

On Evaluating Embedding Models for Knowledge Base Completion

Yanjie Wang, Daniel Ruffinelli, Samuel Broscheit, Rainer Gemulla

University of Mannheim, Germany

{ywang, rgemulla}@uni-mannheim.de and {daniel, broscheit}@informatik.uni-mannheim.de

Abstract

Knowledge bases contribute to many artificial intelligence tasks, yet they are often incomplete. To add missing facts to a given knowledge base, various embedding models have been proposed in the recent literature. Perhaps surprisingly, relatively simple models with limited expressiveness often performed remarkably well under today’s most commonly used evaluation protocols. In this paper, we explore whether recent embedding models work well for knowledge base completion tasks and argue that the current evaluation protocols are more suited for question answering rather than knowledge base completion. We show that using an alternative evaluation protocol more suitable for knowledge base completion, the performance of all models is unsatisfactory. This indicates the need for more research into embedding models and evaluation protocols for knowledge base completion.

1 Introduction

Knowledge bases (KB) such as DBpedia (Auer et al. 2007) or YAGO (Rebele et al. 2016) have become valuable resources for many AI applications, including word sense disambiguation (Agirre, de Lacalle, and Soroa 2014), question answering (Gua, Miller, and Liang 2015; Xu et al. 2016), and zero-shot learning (Wang, Ye, and Gupta 2018). A knowledge base is a collection of relational facts, often represented in form of (*subject, relation, object*)-triples; e.g., (*Einstein, bornIn, Ulm*). Despite the great effort in constructing large KBs, they still miss a large number of facts (West et al. 2014). Consequently, there has been considerable interest in the task of knowledge base completion (KBC), which aims to automatically infer missing facts by reasoning about the information already present in the KB.

In the recent literature, a large number of *embedding models* for KBC have been proposed. Such models (Nickel et al. 2016) embed both entities and relations in a low-dimensional latent factor space such that the structure of the knowledge graph is suitably captured. The embeddings are subsequently used to score unobserved triples in order to assess whether they constitute missing information (high score) or are likely to be false (low score). Liu, Wu, and Yang (2017) and Wang, Gemulla, and Li (2018) recently showed that some embedding models are restricted

in expressiveness in the sense that they cannot model all types of relations, most notably TransE (Bordes et al. 2013) and DistMult (Yang et al. 2014). Nevertheless, these models showed competitive empirical results in multiple studies. Moreover, it was repeatedly shown that simple baselines outperformed the best embedding models for KBC, raising concerns about the benchmarks (Toutanova and Chen 2015), the models (Kadlec, Bajgar, and Kleindienst 2017) and the evaluation (Joulin et al. 2017).

In this paper, we argue that the methods used to evaluate these models are more suitable for question answering (QA) than for KBC. The most commonly used evaluation protocol¹ for KB embedding models is the *entity ranking protocol* (ER), which uses held-out test data to assess model performance. In particular, for each true test triple such as (*Einstein, bornIn, Ulm*), the embedding model is used to rank answers to the questions (*?, bornIn, Ulm*) and (*Einstein, bornIn, ?*). Model performance is then assessed based on the rank of the test triple in the result. ER thus assesses a model’s performance for KBC based on its ability to answer certain questions. The evaluation set is constructed such that these questions are “sensible” and they always have an answer. As a result, models that assign high scores to nonsensical triples such as (*Ulm, bornIn, Einstein*) are not penalized because the corresponding questions are never asked.

Unlike QA, where the focus is on answering meaningful questions, KBC has different goals: (1) to add missing true triples to the knowledge base and (2) to avoid adding false triples. The first point relates to recall, while the second relates to precision. In fact, a model that performs well under ER may have low precision overall, i.e., it may assign high scores to a large number of false triples (e.g., nonsensical triples). If we completed a KB using the high-scoring triples, we would add these false triples and deteriorate precision. This is undesirable, since many KBs are constructed to be highly precise—e.g. YAGO has a precision of 95% (Suchanek, Kasneci, and Weikum 2008)—and a drop in precision would negatively affect downstream applications. An evaluation protocol should penalize models that assign high scores to false triples.

To illustrate our point, we explored a new but simple evaluation approach called *entity-pair ranking* (PR). For a given

¹We discuss other less adopted evaluation methods in Sec. 3.2.

relation k , PR ranks answers to the question $(?, k, ?)$, e.g. $(?, \text{bornIn}, ?)$, meaning that the rank of all test triples using relation *bornIn* are compared against all possible answers, i.e., entity pairs in the knowledge graph. This includes nonsensical triples such as $(\text{Ulm}, \text{bornIn}, \text{Einstein})$. Consequently, model performance when evaluating with PR is negatively affected when models assign high scores to false or even nonsensical triples.

We conducted an extensive set of experiments to evaluate the performance of popular embedding models on multiple datasets using ER and PR. We found that PR generally shows the performance of all models to be unsatisfactory for KBC, which is unlike what is suggested by ER. To see whether these results were mostly due to the nonsensical triples considered in PR, we applied the background knowledge of domain-range constraints to filter out many of these clearly nonsensical triples. We found model performance to still be unsatisfactory. Our results support the argument that ER is not suitable for KBC and suggest the need for more powerful models for KBC. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work which points out these issues and suggests an alternative evaluation for embedding models for KBC.

2 Preliminaries

Given a set of entities \mathcal{E} and a set of relations \mathcal{R} , a knowledge base $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{E}$ is a set of triples (i, k, j) , where $i, j \in \mathcal{E}$ and $k \in \mathcal{R}$. Commonly, i, k and j are referred to as the *subject*, *relation*, and *object*, respectively. A knowledge base can be viewed as a labelled graph, where each vertex corresponds to an entity, each label to a relation, and each labelled edge to a triple.

An *embedding model* associates an *embedding* $e_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $r_k \in \mathbb{R}^{d_R}$ in a low-dimensional vector space with each entity i and relation k , respectively. We refer to hyperparameters $d, d_R \in \mathbb{N}^+$ as the *size* of the embeddings. Each model uses a *scoring function* $s : \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to associate a score $s(i, k, j)$ to each triple $(i, k, j) \in \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{E}$. The scores induce a ranking: triples with high scores are considered more likely to be true than triples with low scores. The scoring function depends on i, k , and j only through their respective embeddings e_i, r_k , and e_j . Roughly speaking, the models try to find embeddings that capture the structure of the entire knowledge graph well. Since embeddings constitute a form of compression, the models are forced to generalize so that new facts can be predicted.

In the following, we briefly review some recent embedding models for knowledge base completion. We focus throughout on the set of models investigated with respect to their expressiveness in Wang, Gemulla, and Li; Liu, Wu, and Yang (2018; 2017). This allows us to compare model expressiveness with empirical model performance. Many more models have been proposed in the literature; e.g. the neural models GCN (Schlichtkrull et al. 2018) and ConvE (Dettmers et al. 2018).

Embedding models. We subsequently write $R_k \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ (instead of r_k) for the embedding of relation k if it is best interpreted as a matrix. Then $d_R = d^2$; otherwise, $d_R = d$.

RESCAL (Nickel, Tresp, and Kriegel 2011) is the most general bilinear model and uses the scoring function $s(i, k, j) = e_i^T R_k e_j$. TransE (Bordes et al. 2013) is a translation-based model inspired by Word2Vec (Mikolov et al. 2013) and uses $s(i, k, j) = -\|e_i + r_k - e_j\|$ (using either l_1 or l_2 norm). DistMult (Yang et al. 2014; Carroll and Chang 1970) is a fairly constrained factorization model with scoring function $s(i, k, j) = e_i^T \text{diag}(r_k) e_j$. ComplEx (Trouillon et al. 2016) uses embeddings in the complex domain with scoring function $s(i, k, j) = \text{Real}(e_i^T \text{diag}(r_k) e_j)$, where $\text{Real}(\cdot)$ extracts the real part of a complex number. Analogy (Liu, Wu, and Yang 2017) uses the scoring function $s(i, k, j) = e_i^T R_k e_j$ of RESCAL, but constrains $R_k \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ to a block diagonal matrix in which each block is either a real scalar or a 2×2 matrix of form $\begin{pmatrix} x & -y \\ y & x \end{pmatrix}$ with $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$.

Unlike RESCAL, Analogy and ComplEx, DistMult and TransE are restricted models in that they cannot represent any given knowledge base. See Sec. 3.2 for more details.

3 Evaluation Protocols

Previous work questioned the effectiveness of the benchmark datasets (Toutanova and Chen 2015; Dettmers et al. 2018). In contrast, in this section we point out the issues with the current evaluation protocols for KBC. To this end, we first review two widely used evaluation protocols. We then argue that these protocols are not well-suited for assessing KBC performance, because they focus on a small subset of all possible facts for a given relation, and thus the overall precision of the models is not reflected in the results. To illustrate this point, we describe the PR protocol and argue why it is more suitable for KBC.

3.1 Current Evaluation Protocols

Most studies use the triple classification (TC) and the entity ranking (ER) protocols to assess model performance, where ER is arguably the most widely adopted protocol. We assume throughout that only true but no false triples are available (as is commonly the case), and that these triples are divided into training, validation, and test triples. The union of these three sets acts as a proxy of the entire KB, which is unknown due to incompleteness.

Triple classification (TC). The goal of TC is to test the model’s ability to discriminate between true and false triples (Socher et al. 2013). Since only true triples are available in practice, pseudo-negative triples are generated by randomly replacing either the subject or the object of each test triple by another random entity that appears as a subject or object, respectively. Each resulting triple is then classified as positive or negative. In particular, triple (i, k, j) is classified as positive if its score $s(i, k, j)$ exceeds a relation-specific decision threshold σ_k (learned on validation data using the same procedure). Model performance is assessed by its accuracy, i.e., how many triples are classified correctly.




Figure 1: Triples considered during the evaluation by both protocols. In ER, the evaluation is performed for each test triple separately. In PR, all test triples for a given relation are considered simultaneously.

Entity ranking (ER). The goal of ER is to assess model performance in terms of ranking answers to certain questions. In particular, for each test triple $t = (i, k, j)$, two questions $q_s = (?, k, j)$ and $q_o = (i, k, ?)$ are generated. For question q_s , all entities $i' \in \mathcal{E}$ are ranked based on the score $s(i', k, j)$. To avoid misleading results, entities i' that correspond to observed triples in the dataset (i.e., (i', k, j) in train/validate) are discarded to obtain a *filtered ranking*. The same process is applied for question q_o . Model performance is evaluated based on the recorded positions of the test triples in the filtered ranking. The intuition is that models that rank test triples (which are known to be true) higher are expected to be superior. Usually, the micro-average of *filtered Hits@K*—i.e., the proportion of test triples ranking in the top- K —and *filtered MRR*—i.e., the mean reciprocal rank of the test triples—are reported. Figure 1a provides a pictorial view of ER for a single relation. Given the score matrix of a relation k , where s_{ij} is the score of triple (i, k, j) , a single test triple is shown in green, all candidate triples considered during the evaluation are shown in blue, and all triples observed in the training, validation and testing sets (not considered during evaluation) are shown in grey.

3.2 Discussion

Regarding triple classification, Wang, Gemulla, and Li (2018) found that most models achieve an accuracy of at least 93%. This is due to the fact that negative triples with high score are rarely sampled as pseudo-negative triples

because of the large number of entities from which the single replacement entity is picked for a given test triple. This means that most classification tasks are “easy”. Consequently, the accuracy of triple classification overestimates model performance for KBC tasks. This protocol is less adopted in recent work.

We argue that ER also overestimates model performance for KBC. In particular, the protocol is more appropriate to evaluate question answering tasks. Since ER generates questions from true test triples, it only asks questions that are *known to have an answer*. The question itself leaks this information from the test data into the evaluation. This is fine for QA, where the assumption that only “sensible” questions are asked is suitable. In KBC, however, our goal is to infer missing triples with high precision. Consequently, models need to assess every candidate triple, even nonsensical ones such as (*Algorithms to Live By*, *visit*, *Turing Award*), because they should be accurate on these as well.

To better illustrate why ER can lead to misleading results, consider the DistMult model and the asymmetric relation *nominatedFor*. As described in Sec. 2, DistMult models all relations as symmetric in that $s(i, k, j) = s(j, k, i)$. Now consider triple $t = (H. Simon, nominatedFor, Nobel Prize)$, and let us suppose that the model successfully assigns t a high score $s(t)$. Then the inverse triple $t' = (Nobel Prize, nominatedFor, H. Simon)$ will also obtain a high score since $s(t') = s(t)$. Thus, if we use DistMult for KBC, either both or none of these triples will be added to the KB: in each case, we make an error. In ER, however, we never ask a question about t' since there is no test triple for this relation containing either *Nobel Prize* as subject or *Herbert Simon* as object, so these errors made by DistMult do not affect its overall performance. Thus the symmetry property of DistMult does not influence the result.

For another example, consider TransE and the lexical relation $k = derivationally\ related\ form$, which is symmetric but not reflexive. One can show that for all (i, k, j) , the TransE scores satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} s(i, k, j) + s(j, k, i) &= -\|e_i + r_k - e_j\| - \|e_j + r_k - e_i\| \\ &\leq -\|e_i + \mathbf{0} - e_j\| - \|e_j + \mathbf{0} - e_i\|. \end{aligned}$$

Since for symmetric relations TransE aims to assign high scores to both (i, k, j) and (j, k, i) , TransE has the tendency to push the relation embedding r_k towards $\mathbf{0}$ as well as e_i and e_j towards each other. But when $r_k \approx \mathbf{0}$, then $s(i, k, i)$ is large so that the relation is treated as if it were reflexive. Again, in ER, this property only slightly influences the results: only one “reflexive” tuple is in each filtered entity list so that the correct answer i for question $(?, k, j)$ ranks at most one position lower. The same reasoning applies to question $(i, k, ?)$.

In summary, since a high score implies high truthfulness, it is crucial to consider the errors introduced by negative triples with high scores when evaluating KBC performance, otherwise we could get a misleading impression of a model’s precision. The current evaluation protocols may systematically ignore high-scored false triples, thereby potentially overestimating model performance.

3.3 Entity-Pair Ranking Protocol

To study the overestimation effect of current evaluation protocols, we used an evaluation protocol for KBC termed *entity-pair ranking* (PR). PR is simple: for each relation k , we ask question $(?, k, ?)$. As before, we use the model to rank all answers, i.e., pairs of entities, and filter out training and validation data in the ranking so as to rank only triples not used during model training. In this way, any negative triples with a high score will appear at a top position, making it harder for true triples to rank high. Figure 1b shows the contrast between the number of negative triples considered for entity-pair and those considered for ER. Again, test triples are shown in green, candidate triples are shown in blue, and triples observed during training and validation are shown in grey. The number of candidates is much higher than those considered for ER. However, when answering the question $(?, k, ?)$ with all possible entity pairs, all test triples for relation k will be ranked simultaneously. Let $|\mathcal{T}_k|$ be the number of test triples in k . ER needs to consider in total $2 \cdot |\mathcal{T}_k| \cdot |\mathcal{E}|$ candidates for k , while PR needs to consider $|\mathcal{E}|^2$ candidates.

Since all test triples in relation k are considered at once, we do not rely on MRR for PR, but consider weighted $MAP@K$, i.e., weighted mean average precision in the top- K filtered results, and weighted $Hits@K$, i.e., weighted percentage of test triples in the top- K filtered results. For a fixed K , the weights for each relation k are proportional to the number of test triples $|\mathcal{T}_k|$ and upper bounded by K :

$$MAP@K = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{R}} MAP_k@K \times \frac{\min(K, |\mathcal{T}_k|)}{\sum_{k' \in \mathcal{R}} \min(K, |\mathcal{T}_{k'}|)}$$

$$Hits@K = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{R}} Hits_k@K \times \frac{\min(K, |\mathcal{T}_k|)}{\sum_{k' \in \mathcal{R}} \min(K, |\mathcal{T}_{k'}|)}$$

where $MAP_k@K$ is the mean average precision of the top- K list with respect to the test tuples and $Hits_k@K$ corresponds to the ratio of test triples in the top K (i.e., $(\# \text{ test triples in top-}K) / \min(K, |\mathcal{T}_k|)$). In a nutshell, infrequent relations are not treated the same as frequent ones during evaluation due to the weighting factor.

Note that all evaluation methods for KBC may underestimate model performance. This happens when models rank unobserved true triples (neither in train/validate/test) high. This behaviour is generally unavoidable for any protocol without further background knowledge or manual labelling. We empirically study underestimation in PR in Sec. 4.4.

Computational effort. One concern about the entity-pair ranking protocol is its potentially large cost. There are $|\mathcal{E}|^2$ possible entity pairs to consider per relation, and it may be infeasible to compute the score of all these pairs when there is a large number of entities. Note, however, that the protocol only makes use of the high-scoring entity pairs. Such entity pairs may be determined more efficiently, e.g., using techniques for maximum inner-product search such as Shrivastava and Li (2014) or by exploiting available background knowledge as in Sec. 4.5. Although we did not run into

Dataset	$ \mathcal{E} $	$ \mathcal{R} $	$ \mathcal{T}^{train} $	$ \mathcal{T}^{val} $	$ \mathcal{T}^{test} $
FB15K	14 951	1 345	483 142	50 000	59 071
FB-237	14 505	237	272 115	17 535	20 466
WN18	40 943	18	141 442	5 000	5 000
WNRR	40 559	11	86 835	2 824	2 924

Table 1: Dataset statistics

performance issues in our experimental study, more work into efficient retrieval methods is needed to support larger datasets. In general, if we cannot determine high-scoring triples from a particular embedding model, then that embedding model may not be suitable for KBC in the first place.

4 Experimental Study

We conducted an experimental study to compare the performance of various embedding models under ER and PR. Our goal was not to determine which model currently works best, but rather to compare both evaluation protocols. In addition, we investigated the extent to which the underestimation effect due to unobserved triples affects PR. Finally, to determine whether the results provided by PR were mostly due to the high number of nonsensical triples, we used background knowledge to study the performance of models when filtering out most nonsensical triples. All datasets, experimental results, and source code will be made publicly available.

4.1 Experimental Setup

Datasets. We use four common KBC benchmark datasets: FB15K, WN18, FB-237, and WNRR. The first two are subsets of WordNet and Freebase, respectively (Bordes et al. 2013), and it is known that simple rule-based models perform well under ER on these datasets (Dettmers et al. 2018; Meilicke et al. 2018). We will see that despite their simplicity, these datasets can still shed some light on the behavior of various models under PR. FB-237 is constructed from FB15K to make the dataset more challenging (Toutanova et al. 2015). Let $\mathcal{T}^{train}, \mathcal{T}^{val}, \mathcal{T}^{test}$ be the training, validation, and test data, resp. Then FB-237 is obtained from FB15k by removing inverse relations and by ensuring that whenever $(i, k, j) \in \mathcal{T}^{test} \cup \mathcal{T}^{val}$, $(i, k', j) \notin \mathcal{T}^{train}$ for all $k' \neq k$. WNRR is constructed from WN18 by following the same procedure. Key dataset statistics are summarized in Table 1. Interestingly, the latter two datasets were created when considering the former two datasets unsuitable for the task. Conversely, we suggest that independent of the dataset, the standard evaluation protocol is unsuitable.

Negative sampling. Since we are only given true but no false triples, embedding models are usually trained using a negative sampling strategy to obtain pseudo-negative triples (Nickel et al. 2016). We consider two sampling strategies in our experiments:

Perturb 1: For each training triple $t = (i, k, j)$, sample each pseudo-negative triple by randomly replacing either i or j by a random entity (such that the resulting triple is unobserved). This ensures that at least one entity is observed in

Dataset	FB15K		FB-237		WN18		WNRR	
Model	MRR (%)	Hits@K (%)	MRR (%)	Hits@K (%)	MRR (%)	Hits@K (%)	MRR (%)	Hits@K (%)
DistMult	59.0	76.4	27.0	43.2	79.0	93.7	43.2	47.4
TransE	50.0	77.7	28.0	46.6	62.0	82.5	22.0	49.1
ComplEx	59.0	75.6	28.0	43.5	94.0	94.9	44.0	48.1
Analogy	59.0	75.8	27.0	43.3	94.1	94.9	44.0	48.6
RESCAL	42.0	67.3	27.0	42.7	92.0	93.9	42.0	44.7

Table 2: Results with the commonly used entity ranking protocol (ER) ($K = 10$)

Dataset	FB15K		FB-237		WN18		WNRR	
Model	MAP@K (%)	Hits@K (%)	MAP@K (%)	Hits@K (%)	MAP@K (%)	Hits@K (%)	MAP@K (%)	Hits@K (%)
DistMult	1.3	10.6	0.3	3.9	8.0	9.8	14.2	18.0
TransE	21.2	36.3	7.9	17.6	5.8	12.4	0.0	0.6
ComplEx	14.5	31.5	7.1	16.6	58.9	76.8	16.9	20.1
Analogy	14.1	32.6	5.0	14.4	60.6	73.6	15.5	20.0
RESCAL	10.9	21.0	6.8	15.1	48.6	61.3	14.2	18.0

Table 3: Results with the proposed entity-pair ranking protocol (PR) ($K = 100$)

the training data of relation k , which to some extent avoids nonsensical pseudo-negative triples. This sampling is commonly used and matches ER, which is based on questions $(?, k, j)$ and $(i, k, ?)$.

Perturb 2: For each training triple $t = (i, k, j)$, sample pseudo-negative triples by sampling random unobserved tuples from relation k . This method produces many nonsensical negative triples, but is more suited to KBC, which is based on the question $(?, k, ?)$.

Training and implementation. We trained all models as in previous work (Trouillon et al. 2016; Liu, Wu, and Yang 2017). In particular, we used AdaGrad (Duchi, Hazan, and Singer 2011) as an optimizer and trained DistMult, ComplEx, Analogy and RESCAL with binary cross-entropy loss, which works well in practice. TransE always produces negative scores, so it is unclear how to train it with cross-entropy loss in a principled way. We thus used pair-wise ranking loss with margin $\gamma \geq 0$ as in Bordes et al. (2013).

Implementation. We implemented all models on top of the code from Liu, Wu, and Yang (2017)² in C++ using OpenMP. The evaluation protocols were written in Python with Bottleneck³.

Hyperparameters. We trained all models only on the training data. The best hyperparameters are selected based on MRR (for ER) and MAP@100 (for PR) on the validation data. For both protocols, we performed an exhaustive grid search over the following hyperparameter settings: $d \in \{100, 150, 200\}$ ($d \in \{100, 150\}$ for RESCAL), learning rate $\eta \in \{0.01, 0.1\}$, weight of l_2 -regularization $\lambda \in \{0.1, 0.01, 0.001\}$, negative sampling strategies *Perturb1* and *Perturb2*, and margin hyperparameter $\gamma \in$

$\{0.5, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$ for TransE. For each training triple, we sampled 6 pseudo-negative triples. To keep effort tractable, we only used the most frequent relations from each dataset for hyperparameter tuning (top-5, top-5, top-15, and top-30 most frequent relations for WN18, WNRR, FB-237 and FB-15k respectively).⁴ We trained each model for up to 500 epochs during grid search (1800 for TransE)⁵. In all cases, we used early stopping, i.e., we evaluated model performance every 50 epochs (300 for TransE) and used the overall best-performing model. The best hyperparameters for both evaluation protocols are reported in the online material. We found that *Perturb-2* can indeed be useful in both protocols.

4.2 Results with Entity Ranking Protocol

Table 2 summarizes our results with ER.⁶ Regarding Hits@10, the performance of all models is quite similar on all datasets, except for RESCAL in FB15K, and TransE in WN18. Notice that even the results of the more restricted models (TransE and DistMult) are competitive. Regarding MRR, either one or both of the more restricted models show competitive results in the datasets, except in WN18. Due to such results, DistMult is considered a state-of-the-art model for KBC (Kadlec, Bajgar, and Kleindienst 2017). This seems counterintuitive (especially considering the more difficult datasets), since DistMult can only model symmetric relations, but most relations in these datasets are asymmetric. Regarding TransE, while its MRR was relatively low on WN18 and WNRR, it still achieved great performance in Hits@10. Again, this is counterintuitive because WN18 contains a large amount of symmetric relations, so it should be difficult for TransE to achieve good results. These observations indicate that ER may not be well-suited for KBC.

⁴All datasets are highly skewed.

⁵Chosen such that models are usually converged.

⁶Differences with previously reported results are due to differences in hyperparameter tuning and negative sampling strategy.

²<https://github.com/quark0/ANALOGY>

³<https://pypi.org/project/Bottleneck/>

Relation	Model				
	DistMult	TransE	ComplEx	Analogy	RESCAL
<i>hyponymy</i>	1 (1)	18 (32)	99 (99)	99 (99)	92 (93)
<i>hypernymy</i>	0 (0)	5 (33)	99 (99)	99 (99)	96 (98)
<i>derivationally related form</i>	100 (100)	0 (0)	100 (100)	100 (100)	6 (68)
<i>member meronym</i>	0 (0)	18 (41)	74 (84)	83 (85)	44 (63)
<i>member holonym</i>	0 (0)	16 (47)	74 (83)	83 (85)	37 (54)

Table 4: Number of test triples in the top-100 filtered predictions on WN18. An estimate of the number of true triples in the top-100 list is given in parentheses.

4.3 Results of Entity-Pair Ranking Protocol

The evaluation results of PR with $K = 100$ are summarized in Table 3. Note that Tables 2 and 3 are not directly comparable, because PR considers all test triples for a given relation simultaneously. Consequently, it is more difficult to rank at the top in PR, so we chose $K > 10$. Performance for different values of K are reported in Fig. 2. Also, recall that for ER we compute MRR, while for PR we compute MAP, as explained in Sec. 3.3. The effect of the choice of K is discussed later in this section.

Observe that the performance of all models is unsatisfactory on all datasets. For example, DistMult’s Hits@100 is 8.1% on FB15K, meaning that if we add the top 100 ranked triples to the KB, over 90% of what is added is likely false. Even when using ComplEx, the best model on FB15K, we would potentially add more than 70% false triples. The notable exceptions are Analogy and ComplEx on WN18. Relatively speaking, TransE and DistMult did not achieve competitive results on WN18. In addition, DistMult did not achieve competitive results on FB15K and FB-237 and TransE did not achieve competitive results in WNRR. When considering all datasets, there was no single model which outperformed all others. In general, ComplEx and Analogy achieved consistently better results across different datasets than other models. But even the performance of these models was often not satisfactory. This suggests that better models and/or training strategies are needed.

To better understand the behavior of TransE and DistMult, we investigated their performance on the top-5 most frequent relations on WN18. Table 4 shows the number of test triples appearing in the top-100 for each relation (after filtering triples from the training and validation sets). The numbers in parentheses are discussed in Section 4.4.

We found that DistMult worked well on the symmetric relation *derivationally related form*, where its symmetry assumption clearly helps. Here 93% of the training data consists of symmetric pairs (i.e., (i, k, j) and (j, k, i)), and 88% of the test triples have its symmetric counterpart in the training set. In contrast, TransE finds no test triples for *derivationally related form* in the top-100 list. We found that the norm of the embedding vector of this relation was 0.1, which was considerably smaller than for the other relations (avg. 1.4). This supports our argument that TransE has a tendency to push symmetric relations embeddings to 0.

Note that while *hyponymy*, *hypernymy*, *member meronym* and *member holonym* are semantically transitive, the dataset contains almost exclusively their transitive core. As a re-

sult, the models do not “see” their transitivity. This may explain why TransE performs better for these relations than for *derivationally related form*. DistMult did not perform well on these relations (they are asymmetric). ComplEx and Analogy showed superior performance across all relations. RESCAL is in between, most likely due to difficulties in finding a good parameterization. However, it is unclear why TransE performs well on FB15K and FB-237.

To investigate the performance of models for different values of K , we give the curves of Hits@ K as a function of K for all datasets in Fig. 2.⁷ ComplEx and Analogy performed best for large K . As noted before, TransE works the best for small values of K on FB15K and FB-237.

Regarding runtimes, we found that PR is 3 to 4 times slower than ER, but still manageable for these datasets (30~90 minutes in general).

4.4 Influence of Unobserved True Triples

Since all datasets are based on incomplete knowledge bases, evaluation protocols may systematically underestimate model performance. For ranking-based evaluations in particular, a true triple that is neither in the training, nor validation, nor test data may be ranked high by some model, but we treat that triple as negative during the evaluation. To explore the underestimation effect in PR, we decoded the unobserved triples in the top-100 predictions of the 5 most frequent relations of WN18. We then checked whether those triples are implied by the symmetry and transitivity properties of each relation.⁸ In Table 4, we give the resulting number of triples in parentheses (i.e., number of test triples + implied triples). We observed that underestimation indeed happened. TransE was mostly affected, but still did not lead to competitive results when compared to ComplEx and Analogy. This suggests that (1) underestimation is indeed a concern, and (2) the results reported by the PR can nevertheless give an indication of relative model performance.

4.5 Type Filtering

When background knowledge (BK) is available, embedding models only need to predict triples consistent with this BK. We explored whether model performance can be improved with filtering out nonsensical triples from each model’s predictions. This should also help reduce computational costs.

⁷Curves of MAP@ K can be found in the online appendix.

⁸To do so, we computed the symmetric/transitive closure of the available data in the entire WordNet knowledge base.




Figure 2: Hits@K with PR as a function of K

In particular, we investigated how model performance is affected when we filter out predictions that violate type constraints (domain and range of each relation). If a model performance improves with such type filtering, it must have ranked tuples with incorrect types high in the first place. We can thus assess to what extent models capture entity types as well as the domain and range of the relations.

Data	Model	MAP@K (%)	Hits@K (%)
FB15K	DistMult	13.5 (+12.6)	28.0 (+19.9)
	TransE	20.1 (+4.6)	35.1 (+4.8)
	Complex	28.7 (+16.5)	48.3 (+20.9)
	Analogy	16.9 (+8.6)	33.2 (+10.5)
	RESCAL	17.2 (+7.9)	31.2 (+12.7)
FB-237	DistMult	10.3 (+10.0)	19.0 (+14.9)
	TransE	10.3 (+4.0)	18.8 (+4.1)
	Complex	10.3 (+4.5)	20.0 (+5.6)
	Analogy	10.8 (+5.5)	20.8 (+6.4)
	RESCAL	10.0 (+3.3)	18.9 (+4.2)

Table 5: Results with PR using type filtering (K = 100).

We extracted from Freebase type definitions for entities and domain and range constraints for relations. We also added the domain (or range) of a relation k to the type set of each subject (or object) entity which appeared in k . We obtained types for all entities in both FB datasets, and domain/range specifications for roughly 93% of relations in FB15K and 97% of relations in FB-237. The remaining relations were evaluated as before.

We report in Table 5 the Hits@100 and MAP@100 as well as their absolute improvement (in parentheses) w.r.t. Table 3. The results show that all models improve by type filtering; thus all models do predict triples with incorrect types. In particular, DistMult shows considerable improvement on both datasets. Indeed, about 90% of the relations in FB15K (about 85% for FB-237) have a different type for their domain and range. As DistMult treats all relations as symmetric, it introduces a wrong triple for each true triple into the top- K list on these relations; type filtering allows us to ignore these wrong tuples. This is also consistent with DistMult’s improved performance under ER, where type constraints are implicitly used since only questions with correct types are considered. We also observed that Complex improved considerably on FB15K, although it is unclear why this is the case. On FB15K, the relative ranking of the models with type filtering is roughly equal to the one without type filtering. On the harder FB-237 dataset, all models now perform similarly. Finally, due to the reduction in the number of candidates, the average evaluation time was reduced to about 30% of the time required without BK.

5 Conclusion

We investigated the question of whether current embedding models provide good results for the knowledge base completion task. We found that the entity ranking evaluation protocol that is currently widely used is tailored to question answering, but may give a misleading picture of each model’s performance with respect to knowledge base completion, where the aim is high precision. We tested a new and simple evaluation protocol with KBC in mind and evaluated a number of state-of-the-art models under this protocol. We found that most models did not produce satisfactory results. This suggests that more research into embedding models and training methods is needed to assess whether, when, and how KB embedding models can provide high-quality results.

References

- Agirre, E.; de Lacalle, O. L.; and Soroa, A. 2014. Random walks for knowledge-based word sense disambiguation. *Computational Linguistics* 40(1):57–84.
- Auer, S.; Bizer, C.; Kobilarov, G.; Lehmann, J.; Cyganiak, R.; and Ives, Z. G. 2007. Dbpedia: A nucleus for a web of open data. In *International Semantic Web Conference, ISWC*, 722–735.
- Bordes, A.; Usunier, N.; García-Durán, A.; Weston, J.; and Yakhnenko, O. 2013. Translating embeddings for modeling multi-relational data. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS*, 2787–2795.
- Carroll, J. D., and Chang, J.-J. 1970. Analysis of individual differences in multidimensional scaling via an n-way generalization of “eckart-young” decomposition. *Psychometrika* 35(3):283–319.
- Dettmers, T.; Minervini, P.; Stenetorp, P.; and Riedel, S. 2018. Convolutional 2d knowledge graph embeddings. In *Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence, AAAI*.
- Duchi, J. C.; Hazan, E.; and Singer, Y. 2011. Adaptive subgradient methods for online learning and stochastic optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 12:2121–2159.
- Guu, K.; Miller, J.; and Liang, P. 2015. Traversing knowledge graphs in vector space. In *Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP*, 318–327.
- Joulin, A.; Grave, E.; Bojanowski, P.; Nickel, M.; and Mikolov, T. 2017. Fast linear model for knowledge graph embeddings. *CoRR* abs/1710.10881.
- Kadlec, R.; Bajgar, O.; and Kleindienst, J. 2017. Knowledge base completion: Baselines strike back. In *Workshop on Representation Learning for NLP, , PRep4NLP@ACL*, 69–74.
- Liu, H.; Wu, Y.; and Yang, Y. 2017. Analogical inference for multi-relational embeddings. In *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML*, 2168–2178.
- Meilicke, C.; Fink, M.; Wang, Y.; Ruffinelli, D.; Gemulla, R.; and Stuckenschmidt, H. 2018. Fine-grained evaluation of rule- and embedding-based systems for knowledge graph completion. In *International Semantic Web Conference, ISWC*.
- Mikolov, T.; Sutskever, I.; Chen, K.; Corrado, G. S.; and Dean, J. 2013. Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. 3111–3119.
- Nickel, M.; Murphy, K.; Tresp, V.; and Gabrilovich, E. 2016. A review of relational machine learning for knowledge graphs. *Proceedings of the IEEE* 104(1):11–33.
- Nickel, M.; Tresp, V.; and Kriegel, H. 2011. A three-way model for collective learning on multi-relational data. In *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML*, 809–816.
- Rebele, T.; Suchanek, F. M.; Hoffart, J.; Biega, J.; Kuzey, E.; and Weikum, G. 2016. YAGO: A multilingual knowledge base from wikipedia, wordnet, and geonames. In *International Semantic Web Conference, ISWC*, 177–185.
- Schlichtkrull, M. S.; Kipf, T. N.; Bloem, P.; van den Berg, R.; Titov, I.; and Welling, M. 2018. Modeling relational data with graph convolutional networks. volume *Extended Semantic Web Conference, ESWC*.
- Shrivastava, A., and Li, P. 2014. Asymmetric LSH (ALSH) for sublinear time maximum inner product search (MIPS). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS*, 2321–2329.
- Socher, R.; Chen, D.; Manning, C. D.; and Ng, A. Y. 2013. Reasoning with neural tensor networks for knowledge base completion. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 926–934.
- Suchanek, F. M.; Kasneci, G.; and Weikum, G. 2008. Yago: A large ontology from wikipedia and wordnet. *Web Semantics: Science, Services and Agents on the World Wide Web* 6(3):203–217.
- Toutanova, K., and Chen, D. 2015. Observed versus latent features for knowledge base and text inference. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Continuous Vector Space Models and their Compositionality*, 57–66.
- Toutanova, K.; Chen, D.; Pantel, P.; Poon, H.; Choudhury, P.; and Gamon, M. 2015. Representing text for joint embedding of text and knowledge bases. In *Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP*, 1499–1509.
- Trouillon, T.; Welbl, J.; Riedel, S.; Gaussier, É.; and Bouchard, G. 2016. Complex embeddings for simple link prediction. In *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML*, 2071–2080.
- Wang, Y.; Gemulla, R.; and Li, H. 2018. On multi-relational link prediction with bilinear models. In *Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence, AAAI*.
- Wang, X.; Ye, Y.; and Gupta, A. 2018. Zero-shot recognition via semantic embeddings and knowledge graphs. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR*.
- West, R.; Gabrilovich, E.; Murphy, K.; Sun, S.; Gupta, R.; and Lin, D. 2014. Knowledge base completion via search-based question answering. In *International World Wide Web Conference, WWW*, 515–526.
- Xu, K.; Reddy, S.; Feng, Y.; Huang, S.; and Zhao, D. 2016. Question answering on freebase via relation extraction and textual evidence. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL*.
- Yang, B.; Yih, W.; He, X.; Gao, J.; and Deng, L. 2014. Embedding entities and relations for learning and inference in knowledge bases. *CoRR* International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR.

A Supplementary Material

A.1 Hyperparameters of best models


Data	Model	d	η	λ	γ	Perturb
FB15K	DistMult	200	0.1	0.01	-	1
	TransE $_{l_1}$	100	0.1	-	2.0	1
	ComplEx	200	0.1	0.01	-	1
	Analogy	200	0.1	0.01	-	1
	RESCAL	150	0.1	0.1	-	1
FB-237	DistMult	200	0.1	0.01	-	2
	TransE $_{l_1}$	100	0.1	-	4.0	1
	ComplEx	200	0.1	0.01	-	2
	Analogy	200	0.1	0.01	-	2
	RESCAL	150	0.1	0.001	-	1
WN18	DistMult	100	0.1	0.01	-	1
	TransE $_{l_1}$	100	0.01	-	3.0	2
	ComplEx	150	0.1	0.1	-	1
	Analogy	200	0.1	0.1	-	1
	RESCAL	100	0.1	0.01	-	1
WNRR	DistMult	200	0.01	0.001	-	1
	TransE $_{l_1}$	200	0.01	-	2.0	2
	ComplEx	200	0.01	0.01	-	1
	Analogy	200	0.01	0.01	-	1
	RESCAL	100	0.1	0.1	-	1

Table 6: Hyperparameters for best models in ER


Data	Model	d	η	λ	γ	Perturb
FB15K	DistMult	200	0.1	0.001	-	2
	TransE $_{l_1}$	150	0.1	-	3.0	1
	ComplEx	200	0.1	0.001	-	2
	Analogy	200	0.1	0.001	-	2
	RESCAL	150	0.1	0.01	-	1
FB-237	DistMult	100	0.01	0.001	-	2
	TransE $_{l_1}$	200	0.1	-	4.0	1
	ComplEx	150	0.1	0.001	-	2
	Analogy	200	0.1	0.01	-	2
	RESCAL	200	0.1	0.1	-	1
WN18	DistMult	200	0.1	0.01	-	1
	TransE $_{l_1}$	150	0.1	-	4.0	2
	ComplEx	150	0.1	0.1	-	1
	Analogy	200	0.1	0.001	-	1
	RESCAL	150	0.1	0.01	-	1
WNRR	DistMult	100	0.1	0.001	-	1
	TransE $_{l_1}$	200	0.1	-	4.0	2
	ComplEx	200	0.1	0.001	-	1
	Analogy	200	0.1	0.001	-	1
	RESCAL	100	0.1	0.001	-	1

Table 7: Hyperparameters for best models in PR


A.2 MAP@K of best models




(a) FB15K



(b) FB-237



(c) WN18



(d) WNRR

Figure 3: MAP@K with PR as a function of K