
Combining Contextual Words and Knowledge Graph

Embeddings

— NLP M2 —

IDMC, University of Lorraine

Introduce The Team :

1. Fatima Habib (computer science)
2. Võ Tuấn Anh(Linguistics)
3. Minh Huong Ngo(Linguistics)
4. Asmaa Demny(Linguistics)

Combining Contextual Words and Knowledge Graph

Embeddings

— NLP M2 —

IDMC, University of Lorraine

Introduce The Team :

1. Fatima Habib (computer science)
2. Võ Tuấn Anh(Linguistics)
3. Minh Huong Ngo(Linguistics)
4. Asmaa Demny(Linguistics)

Aim of the project :

- ❖ In this project we compare the performance of Knowledge Graph embeddings vs Contextual words embedding vs The combination of the two techniques in applying many in many NLP Tasks like :
 - a. Entity resolution :is the task of checking if two words or KG nodes represent the same entity.
 - b. Textual entailment detection:is a task for which we determine if a chunk of text logically entails another.
- ❖ Follow one of the [1] future work directions :
 - a. applying PCA on the embeddings in order to test for the “curse of dimensionality”
 - b. using a simple, but higher-capacity, model such as MLP
- ❖ Use different Classifier : in [1] they use Logistic Classifier we are going to use Neural Networks instead .

Data sets :

Last year's choice: **Freebase: Open collaborative KB**

Freebase 15K: reasonable number of entities

=> for entity-focused and KG task

Freebase-NewYorkTimes: contain surface realization of triples

=> for relation type prediction task

=> filter FB-NYT for relations and entities that were found in FB15k to do KG task

Some possible Dataset choice

https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Details-of-FB15k-WN18-WD40k-and-WD40k-nl_tbl1_332831254

| | FB15k | WN18 | WD40k | WD40k_nl |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Original data | Freebase | Wordnet | Wikidata | wikidata |
| Number of entities (entity_voc) | 14,951 | 40,943 | 40,000 | 40,000 |
| Number of relations (relation_voc) | 1,345 | 18 | 568 | 568 |
| Number of triples for training | 483,142 | 141,442 | 193,043 | 193,043 |
| Number of triples for validation | 50,000 | 5,000 | 19,461 | 19,461 |
| Number of triples for testing | 59,071 | 5,000 | 19,370 | 13,456 |
| Density | 1.980×10^{-6} | 5.019×10^{-6} | 2.551×10^{-7} | 2.551×10^{-7} |
| % Test Linked | 80.9 | 94.0 | 30.5 | 0.0 |

Evaluations

- Extrinsic evaluation tasks:
 - Relation prediction
 - Entity classification
 - Entity resolution
 - Textual entailment detection
 - Triple (fact) classification
- Evaluation metrics: Precision@n, Mean Average Precision@k, Mean Reciprocal Rank

Tools and Framework:

- ❖ Python (spacy- NLTK -scikit learn -tensorflow)
- ❖ ELMo : Contextual Language Embedding
- ❖ ComplEXFramework

References :

1. Dieudonat, Léa & Han, Kelvin & Leavitt, Phyllicia & Marquer, Esteban. (2020). Exploring the Combination of Contextual Word Embeddings and Knowledge Graph Embeddings.
2. https://github.com/villmow/datasets_knowledge_embedding
3. <https://github.com/nchah/freebase-triples>



Aim of the project :

- ❖ In this project we compare the performance of Knowledge Graph embeddings vs Contextual words embedding vs The combination of the two techniques in applying many in many NLP Tasks like :
 - a. Entity resolution :is the task of checking if two words or KG nodes represent the same entity.
 - b. Textual entailment detection:is a task for which we determine if a chunk of text logically entails another.
- ❖ Follow one of the [1] future work directions :
 - a. applying PCA on the embeddings in order to test for the “curse of dimensionality”
 - b. using a simple, but higher-capacity, model such as MLP
- ❖ Use different Classifier : in [1] they use Logistic Classifier we are going to use Neural Networks instead .

Data sets :

Last year's choice: **Freebase: Open collaborative KB**

Freebase 15K: reasonable number of entities

=> for entity-focused and KG task

Freebase-NewYorkTimes: contain surface realization of triples

=> for relation type prediction task

=> filter FB-NYT for relations and entities that were found in FB15k to do KG task

Some possible Dataset choice

<https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Details-of-FB15k-WN18-WD1254>

| | FB15k | WN18 | WD40k | WD40k_nI |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Original data | Freebase | Wordnet | Wikidata | wikidata |
| Number of entities (entity_voc) | 14,951 | 40,943 | 40,000 | 40,000 |
| Number of relations (relation_voc) | 1,345 | 18 | 568 | 568 |
| Number of triples for training | 483,142 | 141,442 | 193,043 | 193,043 |
| Number of triples for validation | 50,000 | 5,000 | 19,461 | 19,461 |
| Number of triples for testing | 59,071 | 5,000 | 19,370 | 13,456 |
| Density | 1.980×10^{-6} | 5.019×10^{-6} | 2.551×10^{-7} | 2.551×10^{-7} |
| % Test Linked | 80.9 | 94.0 | 30.5 | 0.0 |

Evaluations

- Extrinsic evaluation tasks:
 - Relation prediction
 - Entity classification
 - Entity resolution
 - Textual entailment detection
 - Triple (fact) classification
- Evaluation metrics: Precision@n, Mean Average Precision@k, Mean Reciprocal Rank

Tools and Framework:

- ❖ Python (spacy- NLTK -scikit learn -tensorflow)
- ❖ ELMo : Contextual Language Embedding
- ❖ ComplEXFramework

References :

1. Dieudonat, Léa & Han, Kelvin & Leavitt, Phyllicia & Marquer, Esteban. (2020). Exploring the Combination of Contextual Word Embeddings and Knowledge Graph Embeddings.
2. https://github.com/villmow/datasets_knowledge_embedding
3. <https://github.com/nchah/freebase-triples>

