

Probabilistic Knowledge Base assisted Question Answering

Christan Grant, Kun Li, Yan Chen, Daisy Zhe Wang
University of Florida
Computer & Information Science & Engineering Department
Gainesville, Florida
{cgrant,kli,yang,daisyw} @ cise.ufl.edu

ABSTRACT

Abstract

1. INTRODUCTION

Motivate Prob KBs
Describe Motivation of the the KHop system.
Give example scenario.
Introduce the Khop system.
Describe intro that this demo show real time incremental changes and probability changes to a large KB.

2. BACKGROUND

In this section, we describe the in-database incremental probabilistic inference system.

2.1 Data Set

In this subsection we describe the Freebase data set and how we obtain the rules for use with the Khop method.

2.2 Markov Logic Networks

2.2.1 Rule Generation

2.2.2 Grounding [3]

2.2.3 Inference

3. SYSTEM OVERVIEW

This demonstration describes a question answering systems that leverages a probabilistic knowledge base. To introduce this section, we first give a walkthrough of how a question is evaluated. We then give a detailed description of each component involved in question answering computation.

A user first enters a question q . We then leverage the SEMPRES system to translate the question into SPARQL,




Figure 1: Question answering system architecture.

the de facto language for querying RDF data stores. The SQL-like formalism of SPARQL queries produces a set of subgraph expressions as triples. We can then use the SPARQL query $s(q)$ and extract the supporting triples $t_{s(q)}$ that underly the subgraph. These triples are in the form $\langle s, p, o \rangle$ and correspond to the facts that support the answer to the question. To obtain the $t_{s(q)}$, we can evaluate the SPARQL query and materialize each the intermediate triple. We can use $t_{s(q)}$ to search our probabilistic knowledge base of facts to obtain the closest matching facts. Each fact $f \in \mathcal{F}$ is of the form $R(A, B)$ and a triple $t_{s(q)}$ is equivalent to a fact f when $(s, p, o) = (A, R, B)$. Given the equivalent facts, we use our k-hop algorithm to determine the joint probability that each fact is correct. This probability is a truthfulness score that can be paired with each answer to the question.

In the next few sub-sections we describe each part of the process. We start with the interface where the user can enter natural language questions and a description of how SEMPRES processes the question (Section 3.1). Next, we describe how we perform lookups for candidate facts (Section 3.2). We then define our method to derive the joint probability distribution (Section 3.3).

3.1 Interface

The interface allows users to make queries using three different modalities. Users will be able to enter natural lan-

guage questions, search through the set of existing facts, and use a graph to explore connections between graphs. New probabilistic facts and rules can also be added to the system through the interface. Users can also remove or alter the existing facts and rerun queries. The status of queries and the underlying processes are displayed on the main interface.

When a user enters a natural language utterance q , we use the SEMPRES 2.0 system to transform the utterance to a logical form [1, 2]. We then translate the logical form to SPARQL for execution over a knowledge base \mathcal{D} ; let $s(q, \mathcal{D})$, or equivalently, $s(q)$ be a function that transforms a natural language utterance to the SPARQL query. We then parse the SPARQL query and extract the intermediate triples $t_{s(q)} = \{\langle s, p, o \rangle_1, \dots\}$. Like the SPARQL query, these triples only specify a template of the facts that are required to evaluate the utterance. We evaluate the SPARQL query over \mathcal{D} to obtain an answer α , we map the query template to define the candidate set of triples $t_{s(q)}^\alpha$.

For each triples in $t_{s(q)}^\alpha$ we perform a look up in \mathcal{D}' which may or may not be equivalent to the knowledge base \mathcal{D}' . If there is a exact match, the triple is mapped to a score of 1. If there is no exact match in \mathcal{D} , we estimate the probability of the triple appearing using a straight-forward application of the chain rule. The intuition behind this weighting is that if a fact does not exist we would like to compute the probability that the facts could exist. An equation representing this value is as follows,

$$\omega(s, p, o) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \text{exists}(\langle s, p, o \rangle) \\ \max(\omega(o, p, s), P(s, p, o)) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where $P(s, p, o) = P(s|p, o)P(p|o)P(o)$.

We then use the K-hop algorithm to estimate the joint probability of a fact existing given the rules.

Listing 1: Algorithm for obtaining the information

```

1 def answer (q):
2   t = {'q': q,
3       's': SEMPRES.toLogicalForm (q) }
4   t['a'] = SEMPRES.toSPARQL (t['s'])
5   execute (D, t) # Evaluate query
6   # Do fact search
7   t['α'] = findMatches (D, t)
8   t['ω'] = evaluateTriples (D, t) # Equation 1
9   t['khop'] = kHop (D, t['α'])
10
11   # TODO Perform a weighted combination of kHop and ω
12
13   return t

```

3.2 Fact Search

Given a candidate fact f of the form $\langle s, p, o \rangle$, we use the database to search for the top triples that are similar to f . Some sets of facts contain blank nodes or expect lists or sets of information. For example, the utterance “Who are Justin beiber’s siblings?” produces a SPARQL query that contains the following subtriples: (1)

Describe D3 visualization of graph and rule display Describe user interaction with graph Describe user selecting facts Describe users removing facts

3.3 Probabilistic Inference

Given that we have a set of matching/partially matching facts, give an explanation of how values from the khop algorithm are evaluated.

We compare the fact probabilities to the sempre results.

3.3.1 Knowledge Base

Describe the PostgreSQL database and the other services running on servers. Describe the tables Describe the functions that are called Describe the parallelism

The system is loaded with docker, a system container, so any modifications by demo can be quickly rolled back to the initial state.

4. RELATED WORK

Describe incremental KB from Chris Re

Question answering over freebase [4].

Describe Google Knowledge Vault Describe Fact finding in Google KB Describe Source finding.

5. DEMONSTRATION

Describe the demo setup.

Features Add the auto complete for previous questions.

Describe how users will be able to alter parameters. Add figure of the pipeline process and the user interface.

6. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was partially supported by DARPA under FA8750-12-2-0348-2 (DEFT/CUBISM) and Christian Grant was supported by a NSF Graduate Research Fellowship, Grant DGE-0802270.

7. REFERENCES

- [1] J. Berant, A. Chou, R. Frostig, and P. Liang. Semantic parsing on Freebase from question-answer pairs. In *Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 2013.
- [2] J. Berant, A. Chou, R. Frostig, and P. Liang. Semantic parsing on freebase from question-answer pairs. In *EMNLP*, pages 1533–1544, 2013.
- [3] Y. Chen and D. Z. Wang. Knowledge expansion over probabilistic knowledge bases. In *Proceedings of the 2014 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data*, pages 649–660. ACM, 2014.
- [4] X. Yao and B. Van Durme. Information extraction over structured data: Question answering with freebase. In *Proceedings of ACL*, 2014.