
Leveraging Logical Rules in Knowledge Editing: A Cherry on the Top

Keyuan Cheng^{*,1,2,3}, Muhammad Asif Ali^{*,1,2}, Shu Yang^{*,1,2}, Gang Lin^{1,2,3},
Yuxuan Zhai^{1,2,3}, Haoyang Fei^{1,2,3}, Ke Xu³, Lu Yu⁴, Lijie Hu^{†,1,2}, and Di Wang^{†,1,2}

¹Provable Responsible AI and Data Analytics (PRADA) Lab

²King Abdullah University of Science and Technology

³South China University of Technology ⁴Ant Group

Abstract

Multi-hop Question Answering (MQA) under knowledge editing (KE) is a key challenge in Large Language Models (LLMs). While best-performing solutions in this domain use a plan and solve paradigm to split a question into sub-questions followed by response generation, we claim that this approach is sub-optimal as it fails for *hard to decompose* questions, and it does not explicitly cater to *correlated knowledge updates* resulting as a consequence of knowledge edits. This has a detrimental impact on the overall consistency of the updated knowledge. To address these issues, in this paper, we propose a novel framework named RULE-KE, *i.e.*, **R**ULE based **K**nowledge **E**ditting, which is a cherry on the top for augmenting the performance of all existing MQA methods under KE. Specifically, RULE-KE leverages rule discovery to discover a set of logical rules. Then, it uses these discovered rules to update knowledge about facts highly correlated with the edit. Experimental evaluation using existing and newly curated datasets (*i.e.*, RKE-EVAL) shows that RULE-KE helps augment both performances of parameter-based and memory-based solutions up to 92% and 112.9%, respectively.

1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated powerful reasoning and comprehension capabilities for worldly knowledge [17, 42]. However, it has been shown that LLMs have a very limited adaptability to newly emerging information and/or knowledge [19]. This causes LLMs to generate plausible yet incorrect answers for unknown facts, a phenomenon known as hallucinations [9, 34]. Moreover, such a weakness significantly undermines the reliability of LLMs for Multi-hop Question Answering (MQA), which requires multiple reasoning steps and extensive open-domain knowledge [25, 27]. Updating LLMs’ information/knowledge through model re-training is a computationally demanding task, making well-timed edits almost impossible. Thus, to avoid re-training, MQA under knowledge editing (KE), *i.e.*, answering multi-hop questions based on given fact edits, has thus received much attention in recent years [6, 51].

Briefly speaking, there are two dominant research directions for this topic, *i.e.*, parameter-based and memory-based knowledge editing. Parameter-based methods update the knowledge in LLMs by modifying the parameters of the model. Some examples in this regard include ROME [28] and its improved variant, *i.e.*, MEMIT [29]. On the contrary, the memory-based methods explicitly maintain an edit memory to store the information about the knowledge and facts to be modified. Examples include: MeLLO [51], PokeMQA [6] and TEMPLE-MQA[4]. These methods primarily

*The first three authors contributed equally to this work.

†Correspondence to Lijie Hu {lijie.hu@kaust.edu.sa} and Di Wang {di.wang@kaust.edu.sa}.




Figure 1: (a) The former company of Tom is Amazon, after updating the Tom’s company to Twitter the model still has past knowledge about Tom’s boss. (b) RULE-KE leverages logic rules to also update knowledge about Tom’s boss to Elon Musk following the edit about Tom’s company.

adopt plan-and-solve paradigm [21, 41], where LLMs are prompted to decompose a multi-hop question into multiple sub-questions followed by iteratively interacting with the edit memory to solve each sub-question.

While recently plenty of work has contributed to MQA under KE, we observe that existing research still poses following key limitations: (i) These methods will fail when encountering "*hard to decompose*" multi-hop questions, and (ii) they are unable to cater to "*correlated knowledge updates*" resulting as a consequence of knowledge edits. Here "*hard to decompose*" questions imply a subset of multi-hop questions that cannot be easily decomposed into independent sub-questions using existing plan-and-solve approaches (e.g., [51, 6]). Likewise, "*correlated knowledge update*" implies cases where we need to cater to successive knowledge updates resulting as a consequence of individual knowledge edits to come up with the correct answer. This is also shown in Figure 1 (a), illustrating that it is hard for the existing solutions (i.e., MeLLO [51]) to decompose the the question "*Who is the boss of Tom*" into appropriate sub-questions. At the same time, given the fact edit to update the company of Tom from *Amazon* \rightarrow *Twitter*, yet after updating Tom’s company, the language model still possesses outdated knowledge about the facts correlated with the edit, e.g., Tom’s current boss etc. This leads to knowledge inconsistency and has a detrimental impact on the reliability of KE methods.

To address these limitations, in this work, we propose a novel method, i.e., RULE-KE: **R**ULE based **K**nowledge **E**ditting. As shown in Figure 1 (b), RULE-KE leverages logic rules to identify the core parts of the *hard question* and performs *correlated knowledge updates*, i.e., updating knowledge/facts correlated with the edit to ensure knowledge consistency for KE, thus correctly answering the question as: *Elon Musk*. To the best of our knowledge, RULE-KE is amongst the initial attempts to employ logic rules to help augment the knowledge consistency and improve the end-performance of existing solutions for MQA under KE (both parameter-based and memory-based).

For experimentation, we use an existing benchmark dataset, as well as a newly curated dataset (Section 5) encompassing a relatively higher proportion of *hard to decompose* questions and edits requiring significantly higher *correlated knowledge updates*. Experimental evaluation shows that RULE-KE improves the end performance of existing methods by a significant margin.

To summarize, this paper makes the following key contributions:

1. We introduce RULE-KE, which leverages rule discovery to discover logic rules that are helpful for *hard to decompose* multi-hop questions, as well as performing *correlated knowledge updates* to update knowledge about facts correlated with the edits. As a cherry on top, RULE-KE could augment the performance of all existing memory-based and parameter-based KE methods.
2. To better show the performance of RULE-KE, we introduce an evaluation benchmark, i.e., RKE-EVAL that, in contrast to existing benchmarks, encompasses a wide range of *hard to decompose* multi-hop questions and edits requiring significant *correlated knowledge updates*.
3. We perform an intensive and extensive experimental evaluation to showcase the potential of our proposed approach, showing that RULE-KE can augment the performance of existing solutions for MQA under KE by up to 92% and 112.9% for parameter-based and memory-based systems respectively.

2 Related Work

Parameter-based KE. These methods can be further classified into fine-tuning, locating and editing, and meta-learning. Fine-tuning approaches fine-tune the model parameters or use an auxiliary set of parameters to augment the model’s knowledge. These methods perform poorly in the KE problems because of vulnerability to catastrophic forgetting [3, 52]. The locate and edit approaches consider the layers of a feed-forward network as the primary knowledge repositories and update their parameters to inject new knowledge. This approach was initially proposed in ROME [28] targeting single edit, which is later extended to a large number of edits by MEMIT [29]. Huang et al., [18] emphasized the need for generalization across different contexts in the sub-questions. WILKE [10] uses a dynamic localization KE method to facilitate lifelong editing. Li et al., [26] proposed PMET to precisely update the weights of the feed-forward network. Meta-learning approaches treat the editing task as a machine learning problem. Some examples include: hyper-network trained with constrained optimization for fact-only modification [2], context-aware meta-learned loss scaling by Hu et al., [16], belief-graph by Hase et al., [8]. The end goal of the parameter-editing approaches is to develop an updated model by integrating information about new data/knowledge.

These models perform poorly for multi-hop question-answering, because each multi-hop question may invoke a series of inter-dependent sub-questions (with corresponding fact edits), which makes it harder for the parameter-based approaches to look for updated responses for individual sub-questions followed by coordinated reasoning required to generate the final answer.

Memory-based KE. These techniques store edits in an explicit memory and use retrieval-augmented methods to retrieve the subset of edits relevant to the question. For instance, Mitchell et al., [30] proposed SERAC, a semi-parametric editing method coupled with retrieval-augmented counterfactual model. Cheng et al., [50] employed in-context learning based on three types of demonstrations (copy, update, and retain) to edit the model’s knowledge. Han et al., [7] developed an editing retrieval framework to promote the efficacy of model editing methods during sequential edits. Zhong et al., [51] proposed MeLLO that uses plan-and-solve paradigm along with self-checking to check whether the retrieved edit is relevant to the question. Gu et al., [6] proposed PokeMQA, a two-stage retrieval by decoupling sub-question decomposition from knowledge editing. TEMPLE-MQA [4] transforms the multi-hop questions and edits into a structured form, effectively improving the accuracy of retrieval of relevant edits while addressing the challenge of temporal knowledge editing.

These methods primarily rely on the plan-and-solve paradigm, *i.e.*, using existing LLMs to decompose the question into sub-questions, later, use an inference plan for response/answer generation. They perform poorly on *hard to decompose* multi-hop questions, which limits their ability to ensure knowledge consistency followed by knowledge edits. This has a detrimental impact on the end-performance of MQA under KE systems.

Logical Rules for Knowledge Graph Reasoning. Logical rules have extensively been studied for the knowledge graph reasoning tasks. Quinlan et al., [33] used inductive logic programming to derive logical rules from training samples in the knowledge graph. RNNLogic [32] trains rule generator and reasoning predictor to generate high-quality logic rules. While most of the above-mentioned works focus on mining rules from the knowledge graph triples, RuLE by Tang et al., [36] focuses on the setting where rules are provided beforehand and leverages these provided rules to augment the inference performance of the model. Lajus et al., [24] proposed a rule mining system AMIE-3, which employs a range of pruning strategies and optimization methods to enable fast and accurate rule mining. So far, we are not aware of any work using logic rules for knowledge editing systems.

To summarize, we argue that in contrast to the existing work, RULE-KE leverages rule discovery to infer logic rules that are helpful in inferring new knowledge based on the correlation between the given edit and the model’s prior knowledge. This makes RULE-KE a better choice to ensure knowledge consistency, which is helpful in augmenting the performance of existing solutions for MQA under KE for both parameter-based and memory-based settings.

3 Preliminaries

In this section, we introduce the notations, provide the motivation to use logical rules for RULE-KE, and define our problem.

Notations. We use $\mathcal{K}_{base} = \{r(s, o) | s, o \in \mathcal{E}, r \in \mathcal{R}\}$ to represent the knowledge base, where s represents the subject entity and o represent the object entity of the relation r , \mathcal{E} represents the set of entities and \mathcal{R} represents set of relations. We use $e = r(s, o \rightarrow o^*)$ to represent an individual knowledge edit, denoting that object of the subject s with relation r is updated from o to o^* . A collection of n edits is represented by $\mathcal{M} = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n\}$. We use f to represent a language model and use Q to represent a multi-hop question. Each Q requires multiple reasoning steps to obtain the final answer, where the reasoning steps form a *knowledge path* $\mathcal{P}_Q = \langle r_1(s_1, o_1), \dots, r_n(s_n, o_n) \rangle$ with o_n as the final answer. If one of the fact $r_i(s_i, o_i) \in \mathcal{P}_Q$ is updated by an edit $e_i = r_i(s_i, o_i \rightarrow o_i^*) \in \mathcal{M}$, the resulting knowledge path becomes: $\mathcal{P}_Q^* = \langle r_1(s_1, o_1), \dots, r_i(s_i, o_i^*), \dots, r_n(s_n^*, o_n^*) \rangle$, *i.e.*, the subsequent knowledge path will be changed, yielding o_n^* as the new answer for question Q . It's notable that Q may be modified by multiple edits in \mathcal{M} .

We use $\varphi : X \rightarrow p_0$ to represent a logic rule, where X is a conjunction of predicates representing *pre-condition*, and p_0 is a predicate representing *consequence*. In this work, we use compositional logic rules of the form:

$$\varphi(r_h, \mathbf{r}_b) : r_{b_1}(z_0, z_1) \wedge r_{b_2}(z_1, z_2) \wedge \dots \wedge r_{b_n}(z_{n-1}, z_n) \rightarrow r_h(z_0, z_n) \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{r}_b = \{r_{b_1}, \dots, r_{b_n}\}$ is a set of relations for *pre-condition*, and r_h is a relation for *consequence*, $\{z_0, \dots, z_n\}$ is a set of variables. When these variables are replaced with specific entities, we can get a *grounding* of rules. For example: $father_is(Tom, John) \wedge wife_is(John, Amy) \rightarrow mother_is(Tom, Amy)$. This grounding illustrates that if Tom's father is John and John's wife is Amy, then it implies Tom's mother is Amy.

Motivation of Logic Rules. The motivation for employing logic rules for RULE-KE stems from the fact that an individual edit $e = r(s, o \rightarrow o^*)$ not only affects the knowledge path of Q , but may also initiate new knowledge edits e' . For instance, an edit $e = company_is(Tom, Amazon \rightarrow Twitter)$ will also trigger $e' = boss_is(Tom, Jeff\ Bezos \rightarrow Elon\ Musk)$. For such cases, logic rules provide an effective mechanism to capture and represent these associations among edits more explicitly, which makes them an ideal choice for RULE-KE. We call this phenomenon as *correlated knowledge updates* for edit e in the rest of this paper. Note that this issue has been overlooked by previous research on KE.

Problem Definition. MQA under KE aims to inject new knowledge \mathcal{M} into the language model f to come up with an updated model f^* to be used to answer multi-hop questions Q . For this, we first use rule discovery tools to discover the logic rules $\Sigma = \{\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_m\}$ from existing knowledge-base \mathcal{K}_{base} . Later, we use these rules Σ in relation with the edit information \mathcal{M} to discover the knowledge updates correlated with the edits as augmented knowledge \mathcal{K}' . Finally, we use the \mathcal{K}' along with \mathcal{M} to perform knowledge editing for existing methods in a performance-enhanced fashion.

4 RULE-KE: Rule Based Knowledge Editing

The core idea of RULE-KE is to leverage logical rules to infer new/updated knowledge, resulting in a correlation between requested knowledge edits and prior knowledge. Its workflow is explained as follows.

4.1 Workflow of RULE-KE

The overall workflow of RULE-KE is shown in Figure 2. It could be explained as a three-step process: (a) Discover logic rules Σ from a large-scale knowledge base \mathcal{K}_{base} . (b) For each edit $e \in \mathcal{M}$, determine the subset of rules correlated by the edit e , *i.e.*, $\Sigma_e \subseteq \Sigma$. (c) Use correlated rules (Σ_e) to infer and/or correlated knowledge to be stored as augmented knowledge \mathcal{K}' , later used for knowledge consistency of KE methods.

Step a: Mining Logic Rules. The first step of RULE-KE is the rule mining process. It aims at excavating the common logic rules Σ from the large-scale knowledge base \mathcal{K}_{base} , facilitating subsequent prediction of the *correlated knowledge* affected by the edits. For this, we use Wikidata [38] as our knowledge base. The quality of the discovered rules varies and is not always valid in all situations. In order to avoid redundant rules, we use *support threshold* \mathcal{A}_Σ as a quantitative metric, indicative of the quality of the rule.




Figure 2: The overall workflow of RULE-KE. It encompasses: (a) rule mining, (b) determining correlated rules, and (c) inferring correlated knowledge.

There are many works that study rule mining and achieve excellent results, such as AMIE-3 [24] and RNNLogic [32]. Thus, we use the existing tools to mine logic rules and their corresponding *support threshold* from \mathcal{K}_{base} , as follows:

$$\Sigma, \mathcal{A}_\Sigma = \text{Tool}_{\text{mine}}(\mathcal{K}_{base}), \quad (2)$$

where $\Sigma = \{\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_m\}$ is a set of rules, $\mathcal{A}_\Sigma = \{\alpha_{\varphi_1}, \alpha_{\varphi_2}, \dots, \alpha_{\varphi_m}\}$ is a set of support thresholds, with $\alpha_{\varphi_i} \in [0, 1]$ indicating the likelihood of the rule φ_i to be true. We use AMIE-3 as our rule mining tool ($\text{Tool}_{\text{mine}}$), as it has the ability to mine higher-quality rules in practice.

Step b: Determining correlated Rules. Editing not only affects single knowledge but may trigger changes in the entire knowledge system, causing its related knowledge to be updated accordingly. The logic rules serve as a bridge between an edit and its *correlated knowledge*, thus, determining the relevant bridge for each edit is very important. The objective of this step is to find a subset of relevant rules $\Sigma_e \subseteq \Sigma$ for each edit $e \in \mathcal{M}$. To determine the subset of rules that are relevant to an edit, we use the semantic similarity between the relation part of the edit and the relations in the pre-conditional part of the rule as a selection criterion. For instance, given an edit "*work_for* (Tom, Apple) \rightarrow Twitter", and a set of rules: {"*company_is* (z_0, z_1) \wedge *owner_is* (z_1, z_2) \rightarrow *boss_is* (z_0, z_2)"; "*born_in* (z_0, z_1) \wedge *locate_in* (z_1, z_2) \rightarrow *raised_in* (z_0, z_2)"}, the relation part of the edit "*work_for*" has higher semantic relevance with the relation "*company_is*" compared to other relations, *e.g.*, "*owner_is*", "*born_in*" *etc.*

To implement our above intuition, we followed the idea of dense retrieval [20] to contrast the semantic relevance based on the vector similarity of the relation embeddings. For this, we use an encoder E to encode the relation r of the edit e and the relation set \mathbf{r}_b of rule $\varphi(r_h, \mathbf{r}_b)$, as shown below:

$$\begin{aligned} v_e &= E(r), \\ \mathbf{V}_\varphi &= E(\mathbf{r}_b) = \{E(r_{b_1}), \dots, E(r_{b_n})\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where v_e is the vector embedding for relation r of edit e , \mathbf{V}_φ is the set of vector embedding for the relation set \mathbf{r}_b of φ . Later, we use cosine similarity (sim) for the elements of \mathbf{V}_φ and v_e to determine the relational predicate exhibiting maximum similarity with relation r , as shown below.

$$v_k^* = \arg \max_{v_k \in \mathbf{V}_\varphi} (\text{sim}(v_k, v_e)), \quad (4)$$

where v_k^* is the embedding vector of the predicate relation r_{b_k} with highest similarity with v_e .

Because the quality of rule φ may not be high and *correlated knowledge* found by low-quality rules is not necessarily reliable, we use α_φ times scaled similarity of v_k^* and v_e compared against the correlation threshold δ to determine whether $\varphi_i(r_h, \mathbf{r}_b)$ is a reliable rule for predicting *correlated knowledge* for subsequent steps:

$$\psi : (v_k^* \cdot v_e) * \alpha_\varphi > \delta, \quad (5)$$

where ψ returns a logical indicator of whether the statement is true or not. Finally, we use the above process to find all the logic rules $\varphi(r_h, \mathbf{r}_b) \in \Sigma$ which satisfy corresponding ψ is true, and combine them into the rule subset Σ_e , *i.e.*, a set of rules activated by edit e .

Step c: Inferring Correlated Knowledge. After selecting the subset of rules Σ_e corresponding to the relation in the edit $e \in \mathcal{M}$, we need to infer *correlated knowledge* for edit e . Suppose the rule is activated at position k , *i.e.*, at pre-conditional predicate r_{b_k} , we can instantiate variables z_{k-1} and z_k as s and o^* , respectively, as shown below.

$$r_{b_1}(\mathbf{z}_0, z_1) \wedge r_{b_2}(z_1, z_2) \cdots \underbrace{r_{b_k}(z_{k-1}(s), z_k(o^*))}_{\text{NEW KNOWLEDGE}} \cdots \wedge r_{b_n}(z_{n-1}, \mathbf{z}_n) \rightarrow \underbrace{r_h(\mathbf{z}_0, \mathbf{z}_n)}_{\text{CORRELATED KNOWLEDGE}}. \quad (6)$$

The above equation shows how the *correlated knowledge* is generated from the rule φ and edit e . However, we only know $z_{k-1} = s$ and $z_k = o^*$. Thus, we need to find the specific entity for variable \mathbf{z}_0 and \mathbf{z}_n to determine $r_h(\mathbf{z}_0, \mathbf{z}_n)$ as the *correlated knowledge*. For this, we use: (i) back tracking to determine the \mathbf{z}_0 ; and (ii) forward tracking to determine the \mathbf{z}_n , with corresponding chain shown in (7).

$$\underbrace{\mathbf{z}_0, z_1, \cdots, z_{k-1}(s)}_{\text{BACK TRACKING} \leftarrow} \underbrace{, z_k(o^*), \cdots, z_{n-1}, \mathbf{z}_n}_{\rightarrow \text{FORWARD TRACKING}}. \quad (7)$$

The process flows of forward tracking and backward tracking are explained as follows.

Forward Tracking is an iterative process used to determine the specific entity for the last variable \mathbf{z}_n by traversing the chain $(z_k(o^*), \cdots, z_{n-1}, \mathbf{z}_n)$ in the forward direction for one step at a time, with only prior knowledge about the specific entity o^* for z_k . Each step of this iterative process assumes that we aim to determine the specific entity of variable z_{m+1} based on $r_{b_{m+1}}(z_m(o_{z_m}), z_{m+1})$, where o_{z_m} is the specific entity for z_m , and m indicates the current iterative position $k \leq m \leq n-1$.

It is easy to find that each step corresponds to a single-hop question. However, this question may be modified by the existing edits. Thus, we need to query the edit memory if there are related edits based on o_{z_m} and $r_{b_{m+1}}$. For this, we use dense retrieval [20] to determine the corresponding edit, with details provided in Appendix B.

For the cases, we are unable to find the relevant edit in edit memory, we will query a language model to infer the specific entity for variable z_{m+1} . For this, we design an in-context learning prompt (explained in Appendix A) that prompts an LLM as follows.

$$o_{z_{m+1}} = \text{LLM}(\text{P}_{\text{forward}}(o_{z_m}, r_{b_{m+1}})), \quad (8)$$

where $\text{P}_{\text{forward}}$ is the in-context prompt for o_{z_m} and relation $r_{b_{m+1}}$ used as input for LLM, yielding $o_{z_{m+1}}$ as specific entity for variable z_{m+1} . We can finally get the specific entity for \mathbf{z}_n by iterating the above process.

Back Tracking is similar to forward tracking. The primary difference is that it traverses the chain $(\mathbf{z}_0, \cdots, z_{k-1}(s))$ in the reverse direction in order to infer the specific entity for \mathbf{z}_0 . Specifically, each step of this process assumes that we aim to determine the specific entity of variable z_{j-1} based on $r_{b_j}(z_{j-1}, z_j(o_{z_j}))$, where o_{z_j} is the specific entity for z_j , and j indicating the current iterative position and $1 \leq j \leq k-1$.

Here again, similar to the forward tracking, we first look for relevant edits in the edit memory helpful in inferring z_{j-1} based on o_{z_j} and r_{b_j} . This is explained in detail in Appendix B. For the cases where we are unable to find relevant edits, we infer z_{j-1} by querying the language model. For this, we construct an in-context learning prompt that prompts LLM to infer z_{j-1} :

$$o_{z_{j-1}} = \text{LLM}(\text{P}_{\text{back}}(r_{b_j}, o_{z_j})) \quad (9)$$

where P_{back} is the in-context prompt that uses r_{b_j} and z_j as input and prompts LLM, to yield $o_{z_{j-1}}$ as specific entity for z_{j-1} , for details refer to Appendix A.

Finally, we use the start point \mathbf{z}_0 and endpoint \mathbf{z}_n resulting from backward tracking and forward tracking to infer the correlated knowledge $r_h(\mathbf{z}_0, \mathbf{z}_n)$ to be inserted in \mathcal{K}' .

4.2 RULE-KE—A cherry on the Top

Existing KE methods can not maintain knowledge consistency effectively. The augmented knowledge \mathcal{K}' can help to alleviate this problem because it is generated from the interactions between edits \mathcal{M} and logic rules Σ . In order to adapt RULE-KE to downstream KE methods, we need to transform the

knowledge in \mathcal{K}' from knowledge to edits, *i.e.*, from $r(s, o)$ to $r(s, o \rightarrow o^*)$. Specifically, we define a new set of edits based on \mathcal{K}' as follows:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{K}'} = \{r(s, \text{null} \rightarrow o) \mid r(s, o) \in \mathcal{K}'\}, \quad (10)$$

where null is a specific placeholder, meaning that we no longer need the information about the original object. We then merge the newly curated edit set $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{K}'}$ with \mathcal{M} to come up with \mathcal{M}_{AUG} , *i.e.*, $\mathcal{M}_{\text{AUG}} = \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{K}'}$ as the final set of knowledge edits. Finally, we leverage \mathcal{M}_{AUG} to further edit the model’s knowledge/information for parameter-based methods, whereas for memory-based methods, we can store \mathcal{M}_{AUG} in the edit memory, thus allowing the model to generate the correct response for correlated knowledge instances.

5 RKE-EVAL: RULE-KE Evaluation benchmark

We observe that existing benchmarks for MQA under KE, *e.g.*, MQUAKE [51], are not an ideal option to rigorously test the ability to maintain knowledge consistency for editing methods. The majority of the data in MQUAKE can easily be decomposed into multiple independent knowledge sequences/units, which can be answered independently to come up with the final answer. This severely undermines the end-utility of existing benchmarks for analyzing: (i) hard-to-decompose questions, and (ii) correlation among knowledge updates, *i.e.*, how an individual knowledge update may impact the knowledge for the subsequent parts.

In order to better evaluate the knowledge consistency of RULE-KE and existing methods on MQA under KE for "hard questions" and "correlated knowledge updates", we propose a new evaluation benchmark, namely: **RULEKE-EVALUATION** (RKE-EVAL). RKE-EVAL encompasses numerous multi-hop questions and 17 different rules with pre-condition of length 2. Each multi-hop question is associated with a unique rule and at least one edit. As shown in Figure 3, we categorize the knowledge inferred in RKE-EVAL into four different scenarios: (i) No-Edit: the knowledge of the rule part is not modified by edit. (ii) Right-Edit: only the second part of the rule knowledge is modified by edit and requires back tracking to answer this question. (iii) Left-Edit: only the first part of the rule knowledge is modified by edit and requires forward tracking to answer this question. (iv) Both-Edit: all the knowledge of the rule part is modified by edit. The process flow of data curation is explained in detail in Appendix C, along with an example illustration in Appendix Table 4. This categorization method comprehensively covers all scenarios where new knowledge is generated due to edits and corresponding logic rules.




Figure 3: Four different scenarios of new knowledge generated by logic rules and edits for RKE-EVAL.

6 Experiments

6.1 Experimental Settings

Datasets. We evaluate the performance of RULE-KE using an existing knowledge editing benchmark MQUAKE-CF-3K [51] and our proposed dataset RKE-EVAL. Detailed descriptions and statistics of these datasets are provided in Appendix D.1.

Evaluation Metrics. We use multi-hop accuracy (Acc) [51] as an evaluation metric. Each instance in MQUAKE-CF-3K include three multi-hop questions. An instance is considered correct if any of the three multi-hop questions is answered correctly. Mathematical formulation and further details about the evaluation metrics are given in Appendix D.4. Note that just for simplification, we do not use hop-wise accuracy [6] as a metric because our method primarily relies on the final response rather than the evaluating the intermediate path.

Baseline methods. For performance evaluation of RULE-KE, we use both parameter-based and memory-based KE methods as baselines. The parameter-based baselines include: Fine-tuning (FT) [52], ROME [28] and MEMIT [29]. The memory-based baselines include MeLLO [51], PokeMQA [6] and TEMPLE-MQA [4]. Details about the baseline models are provided in Appendix D.3.

AUG	Method	LLAMA-2-7B						GPT-3.5-TURBO-INSTRUCT					
		MQUAKE-CF-3K			RKE-EVAL			MQUAKE-CF-3K			RKE-EVAL		
		1-E	100-E	All-E	1-E	100-E	All-E	1-E	100-E	All-E	1-E	100-E	All-E
Original	MeLlo	36.13	28.50	21.33	18.24	13.84	2.03	59.67	41.47	35.81	29.05	23.73	10.14
	PoKeMQA	39.13	29.33	22.83	<u>19.81</u>	14.82	3.81	66.18	55.89	47.42	32.05	25.18	13.81
	TEMPLE-MQA	<u>46.67</u>	<u>43.95</u>	<u>41.33</u>	16.54	<u>15.84</u>	<u>14.19</u>	<u>75.08</u>	<u>66.02</u>	<u>53.12</u>	<u>37.29</u>	<u>35.97</u>	<u>33.56</u>
RULE-KE	MeLlo	51.33	30.28	26.13	41.22	16.27	14.26	69.33	52.71	42.06	62.51	45.65	32.43
	PoKeMQA	51.17	29.71	27.91	42.18	19.71	16.83	73.41	60.95	52.38	63.61	47.41	37.72
	TEMPLE-MQA	52.33	44.96	42.17	38.79	32.68	27.70	80.73	69.06	58.03	65.21	61.18	54.68

Table 1: Results for memory-based methods, *i.e.*, original and augmented with RULE-KE on the MQUAKE-CF-3K and RKE-EVAL. We use multi-hop accuracy (Acc) as the evaluation metric. The best scores are **bold-faced**, with the best results among the original models underlined. "E" indicates edit batch size and "AUG" indicates the knowledge augmentation methods. The symbols have the same meaning in the following tables.

Experimental Setup. To assess performance across different number of edits, we conduct stratified sampling based on the number of hops, which allows us to construct batches of different sizes. The setting of different batch sizes is denoted as k -E ($k \in \{1, 100, All\}$). The value of the correlation threshold δ is 0.8. The value of θ in Appendix B is 0.7. We conduct experiments on the three language models, *i.e.*, LLAMA-2-7B [37], LLAMA-2-7B-CHAT [37] and GPT-TURBO-3.5-INSTRUCT [31]. Further details about these models are given in Appendix D.2. We evaluate all the methods in the $\{1, 100, All\}$ -E setting. All experiments are performed using PyTorch 2.1.0 with two A40-48GB GPUs. All the results reported in the paper are averaged over three runs.

6.2 Experimental Results

RULE-KE can boost the performance of memory-based methods. We first analyze the impact of RULE-KE in augmenting the performance of memory-based methods. Corresponding results in Table 1 show that RULE-KE consistently augments the performance of the memory-based methods, outperforming the original models by a significant margin.

Considering the results of our model using LLAMA-2-7B, RULE-KE improves the performance by up to $\{112.92\%, 106.31\%, \text{ and } 95.20\%\}$ for RKE-EVAL, and $\{12.13\%, 2.30\%, \text{ and } 2.03\%\}$ for MQUAKE compared to the best-performing original variants under $\{1, 100, \text{ and } All\}$ -E settings respectively. The results of variants for RULE-KE using GPT-TURBO-3.5-INSTRUCT exhibit a similar trend. Such drastic improvement in performance showcases the logical generalization abilities of RULE-KE, ensuring knowledge consistency for MQA under KE.

We can also observe that as the size of the edit batch increases, the improvement of performance decreases gradually compared to smaller edit batches. A key justification in this regard is the fact that logic rules leveraged by RULE-KE generate additional knowledge edits, thus increasing the size of the edit memory by more than three-fold, which makes it cumbersome for the retrieval to find the right edit from the edit memory. Nevertheless, this issue could be mitigated by using robust retrieval systems. For instance, TEMPLE-MQA [4], with a better retrieval performance, outperforms MeLLO and PokeMQA in the 100/all-E scenario on RKE-EVAL.

RULE-KE improves knowledge consistency for parameter-based methods. We also analyze the impact of RULE-KE on the parameter-based methods. Corresponding results in Figure 4 show that for $\{1, 100, All\}$ -E, RULE-KE improves the performance of the parameter-based methods by $\{30.29\%, 25.80\%, \text{ and } 30.50\%\}$ on MQUAKE-CF-3K; $\{92.00\%, 80.35\%, \text{ and } 75.93\%\}$ on RKE-EVAL respectively. Its impact is more evident for MEMIT [29], which yields a stable improvement in performance even under a large number of edits. Overall, these results indicate that RULE-KE is able to solve some of the key limitations of parameter-based KE methods on MQA under KE, highlighted in previous work [51, 6].

AUG	Method	LLAMA-2-7B-CHAT					
		MQUAKE-CF-3K			RKE-EVAL		
		1-E	100-E	All-E	1-E	100-E	All-E
Original	FT	8.62	3.34	0.34	3.62	2.05	0.29
	ROME	7.42	2.14	0.22	11.39	4.64	0.38
	MEMIT	<u>14.33</u>	<u>12.17</u>	<u>0.59</u>	<u>15.14</u>	<u>5.65</u>	<u>0.54</u>
RULE-KE	FT	9.89	3.62	0.42	11.82	2.66	0.52
	ROME	9.35	2.14	0.31	22.02	7.02	0.40
	MEMIT	18.67	15.31	0.77	29.07	10.19	0.95

Figure 4: Results of parameter-based methods on MQUAKE-CF-3K and RKE-EVAL. We use multi-hop accuracy (Acc) as the evaluation metric.




Figure 5: (a) Avg., multi-hop accuracy (Acc) for memory-based methods for different inferred situations in RKE-EVAL. (b) Increase in size of the edit memory as a multiplier of original size with varying threshold (δ), for all methods. (c) Multi-hop accuracy (Acc) for RULE-KE using RKE-EVAL against different values of threshold (δ). All results are computed using LLAMA-2-7B-CHAT.

Correlating these results, we observe that for a large number of edits, the performance of parameter-based systems degrade more compared to that of the memory-based methods. This finding is also consistent with the previous research [4].

Back tracking is more challenging than forward tracking. We also analyze the impact of RULE-KE on multiple different scenarios of RKE-EVAL, explained in Section 5. Results in Figure 5 (a) show that compared to the original method, the performance improvement incurred by RULE-KE is more prominent for Left/Both-Edit situations compared to that of No/Right-Edit situations. An underlying reason in this regard is the fact that the Right-Edit situation requires the process of back tracking, indicating relatively lower success rate than that of forward tracking. To further explore this phenomenon, we examined some failing cases with back tracking and found that it is primarily caused by many-to-1 relations, *e.g.*, for the question "Who holds the nationality of America?" there are many people who match this question.

To our surprise, for No-Edit situation (*i.e.*, no knowledge edits involved), using RULE-KE leads to slight decrease in accuracy. A probable justification in this regard is the fact that the incorporation of additional knowledge in the edit memory deteriorated the retrieval performance, resulting in a decrease in the overall accuracy of the end model.

Influence of the correlation threshold. The correlation threshold δ in Equation (5), plays a crucial role in controlling the final amount and quality of additional knowledge generated by RULE-KE. Thus, we conduct experiments to explore the influence of different values of δ using the variant of RULE-KE using LLAMA-2 and RKE-EVAL. The results in Figure 5 (b) and (c) show that RULE-KE yields the best possible performance for value of $\delta = 0.8$, while augmenting the size of edit memory by approximately $3.9\times$ times.

We also observe that increasing the value of δ beyond 0.8 will significantly decrease the number of activated rules Σ_e for each edit e , which in turn limits the amount of newly generated knowledge correlated with the edits, thus deteriorating the end-performance of RULE-KE. On the other hand, decreasing the value of δ results in an increased number of activated rules Σ_e , yielding surplus amount of augmented knowledge. This will also limit the retrieval accuracy of memory-based methods. Overall, higher values of δ have a more detrimental impact on the performance compared to the lower ones.

Efficiency analysis of RULE-KE. Finally, we conduct experiments to explore the efficiency of RULE-KE. Note that for these results, we ignore the time it takes to mine the logic rules, as this process is used only once, *i.e.*, only at the start of model training.

Figure 6 (a) shows that for the original variants of parameter-based methods, the running time increases with the increase in the number of edits. However, the increase in the execution time incurred by RULE-KE is almost negligible for edits with different batch sizes. The results in Figure 6 (b) show that for the original variants of the memory-based methods, the execution time is almost not impacted by the edit batch size and is primarily upper-bounded by API calls and/or model inference time. For the model augmented by RULE-KE, the execution time increases by 1.6 folds and 4 folds under 100-E and All-E settings compared to that of 1-E, respectively.




Figure 6: (a) Execution time of RULE-KE with parameter-based methods using RKE-EVAL and LLAMA-2-7B under varying edit batch sizes. (b) Execution time overhead of RULE-KE with memory-based methods using RKE-EVAL and GPT-3.5-TURBO-INSTRUCT under varying edit batch sizes.

Overall, these results show that although for some cases, the running time of RULE-KE is slightly higher than the original variants, it is still within the acceptable range while, at the same time, the end model offers significant improvements in the performance.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed RULE-KE that leverages logic rules for knowledge consistency in order to perform knowledge editing in a performance-enhanced fashion. RULE-KE is a plug-and-play framework that can be used with existing MQA methods under KE as a *cherry on the top*. Experimental results using a benchmark and our newly curated data set showed that RULE-KE can augment the performance of existing methods on MQA under KE by a significant margin.

References

- [1] Muhammad Asif Ali, Zhengping Li, Shu Yang, Keyuan Cheng, Yang Cao, Tianhao Huang, Lijie Hu, Lu Yu, and Di Wang. Prompt-saw: Leveraging relation-aware graphs for textual prompt compression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00489*, 2024.
- [2] Nicola De Cao, Wilker Aziz, and Ivan Titov. Editing factual knowledge in language models. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2021.
- [3] Sanyuan Chen, Yutai Hou, Yiming Cui, Wanxiang Che, Ting Liu, and Xiangzhan Yu. Recall and learn: Fine-tuning deep pretrained language models with less forgetting. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2020.
- [4] Keyuan Cheng, Gang Lin, Haoyang Fei, Lu Yu, Muhammad Asif Ali, Lijie Hu, Di Wang, et al. Multi-hop question answering under temporal knowledge editing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00492*, 2024.
- [5] Cynthia Dwork, Frank McSherry, Kobbi Nissim, and Adam Smith. Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis. In *Theory of Cryptography: Third Theory of Cryptography Conference, TCC 2006, New York, NY, USA, March 4-7, 2006. Proceedings 3*, pages 265–284. Springer, 2006.
- [6] Hengrui Gu, Kaixiong Zhou, Xiaotian Han, Ninghao Liu, Ruobing Wang, and Xin Wang. Pokemqa: Programmable knowledge editing for multi-hop question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.15194*, 2023.
- [7] Xiaoqi Han, Ru Li, Hongye Tan, Wang Yuanlong, Qinghua Chai, and Jeff Pan. Improving sequential model editing with fact retrieval. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 11209–11224, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [8] Peter Hase, Mona T. Diab, Asli Celikyilmaz, Xian Li, Zornitsa Kozareva, Veselin Stoyanov, Mohit Bansal, and Srini Iyer. Do language models have beliefs? methods for detecting, updating, and visualizing model beliefs. *ArXiv*, abs/2111.13654, 2021.

- [9] Ruixin Hong, Hongming Zhang, Honghui Zhao, Dong Yu, and Changshui Zhang. Faithful question answering with monte-carlo planning. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2023.
- [10] Chenhui Hu, Pengfei Cao, Yubo Chen, Kang Liu, and Jun Zhao. Wilke: Wise-layer knowledge editor for lifelong knowledge editing. *ArXiv*, abs/2402.10987, 2024.
- [11] Lijie Hu, Ivan Habernal, Lei Shen, and Di Wang. Differentially private natural language models: Recent advances and future directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.09112*, 2023.
- [12] Lijie Hu, Yixin Liu, Ninghao Liu, Mengdi Huai, Lichao Sun, and Di Wang. Improving faithfulness for vision transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.17983*, 2023.
- [13] Lijie Hu, Yixin Liu, Ninghao Liu, Mengdi Huai, Lichao Sun, and Di Wang. Seat: stable and explainable attention. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37(11), pages 12907–12915, 2023.
- [14] Lijie Hu, Shuo Ni, Hanshen Xiao, and Di Wang. High dimensional differentially private stochastic optimization with heavy-tailed data. In *Proceedings of the 41st ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGAI Symposium on Principles of Database Systems*, pages 227–236, 2022.
- [15] Lijie Hu, Zihang Xiang, Jiabin Liu, and Di Wang. Privacy-preserving sparse generalized eigenvalue problem. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 5052–5062. PMLR, 2023.
- [16] Nathan J. Hu, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D. Manning, and Chelsea Finn. Meta-learning online adaptation of language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2305.15076, 2023.
- [17] Jie Huang and Kevin Chen-Chuan Chang. Towards reasoning in large language models: A survey. *ArXiv*, abs/2212.10403, 2022.
- [18] Youcheng Huang, Wenqiang Lei, Zheng Zhang, Jiancheng Lv, and Shuicheng Yan. See the unseen: Better context-consistent knowledge-editing by noises. *ArXiv*, abs/2401.07544, 2024.
- [19] Cheonsu Jeong. A study on the implementation of generative ai services using an enterprise data-based llm application architecture. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.01105*, 2023.
- [20] Vladimir Karpukhin, Barlas Oğuz, Sewon Min, Patrick Lewis, Ledell Yu Wu, Sergey Edunov, Danqi Chen, and Wen tau Yih. Dense passage retrieval for open-domain question answering. *ArXiv*, abs/2004.04906, 2020.
- [21] Tushar Khot, H. Trivedi, Matthew Finlayson, Yao Fu, Kyle Richardson, Peter Clark, and Ashish Sabharwal. Decomposed prompting: A modular approach for solving complex tasks. *ArXiv*, abs/2210.02406, 2022.
- [22] Nikolaos Kolitsas, Octavian-Eugen Ganea, and Thomas Hofmann. End-to-end neural entity linking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.07699*, 2018.
- [23] Songning Lai, Lijie Hu, Junxiao Wang, Laure Berti-Equille, and Di Wang. Faithful vision-language interpretation via concept bottleneck models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [24] Jonathan Lajus, Luis Galárraga, and Fabian M. Suchanek. Fast and exact rule mining with amie 3. *The Semantic Web*, 12123:36 – 52, 2020.
- [25] Yunshi Lan, Gaole He, Jinhao Jiang, Jing Jiang, Wayne Xin Zhao, and Ji rong Wen. A survey on complex knowledge base question answering: Methods, challenges and solutions. *ArXiv*, abs/2105.11644, 2021.
- [26] Xiaopeng Li, Shasha Li, Shezheng Song, Jing Yang, Jun Ma, and Jie Yu. Pmet: Precise model editing in a transformer. *ArXiv*, abs/2308.08742, 2023.
- [27] Vaibhav Mavi, Anubhav Jangra, and Adam Jatowt. A survey on multi-hop question answering and generation. *ArXiv*, abs/2204.09140, 2022.
- [28] Kevin Meng, David Bau, Alex Andonian, and Yonatan Belinkov. Locating and editing factual associations in gpt. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:17359–17372, 2022.
- [29] Kevin Meng, Arnab Sen Sharma, Alex J Andonian, Yonatan Belinkov, and David Bau. Mass-editing memory in a transformer. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.

- [30] Eric Mitchell, Charles Lin, Antoine Bosselut, Christopher D. Manning, and Chelsea Finn. Memory-based model editing at scale. *ArXiv*, abs/2206.06520, 2022.
- [31] Long Ouyang, Jeff Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L. Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke E. Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul Francis Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan J. Lowe. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *ArXiv*, abs/2203.02155, 2022.
- [32] Meng Qu, Junkun Chen, Louis-Pascal Xhonneux, Yoshua Bengio, and Jian Tang. Rnnlogic: Learning logic rules for reasoning on knowledge graphs. *ArXiv*, abs/2010.04029, 2020.
- [33] J. Ross Quinlan. Learning logical definitions from relations. *Machine Learning*, 5:239–266, 1990.
- [34] Vipula Rawte, Amit Sheth, and Amitava Das. A survey of hallucination in large foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.05922*, 2023.
- [35] Jinyan Su, Lijie Hu, and Di Wang. Faster rates of private stochastic convex optimization. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 995–1002. PMLR, 2022.
- [36] Xiaojuan Tang, Song-Chun Zhu, Yitao Liang, and Muhan Zhang. Rule: Neural-symbolic knowledge graph reasoning with rule embedding. *ArXiv*, abs/2210.14905, 2022.
- [37] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- [38] Denny Vrandečić and Markus Krötzsch. Wikidata: a free collaborative knowledgebase. *Communications of the ACM*, 57(10):78–85, 2014.
- [39] Di Wang, Jiahao Ding, Lijie Hu, Zejun Xie, Miao Pan, and Jinhui Xu. Differentially private (gradient) expectation maximization algorithm with statistical guarantees. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.13520*, 2020.
- [40] Di Wang, Huangyu Zhang, Marco Gaboardi, and Jinhui Xu. Estimating smooth glm in non-interactive local differential privacy model with public unlabeled data. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 1207–1213. PMLR, 2021.
- [41] Lei Wang, Wanyu Xu, Yihuai Lan, Zhiqiang Hu, Yunshi Lan, Roy Ka-Wei Lee, and Ee-Peng Lim. Plan-and-solve prompting: Improving zero-shot chain-of-thought reasoning by large language models. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2023.
- [42] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Ed Huai hsin Chi, F. Xia, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain of thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2201.11903, 2022.
- [43] 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. Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2019.
- [44] Zihang Xiang, Chenglong Wang, and Di Wang. How does selection leak privacy: Revisiting private selection and improved results for hyper-parameter tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13087*, 2024.
- [45] Zihang Xiang, Tianhao Wang, Wanyu Lin, and Di Wang. Practical differentially private and byzantine-resilient federated learning. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data*, 1(2):1–26, 2023.
- [46] Xilie Xu, Keyi Kong, Ning Liu, Lizhen Cui, Di Wang, Jingfeng Zhang, and Mohan Kankanhalli. An llm can fool itself: A prompt-based adversarial attack. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.13345*, 2023.
- [47] Shu Yang, Muhammad Asif Ali, Cheng-Long Wang, Lijie Hu, and Di Wang. Moral: Moe augmented lora for llms’ lifelong learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11260*, 2024.
- [48] Shu Yang, Lijie Hu, Lu Yu, Muhammad Asif Ali, and Di Wang. Human-ai interactions in the communication era: Autophagy makes large models achieving local optima. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11271*, 2024.

- [49] Shu Yang, Jiayuan Su, Han Jiang, Mengdi Li, Keyuan Cheng, Muhammad Asif Ali, Lijie Hu, and Di Wang. Dialectical alignment: Resolving the tension of 3h and security threats of llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00486*, 2024.
- [50] Ce Zheng, Lei Li, Qingxiu Dong, Yuxuan Fan, Zhiyong Wu, Jingjing Xu, and Baobao Chang. Can we edit factual knowledge by in-context learning? *ArXiv*, abs/2305.12740, 2023.
- [51] Zexuan Zhong, Zhengxuan Wu, Christopher D Manning, Christopher Potts, and Danqi Chen. Mquake: Assessing knowledge editing in language models via multi-hop questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14795*, 2023.
- [52] Chen Zhu, Ankit Singh Rawat, Manzil Zaheer, Srinadh Bhojanapalli, Daliang Li, Felix X. Yu, and Sanjiv Kumar. Modifying memories in transformer models. *ArXiv*, abs/2012.00363, 2020.

A Details of Prompts

[Demo]
 Question: (*U.S., president is, <mask>*), what is the answer for <mask>?
 Answer: Joe Biden.

[Instruction]
 Please refer to the above demo and complete the following task:

[Task]
 ($o_{z_m}, r_{b_{m+1}}, <mask>$), what is the answer for <mask>?

Table 2: Prompt P_{forward} used to determine the next value along the chain in Equation 8. **[Demo]** include several high-quality demonstrations handwritten by humans. o_{z_m} and $r_{b_{m+1}}$ are the inputs for the prompt template.

[Demo]
 Question: (<mask>, *president is, Joe Biden*), what is the answer for <mask>?
 Answer: United states.

[Instruction]
 Please refer to the above demo and complete the following task:

[Task]
 (<mask>, r_{b_j}, o_{z_j}), what is the answer for <mask>?

Table 3: Prompts P_{back} used to determine the previous value along the chain in Equation 9. r_{b_j} and o_{z_j} are the input for prompt template.

B Retrieval for Forward Tracking and Back Tracking

In this section, we introduce the process of retrieving the edit memory for forward tracking and back tracking. For each edit $e \in \mathcal{M}$, we denote $e[s]$, $e[r]$ and $e[o^*]$ as subject, relation and object of edit e respectively.

In the process of forward tracking, we need to whether there is edit e in \mathcal{M} , which $e[s] = o_{z_m}$ and $e[r]$ match with $r_{b_{m+1}}$. Inspired by previous work [4], we introduce a two-step retrieval method: (i) First, filter out all edits whose subject is not identical to o_{z_m} . ii) Use dense retrieval to compare the semantic similarity between the relation of the remaining edits and $r_{b_{m+1}}$, then select the most similar one.

Step 1: Filtering. This step extracts a subset \mathcal{M}_{sub} from \mathcal{M} by selecting only the edits that fulfill the subject constraint. Formally, this is represented as:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{sub}} = \{e \in \mathcal{M} \mid e[s] \in \{o_{z_m}\} \cup \text{Alias}(o_{z_m})\} \quad (11)$$

where *Alias* represent multiple different alias of the entities captured from Wikidata via entity linking [22].

Step 2: Re-ranking. This step aims to compare the semantic similarity between $e[r]$ and $r_{b_{m+1}}$. For this, we first encode $r_{b_{m+1}}$ using encoder E , as follows:

$$v_r = E(r_{b_{m+1}}) \quad (12)$$

Then, we re-rank edits in \mathcal{M}_{sub} based on the cosine similarity (*sim*) of the relation and select the edit exhibiting highest relational similarity with the retrieved result.

$$e^*, \eta = \arg \max_{e \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{sub}}} \text{sim}(E(e[r]), v_r), \quad (13)$$

where e^* is the retrieved edit, and η is the corresponding similarity compared against a threshold θ , as follows: if $\eta > \theta$, we assume the relevant edit is found, and $o_{z_{m+1}}$ is the object of this edit, *i.e.*, $o_{z_{m+1}} = e^*[o^*]$, otherwise we assume the relevant edit is not found.

Similar to forward tracking, the objective of back tracking is to obtain $o_{z_{j-1}}$ based on o_{z_j} and r_{b_j} . We first extract subset \mathcal{M}_{sub} to filter out all edits whose object is not identical to o_{z_m} . Then we match the edits in \mathcal{M}_{sub} according to the semantic similarity between its relation and r_{b_j} and select the edit e^* with the highest similarity η compared against a threshold θ , as follows: if $\eta > \theta$, we assume the edit is found, *i.e.*, $o_{z_{j-1}} = e^*[s]$, otherwise we assume the relevant edit is not found.

Question	Who is the father of the first lady of America?
Edit	head_of_state(America, Joe Biden \rightarrow Albert Einstein)
Rule	head_of_state \wedge wife_is \rightarrow first_lady_is
Reasoning	head_of_state (America, Albert Einstein) \wedge wife_is (Albert Einstein, Elsa Einstein) \rightarrow first_lady_is (America, Elsa Einstein)
Inference Chain	first_lady_is (America, Elsa Einstein) father_is (Elsa Einstein, Rudolf Einstein)
Answer	Rudolf Einstein

Table 4: An example illustration of Left-Edit on RKE-EVAL. It shows how RULE-KE employed logic rules to infer derived knowledge, helpful for the model to generate the correct answer.

C Data Construction of RKE-EVAL

RKE-EVAL is created using Wikidata ³, a large-scale knowledge base encompassing millions of real-world entities and their associated knowledge triplets. We explain the data curation process as follows:

Step 1: Collecting high-quality logic rules and relation templates. We first employ the rule-mining tools to discover a larger number of rules from Wikidata, later manually select a small subset of representative rules. Table 8 illustrated multiple different rules used for the curation of RKE-EVAL. Following prior work [51], we also collect some common relations from Wikidata and create a question template and cloze-style statement template for them, as shown in Table 7.

Step 2: Constructing relation path template. Multi-hop questions require a series of reasoning steps to come up with the final answer. We refer to all the relations involved in this process as a *relation path template*, e.g., for the question: "What is the nationality of the owner of company of Tom?", the corresponding relation path template is "company_is(z_0, z_1), owner_is(z_1, z_2), nationality(z_2, z_3)". Once given with the start point z_0 , we can get a potentially valid multi-hop question. We get the potential relation path template by arranging all the relation templates obtained in the previous step, and delete inappropriate templates, e.g., "company_is(z_0, z_1), educated_at_university(z_1, z_2)" is an inappropriate template since a company is not a person.

Step 3: Generating knowledge paths. Then we use the above relation path template to generate a knowledge path by setting the start point z_0 for a specific entity. This is an iterative process which involves determining the specific object o based on the $r(s, ?)$, with the subject s and relation r as known. Following the previous work [4], we use the database language SPASQL to query the object o for each iterative process.

Step 4: Introducing counterfactual edit to the knowledge path. Next, we use the counterfactual edit to modify some reasoning steps of the knowledge path to mimic the knowledge editing scenario in reality.

Step 5: Using rules to curate multi-hop questions. We finally combine some connected relations in the knowledge path into one relation based on logic rules, e.g., Combine "father_is($Tom, John$), wife_is($John, Amy$), company_is($Amy, Twitter$)" into "mother_is(Tom, Amy), company_is($Amy, Twitter$)". In this way, we can construct a challenging multi-hop question that can be used to evaluate the ability of end-models to maintain knowledge consistency of KE methods. Finally, we use GPT-4 to transform them into natural language forms.

D Additional Experimental Details

D.1 Dataset

- (i) MQUAKE-CF-3K [51] is a knowledge editing dataset, which contains a number of k-hop questions ($k \in \{2, 3, 4\}$) questions, each k-hop question is associated with at least one counterfactual edit. The statistics of MQUAKE-CF-3K are shown in Table 5.
- (ii) RKE-EVAL is a dataset proposed by us to evaluate the ability of knowledge editing methods

³https://www.wikidata.org/wiki/Wikidata:Main_Page

to maintain knowledge consistency. Like MQUAKE, RKE-EVAL contains a number of multi-hop questions related to one or more edits. The Statistics of RKE-EVAL are shown in Table 6.

#Edits	2-hop	3-hop	4-hop	Total
1	513	356	224	1093
2	487	334	246	1067
3	-	310	262	572
4	-	-	268	268
All	1000	1000	1000	3000

Table 5: Statistics of MQUAKE-CF-3K.

Situation	2-hop	3-hop	4-hop	Total
Left-Edit	330	410	342	1082
Right-Edit	357	290	244	891
Both-Edit	244	156	209	609
No-Edit	-	153	212	365
All	931	1009	1007	2947

Table 6: Statistics of RKE-EVAL.

D.2 Large Models

We conduct experiments on the following base language models: (i) LLAMA-2-7B [37] is a very powerful open source pre-trained large language model, and we use the implementation of huggingface [43]. (ii) LLAMA-2-7B-CHAT [37] is fine-tuned version of LLAMA-2-7B with stronger ability in chat. (iii) GPT-3.5-TURBO-INSTRUCT [31] is a variant of the most capable GPT-3.5 series model, specifically designed to follow instructions and complete tasks thoughtfully.

D.3 Baseline Methods

Parameter-based editing method. We take three parameter-based editing methods as baselines.

1. Fine-tuning (FT) [52] simply perform a gradient descent algorithm on the model based on the new knowledge to update the parameters.
2. ROME [28] first locates factual knowledge at a specific layer of the transformer architecture and then updates the feedforward network of this layer to insert new knowledge.
3. MEMIT [29] modifies a range of layer feedforward networks and expands ROME to modify a large amount of knowledge.

Memory-based editing method. We evaluate the following state-of-the-art memory-based editing methods.

1. MeLLO [51] uses the plan-and-solve paradigm. When solving a sub-problem, MeLLO first asks the model to generate a candidate answer and then gives the retrieved edits to the model to determine whether they are relevant.
2. PokeMQA [6] extend the MeLLO, adopt a two-stage retrieval, and decouple the responsibilities of LLM.
3. TEMPLE-MQA [4] adopts a structural retrieval method, effectively enhancing the accuracy of retrieving relevant edits while addressing the challenge of temporal editing.

D.4 Evaluation Metric

Multi-hop Accuracy (Acc) is used to evaluate the performance of the model in multi-hop question-answering. If the answer generated by a model is equal to the target answer (a^*) or its alias ($Alias(a^*)$), we consider it as a correct answer. Assume that the edited model is expressed as $f^*(\cdot)$, the multi-hop accuracy is computed as follows:

$$\mathbb{1}[f^*(q) \in \{a^*\} \cup Alias(a^*)]. \quad (14)$$

What needs to be emphasized is that each instance in MQUAKE-CF-3K contains three multi-hop questions, and as long as the model can correctly answer one of them, the instance is considered correct. This can be represented by the following formula:

$$\mathbb{1}\left[\bigvee_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} [f^*(q) \in \{a^*\} \cup Alias(a^*)]\right]. \quad (15)$$

Where \mathcal{Q} represent the multi-hop questions for each instance.

Relation	Question template	Cloze-style statement template
the_First_Lady_is	Who is the First Lady of [S]?	The First Lady of [S] is
head_of_state_is	Who is the current head of state in [S]?	The current head of state in [S] is
wife_is	Who is [S]'s wife?	[S]'s wife is
live_in_the_country	Which country does [S] live in?	[S] live in the country of
live_in_the_place	Where does [S] live in?	[S] live in
located_in_the_country	Which country is [S] located in?	[S] located in the country of
studying_in_the_country	Which country is [S] studying in?	[S] study in the country of
educated_at_the_university	Which university is [S] educated at?	The university where [S] is educated is
native_language_is	What is [S]'s native language?	[S]'s country is
holds_nationality_in	What is [S]'s nationality?	[S]'s nationality is
official_language_is	What is the official language of [S]?	The official language of [S] is
father_is	Who is [S]'s father?	[S]'s father is
mother_is	Who is [S]'s mother?	[S]'s mother is
husband_is	Who is [S]'s husband?	[S]'s husband is
uncle_is	Who is [S]'s uncle?	[S]'s uncle is
parent_is	Who is [S]'s parent?	[S]'s parent is
brother_is	Who is [S]'s brother?	[S]'s brother is
aunt_is	Who is [S]'s aunt?	[S]'s aunt is
sister_is	Who is [S]'s sister?	[S]'s sister is
grandmother_is	Who is [S]'s grandmother?	[S]'s grandmother is
grandfather_is	Who is [S]'s grandfather?	[S]'s grandfather is
nephew_is	Who is [S]'s nephew?	[S]'s nephew is
sibling_is	Who is [S]'s sibling?	[S]'s sibling is
son_is	Who is [S]'s son?	[S]'s son is
niece_is	Who is [S]'s niece?	[S]'s niece is
daughter_is	Who is [S]'s daughter?	[S]'s daughter is
mother-in-law_is	Who is [S]'s mother-in-law?	[S]'s mother-in-law is
spouse_is	Who is [S]'s spouse?	[S]'s spouse is
father-in-law_is	Who is [S]'s father-in-law?	[S]'s father-in-law is
born_in_the_place	Where is [S]'s birthplace?	[S]'s birthplace is
party_membership_is	What is [S]'s party membership?	[S]'s party membership is
is_a_political_party	Which country is [S] a political party in?	[S] is a political party of
located_in_the_continent	Which continent is [S] located in?	[S] located in the continent of
located_in_the_continent	Which continent is [S] a country in?	[S] is a country of
located_in_the_country	Which country is [S] a university in?	[S] is a university of
capital_is	What is the capital of [S]?	The capital of [S] is
affiliated_with_the_religion	Which religion is [S] affiliated with?	[S] is affiliated with the religion of
occupation_is	What is [S]'s occupation?	[S]'s occupation is
died_in_the_place	Where is [S]'s place of death?	[S] died in
workplace_is_at	Where is [S]'s workplace?	[S]'s workplace is at

Table 7: Question templates and cloze-style statement templates used in RKE-EVAL

$\text{father_is}(z_0, z_1) \wedge \text{wife_is}(z_1, z_2) \rightarrow \text{mother_is}(z_0, z_2)$
$\text{parent_is}(z_0, z_1) \wedge \text{sister_is}(z_1, z_2) \rightarrow \text{aunt_is}(z_0, z_2)$
$\text{sibling_is}(z_0, z_1) \wedge \text{son_is}(z_1, z_2) \rightarrow \text{nephew_is}(z_0, z_2)$
$\text{parent_is}(z_0, z_1) \wedge \text{brother_is}(z_1, z_2) \rightarrow \text{uncle_is}(z_0, z_2)$
$\text{mother_is}(z_0, z_1) \wedge \text{husband_is}(z_1, z_2) \rightarrow \text{father_is}(z_0, z_2)$
$\text{sibling_is}(z_0, z_1) \wedge \text{daughter_is}(z_1, z_2) \rightarrow \text{niece_is}(z_0, z_2)$
$\text{parent_is}(z_0, z_1) \wedge \text{mother_is}(z_1, z_2) \rightarrow \text{grandmother_is}(z_0, z_2)$
$\text{parent_is}(z_0, z_1) \wedge \text{father_is}(z_1, z_2) \rightarrow \text{grandfather_is}(z_0, z_2)$
$\text{spouse_is}(z_0, z_1) \wedge \text{mother_is}(z_1, z_2) \rightarrow \text{mother-in-law_is}(z_0, z_2)$
$\text{spouse_is}(z_0, z_1) \wedge \text{father_is}(z_1, z_2) \rightarrow \text{father-in-law_is}(z_0, z_2)$
$\text{head_of_state_is}(z_0, z_1) \wedge \text{wife_is}(z_1, z_2) \rightarrow \text{the_First_Lady_is}(z_0, z_2)$
$\text{holds_nationality_in}(z_0, z_1) \wedge \text{official_language_is}(z_1, z_2) \rightarrow \text{native_language_is}(z_0, z_2)$
$\text{party_membership_is}(z_0, z_1) \wedge \text{is_a_political_party}(z_1, z_2) \rightarrow \text{holds_nationality_in}(z_0, z_2)$
$\text{live_in_the_place}(z_0, z_1) \wedge \text{located_in_the_country}(z_1, z_2) \rightarrow \text{live_in_the_country}(z_0, z_2)$
$\text{born_in_the_place}(z_0, z_1) \wedge \text{located_in_the_country}(z_1, z_2) \rightarrow \text{holds_nationality_in}(z_0, z_2)$
$\text{located_in_the_country}(z_0, z_1) \wedge \text{located_in_the_continent}(z_1, z_2) \rightarrow \text{located_in_the_continent}(z_0, z_2)$
$\text{educated_at_the_university}(z_0, z_1) \wedge \text{located_in_the_country}(z_1, z_2) \rightarrow \text{studying_in_the_country}(z_0, z_2)$

Table 8: Logic rules in RKE-EVAL.

E Limitations

While large language models (LLMs) have garnered widespread attention due to their exceptional knowledge comprehension capabilities, research shows they experience hallucinations and may generate incorrect knowledge. While RULE-KE is an attempt to overcome this limitation, yet employing our model may not completely eradicate this problem. This challenge stems from: (i) inherent limitations underlying LLMs modeling assumptions, (ii) in-consistency in the data used for training the large models, however, these problems could be alleviated as the data and capabilities of LLMs continue to improve in the future.

Besides, although Large Language Models (LLMs) have garnered widespread attention for their remarkable capacity for knowledge comprehension [48, 47, 4, 1, 49], enabling tailored solutions across various applications, they also face critical issues such as privacy concerns [11], and explainability [13, 23, 12]. LLM applications typically involve data containing sensitive information, necessitating effective solutions to safeguard privacy [46]. One promising approach to address this challenge is the design of Differentially Private (DP) algorithms [5]. DP offers provable protection against identification and is resilient to arbitrary auxiliary information that may be available to attackers. While there have been numerous studies on DP machine learning [14, 39, 40, 35, 15] and DP deep learning [44, 45], most of these efforts have primarily focused on either continuous tabular data or image data. Unfortunately, less attention has been given to adapting variants of DP algorithms to the context of Natural Language Processing (NLP) and the text domain. Addressing this gap is crucial as text data presents its own unique challenges and characteristics that necessitate specialized privacy-preserving techniques. By developing and refining DP algorithms tailored to NLP tasks, we can enhance the privacy protections of LLMs and enable their responsible and ethical deployment across various domains. We will leave it for future work.