

Fast-and-Frugal Text-Graph Transformers are Effective Link Predictors

Andrei C. Coman
Idiap Research Institute, EPFL
andrei.coman@idiap.ch

Christos Theodoropoulos
KU Leuven
christos.theodoropoulos@kuleuven.be

Marie-Francine Moens
KU Leuven
sien.moens@kuleuven.be

James Henderson
Idiap Research Institute
james.henderson@idiap.ch

Abstract

Link prediction models can benefit from incorporating textual descriptions of entities and relations, enabling fully inductive learning and flexibility in dynamic graphs. We address the challenge of also capturing rich structured information about the local neighbourhood of entities and their relations, by introducing a Transformer-based approach that effectively integrates textual descriptions with graph structure, reducing the reliance on resource-intensive text encoders. Our experiments on three challenging datasets show that our Fast-and-Frugal Text-Graph (FnF-TG) Transformers achieve superior performance compared to the previous state-of-the-art methods, while maintaining efficiency and scalability.

1 Introduction

Knowledge graphs (KGs) represent complex information as a structured collection of entities and their relationships. They are a fundamental component of various applications, including information extraction (Mintz et al., 2009; Bosselut et al., 2019; Theodoropoulos et al., 2021) and retrieval (Dalton et al., 2014; Gupta et al., 2019), question answering (Saxena et al., 2022; Yu et al., 2022; Coman et al., 2023a), reasoning (Zhang et al., 2020; Jiang et al., 2022; Niu et al., 2022), fact-aware language modelling (Logan et al., 2019; Yang et al., 2023), and many others (Fensel et al., 2020; Schneider et al., 2022). KGs typically include both a graph structure where the entities are nodes and the relations are edges, where each node and edge has a corresponding textual descriptions. This hybrid nature makes modelling them interesting and challenging.

Initial attempts to model KGs focused on their graph nature, typically addressing a *transductive* setting (Bordes et al., 2013; Nickel et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2017). These models could only make predictions for entities observed during training and only considered the structural information of

the KG, ignoring any textual information associated with the entities.

To overcome this limitation, later work focused on using the textual descriptions in KGs to address an *inductive* setting (Xie et al., 2016; Shi and Weninger, 2018; Wang et al., 2021b), meaning that predictions can be made even for entities not observed during training, using entity representations computed based on their textual descriptions.

Combining information from textual descriptions and graph structures has proven crucial (Schlichtkrull et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2020b). The local neighbourhood of an entity provides valuable context, disambiguating its role and distinguishing it from other entities with similar textual descriptions. While there has been progress in leveraging the local neighbourhood, we believe that there is significant room for more effective approaches.

Modelling KGs in an inductive setting by integrating textual descriptions with graph structure still faces a number of challenges. One challenge is that previous models fail to leverage the textual descriptions of relations. They still assume a fixed inventory of relations, meaning that they cannot handle relations which they did not see during training and thus are not fully inductive. Another challenge is that text encoders are resource-intensive, especially when the textual descriptions of both entities and their neighbours need to be encoded, leading to considerably increased training and inference time (Markowitz et al., 2022). A third challenge is the fundamental problem of the effective integration of both text and graph structure in embeddings for KG modelling.

To address this latter fundamental challenge, in this paper we leverage recent advances in using Transformers (Vaswani et al., 2017) for graph encoding (Mohammadshahi and Henderson, 2021; Henderson et al., 2023; Coman et al., 2023b). This method exploits the inherent graph processing abilities of a Transformer’s self-attention mechanism,

arXiv:2408.06778v1 [cs.CL] 13 Aug 2024

while maintaining its excellent ability to model the semantic content of text.

We propose an extension of this method to address the challenge of being fully inductive, by computing a relation embedding from the text describing that relation. This computed embedding is then used as the relation label which is input to the self-attention mechanism.

We demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed model on three challenging datasets for KG link prediction from the experimental setting of [Daza et al. \(2021\)](#) and [Wang et al. \(2021b\)](#), and show that it improves over the state of the art (SOTA) in all cases. In additional experiments, we also show that this effective integration of the KG’s graph structure with its textual descriptions addresses the challenge of resource-intensive text encoders.

Compared to text-only models, our proposed model reduces reliance on large pretrained text encoders, maintaining competitive performance while drastically reducing training time. This leads to a series of models that we refer to Fast-and-Frugal Text-Graph Transformers (FnF-TG).

Contributions:

1. We propose a novel KG embedding model which leverages the intrinsic graph processing capabilities of Transformers to effectively capture the information in both the KG’s textual descriptions and the KG’s graph structure.
2. We propose Fast-and-Frugal Text-Graph (FnF-TG¹) Transformers which achieve new state-of-the-art results on three popular knowledge graph link prediction tasks, even with small and efficient text encoders.
3. We extend inductive KG learning to a fully inductive setting, where both entity and relation representations are computed as functions of their textual descriptions.
4. We conduct a controlled quantitative analysis of several properties of our and existing link prediction models to evaluate their performance and ensure fair comparisons.

2 Related Work

Transductive Link Prediction In the transductive setting, link prediction aims to identify miss-

ing links within a fixed and fully observable graph where all entities and their connections are known during training. Typically, it involves learning embeddings within a geometric space, as demonstrated by models like RESCAL ([Nickel et al., 2011](#)), NTN ([Socher et al., 2013](#)), TransE ([Bordes et al., 2013](#)), DistMult ([Yang et al., 2014](#)), ComplEx ([Trouillon et al., 2016](#)), TorusE ([Ebisu and Ichise, 2018](#)), RotatE ([Sun et al., 2019](#)), and Simple ([Kazemi and Poole, 2018](#)). Additionally, there are approaches that incorporate convolutional layers such as ConvE ([Dettmers et al., 2018](#)), HypER ([Balazevic et al., 2018](#)), ConvR ([Jiang et al., 2019](#)), and R-GCN ([Schlichtkrull et al., 2017](#)). Moreover, recent advancements have seen the integration of Transformers ([Vaswani et al., 2017](#)) in models such as CoKE ([Wang et al., 2019b](#)) and HittER ([Chen et al., 2021](#)).

Inductive Link Prediction In the inductive setting, link prediction involves predicting missing links in a dynamic graph where only partial information is available during training. Several pieces of work have explored leveraging partial knowledge between novel entities and those already present in the training graph ([Bhowmik and de Melo, 2020](#); [Wang et al., 2020a](#)). Examples include LAN ([Wang et al., 2019a](#)), IndTransE ([Dai et al., 2021](#)), OpenWorld ([Shah et al., 2019](#)), GraIL ([Teru et al., 2020](#)), NBFNet ([Zhu et al., 2021](#)), NodePiece ([Galkin et al., 2021](#)), and BERTRL ([Zha et al., 2021](#)). Moreover, approaches such as DKRL ([Xie et al., 2016](#)), Commonsense ([Malaviya et al., 2020](#)), KG-BERT ([Yao et al., 2019](#)), KEPLER ([Wang et al., 2021b](#)), BLP ([Daza et al., 2021](#)), StAR ([Wang et al., 2021a](#)), SimKGC ([Wang et al., 2022](#)), StATIK ([Markowitz et al., 2022](#)), and iHT ([Chen et al., 2023](#)) used language models to encode entities based on their textual descriptions. Among these, StATIK ([Markowitz et al., 2022](#)) stands out as it combines both a language model and a graph encoder, specifically employing a Message Passing Neural Network (MPNN) ([Gilmer et al., 2017](#)), to create entity embeddings, making it particularly relevant to our approach.

Transformers and Graphs Graph Transformers (GTs) represent a significant evolution in graph input methods within the Transformer architecture ([Henderson et al., 2023](#)). Early work such as G2GT ([Mohammadshahi and Henderson, 2020](#)) laid the foundation by incorporating explicit graphs into Transformer’s latent attention graph. Later ad-

¹Code will be made available upon publication.




Figure 1: Architecture of the proposed Fast-and-Frugal Text-Graph (FnF-TG) Transformer model. The *Knowledge Graph* contains a set of triples of type (h_{KG}, r_{KG}, t_{KG}) along with their corresponding textual descriptions. For each head h_{KG} and tail t_{KG} we extract their 1-hop local neighbourhood subgraphs, denoted as $S(h_{KG})$ and $S(t_{KG})$, respectively. The textual descriptions of the elements in the subgraph are first passed to the *Text Transformer Encoder*, which produces vector representations $(\mathbf{h}_{TT}, \mathbf{r}_{TT}, \mathbf{t}_{TT})$ together with subgraphs $S(\mathbf{h}_{TT})$, and $S(\mathbf{t}_{TT})$. The output of this module is then input into the *Graph Transformer Encoder*, which produces vector representations \mathbf{h}_{GT} and \mathbf{t}_{GT} . Finally, the *Link Prediction Objective* is applied to the combined representations $(\mathbf{h}_{GT}, \mathbf{r}_{TT}, \mathbf{t}_{GT})$.

vancements saw the introduction of RoFormer (Su et al., 2021), which utilises a rotation matrix to encode absolute positions, and Graphormer (Ying et al., 2021), which incorporates node centrality encoding and soft attention biases. Other models like SSAN (Xu et al., 2021), JointGT (Ke et al., 2021), TableFormer (Yang et al., 2022), and GADePo (Coman et al., 2023b) have successfully applied GTs to various tasks such as document-level relation extraction, knowledge-to-text generation, table-based question answering, and graph-aware declarative pooling.

We build upon these advances and show that GTs, when combined with an effective inductive bias in the input graph, achieve state-of-the-art performance on inductive link prediction tasks.

3 Background

3.1 Inductive Representation Learning

A knowledge graph that incorporates textual information can be defined as $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D})$ where \mathcal{E} represents the set of entities, \mathcal{R} denotes the set of relation labels, \mathcal{T} consists of the set of relation triples $(h, r, t) \in \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{E}$, and \mathcal{D} contains the textual descriptions associated with entities and relations. In each triple, h and t represent the head and tail entities, respectively, which are connected by a directional relation r . Inductive link prediction

involves completing missing triples in the graph by leveraging the textual descriptions associated with the entities and relations. The goal is to learn an embedder that maps these descriptions and the partial graph to a representation space where the missing triples can be inferred. Specifically, given a training graph $\mathcal{G}_{train} = (\mathcal{E}_{train}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}_{train}, \mathcal{D}_{train})$, where $\mathcal{E}_{train} \subset \mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{D}_{train} \subset \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{train} \subset \mathcal{T}$ only includes triples involving entities in \mathcal{E}_{train} , the goal is to infer the missing triples in $\mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}_{train}$. During evaluation, for a given query triple $\mathcal{T}_i = (h, r, t)$, the model is tasked with performing head or tail prediction on the graph $\mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{T}_i$. This involves two types of queries: tail prediction, where the query is of the form (h, r, \hat{e}) and head prediction, where the query is of the form (\hat{e}, r, t) . In both cases, the model must rank all possible candidate entities $\hat{e} \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}$ to identify the correct entity \hat{e}_t or \hat{e}_h and place it at the top of the ranked list.

3.2 Scoring and Loss Functions

For the inductive link prediction task, we adopt a margin-based ranking loss as our optimisation objective. We construct two sets of triples: a set of true triples T and a set of negative triples T' , where a negative triple consists of a corrupted version of a true triple with either the head or tail entity replaced by a random entity (target excluded) from the training minibatch. We define the scoring func-

tion f using the TransE (Bordes et al., 2013) model, which represents each triple (h, r, t) as:

$$f_{\text{TransE}}(h, r, t) = -\|\mathbf{h} + \mathbf{r} - \mathbf{t}\|_1$$

where \mathbf{h} , \mathbf{r} , and \mathbf{t} are the vector representations of the head entity, relation, and tail entity, respectively. The loss function is then defined as:

$$\text{Loss} = \sum_{(t,t') \in (T \times T')} \max(0, 1 - f(t) + f(t'))$$

where $f(t)$ and $f(t')$ are the scores assigned to the true triple t and the negative triple t' , respectively.

3.3 Evaluation and Metrics

Evaluation Scenarios We assess our models in two inductive scenarios, following Bordes et al. (2013). In the first setting, called *dynamic* evaluation, new entities may appear in the head or tail positions, and the candidates set is defined as $\hat{\mathcal{E}} = \mathcal{E}_{\text{train}} \cup \mathcal{E}_{\text{eval}}$. In the second setting, called *transfer* evaluation, both head and tail entities are new and unseen during training, and the candidates set is defined as $\hat{\mathcal{E}} = \mathcal{E}_{\text{eval}}$, where $\mathcal{E}_{\text{eval}}$ is disjoint from the training set of entities $\mathcal{E}_{\text{train}}$.

Metrics For each evaluation triple, we create two types of queries: (h, r, \hat{e}) for predicting tails and (\hat{e}, r, t) for predicting heads, where $\hat{e} \in \mathcal{E}$ represents all possible candidate entities, as described in Subsection 3.1. We rank candidate triples by their scores and evaluate the ranking of the correct triple. We report Mean Reciprocal Rank (MRR) and Hits@k (H@k) with $k \in \{1, 3, 10\}$ averaged across head and tail prediction tasks. We adopt the *filtered* setting as in Bordes et al. (2013), removing valid triples from the set of negative candidate triples when ranking candidate targets.

3.4 Proposed Architecture

Figure 1 shows the overall architecture of our proposed model. There are three main components: *Knowledge Graph* (KG), *Text Transformer Encoder* (TT) and *Graph Transformer Encoder* (GT).

Knowledge Graph The KG component contains a set of triples of type (h_{KG}, r_{KG}, t_{KG}) , along with their corresponding textual descriptions. For each head h_{KG} and tail t_{KG} , we also extract their 1-hop local neighbourhood subgraphs, denoted as $S(h_{KG})$ and $S(t_{KG})$, respectively. Then we encode each of these nodes with the text encoder,

discussed below. Specifically, for each centre entity, we encode its textual description, as well as encoding the textual descriptions of its neighbouring entities and the relations that connect the centre entity to its neighbours.

Text Transformer Encoder The textual descriptions from the KG module are passed to the *Text Transformer Encoder* (TT), which produces vector representations \mathbf{x}_{TT} for each entity and relation textual description x_{KG} in the subgraph. More formally, we apply the following function:

$$\mathbf{x}_{TT} = \sigma(\text{BERT}_{\text{SIZE}}(x_{KG})_{[\text{CLS}]}) \mathbf{W}_0 \mathbf{W}_1$$

where $\mathbf{W}_0, \mathbf{W}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ are two linear projection matrices and σ is the SiLU (Elfwing et al., 2017) activation function. We employ BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) as our encoder and use the [CLS] vector representation output by the encoder as the embedding. BERT_{SIZE} indicates that we employ different sizes of this model released by Turc et al. (2019).

When encoding candidate entities $\hat{e} \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}$, we simply pass the text associated with the entity through the TT component. However, when encoding queries (h, r, \hat{e}) and (\hat{e}, r, t) we condition h and t on the relation type r . Similarly to StAR (Wang et al., 2021a) and StATIK (Markowitz et al., 2022), for tail prediction queries (h, r, \hat{e}) we concatenate the text associated with h_{KG} and r_{KG} , resulting in $[h||r]_{KG}$. For head prediction queries (\hat{e}, r, t) , we create an inverse version of the relation text by prepending its textual description with the text "inverse of", denoted as r_{KG}^{-1} . We then concatenate the text associated with t_{KG} and r_{KG}^{-1} , resulting in $[t||r^{-1}]_{KG}$.

Graph Transformer Encoder The output of the TT component, together with the subgraphs $S(h_{TT})$ and $S(t_{TT})$ are then input to the *Graph Transformer Encoder* (GT), depicted in Figure 2. The input embedding for each node of the graph is the vector output by the TT encoder applied to the text associated with that entity. In addition, we add learnable segment embeddings to each node input, indicated as $s_{[\text{CENTRE}]}$ and $s_{[\text{NEIGHBOUR}]}$, to disambiguate between the centre and neighbour nodes in the subgraph. These embeddings indicate to the model which input nodes will be used subsequently as the embedding representation of the subgraph.

To encode the subgraph relations, we follow Mohammadshahi and Henderson (2021); Henderson et al. (2023); Coman et al. (2023b) in leveraging the




Figure 2: Graph Transformer Encoder. The subgraph $S(\text{Hans Zimmer})$ of the entity *Hans Zimmer* is input together with the node segment embeddings that disambiguate between the centre node and neighbour nodes.

intrinsic graph processing capabilities of the Transformer model by incorporating graph relations as relation embeddings input to the self-attention function. But unlike in that previous work, our relation embeddings are computed from the text associated with the relation, rather than coming from a fixed set of relations. For every pair of input nodes ij , the pre-softmax attention score $e_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$ is computed from both the respective node embeddings $\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and the embeddings of the relation r_{ij} between the i -th and j -th nodes, as:

$$e_{ij} = \frac{\mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{W}_Q \text{diag}(\mathbf{1} + \text{LN}(\mathbf{r}_{ij}) \mathbf{W}_R) (\mathbf{x}_j \mathbf{W}_K)^\top}{\sqrt{d}}$$

where $\mathbf{W}_Q, \mathbf{W}_K \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ represent the query and key matrices, respectively. \mathbf{r}_{ij} represents the relation embedding output by the TT module when it encodes the text associated with the relation between the i -th and j -th nodes, and $\mathbf{W}_R \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is the relation matrix. Thus, $\text{LN}(\mathbf{r}_{ij}) \mathbf{W}_R$ is the embedding of the relation between i and j , where LN stands for the *LayerNorm* operation. Finally, $\text{diag}(\mathbf{1} + \dots)$ maps this vector into a diagonal matrix plus the identity matrix.

When encoding candidate entities and queries in the GT, it is crucial to ensure that no information regarding the target triple (h, r, t) leaks into the $S(\hat{e})$, $S(\mathbf{h}_{TT})$, or $S(\mathbf{t}_{TT})$ subgraphs. This precaution prevents the model from learning trivial solutions or biases from leaked information.

4 Experiments

4.1 Datasets and Setting

The inductive variants of WN18RR (Dettmers et al., 2018) and FB15k-237 (Toutanova and Chen, 2015), introduced by Daza et al. (2021), simulate a dynamic environment where new entities and triples are dynamically added to the graph. The training graph is constructed as $\mathcal{G}_{train} = \{(h, r, t) \in \mathcal{T}_{train} : h, t \in \mathcal{E}_{train}\}$. The validation and test graphs are constructed by incrementally adding entities and triples, such that $\mathcal{G}_{val} = \{(h, r, t) \in \mathcal{T}_{val} : h, t \in \mathcal{E}_{train} \cup \mathcal{E}_{val}\}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{test} = \{(h, r, t) \in \mathcal{T}_{test} : h, t \in \mathcal{E}_{train} \cup \mathcal{E}_{val} \cup \mathcal{E}_{test}\}$.

In contrast, the Wikidata5M dataset curated by Wang et al. (2021b) provides a transfer learning scenario in which the evaluation sets are constructed such that the validation and test entity and triple sets, \mathcal{E}_{val} and \mathcal{E}_{test} , and \mathcal{T}_{val} and \mathcal{T}_{test} are disjoint from the training entity and triple set \mathcal{E}_{train} and \mathcal{T}_{train} . The validation and test graphs are constructed as $\mathcal{G}_{val} = \{(h, r, t) \in \mathcal{T}_{val} : h, t \in \mathcal{E}_{val}\}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{test} = \{(h, r, t) \in \mathcal{T}_{test} : h, t \in \mathcal{E}_{test}\}$. Because the graphs \mathcal{G}_{val} and \mathcal{G}_{test} do not include the entities from \mathcal{G}_{train} , they are much smaller graphs (see Appendix Table 5), which poses challenges for generalisation with graph-aware models, as will be discussed further below. We evaluate our model’s ability to generalise to entirely new entities and triples in this setting.

We conduct our experiments in the setting of Daza et al. (2021) and Wang et al. (2021b), where textual information extraction is an integral part. Our method is directly comparable to BLP (Daza et al., 2021), KEPLER (Wang et al., 2021b), StAR (Wang et al., 2021a), and the current SOTA method, StATIK (Markowitz et al., 2022). Similar to StATIK, our work aims to jointly model the text and the structure of knowledge graphs, including extracting information about KG links from the text. This sets us apart from the setting of Teru et al. (2020), which uses different datasets splits and is employed in GraIL (Teru et al., 2020), NBFNet (Zhu et al., 2021), and NodePiece (Galkin et al., 2021), that solely focus on utilising the structure of the graph without incorporating any textual information extraction component.

4.2 Controlled Experimental Setup

When comparing the performance of different models on link prediction tasks, it is important to establish a fair and consistent baseline. Our experiments

in Table 1 highlight the importance of carefully setting this baseline, as various factors can greatly influence the results. Specifically we demonstrate that the computational budget, which determines the batch size, as well as other factors such as negative sampling strategy, the number of negatives, and embedding dimension, can have a big impact on model performance.

The first model in Table 1 shows the test results obtained by the baseline model $\text{BLP}_{\text{BERT}_{\text{BASE}}}$ (Daza et al., 2021) on the WN18RR and FB15k-237 datasets using the experimental setting of Daza et al. (2021). We reimplement a similar baseline (indicated as $\text{BLP}_{\text{BERT}_{\text{BASE}}^{\bullet}}$) that closely matches the results reported by the authors. Both models employ $\text{BERT}_{\text{BASE}}$ for encoding the textual descriptions of the head h_{KG} and tail t_{KG} . Notably, relations r_{KG} are indexed in a fixed-sized learnable relations embedding matrix $R \in \mathbb{R}^{|r_{KG}| \times d}$ rather than being a function of their textual description.

MRR		
Model	WN18RR	FB15k-237
$\text{BLP}_{\text{BERT}_{\text{BASE}}}^*$	0.285	0.195
$\text{BLP}_{\text{BERT}_{\text{BASE}}}^{\bullet}$	0.280	0.205
+ inductive relations	0.281	0.219
+ negatives batch tying	0.300	0.221
+ bigger embedding size	0.339	0.254
+ bigger batch size	0.366	0.260
+ better sampling method	0.373	0.266
FnF-T$_{\text{BERT}_{\text{BASE}}}$ (ours)	0.373	0.266

Table 1: WN18RR and FB15k-237 test set results with cumulative additions over the baseline model $\text{BLP}_{\text{BERT}_{\text{BASE}}}$ that lead to our improved baseline model $\text{FnF-T}_{\text{BERT}_{\text{BASE}}}$. $\text{BLP}_{\text{BERT}_{\text{BASE}}}^{\bullet}$ indicates our reimplementation of BLP (Daza et al., 2021). *Results reported by Daza et al. (2021). See Subsection 4.2 for details.

Building upon this baseline, we cumulatively introduce new features. First, we incorporate inductive relations, where the relation embeddings become a function of their textual descriptions, rather than relying on a fixed relation matrix. This modification makes the model fully inductive, as all the triple elements are now a function of their corresponding textual description. We observe a slight improvement on WN18RR, from 0.280 to 0.281, and a more significant improvement on FB15k-237, from 0.205 to 0.219. The difference in improvement is likely due to the datasets’ characteristics (see Appendix Table 5). WN18RR has few relations with brief descriptions, while FB15k-237 has more relations with more descriptive texts, allowing the model to

better capture their nuances. Next, we investigate the impact of the number of negative triples on the model’s performance. We find that adjusting the initial 32 negative triples to match the batch size of 64, denoted as negatives batch tying in Table 1, has a significant positive effect. We observe a notable improvement on both datasets: WN18RR increases from 0.281 to 0.300, and FB15k-237 increases from 0.219 to 0.221. Furthermore, we explore the effect of increasing the embedding dimension d in the *Text Transformer Encoder*. By raising it from 128 to 768, we observe substantial improvements in both models. Specifically, the performance on WN18RR increases from 0.300 to 0.339, while on FB15k-237, it rises from 0.221 to 0.254. Additionally, we examine the impact of increasing the batch size on the model’s performance. We find that doubling the batch size from 64 to 128 yields further improvements. Specifically, the performance on WN18RR increases from 0.339 to 0.366, and on FB15k-237, it rises from 0.254 to 0.260. Lastly, we modify the negative sampling strategy to two-sided reflexive, where both head and tail entities are considered as potential negatives. This change leads to further improvements, with WN18RR increasing from 0.366 to 0.373 and FB15k-237 from 0.260 to 0.266. By doing so, the model is forced to be more selective and avoid obvious solutions, such as predicting its own entities as good candidates.

Our cumulative improvements have resulted in the development of a new text-only model baseline, $\text{FnF-T}_{\text{BERT}_{\text{BASE}}}$. It is important to note that none of the models in this table incorporate relation conditioning, specifically $[h||r]_{KG}$ and $[t||r^{-1}]_{KG}$, when encoding queries (h, r, \hat{e}) and (\hat{e}, r, t) .

To ensure a fair comparison, we fixed our computational budget to a constant in this paper, using a consumer-grade GPU (NVIDIA RTX3090 24GB). This allows for a consistent and reproducible experimental setup, enabling a more accurate assessment of performance. For more details, see Appendix A.

4.3 Link Prediction Results

As shown in the top half of Table 2, for both the WN18RR and the FB15k-237 datasets, our inductive relation embeddings and the enhanced controlled experimental setup result in improved text-only models. These models rely heavily on having powerful text encoders, as shown by the degradation in performance when using smaller versions of BERT as the text encoder.

Model	WN18RR				FB15k-237			
	MRR	H@1	H@3	H@10	MRR	H@1	H@3	H@10
<i>Text-Only Models</i>								
BOW* _{GloVe}	0.170	0.055	0.215	0.405	0.172	0.099	0.188	0.316
BLP* _{BERT_{BASE}}	0.285	0.135	0.361	0.580	0.195	0.113	0.213	0.363
FnF-T _{BERT_{BASE}}	0.373	0.238	0.442	0.647	0.266	0.174	0.297	0.453
FnF-T _{BERT_{MEDIUM}}	0.342	0.213	0.405	0.603	0.253	0.164	0.281	0.431
FnF-T _{BERT_{SMALL}}	0.320	0.197	0.379	0.572	0.239	0.152	0.265	0.411
FnF-T _{BERT_{MINI}}	0.268	0.156	0.318	0.498	0.204	0.128	0.223	0.354
FnF-T _{BERT_{TINY}}	0.193	0.098	0.230	0.385	0.164	0.100	0.176	0.289
<i>Structure-Informed Models</i>								
StAR* _{BERT_{BASE}}	0.321	0.192	0.381	0.576	0.163	0.092	0.176	0.309
StATIK* _{BERT_{BASE}}	0.516	0.425	0.558	0.690	0.224	0.143	0.248	0.381
FnF-TG _{BERT_{BASE}}	0.732	0.652	0.785	0.875	0.316	0.214	0.350	0.524
FnF-TG _{BERT_{MEDIUM}}	0.737	0.661	0.789	0.873	0.314	0.214	0.353	0.515
FnF-TG _{BERT_{SMALL}}	0.727	0.648	0.781	0.867	0.316	0.216	0.354	0.518
FnF-TG _{BERT_{MINI}}	0.713	0.632	0.768	0.857	0.302	0.204	0.337	0.502
FnF-TG _{BERT_{TINY}}	0.638	0.543	0.700	0.808	0.288	0.195	0.318	0.475

Table 2: WN18RR and FB15k-237 test set results. **Results reported by Daza et al. (2021); Markowitz et al. (2022).

Model	MRR	H@1	H@3	H@10
<i>Text-Only Models</i>				
KEPLER ^o _{BERT_{BASE}}	0.402	0.222	0.514	0.730
BLP* _{BERT_{BASE}}	0.478	0.241	0.660	0.871
FnF-T _{BERT_{BASE}}	0.597	0.427	0.722	0.896
FnF-T _{BERT_{MEDIUM}}	0.588	0.418	0.712	0.890
FnF-T _{BERT_{SMALL}}	0.588	0.417	0.714	0.889
FnF-T _{BERT_{MINI}}	0.562	0.391	0.683	0.870
FnF-T _{BERT_{TINY}}	0.526	0.348	0.649	0.849
<i>Structure-Informed Models</i>				
StATIK* _{BERT_{BASE}}	0.770	0.765	0.771	0.779
FnF-TG _{BERT_{BASE}}	0.799	0.741	0.833	0.911
FnF-TG _{BERT_{MEDIUM}}	0.785	0.727	0.817	0.900
FnF-TG _{BERT_{SMALL}}	0.781	0.721	0.816	0.898
FnF-TG _{BERT_{MINI}}	0.779	0.719	0.814	0.894
FnF-TG _{BERT_{TINY}}	0.761	0.697	0.799	0.883

Table 3: Wikidata5M test set results. ^o**Results reported by Wang et al. (2021b); Daza et al. (2021); Markowitz et al. (2022).

As shown in the bottom half of Table 2, when we add our graph encoder to the model, link prediction accuracy substantially increases over the text-only model. We also see that our TG encoder results in substantially better accuracy than the previous SOTA model, StATIK. Interestingly, this effective addition of information about neighbours in the graph also has a big impact on the model’s dependence on powerful text encoders. Reducing the size of the text encoder (BERT_{BASE} > BERT_{MEDIUM} > BERT_{SMALL} > BERT_{MINI} > BERT_{TINY}) does result in some degradation of accuracy, but the differences are much smaller than in the text-only case. Even with a BERT_{TINY} text encoder, the

graph-aware model performs better than the text-only model with a BERT_{BASE} encoder.

This pattern of results is repeated in the transfer case, shown in Table 3. Here, the training set is much larger, but the graph in the test set is relatively small with each entity having fewer neighbours (see Appendix Table 5). This reduces the advantage gained from adding an effective graph encoder and the margin of our models’ improvement over the text-only models, and over the previous SOTA model, StATIK.² But we still see the same pattern where the size of the text encoder has less effect on accuracy for the graph-aware model.

4.4 Ablation Study

Table 4 presents results from our ablation studies, showing the impact of removing various design features from our graph-aware model on its accuracy.

Removing the r_{ij} relation embeddings in the pre-softmax attention score leads to a decline in model performance, with a more significant drop observed on the FB15K-237 dataset (from 0.316 to 0.306) compared to the WN18RR dataset (from 0.737 to 0.733). This discrepancy can be attributed to the inherent differences between the datasets: WordNet (WN18RR) is a lexical database focused on semantic relationships between words, whereas Freebase (FB15k-237) is a more structured knowledge graph

²The StATIK model has a surprisingly high H@1 score, almost identical to its H@3, H@10 and MRR scores. It is not clear why this is the case. Regardless, our model’s MRR (and H@3 and H@10) score is better than StATIK. MRR is the primary evaluation measure since it summarises the entire ranking.

Model	MRR	
	WN18RR	FB15k-237
FnF-TG _{BERT_{MEDIUM} SMALL}	0.737	0.316
– r_{ij}	0.733	0.306
– $s_{[CENTRE]}, s_{[NEIGHBOUR]}$	0.677	0.298
– $S(h_{TT}), S(t_{TT})$	0.480	0.251
– $[h r]_{KG}, [t r^{-1}]_{KG}$	0.342	0.239

Table 4: Ablation studies on the WN18RR and FB15k-237 test sets using the top FnF-TG model. Each row indicates the performance after cumulatively removing a specific feature. See Subsection 4.4 for details.

with a wider range of relationships (see Table 5). Note that with this modification the model still knows that there is some relation to the neighbours, but does not know its label.


Removing the learnable segment embeddings $s_{[CENTRE]}$ and $s_{[NEIGHBOUR]}$ significantly impacts the model’s performance, with WN18RR decreasing from 0.733 to 0.677 and FB15k-237 decreasing from 0.306 to 0.298. These embeddings are vital for helping the model identify which node should pool information from its neighbours. Without these embeddings, the model struggles to determine the representative node, leading to a broader distribution of information across all input nodes. This makes it difficult for the model to effectively utilise subgraph embeddings.

Eliminating the subgraphs $S(h_{TT})$ and $S(t_{TT})$ altogether results in an even more substantial performance drop. The WN18RR dataset sees a decrease of from 0.677 to 0.480, and the FB15k-237 dataset shows a drop from 0.298 to 0.251. Despite this, the model remains competitive as a text-only model compared to the BLP baseline, owing to its ability to leverage relation conditioning features to represent candidate relations.


Finally, removing the relation conditioning $[h|r]_{KG}$ and $[t|r^{-1}]_{KG}$, results in a further notable decrease in performance. The WN18RR dataset drops from 0.480 to 0.342, and the FB15k-237 dataset declines from 0.251 to 0.239. Without relation conditioning, the model loses its ability to anticipate the query relation, severely impacting its accuracy.

4.5 Efficient Text Encoders

Being able to reduce the size of the text encoder with minimal degradation in accuracy is important because the text encoder is a substantial part of the training cost. In Figure 3 we plot the relative reduction in accuracy against the relative reduc-



(a) WN18RR



(b) FB15k-237

Figure 3: Accuracy and training time plotted as a function of text encoder size. The largest text encoder with the highest accuracy is shown as (1.0, 1.0), and other encoders are plotted as proportions of that.

tion in training time as we reduce the size of the text encoder, for the WN18RR and the FB15k-237 datasets. We see that reducing the encoder size by a factor of four reduces the training time by a factor of three for WN18RR (and nearly two for FB15k-237) with very little reduction in accuracy.

5 Conclusion

We presented a new approach to knowledge graph link prediction that combines textual descriptions and graph structure in a fully inductive setting. Our Fast-and-Frugal Text-Graph (FnF-TG) Transformers outperform previous state-of-the-art models on three challenging datasets, showcasing the importance of capturing rich structured information about entities and their relations. Our approach achieves superior performance while maintaining efficiency and scalability, making it a promising solution for large-scale knowledge graph applications. Our ablation studies provide insights into the key factors contributing to its effectiveness, demonstrating the value of each component in our model.

Limitations

While our approach has achieved promising results, there are opportunities for further improvement.

We recognise the inherent limitation of the experimental setting of Daza et al. (2021) and Wang et al. (2021b), which do not support the direct evaluation of performance on unseen relations. Nonetheless, we believe that our use of relation embeddings, derived from textual descriptions, both in the TransE function (see Subsection 3.2) and for biasing the attention in the Graph Transformer Encoder (see Figure 2), represents an important step by making it possible to do fully inductive link prediction. Unlike previous work, such as BLP (Daza et al., 2021), KEPLER (Wang et al., 2021b), StAR (Wang et al., 2021a), and StATIK (Markowitz et al., 2022), our approach is not confined to a fixed set of relations learned during training, thus providing the potential for greater adaptability. This mechanism and ability is a distinctive aspect of our approach, and we do show that it improves accuracy even on seen relations (see Table 1).

One area for exploration is optimising the scalability of our Graph Transformer Encoder component (see Figure 2), which currently requires computing fully quadratic attention over the entire neighbourhood of a given entity. In fact it could still require considerable resources if the number of nodes in the subgraph is scaled to the order of thousands, hundreds of thousands, or even millions.

Our work demonstrates that effectively capturing even local neighbourhood information is both non-trivial and under-explored and that it can significantly enhance performance. Indeed, our simplification to a 1-hop neighbourhood was a careful decision to balance effectiveness and complexity. This approach not only allows for a fair comparison with the current SOTA method, StATIK (Markowitz et al., 2022), but also mitigates the exponential increase in computational complexity (see Appendix Subsection A.2) associated with larger neighbourhoods. While this predefined 1-hop neighbourhood provides a solid starting point, there is room to explore better alternatives. For instance, investigating multi-hop neighbourhoods or adaptive neighbourhood definitions could uncover more nuanced insights from the graph structure, potentially leading to even better results.

By building upon our framework, future work could refine these aspects, ultimately enhancing the effectiveness and versatility of our approach.

Ethics Statement

We do not anticipate any ethical concerns related to our work, as it primarily presents an alternative approach to a previously proposed method. Our main contribution lies in introducing a new approach for link prediction. In our experiments, we use the same datasets and pretrained models as previous research, all of which are publicly available. However, it is important to acknowledge that these datasets and models may still require further examination for potential fairness issues and the knowledge they encapsulate.

References

- Ivana Balazevic, Carl Allen, and Timothy M. Hospedales. 2018. [Hypernetwork knowledge graph embeddings](#). In *International Conference on Artificial Neural Networks*.
- Rajarshi Bhowmik and Gerard de Melo. 2020. Explainable link prediction for emerging entities in knowledge graphs. In *The Semantic Web–ISWC 2020: 19th International Semantic Web Conference, Athens, Greece, November 2–6, 2020, Proceedings, Part I 19*, pages 39–55. Springer.
- Antoine Bordes, Nicolas Usunier, Alberto Garcia-Duran, Jason Weston, and Oksana Yakhnenko. 2013. [Translating embeddings for modeling multi-relational data](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 26. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Antoine Bosselut, Hannah Rashkin, Maarten Sap, Chaitanya Malaviya, Asli Celikyilmaz, and Yejin Choi. 2019. [COMET: Commonsense transformers for automatic knowledge graph construction](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4762–4779, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sanxing Chen, Hao Cheng, Xiaodong Liu, Jian Jiao, Yangfeng Ji, and Jianfeng Gao. 2023. [Pre-training transformers for knowledge graph completion](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2303.15682.
- Sanxing Chen, Xiaodong Liu, Jianfeng Gao, Jian Jiao, Ruofei Zhang, and Yangfeng Ji. 2021. [HittER: Hierarchical transformers for knowledge graph embeddings](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10395–10407, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Andrei Coman, Gianni Barlacchi, and Adrià de Gispert. 2023a. [Strong and efficient baselines for open](#)

- domain conversational question answering. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 6305–6314, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Andrei Catalin Coman, Christos Theodoropoulos, Marie-Francine Moens, and James Henderson. 2023b. [Gadepo: Graph-assisted declarative pooling transformers for document-level relation extraction](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2308.14423.
- Damai Dai, Hua Zheng, Fuli Luo, Pengcheng Yang, Tianyu Liu, Zhifang Sui, and Baobao Chang. 2021. [Inductively representing out-of-knowledge-graph entities by optimal estimation under translational assumptions](#). In *Proceedings of the 6th Workshop on Representation Learning for NLP (RepLanLP-2021)*, pages 83–89, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jeffrey Dalton, Laura Dietz, and James Allan. 2014. [Entity query feature expansion using knowledge base links](#). In *Proceedings of the 37th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research & Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR '14*, page 365–374, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Daniel Daza, Michael Cochez, and Paul Groth. 2021. [Inductive entity representations from text via link prediction](#). In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021, WWW '21*, page 798–808, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Tim Dettmers, Pasquale Minervini, Pontus Stenetorp, and Sebastian Riedel. 2018. Convolutional 2d knowledge graph embeddings. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Thirtieth Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence Conference and Eighth AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, AAAI'18/IAAI'18/EAAI'18*. AAAI Press.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Takuma Ebisu and Ryutaro Ichise. 2018. Toruse: knowledge graph embedding on a lie group. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Thirtieth Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence Conference and Eighth AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, AAAI'18/IAAI'18/EAAI'18*. AAAI Press.
- Stefan Elfving, Eiji Uchibe, and Kenji Doya. 2017. [Sigmoid-weighted linear units for neural network function approximation in reinforcement learning](#). *Neural networks : the official journal of the International Neural Network Society*, 107:3–11.
- William Falcon and The PyTorch Lightning team. 2019. [PyTorch Lightning](#).
- Dieter A. Fensel, Umutcan Simsek, Kevin Angele, Elwin Huaman, Elias Kärle, Oleksandra Panasiuk, Ioan Toma, Jürgen Umbrich, and Alexander Wahler. 2020. [Knowledge graphs: Methodology, tools and selected use cases](#). *Knowledge Graphs*.
- Mikhail Galkin, Jiapeng Wu, E. Denis, and William L. Hamilton. 2021. [Nodepiece: Compositional and parameter-efficient representations of large knowledge graphs](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2106.12144.
- Justin Gilmer, Samuel S. Schoenholz, Patrick F. Riley, Oriol Vinyals, and George E. Dahl. 2017. Neural message passing for quantum chemistry. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 70, ICML'17*, page 1263–1272. JMLR.org.
- Swapnil Gupta, Sreyash Kenkre, and Partha Talukdar. 2019. [CaRe: Open knowledge graph embeddings](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 378–388, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- James Henderson, Alireza Mohammadshahi, Andrei Coman, and Lesly Miculicich. 2023. [Transformers as graph-to-graph models](#). In *Proceedings of the Big Picture Workshop*, pages 93–107, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jinhao Jiang, Kun Zhou, Xin Zhao, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2022. [Unikgqa: Unified retrieval and reasoning for solving multi-hop question answering over knowledge graph](#). In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Xiaotian Jiang, Quan Wang, and Bin Wang. 2019. [Adaptive convolution for multi-relational learning](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 978–987, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Seyed Mehran Kazemi and David Poole. 2018. [Simple embedding for link prediction in knowledge graphs](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Pei Ke, Haozhe Ji, Yu Ran, Xin Cui, Liwei Wang, Linfeng Song, Xiaoyan Zhu, and Minlie Huang. 2021. [JointGT: Graph-text joint representation learning for text generation from knowledge graphs](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 2526–2538, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Liyuan Liu, Haoming Jiang, Pengcheng He, Weizhu Chen, Xiaodong Liu, Jianfeng Gao, and Jiawei Han. 2020. [On the variance of the adaptive learning rate and beyond](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Robert Logan, Nelson F. Liu, Matthew E. Peters, Matt Gardner, and Sameer Singh. 2019. [Barack’s wife hillary: Using knowledge graphs for fact-aware language modeling](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5962–5971, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chaitanya Malaviya, Chandra Bhagavatula, Antoine Bosselut, and Yejin Choi. 2020. Commonsense knowledge base completion with structural and semantic context. *Proceedings of the 34th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Elan Markowitz, Keshav Balasubramanian, Mehrnoosh Mirtaheer, Murali Annavam, Aram Galstyan, and Greg Ver Steeg. 2022. [StATIK: Structure and text for inductive knowledge graph completion](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022*, pages 604–615, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mike Mintz, Steven Bills, Rion Snow, and Daniel Jurafsky. 2009. [Distant supervision for relation extraction without labeled data](#). In *Proceedings of the Joint Conference of the 47th Annual Meeting of the ACL and the 4th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing of the AFNLP*, pages 1003–1011, Suntec, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alireza Mohammadshahi and James Henderson. 2020. [Graph-to-graph transformer for transition-based dependency parsing](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 3278–3289, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alireza Mohammadshahi and James Henderson. 2021. [Recursive non-autoregressive graph-to-graph transformer for dependency parsing with iterative refinement](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:120–138.
- Maximilian Nickel, Kevin Murphy, Volker Tresp, and Evgeniy Gabrilovich. 2015. A review of relational machine learning for knowledge graphs. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 104(1):11–33.
- Maximilian Nickel, Volker Tresp, and Hans-Peter Kriegel. 2011. A three-way model for collective learning on multi-relational data. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML’11*, page 809–816, Madison, WI, USA. Omnipress.
- Guanglin Niu, Bo Li, Yongfei Zhang, and Shiliang Pu. 2022. [CAKE: A scalable commonsense-aware framework for multi-view knowledge graph completion](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2867–2877, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Kopf, Edward Yang, Zachary DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. 2019. [PyTorch: An Imperative Style, High-Performance Deep Learning Library](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32*, pages 8024–8035. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Apoorv Saxena, Adrian Kochsiek, and Rainer Gemulla. 2022. [Sequence-to-sequence knowledge graph completion and question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2814–2828, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- M. Schlichtkrull, Thomas Kipf, Peter Bloem, Rianne van den Berg, Ivan Titov, and Max Welling. 2017. [Modeling relational data with graph convolutional networks](#). In *Extended Semantic Web Conference*.
- Phillip Schneider, Tim Schopf, Juraj Vladika, Mikhail Galkin, Elena Simperl, and Florian Matthes. 2022. [A decade of knowledge graphs in natural language processing: A survey](#). In *Proceedings of the 2nd Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 12th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 601–614, Online only. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Haseeb Shah, Johannes Villmow, Adrian Ulges, Ulrich Schwanecke, and Faisal Shafait. 2019. An open-world extension to knowledge graph completion models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 33, pages 3044–3051.
- Noam M. Shazeer. 2020. [Glu variants improve transformer](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2002.05202.
- Baoxu Shi and Tim Wener. 2018. Open-world knowledge graph completion. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 32.
- Richard Socher, Danqi Chen, Christopher D Manning, and Andrew Ng. 2013. [Reasoning with neural tensor networks for knowledge base completion](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 26. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Jianlin Su, Yu Lu, Shengfeng Pan, Bo Wen, and Yunfeng Liu. 2021. [Roformer: Enhanced transformer with rotary position embedding](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2104.09864.
- Zhiqing Sun, Zhi-Hong Deng, Jian-Yun Nie, and Jian Tang. 2019. Rotate: Knowledge graph embedding by

- relational rotation in complex space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.10197*.
- Komal K. Teru, Etienne G. Denis, and William L. Hamilton. 2020. Inductive relation prediction by subgraph reasoning. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML'20*. JMLR.org.
- Christos Theodoropoulos, James Henderson, Andrei Catalin Coman, and Marie-Francine Moens. 2021. Imposing relation structure in language-model embeddings using contrastive learning. In *Proceedings of the 25th Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 337–348, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kristina Toutanova and Danqi Chen. 2015. Observed versus latent features for knowledge base and text inference. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Continuous Vector Space Models and their Compositionality*, pages 57–66, Beijing, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Théo Trouillon, Johannes Welbl, Sebastian Riedel, Éric Gaussier, and Guillaume Bouchard. 2016. Complex embeddings for simple link prediction. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2071–2080. PMLR.
- Iulia Turc, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. Well-read students learn better: On the importance of pre-training compact models. *arXiv: Computation and Language*.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Bo Wang, Tao Shen, Guodong Long, Tianyi Zhou, Ying Wang, and Yi Chang. 2021a. Structure-augmented text representation learning for efficient knowledge graph completion. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021, WWW '21*, page 1737–1748, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Hongwei Wang, Hongyu Ren, and Jure Leskovec. 2020a. Relational message passing for knowledge graph completion. *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*.
- Liang Wang, Wei Zhao, Zhuoyu Wei, and Jingming Liu. 2022. SimKGC: Simple contrastive knowledge graph completion with pre-trained language models. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4281–4294, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Peifeng Wang, Jialong Han, Chenliang Li, and Rong Pan. 2019a. Logic attention based neighborhood aggregation for inductive knowledge graph embedding. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Third AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Thirty-First Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence Conference and Ninth AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, AAAI'19/IAAI'19/EAAI'19*. AAAI Press.
- Quan Wang, Pingping Huang, Haifeng Wang, Songtai Dai, Wenbin Jiang, Jing Liu, Yajuan Lyu, Yong Zhu, and Hua Wu. 2019b. Coke: Contextualized knowledge graph embedding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.02168*.
- Quan Wang, Zhendong Mao, Bin Wang, and Li Guo. 2017. Knowledge graph embedding: A survey of approaches and applications. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 29(12):2724–2743.
- Rui Wang, Bicheng Li, Shengwei Hu, Wen Wen Du, and Min Zhang. 2020b. Knowledge graph embedding via graph attenuated attention networks. *IEEE Access*, 8:5212–5224.
- Xiaozhi Wang, Tianyu Gao, Zhaocheng Zhu, Zhengyan Zhang, Zhiyuan Liu, Juanzi Li, and Jian Tang. 2021b. KEPLER: A unified model for knowledge embedding and pre-trained language representation. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:176–194.
- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Remi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, Joe Davison, Sam Shleifer, Patrick von Platen, Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu, Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, Mariama Drame, Quentin Lhoest, and Alexander Rush. 2020. Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 38–45, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ruobing Xie, Zhiyuan Liu, Jia Jia, Huanbo Luan, and Maosong Sun. 2016. Representation learning of knowledge graphs with entity descriptions. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Ruibin Xiong, Yunchang Yang, Di He, Kai Zheng, Shuxin Zheng, Chen Xing, Huishuai Zhang, Yanyan Lan, Liwei Wang, and Tie-Yan Liu. 2020. On layer normalization in the transformer architecture. *ArXiv*, abs/2002.04745.
- Benfeng Xu, Quan Wang, Yajuan Lyu, Yong Zhu, and Zhendong Mao. 2021. Entity structure within and throughout: Modeling mention dependencies for document-level relation extraction. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Bishan Yang, Wen-tau Yih, Xiaodong He, Jianfeng Gao, and Li Deng. 2014. Embedding entities and relations for learning and inference in knowledge bases. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6575*.

Jingfeng Yang, Aditya Gupta, Shyam Upadhyay, Luheng He, Rahul Goel, and Shachi Paul. 2022. [TableFormer: Robust transformer modeling for table-text encoding](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 528–537, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Lin F. Yang, Hongyang Chen, Zhao Li, Xiao Ding, and Xindong Wu. 2023. [Give us the facts: Enhancing large language models with knowledge graphs for fact-aware language modeling](#). *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 36:3091–3110.

Liang Yao, Chengsheng Mao, and Yuan Luo. 2019. [Kgbert: Bert for knowledge graph completion](#). *ArXiv*, abs/1909.03193.

Chengxuan Ying, Tianle Cai, Shengjie Luo, Shuxin Zheng, Guolin Ke, Di He, Yanming Shen, and Tie-Yan Liu. 2021. [Do transformers really perform bad for graph representation?](#) In *Neural Information Processing Systems*.

Donghan Yu, Chenguang Zhu, Yuwei Fang, Wenhao Yu, Shuohang Wang, Yichong Xu, Xiang Ren, Yiming Yang, and Michael Zeng. 2022. [KG-FiD: Infusing knowledge graph in fusion-in-decoder for open-domain question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4961–4974, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Hanwen Zha, Zhiyu Chen, and Xifeng Yan. 2021. [Inductive relation prediction by bert](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2103.07102.

Houyu Zhang, Zhenghao Liu, Chenyan Xiong, and Zhiyuan Liu. 2020. [Grounded conversation generation as guided traverses in commonsense knowledge graphs](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2031–2043, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Zhaocheng Zhu, Zuobai Zhang, Louis-Pascal Xhonneux, and Jian Tang. 2021. [Neural bellman-ford networks: A general graph neural network framework for link prediction](#). In *Neural Information Processing Systems*.

A Appendix

A.1 Datasets statistics

Table 5 provides the statistics of the datasets used in our experiments. \mathcal{E} represents the set of entities, \mathcal{R} denotes the set of relation labels, \mathcal{T} consists of the set of relation triples $(h, r, t) \in \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{E}$, and $S(e)$ shows the mean and standard deviation (μ_σ) of the number of neighbours in an entity’s subgraph.

A.2 Complexity of FnF-TG

Our method exhibits identical computational complexity to StATik (Markowitz et al., 2022), with $O(N + Q)$ complexity, where N denotes the number of nodes in the graph and Q represents the number of queries (h, r, \hat{e}) and (\hat{e}, r, t) .

A.3 Training and Implementation Details

We provide details on the training and implementation of our models on three datasets: WN18RR, FB15k-237, and Wikidata5M.

Seeds and Epochs We run our experiments with five different seeds (73, 21, 37, 3, 7) for WN18RR and FB15k-237, and two seeds (73, 21) for Wikidata5M due to its large scale (see Table 5). We train our models for 40 epochs on WN18RR and FB15k-237, and 5 epochs on Wikidata5M, following previous works (Daza et al., 2021; Markowitz et al., 2022).

Hyperparameters We set the number of sampled neighbors per entity based on the dataset statistics (Table 5): 10 for WN18RR, 40 for FB15k-237, and 1 for Wikidata5M. We use 24 words of text for each x_{KG} in WN18RR and FB15k-237, and 64 words for Wikidata5M.

Graph Transformer Encoder We implement the *Graph Transformer Encoder* layer using a pre-LayerNorm Transformer (Xiong et al., 2020) with a SwiGLU-type pointwise feed-forward network (Shazeer, 2020). We use a single GT layer, as multiple layers did not improve performance while increasing latency.

Optimisation We set the learning rate to $1e^{-5}$ for a batch size of 32 and scale it proportionally with the batch size following a power-of-2 rule to fit the GPU budget. We use RAdam (Liu et al., 2020) as our optimiser and a cosine learning rate decay throughout the training process.

Libraries We develop our models using PyTorch (Paszke et al., 2019), Lightning (Falcon and The PyTorch Lightning team, 2019), and Hugging Face’s Transformers (Wolf et al., 2020) libraries.

A.4 Computational Budget

We fix our computational budget to a constant consumer-grade GPU (NVIDIA RTX3090 24GB) as stated in Subsection 4.2 and report the GPU budget per run for each dataset on FnF-TG_{BERT_{BASE}}. The GPU budget per run is 4 GPU/h for WN18RR,

Dataset	\mathcal{R}	\mathcal{E}_{train}	\mathcal{T}_{train}	$S(e)_{train}$	\mathcal{E}_{val}	\mathcal{T}_{val}	$S(e)_{val}$	\mathcal{E}_{test}	\mathcal{T}_{test}	$S(e)_{test}$
WN18RR	11	32,755	69,585	2,12 _{3,15}	4,094	11,381	1,17 _{1,33}	4,456	12,037	1,18 _{1,35}
FB15K-237	237	11,633	215,082	18,49 _{28,91}	1,454	42,164	4,70 _{10,63}	2,416	52,870	4,97 _{12,29}
Wikidata-5M	822	4,579,609	20,496,514	4,48 _{4,41}	7,374	6,699	0,91 _{0,78}	7,475	6,894	0,92 _{0,81}

Table 5: WN18RR, FB15K-237, and Wikidata-5M datasets statistics. \mathcal{E} represents the set of entities, \mathcal{R} denotes the set of relation labels, \mathcal{T} consists of the set of relation triples $(h, r, t) \in \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{E}$, and $S(e)$ shows the mean and standard deviation (μ_σ) of the number of neighbours in an entity’s subgraph.

6 GPU/h for FB15k-237, and 40 GPU/h for Wikidata5M.

001
002
003
004
005
006
007
008
009
010
011
012
013
014
015
016
017
018
019
020
021
022
023
024
025
026
027
028
029
030
031
032
033
034
035
036
037
038
039
040

Response

Although we did not write this paper to address the specific suggestions of the previous reviewers, the previous reviews did have a big impact on how we revised the paper.

We have substantially revised our paper, enhancing its clarity and readability. We have provided additional details regarding the datasets used and the experimental setting of our research, offering a comprehensive insight into the scope and focus of our work. Furthermore, we have clarified and distinguished our approach from orthogonal experimental settings, addressing potential confusion among the reviewers. These revisions aim to provide a clearer context for our work, ensuring a more accurate and focused evaluation. Additionally, we have enhanced the description of the Text Transformer component to address a reviewer's request. This component now includes a more detailed explanation, ensuring a comprehensive understanding of its functionality. Moreover, we have expanded the Related Works section with valuable input from a reviewer, who suggested additional relevant literature. This enhancement helps to clearly differentiate our work from previous studies. Also, we have added further details on the computational complexity of our method, as requested by a reviewer. Finally, we also expanded the Limitations section to include the inherent limitation of the datasets, which do not support the direct evaluation of performance on unseen relations.

We hope that this substantially revised version of the paper better conveys the important contributions which this work makes to understanding and improving the use of Pretrained Language Models combined with Graph Transformers in inductive link prediction.

We feel that a fresh set of reviewers would better be able to judge our contributions given the substantial revisions we have made.