	.391	.293	.449	.575	.123	.070	.133	.236	.151	.101	.159	.247
MultiHopKG [Lin <i>et al.</i> , 2018]	<u>.407</u>	<u>.327</u>	<u>.443</u>	<u>.564</u>	<u>.467</u>	<u>.388</u>	<u>.512</u>	<u>.609</u>	.231	.167	.250	.361	.178	.124	.188	.297
RuleGuider [Lei <i>et al.</i> , 2020]	.387	.297	.428	.563	.417	.344	.476	.582	.094	.042	.094	.21	.112	.030	.140	.273
DacKGR [Lv <i>et al.</i> , 2020]	.347	.274	.382	.493	.421	.347	.464	.554	<u>.246</u>	<u>.180</u>	<u>.270</u>	<u>.386</u>	<u>.197</u>	<u>.133</u>	<u>.211</u>	<u>.337</u>
<i>Sequence-based methods</i>																
SQUIRE (Our)	.421	.329	.465	.606	.498	.409	.550	.668	.249	.180	.272	.401	.233	.157	.256	.389

Table 2: Link prediction results on four benchmark datasets. The best score of multi-hop reasoning models is in **bold**. The best score among embedding-based models and the best score among RL-based models are underlined.

	FB15K237				NELL995			
	MRR	H@1	H@3	H@10	MRR	H@1	H@3	H@10
SQUIRE	.421	.329	.465	.606	.498	.409	.550	.668
-iter	.411	.321	.452	.594	.488	.402	.536	.654
-iter -rule	.386	.294	.430	.572	.482	.394	.532	.653

Table 3: Ablation study on our proposed iterative training strategy and rule-enhanced learning. “-iter” refers to the model without iterative training, “-iter -rule” refers to one that further removes rule-enhanced learning.

across four datasets, while the gaps on MRR metric between the best KGE results and the best multi-hop results are all smaller than 5%. Hence, it is worth sacrificing a little performance for interpretability on triple query answering.

Among RL-based methods, MultiHopKG performs superior to others on standard datasets (left two), while DacKGR provides the most precise inference on sparse datasets (right two), since it is specially designed to handle sparse setting. We observe that our model outperforms all previous multi-hop reasoning methods across four datasets by a large margin on most metrics, specifically, by an absolute of 4.2%, 5.9%, 1.5% and 5.2% on Hits@10 metric compared to previous best results. The performance gain of our model on sparse KGs is due to the flexibility of our framework, allowing our model to dynamically complete the graph while generating the path (a more detailed analysis is in Sec. 4.6). In general, the link prediction results show the effectiveness of our SQUIRE model. We further show a case study of our model’s predicted paths on example triple queries in Appendix C, we observe good interpretability of our model’s output.

4.3 Ablation studies

We present the ablation studies on our proposed iterative training strategy and rule-enhanced learning in Table 3. We can see that both techniques are beneficial to the overall performance of our model. As the numbers suggest, the two strategies play a more important role on FB15K237 than on NELL995. The reason why our model benefits more on FB15K237 lies in the density of the two graphs: FB15K237

Dataset	FB15K237	NELL995	KACC-M	FB100K
MultiHopKG	19.5	12.0	33.3	57.8
SQUIRE	3.2 (6x)	3.5 (4x)	7.5 (4x)	8.5 (7x)

Table 4: Training time (in hour) of RL-based MultiHopKG model and our model on four datasets including two standard KGs and two larger KGs.

	KACC-M			FB100K		
	MRR	H@1	H@10	MRR	H@1	H@10
MultiHopKG	.576	.492	.713	.652	.601	.744
SQUIRE	.578	.515	.702	.655	.595	.766

Table 5: Link prediction results on two larger KGs.

is denser and thus the two strategies can help distinguish the real evidential path among a larger set of random paths between h and t , with the help of mined rules or trained model. Observe that SQUIRE with rule-enhanced learning significantly outperforms AnyBURL, indicating that our model is learning from the paths, rather than fitting the mined rules by AnyBURL. To obtain a deeper understanding of how the two strategies help during the training process of our model, we compare the convergence rate of the original model with the two ablated models. The convergence analysis indicates (see detailed analysis in Appendix B): (a) New aggregated data during training helps the overall performance of the model; (b) Rule-guided searching improves the quality of the paths in training set, resulting in a more stable convergence.

4.4 Efficiency Studies on Larger KG

To provide empirical evidence for the efficiency of our framework, we provide the training time of our model and RL-based MultiHopKG model on the two standard KGs and two larger KGs. We report the training time (in hour) on each of these datasets in Table 4, and the link prediction results on two larger KGs in Table 5 (all models are trained on 1 GPU).

We can see that our sequence-to-sequence framework for multi-hop reasoning brings 4x-7x speed-up across the four datasets. Typically, MultiHopKG model takes more than a




Figure 3: Attention visualization of Transformer encoder layer 2 and 6 in our trained model. Colored lines show the attention from tokens in predicted path (top line) to the input query and their previous tokens (bottom line), recall that on each position, the Transformer encoder can only attend to query tokens and its previous tokens. Thicker line indicates a higher degree of attention. More straightforward, the attention value varies from 0 to 1, with color changing from green to red.




Figure 4: Model trained on FB15K237 and FB15K237-20% are evaluated on the same valid set. Different bars correspond to Hits@1 under different constraint during generation.

day to converge on the two larger KGs, while our method shows great efficiency on large KGs, increasing the speed by more than 400% while obtaining comparable performance.

4.5 Attention Analysis

Having seen the promising performance of our model, we want to find out more about how our sequence-to-sequence model infers the evidential path. To this end, we visualize the attention matrix in each Transformer encoder layer for the query (Einstein, native.language, ?) along with its evidential path. The attention visualization of layer 2 and layer 6 are shown in Fig. 3. For each token in the predicted path, we observe massive attention paid to its predecessor token, i.e., the previous step along the path. For example, r_1 on h , t_1 on r_1 , r_2 on t_1 and so on. This explains how our model generates a valid path without any supervision about the graph: the model has memorized the edges during training, and in generation phase it predicts the next step based on current position and adjacent edges or nodes.

Moreover, comparing the two visualizations, we find that the latter layer aggregates more global information during self-attention computation. Particularly, in layer 6, there is a moderate level of attention from r_1, r_2 to query relation r . This suggests that our model may distinguish the real evidential path from other spurious paths by attending to the query.

4.6 No-constraint Inference in Sparse Setting

Earlier in the paper, we suggest our performance gain on sparse graph comes from no-constraint generation, where there is no constraint on the path sequence generated by the model. It gives the model the flexibility to dynamically complete the path during generation. Here we show empirical evidence to support such a statement.

We study the effect of constraint on our model’s performance on link prediction. Under the constraint of a set of edges, we treat a path as a valid path if it only contains edges in the constraint, and evaluate on all valid paths that the model generates. In Fig.4, we report Hits@1 of models trained on FB15K237 and its subgraph FB15K237-20%, under constraints of edges in FB15K237 and edges in FB15K237-20%.

We see that for model trained on FB15K237, out of 34.2% paths that it correctly predicted (without constraint), 85% of them contain only edges from the trained graph (0.342 \rightarrow 0.291). This indicates that in a more complete graph, most of the generated paths exist in the graph. Meanwhile, for model trained on FB15K237-20%, only 41% of all Hits@1 paths contain only edges from the trained graph (0.183 \rightarrow 0.075), while 75% of them contain only edges from FB15K237 (0.183 \rightarrow 0.138), a more complete set of edges. In other words, at least 34% of all Hits@1 paths are inferred by dynamically completing missing edges along the path. The results suggest that our model can indeed, “walk and complete”, which has shown to be effective in sparse setting.

5 Conclusion

This paper introduces SQUIRE, a sequence-to-sequence framework for efficient and effective multi-hop knowledge graph reasoning. SQUIRE treats the triple query and the evidential path as sequences and utilizes Transformer to learn and infer in an end-to-end fashion. We propose rule-enhanced learning and iterative training to further boost performance. Experiments show that our approach significantly outperforms previous methods, on both standard KGs and sparse KGs. Compared with RL-based methods, SQUIRE has faster convergence, and can be efficiently trained on larger KGs.

⁶The comparison is fair, since FB15K237 and FB15K237-20% share the same valid/test set.

References

- [Bai *et al.*, 2021] Yushi Bai, Rex Ying, Hongyu Ren, and Jure Leskovec. Modeling heterogeneous hierarchies with relation-specific hyperbolic cones. In *NeurIPS*, 2021.
- [Balažević *et al.*, 2019] Ivana Balažević, Carl Allen, and Timothy M Hospedales. Tucker: Tensor factorization for knowledge graph completion. In *EMNLP-IJCNLP*, 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 *NeurIPS*, 2013.
- [Chen *et al.*, 2021] Lili Chen, Kevin Lu, Aravind Rajeswaran, Kimin Lee, Aditya Grover, Michael Laskin, Pieter Abbeel, Aravind Srinivas, and Igor Mordatch. Decision transformer: Reinforcement learning via sequence modeling. In *NeurIPS*, 2021.
- [Das *et al.*, 2018] Rajarshi Das, Shehzaad Dhuliawala, Manzil Zaheer, Luke Vilnis, Ishan Durugkar, Akshay Krishnamurthy, Alex Smola, and Andrew McCallum. Go for a walk and arrive at the answer: Reasoning over paths in knowledge bases using reinforcement learning. In *ICLR*, 2018.
- [Dettmers *et al.*, 2018] Tim Dettmers, Pasquale Minervini, Pontus Stenetorp, and Sebastian Riedel. Convolutional 2d knowledge graph embeddings. In *AAAI*, 2018.
- [Hao *et al.*, 2017] Yanchao Hao, Yuanzhe Zhang, Kang Liu, Shizhu He, Zhanyi Liu, Hua Wu, and Jun Zhao. An end-to-end model for question answering over knowledge base with cross-attention combining global knowledge. In *ACL*, 2017.
- [Janner *et al.*, 2021] Michael Janner, Qiyang Li, and Sergey Levine. Offline reinforcement learning as one big sequence modeling problem. In *NeurIPS*, 2021.
- [Kingma and Ba, 2015] Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In *ICLR*, 2015.
- [Lei *et al.*, 2020] Deren Lei, Gangrong Jiang, Xiaotao Gu, Kexuan Sun, Yuning Mao, and Xiang Ren. Learning collaborative agents with rule guidance for knowledge graph reasoning. In *EMNLP*, 2020.
- [Lin *et al.*, 2018] Xi Victoria Lin, Richard Socher, and Caiming Xiong. Multi-hop knowledge graph reasoning with reward shaping. In *EMNLP*, 2018.
- [Lv *et al.*, 2019] Xin Lv, Yuxian Gu, Xu Han, Lei Hou, Juanzi Li, and Zhiyuan Liu. Adapting meta knowledge graph information for multi-hop reasoning over few-shot relations. In *EMNLP-IJCNLP*, 2019.
- [Lv *et al.*, 2020] Xin Lv, Xu Han, Lei Hou, Juanzi Li, Zhiyuan Liu, Wei Zhang, Yichi Zhang, Hao Kong, and Suhui Wu. Dynamic anticipation and completion for multi-hop reasoning over sparse knowledge graph. In *EMNLP*, 2020.
- [Meilicke *et al.*, 2019] Christian Meilicke, Melisachew Wudage Chekol, Daniel Ruffinelli, and Heiner Stuckenschmidt. Anytime bottom-up rule learning for knowledge graph completion. In *IJCAI*, 2019.
- [Ranzato *et al.*, 2016] Marc’ Aurelio Ranzato, Sumit Chopra, Michael Auli, and Wojciech Zaremba. Sequence level training with recurrent neural networks. In *ICLR*, 2016.
- [Rocktäschel and Riedel, 2017] Tim Rocktäschel and Sebastian Riedel. End-to-end differentiable proving. *NeurIPS*, 2017.
- [Ross *et al.*, 2011] Stéphane Ross, Geoffrey Gordon, and Drew Bagnell. A reduction of imitation learning and structured prediction to no-regret online learning. In *AISTATS*, 2011.
- [Sadeghian *et al.*, 2019] Ali Sadeghian, Mohammadreza Armandpour, Patrick Ding, and Daisy Zhe Wang. Drum: End-to-end differentiable rule mining on knowledge graphs. In *NeurIPS*, 2019.
- [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 and Chen, 2015] Kristina Toutanova and Danqi Chen. Observed versus latent features for knowledge base and text inference. In *Proceedings of the 3rd workshop on continuous vector space models and their compositionality*, 2015.
- [Vaswani *et al.*, 2017] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *NeurIPS*, 2017.
- [Venkatraman *et al.*, 2015] Arun Venkatraman, Martial Hebert, and J Andrew Bagnell. Improving multi-step prediction of learned time series models. In *AAAI*, 2015.
- [Woergoetter and Porr, 2008] Florentin Woergoetter and Bernd Porr. Reinforcement learning. *Scholarpedia*, 2008.
- [Xiong *et al.*, 2017a] Chenyan Xiong, Russell Power, and Jamie Callan. Explicit semantic ranking for academic search via knowledge graph embedding. In *WWW*, 2017.
- [Xiong *et al.*, 2017b] Wenhan Xiong, Thien Hoang, and William Yang Wang. DeepPath: A reinforcement learning method for knowledge graph reasoning. In *EMNLP*, 2017.
- [Yang *et al.*, 2017] Fan Yang, Zhilin Yang, and William W Cohen. Differentiable learning of logical rules for knowledge base reasoning. In *NeurIPS*, 2017.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2019] Wen Zhang, Yang Feng, Fandong Meng, Di You, and Qun Liu. Bridging the gap between training and inference for neural machine translation. In *ACL*, 2019.
- [Zhou *et al.*, 2021] Jie Zhou, Shengding Hu, Xin Lv, Cheng Yang, Zhiyuan Liu, Wei Xu, Jie Jiang, Juanzi Li, and Maosong Sun. KACC: A multi-task benchmark for knowledge abstraction, concretization and completion. In *Findings of ACL-IJCNLP*, 2021.

A Training Details

Dataset	lr	ϵ	p	α	epoch	beam size
FB15K237	0.0005	0.25	0.15	1/3	30	256
NELL995	0.001	0.25	0.15	1/10	30	512
FB15K237-20%	0.0001	0.25	0.25	1/3	30	256
NELL23K	0.0005	0.25	0.15	1/3	100	512
KACC-M	0.001	0.75	0.15	1/10	20	256
FB100K	0.001	0.55	0.15	1/3	40	256

Table 6: Best hyperparameters on each dataset.

The Transformer Encoder used in our model contains 6 Transformer encoder layers. All layers have embedding size d of 256, feedforward dimension of 512, 4 attention heads, and dropout of 0.1. We report the best hyperparameters of SQUIRE on each dataset in Table 6. These hyperparameters include learning rate lr , label smoothing factor ϵ , token mask probability p , ratio of warmup step α^7 , number of epochs and beam size during beam searching.

On all datasets, we set maximum hops of path $N = 3$, in other words, we only consider evidential path that contains 3 or less hops (since longer path may not be as meaningful, especially in dense KGs). To diversify the training set, we sample 6 query-path pairs from each triple. This means that for rule-enhanced learning, we obtain 6 different paths from 6 logical rules, where rules with higher confidence scores come first. On larger datasets (KACC-M and FB100K), we turn off iterative training strategy since its time cost is large.⁸

B Convergence Analysis




Figure 5: Ablation results on convergence rate, on FB15K237 dataset. The curves show the valid set MRR w.r.t number of optimization steps. The blue curve represents our original SQUIRE model, while the orange and green curves represent two ablated models.

We compare the convergence rate of the original model with the two ablated models training on FB15K237 dataset. The convergence result is shown in Fig. 5, the curves show the trend in test MRR w.r.t. number of optimization steps (all other hyperparameters are kept the same for the three models). We observe that under iterative training, our model gains a boost on MRR at the start of each iteration, i.e., after data aggregation with current model, as suggested by the trend of the blue curve at the start of Iter 2 and Iter 3 in the figure. This indicates that the new aggregated data during training helps the model’s overall performance. Furthermore, we can see that the convergence curve is more fluctuating without rule-enhanced learning (green curve). This instability comes from the noise in random sampling, where many paths in the training set may have been misleading and meaningless. On the other hand, rule-guided searching improves the quality of the paths in training set, and thus resulting in a more stable convergence.

⁷Warmup for learning rate schedule is vital for training Transformer model [Vaswani *et al.*, 2017], where the learning rate increase from 0 to its peak during warmup steps and slowly decrease to 0 afterwards. α is the ratio of number of warmup steps over total optimization steps.

⁸The code of our paper is available at <https://github.com/bys0318/SQUIRE>.

w/o missing	Query: (<i>Lycoming County, currency, ?</i>)
	Path: <i>Lycoming County</i> $\xleftarrow{\text{contains}}$ <i>State of Pennsylvania</i> $\xrightarrow{\text{currency}}$ <u><i>US Dollar</i></u>
w/ missing	Query: (<i>Gale Sayers, won trophy, ?</i>)
	Path: <i>Gale Sayers</i> $\xrightarrow{\text{play for}}$ <i>Bears</i> $\xleftarrow{\text{coach team}}$ <i>Urlacher</i> $\xrightarrow{\text{won trophy}}$ <u><i>Super Bowl</i></u>
w/ missing	Query: (<i>Vladimir Guerrero, athlete home stadium, ?</i>)
	Path: <i>Vladimir Guerrero</i> $\xrightarrow{\text{play for}}$ <i>Anaheim Angels</i> $\xrightarrow{\text{team home stadium}}$ <u><i>Edison Field</i></u>
w/ missing	Query: (<i>Haifeng Xu, work for, ?</i>)
	Path: <i>Haifeng Xu</i> $\xrightarrow{\text{lead organization}}$ <u><i>Chinese National Shooting Team</i></u>

Table 7: Case study of our model on link prediction. We show each triple query along with our model’s predicted evidential path, the correct tail entities are underlined. “w/o missing” indicates the predicted paths contain only edges in the graph, while “w/ missing” suggests the predicted paths contain valid edges missing from the graph due to incompleteness (missing edges in **bold**).

C Case Study

We provide case studies on link prediction in Table 7. We give four examples of triple query along with the Hits@1 evidential path our model inferred, including paths containing only existing edges (w/o missing) and paths containing missing edges (w/ missing). From the listed cases, we see that our model can provide reasonable paths, and furthermore, it can dynamically complete the path in generation, thus yielding superior performance on sparse datasets.