

Prompting Disentangled Embeddings for Knowledge Graph Completion with Pre-trained Language Model

Yuxia Geng

School of Computer Science
Hangzhou Dianzi University
Hangzhou, China
yuxia.geng@hdu.edu.cn

Jiaoyan Chen

Department of Computer Science
The University of Manchester
Manchester, United Kingdom
jiaoyan.chen@manchester.ac.uk

Yuhang Zeng

HDU-ITMO Joint Institute
Hangzhou Dianzi University
Hangzhou, China
yuhang.zeng@hdu.edu.cn

Zhuo Chen, Wen Zhang

Zhejiang University
Hangzhou, China
{zhuo.chen, zhang.wen}@zju.edu.cn

Jeff Z. Pan

School of Informatics
The University of Edinburgh
Edinburgh, United Kingdom
j.z.pan@ed.ac.uk

Yuxiang Wang, Xiaoliang Xu

School of Computer Science
Hangzhou Dianzi University
Hangzhou, China
{lsswyx, xxl}@hdu.edu.cn

Abstract—Both graph structures and textual information play a critical role in Knowledge Graph Completion (KGC). With the success of Pre-trained Language Models (PLMs) such as BERT, they have been applied for text encoding for KGC. However, the current methods mostly prefer to fine-tune PLMs, leading to huge training costs and limited scalability to larger PLMs. In contrast, we propose to utilize prompts and perform KGC on a frozen PLM with only the prompts trained. Accordingly, we propose a new KGC method named PDKGC with two prompts — a hard task prompt which is to adapt the KGC task to the PLM pre-training task of token prediction, and a disentangled structure prompt which learns disentangled graph representation so as to enable the PLM to combine more relevant structure knowledge with the text information. With the two prompts, PDKGC builds a textual predictor and a structural predictor, respectively, and their combination leads to more comprehensive entity prediction. Solid evaluation on two widely used KGC datasets has shown that PDKGC often outperforms the baselines including the state-of-the-art, and its components are all effective. Our codes and data are available at <https://github.com/gengengcss/PDKGC>.

Index Terms—Knowledge Graph Completion, Pre-trained Language Model, Prompt Tuning, Disentangled Embedding

I. INTRODUCTION

Knowledge Graphs (KGs) [31] are collections of real-world factual knowledge represented as RDF triples. A set of such triples typically constitutes a multi-relational graph with entities as nodes and relations as edges. The entities and relations often have rich textual information as their names and descriptions. In recent years, KGs have been valuable resources in a variety of knowledge-intensive applications, such as question answering, search engines, and recommender systems. Despite the increasing use, KGs often suffer from incompleteness with a high ratio of plausible facts missing [13]. Knowledge Graph Completion (KGC) is then proposed to find these missing facts using the existing facts and/or external resources.

With the graph structure implied by triples, a large part of KGC methods uses KG embedding (KGE) techniques to encode the KG entities and relations into a vector space with their

semantics like neighborhood graph patterns concerned, so that the missing facts can be inferred by their vector representations (a.k.a. embeddings) [7], [45]. We call them *structure*-based methods (see Section II). Besides the graph structure, there are also some methods exploiting the text of the entities and relations as additional information for prediction, but methods of this type proposed before 2021 such as DKRL [48] (see their review [15]) use non-contextualized text embeddings such as Word2Vec to encode the text, which specify a token a unique embedding and cannot fully capture its meaning in the context.

Recently, Pre-trained Language Models (PLMs) such as BERT [11], which encode the text with the tokens' contexts considered, have achieved great success in natural language processing (NLP), and they have been applied to KGC. The methods often represent entities and relations using their textual information, view KGC as an NLP downstream task, and fine-tune PLMs to infer the missing facts. For example, KG-BERT [52] takes as input a triple's whole text, encodes the text with BERT, and feeds the text encoding into a classifier to predict its plausibility (score); KGT5 [33] leverages the Seq2Seq PLM framework to directly generate a triple's missing part conditioned on its other two known parts. We call the methods that utilize the textual information with some PLMs as *PLM*-based. The challenge of these methods thus lies in incorporating the graph structure simultaneously. Several efforts have been made in this direction. For example, LASS [35] and StAR [43] further forward the PLM-based text encoding to a KGE model to fine-tune the PLM and learn the structure embeddings jointly. However, fine-tuning the PLM is (i) costly in both computation and storage, limiting the applicability to larger models, and (ii) more prone to overfit and forget the knowledge e.g. linguistic inherece learned during pre-training, in many cases limiting the performance [3], [12].

Meanwhile, a more efficient technology of using PLMs named **prompt-tuning** has arisen: adapting the PLM directly as a downstream task predictor by adding (learnable) task-specific




Fig. 1: An example of the KG entity “David Beckham” which is associated with neighboring entities of different aspects (e.g., “family”, “career”) by different kinds of relations.

prompts on the input side without fine-tuning the PLM [3], [20], [24]. For example, the prompt “It was [MASK]” prepended to the input sentence “No reason to watch it.” formulates a binary sentiment classification task as the masked token prediction which is one of the pre-training tasks of LMs such as BERT [11]. In general, such prompts on the one hand reduce the task gap between language modeling and downstream tasks with more generalization gains from PLMs, and on the other hand allow to freeze the PLMs with fewer parameters to tune.

Although prompt-tuning has been applied to various fields including NLP [23], computer vision [54], protein design [29], etc, relatively few attempts have been proposed for KGC. The only one we know is CSProm-KG [5], which uses a frozen PLM to incorporate the textual information into a KG’s structural embeddings through structure-aware soft prompts, and then adopts the enhanced structural embeddings and a KGE model to predict the triple. However, the proposed structure-aware soft prompt is still quite preliminary and the whole method neglects the potential of the PLM for triple prediction.

In exploring prompt-tuning for KGC, we have the following questions: (1) *How to make KGC close to the pre-training tasks of a PLM to obtain more task-relevant knowledge especially when the PLM is frozen?* (2) *Given massive triples in a KG, how to effectively fuse the graph structure and the text by prompts?* As shown in Fig. 1, an entity in a KG is often connected to different neighboring entities via different relations, indicating semantics of different aspects. To complete the triple (*David Beckham, member of team, ?*), the text about *David Beckham*’s career should have higher attention to neighbors connected to *David Beckham* through career-related relations such as *works for* than to neighbors connected through other kinds of relations. Thus to answer the second question, we need to learn the relevance between different text parts and different semantic aspects of the graph. The self-attention mechanism of the PLM can automatically learn the relevance between two sequences. Thus a straightforward idea is serializing the neighborhood into a sequence and feeding it to a self-attention layer together with the text. However, it is impracticable due to PLMs’ maximum sequence length limit.

To this end, we propose a new PLM-based KGC method **PDKGC** which includes a **hard task prompt** and a **disentangled structure prompt** for tackling the above two questions.

The hard task prompt is a pre-defined template containing the [MASK] token, which reformulates the KGC task as a token prediction task in line with the pre-training tasks of many PLMs. The disentangled structure prompt is a series of trainable vectors (i.e., soft prompts) generated from disentangled entity embeddings which are learned by a graph learner with selective aggregations over different neighboring entities. It is prepended to the hard task prompt to form the inputs of a frozen PLM. In this way, we incorporate structure knowledge into a PLM with shorter prompts and utilize powerful self-attention to learn the relevant part for a specific triple to complete.

After encoding by the PLM, for a KG triple to complete, PDKGC not only includes a *textual predictor* to output a probability distribution over all entities based on the encoded representations of the [MASK] token which has fused relevant structural knowledge, but also includes a *structural predictor* to simultaneously produce the entity ranks by forwarding the encoded representations of structural soft prompts to a KGE model. Naturally, their outputs can be further combined for more comprehensive prediction. Evaluations on two popular KG datasets demonstrate the superiority of our proposed model to CSProm-KG, as well as fine-tuned *PLM*-based methods and traditional *structure*-based methods.

II. RELATED WORK

A. Structure-based Methods

These methods generally consist of three steps: (i) assigning a trainable embedding to each entity and relation, (ii) defining a scoring function to measure the plausibility of a triple, and (iii) optimizing the entity and relation embeddings such that the positive triples get high scores while the negative ones get low scores. According to how a triple is scored, the existing methods can be grouped into three types: *translation*-based ones such as TransE [2] and RotatE [36], *semantic matching*-based ones such as DistMult [51] and ComplEx [39], and *neural network*-based ones such as ConvE [10]. Recently, graph neural networks (GNNs) are also employed to encode the entity by aggregation. Typical practices include relation-aware GCN [34], CompGCN [40], etc. All of these models have shown their capability to embed complex semantics of the graph structure of a KG and have achieved promising results for KGC.

B. PLM-based Methods

PLM-based approaches use plain text (sequence of tokens) to represent the entities and relations for predicting the missing triples. Some of them take PLMs as encoders, encoding the textual information and then predicting the plausibility of triples by feeding the encoded representations into a prediction layer. More specifically, KG-BERT [52], PKGC [26] and MTL-KGC [18] pack the text of the head, relation and tail of a triple as one sentence, forward it into BERT, and feed the output at the [CLS] token into a simple MLP layer to predict whether the triple is true or not. BERTSubs [6] is quite similar but is to predict the special subsumption relation between two concepts in an ontology. To predict the missing entity in an incomplete triple, these methods have to traverse all the entities to generate

a set of candidate triples and predict all their scores. To avoid this combinatorial explosion, StAR [43] and SimKGC [44] separately encode the text of (h, r) and t using a Siamese BERT and predict the triple score by measuring the compatibility of these two parts. Nevertheless, they rely on high-quality negative samples. Motivated by the masked token prediction in PLM pre-training, MEM-KGC [8] regards the missing entity of a triple as the masked token, and classifies this token over all the entities with the text of the known entity and relation.

Some methods take encoder-decoder or decoder-only PLMs to directly generate text of the missing entity to complete a triple. KGT5 [33] makes the first attempt by pre-training a T5 model using large-scale KG datasets from scratch. GenKGC [49] and KG-S2S [4] instead fine-tune BART and T5, respectively, with effective decoding strategies proposed. Although these methods improve the inference efficiency by avoiding the traversal of all the candidates, the auto-regressive generation still takes a long time. Also, matching the generated text with the existing entities is non-trivial but challenging since an entity may have diverse surface names and may not exist in the KG.

To sum up, due to the inherent gap between the KGC task and the PLM pre-training task, the above PLM-based methods require diverse fine-tuning strategies with both positive and negative samples, and mostly cost much time in training and inference. Meanwhile, they mainly rely on the textual information alone, with the graph structure weakly incorporated.

C. Joint Methods

Before PLMs, there were already some KGC methods trying to utilize both structure and text knowledge for KGC [15], [19], [48], [50]. However, they often adopt non-contextualized text embedding methods. Thanks to the advances in PLMs, KEPLER [46] proposes to use PLMs to encode entity descriptions as entity embeddings and then jointly optimize the KGE and masked language modeling objectives on the same PLM. StAR [43] additionally composes the text encodings of (h, r) and t using translation-based KGE methods' score functions, while LASS [35] follows KG-BERT to encode the full text of a triple but forwards the pooled text encodings of h, r, t into a KGE model to reconstruct the KG structure.

Recently, Chen et al. proposed **CSProm-KG** [5], which is the first work to investigate frozen PLMs for KGC. It utilizes the text encoding from a frozen PLM for enhancing the structure embeddings by soft prompts, but predicts the missing triple using the structure embeddings alone by feeding them to a KGE model such as ConvE. Our **PDKGC** also includes such a text-augmented KGE module (i.e., the *structure predictor*) but goes beyond it. It simultaneously has a structure-augmented text predictor to enable the frozen PLM to predict an incomplete triple through a hard task prompt. These two predictors complement each other and provide more comprehensive predictions, leading to better results with a simple ensemble method. Most importantly, CSProm-KG focuses on non-disentangled structural representations with limited attention between the text encoding and the graph

structure embedding, while our PDKGC learns disentangled entity representations, through which more fine-grained correlations between the text and the graph structure can be learned for more robust prediction.

III. METHODOLOGY

In this session, we first introduce the preliminary including a formal definition of the KGC problem we aim at, and an overview of the pre-trained language models (PLMs). Then, as shown in Fig. 2, we introduce the hard task prompt applied in this study for reformulating KGC, and a disentangled graph learner for learning disentangled structural embeddings. Based on them, we present a structure-aware text encoder built upon frozen PLMs for generating the disentangled structure prompt and encoding it with the text included in the hard task prompt. Finally, two predictors based on textual and structural encodings are designed to simultaneously output the entity ranking results.

A. Preliminary

1) *KGC Problem Formulation*: In this study, a KG is formulated as $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}\}$, where \mathcal{E} is a set of entities, \mathcal{R} is a set of relations, and $\mathcal{T} = \{(h, r, t) | h, t \in \mathcal{E}; r \in \mathcal{R}\}$ is a set of relational facts in form of RDF¹ triple. For a triple (h, r, t) , h , r and t are called head entity, relation and tail entity, respectively. For each entity or relation, it is often associated with a phrase of surface names and/or a paragraph of textual descriptions as its textual information. The completion is then defined to predict an input candidate triple as true or not, i.e., *triple classification*, or predict the missing entity/relation in a triple with the other two elements given, i.e., *entity/relation prediction* or *link prediction*. In our paper, we aim at training a model for the more challenging *entity prediction* task for KGC, i.e., given a head h (resp. tail t) and a relation r , the model is expected to find out a tail t (resp. head h) from \mathcal{E} for a new and correct triple (h, r, t) . During inference, for an incomplete triple such as $(h, r, ?)$, the trained model will rank all the potential tail entities according to the probabilities of them being the correct or the scores of all candidate triples $\{(h, r, t') | t' \in \mathcal{E}, (h, r, t') \notin \mathcal{T}\}$. A tail entity is ranked at a higher position if it makes the current triple more plausible.

2) *Pre-trained Language Models*: PLMs are language models that are pre-trained on large-scale corpora in a self-supervised fashion, most of them derive from the Transformer [41] design, containing the encoder and decoder modules empowered by the self-attention mechanism. Based on model architectures, PLMs can be grouped into encoder-only, encoder-decoder, and decoder-only. Encoder-only PLMs only use the encoder to encode the input sequence, and are often pre-trained to predict the randomly masked tokens for recovery, i.e., masked language modeling (MLM). Typical models include BERT [11], RoBERTa [25] and ELECTRA [9]. After pre-training, an extra prediction layer, such as MLP, is often added to fine-tune the pre-trained models to solve downstream tasks. Encoder-decoder PLMs include an encoder that encodes the input sequence into a

¹Resource Description Framework. See <https://www.w3.org/RDF/>.




Fig. 2: The framework overview of our proposed PDKGC, with the KG triple example (*David Beckham, has son, ?*) to complete. It includes (1) a disentangled graph learner that learns structure semantics of different K aspects for each entity, here we take $K = 3$ as an example, (2) a structure-aware text encoder that encodes the triple text together with a set of prefix prompts generated from disentangled structural embeddings, i.e., our proposed disentangled structure prompt with p^0 and p^L at the first and last layers of the frozen PLM, respectively, and (3) two predictors that respectively take as input the structure-augmented textual encoding, i.e., [MASK] token’s hidden vector at PLMs’ final layer w_{MASK}^L , and the text-augmented structural encoding, i.e., the structural prompts at PLM’s last layer $p_h^{1,L}, p_h^{2,L}, p_h^{3,L}$ and p_r^L , for predicting the probabilities (scores) that t is the correct tail entity, i.e., Q_S and Q_T , which can be further fused to output a final score. Notably, $w_{h,i}^0$ is the input embedding of the i -th token in the head entity h ’s textual names and descriptions, while $p_h^{k,0}$ represents the input token sequence embedding corresponding to h ’s k -th disentangled embedding.

hidden space, and a decoder that generates the target output text conditioned on these hidden states. Models in this group e.g. T5 [32], BART [21] and GLM [53] are suitable for downstream tasks that generate text. Decoder-only PLMs only employ the decoder to generate target text, and the pre-training paradigm is to predict the next word in a sentence. Many state-of-the-art PLMs e.g. GPT-4 [30] and LLaMA [38] follow this design.

B. Hard Task Prompt

As introduced above, many PLMs are pre-trained by the missing token prediction task, where a standard cross-entropy loss is applied to score the true token against all other tokens. Therefore, to meet the needs of bridging KGC to these pre-training tasks, to distill the pre-trained knowledge from PLMs without having to fine-tune, we propose an “auto-completion” task prompt, to view the missing entity as a missing token and coax the off-the-shelf PLM models into producing a textual output based on the entity vocabulary. Formally, in the case of *tail entity prediction*, the task prompt is defined as:

$$X_{prompt} = [B] h_{text} [S] r_{text} [S] [MASK] [S] \quad (1)$$

where [MASK] is a placeholder to represent the missing tail entity t to predict, the texts of the given head entity and relation, i.e., h_{text} and r_{text} , are kept as the context. [B] and [S] are special tokens in the PLMs, for encoder-only PLMs such as BERT, they are [CLS] and [SEP], for decoder-only PLMs such as LLaMA, [B] is initialized as [BOS], and the last [S] is [EOS]. X_{prompt} is then fed into an arbitrary PLM, and the PLM will decide which entity is more appropriate to fill in [MASK] by feeding its output hidden vector $w_{[MASK]}^L$ into a liner layer parameterized by weights $W_e \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{E}| \times H}$:

$$\begin{aligned} p(t|X_{prompt}) &= p([MASK] = t|X_{prompt}) \\ &= \frac{\exp(e_t \cdot w_{[MASK]}^L)}{\sum_{t' \in \mathcal{E}} \exp(e_{t'} \cdot w_{[MASK]}^L)} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where H is the PLM’s hidden vector size, L is its layer number in total, and e_t is the row vector in W_e that corresponds to the correct entity t . Similarly, the cross-entropy loss is used to optimize the prediction, but instead scores the true entity against all other entities. Notably, for encoder-decoder and decoder-only PLMs, we only decode one token corresponding to the

predicted entity without having to auto-regressively generate a text sequence for representing t , which would cost extra inference time. The case of *head entity prediction* is the same except that the missing head entity is replaced by [MASK] for prediction. Without losing the generalization, in the remainder of this section, we use the case of *tail entity prediction* to introduce the method. Next, we will introduce how to leverage the disentangled structure prompt to incorporate highly relevant local structural information into the PLM.

C. Disentangled Graph Learner

Given the graph context of a triple to complete, i.e., $(h, r, ?)$, especially the surrounding triples of h , we find that only a subset of neighbors carries valuable information that can be used to augment the inference, i.e., highly relevant graph structures. Therefore, we propose to learn a disentangled representation (embedding) for each entity. Such a representation contains multiple components, each of which encodes the features of a specific subset of neighbors that are highly relevant to this entity in a certain semantic aspect. Briefly, different components correspond to different semantic aspects of the entity. Take the entity ‘‘David Beckham’’ as an example, its associated relations ‘‘daughter’’ and ‘‘wife’’ and its neighboring entities connected by these two relations contain semantics of the family aspect, and they are expected to be encoded in one component of this entity’s disentangled representation. In contrast, the semantics of the career aspect of ‘‘David Beckham’’ are expected to be encoded in another component. With such a disentangled representation, more relevant semantics from the graph can be captured for the contextual text of the triple to complete. In this subsection, an entity is denoted by v , and its disentangled representation is denoted as $\mathbf{v} = [\mathbf{v}^1, \mathbf{v}^2, \dots, \mathbf{v}^K]$ where $\mathbf{v}^k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denotes k^{th} component, d is its embedding size, and K is the number of components.

To identify the aspect-specific subset, we follow the attention-based neighborhood routing strategy proposed in disentangled graph learning [27], [47]. Also, considering the various relation types in the neighborhood, we apply a **relation-aware attention mechanism**. Specifically, for the k -th aspect, the attention value of one neighbor v_j of entity v_i is computed by the similarity of the k -th component embeddings of v_j and v_i in the subspace of their connection relation r following the assumption that when a neighbor contributes more to v_i during encoding, their relation-aware representations are more similar, formally:

$$\alpha_{(v_i, r, v_j)}^k = \frac{\text{softmax}((\mathbf{v}_{i,r}^k)^T \cdot \mathbf{v}_{j,r}^k)}{\sum_{(v_j, r') \in \mathcal{N}(v_i)} \text{exp}((\mathbf{v}_{i,r'}^k)^T \cdot \mathbf{v}_{j,r'}^k)} \quad (3)$$

$$\mathbf{v}_{i,r}^k = \mathbf{v}_i^k \circ \mathbf{W}_r, \quad \mathbf{v}_{j,r}^k = \mathbf{v}_j^k \circ \mathbf{W}_r \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{v}_{i,r}^k$ is the k -th component embedding of v_i w.r.t. relation r , \circ denotes the Hadamard product, and \mathbf{W}_r is a learnable projection matrix of r for projecting component embeddings into a relation specific subspace. $\mathcal{N}(v_i)$ denotes entity-relation pairs, for each of which the entity is associated with v_i through

the relation, including v_i itself with a special self-connection relation. The dot-product similarity is adopted here.

With attention values, we next aggregate the highlighted neighbors’ features to represent each component so as to encode the relevant graph structures into component embeddings:

$$\mathbf{h}_i^{k,l} = \sigma \left(\sum_{(v_j, r) \in \mathcal{N}(v_i)} \alpha_{(v_i, r, v_j)}^{k,l-1} \phi(\mathbf{h}_j^{k,l-1}, \mathbf{h}_r^{l-1}, \mathbf{W}_r) \right) \quad (5)$$

$$\phi(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{W}) = \mathbf{W}\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{W}(\mathbf{a} \circ \mathbf{b}) \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{h}_i^{k,l}$ is the k -th component hidden state of v_i obtained after l layers aggregation, and $l \in \{1, \dots, L_g\}$ with L_g as the total number of aggregation layers. \mathbf{h}_r^{l-1} is relation r ’s embedding in the $(l-1)$ -th layer, and we also update it with layer-specific transformation matrix parameterized by Θ_r^{l-1} as: $\mathbf{h}_r^l = \Theta_r^{l-1} \cdot \mathbf{h}_r^{l-1}$. ϕ is a combination operator for fusing the features of neighboring entities and relations, computed as Eq. (6). $\mathbf{h}_i^{k,0}$ and \mathbf{h}_r^0 are randomly initialized, and \mathbf{h}_i^{k,L_g} is outputted at the last layer which has encoded the neighborhood information specific to k -th component. In the remainder, we use \mathbf{v}_i^k to denote \mathbf{h}_i^{k,L_g} and \mathbf{r} to denote $\mathbf{h}_r^{L_g}$ for simplicity.

D. Structure-aware Text Encoder

After obtaining the embedded structural information, we next integrate them with the PLM. Specifically, we learn a projection network to translate the learned entity and relation embeddings into a sequence of token embeddings, and prepend them at the inputs to the frozen PLMs. Before that, given the facts that not all the structure knowledge is truly useful for a target triple, and we have learned disentangled representations for entities with their different semantic aspects considered, a question raised here is: how to select the entity embedding components that are highly related to the triple to complete. A practicable solution is to measure the semantic relatedness between a component and the relation in the target triple by e.g. computing the similarity of their structural embeddings, and select those highly related. However, the structural representations might not be comprehensive enough to accurately evaluate the relatedness. Thus, we propose to feed all the components into the PLM and rely on the powerful self-attention mechanism to make decisions, where the textual information of the current triple also helps in determining which components are more relevant.

Specifically, for an entity v and its one component embedding \mathbf{v}^k , we first generate for \mathbf{v}^k a set of token vectors as:

$$\mathbf{p}_v^k = \mathbf{W}_{s2p_out} \cdot (\text{ReLU}(\mathbf{W}_{s2p_in} \cdot \mathbf{v}^k)) \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbf{W}_{s2p_in} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_h \times d}$ and $\mathbf{W}_{s2p_out} \in \mathbb{R}^{(H*n) \times d_h}$ are weight matrices in the two-layer projection network, d_h is its middle hidden size, d denotes the embedding size of each component. The projected output is then re-shaped as $\mathbb{R}^{H \times n}$, where H represents the hidden state size in the PLM and n is the length of the generated prompts, meaning that we translate each component into a sequence of length n . The relation embeddings are also translated similarly. Consequently, for a target triple $(h, r, ?)$ with the tail entity missing, we generate for the corresponding structural embeddings $\mathbf{h}_s^1, \mathbf{h}_s^2, \dots, \mathbf{h}_s^K$ and

r_s a sequence $\mathbf{p} = [\mathbf{p}_h^1; \mathbf{p}_h^2; \dots; \mathbf{p}_h^K; \mathbf{p}_r]$, with $(K+1)*n$ tokens in total, where $[\cdot]$ denotes the vector concatenation operation. \mathbf{p} is thus the **disentangled structure prompt**. Meanwhile, we also convert the h_{text} and r_{text} in the hard task prompt into corresponding input embeddings with the PLM’s tokenizer and pre-trained token embedding table. As shown in Fig. 2, the first token of h_{text} is represented as $\mathbf{w}_{h,1}$, with $\mathbf{w}_{h,1}^0$ and $\mathbf{w}_{h,1}^L$ as the input of the first layer and the output of the last layer, respectively, of the PLM. The disentangled structure prompt sequence is then re-denoted as $\mathbf{p}^0 = [\mathbf{p}_h^{1,0}; \mathbf{p}_h^{2,0}; \dots; \mathbf{p}_h^{K,0}; \mathbf{p}_r^0]$ and prepended to the input embeddings to forward to the PLM.

In practice, to avoid too long inputs for PLMs, especially when we load all components of an entity, we follow [22] and [5] to build layer-wise prompts with shorter lengths but inserted at each layer. To be more specific, we modify the output matrix of the projection network as $\mathbf{W}_{s2p_out} \in \mathbb{R}^{(L*H*n) \times d_h}$, where L means the number of layers in a PLM. In this way, the prompt \mathbf{p} with relatively small n is prepended at the beginning of each layer and frequently interacts with the textual information.

To sum up, we implement the structure-aware text encoding by prepending the disentangled structure prompts to the text encoder, which introduces more relevant structure knowledge in the masked token’s final representation (i.e., $\mathbf{w}_{[MASK]}^L$). On the other hand, we also leverage the semantics implied in text to help the disentangled graph learning through self-attention over all components of the entity representation, and get a set of text-enhanced structure representations (i.e., $\mathbf{p}_h^{k,L}$ and \mathbf{p}_r^L).

E. Textual and Structural Predictors

With the final hidden vector of the $[MASK]$ token $\mathbf{w}_{[MASK]}^L$, we next predict the missing entities. In our preliminary experiments, we follow Eq. (2) to use a randomly initialized linear layer parameterized by \mathbf{W}_e to classify $\mathbf{w}_{[MASK]}^L$ over all entities, where the i -th row vector e_i serves as the classification vector corresponding to the i -th entity. Feeding $\mathbf{w}_{[MASK]}^L$ into the linear layer can thus be viewed as matching it with these classification vectors, the most similar one whose corresponding entity is the predicted entity. However, these classification vectors are directly learned representations instead of encoding the textual information like $\mathbf{w}_{[MASK]}^L$. Therefore, to better utilize the textual semantics, for each candidate entity, we run a frozen textual encoder, which is the same as the main PLM, to encode its textual information and obtain a fixed textual embedding e_i^T in advance. Then, we replace \mathbf{W}_e with these textual embeddings and predict the probability of e_i being the correct entity as:

$$Q_i^T = e_i^T \cdot \mathbf{W}_o \cdot \mathbf{w}_{[MASK]}^L \quad (8)$$

where $\mathbf{W}_o \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times H}$ is a trainable transformation matrix for more flexible learning.

With *tail entity prediction*, the standard cross-entropy loss with label smoothing is applied to train the whole model as:

$$\mathcal{L}^T = -\frac{1}{B} \sum_{(h,r) \in batch} ((1-\epsilon) \cdot \log p(t|X_{prompt}) + \frac{\epsilon}{|\mathcal{E}|-1} \sum_{t' \in \mathcal{E}/\{t\}} \log p(t'|X_{prompt})) \quad (9)$$

where $p(t|X_{prompt}) = \frac{\exp(Q_t^T)}{\sum_{t' \in \mathcal{E}} \exp(Q_{t'}^T)}$, t is the label of the given testing triple $(h, r, ?)$, i.e., the ground-truth tail entity. B is the batch size, ϵ is for label smoothing often set to 0.1.

We call the prediction made by Eq. (8) *textual predictor* since it mainly relies on the LMs for inference. Furthermore, to ensure that the structural embeddings really capture the dependencies on graph, we propose a parallel *structural predictor* that forwards the structural embeddings especially the text-enhanced structural embeddings to a KGE model to reconstruct the graph structures. Specifically, we extract the hidden vectors of structural prompts at the last layer and map them into the graph embedding space again through a linear layer parameterized by $\mathbf{W}_{p2s} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times (H*n)}$. Then, regarding that we have multiple mapped entity prompts with different semantic aspects, and the importance of each component has been weighted by the current triple, we conduct component-level prediction and leverage a triple-wise attention mechanism to fuse the results from different components.

Take the tail entity prediction $(h, r, ?)$ as an example, once obtained the mapped head entity component embedding \mathbf{h}_{p2s}^k and the mapped relation embedding \mathbf{r}_{p2s} , for an entity $e_i \in \mathcal{E}$, we can choose a triple score function from one of the existing geometric KGE models to compute its score to be the correct tail entity. Here we take the score function of TransE [2] as an illustration:

$$Q_{i,k}^S = \gamma - \|\mathbf{h}_{p2s}^k + \mathbf{r}_{p2s} - e_{i,k}^S\|_2^2 \quad (10)$$

where γ represents a margin parameter controlling the score difference between true and false entities, $e_{i,k}^S$ is the k -th component of the embedding of e_i learned by the Disentangled Graph Learner.

Meanwhile, since the relation information plays an important role in distinguishing the semantic aspects of entities, we obtain the attention weight of each prediction by computing the similarity between the mapped entity component prompts and relation prompts, formally:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{(h,r)}^k &= \text{softmax}((\mathbf{h}_{p2s}^k)^T \cdot \mathbf{r}_{p2s}) \\ &= \frac{\exp((\mathbf{h}_{p2s}^k)^T \cdot \mathbf{r}_{p2s})}{\sum_{k' \in \{1,2,\dots,K\}} \exp((\mathbf{h}_{p2s}^{k'})^T \cdot \mathbf{r}_{p2s})} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The final score of e_i is computed as:

$$Q_i^S = \sum_{k \in \{1,2,\dots,K\}} \beta_{(h,r)}^k Q_{i,k}^S \quad (12)$$

, and the standard cross-entropy loss is calculated as:

$$\mathcal{L}^S = -\frac{1}{B} \sum_{(h,r) \in batch} ((1-\epsilon) \cdot \log p(t|h,r) + \frac{\epsilon}{|\mathcal{E}|-1} \sum_{t' \in \mathcal{E}/\{t\}} \log p(t'|h,r)) \quad (13)$$

where $p(t|h,r) = \frac{\exp(Q_t^S)}{\sum_{t' \in \mathcal{E}} \exp(Q_{t'}^S)}$.

As we can see, we predict the tail entity using the structural prompts outputted from the PLM, which are representation enhanced by the triple’s textual information, instead of the

structural embeddings before feeding into the PLM. This is similar to the textual predictor in Eq. (8) where the final representation of the [MASK] token has been augmented by the triple’s structure information. In this way, we not only obtain a model that can effectively fuse the textual and structural knowledge, but also have two predictions for a triple to complete. Consequently, we can fuse them during inference by e.g., performing a weighted sum of the predicted scores.

The final training loss is defined as:

$$\mathcal{L} = f(\mathcal{L}^T, \mathcal{L}^S) + \lambda \cdot \mathcal{L}_{mi} \quad (14)$$

where \mathcal{L}_{mi} is a mutual information based loss used to regularize the independence among disentangled components, λ is its corresponding hyperparameter. The function f , derived from [17] for effective multi-task learning, contains a two-valued trainable parameter to automatically weight and sum the loss items of the *textual predictor* and *structural predictor*. See more details in our published codes. During inference, we also use the well-trained f to compute the weighted sum of the scores of these two predictors. In the future, it is expected to explore more effective score fusion solutions.

IV. EXPERIMENTS

A. Experiment Settings

1) *Datasets and Evaluation Metrics*: We experiment with two benchmark datasets that are widely used in the KGC domain, i.e., WN18RR [10] extracted from WordNet [28] and FB15K-237 [37] extracted from Freebase [1]. WordNet is a large lexical KG of English, where nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs are organized into sets of synonyms, each representing a lexicalized entity. Semantic relations such as hypernym, hyponymy and meronymy are used to link these entities. Freebase is a collaboratively created KG for structuring human knowledge, which has been widely used to support KG-related applications, such as open information extraction and open-domain question answering [16]. The statistics of these two datasets are given in Table I.

For entity text information, we use synonym definitions for WN18RR, and names and descriptions from [48] for FB15K-237, following KG-BERT. For the relations of these two datasets, we use relation names as the textual information.

TABLE I: Summary Statistics of the Datasets.

Dataset	#Entity	#Relation	#Train	#Valid	#Test
WN18RR	40,943	11	86,835	3,034	3,134
FB15K-237	14,541	237	272,115	17,535	20,466

We evaluate our method PDKGC and the baselines with both *head entity prediction* and *tail entity prediction*. For a triple to complete, i.e., $(h, r, ?)$ or $(?, r, t)$, the methods are expected to rank a set of candidate entities in descending order according to their predicted scores as the correct head or tail entity of this triple. A smaller rank of the ground truth entity indicates a better method. Accordingly, we report two widely used metrics [45]: Mean Reciprocal Ranking (MRR), i.e., the

average reciprocal rank over all test triples, and Hits@{1,3,10}, i.e., the ratio of testing triples whose ground truth entities are ranked within top 1/3/10. Notably, these two metrics are both counted under the *filter setting* [2] where other correct entities are filtered before ranking and only the current test one is left.

2) *Baselines and Variants of PDKGC*: We compare our methods with the existing *structure-based* and *PLM-based* methods, as well as those jointly encoding structural and textual information through PLMs.

Structure-based methods include well-known TransE [2], DistMult [51] and ConvE [10], which all define effective score functions for learning meaningful structural entity and relation embeddings. Besides, we also make comparisons with two GNN-based methods CompGCN [40] and DisenKGAT [47], which aim to capture richer structural knowledge for entities from their local neighborhood. Especially, DisenKGAT is a method that learns disentangled representations for entities but only utilizes the graph structure for KGC.

PLM-based methods present various solutions for KGC problems by incorporating textual information and taking PLMs as encoders or generators. For each kind of these methods, we select one or two representative ones for comparison, including KG-BERT [52] and MTL-KGC [18] which encode the full text of a triple, StAR [43] built upon separated encodings of (h, r) and t , GenKGC [49] and KG-S2S [4] which generate text of the missing entity in a triple token by token, and MEM-KGC [8] which predicts the missing entity through masked entity prediction. Note that these KGC methods all fine-tune PLMs.

Joint methods embed and utilize both structure and text, here we mainly compare with those based on PLMs, including KEPLER [46], StAR [43], LASS [35] and CSProm-KG [5]. In our experiments, we mainly consider StAR and CSProm-KG. KEPLER is a work at an early stage. It does not experiment with any of our two datasets, and is hard to re-implement since the model is per-trained using a large-scale KG extracted from Wikidata [42]. Moreover, it performs worse than KGT5 [33] on the corresponding test data, and KGT5 is also ignored by us as its underperformance compared with KG-S2S. We also omit LASS since the results of important metrics of MRR, Hits@1 and Hits@3 are missing in the original work, and a lot of computation (8 V100 GPUs used in the original work) is required to re-implement them. For CSProm-KG [5], we also compare one of its variants where the local adversarial regularization (LAR) module is removed, denoted as CSProm-KG_{non-LAR}. LAR is mainly for distinguishing textually similar entities. Formally, given a target triple $(h, r, ?)$ and the ground truth entity t , it selects a set of entities that are textually similar to t as negative samples and uses a margin loss to constrain the distance between them.

Variants of our PDKGC. Among *PLM-based* and *Joint* baselines, we find that many of them are built upon PLMs of BERT [11] and RoBERTa [25], e.g., KG-BERT and MEM-KGC fine-tune BERT-base, StAR reports the results with BERT-base, RoBERTa-base and RoBERTa-large, while CSProm-KG focuses on BERT-large. Table Vb lists the PLMs used by the baselines, as well as their parameter sizes. Therefore, for

TABLE II: Overall Results. The best results are in bold and the second best results are underlined. Among baselines, the numbers in italic mean the results implemented by us, others are derived from the original papers.

Category	Methods	WN18RR				FB15K-237			
		MRR	Hits@1	Hits@3	Hits@10	MRR	Hits@1	Hits@3	Hits@10
Structure-based	TransE [2]	0.243	0.043	0.441	0.532	0.279	0.198	0.376	0.441
	DistMult [51]	0.444	0.412	0.470	0.504	0.281	0.199	0.301	0.446
	ConvE [10]	0.456	0.419	0.470	0.531	0.312	0.225	0.341	0.497
	CompGCN [40]	0.479	0.443	0.494	0.546	0.355	0.264	0.390	0.535
	DisenKGAT [47]	0.486	0.441	0.502	0.578	<i>0.366</i>	<i>0.271</i>	<i>0.405</i>	<i>0.553</i>
PLM-based	KG-BERT [52]	0.216	0.041	0.302	0.524	-	-	-	0.420
	MTL-KGC [18]	0.331	0.203	0.383	0.597	0.267	0.172	0.298	0.458
	GenKGC [49]	-	0.287	0.403	0.535	-	0.192	0.355	0.439
	KG-S2S [4]	0.574	0.531	0.595	0.661	0.336	0.257	0.373	0.498
	MEM-KGC [8]	0.533	0.473	0.570	0.636	0.339	0.249	0.372	0.522
	MEM-KGC _{fine-tuned}	<i>0.530</i>	<i>0.483</i>	<i>0.559</i>	<i>0.611</i>	<i>0.332</i>	<i>0.244</i>	<i>0.367</i>	<i>0.508</i>
	MEM-KGC _{frozen}	<i>0.264</i>	<i>0.193</i>	<i>0.300</i>	<i>0.401</i>	<i>0.245</i>	<i>0.179</i>	<i>0.265</i>	<i>0.376</i>
Joint	StAR [43]	0.401	0.243	0.491	0.709	0.296	0.205	0.322	0.482
	CSProm-KG [5]	<u>0.575</u>	<u>0.522</u>	0.596	0.678	0.358	0.269	0.393	0.538
	CSProm-KG _{non-LAR}	0.534	0.489	-	0.624	<i>0.350</i>	<i>0.259</i>	<i>0.384</i>	<i>0.530</i>
Ours	PDKGC _{BERT} [T]	0.531	0.450	0.571	0.688	0.348	0.260	0.383	0.526
	PDKGC _{BERT} [S]	0.543	0.490	0.565	0.646	0.370	0.278	0.407	0.551
	PDKGC _{BERT} [C]	0.568	0.500	<u>0.598</u>	0.702	0.381	0.289	0.418	0.567
	PDKGC _{RoBERTa} [T]	0.541	0.455	0.586	0.708	0.353	0.264	0.385	0.531
	PDKGC _{RoBERTa} [S]	0.551	0.492	0.579	0.664	0.365	0.275	0.399	0.545
	PDKGC _{RoBERTa} [C]	0.577	0.505	0.609	0.713	<u>0.379</u>	<u>0.285</u>	<u>0.415</u>	<u>0.566</u>

fairer comparisons, we use BERT-large and RoBERTa-large as the frozen PLMs in our PDKGC, leading to two variants named PDKGC_{BERT} and PDKGC_{RoBERTa}. Notably, we use their uncased English versions. In this case, our proposed hard task prompt formulates KGC as a masked token prediction task, which is in line with the masked language modeling (MLM) proposed for pre-training BERT and RoBERTa. Meanwhile, MEM-KGC [8] is a baseline that very close to us but fine-tunes BERT-base, therefore, we also re-produce it with both fine-tuned and frozen BERT-large, denoted as MEM-KGC_{fine-tuned} and MEM-KGC_{frozen}, respectively.

Regarding our proposed *textual predictor* and *structural predictor* both yield valid entity ranking results, we also record them together with the ensemble ones. We use the form of “X[Y]” to distinguish, where “X” means the model variant, and “Y={T, S, C}” represent the results from *textual predictor*, *structural predictor* and the ensemble results, respectively.

3) *Implementation Details*: For more convenient training and inference, in our paper, we follow many works e.g. [10], [40] to add an inverse triple (t, r^{-1}, h) for each triple (h, r, t) to predict the head entity, where r^{-1} is the inverse relation of r . Based on such reformulation, we only need to deal with the tail entity prediction problem. For inverse relation r^{-1} , we add a prefix word “reverse” to the description of r . For examples, if r has the name of “produced_by”, then r^{-1} is named as “reverse: produced_by”. We by default use ConvE [10] as the basic KGE algorithm and accordingly calculate the triple score as the dot-product between the representation of (h, r) by 2D convolutions and the tail entity representation, except for Table IV which reports results with different KGE algorithms.

All the experiments are run on a single NVIDIA Tesla V100 GPU with 32GB memory. The hidden vector size H and total

layer number L are both 1024 and 24, respectively, according to the PLMs adopted. We follow CSProm-KG to set the prompt length n for a single transformed structural embedding as 10, and the textual information for a triple to predict is truncated to a maximum of 72 tokens. As for the disentangled graph learner, the dimension of structural component embedding and relation embedding is set to 200. Correspondingly, the kernel sizes k_w, k_h in ConvE become 10 and 20, respectively. The number of the aggregation layer L_g is set to 1. The coefficient of Mutual Information regularization λ is set to 0.1. We select the component numbers K from a pool of $\{2, 4, 6\}$, and finally select an optimum one according to MRR on the validation set; it is 2 for WN18RR, and 4 for FB15K-237. We implement our model with PyTorch and use Adam as optimizer with a learning rate of 0.0001 and a batch size of 64, which are the optimum configurations selected according to MRR on the validation set.

B. Main Results

The overall results are shown in Table II. As we can see, our models always outperform the baselines of *Structure-based*, *PLM-based* and *Joint*. Especially, on FB15K-237, PDKGC_{BERT}[C] and PDKGC_{RoBERTa}[C] have achieved the top-2 best results, PDKGC_{BERT}[S] outperforms all *Structure-based* methods on most metrics, and PDKGC_{RoBERTa}[T] consistently beats all *PLM-based* methods by a large margin. We also note that 1) the best [T] and [S] are achieved by different PLMs, indicating that different PLMs show different preferences in encoding the textual information, and 2) the gap between PDKGC_{BERT}[C] and PDKGC_{RoBERTa}[C] is slight, where our proposed ensemble solution is effective in combining the outputs of the two *predictors*.

TABLE III: Prompt Analysis Results. PDKGC here uses BERT-large. Among variants that have three prediction results, i.e., “X[Y]” and “Y={T, S, C}”, for each kind of prediction, we highlight the best ones using underline.

No.	Methods	WN18RR				FB15K-237			
		MRR	Hits@1	Hits@3	Hits@10	MRR	Hits@1	Hits@3	Hits@10
1	DisenKGAT	0.486	0.441	0.502	0.578	<u>0.366</u>	<u>0.271</u>	<u>0.405</u>	<u>0.553</u>
2	MEM-KGC _{fine-tuned}	<u>0.530</u>	<u>0.483</u>	<u>0.559</u>	<u>0.611</u>	<u>0.332</u>	<u>0.244</u>	<u>0.367</u>	<u>0.508</u>
3	CSProm-KG _{non-LAR}	0.534	0.489	–	0.624	<u>0.350</u>	<u>0.259</u>	<u>0.384</u>	<u>0.530</u>
4	PDKGC [T]	0.531	0.450	0.571	0.688	0.348	0.260	0.383	0.526
5	PDKGC [S]	<u>0.543</u>	<u>0.490</u>	<u>0.565</u>	<u>0.646</u>	<u>0.370</u>	<u>0.278</u>	<u>0.407</u>	<u>0.551</u>
6	PDKGC [C]	<u>0.568</u>	<u>0.500</u>	<u>0.598</u>	<u>0.702</u>	<u>0.381</u>	<u>0.289</u>	<u>0.418</u>	<u>0.567</u>
7	PDKGC _{w/o Disen} [T]	0.533	<u>0.456</u>	0.571	0.678	0.349	0.262	0.381	0.524
8	PDKGC _{w/o Disen} [S]	0.536	0.490	0.551	0.627	0.350	0.260	0.386	0.534
9	PDKGC _{w/o Disen} [C]	0.557	0.500	0.577	0.669	0.368	0.275	0.403	0.557
10	PDKGC _{w/o TP}	0.542	0.485	0.568	0.651	0.366	0.276	0.402	0.545
11	PDKGC _{single} [T]	<u>0.535</u>	0.443	<u>0.573</u>	<u>0.695</u>	<u>0.354</u>	<u>0.265</u>	<u>0.387</u>	<u>0.532</u>
12	PDKGC _{single} [S]	<u>0.541</u>	0.478	0.561	<u>0.635</u>	<u>0.358</u>	0.266	0.396	0.537
13	PDKGC _{single} [C]	0.566	0.489	0.591	0.701	0.378	0.283	0.417	0.567

The PDKGC variants achieve very competitive results on WN18RR. When RoBERTa is used, PDKGC[C] has better overall results than all the baselines, especially on MRR, Hits@3 and Hits@10. However, the outperformance on WN18RR is less promising in comparison with that on FB15K-237. This discrepancy may be due to that textually similar entities are more common in WN18RR. In contrast to our methods that solely rely on the given text and structural context to choose the missing entities, the baselines often raise additional strategies to highlight the correct ones. For example, KG-S2S [4] first collects all the tokens in the entity text to generate an Entity Prefix Trie and uses this prefix Trie to control the scope of decoding next token, leading to impressive scores on Hits@1. While CSProm-KG [5] adds a LAR loss to filter textually similar entities, significantly narrowing down the space of possible correct entities. Therefore, we also report the results of CSProm-KG_{non-LAR} with LAR removed, it can be seen that either PDKGC_{BERT}[C] or PDKGC_{RoBERTa}[C] outperforms it by a large margin on WN18RR. This also motivates us to try some effective solutions to tackle these textually similar entities.

There is another interesting observation from variants of MEM-KGC. We can find that fine-tuning with BERT-large (i.e., MEM-KGC_{fine-tuned}) performs slightly worse than fine-tuning with BERT-base (i.e., the original MEM-KGC). This is consistent with the observation of KG-BERT [52], and can be explained by the fact that BERT-base is simpler and less sensitive to hyper-parameter settings. Meanwhile, when we freeze the parameters of BERT-large with only a simple linear classification layer fine-tuned (i.e., MEM-KGC_{frozen}), the performance dramatically drops, illustrating that this single linear layer is not ready for adapting the frozen PLMs to the KGC tasks. In contrast, our PDKGC incorporates hard task prompts with disentangled structure embedding (prompts) to provide more valuable information for the frozen PLM to perform entity prediction and has much better results. We also notice that MEM-KGC_{frozen} even performs better than some fine-tuned models such as KG-BERT, indicating the potential

of frozen PLMs for inferring the missing triples.

C. Impacts of the Prompts

In this subsection, we use two PDKGC variants to analyze the impact of two critical techniques — hard task prompt and disentangled structure prompt. One variant is PDKGC_{w/o Disen}, which replaces the disentangled entity embeddings with normal non-disentangled entity embeddings, for analysing the impact of the disentangled structure prompt (i.e., the disentangled graph learner module). In PDKGC_{w/o Disen}, we directly generate the structural prompts based on the initialized entity embeddings without attentively aggregating features of different semantic aspects from the neighborhood. The other variant is PDKGC_{w/o TP}, which removes the *textual predictor* (TP) that is used to predict the missing entities through the hard task prompt given the triple context. PDKGC_{w/o TP} relies on the *structural predictor* (SP) alone to make predictions.

We test these two variants on our benchmarks, with the results reported in Table III. It can be seen that their performance consistently drops in comparison with the original PDKGC. More specifically, the outputs of PDKGC_{w/o Disen}’s *structural predictor* and its ensemble results (Rows 8 and 9) are both inferior to those of PDKGC (Rows 5 and 6). There are also some exceptions on the outputs of PDKGC_{w/o Disen}’s *textual predictor* w.r.t. the metrics of MRR and Hits@1 (Row 4 vs Row 7). This may be due to the weighted loss which aims to balance the prediction results of *textual predictor* and *structural predictor*. Meanwhile, their gaps are relatively small. Through comparing Row 10 with Rows 5 and 6, we can observe that PDKGC_{w/o TP} performs worse than PDKGC, sometimes even worse than PDKGC’s *structural predictor*. To sum up, both disentangled structure prompt and hard task prompt are contributory modules of PDKGC.

In comparison with CSProm-KG_{non-LAR}, the difference of PDKGC_{w/o Disen} mainly lies in an additional TP module. In comparison with MEM-KGC, PDKGC_{w/o Disen} additionally utilizes structural information. As shown in Table III, PDKGC_{w/o Disen}

performs better than both CSProm-KG_{non-LAR} and MEM-KGC. Also, PDKGC_{w/o TP} is equivalent to CSProm-KG_{non-LAR} with the disentangled entity representations concerned, and is close to DisenKGAT which considers no textual information. Similarly, PDKGC_{w/o TP} is superior to both CSProm-KG_{non-LAR} and DisenKGAT on most metrics. As a result, we can say our method outperforms CSProm-KG_{non-LAR} through the disentangled structural prompt and the prediction from the text side by hard task prompt, and outperforms MEM-KGC and DisenKGAT through effectively adding the structural information and textual information, respectively. All these further verify the effectiveness of the disentangled structure prompt and the hard task prompt we proposed.




Fig. 3: Performance (MRR) of different models on different testing triples of FB15K-237, which have different numbers of surrounding entities. “PDKGC [T]” and “PDKGC (single) [T]” means the results from PDKGC and PDKGC_{single}’s *textual predictors*, respectively.

We further have quantitative results to analyze the discrepancy between PDKGC_{w/o TP} and CSProm-KG_{non-LAR}, they differ in taking into account the complex neighborhood environment around a triple to complete, i.e., its surrounding entities. Therefore, for all the triples in the testing set, we group them according to the range of the number of entities surrounding the known entities, and re-calculate the result of MRR of each group. The results on FB15K-237 are shown in Fig. 3, where we can see that the performance gap between PDKGC_{w/o TP} and CSProm-KG_{non-LAR} is enlarged as the number of surrounding entities increases. Statistically, the relative performance gain from CSProm-KG_{non-LAR} to PDKGC_{w/o TP} is 2.35%, 2.4%, 4.2%, 5.8%, 19.3%, 32.5% across the six increasing intervals. This indicates that our proposed disentangled structure prompt is more effective in processing the structural information, especially when the neighborhood is complex with semantics of different aspects.

D. Ablation Studies

1) Impact of using all or one of the disentangled components:

As introduced in Section III-D, for each triple to complete, we feed all the disentangled component embeddings of the entity into the PLM instead of selecting one component that is highly relevant to the triple. To illustrate the effectiveness of this choice, we implement another model variant PDKGC_{single}

for comparison, which first assesses all the components by measuring their relatedness with the relation of the triple, and then feeds the most relevant component into the PLM as the structure prompt. The relatedness is measured by computing the dot-product similarity of two structural embeddings.

The results are shown in the last three rows of Table III. We can see that PDKGC_{single} performs worse than PDKGC w.r.t the *structural predictor* (Row 5 vs 12) and the ensemble (Row 6 vs 13), but performs a bit better w.r.t. the *textual predictor* (Row 4 vs 11). One potential reason is that using the selected single component loses some information in comparison with using all the components, especially when the neighborhood of the triple is complex, leading to worse performance of the *structural predictor* and the ensemble. While it sometimes can provide useful and more compact structural information to the *textual predictor*, leading to a bit better performance. To further verify this, we calculate the results of the *textual predictors* of PDKGC and PDKGC_{single} on different testing triple sets with different numbers of neighboring entities, as shown in Fig. 3. It can be seen that PDKGC performs better when the number of neighboring entities exceeds 100, showing the superiority of using all the components when the neighborhood is complex. We have more observations about this in Section IV-E.

2) *Impact of KGE models:* As we have mentioned, our PDKGC is flexible to incorporate different KGE models. To validate this, we replace the applied ConvE with another two popular KGE models: TransE and DistMult, and conduct evaluations with BERT-large. We report the ensemble results of PDKGC on WN18RR in Table IV. As we can see, PDKGC successfully cooperates with these KGE models and significantly outperforms their original versions. Moreover, we also list the public results of CSProm-KG when it incorporates these KGE models. It can be seen that with TransE and DistMult, PDKGC achieves higher performance gains compared with CSProm-KG in most situations, illustrating that our PDKGC is more robust when shifting to other KGE models, while the good performance of CSProm-KG with ConvE may be partially due to the careful selection of hyper-parameters, especially those for optimizing the LAR module.

TABLE IV: The ensemble results of PDKGC_{BERT[C]} on WN18RR when different KGE models are applied.

Methods	MRR	Hits@1	Hits@3	Hits@10
TransE	0.243	0.043	0.441	0.532
+ CSProm-KG	0.499 ($\uparrow 0.256$)	0.462 ($\uparrow 0.419$)	0.515 ($\uparrow 0.074$)	0.569 ($\uparrow 0.037$)
+ PDKGC	0.542 ($\uparrow 0.299$)	0.466 ($\uparrow 0.423$)	0.575 ($\uparrow 0.134$)	0.690 ($\uparrow 0.158$)
DistMult	0.444	0.412	0.470	0.504
+ CSProm-KG	0.543 ($\uparrow 0.099$)	0.494 ($\uparrow 0.082$)	0.562 ($\uparrow 0.092$)	0.639 ($\uparrow 0.135$)
+ PDKGC	0.560 ($\uparrow 0.116$)	0.491 ($\uparrow 0.079$)	0.588 ($\uparrow 0.118$)	0.693 ($\uparrow 0.189$)
ConvE	0.456	0.419	0.470	0.531
+ CSProm-KG	0.575 ($\uparrow 0.119$)	0.522 ($\uparrow 0.103$)	0.596 ($\uparrow 0.126$)	0.678 ($\uparrow 0.147$)
+ PDKGC	0.568 ($\uparrow 0.112$)	0.500 ($\uparrow 0.081$)	0.598 ($\uparrow 0.128$)	0.702 ($\uparrow 0.171$)

E. Case Studies

In Fig. 4, we present two testing triples to complete with the descriptions of their head entities, their ground truth tail entities, and the entity ranking results by different models. For PDKGC and PDKGC_{single}, we not only present the ranking result but

Triple to complete	Ground Truth Tail	MEM-KGC _{fine-tuned}	PDKGC and Its Entity Components		PDKGC _{single} and Its Entity Components	
(Rush Hour 2, /film/film/language, ?) Entity Description: Rush Hour 2 is a 2001 martial arts buddy action comedy film. This is the second installment in the Rush Hour series. A sequel to the 1998 film Rush Hour, ...	Standard Mandarin	Rank: 6 Rank Results: French Language Japanese Language Korean Language Spanish Language Latin Language Standard Mandarin Mandarin Chinese Italian Language German Language Hindi Language	Rank: 1 v^1 (0.0860)	Top2 neighbors of each component (award_nomination, MTV Movie Award for Best On-Screen Duo) (award_nomination, MTV Movie Award for Best Comedic Performance)	Rank: 1 v^1 (0.0553)	Top2 neighbors of each component (award_nomination, MTV Movie Award for Best On-Screen Duo) (award_nomination, MTV Movie Award for Best Comedic Performance)
		v^2 (0.1522)	(film/genre, Comedy-GB) (film/genre, Action Film)	v^2 (0.1103)	(film/genre, Buddy Film) (film/genre, Action Film)	
		v^3 (0.4635)	(film/language, Yue Chinese) (film/location, HongKong)	v^3 (0.5551)	(film/language, Yue Chinese) (film/location, HongKong)	
		v^4 (0.2983)	(film/actor, Zhang Ziyi) (film/actor, Jackie Chan)	v^4 (0.2793)	(film/actor, Chris Tucker) (film/actor, Jackie Chan)	
(Sirius Satellite Radio, /business/business_operation/industry, ?) Entity Description: Sirius Satellite Radio is a satellite radio service operating in North America, owned by Sirius XM Radio. Headquartered in New York City, with smaller studios in Los Angeles ...	Broadcasting	Rank: 9 Rank Results: Entertainment Media Advertising English Language Video Game Satire Film Custom Broadcasting	Rank: 2 v^1 (0.3284)	Top2 neighbors of each component (phone_sandbox/contact_category, Customer service) (phone_sandbox/service_language, English Language)	Rank: 1 v^1 (0.6788)	Top2 neighbors of each component (phone_sandbox/contact_category, Customer service), (business_operation/industry, Telecommunications)
		v^2 (0.2611)	(assets_currency, United States Dollar) (income_currency, United States Dollar)	v^2 (0.1245)	(assets_currency, United States Dollar) (income_currency, United States Dollar)	
		v^3 (0.2786)	(/location/state_province, New York) (/location/citytown, New York City)	v^3 (0.1511)	(/location/state_province, New York), (/location/citytown, New York City)	
		v^4 (0.1319)	(job_title, Chief Financial Officer-GB) (job_title, President)	v^4 (0.0457)	(job_title, Chief Financial Officer-GB) (job_title, President)	

Fig. 4: Two triples to complete from FB15K-237’s testing set. The ranks predicted by different models are highlighted using green background. For PDKGC and PDKGC_{single}, we report the ranks produced by their *textual predictors*, and also present the disentangled components of the head entity including the correlation weight between the component and the target triple, and the component’s corresponding Top-2 neighbors.

also demonstrate the head entity’s disentangled embedding and neighbors. More specifically, for each entity, we leverage the attention value α to measure its correlations to different neighbors according to each component of the disentangled embedding. For example, in the first testing triple of Fig. 4, the top-2 most similar neighbors of the head entity “Rush Hour 2” w.r.t. the second component (v^2), as well as the corresponding relations for connection, are *(film/genre, Comedy-GB)*² and *(film/genre, Action Film)*, while *(film/actor, Zhang Ziyi)* and *(film/actor, Jackie Chan)* are the top-2 w.r.t. the fourth component (v^4). It is clear that different components are associated with different neighbors, representing different semantic aspects of the head entity. Also, we can use these neighbors to explain the semantic meanings of each component. For example, we assume that the four components of “Rush Hour 2” respectively reflect its four semantic aspects: awards received, category, film features, and actor/actress.

Moreover, for each triple to predict, we also utilize a dot-product similarity between the structural embeddings of the target relation and entity component to highlight the relevant components for the current inference. As shown in the first case of Fig. 4, with PDKGC, the components v^3 and v^4 of “Rush Hour 2” contribute more effective clues to infer the tail entity, which is a language specific to the features and actors/actresses of film “Rush Hour 2”, while the other components play a much less important role. We can use these component weights to provide an explanation for each prediction, justifying whether the prediction is good or bad.

Back to the rank results produced by different models, it can

²The complete triple is *(Rush Hour 2, /film/film/genre, Comedy-GB)*, where the relation is abbreviated as above. Each neighboring entity and relation are represented by the format of (relation, tail) with reversed relations concerned.

be observed that our PDKGC and PDKGC_{single} both have higher ranks than MEM-KGC (a version fine-tuned using BERT-large) over two examples. For example, in the second case of Fig. 4, the rank of the ground truth tail “Broadcasting” is raised from 9 to 2 by PDKGC, and to 1 by PDKGC_{single}. This indicates that our model variants successfully provide extra discriminative structural information except for the textual descriptions of the head entity and relation given in the target triple. Moreover, according to the disentangled components highlighted by our models, we find that PDKGC and PDKGC_{single} both extract useful structural information from the neighborhood, i.e., the neighbors *(phone_sandbox/contact_category, Customer service)* and *(business_operation/industry, Telecommunications)* both indicate that “Sirius Satellite Radio” is more likely to be a Broadcasting company.

From the second example in Fig. 4, we also find that the component v^1 learned by PDKGC_{single} contains more accurate information than that learned by PDKGC, this is in line with our observations in Section IV-D1, where PDKGC_{single} may gather less irrelevant structure semantics by feeding only a single component into PLMs. However, the number of neighbors around “Sirius Satellite Radio” is limited to 16. When we face the first example in Fig. 4 where the number of neighbors around “Rush Hour 2” is much more, PDKGC also highlights component v^4 to predict the tail with higher confidence. Namely, besides the facts implied in v^3 (i.e., the film location is “Hong Kong” and the film language is “Yue Language”), PDKGC can more accurately predict the tail as “Standard Mandarin” according to the facts that the film has two Chinese famous actors/actresses “Jackie Chan” and “Zhang Ziyi” implied in v^4 . This observation verifies that PDKGC keeps more complete structural information than PDKGC_{single}

for each triple to complete.

F. Model Efficiency

In comparison with the existing *PLM*-based and joint KGC methods, our PDKGC has higher training and inference efficiency, and fewer parameters to learn.

1) *Training Efficiency*: We first analyze the time complexity of different models w.r.t. one training triple. Since the computation overheads are mainly happening inside the Transformer, we focus on computing the complexity of performing the (multi-head) self-attention, which is $\mathcal{O}(L_s^2 H)$ with L_s as the length of the input sequence and H as the embedding size. Here, we use $\mathcal{O}(L_s^2)$ to simply represent the complexity as $H \ll L_s^2$. When methods such as KG-BERT and LASS forward the full text of a triple to the PLM with a sequence length of L_s , their time complexity is thus illustrated as L_s^2 .

In practice, the sequence lengths of the two split parts in a triple, i.e., (h, r) and t , or h and (r, t) , are similar because the length of an entity’s text is usually longer than a relation’s text, especially when the entity description is included. Therefore, for methods that separately process the two different parts of a triple by Siamese PLMs, e.g., StAR and SimKGC, or encoder-decoder PLMs, e.g., KG-S2S, the complexity is computed as $(L_s/2)^2 + (L_s/2)^2$. As for MEM-KGC, CSPromKG and our PDKGC, only encoding (h, r) or (r, t) is required during training, the corresponding complexity is $(L_s/2)^2$. Note the applied prompt is far shorter than the entity description.

Besides the complexity of encoding each triple, some methods raise negative training triples, which require additional computation. SimKGC takes the entities within the same batch and the one or two pre-batches as negatives. StAR follows KG-BERT to set 5 corrupted triples for one positive. The original CSProm-KG selects 8 textually similar entities as adversarial examples for each training triple. In contrast, our method PDKGC requires no negative samples during the training.

2) *Inference Efficiency*: During inference (testing), the main computation overheads similarly happen in the PLMs. As shown in Table Va, we list the inference complexities in two cases, i.e., only one test triple and all the test triple. As we have introduced more than once, the combinatorial explosion in the testing stage of KG-BERT and LASS often results in huge time cost, where all the entities in the dataset are taken as candidates to send into the BERT for predicting each triple. StAR and SimKGC require well-trained PLM outputs to represent all entities at first during testing. KG-S2S struggles in decoding the textual descriptions of the missing entities token by token with the costly beam search. Our method PDKGC as well as CSProm-KG and MEM-KGC are expected to be the fastest because they infer scores of all entities at once, by comparing entity representations with the encoded representation of the other two known elements in a triple or sending the the encoded representation into the entity classifier.

3) *Parameter Size*: Another advantage of PDKGC in training and testing efficiency is its less trainable parameters, especially when compared to existing models with fine-tuned PLMs. We list the total and trainable parameters in Table Vb, as well as the

TABLE V: Comparisons of different models w.r.t. their inference efficiency and their trainable and total parameter sizes.

(a) Inference Complexity. L_s here means the length (token number) of the text of a triple. BS is for *beam search* and computed as $|V| \times m \times L_s/2$ where m is its beam size and $|V|$ is the applied PLM’s vocabulary size. N_{te} denotes the number of all the test triples.

Model	One Triple	All Triples
KG-BERT, LASS	$L_s^2 \times \mathcal{E} $	$L_s^2 \times (\mathcal{E} N_{te})$
StAR, SimKGC	$(L_s/2)^2 \times (1 + \mathcal{E})$	$(L_s/2)^2 \times (N_{te} + \mathcal{E})$
KG-S2S	$(L_s/2)^2 + BS$	$((L_s/2)^2 + BS) \times N_{te}$
CSProm-KG, MEM-KGC, PDKGC	$(L_s/2)^2$	$(L_s/2)^2 \times N_{te}$

(b) Parameter Sizes.

Model	PLM	# Total	# Trainable
KG-BERT, SimKGC, MEM-KGC	BERT-base	110M	110M
StAR, LASS	RoBERTa-large	355M	355M
KG-S2S	T5-base	222M	222M
CSProm-KC	BERT-large	363M	28M
PDKGC (ours)	BERT-large	379M	44M
	RoBERTa-large	399M	44M

PLMs used in these methods. It can be seen that our PDKGC and CSProm-KG both have fewer parameters to train while the encoders occupying more parameters are frozen during training, enabling the models to achieve the optimal at a faster speed. Moreover, the models with a smaller number of tunable parameters are also less sensitive to the hyperparameter choices.

V. CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

In this paper, we proposed PDKGC, a novel prompt-tuning-based method for KG completion, which is built upon one frozen pre-trained language model (PLM) and two different prompts for fully utilizing the text encoding knowledge learned in the PLM and effectively incorporating structural knowledge with disentangled KG embeddings. Briefly, PDKGC includes (i) a disentangled graph learner with the relation-aware attention mechanism applied to distribute the neighbors on the graph to learn different representation components, each of which encodes one aspect of the structure semantics; (ii) a *textual predictor* which projects the graph representation components into a disentangled structure prompts and feeds it to the frozen PLM together with a hard task prompt from the triple text to predict the missing entity; (iii) a *structural predictor* which feeds the PLM outputs of these structural prompts into a KGE model for entity prediction. The textual and structural predictors complement each other, and their ensemble leads to better performance. In evaluation, we conducted solid experiments on two widely-used KGC benchmarks, and compared PDKGC with traditional *structure*-based methods as well as state-of-the-art fine-tuned and frozen *PLM*-based methods. PDKGC often achieves better performance, and the effectiveness of the two proposed prompts has been fully verified. In the future, we will consider encoder-decoder and decoder-only PLMs with a larger size, and extend PDKGC to inductive KGC which aims to complete triples with new entities and/or relations that have never appeared during training [14].

REFERENCES

- [1] Kurt Bollacker, Colin Evans, Praveen Paritosh, Tim Sturge, and Jamie Taylor. Freebase: a collaboratively created graph database for structuring human knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 2008 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data*, pages 1247–1250, 2008.
- [2] Antoine Bordes, Nicolas Usunier, Alberto Garcia-Duran, Jason Weston, and Oksana Yakhnenko. Translating embeddings for modeling multi-relational data. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 26, 2013.
- [3] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- [4] Chen Chen, Yufei Wang, Bing Li, and Kwok-Yan Lam. Knowledge is flat: A seq2seq generative framework for various knowledge graph completion. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics, COLING 2022, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea, October 12-17, 2022*, pages 4005–4017, 2022.
- [5] Chen Chen, Yufei Wang, Aixin Sun, Bing Li, and Kwok-Yan Lam. Dipping plms sauce: Bridging structure and text for effective knowledge graph completion via conditional soft prompting. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023, Toronto, Canada, July 9-14, 2023*, pages 11489–11503, 2023.
- [6] Jiaoyan Chen, Yuan He, Yuxia Geng, Ernesto Jiménez-Ruiz, Hang Dong, and Ian Horrocks. Contextual semantic embeddings for ontology subsumption prediction. *World Wide Web*, pages 1–23, 2023.
- [7] Zhe Chen, Yuehan Wang, Bin Zhao, Jing Cheng, Xin Zhao, and Zongtao Duan. Knowledge graph completion: A review. *IEEE Access*, 8:192435–192456, 2020.
- [8] Bonggeun Choi, Daesik Jang, and Youngjoong Ko. Mem-kgc: Masked entity model for knowledge graph completion with pre-trained language model. *IEEE Access*, 9:132025–132032, 2021.
- [9] Kevin Clark, Minh-Thang Luong, Quoc V Le, and Christopher D Manning. Electra: Pre-training text encoders as discriminators rather than generators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.10555*, 2020.
- [10] Tim Dettmers, Pasquale Minervini, Pontus Stenetorp, and Sebastian Riedel. Convolutional 2d knowledge graph embeddings. In *AAAI*, 2018.
- [11] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 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, NAACL-HLT 2019, Minneapolis, MN, USA, June 2-7, 2019, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, 2019.
- [12] Ning Ding, Yujia Qin, Guang Yang, Fuchao Wei, Zonghan Yang, Yusheng Su, Shengding Hu, Yulin Chen, Chi-Min Chan, Weize Chen, et al. Parameter-efficient fine-tuning of large-scale pre-trained language models. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 5(3):220–235, 2023.
- [13] Michael Färber, Frederic Bartscherer, Carsten Menne, and Achim Rettinger. Linked data quality of dbpedia, freebase, openycyc, wikidata, and yago. *Semantic Web*, 9(1):77–129, 2018.
- [14] Yuxia Geng, Jiaoyan Chen, Jeff Z Pan, Mingyang Chen, Song Jiang, Wen Zhang, and HuaJun Chen. Relational message passing for fully inductive knowledge graph completion. In *2023 IEEE 39th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*, pages 1221–1233. IEEE, 2023.
- [15] Genet Asefa Gesese, Russa Biswas, Mehwish Alam, and Harald Sack. A survey on knowledge graph embeddings with literals: Which model links better literal-ly? *Semantic Web*, 12(4):617–647, 2021.
- [16] Kelvin Jiang, Dekun Wu, and Hui Jiang. Freebaseqa: A new factoid qa data set matching trivia-style question-answer pairs with freebase. 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 318–323, 2019.
- [17] Alex Kendall, Yarin Gal, and Roberto Cipolla. Multi-task learning using uncertainty to weigh losses for scene geometry and semantics. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 7482–7491, 2018.
- [18] Bosung Kim, Taesuk Hong, Youngjoong Ko, and Jungyun Seo. Multi-task learning for knowledge graph completion with pre-trained language models. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 1737–1743, 2020.
- [19] Agustinus Kristiadi, Mohammad Asif Khan, Denis Lukovnikov, Jens Lehmann, and Asja Fischer. Incorporating literals into knowledge graph embeddings. In *The Semantic Web–ISWC 2019: 18th International Semantic Web Conference, Auckland, New Zealand, October 26–30, 2019, Proceedings, Part 1 18*, pages 347–363. Springer, 2019.
- [20] Brian Lester, Rami Al-Rfou, and Noah Constant. The power of scale for parameter-efficient prompt tuning. In Marie-Francine Moens, Xuanjing Huang, Lucia Specia, and Scott Wen-tau Yih, editors, *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2021, Virtual Event / Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 7-11 November, 2021*, pages 3045–3059, 2021.
- [21] Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 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, ACL 2020, Online, July 5-10, 2020*, pages 7871–7880, 2020.
- [22] Xiang Lisa Li and Percy Liang. Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, ACL/IJCNLP 2021, (Volume 1: Long Papers), Virtual Event, August 1-6, 2021*, pages 4582–4597, 2021.
- [23] Pengfei Liu, Weizhe Yuan, Jinlan Fu, Zhengbao Jiang, Hiroaki Hayashi, and Graham Neubig. Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(9):1–35, 2023.
- [24] Xiao Liu, Yanan Zheng, Zhengxiao Du, Ming Ding, Yujie Qian, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. Gpt understands, too. *AI Open*, 2023.
- [25] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*, 2019.
- [26] Xin Lv, Yankai Lin, Yixin Cao, Lei Hou, Juanzi Li, Zhiyuan Liu, Peng Li, and Jie Zhou. Do pre-trained models benefit knowledge graph completion? a reliable evaluation and a reasonable approach. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2022.
- [27] Jianxin Ma, Peng Cui, Kun Kuang, Xin Wang, and Wenwu Zhu. Disentangled graph convolutional networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 4212–4221. PMLR, 2019.
- [28] George A Miller. Wordnet: a lexical database for english. *Communications of the ACM*, 38(11):39–41, 1995.
- [29] Andrea Nathansen, Kevin Klein, Bernhard Y Renard, Melania Nowicka, and Jakub M Bartoszewicz. Evaluating prompt tuning for conditional protein sequence generation. *bioRxiv*, pages 2023–02, 2023.
- [30] OpenAI. GPT-4 technical report. *CoRR*, abs/2303.08774, 2023.
- [31] Jeff Z. Pan, Guido Vetere, Jose Manue Gomez-Perez, and Honghan Wu. *Exploiting Linked Data and Knowledge Graphs in Large Organisations*. Springer, 2017.
- [32] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(1):5485–5551, 2020.
- [33] Apoorv Saxena, Adrian Kochsiek, and Rainer Gemulla. 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), ACL 2022, Dublin, Ireland, May 22-27, 2022*, pages 2814–2828, 2022.
- [34] Michael Sejr Schlichtkrull, Thomas N. Kipf, Peter Bloem, Rianne van den Berg, Ivan Titov, and Max Welling. Modeling relational data with graph convolutional networks. In *ESWC*, pages 593–607, 2018.
- [35] Jianhao Shen, Chenguang Wang, Linyuan Gong, and Dawn Song. Joint language semantic and structure embedding for knowledge graph completion. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics, COLING 2022, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea, October 12-17, 2022*, pages 1965–1978, 2022.
- [36] Zhiqing Sun, Zhi-Hong Deng, Jian-Yun Nie, and Jian Tang. RotatE: Knowledge graph embedding by relational rotation in complex space. In *ICLR (Poster)*. OpenReview.net, 2019.
- [37] Kristina Toutanova and Danqi Chen. 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, 2015.

- [38] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- [39] Théo Trouillon, Johannes Welbl, Sebastian Riedel, Eric Gaussier, and Guillaume Bouchard. Complex embeddings for simple link prediction. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2071–2080. PMLR, 2016.
- [40] Shikhar Vashishth, Soumya Sanyal, Vikram Nitin, and Partha P. Talukdar. Composition-based multi-relational graph convolutional networks. In *ICLR*. OpenReview.net, 2020.
- [41] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [42] Denny Vrandečić and Markus Krötzsch. Wikidata: a free collaborative knowledgebase. *Communications of the ACM*, 57(10):78–85, 2014.
- [43] Bo Wang, Tao Shen, Guodong Long, Tianyi Zhou, Ying Wang, and Yi Chang. Structure-augmented text representation learning for efficient knowledge graph completion. In *WebConf*, pages 1737–1748, 2021.
- [44] Liang Wang, Wei Zhao, Zhuoyu Wei, and Jingming Liu. 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), ACL 2022, Dublin, Ireland, May 22-27, 2022*, pages 4281–4294, 2022.
- [45] Quan Wang, Zhendong Mao, Bin Wang, and Li Guo. Knowledge graph embedding: A survey of approaches and applications. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 29(12):2724–2743, 2017.
- [46] Xiaozhi Wang, Tianyu Gao, Zhaocheng Zhu, Zhengyan Zhang, Zhiyuan Liu, Juanzi Li, and Jian Tang. Kepler: A unified model for knowledge embedding and pre-trained language representation. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:176–194, 2021.
- [47] Junkang Wu, Wentao Shi, Xuezhi Cao, Jiawei Chen, Wenqiang Lei, Fuzheng Zhang, Wei Wu, and Xiangnan He. Disenkgat: knowledge graph embedding with disentangled graph attention network. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM international conference on information & knowledge management*, pages 2140–2149, 2021.
- [48] Ruobing Xie, Zhiyuan Liu, Jia Jia, Huanbo Luan, and Maosong Sun. Representation learning of knowledge graphs with entity descriptions. In *AAAI*, 2016.
- [49] Xin Xie, Ningyu Zhang, Zhoubo Li, Shumin Deng, Hui Chen, Feiyu Xiong, Mosha Chen, and Huajun Chen. From discrimination to generation: Knowledge graph completion with generative transformer. In *Companion Proceedings of the Web Conference 2022*, pages 162–165, 2022.
- [50] Jiacheng Xu, Xipeng Qiu, Kan Chen, and Xuanjing Huang. Knowledge graph representation with jointly structural and textual encoding. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2017, Melbourne, Australia, August 19-25, 2017*, pages 1318–1324. ijcai.org, 2017.
- [51] Bishan Yang, Wen-tau Yih, Xiaodong He, Jianfeng Gao, and Li Deng. Embedding entities and relations for learning and inference in knowledge bases. In *ICLR (Poster)*, 2015.
- [52] Liang Yao, Chengsheng Mao, and Yuan Luo. KG-BERT: BERT for knowledge graph completion. *unpublished*.
- [53] Aohan Zeng, Xiao Liu, Zhengxiao Du, Zihan Wang, Hanyu Lai, Ming Ding, Zhuoyi Yang, Yifan Xu, Wendi Zheng, Xiao Xia, Weng Lam Tam, Zixuan Ma, Yufei Xue, Jidong Zhai, Wenguang Chen, Zhiyuan Liu, Peng Zhang, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. GLM-130B: an open bilingual pre-trained model. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*, 2023.
- [54] Kaiyang Zhou, Jingkang Yang, Chen Change Loy, and Zifei Liu. Learning to prompt for vision-language models. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 130(9):2337–2348, 2022.