

Learning to Transpile AMR into SPARQL

Mihaela Bornea^{*}, Ramon Fernandez Astudillo^{*}, Tahira Naseem, Nandana Mihindukulasooriya
Ibrahim Abdelaziz, Pavan Kapanipathi, Radu Florian and Salim Roukos

IBM Research AI

mabornea@us.ibm.com, ramon.astudillo@ibm.com, tnassem@us.ibm.com

{nandana.m, ibrahim.abdelaziz2}@ibm.com

{kapanipa, raduf, roukos}@us.ibm.com

Abstract

We propose a transition-based system to transpile Abstract Meaning Representation (AMR) into SPARQL for Knowledge Base Question Answering (KBQA). This allows us to delegate part of the semantic representation to a strongly pre-trained semantic parser, while learning transpiling with small amount of paired data. We depart from recent work relating AMR and SPARQL constructs, but rather than applying a set of rules, we teach a BART model to selectively use these relations. Further, we avoid explicitly encoding AMR but rather encode the parser state in the attention mechanism of BART, following recent semantic parsing works. The resulting model is simple, provides supporting text for its decisions, and outperforms recent approaches in KBQA across two knowledge bases: DBPedia (LC-QuAD 1.0, QALD-9) and Wikidata (WebQSP, SWQ-WD).

1 Introduction

The task of Question Answering over Knowledge Bases (KBQA) (Zou et al., 2014; Vakulenko et al., 2019; Diefenbach et al., 2020) consists in finding the answer to natural questions by retrieving the information contained in a Knowledge Graph (KG). Compared to other automatic QA tasks, such as reading comprehension (Rajpurkar et al., 2018; Kwiatkowski et al., 2019; Clark et al., 2020), KBQA has the advantage of producing answers backed by structured repositories of information, offering strong factual accuracy guarantees. Solving KBQA amounts to transforming a natural language question into some programming language, usually a query language such as SQL or SPARQL. It is thus considered a form of executable semantic parsing. We illustrate the KBQA task in Figure 1.

While some large KBQA datasets exist (Yu et al., 2018), the amount of paired examples, i.e. aligned

```
PREFIX dbr:http://dbpedia.org/resource/  
PREFIX dbo:http://dbpedia.org/ontology/  
PREFIX dbp:http://dbpedia.org/property/  
SELECT DISTINCT ?s WHERE {  
  ?i <dbp:state> <dbr:Maharashtra>.  
  ?i <dbo:sport> ?s.  
}
```

Figure 1: SPARQL graph for the question *Name some sports played in institutions of Maharashtra?*. **?s** is the **unknown variable** (related to *sports*) and **?i** is an **intermediate variable** (related to *institution*), needed to relate the unknown with the **KG entity** (*Maharashtra*).

natural language and query language pairs, is generally scarce (Trivedi et al., 2017; Usbeck et al., 2017). Furthermore, human language exhibits large variability, and obtaining enough training pairs for specific domains or infrequent natural language formulations requires large annotation investments. Often, real world implementations of KBQA end up containing a number of domain specific hand-crafted rules that can be costly to maintain and expand. The need to manipulate a formal representation with only a few examples, makes this task harder to learn compared to other QA tasks.

In order to mitigate the data availability problem (Kapanipathi et al., 2021) proposed to delegate part of the task to an Abstract Meaning Representation (AMR) parse that incorporates additional semantic information. This work identifies associations between certain AMR nodes and SPARQL entities and variables. Unfortunately, these AMR to SPARQL mappings are imperfect, suffering from low coverage and granularity mismatch. Another concern with AMR-based approaches is the encoding of the AMR itself which implies an additional learning burden.

To address these limitations, in this work we propose a new approach to leverage AMR parsing for KBQA that *learns to transpile* AMR into the SPARQL query language. The contributions can

^{*} These authors contributed equally to this work




Figure 2: (Left) Rules used to align AMR with SPARQL. Matching AMR subgraph patterns (a-h) are assigned SPARQL constructs (variables, entities). For example rule (b) identifies AMR node ‘sport’ as unknown variable because it is the object (ARG1) of an ‘imperative’ statement. This is a significantly reduced subset of the rules in (Kapanipathi et al., 2021). Further, some of the rules (e-h for intermediate variables) are not deterministically applied but must be instead chosen by the model. (Right) Examples applying hard rules (b) and (d) and an optional rule (e). Dashed links represent alignments between AMR and SPARQL.

be summarized as follows

- We develop a state machine and an oracle that transpiles AMR into SPARQL and we learn to imitate this oracle with BART (Lewis et al., 2019) for KBQA tasks.
- This oracle leverages known relations (i.e. similarities) between AMR and SPARQL (Kapanipathi et al., 2021), but rather than applying them deterministically as in prior work, we teach the model when to use them.
- We show that it is not necessary to encode AMR directly, but rather encoding the transpiler state through attention masking as in (Fernandez Astudillo et al., 2020) suffices.
- The resulting transpiler improves upon recent KBQA approaches across Dbpedia and Wikidata. It outperforms (Kapanipathi et al., 2021), by 10 points on LcQuAD 1.0 and matches it on QALD-9, while being simpler and exploiting similar inductive biases. It also outperforms (Neelam et al., 2021b), by 2 points on WebQSP-WD and 4 points on SWQ-WD.

2 AMR to SPARQL Machine and Oracle

Here we show how transition-based parsing can be used to transpile AMR to SPARQL.

2.1 A Transition-based Transpiler

The objective is to learn to predict the SPARQL query s corresponding to the natural language question w , by transforming its AMR parse g .

At its core, a transition-based transpiler learns to predict a sequence of actions a that applied to a parameter-less state machine acting on g yields s .

$$s = M(a, g). \quad (1)$$

The sequence of actions is given by a rule-based oracle that, given the original question w , its AMR g and the gold SPARQL s , yields the action sequence.

$$a = O(s, g, w). \quad (2)$$

The oracle, detailed in Section 2.2, requires alignments between the AMR g and SPARQL s graphs but it is only needed to generate training samples $(w, g, a) \sim \mathcal{D}$, through following procedure:




Figure 3: Top-left: LC-QuAD train sentence w : *Name some sports played in institutions of Maharashtra?* aligned to its AMR graph g (system input) and 3 relevant subgraphs identified by applying Figure 2 (c, d, e): **unknown variable** (imperative root), **optional secondary variable** (entity-adjacent nominal), **linked entity** (wiki). Top-right: time-step 3 of decoding of same sentence indicating AMR/KG-based constrained decoding and attention masking. Bottom box: Full oracle for same sentence including implicit machine state defined by the AMR path stack, explicit machine state defined by the supporting text, oracle action sequence a and resulting SPARQL s (system output).

- draw sentence and SPARQL train pair (w, s) from a KBQA training corpus
- parse w into its AMR graph g^1
- obtain oracle sequence $a = O(s, g, w)$

With these, one can use the oracle as a teacher to train a sequence to sequence model, e.g. BART (Lewis et al., 2020), with a conventional cross entropy loss

$$\hat{\theta} = \arg \max_{\theta} \{\mathbb{E}_{(w,g,a) \sim \mathcal{D}} \{\log p(a | w, g; \theta)\}\}. \quad (3)$$

At test time, we predict the SPARQL as $\hat{s} = M(\hat{a}, g)$, where g is obtained by parsing w and \hat{a} is obtained with conventional decoding.

$$\hat{a} = \arg \max_a \{p(a | w, g; \theta)\} \quad (4)$$

It is important to note that the use of a state machine generates a strong inductive bias, imposing some specific way in which the sequence to

sequence problem can be solved. In this case we leverage the bias to make the transpiler aware of AMR path information, but it comes at the penalty of not fully being able to recover all SPARQL queries i.e. for some queries.

$$s \neq M(O(s, g, w), g) \quad (5)$$

This is analyzed in Section 6.

2.2 KBQA Oracle and Machine

This section describes how to formulate the state machine $s = M(a, g)$ and oracle $a = O(s, g, w)$. The basic idea is that given alignments between AMR and SPARQL graphs, as depicted in Figure 2 (right), it is possible to sequentially proceed over a subset of paths in the AMR graph and transform them into components of the SPARQL query, as shown in Figure 3 (bottom).

Initially, all AMR paths to be processed are put in a stack, Figure 3 (bottom left). At each time step one of the following actions is chosen by the oracle

- **{SELECT, ASK, COUNT}**: Generate the query header from a closed vocabulary

¹Throughout this work we always use the APT parser (Zhou et al., 2021a) to obtain AMR graphs.

- <KG relation>: Produce the KG relation for path at the top of the stack and REDUCE
- REDUCE: Pop path at the top of the stack without predicting any KG relation.
- {CLOSE}: Close the machine

All actions are special symbols added to BART’s vocabulary with the exception of KG relations, which allows free text generation. The stack initially contains all AMR paths between entities in the KG (green) and the unknown variable in the query (red) and optional paths involving secondary variables (blue), if there are any in the AMR. As long as all the AMR subgraphs matching SPARQL components are present in g , the transpiling oracle is able to generate SPARQL queries with any number of entities and with the presence of secondary variables i.e. multi-hop questions². The REDUCE action allows the oracle to ignore a given AMR path, which in practice controls the application of rules (e-h). This is useful to compensate for false positive cases where this rule generates non-existing secondary unknowns.

As an example: In Figure 3, the path at the top of the stack is [s1 i p s]. This path is determined by the alignment of the unknown variable s in the AMR to the SPARQL projected variable $?s$ and the alignment of the subgraph $s1$ to the entity Maharashtra (rules b, d). Since there is no gold SPARQL triple connecting $?s$ and Maharashtra, the action for this path is REDUCE. For the second AMR path [s1 i], there is a gold SPARQL triple matching the entity Maharashtra and an intermediate SPARQL variable $?i$ (obtained by rule e) thus the action for this path is the KG relation `state`.

One fundamental advantage of the proposed approach, is that by construction it aligns sentence w , AMR g and SPARQL s . This information can be used during decoding to restrict the output vocabulary of $p(a | w)$. For example, we can enforce header and closing operations only on a full and empty stack respectively. Further, we can also query the KG with nodes involved in the path on the top of the stack, to restrict the possible relations to predict. For example in Figure 3, bottom, to predict the KG relation `state` we restrict it to incoming or outgoing KG relations of the node $s1$,

²Section 6 for an empirical analysis of oracle coverage in KBQA datasets.

Maharashtra. Finally, we also obtain textual cues to predict the KG relation, see **Supporting Text** in Figure 3. In Section 3 we describe how textual cues are incorporated into the model, allowing to avoid encoding AMR explicitly.

3 BART Transpiler with Inductive Bias

We parametrize $p(a | w, g; \theta)$ with a modified BART model (Lewis et al., 2019), but the approach is applicable to sequence-to-sequence Transformers (Vaswani et al., 2017). We dynamically mask cross-attention to encode the transpiler state, described in Section 2.2. We also dynamically masking of the output vocabulary to force the decoder to generate only the valid actions for every state.

3.1 Encoding AMR through Transpiler State

In order to encode both sentence w and AMR g in $p(a | w, g; \theta)$ one simple option could be to concatenate both w and g as inputs to BART. Given the quadratic cost of Transformer’s attention, the large size of AMRs and the redundancies between w and g this is likely too expensive.

Our model does not need to encode the entire AMR. It suffices to encode the parser state in the cross-attention heads of the Transformer. Unlike prior work (Fernandez Astudillo et al., 2020; Zhou et al., 2021a,b), our transpiler stack does not contain the question words directly but contains AMR paths which we use to represent the transpiler state. A key element is the alignment between the AMR nodes and words in the question, which allows us to identify the supporting text for every path.

For example, in Figure 3, top-right we show the BART decoder at the third decoding step where the path at the top of the stack is [s1 i]. The supporting text for this path is *institutions Maharashtra*.

The encoder takes as input the question and we dedicate some heads to attend to the words in the supporting text for the path at the top of the stack.

These structured head weights are given by

$$W_{it}^{\text{cross-att}} \propto e^{\frac{1}{d}(K \cdot h_i^w)^T \cdot (Q \cdot h_t^g) + m_2(a_{<t,w,g})_i} \quad (6)$$

where h_i^w and h_t^g are encoder and decoder representations for i^{th} word and t^{th} prediction, and Q , K , d are query, value and scaling weights. $m_2()_i$ masks h_i^w unless it is aligned to the path of g for which we are going to predict relation at step t .

Using the additional supporting text for every transpiler decision, helps the explainability of the model decisions, but also plays an important role in performance, as shown in Section 6.

3.2 Constrained Decoding

We use the state machine described in Section 2.2 to forbid certain actions at each time step t through

$$p(a_t | a_{<t}, w, g; \theta) \propto e^{f(a_{<t}, w, \theta) + m(a_{<t}, w, g)} \quad (7)$$

where $f(a_{<t}, w)$ is the output layer of BART without the softmax and $m(a_{<t}, w, g)$ is a state-machine dependent mask that is set to $-\infty$ to forbid actions. $m()$ is a deterministic function of the input sentence w , its AMR g and action history $a_{<t}$ until step $t - 1$.

For the proposed model, masking is used to perform header actions only at the beginning of the action sequence and closing on an empty stack. In addition, when the AMR path at the top of the stack contains entity nodes, the KG is queried and the mask is set to restrict the actions to the appropriate KG relations. We show such an example in the BART decoder in Figure 3, top-right, where the actions are restricted to the KG relations for the entity *Maharashtra*. The relation’s prefix³ and direction is also obtained in this process.

These constrains are applied at decoding time only. As shown in the Section 4, constrained decoding has a fundamental effect on performance.

4 Experimental Setup

4.1 Datasets

We evaluated our system on two knowledge graphs: DBpedia and Wikidata. For DBpedia we used the LC-QuAD 1.0 and QALD-9 datasets following the partitions in (Kapanipathi et al., 2021). For Wikidata we used the SWQ-WD and WebQSP-WD datasets with splits from (Neelam et al., 2021b). As in prior work, we report the Macro F1 score comparing the gold answers to the answers that TransQA generates when executing its predicted SPARQL. We compute the F1 score for every question and we report the average over all questions.

LC-QuAD 1.0 (Trivedi et al., 2017) contains 4,000 questions for training and 1,000 questions for test, created from templates. We tune the hyper parameters of our model on a random sample of 200

questions from the training set. LC-QuAD 1.0 predominantly focuses on multi-relational questions, aggregation (e.g. COUNT) and simple questions. Although Lc-QuAD has quantitative questions, the KG contains relations that can answer these queries without the need for specific SPARQL constructs e.g. `largestCity`.

QALD-9 (Usbeck et al., 2017) has 408 training and 150 test questions concerning DBpedia. We created a randomly chosen set of 98 questions as development set. QALD-9 contains more complex queries than LC-QuAD 1.0 including quantitative questions, time constructs and other.

SWQ-WD (Diefenbach et al., 2017) is a KBQA dataset adapted to Wikidata with 14,894 train and 5,622 test examples. We held out 200 examples from the train set for development. This dataset contains simple queries, with only one relation.

WebQSP-WD (Sorokin and Gurevych, 2018) has 2,880 train and 1,033 test set questions based on Wikidata. It includes more complex queries, often involving more than one relation.

4.2 TransQA Model and Training Setup

The model, henceforth referred to as TransQA, uses a modified BART (Lewis et al., 2020) implemented in (Wolf et al., 2020) to parameterize $f(a_{<t}, w)$ and trained to learn to imitate the oracle. We implement constrained decoding at test time and parser state encoding by masking 8/16 cross-attention heads both at train and test time, see Section 3 for details.

For LC-QuAD 1.0 the model was trained with the LC-QuAD 1.0 train questions for 13 epochs and using a learning rate of 5×10^{-5} . The QALD-9 model is trained with both LC-QuAD 1.0 and QALD-9 training examples. We upsample the QALD-9 5 times to balance between the two datasets and we trained the model for 16 epochs using a learning rate of 4×10^{-5} . For SWQ-WD we used its train set and trained the system for 9 epochs with learning rate 5×10^{-5} . WebQSP-WD does not provide SPARQL queries and we use a combination of LC-QuAD 2.0 (Dubey et al., 2019) and SWQ-WD to train the system. LC-QuAD 2.0 (Dubey et al., 2019) is a template-based dataset based on Wikidata. It has some known quality issues (Diomedi and Hogan, 2022) and does not have a baseline to compare against. Therefore, we used its training data only to build our models. From LC-QuAD 2.0, we use only training examples with

³PREFIX dbo: <http://dbpedia.org/ontology/>, PREFIX dbp: <http://dbpedia.org/property/>

direct relations. The final train set contains 12,900 LC-QuAD 2.0 and 14,693 SWQ-WD examples. We trained the system for 5 epochs with learning rate 5×10^{-5} .

For all models we set the max input sequence length to 64 tokens, max target sequence length to 32 tokens and beam size to 4. We used the Adam optimizer with standard parameters and trained on a V100 Nvidia GPU. All hyper-parameters were determined based on the dev set F1 score. The number of epochs and learning rate we determined from ranges [3, 18] and $[10^{-5}, 10^{-4}]$ respectively.

4.3 AMR Parsing and Entity Linking

We used the Action Pointer Transformer (APT) transition-based AMR parser (Zhou et al., 2021a) which provides alignments between AMR graph nodes and surface tokens. The model was trained combining AMR3.0 with the QALD-9-AMR train dataset (Lee et al., 2021) to adapt it to the question domain⁴. Although AMR graphs can include entity linking, BLINK (Wu et al., 2020) was also applied as a post-processing stage to AMR parsing. We run BLINK separately and then attach the `:wiki` edge to the most suitable node in the AMR. Linking the AMR nodes to KG entities is attained by matching the span of text aligned to a subgraph with the mention via a greedy set of checks. Attachment to conventional named entities is attempted first. Edit distance and fuzzy match search are also used to find a suitable alignment.

The rule (e) in Figure 2 requires Part of Speech tagging for which we use Spacy.

See Section 2.2 for information on how alignments are used to determine parser state. The same mechanism is used to produce the oracle action sequences for training.

5 Comparison with Related Work

We compare TransQA against a number of recent neural approaches for KBQA trained in comparable conditions. We excluded approaches using gold entity linking and relation linking (Banerjee et al., 2022) since, both tasks have a strong impact in performance. We also include a BART baseline to control for the effect of pre-trained models since most other recent methods use BERT (Devlin et al., 2019).

NSQA (Kapanipathi et al., 2021) Uses a pipeline of AMR parsing (StackTransformer (Fernandez As-

tudillo et al., 2020)), entity linking (BLINK (Wu et al., 2020)), rule-based transpiling of AMR, BERT based Relation linking (SemRel (Naseem et al., 2021)) and a final integrator module producing SPARQL from competing hypothesis. TransQA, borrows a significantly reduced amount of rules from this work for alignment, but replaces this pipeline by a simpler learnt transpilation of AMR using a modified BART (Lewis et al., 2020).

SYGMA (Neelam et al., 2021b) is another multi-component pipeline with final integrator and using the same entity and relation linking as NSQA. It leverages lambda calculus as intermediate representation and features improved handling of temporal relations and an extended experimental setup.

EDGQA (Hu et al., 2021) proposes a custom Entity Description Graph (EDG) to represent the structure of complex questions, rather than relying on established formalisms such as AMR. It applies multiple decomposition rules and BERT-based re-scoring to produce SPARQL. It also uses an ensemble of three entity linking tools: Dexter (Ceccarelli et al., 2014), EARL (Dubey et al., 2018) and Falcon (Sakor et al., 2019) as one entity retriever. EDGQA also uses a relation linker trained with LC-QuAD 1.0 and QALD-9.

STaG-QA (Ravishankar et al., 2021) is a two stage text to SPARQL system that first generates a query skeleton learned end-to-end with a BERT model and then performs beam search to find optimal grounding of the skeleton into a target KG. The paper also provides results for silver data training which are left-out for comparability purposes.

seq2seq baseline. BART has been shown to excel at semantic parsing with no need for special parametrization (Chen et al., 2020; Bevilacqua et al., 2021). We train BART to produce the SPARQL directly from input sentences and we use the same training data as for TransQA. To incorporate Entity Linking, we concatenate BLINK entity linking to the input to teach BART to copy it into the target.

Table 1 displays the comparison with related work. The proposed TransQA outperforms all methods both on DBpedia and Wikidata, with two notable exceptions. EDGE-QA has better results in QALD-9 but it utilizes likely stronger entity linking. Also the simple BART baseline outperforms all other methods in simple web questions, while lagging clearly behind in LC-QuAD and QALD, which are more complex. This result may

⁴AMR train has no overlap with QALD-9 dev or test.

	EL	RL	SI	LCQ1	Q9	WQSP	SWQ
NSQA (Kapanipathi et al., 2021)	BLINK	BERT	rules	44.5 ⁵	30.9	-	-
EDGQA (Hu et al., 2021)	Ensemb.	BERT	rules	53.1	32.0	-	-
STaG-QA (Ravishankar et al., 2021)	BLINK	-	BERT	51.4	-	-	* ⁶
SYGMA (Neelam et al., 2021a)	BLINK	BERT	rules	47.0	29.0	31.0	44.0
Seq2Seq	BLINK	-	BART	20.5	22.6	30.3	50.3
TransQA	BLINK	-	BART	54.5	31.4	33.0	48.1

Table 1: TransQA comparison with other recent KBQA approaches. Including Entity Linking (EL), Relation Linking (RL) and the SPARQL inference (SI) components. TransQA uses a single module for relation linking and SPARQL inference. Macro F1 scores for SPARQL results on the test set to LC-QuAD1.0 (LCQ1), QALD-9 (Q9), WebQSP-WD (WQSP), SWQ-WD (SWQ)

AMR parsing [†]	Entity Linking	LC-QuAD 1.0		QALD-9	
		Oracle (F1)	TransQA (F1)	Oracle (F1)	TransQA (F1)
APT	BLINK	68.7	47.4	67.0	53.6
APT	Gold	78.7	63.1	77.5	58.6

Table 2: Oracle and TransQA performances as well as effect of gold Entity Linking, measured by macro F1 of SPARQL results on the dev set of LC-QuAD 1.0 and QALD-9. Oracle performance with gold Entity Linking can be seen as reflecting transpiler coverage i.e. how much of the SPARQL patterns are captured and an approximate upper bound for TransQA performance. [†]Note that entity Linking is part of AMR but is separated here for clarity.

be explained by a trade-off between inductive bias and expressiveness, helping TransQA for complex grammars but limiting performance in simple cases. It is also worth noting that TransQA outperforms NSQA and SYGMA, while exploiting similar inductive bias and being simpler⁶.

6 Oracle and State Encoding Analysis

Table 2 reports oracle performance for BLINK and gold entity linking on the development set of LC-QuAD 1.0 and QALD and system performance of a TransQA trained with the corresponding oracle. Note that both results still use real AMR parses from APT (Zhou et al., 2021a). The gold entity linking oracle results measures how well oracle covers the distribution of SPARQL patterns found in these datasets and can be seen as an approximate upper bound for the performance of TransQA. Overall, correcting for entity linking errors, oracle performance reaches 78.7 and 77.5 for LC-QuAD 1.0 and QALD respectively. Although much higher than any reported system performance, this indicates oracles do not cover all possible SPARQL

patterns, supporting the idea that a transpiling oracle implies a trade-off between inductive bias and expressiveness. Overall, this trade-off has strong positive effect if we compare the TransQA and BART seq2seq baseline results in Table 2.

Entity linking errors are shown to have a strong influence in TransQA, reducing performance by at least 5 points for both LC-QuAD 1.0 and QALD. Other systems can also be expected to have a similar dependency since they can not recover for a linking error, making systems harder to compare.

Table 3 ablates the inductive bias introduced in BART through attention and output vocabulary modifications described in Section 3. Masking cross-attention to attend to the sentence words aligned to and AMR path, and thus to a potential triple, improves performance by around 4 points for an optimal number of 8 modified attention heads, selected on the dev set. Constrained decoding has an even larger effect of 10 points on LC-QuAD 1.0 and 12 points on QALD-9, sensibly larger than the effect of gold entity linking. This is likely because of the large reduction on possible decoding options. Another possibility is that it provides some visibility into the KG structure. This is particularly important to compensate for the fact that the knowledge graphs lack a schema, i.e. it is unclear if relations expressing one particular category will

⁵The relation linking method GenRel (Rossiello et al., 2021) reports 59.6 F1 result in LC-QuAD1.0 when combined with NSQA, without specifying the integration details.

⁶STaG-QA SWQ-WD experiments use a self-selected data split, with smaller, non comparable test set

		LC-QuAD 1.0	QALD-9
TransQA	mask 8 heads	56.5	53.6
TransQA	no mask	52.1	49.5
TransQA	mask 5 heads	56.0	50.5
TransQA	mask 12 heads	55.8	52.8
TransQA	no constrained decoding using KG	46.3	41.8

Table 3: Ablation study measuring the effect of constrained decoding and parser state encoding on BART. Measured by the macro F1 of SPARQL results on the dev set.

exist. Constrained decoding provides thus a limited view into the database, informing future decisions of the transpiler.

7 Prior Work

See Section 5, for descriptions of NSQA (Kapani-[pathi et al., 2021](#)), SYGMA (Neelam [et al., 2021a](#)), EDGQA (Hu [et al., 2021](#)) and STaG-QA (Ravis-[hankar et al., 2021](#)). Both NSQA and SYGMA are relatively similar and involve a combination of multiple systems including entity and relation linking an integration module and a large set of rules. They can thus be seen as having the strongest inductive bias, exploiting human knowledge at the cost of complexity and limited expressiveness. The BART seq2seq baseline can be seen as the other extreme, lacking any inductive bias and clearly suffering when fine-tuned to complex grammars and limited amounts of train data. TransQA can be seen as finding the optimum between these two, needing only a small sub-set of NSQA’s rules, and introducing the inductive bias through oracle imitation, attention masking and constrained decoding. The resulting system, is clearly simpler than NSQA and SYGMA but has higher performance in all corpora tested and, unlike BART, it does not suffer with more complex grammars.

EDGQA and other recent approaches such as (Saparina and Osokin, 2021), transform natural language into intermediate question decomposition representations that are not well known and require of a number of rules. Here we employ AMR, a well established formalism with abundant training data in various languages and robust high performant parsers e.g. (Lee [et al., 2021](#)). TransQA is therefore likely to generalize better while requiring a small set of rules. Though EDGQA outperforms TransQA on QALD, it has to be taken into account that this model uses a ensemble of models for entity

linking that likely provides extra performance.

Though less performant than TransQA, STAG-QA is also a relatively simple approach using two stages of inference. The latter step needs however the beam search which can be computationally prohibitive in datasets with more complex structure than LC-QUAD.

GGNN (Sorokin and Gurevych, 2018) is a baseline system on WebQSP-WD dataset which specifically models the graph structure of the semantic parse using graph convolution. It also defines a custom semantic parsing formalism to construct semantic graph representation from the train examples in WebQSP-WD. Our system outperforms GGNN by 7 F1 points on the WebQSP-WD dataset.

More recently (Banerjee [et al., 2022](#)), propose a seq2seq baseline with T5 where they assume the gold entities and relations have been provided. As shown in our experiments in Table 2, gold entity linking alone causes a large difference in performance. This work is therefore not comparable with the rest of the approaches here considered.

8 Conclusions

We introduced TransQA, an approach for KBQA that transpiles a well established semantic representation, AMR, obtained from an off-the-shelf parser, into SPARQL. This transpiling operation is learned through a transition-based approach, resulting on a simpler and more performant system than prior approaches leveraging AMR. Empirical results on KBQA corpora show that TransQA finds an optimal trade-off between inductive bias and expressiveness, outperforming both sequence to sequence models and more complex pipeline systems incorporating a large number of rules. Ablation analysis shows that encoding of the transpiler state in the self-attention mechanism and constrained decoding yields clear gains, while removing the need

to encode AMR. Finally oracle analysis reveals that the proposed transition system is able to attain high coverage across datasets while remaining simple.

9 Limitations

The current implementation has several limitations which can be addressed in future work. We show in section 5.1 that our technique is severely impacted by the quality of relation linking. This also complicates comparison across systems. Furthermore, we still rely on a small set of rules, see Figure 2 and do not support type constraints and other SPARQL constructs. This limits the coverage of the model, see Table 3, although overall still leads to competitive results and theoretical limits given by the oracle are close to 80 F1. For Wikidata our system uses direct KB relations and the current implementation can not predict statements and reified relations.

Regarding data and compute requirements, the model is trained with small data-sets by leveraging transfer learning from BART and a pre-trained semantic parser. Both models have multiple other purposes, amortizing the overall cost.

The experiments were carried out for the English language but there are little language-specific choices. Both multi-lingual versions of BART (Liu et al., 2020) and cross-lingual transition AMR parsers (Lee et al., 2021) exist and some of the corpora like QALD have multi-lingual versions. Though limited by the amount of data available and alignment quality, the approach could be in principle extended to other languages without drastic changes being needed.

References

- Debayan Banerjee, Pranav Ajit Nair, Jivat Neet Kaur, Ricardo Usbeck, and Chris Biemann. 2022. Modern baselines for sparql semantic parsing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.12793*.
- Michele Bevilacqua, Rexhina Blloshmi, and Roberto Navigli. 2021. One spring to rule them both: Symmetric amr semantic parsing and generation without a complex pipeline.
- Diego Ceccarelli, Claudio Lucchese, Salvatore Orlando, R. Perego, and Salvatore Trani. 2014. Dexter 2.0 - an open source tool for semantically enriching data. In *SEMWEB*.
- Xilun Chen, Asish Ghoshal, Yashar Mehdad, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Sonal Gupta. 2020. [Low-resource domain adaptation for compositional task-oriented semantic parsing](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 5090–5100, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jonathan H. Clark, Eunsol Choi, Michael Collins, Dan Garrette, Tom Kwiatkowski, Vitaly Nikolaev, and Jennimaria Palomaki. 2020. [TyDi QA: A benchmark for information-seeking question answering in typologically diverse languages](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:454–470.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *ArXiv*, abs/1810.04805.
- Dennis Diefenbach, Andreas Both, Kamal Deep Singh, and Pierre Maret. 2020. Towards a question answering system over the semantic web. *Semantic Web*, 11:421–439.
- Dennis Diefenbach, Thomas Pellissier Tanon, Kamal Deep Singh, and Pierre Maret. 2017. Question answering benchmarks for wikidata. In *SEMWEB*.
- Daniel Diomedes and Aidan Hogan. 2022. Entity linking and filling for question answering over knowledge graphs.
- Mohnish Dubey, Debayan Banerjee, Abdelrahman Abdelkawi, and Jens Lehmann. 2019. Lc-quad 2.0: A large dataset for complex question answering over wikidata and dbpedia. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Semantic Web Conference (ISWC)*. Springer.
- Mohnish Dubey, Debayan Banerjee, Debanjan Chaudhuri, and Jens Lehmann. 2018. Earl: Joint entity and relation linking for question answering over knowledge graphs.
- Ramón Fernández Astudillo, Miguel Ballesteros, Tahira Naseem, Austin Blodgett, and Radu Florian. 2020. [Transition-based parsing with stack-transformers](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 1001–1007, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xixin Hu, Yiheng Shu, Xiang Huang, and Yuzhong Qu. 2021. Edg-based question decomposition for complex question answering over knowledge bases. In *The Semantic Web – ISWC 2021*, pages 128–145, Cham. Springer International Publishing.
- Pavan Kapanipathi, Ibrahim Abdelaziz, Srinivas Ravishankar, Salim Roukos, Alexander Gray, Ramón Fernández Astudillo, Maria Chang, Cristina Cornelio, Saswati Dana, Achille Fokoue, Dinesh Garg, Alfio Gliozzo, Sairam Gurajada, Hima Karanam, Naweel Khan, Dinesh Khandelwal, Young-Suk Lee, Yunyao Li, Francois Luus, Ndivhuwo Makondo, Nandana Mihindukulasooriya, Tahira Naseem, Sumit Neelam, Lucian Popa, Revanth Gangi Reddy, Ryan Riegel,

- Gaetano Rossiello, Udit Sharma, G P Shrivatsa Bhargav, and Mo Yu. 2021. [Leveraging Abstract Meaning Representation for knowledge base question answering](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 3884–3894, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tom Kwiatkowski, Jennimaria Palomaki, Olivia Redfield, Michael Collins, Ankur Parikh, Chris Alberti, Danielle Epstein, Illia Polosukhin, Matthew Kelcey, Jacob Devlin, Kenton Lee, Kristina N. Toutanova, Llion Jones, Ming-Wei Chang, Andrew Dai, Jakob Uszkoreit, Quoc Le, and Slav Petrov. 2019. Natural questions: a benchmark for question answering research. *Transactions of the Association of Computational Linguistics*.
- Young-Suk Lee, Ramon Fernandez Astudillo, Thanh Lam Hoang, Tahira Naseem, Radu Florian, and Salim Roukos. 2021. Maximum bayes smatch ensemble distillation for amr parsing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.07790*.
- Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Ves Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2019. Bart: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.13461*.
- Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. BART: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yinhan Liu, Jiatao Gu, Naman Goyal, Xian Li, Sergey Edunov, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Mike Lewis, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. Multilingual denoising pre-training for neural machine translation. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:726–742.
- Tahira Naseem, Srinivas Ravishankar, Nandana Mihindukulasooriya, Ibrahim Abdelaziz, Young-Suk Lee, Pavan Kapanipathi, Salim Roukos, Alfio Gliozzo, and Alexander Gray. 2021. [A semantics-aware transformer model of relation linking for knowledge base question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 256–262, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sumit Neelam, Udit Sharma, Hima Karanam, Shajith Ikbal, Pavan Kapanipathi, Ibrahim Abdelaziz, Nandana Mihindukulasooriya, Young-Suk Lee, Santosh Srivastava, Cezar Pendus, et al. 2021a. Sygma: System for generalizable modular question answering over knowledge bases. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.13430*.
- Sumit Neelam, Udit Sharma, Hima P. Karanam, Shajith Ikbal, Pavan Kapanipathi, I. Abdelaziz, Nandana Mihindukulasooriya, Young-Suk Lee, Santosh Srivastava, Cezar Pendus, Saswati Dana, Dinesh Garg, Achille Fokoue, G P Shrivatsa Bhargav, Dinesh Khandelwal, Srinivas Ravishankar, Sairam Gurajada, Maria Chang, Rosario A. Uceda-Sosa, Salim Roukos, Alexander G. Gray, Guilherme Lima Ryan Riegel, Francois P. S. Luus, and L. V. Subramaniam. 2021b. Sygma: System for generalizable modular question answering over knowledge bases. *ArXiv*, abs/2109.13430.
- Pranav Rajpurkar, Robin Jia, and Percy Liang. 2018. Know what you don’t know: Unanswerable questions for squad. In *ACL*.
- Srinivas Ravishankar, June Thai, Ibrahim Abdelaziz, Nandana Mihindukulasooriya, Tahira Naseem, Pavan Kapanipathi, Gaetano Rossiello, and Achille Fokoue. 2021. [A two-stage approach towards generalization in knowledge base question answering](#).
- Gaetano Rossiello, Nandana Mihindukulasooriya, I. Abdelaziz, Mihaela A. Bornea, A. Gliozzo, Tahira Naseem, and Pavan Kapanipathi. 2021. Generative relation linking for question answering over knowledge bases. *ArXiv*, abs/2108.07337.
- Ahmad Sakor, Isaiah Onando Mulang’, Kuldeep Singh, Saeedeh Shekarpour, Maria Esther Vidal, Jens Lehmann, and Sören Auer. 2019. [Old is gold: Linguistic driven approach for entity and relation linking of short text](#). 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 2336–2346, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Irina Saparina and Anton Osokin. 2021. Sparqling database queries from intermediate question decompositions. In *EMNLP*.
- Daniil Sorokin and Iryna Gurevych. 2018. [Modeling semantics with gated graph neural networks for knowledge base question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 3306–3317, Santa Fe, New Mexico, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Priyansh Trivedi, Gaurav Maheshwari, Mohnish Dubey, and Jens Lehmann. 2017. [Lc-quad: A corpus for complex question answering over knowledge graphs](#).
- Ricardo Usbeck, Axel-Cyrille Ngonga Ngomo, Bastian Haarmann, Anastasia Krithara, Michael Röder, and Giulio Napolitano. 2017. 7th open challenge on question answering over linked data (qald-7).

- In *Semantic Web Challenges*, pages 59–69, Cham. Springer International Publishing.
- Svitlana Vakulenko, Javier David Fernandez Garcia, Axel Polleres, M. de Rijke, and Michael Cochez. 2019. Message passing for complex question answering over knowledge graphs. *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*.
- 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*, pages 5998–6008.
- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi 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 M. 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.
- Ledell Yu Wu, Fabio Petroni, Martin Josifoski, Sebastian Riedel, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. Scalable zero-shot entity linking with dense entity retrieval. In *EMNLP*.
- Tao Yu, Rui Zhang, Kai-Chou Yang, Michihiro Yasunaga, Dongxu Wang, Zifan Li, James Ma, Irene Z Li, Qingning Yao, Shanelle Roman, Zilin Zhang, and Dragomir R. Radev. 2018. Spider: A large-scale human-labeled dataset for complex and cross-domain semantic parsing and text-to-sql task. In *EMNLP*.
- Jiawei Zhou, Tahira Naseem, Ramón Fernandez Astudillo, and Radu Florian. 2021a. [AMR parsing with action-pointer transformer](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 5585–5598, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jiawei Zhou, Tahira Naseem, Ramón Fernandez Astudillo, Young-Suk Lee, Radu Florian, and Salim Roukos. 2021b. [Structure-aware fine-tuning of sequence-to-sequence transformers for transition-based AMR parsing](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6279–6290, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lei Zou, Ruizhe Huang, Haixun Wang, Jeffrey Yu, Wenqiang He, and Dongyan Zhao. 2014. [Natural language question answering over rdf - a graph data driven approach](#). *Proceedings of the ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data*.