

# Neuro-Symbolic Models for AI

2021.11.23

Jeonbuk National University

Seung-Hoon Na

# Reference

- The symbol grounding problem [Harnad '90]
- Knowledge-based artificial neural networks [Towell & Shavlik '94]
- Harnessing Deep Neural Networks with Logic Rules [Hu et al '16]
- TensorLog: Deep Learning Meets Probabilistic DBs [Cohen et al '16]
- Neural Programmer-Interpreters [Reed & Freitas '16]
- Neural theorem prover [Rocktäschel & Riedel '16]
- Neural Symbolic Machines [Liang et al '16]
- Harnessing Deep Neural Networks with Logic Rules [Hu et al '16]
- Towards Deep Symbolic Reinforcement Learning [Garnelo et al '16]
- Learning Explanatory Rules from Noisy Data [Evans & Grefenstette '17]
- Logic Tensor Networks for Semantic Image Interpretation [Denodello et al '17]
- The consciousness prior [Bengio '17]
- An Empirical Evaluation of Rule Extraction from Recurrent Neural Networks [Wang et al '18]
- Neural-Symbolic Computing: An Effective Methodology for Principled Integration of Machine Learning and Reasoning [Garcez et al '19]
- Scalable Neural Methods for Reasoning With a Symbolic Knowledge Base [Cohen et al '20]
- Neural Query Language: A Knowledge Base Query Language for Tensorflow [Cohen et al '19]
- Greedy NTPs [Minervini et al '19]

# Reference

- Embedding Logical Queries on Knowledge Graphs [Hamilton et al '18]
- Query2box: Reasoning over Knowledge Graphs in Vector Space using Box Embeddings [Ren et al '20]
- Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]
- LNN-EL: A Neuro-Symbolic Approach to Short-text Entity Linking [Jiang et al '21]

# Neural-Symbolic Models

- Integrating two most fundamental cognitive abilities: Learning & reasoning [Valiant ]
    - 1) Learning: The ability to learn from the environment
    - 2) Reasoning: The ability to reason from what has been learned
  - Neural-symbolic computing [Garcez et al '19]
    - Aims at reconciling the dominating symbolic and connectionist paradigms of AI under a principled foundation
    - Knowledge is represented in symbolic form
    - Learning and reasoning are computed by a neural network
- ➔ Make Interpretability & explainability of AI systems enriched



# Neural-Symbolic Models

- Neural-symbolic computing [Garcez et al '19]
  - Neural learning and inference under uncertainty
    - may address the brittleness of symbolic systems
  - Symbolism provides additional knowledge for learning
    - May ameliorate neural network's well-known catastrophic forgetting or difficulty with extrapolating
  - The integration of neural models with logic-based symbolic models provides an AI system
    - Capable of bridging lower-level information processing (for perception and pattern recognition)
    - Higher-level abstract knowledge (for reasoning and explanation)

# Neural-symbolic models

- Neural symbolic computing: Issues [Garcez et al '19]
  - Representation
    - Knowledge representation in NN
      - Propositional logic, first-order logic, tensorisation
  - Learning
    - Inductive logic programming
      - $\partial$ ILP [Evans and Grenfenstette '18]
    - Horizontal hybrid learning
      - Combining logic rules/formula with data during learning, also using the data to fine-tune knowledge
      - E.g.) Self-transfer with symbolic knowledge distillation [Hu et al '16]
    - Vertical hybrid learning
      - Low-level: neural model
      - High-level: symbolic knowledge
      - E.g.) logic tensor network [Donadello et al '17]

# Neural-symbolic models

- Neural symbolic computing: Issues [Garcez et al '19]
  - Reasoning
    - Forward /backward chaining
    - Neural theorem prover [Rocktaschel et al '16]
    - Neural logic machine [Dong et al '19]
  - Extraction
    - Explainable AI
- Neural program induction
  - Neural Programmer-Interpreters [Reed & Freitas '16]

# Query2box: Reasoning over Knowledge Graphs in Vector Space using Box Embeddings [Ren et al '20]

- Motivation
  - Answering complex logical queries on large-scale incomplete KGs: A fundamental yet challenging task
  - a promising approach: embed KG entities as well as the query into a vector space such that entities that answer the query are embedded close to the query
  - Limitation
    - Prior work models queries as single points in the vector space, which is problematic
      - Because a complex query represents a potentially large set of its answer entities,
      - but it is unclear how **such a set can be represented as a single point**
    - Prior work can only handle queries that use **conjunctions** ( $\wedge$ ) and **existential** quantifiers ( $\exists$ )
      - Handling queries with logical disjunctions ( $\vee$ ) remains an open problem.

# Query2box: Reasoning over Knowledge Graphs in Vector Space using Box Embeddings [Ren et al '20]


- QUERY2BOX
  - An embedding-based framework for reasoning over arbitrary queries with  $\wedge$ ,  $\vee$ , and  $\exists$  operators in massive and incomplete KGs
    - Capable of handling arbitrary **Existential Positive First-order (EPFO) logical queries** (i.e., queries that include any set of  $\wedge$ ,  $\vee$ , and  $\exists$ ) in a scalable manner.
  - **Embed queries as boxes (i.e., hyper-rectangles)**
    - A set of points inside the box corresponds to a set of answer entities of the query

# Query2box: Reasoning over Knowledge Graphs in Vector Space using Box Embeddings [Ren et al '20]


- Query2Box reasoning framework

(A) Query  $q$  and Its Dependency Graph


$q = V_? . \exists V : \text{Win}(\text{TuringAward}, V) \wedge \text{Citizen}(\text{Canada}, V) \wedge \text{Graduate}(V, V_?)$




(B) Computation Graph



(C) Knowledge Graph Space



(D) Vector Space



# Query2box: Reasoning over Knowledge Graphs in Vector Space using Box Embeddings [Ren et al '20]

- Query2Box

- Knowledge graphs and conjunctive queries

- $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{R})$  : a KG as a graph

- $v \in V$  represents an entity, and  $r \in R$  is a binary function

- indicating whether the relation  $r$  holds between a pair of entities or not

$$v \xrightarrow{r} v' \text{ iff } r(v, v') = \text{True}$$

- **Conjunctive queries:** a subclass of the first-order logical queries that use existential ( $\exists$ ) and conjunction ( $\wedge$ ) operations

$$q[V?] = V? . \exists V_1, \dots, V_k : e_1 \wedge e_2 \wedge \dots \wedge e_n,$$

where  $e_i = r(v_a, V)$ ,  $V \in \{V?, V_1, \dots, V_k\}$ ,  $v_a \in \mathcal{V}$ ,  $r \in \mathcal{R}$ ,

or  $e_i = r(V, V')$ ,  $V, V' \in \{V?, V_1, \dots, V_k\}$ ,  $V \neq V'$ ,  $r \in \mathcal{R}$ ,

- $v_a$ : non-variable anchor entity
        - $V_1, \dots, V_k$ : existentially quantified bound variables,
        - $V?$ : the target variable

# Query2box: Reasoning over Knowledge Graphs in Vector Space using Box Embeddings [Ren et al '20]

- Query2Box

- Knowledge graphs and conjunctive queries

$$q[V?] = V? . \exists V_1, \dots, V_k : e_1 \wedge e_2 \wedge \dots \wedge e_n,$$

where  $e_i = r(v_a, V)$ ,  $V \in \{V?, V_1, \dots, V_k\}$ ,  $v_a \in \mathcal{V}$ ,  $r \in \mathcal{R}$ ,

or  $e_i = r(V, V')$ ,  $V, V' \in \{V?, V_1, \dots, V_k\}$ ,  $V \neq V'$ ,  $r \in \mathcal{R}$ ,

- The goal of answering the logical query  $q$ 
  - To find a set of entities  $\llbracket q \rrbracket \subseteq \mathcal{V}$  such that  $v \in \llbracket q \rrbracket$  iff  $q[v] = \text{True}$
  - $\llbracket q \rrbracket$  : the denotation set (i.e., answer set) of query  $q$



# Query2box: Reasoning over Knowledge Graphs in Vector Space using Box Embeddings [Ren et al '20]

- Query2Box
  - Dependency graph for query
    - A graphical representation of conjunctive query  $q$ 
      - Nodes correspond to variable or non-variable entities in  $q$  and edges correspond to relations in  $q$
      - In order for the query to be **valid**, the corresponding dependency graph needs to be a **Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG)**
        - » with the anchor entities as the source nodes of the DAG and the query target  $V$ ? as the **unique sink node** (Hamilton et al., 2018).

# Query2box: Reasoning over Knowledge Graphs in Vector Space using Box Embeddings [Ren et al '20]

- Query2Box
  - Computation graph from dependency graph
    - Consists of two types of directed edges that represent operators over sets of entities
- **Projection:** Given a set of entities  $S \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ , and relation  $r \in \mathcal{R}$ , this operator obtains  $\cup_{v \in S} A_r(v)$ , where  $A_r(v) \equiv \{v' \in \mathcal{V} : r(v, v') = \text{True}\}$ .
- **Intersection:** Given a set of entity sets  $\{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_n\}$ , this operator obtains  $\cap_{i=1}^n S_i$ .
  - For a given query  $q$ , the computation graph specifies the procedure of reasoning to obtain a set of answer entities, i.e., starting from a set of anchor nodes, the above two operators are applied iteratively until the unique sink target node is reached.

# Query2box: Reasoning over Knowledge Graphs in Vector Space using Box Embeddings [Ren et al '20]

- Query2Box
  - Reasoning over sets of entities using box embeddings
    - **Box embeddings**
      - To efficiently model a set of entities in the vector space, we use boxes (i.e., axis-aligned hyper-rectangles).
        - » The benefit is that unlike a single point, the box has the interior; thus, if an entity is in a set, it is natural to model the entity embedding to be a point inside the box
    - Operate on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , define a box in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ 
$$\mathbf{p} = (\text{Cen}(\mathbf{p}), \text{Off}(\mathbf{p})) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$$

$$\text{Box}_{\mathbf{p}} \equiv \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \text{Cen}(\mathbf{p}) - \text{Off}(\mathbf{p}) \preceq \mathbf{v} \preceq \text{Cen}(\mathbf{p}) + \text{Off}(\mathbf{p})\}$$

element-wise inequality

# Query2box: Reasoning over Knowledge Graphs in Vector Space using Box Embeddings [Ren et al '20]

- Reasoning over sets of entities using box embeddings
  - Initial boxes for source nodes
    - Each source node represents an **anchor entity**  $v \in V$ , which we can regard as **a set that only contains the single entity**.
    - Set the initial box embedding as  $(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{0})$
  - Geometric projection operator
    - Associate each relation  $r \in R$  with relation embedding  $(\mathbf{Cen}(\mathbf{r}), \mathbf{Off}(\mathbf{r})) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$  with  $\mathbf{Off}(\mathbf{r}) \succeq \mathbf{0}$
    - Given an input box embedding  $\mathbf{p}$ , model the projection by  $\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{r}$
    - Gives us a new box with the **translated center** and **larger offset**

# Query2box: Reasoning over Knowledge Graphs in Vector Space using Box Embeddings [Ren et al '20]

– Reasoning over sets of entities using box embeddings

- Geometric intersection operator

- $\{\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_n\}$  : Given a set of box embeddings
- Model the intersection by

$$\mathbf{p}_{\text{inter}} = (\text{Cen}(\mathbf{p}_{\text{inter}}), \text{Off}(\mathbf{p}_{\text{inter}}))$$

$$\text{Cen}(\mathbf{p}_{\text{inter}}) = \sum_i \mathbf{a}_i \odot \text{Cen}(\mathbf{p}_i), \quad \mathbf{a}_i = \frac{\exp(\text{MLP}(\mathbf{p}_i))}{\sum_j \exp(\text{MLP}(\mathbf{p}_j))},$$

$$\text{Off}(\mathbf{p}_{\text{inter}}) = \text{Min}(\{\text{Off}(\mathbf{p}_1), \dots, \text{Off}(\mathbf{p}_n)\}) \odot \sigma(\text{DeepSets}(\{\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_n\}))$$

the permutation-invariant deep architecture


$$\text{DeepSets}(\{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N\}) = \text{MLP}((1/N) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^N \text{MLP}(\mathbf{x}_i))$$

- Generate a **smaller** box that **lies inside a set of boxes**

# Query2box: Reasoning over Knowledge Graphs in Vector Space using Box Embeddings [Ren et al '20]


- Reasoning over sets of entities using box embeddings

**(A) Projection**



Projection generates a larger box with a translated center

**(B) Intersection**



Intersection generates a smaller box lying inside the given set of boxes

# Query2box: Reasoning over Knowledge Graphs in Vector Space using Box Embeddings [Ren et al '20]

– Reasoning over sets of entities using box embeddings

- **Entity-to-box distance**

- $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$  : A given query box
- $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  : a entity vector
- Define their distance:

$$\text{dist}_{\text{box}}(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{q}) = \text{dist}_{\text{outside}}(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{q}) + \alpha \cdot \text{dist}_{\text{inside}}(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{q})$$


$$\mathbf{q}_{\text{max}} = \text{Cen}(\mathbf{q}) + \text{Off}(\mathbf{q}) \in \mathbb{R}^d, \mathbf{q}_{\text{min}} = \text{Cen}(\mathbf{q}) - \text{Off}(\mathbf{q}) \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

$$\text{dist}_{\text{outside}}(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{q}) = \|\text{Max}(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{q}_{\text{max}}, \mathbf{0}) + \text{Max}(\mathbf{q}_{\text{min}} - \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{0})\|_1,$$

$$\text{dist}_{\text{inside}}(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{q}) = \|\text{Cen}(\mathbf{q}) - \text{Min}(\mathbf{q}_{\text{max}}, \text{Max}(\mathbf{q}_{\text{min}}, \mathbf{v}))\|_1.$$

# Query2box: Reasoning over Knowledge Graphs in Vector Space using Box Embeddings [Ren et al '20]

## (C) Distance



- $\text{dist}_{\text{outside}}$ : corresponds to the distance between the entity and closest corner/side of the box.
- $\text{dist}_{\text{inside}}$ : corresponds to the distance between the center of the box and its side/corner

Distance  $\text{dist}_{\text{box}}$  is the weighted sum of  $\text{dist}_{\text{outside}}$  and  $\text{dist}_{\text{inside}}$ , where the latter is weighted less.

The key here is to *downweight* the distance inside the box by using  $0 < \alpha < 1$ . This means that as long as entity vectors are inside the box, we regard them as “close enough” to the query center (*i.e.*,  $\text{dist}_{\text{outside}}$  is 0, and  $\text{dist}_{\text{inside}}$  is scaled by  $\alpha$ ). When  $\alpha = 1$ ,  $\text{dist}_{\text{box}}$  reduces to the ordinary  $L_1$  distance, *i.e.*,  $\|\text{Cen}(q) - v\|_1$ , which is used by the conventional TransE (Bordes et al., 2013) as well as prior query embedding methods (Guu et al., 2015; Hamilton et al., 2018).



# Query2box: Reasoning over Knowledge Graphs in Vector Space using Box Embeddings [Ren et al '20]

## – Training objective

- Learn entity embeddings as well as geometric projection and intersection operators.
  - $v \in \llbracket q \rrbracket$  : a positive entity
  - $v'_i \notin \llbracket q \rrbracket$  : the i-th negative entity (non-answer to the query q)

$$L = -\log \sigma(\gamma - \text{dist}_{\text{box}}(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{q})) - \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{k} \log \sigma(\text{dist}_{\text{box}}(\mathbf{v}'_i; \mathbf{q}) - \gamma)$$

# Query2box: Reasoning over Knowledge Graphs in Vector Space using Box Embeddings [Ren et al '20]

- Tractable handling of disjunction using disjunctive normal form
  - The goal here is to tractably handle in the vector space a wider class of logical queries, called Existential Positive First-order (EPFO) queries: involve  $\{\vee, \exists, \wedge\}$
  - We now have an additional type of directed edge, called **union** defined as follows:

**Union:** Given a set of entity sets  $\{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_n\}$ , this operator obtains  $\cup_{i=1}^n S_i$ .

- A straightforward approach: to define another geometric operator for union and embed the query as we did in the previous sections
  - An immediate challenge for our box embeddings is that **boxes can be located anywhere in the vector space**
    - Their union would no longer be a simple box.
    - In other words, **union operation over boxes is not closed**

# Query2box: Reasoning over Knowledge Graphs in Vector Space using Box Embeddings [Ren et al '20]

- Tractable handling of disjunction using disjunctive normal form
  - A straightforward approach:
    - We prove a general negative result
      - Holds for **any** embedding-based method that embeds query  $q$  into  $\mathbf{q}$  and uses **some distance function** to retrieve entities
      - $\text{dist}(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{q}) \leq \beta$  iff  $v \in \llbracket q \rrbracket$
      - $\text{dist}(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{q})$  : the distance between entity and query embeddings
        - »  $\text{dist}_{\text{box}}(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{q})$  or  $\|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{q}\|_1$

**Theorem 1.** Consider any  $M$  conjunctive queries  $q_1, \dots, q_M$  whose denotation sets  $\llbracket q_1 \rrbracket, \dots, \llbracket q_M \rrbracket$  are disjoint with each other,  $\forall i \neq j, \llbracket q_i \rrbracket \cap \llbracket q_j \rrbracket = \emptyset$ . Let  $D$  be the VC dimension of the function class  $\{\text{sign}(\beta - \text{dist}(\cdot; \mathbf{q})) : \mathbf{q} \in \Xi\}$ , where  $\Xi$  represents the query embedding space and  $\text{sign}(\cdot)$  is the sign function. Then, we need  $D \geq M$  to model any EPFO query, i.e.,  $\text{dist}(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{q}) \leq \beta \Leftrightarrow v \in \llbracket q \rrbracket$  is satisfied for every EPFO query  $q$ .

# Query2box: Reasoning over Knowledge Graphs in Vector Space using Box Embeddings [Ren et al '20]

- Tractable handling of disjunction using disjunctive normal form
  - A straightforward approach:
    - The proof
      - The key is that with the introduction of the union operation any subset of denotation sets can be the answer, which forces us to model the powerset  $\{\cup_{q_i \in S} \llbracket q_i \rrbracket : S \subseteq \{q_1, \dots, q_M\}\}$  in a vector space
      - For a real-world KG, there are  $M \approx |V|$  conjunctive queries with non-overlapping answers
    - Theorem 1 shows that in order to accurately model any EPFO query with the existing framework, the complexity of the distance function measured by the VC dimension needs to be as large as the number of KG entities
    - Their parameter dimensionality needs to be  $\Theta(M)$ , which is  $\Theta(|V|)$  for real KGs

# Query2box: Reasoning over Knowledge Graphs in Vector Space using Box Embeddings [Ren et al '20]

- Tractable handling of disjunction using disjunctive normal form
  - To rectify this issue, our key idea is to transform a given EPFO query into a Disjunctive Normal Form (DNF)
  - Transformation to DNF:
    - For each  $v \in V_{union}$ , define  $P_v \subset V_q$  as a set of its parent nodes
    - First generate  $N = \prod_{v \in V_{union}} |P_v|$  different computation graphs  $G_{q(1)}, \dots, G_{q(N)}$  each with different choices of  $v_{parent}$  in the first step
- 1. For every  $v \in V_{union}$ , select one parent node  $v_{parent} \in P_v$
- 2. Remove all the edges of type 'union.'
- 3. Merge  $v$  and  $v_{parent}$ , while retaining all other edge connections.

# Query2box: Reasoning over Knowledge Graphs in Vector Space using Box Embeddings [Ren et al '20]


- Tractable handling of disjunction using disjunctive normal form
  - Then combine the obtained computation graphs  $G_{q(1)}, \dots, G_{q(N)}$  as follows to give the final equivalent computation graph.
    1. Convert the target sink nodes of all the obtained computation graphs into the existentially quantified bound variables nodes.
    2. Create a new target sink node  $V_?$ , and draw directed edges of type “union” from all the above variable nodes to the new target node.

# Query2box: Reasoning over Knowledge Graphs in Vector Space using Box Embeddings [Ren et al '20]


- Tractable handling of disjunction using disjunctive normal form

Illustration of converting a computation graph of an EPFO query into an equivalent computation graph of the Disjunctive Normal Form.

(A) Original Computation Graph



(B) Converted Computation Graph



# Query2box: Reasoning over Knowledge Graphs in Vector Space using Box Embeddings [Ren et al '20]

- Tractable handling of disjunction using disjunctive normal form
  - Aggregation
    - The distance function between the given EPFO query  $q$  and an entity  $v \in V$ :

- $q$ : logically equivalent to  $q^{(1)} \vee \dots \vee q^{(N)}$

$$\text{dist}_{\text{agg}}(\mathbf{v}; q) = \text{Min}(\{\text{dist}_{\text{box}}(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{q}^{(1)}), \dots, \text{dist}_{\text{box}}(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{q}^{(N)})\})$$

- $\text{dist}_{\text{agg}}$  is parameterized by the EPFO query  $q$
- When  $q$  is a conjunctive query, i.e.,  $N = 1$ ,

$$\text{dist}_{\text{agg}}(\mathbf{v}; q) = \text{dist}_{\text{box}}(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{q})$$




# Query2box: Reasoning over Knowledge Graphs in Vector Space using Box Embeddings [Ren et al '20]

- Experiments


- Setting: Knowledge graph & query generation

Query structures considered in the experiments, where anchor entities and relations are to be specified to instantiate logical queries. Naming for each query structure is provided under each subfigure, where 'p', 'i', and 'u' stand for 'projection', 'intersection', and 'union', respectively. Models are trained on the first 5 query structures, and evaluated on all 9 query structures. For example, "3p" is a path query of length three, and "2i" is an intersection of cardinality two.


Training Conjunctive Queries



Unseen Conjunctive Queries



Union Queries



Dataset	1p	2p	3p	2i	3i	ip	pi	2u	up
FB15k	10.8	255.6	250.0	90.3	64.1	593.8	190.1	27.8	227.0
FB15k-237	13.3	131.4	215.3	69.0	48.9	593.8	257.7	35.6	127.7
NELL995	8.5	56.6	65.3	30.3	15.9	310.0	144.9	14.4	62.5

# Query2box: Reasoning over Knowledge Graphs in Vector Space using Box Embeddings [Ren et al '20]

- Experiments

- H@3 results of QUERY2BOX vs. GQE on FB15k, FB15k-237 and NELL995

Method	Avg	1p	2p	3p	2i	3i	ip	pi	2u	up
FB15k										
Q2B	<b>0.484</b>	<b>0.786</b>	<b>0.413</b>	<b>0.303</b>	<b>0.593</b>	<b>0.712</b>	<b>0.211</b>	<b>0.397</b>	<b>0.608</b>	<b>0.33</b>
GQE	0.386	0.636	0.345	0.248	0.515	0.624	0.151	0.310	0.376	0.273
GQE-DOUBLE	0.384	0.630	0.346	0.250	0.515	0.611	0.153	0.320	0.362	0.271
FB15k-237										
Q2B	<b>0.268</b>	<b>0.467</b>	<b>0.24</b>	<b>0.186</b>	<b>0.324</b>	<b>0.453</b>	<b>0.108</b>	<b>0.205</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.193</b>
GQE	0.228	0.402	0.213	0.155	0.292	0.406	0.083	0.17	0.169	0.163
GQE-DOUBLE	0.23	0.405	0.213	0.153	0.298	0.411	0.085	0.182	0.167	0.16
NELL995										
Q2B	<b>0.306</b>	<b>0.555</b>	<b>0.266</b>	<b>0.233</b>	<b>0.343</b>	<b>0.48</b>	<b>0.132</b>	<b>0.212</b>	<b>0.369</b>	<b>0.163</b>
GQE	0.247	0.418	0.228	0.205	0.316	0.447	0.081	0.186	0.199	0.139
GQE-DOUBLE	0.248	0.417	0.231	0.203	0.318	0.454	0.081	0.188	0.2	0.139

# Query2box: Reasoning over Knowledge Graphs in Vector Space using Box Embeddings [Ren et al '20]

- Experiments

- H@3 results of QUERY2BOX vs. several variants on FB15k, FB15k-237 and NELL995

Method	Avg	1p	2p	3p	2i	3i	ip	pi	2u	up
FB15k										
Q2B	<b>0.484</b>	0.786	<b>0.413</b>	<b>0.303</b>	<b>0.593</b>	<b>0.712</b>	<b>0.211</b>	<b>0.397</b>	0.608	<b>0.330</b>
Q2B-AVG	0.468	0.779	0.407	0.300	0.577	0.673	0.199	0.345	0.607	0.326
Q2B-DEEPSETS	0.467	0.755	0.407	0.294	0.588	0.699	0.197	0.378	0.562	0.324
Q2B-AVG-1P	0.385	<b>0.812</b>	0.262	0.173	0.463	0.529	0.126	0.263	<b>0.653</b>	0.187
Q2B-SHAREDOFFSET	0.372	0.684	0.335	0.232	0.442	0.559	0.144	0.282	0.417	0.252
FB15k-237										
Q2B	<b>0.268</b>	<b>0.467</b>	0.24	<b>0.186</b>	<b>0.324</b>	<b>0.453</b>	<b>0.108</b>	<b>0.205</b>	0.239	<b>0.193</b>
Q2B-AVG	0.249	0.462	0.242	0.182	0.278	0.391	0.101	0.158	0.236	0.189
Q2B-DEEPSETS	0.259	0.458	<b>0.243</b>	<b>0.186</b>	0.303	0.432	0.104	0.187	0.231	0.190
Q2B-AVG-1P	0.219	0.457	0.193	0.132	0.251	0.319	0.083	0.142	<b>0.241</b>	0.152
Q2B-SHAREDOFFSET	0.207	0.391	0.199	0.139	0.251	0.354	0.082	0.154	0.15	0.142
NELL995										
Q2B	<b>0.306</b>	0.555	<b>0.266</b>	<b>0.233</b>	<b>0.343</b>	<b>0.480</b>	<b>0.132</b>	<b>0.212</b>	0.369	<b>0.163</b>
Q2B-AVG	0.283	0.543	0.250	0.228	0.300	0.403	0.116	0.188	0.36	0.161
Q2B-DEEPSETS	0.293	0.539	0.26	0.231	0.317	0.467	0.11	0.202	0.349	0.16
Q2B-AVG-1P	0.274	<b>0.607</b>	0.229	0.182	0.277	0.315	0.097	0.18	<b>0.443</b>	0.133
Q2B-SHAREDOFFSET	0.237	0.436	0.219	0.201	0.278	0.379	0.096	0.174	0.217	0.137



# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- Logical Neural Networks (LNNs)
  - A neuro-symbolic framework designed to simultaneously provide key properties of both neural nets (NNs) (learning) and symbolic logic (knowledge and reasoning)
    - Toward direct interpretability, utilization of rich domain knowledge realistically, and the general problem-solving ability of a full theorem prover
  - Create a 1-to-1 correspondence between neurons and the elements of logical formulae, using the observation that the weights of neurons can be constrained to act as, e.g. AND or OR gates
  - No conversions are needed because logical statements are identical.
    - Inputs include a propositional or first-order logic (FOL) knowledge base (KB), including the usual training data (feature-value pairs) as a special case, and which variables should be predicted from which.
    - C.f.) Previous approaches on the view of neurons as logical gates: [Converting](#) logical statements into NN forms

# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- **Per-neuron interoperability, via full logical expressivity**
  - Many approaches are based on Markov random fields (MRFs), such as Markov logic networks [15], probabilistic soft logic [1], and those based on ILP/SLPs e.g. [3]
    - Each logical clause has a weight; the clauses are atomic i.e. their internal logical structure is not represented.
    - Obtaining probabilities from them requires an unwieldy satisfiability problem to be solved, e.g. via MCMC in [15]
  - LNN
    - LNN inference is deterministic/repeatable and provably convergent in finite steps.
    - Every neuron represents an element in a clause, and is either a concept (e.g. "cat") or a logical connective (e.g. AND, OR), with weights on the connecting edges.

# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- Per-neuron interoperability, via full logical expressivity
  - LNN
    - Each neuron represents
      - 1) a **meaning**, raising the level of **interpretability** versus previous approaches
      - 2) a way to **identify the importance of relationships between variables**
      - 3) **more parameters**, defining a **richer model space** for potentially more accurate prediction.
    - The network structure is thus **compositional** and **modular**, e.g. able to represent that one clause may be a sub-clause of another
    - The representation is **disentangled**, versus approaches such as [Serafini & Garcez '16; Rocktaschel and Riedel '17] that use a vector representation, sacrificing interpretability of the network.
    - Allow **full function-free first-order logic** with real values  $0 \leq x \leq 1$ , and classical 0/1 logic as a special case.
      - Where many approaches only allow the representational power of propositional logic or Horn clauses

# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- Tolerance to incomplete knowledge, via truth bounds
  - The line of approach embodied by MRFs make a closed-world assumption
    - if a statement doesn't appear in the KB, it is false
  - LNN
    - Does not require complete specification of all variables' exact degree of truth, more generally maintaining upper and lower bounds for each variable
    - Allows the open-world assumption that complete knowledge of the world is not realistic in general.
    - Bounds also contain more interpretable information than single values, and we show that they can represent probabilistic semantics.



# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- **Many-task generality, via omnidirectional inference**
  - LNN
    - LNN neurons express **bidirectional relationships** with each neighbor, allowing **inference in any direction**
    - Allows task generality versus typical single-task NNs, and allows **full-fledged theorem proving**
  - C.f.) MRF approaches
    - Hide the internal logical structure of clauses cannot draw the same conclusions that a theorem prover can.
  - C.f.) Many/most neuro-symbolic approaches, e.g. those based on embeddings
    - Arguably only “logic-like” and typically do not demonstrate reliably precise deduction

# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- LNN: Overview
  - LNN: a form of recurrent neural network with a 1-to-1 correspondence to a set of logical formulae in any of various systems of **weighted, real-valued logic**, in which evaluation performs logical inference.
  - Key innovations
    - 1) Neural activation functions **constrained** to implement the truth functions of the logical operations they represent, i.e.  $\wedge$ ,  $\vee$ ,  $\neg$ ,  $\rightarrow$ , and, in FOL,  $\forall$  and  $\exists$ ,
    - 2) Results expressed in terms of **bounds** on truth values so as to distinguish known, approximately known, unknown, and contradictory states
    - 3) **Bidirectional inference** permitting, e.g.,  $x \rightarrow y$  to be evaluated as usual in addition to being able to prove  $y$  given  $x$  or, just as well,  $\neg x$  given  $\neg y$

# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- LNN: Overview
  - The nature of the modeled system of logic depends on the family of activation functions chosen for the network's neurons, which implement the logic's various atoms and operations.
  - In particular, it is possible to constrain the network to behave exactly classically when provided classical input
  - Computation is characterized by tightening bounds on truth values at neurons pertaining to subformulae in upward and downward passes over the represented formulae's syntax trees.
  - Bounds tightening is monotonic; accordingly, computation cannot oscillate and necessarily converges for propositional logic.
  - Because of the network's modular construction, it is possible to partition and/or compose networks, inject formulae serving as logical constraints or queries, and control which parts of the network (or individual neurons) are trained or evaluated.


# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- LNN: Overview
  - Inputs are initial truth value bounds for each of the neurons in the network
    - in particular, neurons pertaining to predicate atoms may be populated with truth values taken from KB data
  - Additional inputs may take the form of injected formulae representing a query or specific inference problem
  - Outputs are typically the final computed truth value bounds at one or more neurons pertaining to specific atoms or formulae of interest.
  - In other problem contexts, the outputs of interest may instead be the neural parameters themselves — serving as a form of inductive logic programming (ILP) — after learning with a given loss function and input training data set

# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- LNN: Model Structure
  - Described in terms of FOL, but it is useful to discuss LNNs restricted to the scope of propositional logic

The LNN graph structure reflects the formulae it represents



There exists one neuron for each logical operation occurring in each formula and, in addition, one neuron for each unique proposition occurring in any formula.

# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- LNN: Model Structure
  - All neurons return pairs of values in the range  $[0, 1]$  representing lower and upper bounds on the truth values of their corresponding subformulae and propositions
  - To aid interpretability of bounds, we define a threshold of truth  $1/2 < \alpha \leq 1$ 
    - A continuous truth value is considered True if it is greater than  $\alpha$  and False if it is less than  $1 - \alpha$ .
  - Bound values identify one of four primary states that a neuron can be in
    - Secondary states offer a more-true-than-not or more-false-than-not interpretation

Bounds	Unknown	True	False	Contradiction
Upper	$[\alpha, 1]$	$[\alpha, 1]$	$[0, 1 - \alpha]$	Lower > Upper
Lower	$[0, 1 - \alpha]$	$[\alpha, 1]$	$[0, 1 - \alpha]$	

# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- LNN: Model Structure
  - Neurons corresponding to logical connectives
    - Accept as input the output of neurons corresponding to their operands and have activation functions configured to match the connectives' truth functions.
  - Neurons corresponding to propositions
    - Accept as input the output of neurons established as proofs of bounds on the propositions' truth values and have activation functions configured to aggregate the tightest such bounds
      - Proofs for propositions may be established explicitly, e.g. as the heads of Horn clauses
  - Negation: modeled as a pass-through node with no parameters, canonically performing  $\neg x = 1 - x$

# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- LNN: Model Structure

- Activation functions for connectives

- Many candidate neural activation functions can accommodate the classical truth functions of logical connectives, each varying in how it handles inputs strictly between 0 and 1
  - E.g.)  $\min\{x, y\}, x \cdot y, \max\{0, x + y - 1\}$ 
    - » Suitable activation functions for real-valued conjunction  $x \otimes y$
- The choice of activation function corresponds to the implemented real-valued logic: Gödel, product, and Łukasiewicz logic are common examples.

- In addition, LNN requires **monotonicity**

- The activation functions for conjunction and disjunction:
  - Must increase monotonically wrt each operand
- The activation function for implication:
  - Must decrease monotonically wrt the antecedent and increase monotonically wrt the consequent.

- The real-valued conjunction  $\otimes$  and real-valued disjunction  $x \oplus y$  are related via the **De Morgan laws**

- Both operations are **commutative** and **associative**

- Real-valued implication  $x \rightarrow y$  is the the residuum of  $\otimes$

$$(x \rightarrow y) = \max\{z \mid y \geq (x \otimes z)\}$$

- These properties do not guarantee that  $((x \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow 0) = x$

$$(x \rightarrow y) = (\neg x \oplus y) \quad (x \otimes x) = (x \oplus x) = x$$

though they may individually hold for certain activation functions.



# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- LNN: Model Structure
  - Activation functions for connectives
    - Gradient-based neural learning also **requires differentiable parameters** that can be tuned to improve model performance
    - Introduce the concept of **importance weighting**: Neural inputs with larger weight have more influence on neural output
  - Important weighting can take many forms, as thoroughly explored in [Fagin & Wimmers '00]
    - Here, the current work focuses on an easily computable weighting scheme based on nonlinear functions applied to dot products.

# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- LNN: Model Structure
  - Weighted nonlinear logic: A weighted generalization of Łukasiewicz-like logic
    - Weighted generalizations of the standard real-valued logics
    - Completes the mapping of NNs to weighted real-valued logics
  - The n-ary weighted nonlinear conjunctions for logical AND

$$\beta(\bigotimes_{i \in I} x_i^{\otimes w_i}) = f(\beta - \sum_{i \in I} w_i(1 - x_i))$$

$$f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1] \text{ with } f(1 - x) = 1 - f(x)$$

$$\text{weights } w_i \geq 0 \quad \text{inputs } x_i \in [0, 1]$$


- The n-ary weighted nonlinear disjunctions for logical OR

$$\beta(\bigoplus_{i \in I} x_i^{\oplus w_i}) = f(1 - \beta + \sum_{i \in I} w_i x_i)$$


$\beta$  and the various  $w_i$  establish a hyperplane with respect to the inputs  $x_i$ , though clamped to the  $[0, 1]$  range.

# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- LNN: Model Structure
  - Weighted nonlinear logic: A weighted generalization of Łukasiewicz-like logic
    - For  $f(x) = \max\{0, \min\{1, x\}\}$  The resulting activation functions are similar to the rectified linear unit (ReLU) from neural network literature and to the Łukasiewicz t- and s-norms
  - Alternate choices of  $f$ : include the logistic function & a linearly interpolated tailored activation function



(b) A logistic activation function



(c) A linearly interpolated activation function

# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- LNN: Model Structure
  - Weighted nonlinear logic
    - Bias term  $\beta$  permits
      - classically equivalent formulae  $x \rightarrow y$ ,  $\neg y \rightarrow \neg x$ , and  $\neg x \oplus y$
      - to be made equivalent in weighted nonlinear logic by adjusting  $\beta$
  - The weighted nonlinear residuum for logical implication

$$\beta(x^{\otimes w_x} \rightarrow y^{\oplus w_y}) = f(1 - \beta + w_x(1 - x) + w_y y)$$

- The use of  $\otimes$  in the antecedent weight but  $\oplus$  in the consequent weight:
  - » Indicate the antecedent has AND-like weighting (scaling its distance from 1) while the consequent has OR-like weighting (scaling its distance from 0)
- This residuum
  - most disjunction-like when  $\beta = 1$ ,
  - most  $(x \rightarrow y)$ -like when  $\beta = w_y$ ,
  - most  $(\neg y \rightarrow \neg x)$ -like when  $\beta = w_x$ .

# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- LNN: Model Structure
  - Activation functions for atoms
    - Neurons pertaining to atoms
      - Require activation functions that aggregate truth values found for the various computations identified as proofs of the atom
      - E.g.) Each of  $(x_1 \otimes x_2 \otimes x_3) \rightarrow y$ ,  $(x_1 \otimes x_4) \rightarrow y$   
 $(x_2 \otimes x_4) \rightarrow \neg y$ 
        - » may constitute proofs (or disproofs) of  $y$
    - A typical means of aggregating proven truth values:
      - To return the maximum proven lower bound and minimum proven upper bound
    - Alternative mean: to employ importance weighting via weighted nonlinear logic in aggregation
      - Substituting OR for max in the lower bound computation and AND for min in the upper bound

# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- LNN: Model Structure
  - Activation functions for atoms
    - A natural choice of weights for such aggregations: **the weights of the atoms as they occur in the formulae serving as their proofs**
      - E.g.) If  $x_1^{\otimes 3} \rightarrow y^{\oplus 2}$  and  $x_2^{\otimes 1} \rightarrow y^{\oplus .5}$  are proofs of  $y$ ,
        - » Then aggregation would use weights 2 and .5, respectively

# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- LNN: Inference
  - Inference
    - Refers to the entire process of computing truth value bounds for (sub)formulae and atoms based on initial knowledge
      - ultimately resulting in predictions made at neurons pertaining to queried formulae or other results of interest
  - LNN
    - Achieves this with **multiple passes over the represented formulae**, propagating tightened truth value bounds from neuron to neuron until computation necessarily converges
    - The **upward pass of the inference**
      - Formulae compute their truth value bounds based on bounds available for their subformulae
    - The **downward pass**
      - Permits prior belief in the truth or falsity of formulae to inform truth value bound for propositions or predicates used in said formulae

# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- LNN: Inference

- Bidirectional inference

- LNN infers truth values bounds for each of a connective's inputs based on bounds on its output and other inputs
    - Depending on the type of connective involved, such computations correspond to the familiar inference rules of classical logic:

$$x, x \rightarrow y \vdash y \quad (\textit{modus ponens})$$

$$\neg y, x \rightarrow y \vdash \neg x \quad (\textit{modus tollens})$$

$$x, \neg(x \wedge y) \vdash \neg y \quad (\textit{conjunctive syllogism})$$

$$\neg x, x \vee y \vdash y \quad (\textit{disjunctive syllogism})$$

- The precise nature of these computations depends on the selected family of activation functions
      - E.g.) if implication is defined as the **residuum**, then modus ponens is performed via the logic's t-norm, i.e. AND
    - The application of these inference rules immediately suggests a means of generating proofs for atoms based on the formulae they occur in
      - Given truth value bounds for a formula, it is possible to apply inference rules to obtain truth value bounds for each of its leaves.



# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- LNN: Inference

- Inference rules in weighted nonlinear logic

- $L$  and  $U$  denote lower and upper bounds found for neurons corresponding to the formulae indicated in their subscripts

- E.g.)  $L_{x \rightarrow y}$ : the lower-bound truth value for  $x \rightarrow y$

- The bounds computations for  $\neg$  are trivial:

$$L_{\neg x} \geq \neg U_x = 1 - U_x,$$

$$U_{\neg x} \leq \neg L_x = 1 - L_x,$$

$$L_x \geq \neg U_{\neg x} = 1 - U_{\neg x},$$

$$U_x \leq \neg L_{\neg x} = 1 - L_{\neg x}.$$

- In weighted nonlinear logic,

$$\beta(x^{\otimes w_x} \rightarrow y^{\oplus w_y}) = \beta((1 - x)^{\oplus w_x} \oplus y^{\oplus w_y})$$

$$\beta(\bigotimes_{i \in I} x_i^{\otimes w_i}) = 1 - \beta(\bigoplus_{i \in I} (1 - x_i)^{\oplus w_i})$$

- it is only necessary to define one set of inference rule computations to cover all connectives

# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- LNN: Inference

- Inference rules in weighted nonlinear logic

- The upward bounds computations for  $\beta(\bigoplus_{i \in I} x_i^{\oplus w_i})$

$$L_{\bigoplus_i x_i} \geq \beta(\bigoplus_{i \in I} L_{x_i}^{\oplus w_i}), \quad U_{\bigoplus_i x_i} \leq \beta(\bigoplus_{i \in I} U_{x_i}^{\oplus w_i})$$

- The downward bounds computations for disjunction are

$$\begin{aligned} L_{x_i} &\geq \beta/w_i ((\bigotimes_{j \neq i} (1 - U_{x_j})^{\otimes w_j/w_i}) \otimes L_{\bigoplus_i x_i}^{\otimes 1/w_i}) && \text{if } L_{\bigoplus_i x_i} > 1 - \alpha, && \text{else } 0 \\ U_{x_i} &\leq \beta/w_i ((\bigotimes_{j \neq i} (1 - L_{x_j})^{\otimes w_j/w_i}) \otimes U_{\bigoplus_i x_i}^{\otimes 1/w_i}) && \text{if } U_{\bigoplus_i x_i} < \alpha, && \text{else } 1 \end{aligned}$$

- $\alpha$  is threshold determined by  $f$  to address potential divergent behavior at

$$L_{\bigoplus_i x_i} \leq 1 - \alpha \quad U_{\bigoplus_i x_i} \geq \alpha$$

To understand why this occurs, observe that, for  $f(x) = \max\{0, \min\{1, x\}\}$ , i.e. the ReLU case,  $x \oplus y$  can return 1 for many different values of  $x$  and  $y$ ; specifically, whenever  $w_x x + w_y y \geq \beta$ . Accordingly, if  $U_{\bigoplus_i x_i} = 1$ , we cannot infer an upper bound for any  $x_i$ .

# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- LNN: Inference

- The Upward–Downward algorithm

- Inference propagates truth value bounds from neuron to neuron along in alternating upwards and downwards passes over the syntax trees of the represented formulae
- The upward pass: uses truth value bounds available at atoms to compute bounds at each subformula according to the normal evaluation of connectives based on their operands

---

**Algorithm 1:** Upward pass to infer formula truth value bounds from subformulae bounds

---

```
function upwardPass(formula  $z$ ):  
    for operand  $x_i$  of  $z$ ,  $i \in I$  do                                # propagate bounds upward from leaves  
        | upwardPass( $x_i$ )  
    if  $z = \neg x$  then                                              # negation  
        | aggregate( $z$ ,  $(1 - U_x, 1 - L_x)$ )  
    else if  $z = {}^\beta(\bigoplus_{i \in I} x_i^{\oplus w_i})$  then                        # multi-input disjunction  
        | aggregate( $z$ ,  $({}^\beta(\bigoplus_{i \in I} L_{x_i}^{\oplus w_i}), {}^\beta(\bigoplus_{i \in I} U_{x_i}^{\oplus w_i}))$ )  
    # Other operations are handled as combinations of the above  
  
function aggregate(formula  $z$ ,  $(L'_z, U'_z)$ ):  
    |  $(L_z, U_z) := (\max\{L_z, L'_z\}, \min\{U_z, U'_z\})$             # tighten existing bounds
```

---

# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- LNN: Inference
  - The Upward–Downward algorithm
    - The downward pass: uses truth value bounds known for formulae and previously computed at other subformulae to tighten bounds at each subformula (and ultimately each atom) according to the inference rules given above

---

**Algorithm 2:** Downward pass to infer subformula truth value bounds from formula bounds

---

```
function downwardPass(formula  $z$ ):  
  for operand  $x_j$  of  $z$ ,  $j \in I$  do  
    if  $z = \neg x$  then                                     # negation  
      | aggregate( $x$ ,  $(1 - U_z, 1 - L_z)$ )  
    else if  $z = \beta(\bigoplus_{i \in I} x_i^{\oplus w_i})$  then             # multi-input disjunction  
      |  $L'_{x_j} := \beta/w_j((\bigotimes_{i \neq j} (1 - U_{x_i})^{\otimes w_i/w_j}) \otimes L_{\bigoplus_i x_i}^{\otimes 1/w_j})$  if  $L_{\bigoplus_i x_i} > 1 - \alpha$ , else 0  
      |  $U'_{x_j} := \beta/w_j((\bigotimes_{i \neq j} (1 - L_{x_i})^{\otimes w_i/w_j}) \otimes U_{\bigoplus_i x_i}^{\otimes 1/w_j})$  if  $U_{\bigoplus_i x_i} < \alpha$ , else 1  
      | aggregate( $x_j$ ,  $(L'_{x_j}, U'_{x_j})$ )  
    downwardPass( $x_j$ )                                     # propagate bounds downward to leaves
```

---



# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- LNN bounds as probability bounds
  - A variant of LNN where lower and upper bound truth values at each subformula **serve as bounds on the probability that the subformula is True in classical logic**
    - This is achieved by using different activation functions for lower and upper bound computations
  - Again, observing that implication and conjunction may be defined in terms of negation and disjunction

$$L_{\oplus_i x_i} \geq \max_{i \in I} L_{x_i}$$

$$L_{x_i} \geq \max\{0, L_{\oplus_i x_i} - \sum_{j \neq i} U_{x_j}\},$$

$$U_{\oplus_i x_i} \leq \min\{1, \sum_{i \in I} U_{x_i}\}$$

$$U_{x_i} \leq U_{\oplus_i x_i}$$

- with negation unchanged from above

# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- LNN bounds as probability bounds
  - $A$ : the set of atomic formulae
  - $g : A \rightarrow \{\text{T}, \text{F}\}$ : an interpretation
  - $g(\sigma)$ : the truth value of  $\sigma$  for any formula  $\sigma$  on  $A$  under the truth-value assignments by  $g$  to the atomic formulae
  - $\Lambda$ : the set of all interpretations
  - $(\sigma, l, u)$ : a sentence
    - $\sigma$  is a formula and  $l, u \in [0, 1]$ .
  - $\Gamma = \{(\sigma_1, l_1, u_1), \dots, (\sigma_k, l_k, u_k)\}$ : a theory
  - $S_\sigma \triangleq \{g \mid g(\sigma) = \text{T}\}$ : defined for any formula  $\sigma$

# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- LNN bounds as probability bounds
  - $p(\cdot)$  : A model, which is a probability function over  $\Lambda$
  - $p(\cdot) \models \Gamma$  :  $p(\cdot)$  is a model of  $\Gamma$   
if and only if  $l_i \leq p(S_{\sigma_i}) \leq u_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k$
  - $P_\Gamma$  : the set of all models of  $\Gamma$
  - Initial knowledge is specified by
    - $V_0$  : a set of formulas



$$L_0 : V_0 \rightarrow [0, 1] \quad U_0 : V_0 \rightarrow [0, 1]$$

**Theorem 2.** Let  $L_\sigma$  and  $U_\sigma$  denote the lower and upper bounds computed by LNN for formula  $\sigma$ . Define  $\Gamma_0 = \{(v, L_0(v), U_0(v)) \mid v \in V_0\}$ . If  $P_{\Gamma_0} \neq \emptyset$ , the following inequalities hold:

$$L_\sigma \leq \inf_{p \in P_{\Gamma_0}} p(S_\sigma) \qquad U_\sigma \geq \sup_{p \in P_{\Gamma_0}} p(S_\sigma)$$



# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- Learning
  - Design loss functions for LNN
    - We may exploit the logical interpretability, in particular by penalizing contradiction, which can then be used to enforce even complicated logical requirements.
    - But, an important consideration is **whether it is desired to preserve neurons' fidelity to their corresponding logical connectives, especially when presented with classical input**
  - Weighted nonlinear logic behaves classically for classical inputs when optimized as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{B,W} \quad & E(B,W) + \sum_{k \in N} \max\{0, L_{B,W,k} - U_{B,W,k}\} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \forall k \in N, i \in I_k, \quad \alpha \cdot w_{ik} - \beta_k + 1 \geq \alpha, \quad w_{ik} \geq 0 \\ & \forall k \in N, \quad \sum_{i \in I_k} (1 - \alpha) \cdot w_{ik} - \beta_k + 1 \leq 1 - \alpha, \quad \beta_k \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

for loss function  $E$ , bias vector  $B$ , weight matrix  $W$ , (disjunction) neuron index set  $N$ , and inferred lower and upper bounds  $L_{B,W,k}$  and  $U_{B,W,k}$  at each neuron. Intuitively, (6) requires disjunctions to return True if *any* of their inputs are true, even if their other inputs are 0, i.e. maximally false, while (7) requires them to return False if *all* of their inputs are false. Loss function  $E$  often embodies typical NN learning objectives such as mean-square error; in addition, *contradiction loss*  $\sum_{k \in N} \max\{0, L_{B,W,k} - U_{B,W,k}\}$  penalizes the sum total contradiction observed in the system.

# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- Learning

- Tailored activation functions

- For disjunction with  $\beta = 1$ , a linear interpolation between four critical points  $(0, 0)$ ,  $(x_F, 1 - \alpha)$ ,  $(x_T, \alpha)$ , and  $(x_{\max}, 1)$

$$f_{\mathbf{w}}(x) = \begin{cases} x \cdot (1 - \alpha) / x_F & \text{if } 0 \leq x \leq x_F, \\ (x - x_F) \cdot (2\alpha - 1) / (x_T - x_F) + 1 - \alpha & \text{if } x_F < x < x_T, \\ (x - x_T) \cdot (1 - \alpha) / (x_{\max} - x_T) + \alpha & \text{if } x_T \leq x \leq x_{\max}, \end{cases}$$

$$x_F = \sum_{i \in I} w_i \cdot (1 - \alpha), \quad x_T = w_{\max} \cdot \alpha, \quad x_{\max} = \sum_{i \in I} w_i.$$

- By construction, this guarantees classical inputs produce classical results without the need for constraints
      - In addition, because  $x_T$  is defined in terms of  $w_{\max}$ , weights may drop to 0 without significantly impacting  $f_{\mathbf{w}}$

# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al ‘20]

- Empirical evaluation
  - Smokers and friends

Table 2: Learnt LNN neuron weights (from  $P_1^8$ ) and axiom lower bounds (as %) for LTN experiment  $\mathcal{K}_{\text{exp2}}$  (universe: a-h) [19], compares LTN degree of satisfiability (as % for 5 axioms) to LNN  $P_1^5, P_2^5$  and repeats in  $P_1^8, P_2^8$  for 8 axioms including 3 induced by MLN [15], with corresponding MLN log-probability weights, followed by axiom-wise contradiction counts. Loss function  $(1 + \text{contradiction}) / (1 + \text{factalign} + \text{tightbounds})$  (normalized) component values after training show complete removal of contradictions by relaxing facts and inferences. Gradient descent ( $\alpha = 1, \beta = 1, w_{\text{max}} = 1$  with weight normalization and gradient-transparent clamping) adjusts operand weights ( $P_1$ ), initial axiom/fact bounds ( $P_1, P_2$ ). Every training epoch performs inference initialized with updated bounds until convergence after the parameter update.

Smokers and friends [ $\mathcal{K}_{\text{exp2}}$ (a-h)]	LNN [ $L, U$ ] 100 epochs, lr: 0.1→0						MLN $L > U$	
	LTN	$P_1^5$	$P_2^5$	$P_1^8$	$P_2^8$			
$\exists y F(x, y)$	100	100	100	100	100	6.88	0	
$\neg F(x, x)$	98	[83, 98]	[83, 98]	[56, 98]	[80, 98]	0.26	0	
$\neg F(x, y)^{0.96} \vee F(y, x)^1$	90	[96, 97]	[97, 100]	[51, 95]	[82, 97]	-	0	
$\neg S(x)^{0.98} \vee \neg F(x, y)^1 \vee S(y)^{0.97}$	96	[65, 100]	[65, 100]	[65, 100]	[66, 100]	3.53	2	
$\neg S(x)^1 \vee C(x)^{0.98}$	77	[57, 100]	[58, 100]	[50, 100]	[60, 100]	-1.35	2	
$\neg F(x, y)^{0.97} \vee \neg S(y)^1 \vee F(y, x)^{0.96} \vee S(x)^1$				100	100	6.87	0	
$\neg F(w, x)^1 \vee \neg F(w, y)^1 \vee \neg F(z, x)^1 \vee C(z)^{0.97}$				[73, 100]	[70, 100]	4.33	51	
$\neg F(w, x)^1 \vee \neg F(y, w)^1 \vee \neg F(z, y)^1 \vee \neg S(y)^{0.99}$				[80, 100]	[77, 100]	9.68	66	
Contradiction (remaining)		0	0	0	0			121
Factual $E_i[ L'_i - L_i  +  U'_i - U_i ]$ (start: 0.64)		0.42	0.43	0.27	0.37			
Bound tightness $E_i[\exp(L_i - U_i)]$ (start: 1)		0.88	0.89	0.9	0.97			

# Logical Neural Networks [Riegel et al '20]

- Empirical evaluation
  - **Smokers and friends**
  - Results
    - $\exists y F(x, y)$ : MLN axiom weight 6.88 for  $\exists y F(x, y)$  states that a world with  $n$  friendless people is  $e^{6.88n}$  times less probable than a world where all have friends, other things being equal, But LNN sets full truth as it does not conflict.
    - $\neg S(x) \vee C(x)^{0.98}$ : MLN assigns high log-probability to the last axiom even though it produces contradictions, while LNN sufficiently relaxes the axiom to remove conflicts.
    - $\neg S(x) \vee \neg F(x, y) \vee S(y)$ : LTN assigns high satisfiability of 96 to  $\neg S(x) \vee \neg F(x, y) \vee S(y)$ , despite evidence against the axiom whereas LNN correctly adjusts bounds to remove contradiction.
    - LNN also infers all logical consequences, in particular friendship symmetry that LTN is unable to produce. Learning of neuron weights can possibly reduce bounds relaxation in  $P_1^8$  when comparing to  $P_2^8$  for the last two high-conflict axiom

# LNN-EL: A Neuro-Symbolic Approach to Short-text Entity Linking [Jiang et al '21]


- Require the use of collective entity linking.
  - This example provides some intuition as to how priors, [local features \(string similarity\)](#) and [collective entity linking](#) can be exploited to overcome the limited context in short-text EL

Who composed soundtrack  
of *Cameron's* *Titanic* ?  
mention<sub>1</sub>    mention<sub>2</sub>

Mention	Entity	Similarity	In-degree
mention <sub>1</sub>	James_Cameron	0.7	30
	Roderick_Cameron	0.6	10
mention <sub>2</sub>	Titanic	1.0	44
	Titanic_(1997_film)	0.4	52

(a)


(b)




(c)

# LNN-EL: A Neuro-Symbolic Approach to Short-text Entity Linking [Jiang et al '21]

- Logical neural networks



Product t-norm



LNN- $\wedge$  ( $\alpha = 0.7$ ).

# LNN-EL: A Neuro-Symbolic Approach to Short-text Entity Linking [Jiang et al '21]

- Logical neural networks
  - Offer operators that include parameters, thus allowing to better learn from the data.
  - LNNs enforce constraints when learning operators such as conjunction
  - LNN- $\wedge$ :
$$\max(0, \min(1, \beta - w_1(1 - x) - w_2(1 - y)))$$
subject to:
$$\beta - (1 - \alpha)(w_1 + w_2) \geq \alpha$$
$$\beta - \alpha w_1 \leq 1 - \alpha$$
$$\beta - \alpha w_2 \leq 1 - \alpha$$
$$w_1, w_2 \geq 0$$
    - $\beta, w_1, w_2$  are learnable parameters,
    - $\alpha \in [1/2, 1]$  is a hyperparameter

# LNN-EL: A Neuro-Symbolic Approach to Short-text Entity Linking [Jiang et al '21]

- Logical neural networks

- LNN- $\wedge$ : relaxed via the inclusion of slack

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LNN-}\wedge(x, y) = & \max(0, \min(1, \beta - w_1(1 - x) - w_2(1 - y))) \\ \text{subject to: } & \beta - (1 - \alpha)(w_1 + w_2) + \Delta \geq \alpha \\ & \beta - \alpha w_1 \leq 1 - \alpha + \delta_1 \\ & \beta - \alpha w_2 \leq 1 - \alpha + \delta_2 \\ & w_1, w_2, \delta_1, \delta_2, \Delta \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

- LNN negation is a pass-through operator:

$$\text{LNN-}\neg(x) = 1 - x$$

- LNN disjunction is defined in terms of LNN- $\wedge$

$$\text{LNN-}\vee(x, y) = 1 - \text{LNN-}\wedge(1 - x, 1 - y)$$



# LNN-EL: A Neuro-Symbolic Approach to Short-text Entity Linking [Jiang et al '21]

- Logical neural networks
  - Learning
    - While vanilla backpropagation cannot handle linear inequality constraints such as Constraint (1),
    - Specialized learning algorithms are available within the LNN framework.


# LNN-EL: A Neuro-Symbolic Approach to Short-text Entity Linking [Jiang et al '21]

- LNN-EL
  - Non-embedding based feature functions.

Features	Description
Name	$sim(m_i, e_{ij})$ , where $sim$ is a general purpose string similarity function such as Jaccard ( $jacc$ ), JaroWinkler ( $jw$ ), Levenshtein ( $lev$ ), Partial Ratio ( $pr$ ), etc.
Context	$Ctx(m_i, e_{ij})$ $= \sum_{m_k \in M \setminus \{m_i\}} pr(m_k, e_{ij}.desc)$ where $m_k$ is a mention in the context of $m_i$
Type	$Type(m_i, e_{ij})$ $= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } m_i.type \in e_{ij}.dom \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ where $m_i.type$ is the type of the mention and $e_{ij}.dom$ is the set of domains
Entity Prominence	$Prom(e_{ij}) = indegree(e_{ij})$ , i.e., number of links pointing to entity $e_{ij}$

# LNN-EL: A Neuro-Symbolic Approach to Short-text Entity Linking [Jiang et al '21]

- Overview



# LNN-EL: A Neuro-Symbolic Approach to Short-text Entity Linking [Jiang et al '21]

- LNN-EL

- Embedding based feature functions.

- Pre-trained Embedding Models

- Include SpaCy's semantic similarity function that uses Glove (Pennington et al., 2014) trained on Common Crawl.
      - Also use scores from an entity linking system such as BLINK (Wu et al., 2020) (a state-of-the-art entity linking model) as a feature function in our system.

- BERT Embeddings.

- Incorporate an embedding based similarity by training a mini entity linking model without any aforementioned prior information.
      - First tag the input text  $T$  with a special token [MENT] to indicate the position of mention  $m_i$ , and then encode  $T$  with BERT

$$\mathbf{m}_i = \text{BERT}(m_i, T)$$

- Each candidate  $e_{ij}$  is encoded with a pre-trained graph embedding Wiki2Vec

$$\mathbf{e}_{ij} = \text{Wiki2Vec}(e_{ij})$$


- The candidates are ranked in order of the cosine similarity:

$$\text{Sim}_{cos}(\mathbf{m}_i, \mathbf{e}_{ij})$$

# LNN-EL: A Neuro-Symbolic Approach to Short-text Entity Linking [Jiang et al '21]

- LNN-EL
  - Embedding based feature functions.
    - BERT with Box Embeddings.
      - Jointly disambiguate the mentions in text to the actual entities in the KG
      - Exploiting the structural context in the KG
      - The simultaneous linking of co-occurring mentions in text to related entities in the KG is a way to reinforce the links for each individual mention

Candidates for linking the 'Titanic' mention appear in the intersection of the two boxes.



# LNN-EL: A Neuro-Symbolic Approach to Short-text Entity Linking [Jiang et al '21]

## LNN-EL


- **BERT with Box Embeddings.**
  - While we may assume that the correct entities for our Cameron and Titanic mentions are connected in the KG, we **do not know how these are connected, i.e., via which relation**
  - To circumvent this challenge, we introduce a special neighborhood relation  $\mathcal{N}$ 
    - » Such that  $v \in \mathcal{N}(u)$
    - » whenever **there is some KG relation from entity  $u$  to entity  $v$ .**
  - Two box operations
    - » 1) The first operation represents mention  $m_i$  as a box, by taking the smallest box that contains the set  $C_i$  of candidate entities for  $m$
    - » 2) take  $m_i$ 's box and produces the box containing its neighbors in the KG

$$\mathbf{Box}(C_i) = \{\mathbf{v} \mid \min(\{\mathbf{e}_{ij} \mid e_{ij} \in C_i\}) \preceq \mathbf{v} \preceq \max(\{\mathbf{e}_{ij} \mid e_{ij} \in C_i\})\}$$

$$\mathbf{Box}(\mathcal{N}(C_i)) = \mathbf{Box}(C_i) + \mathbf{Box}_{\mathcal{N}}$$

# LNN-EL: A Neuro-Symbolic Approach to Short-text Entity Linking [Jiang et al '21]

- LNN-EL
  - BERT with Box Embeddings.



Take the box for Cameron, compute its neighborhood box, then intersect with the Titanic box. This intersection contains valid entities that can disambiguate Titanic and are connected to the entity for Cameron.

- For the actual score of each such entity, we take its distance to the center of the intersection box and convert it to a similarity score  $\text{Sim}_{\text{box}}(\mathbf{m}_i, \mathbf{e}_{ij})$
- Then linearly combine this with the BERT-based similarity measure

$$\beta_{\text{box}} \text{Sim}_{\text{box}}(\mathbf{m}_i, \mathbf{e}_{ij}) + \text{Sim}_{\text{cos}}(\mathbf{m}_i, \mathbf{e}_{ij})$$

# LNN-EL: A Neuro-Symbolic Approach to Short-text Entity Linking [Jiang et al '21]

- LNN-EL

- Model

- **Entity Linking Rules**

- A restricted form of FOL rules comprising of a set of Boolean predicates connected via logical operators: conjunction ( $\wedge$ ) and disjunction ( $\vee$ ).

- (a) EL Rules

$$R_1(m_i, e_{ij}) \leftarrow jacc(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_1 \wedge Ctx(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_2$$

$$R_2(m_i, e_{ij}) \leftarrow lev(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_3 \wedge Prom(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_4$$

- (b) EL Algorithm

$$Links(m_i, e_{ij}) \leftarrow R_1(m_i, e_{ij}) \vee R_2(m_i, e_{ij})$$

- (c) Scoring

$$s(m_i, e_{ij}) =$$

$$+ \left( \begin{array}{l} rw_1 \times ((fw_1 \times jacc(m_i, e_{ij}) \times (fw_2 \times Ctx(m_i, e_{ij}))) \\ rw_2 \times ((fw_3 \times jacc(m_i, e_{ij}) \times (fw_4 \times Ctx(m_i, e_{ij}))) \end{array} \right)$$

In a baseline implementation, use the scoring function, where  $r_{w_i}$  denote manually assigned rule weights, while  $f_{w_i}$  are manually assigned feature weights.



## Name Rule:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{name} \leftarrow & [f_{jacc}(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_1 \vee f_{lev}(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_2 \\ & \vee f_{jw}(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_3 \vee f_{spacy}(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_4] \\ & \wedge f_{prom}(m_i, e_{ij}) \end{aligned}$$

## Context Rule:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{ctx} \leftarrow & [f_{jacc}(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_1 \vee f_{lev}(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_2 \\ & \vee f_{jw}(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_3 \vee f_{spacy}(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_4] \\ & \wedge f_{ctx}(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_5 \\ & \wedge f_{prom}(m_i, e_{ij}) \end{aligned}$$

## Type Rule:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{type} \leftarrow & [f_{jacc}(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_1 \vee f_{lev}(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_2 \\ & \vee f_{jw}(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_3 \vee f_{spacy}(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_4] \\ & \wedge f_{type}(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_5 \\ & \wedge f_{prom}(m_i, e_{ij}) \end{aligned}$$

## Blink Rule:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{blink} \leftarrow & [f_{jacc}(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_1 \vee f_{lev}(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_2 \\ & \vee f_{jw}(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_3 \vee f_{spacy}(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_4] \\ & \wedge f_{blink}(m_i, e_{ij}) \end{aligned}$$

### **Box Rule:**

$$\begin{aligned} R_{box} \leftarrow & [f_{jacc}(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_1 \vee f_{lev}(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_2 \\ & \vee f_{jw}(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_3 \vee f_{spacy}(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_4] \\ & \vee f_{box}(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_5 \end{aligned}$$

### **BERT Rule:**

$$\begin{aligned} R_{bert} \leftarrow & [f_{jacc}(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_1 \vee f_{lev}(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_2 \\ & \vee f_{jw}(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_3 \vee f_{spacy}(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_4] \\ & \vee f_{bert}(m_i, e_{ij}) > \theta_5 \end{aligned}$$

### **LNN-EL:**

$$R_{LNN-EL} \leftarrow R_{name} \vee R_{ctx} \vee R_{type}$$

### **LNN-EL<sub>+BLINK</sub>:**

$$R_{LNN-EL_{+BLINK}} \leftarrow R_{LNN-EL} \vee R_{blink}$$

### **LNN-EL<sub>ens</sub>:**

$$R_{LNN-EL_{ens}} \leftarrow R_{LNN-EL} \vee R_{blink} \vee R_{box}$$

# LNN-EL: A Neuro-Symbolic Approach to Short-text Entity Linking [Jiang et al '21]

- LNN-EL
  - LNN Reformulation
    - To facilitate learning of the thresholds and weights in an EL algorithm, we map the Boolean-valued logic rules into the LNN formalism
      - The LNN constructs – LNN- $\vee$  (for logical OR) and LNN- $\wedge$  (for logical AND)
      - Allow for continuous real-valued numbers in  $[0, 1]$ .
    - LNN- $\wedge$  and LNN- $\vee$ : a weighted real-valued version of the classical logical operators, where a hyperparameter  $\alpha$  is used as a proxy for 1.

# LNN-EL: A Neuro-Symbolic Approach to Short-text Entity Linking [Jiang et al '21]

- LNN-EL

- LNN Reformulation

- Each LNN operator
      - Produces a value in  $[0, 1]$  based on the values of the inputs, their weights and bias  $\beta$
    - The score of each link
      - Based on the score that the LNN operators give, with an added complication related to how we score the feature functions

$$s(m_i, e_{ij}) =$$

$$\text{LNN-} \vee \left( \begin{array}{l} \text{LNN-} \wedge \left( \begin{array}{l} TL(jacc(m_i, e_{ij}), \theta_1), \\ TL(Ctx(m_i, e_{ij}), \theta_2) \end{array} \right), \\ \text{LNN-} \wedge \left( \begin{array}{l} TL(lev(m_i, e_{ij}), \theta_3), \\ TL(Prom(m_i, e_{ij}), \theta_4) \end{array} \right) \end{array} \right)$$

$$TL(f, \theta) = f \cdot \sigma(f - \theta)$$

# LNN-EL: A Neuro-Symbolic Approach to Short-text Entity Linking [Jiang et al '21]

- LNN-EL

- Training

- Train the LNN formulated EL rules over the labeled data and use a margin-ranking loss over all the candidates in  $C_i$  to perform gradient descent
    - The loss function  $L(m_i, C_i)$  for mention  $m_i$  and candidates set  $C_i$

$$\sum_{e_{in} \in C_i \setminus \{e_{ip}\}} \max(0, -(s(m_i, e_{ip}) - s(m_i, e_{in})) + \mu)$$

- $e_{ip} \in C_i$  is a positive candidate
      - $C_i \setminus \{e_{ip}\}$  is the set of negative candidates, and  $\mu$  is a margin hyper parameter.

# LNN-EL: A Neuro-Symbolic Approach to Short-text Entity Linking [Jiang et al '21]

- LNN-EL

- Inference

- Step1) Feature generation: Given mention  $m_i$  and candidate set  $C_i$ , similar to training, we generate features for each mention-candidate pair  $(m_i, e_{ij})$
    - Step2) LNN-based inference: We then pass them through the learned LNN network to obtain final scores for each candidate entity in  $C_i$

# LNN-EL: A Neuro-Symbolic Approach to Short-text Entity Linking [Jiang et al '21]

- Evaluation
  - Characteristics of the datasets.

Dataset	Train		Test	
	Q	E	Q	E
LC-QuAD 1.0 (Trivedi et al., 2017)	4,000	6,823	1000	1,721
QALD-9 (Usbeck et al., 2018)	408	568	150	174
WebQSP <sub>EL</sub> (Li et al., 2020)	2974	3,237	1603	1,798

# LNN-EL: A Neuro-Symbolic Approach to Short-text Entity Linking [Jiang et al '21]

- Evaluation

- Overall Performance

- Performance comparison of various baselines with our neuro-symbolic variants.

Model	LC-QuAD			QALD-9			WebQSP <sub>EL</sub>		
	Precision	Recall	F1	Precision	Recall	F1	Precision	Recall	F1
BLINK	87.04	87.04	87.04	89.14	89.14	89.14	92.15	92.05	92.10
BERT	57.14	63.09	59.97	55.46	61.11	58.15	70.26	72.15	71.20
BERTWiki	66.96	73.85	70.23	66.16	72.90	69.37	81.11	83.29	82.19
Box	67.31	74.32	70.64	68.91	75.93	72.25	81.53	83.72	82.61
<i>LogisticRegression</i>	87.04	86.83	86.93	84.73	84.73	84.73	83.39	83.33	83.36
<i>LogisticRegression<sub>BLINK</sub></i>	90.50	90.30	90.40	88.94	88.94	88.94	89.33	89.28	89.31
<i>RuleEL</i>	79.82	80.10	79.96	81.55	75.15	78.22	76.56	74.55	75.54
<i>LogicEL</i>	86.68	86.48	86.58	83.05	83.05	83.05	82.60	82.58	82.59
<i>LNN-EL</i>	87.74	87.54	87.64	88.52	88.52	88.52	85.11	85.05	85.08
<i>LNN-EL<sub>ens</sub></i>	<b>91.10</b>	<b>90.90</b>	<b>91.00</b>	<b>91.38</b>	<b>91.38</b>	<b>91.38</b>	<b>92.17</b>	<b>92.08</b>	<b>92.12</b>



# LNN-EL: A Neuro-Symbolic Approach to Short-text Entity Linking [Jiang et al '21]

- Evaluation

- Overall Performance

- Recall@k performance of LNN-EL models

Dataset	Model	R@5	R@10	R@64
LC-QuAD	BLINK	94.69	96.01	96.92
	LNN-EL	93.66	94.39	97.56
	LNN-EL <sub>ens</sub>	97.07	97.20	97.68
QALD-9	BLINK	93.39	93.39	94.29
	LNN-EL	92.72	95.94	98.04
	LNN-EL <sub>ens</sub>	94.63	94.63	95.48
WebQSP <sub>EL</sub>	BLINK	97.40	97.64	98.61
	LNN-EL	93.54	95.12	96.59
	LNN-EL <sub>ens</sub>	96.34	96.59	96.95

# LNN-EL: A Neuro-Symbolic Approach to Short-text Entity Linking [Jiang et al '21]

- Evaluation

- **Extensibility**

- F1 scores of LNN-EL with additional features coming from various black-box EL approaches.



Dataset	LNN-EL	LNN-EL +BLINK	LNN-EL +BERTWiki	LNN-EL +Box	LNN-EL <sub>ens</sub>
LC-QuAD	87.64	90.24	88.23	89.05	<b>91.00</b>
QALD-9	88.52	90.96	86.41	88.52	<b>91.38</b>
WebQSP <sub>EL</sub>	85.08	<b>92.32</b>	91.70	91.44	92.12

# LNN-EL: A Neuro-Symbolic Approach to Short-text Entity Linking [Jiang et al '21]

- Evaluation

- Interpretability**

- Feature weights of two models  $LNNEL_{ens}$  (left) and  $LNN-EL_{+BLINK}$  (right) on WebQSPEL



# LNN-EL: A Neuro-Symbolic Approach to Short-text Entity Linking [Jiang et al '21]

- Evaluation
  - **Transferability**
    - F1 scores of LNN-EL in transfer settings.

Train	Test		
	LC-QuAD	QALD-9	WebQSP <sub>EL</sub>
LC-QuAD	<u>87.64</u>	86.41	78.90
QALD-9	85.58	<u>88.52</u>	83.06
WebQSP <sub>EL</sub>	80.95	87.25	<u>85.08</u>

# LNN-EL: A Neuro-Symbolic Approach to Short-text Entity Linking [Jiang et al '21]

- Evaluation

- Runtime analysis

- Time per question for candidate & feature generation, along with train and inference time per question for LNN-ELens. All numbers are in seconds

	Candidate & feature generation	Training per epoch	Inference per epoch
QALD-9	26.21	0.010	0.009
LC-QuAD	33.05	0.010	0.013
WebQSP <sub>EL</sub>	19.80	0.009	0.012

# Learning explanatory rules from noisy data

[Evans and Grefenstette '18]

$\text{edge}(a, b)$

$\text{connected}(X, Y) \leftarrow \text{edge}(X, Y)$

$\text{edge}(b, c)$

$\text{connected}(X, Y) \leftarrow \text{edge}(X, Z), \text{connected}(Z, Y)$

$\text{edge}(c, a)$

- An **extensional** predicate: a predicate that is wholly defined by a set of ground atoms
  - E.g.) , **edge** is an extensional predicate  
 $\{\text{edge}(a, b), \text{edge}(b, c), \text{edge}(c, a)\}$
- An **intensional** predicate: defined by a set of clauses.
  - E.g.) **connected** is an intensional predicate defined by the clauses:

$\text{connected}(X, Y) \leftarrow \text{edge}(X, Y)$

$\text{connected}(X, Y) \leftarrow \text{edge}(X, Z), \text{connected}(Z, Y)$

# Learning explanatory rules from noisy data

## [Evans and Grefenstette '18]

- Inductive Logic Programming (ILP)
  - A tuple  $(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{N})$  of ground atoms
  - $\mathcal{B}$  is a set of background assumptions, a set of ground atoms
  - $\mathcal{P}$  is a set of positive instances - examples taken from the extension of the target predicate to be learned
  - $\mathcal{N}$  is a set of negative instances - examples taken outside the extension of the target predicate

# Learning explanatory rules from noisy data [Evans and Grefenstette '18]

- Given an ILP problem  $(B, P, N)$ , a solution is a set  $R$  of definite clauses such that

$$\mathcal{B}, R \models \gamma \text{ for all } \gamma \in \mathcal{P}$$

$$\mathcal{B}, R \not\models \gamma \text{ for all } \gamma \in \mathcal{N}$$

- Examples:

$$\mathcal{B} = \{zero(0), succ(0, 1), succ(1, 2), succ(2, 3), \dots\}$$

$$\mathcal{P} = \{even(0), even(2), even(4), even(6), \dots\}$$

$$\mathcal{N} = \{even(1), even(3), even(5), even(7), \dots\}$$



# Learning explanatory rules from noisy data [Evans and Grefenstette '18]

- one solution is the set  $R$ :

$$\textit{even}(X) \leftarrow \textit{zero}(X)$$

$$\textit{even}(X) \leftarrow \textit{even}(Y), \textit{succ2}(Y, X)$$

$$\textit{succ2}(X, Y) \leftarrow \textit{succ}(X, Z), \textit{succ}(Z, Y)$$

# Learning explanatory rules from noisy data [Evans and Grefenstette '18]

- **Language frame**  $(target, P_e, arity_e, C)$ 
  - *target*: the target predicate, the **intensional** predicate we are trying to learn
  - $P_e$ : a set of **extensional** predicates
  - *arity<sub>e</sub>*: a map  $P_e \cup \{target\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  specifying the arity of each predicate
  - $C$ : a set of constants

# Learning explanatory rules from noisy data [Evans and Grefenstette '18]

- **ILP problem**  $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{N})$ 
  - $\mathcal{L}$ : a language frame
  - $\mathcal{B}$ : a set of background assumptions, ground atoms formed from the predicates in  $P_e$  and the constants in  $C$
  - $\mathcal{P}$ : a set of positive examples, ground atoms formed from the target predicate and the constants in  $C$
  - $\mathcal{N}$ : a set of negative examples, ground atoms formed from the target predicate and the constants in  $C$

$$\mathcal{P} = \{\text{even}(0), \text{even}(2), \text{even}(4), \text{even}(6), \dots\}$$

$$\mathcal{N} = \{\text{even}(1), \text{even}(3), \text{even}(5), \text{even}(7), \dots\}$$

# Learning explanatory rules from noisy data [Evans and Grefenstette '18]

- **Rule template**  $\tau = (v, int)$ : a range of clauses that can be generated
  - $v \in \mathbb{N}$ : specifies the number of existentially quantified variables allowed in the clause
  - $int \in \{0, 1\}$ : specifies whether the atoms in the body of the clause can use intensional predicates ( $int = 1$ ) or only extensional predicates ( $int = 0$ )
- **Program template**  $\Pi = (P_a, arity_a, rules, T)$ 
  - $P_a$ : a set of auxiliary (**intensional**) predicates; these are the additional invented predicates used to help define the target predicate
  - $arity_a$ : a map  $P_a \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  specifying the arity of each auxiliary predicate
  - $rules$ : a map from each intensional predicate  $p$  to a pair of rule templates  $(\tau_p^1, \tau_p^2)$
  - $T \in \mathbb{N}$ : specifies the max number of steps of forward chaining inference

# Learning explanatory rules from noisy data [Evans and Grefenstette '18]

- *rules*: a map from each intensional predicate  $p$  to a pair of rule templates  $(\tau_p^1, \tau_p^2)$
- *rules*
  - defines each intensional predicate by a pair of rule templates.
  - In our system, we insist, without loss of generality that each predicate can be defined by **exactly two clauses**.

# Learning explanatory rules from noisy data [Evans and Grefenstette '18]

- **Language:**  $(P_e, P_i, arity, C)$   $P = P_e \cup P_i$   
 $P_i = P_a \cup \{target\}$   $arity = arity_e \cup arity_a$ 
  - Combine the extensional predicates from the language-frame  $\Pi = (P_a, arity_a, rules, T)$
  - with the intensional predicates from the program template  $\mathcal{L} = (target, P_e, arity_e, C)$
  - A language determines the set  $G$  of all ground atoms
    - E.g.) If we restrict ourselves to nullary, unary, and dyadic predicates
$$G = \{\gamma_i\}_{i=1}^n = \{p() \mid p \in P, \text{arity}(p) = 0\} \cup \{p(k) \mid p \in P, \text{arity}(p) = 1, k \in C\} \cup \{p(k_1, k_2) \mid p \in P, \text{arity}(p) = 2, k_1, k_2 \in C\} \cup \{\perp\}$$

# Learning explanatory rules from noisy data [Evans and Grefenstette '18]

- **Generating Clauses**

- For each rule template  $\tau$ , we can generate a set  $cl(\tau)$  of clauses that satisfy the template
- Restrictions to keep  $cl(\tau)$  manageable
  - 1) we only consider clauses composed of atoms involving free variables
    - We do not allow any constants in any of our clauses →
    - If we need a predicate whose meaning depends on particular constants, then we treat it as an extensional predicate, rather than an intensional predicate.

*zero(0)*

- 2) we only allow predicates of arity 0, 1, or 2
  - We do not currently support ternary predicates or higher
- 3) we insist that all clauses have exactly two atoms in the body

# Learning explanatory rules from noisy data [Evans and Grefenstette '18]: Example

$$\text{arity}(q) = 2$$

- The language-frame:  $\mathcal{L} = (\text{target}, P_e, \text{arity}_e, C)$

$$\text{target} = q/2 \quad P_e = \{p/2\} \quad C = \{a, b, c, d\}$$

- The ILP problem:  $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{N})$

$$\mathcal{B} = \{p(a, b), p(b, c), p(c, d)\}$$

$$\mathcal{P} = \{q(a, b), q(a, c), q(a, d), q(b, c), q(b, d), q(c, d)\}$$

$$\mathcal{N} = \{q(X, Y) \mid (X, Y) \in \{a, b, c, d\}^2, q(X, Y) \notin \mathcal{P}\}$$



# Learning explanatory rules from noisy data

## [Evans and Grefenstette '18]: Example

- Use the program template  $\Pi = (P_a, arity_a, rules, T)$   
 $P_a = \{\}$   $arity_a = \{\}$   $rules = \{\tau_q^1, \tau_q^2\}$   $T = 3$
- Suppose template  $\tau_q^1$  for  $q$  is  $(v = 0, int = 0)$

- Then, clauses generated after pruning are:

1.  $q(X, Y) \leftarrow p(X, X), p(X, Y)$
2.  $q(X, Y) \leftarrow p(X, X), p(Y, X)$
3.  $q(X, Y) \leftarrow p(X, X), p(Y, Y)$
4.  $q(X, Y) \leftarrow p(X, Y), p(X, Y)$
5.  $q(X, Y) \leftarrow p(X, Y), p(Y, X)$
6.  $q(X, Y) \leftarrow p(X, Y), p(Y, Y)$
7.  $q(X, Y) \leftarrow p(Y, X), p(Y, X)$
8.  $q(X, Y) \leftarrow p(Y, X), p(Y, Y)$

# Learning explanatory rules from noisy data [Evans and Grefenstette '18]: Example

- Suppose template  $\tau_q^2$  for  $q$  is  $(v = 1, int = 1)$ 
  - Then, there are 58 clauses generated after pruning, of which the first 16 are:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. $q(X, Y) \leftarrow p(X, X), q(Y, X)$ | 9. $q(X, Y) \leftarrow p(X, Y), q(Y, Z)$  |
| 2. $q(X, Y) \leftarrow p(X, X), q(Y, Y)$ | 10. $q(X, Y) \leftarrow p(X, Y), q(Z, X)$ |
| 3. $q(X, Y) \leftarrow p(X, X), q(Y, Z)$ | 11. $q(X, Y) \leftarrow p(X, Y), q(Z, Y)$ |
| 4. $q(X, Y) \leftarrow p(X, X), q(Z, Y)$ | 12. $q(X, Y) \leftarrow p(X, Y), q(Z, Z)$ |
| 5. $q(X, Y) \leftarrow p(X, Y), q(X, X)$ | 13. $q(X, Y) \leftarrow p(X, Z), q(Y, X)$ |
| 6. $q(X, Y) \leftarrow p(X, Y), q(X, Z)$ | 14. $q(X, Y) \leftarrow p(X, Z), q(Y, Y)$ |
| 7. $q(X, Y) \leftarrow p(X, Y), q(Y, X)$ | 15. $q(X, Y) \leftarrow p(X, Z), q(Y, Z)$ |
| 8. $q(X, Y) \leftarrow p(X, Y), q(Y, Y)$ | 16. $q(X, Y) \leftarrow p(X, Z), q(Z, Y)$ |

# Learning explanatory rules from noisy data

[Evans and Grefenstette '18]:

## Differentiable ILP ( $\partial$ ILP)

- **Valuations**

- Given a set  $G$  of  $n$  ground atoms, a vector  $[0, 1]^n$  mapping each ground atom  $\gamma_i \in G$  to the real unit interval

- E.g.)  $L = (P_e, P_i, \text{arity}, C)$

$$P_e = \{r/2\} \quad P_i = \{p/0, q/1\} \quad C = \{a, b\}$$

- One possible valuation on the ground atoms  $G$  of  $L$


$$\begin{array}{llll} \perp \mapsto 0.0 & p() \mapsto 0.0 & q(a) \mapsto 0.1 & q(b) \mapsto 0.3 \\ r(a, a) \mapsto 0.7 & r(a, b) \mapsto 0.1 & r(b, a) \mapsto 0.4 & r(b, b) \mapsto 0.2 \end{array}$$

# Learning explanatory rules from noisy data [Evans and Grefenstette '18]: Differentiable ILP ( $\partial$ ILP)

- **Induction by Gradient Descent**

$$\Lambda = \{(\gamma, 1) \mid \gamma \in \mathcal{P}\} \cup \{(\gamma, 0) \mid \gamma \in \mathcal{N}\}$$

- given an ILP problem  $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{N})$ , a program template  $\Pi$  and a set of clause weights  $W$ , we construct a differentiable model that implements the conditional probability of  $\lambda$  for a ground atom  $\alpha$


$$p(\lambda \mid \alpha, W, \Pi, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$$

Clause weights   Program template   Language frame   Background

- Loss: The expected negative log likelihood

$$loss = - \mathbb{E}_{(\alpha, \lambda) \sim \Lambda} [\lambda \cdot \log p(\lambda \mid \alpha, W, \Pi, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B}) + (1 - \lambda) \cdot \log(1 - p(\lambda \mid \alpha, W, \Pi, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B}))]$$

# Learning explanatory rules from noisy data

## [Evans and Grefenstette '18]:

### Differentiable ILP ( $\partial$ ILP)

- **Induction by Gradient Descent**

- To calculate the probability of the label  $\lambda$  given the atom  $\alpha$ , we infer the **consequences** of applying the rules to the background facts (**using T steps of forward chaining**).
- These consequences are called the **Conclusion Valuation**
- Then, we extract  $\lambda$  as the probability of  $\alpha$  in this valuation.

# Learning explanatory rules from noisy data

## [Evans and Grefenstette '18]:

### Differentiable ILP ( $\partial$ ILP)

$$p(\lambda \mid \alpha, W, \Pi, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B}) = f_{\text{extract}}(f_{\text{infer}}(f_{\text{convert}}(\mathcal{B}), f_{\text{generate}}(\Pi, \mathcal{L}), W, T), \alpha)$$

Differentiable

Non-differentiable

$f_{\text{extract}} : [0, 1]^n \times G \rightarrow [0, 1]$  Takes a valuation  $\mathbf{x}$  and an atom  $\gamma$  and extracts the value for that atom

$f_{\text{extract}}(\mathbf{x}, \gamma) = \mathbf{x}[\text{index}(\gamma)]$

Valuation      Atom

$\text{index} : G \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$   
a function that assigns each ground atom a unique integer index

$f_{\text{convert}} : 2^G \rightarrow [0, 1]^n$  Takes a set of atoms and converts it into a valuation mapping the elements of  $B$  to 1 and all other elements of  $G$  to 0

$f_{\text{convert}}(\mathcal{B}) = \mathbf{y}$  where  $\mathbf{y}[i] = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \gamma_i \in \mathcal{B} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

the  $i$ 'th ground atom in  $G$  for  $i = 1..n$

# Learning explanatory rules from noisy data

## [Evans and Grefenstette '18]:

### Differentiable ILP ( $\partial$ ILP)

$$p(\lambda \mid \alpha, W, \Pi, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B}) = f_{\text{extract}}(f_{\text{infer}}(f_{\text{convert}}(\mathcal{B}), f_{\text{generate}}(\Pi, \mathcal{L}), W, T), \alpha)$$

Differentiable

Non-differentiable

$f_{\text{generate}}$

produces a set of clauses from a program template  $\Pi$  and a language  $L$

$$f_{\text{generate}}(\Pi, \mathcal{L}) = \{cl(\tau_p^i) \mid p \in P_i, i \in \{1, 2\}\}$$

$$P_i = P_a \cup \{target\}$$


$$f_{\text{infer}} : [0, 1]^n \times C \times W \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow [0, 1]^n$$

All the heavy-lifting takes place.

It performs  $T$  steps of forward-chaining inference using the generated clauses, amalgamating the various conclusions together using the clause weights  $W$

# Differentiable ILP ( $\partial$ ILP)

[Evans and Grefenstette '18]





# Differentiable ILP ( $\partial$ ILP)

## [Evans and Grefenstette '18]

- **Rule Weights**

– Weights  $W$ :  $\{\mathbf{W}_1, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{|P_i|}\}$

$\mathbf{W}_p \in \mathbb{R}^{|cl(\tau_p^1)| \times |cl(\tau_p^2)|}$  one matrix for  $p \in P_i$

the number of clauses generated by the first rule templates  $\tau_p^1, \tau_p^2$

$\mathbf{W}_p[j, k]$  represents how strongly the system believes that the pair of clauses  $(C_p^{1,j}, C_p^{2,k})$  is the right way to define the intensional predicate  $p$

note that each predicate is defined by exactly two clauses

$$\mathbf{W}_p^*[j, k] = \frac{e^{\mathbf{W}_p[j, k]}}{\sum_{j', k'} e^{\mathbf{W}_p[j', k']}}$$

# Differentiable ILP ( $\partial$ ILP)

## [Evans and Grefenstette '18]

- Inference

- The idea: each clause  $c$  induces a function

$$\mathcal{F}_c : [0, 1]^n \rightarrow [0, 1]^n \text{ on valuations}$$

- E.g.)  $p(X) \leftarrow q(X)$

Applying  $c = p(X) \leftarrow q(X)$  treated as a function

$G$	$\mathbf{a}_0$	$\mathcal{F}_c(\mathbf{a}_0)$	$\mathbf{a}_1$	$\mathcal{F}_c(\mathbf{a}_1)$
$p(a)$	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.7
$p(b)$	0.0	0.3	0.9	0.4
$q(a)$	0.1	0.0	0.7	0.0
$q(b)$	0.3	0.0	0.4	0.0
$\perp$	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

# Differentiable ILP ( $\partial$ ILP)

## [Evans and Grefenstette '18]

- $\mathcal{F}_p^{i,j}$  : the valuation function corresponding to the clause  $C_p^{i,j}$  — the  $j$ 'th clause of the  $i$ 'th rule template  $\tau_p^i$  for intensional predicate  $p$ .
- $\mathcal{G}_p^{j,k}$  : another indexed set of functions that combines the application of two functions  $\mathcal{F}_p^{1,j}$  &  $\mathcal{F}_p^{2,k}$

$$\mathcal{G}_p^{j,k}(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{x} \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbf{x}[i] = \max(\mathcal{F}_p^{1,j}(\mathbf{a})[i], \mathcal{F}_p^{2,k}(\mathbf{a})[i])$$

- The initial value  $\mathbf{a}_0$ : 
$$\mathbf{a}_0[x] = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \gamma_x \in \mathcal{B} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\mathbf{c}_t^{p,j,k} = \mathcal{G}_p^{j,k}(\mathbf{a}_t)$$

Intuitively,  $\mathbf{c}_t^{p,j,k}$  the result of applying one step of forward chaining inference to  $\mathbf{a}_t$  using clauses  $C_p^{1,j}$  &  $C_p^{2,k}$

# Differentiable ILP ( $\partial$ ILP)

## [Evans and Grefenstette '18]

- The weighted average of the  $\mathbf{c}_t^{p,j,k}$ , using the softmax of the weights

$$\mathbf{b}_t^p = \sum_{j,k} \mathbf{c}_t^{p,j,k} \cdot \frac{e^{\mathbf{W}_p[j,k]}}{\sum_{j',k'} e^{\mathbf{W}_p[j',k']}}$$

$\mathbf{b}_t^p$  is also zero everywhere except for the  $p$ 'th intensional predicate



- The successor function:

$\mathbf{b}_t^p$  are disjoint for different  $p$ , so we can simply sum these valuations

$$\mathbf{a}_{t+1} = f_{amalgamate}(\mathbf{a}_t, \sum_{p \in P_i} \mathbf{b}_t^p)$$

$$f_{amalgamate}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \max(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$$

$$f_{amalgamate}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y}$$

# Differentiable ILP ( $\partial$ ILP) [Evans and Grefenstette '18]

- Computing the  $F_c$  Functions
  - Let  $X_c = \{x_k\}_{k=1}^n$  be a set of sets of pairs of indices of ground atoms for clause  $c$
  - Each  $x_k$  contains all the pairs of indices of atoms that justify atom  $\gamma_k$  according to the current clause  $c$ :

$$x_k = \{(a, b) \mid \text{satisfies}_c(\gamma_a, \gamma_b) \wedge \text{head}_c(\gamma_a, \gamma_b) = \gamma_k\}$$

$\text{satisfies}_c(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$  if the pair of ground atoms  $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$  satisfies the body of clause  $c$

true if given  $c = \alpha \leftarrow \alpha_1, \alpha_2$

there is a substitution  $\theta$  such that  $\alpha_1[\theta] = \gamma_1$  &  $\alpha_2[\theta] = \gamma_2$

$\text{head}_c(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$  : the head atom produced when applying clause  $c$  to the pair of atoms  $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$

If  $c = \alpha \leftarrow \alpha_1, \alpha_2$ ,  $\alpha_1[\theta] = \gamma_1$  &  $\alpha_2[\theta] = \gamma_2$

$\text{head}_c(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = \alpha[\theta]$

# Differentiable ILP ( $\partial$ ILP)

[Evans and Grefenstette '18]

- E.g.) Suppose  $P = \{p, q, r\}$  &  $C = \{a, b\}$ 
  - Then our ground atoms  $G$  are:

$k$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
$\gamma_k$	$\perp$	$p(a, a)$	$p(a, b)$	$p(b, a)$	$p(b, b)$	$q(a, a)$	$q(a, b)$	$q(b, a)$	$q(b, b)$
$k$	9	10	11	12					
$\gamma_k$	$r(a, a)$	$r(a, b)$	$r(b, a)$	$r(b, b)$					

- Suppose clause  $c$  is:  $r(X, Y) \leftarrow p(X, Z), q(Z, Y)$
- Then  $X_c = \{x_k\}_{k=1}^n$  is:

$k$	$\gamma_k$	$x_k$
0	$\perp$	$\{\}$
1	$p(a, a)$	$\{\}$
2	$p(a, b)$	$\{\}$
3	$p(b, a)$	$\{\}$
4	$p(b, b)$	$\{\}$

$k$	$\gamma_k$	$x_k$
5	$q(a, a)$	$\{\}$
6	$q(a, b)$	$\{\}$
7	$q(b, a)$	$\{\}$
8	$q(b, b)$	$\{\}$

$k$	$\gamma_k$	$x_k$
9	$r(a, a)$	$\{(1, 5), (2, 7)\}$
10	$r(a, b)$	$\{(1, 6), (2, 8)\}$
11	$r(b, a)$	$\{(3, 5), (4, 7)\}$
12	$r(b, b)$	$\{(3, 6), (4, 8)\}$

# Differentiable ILP ( $\partial$ ILP)

## [Evans and Grefenstette '18]

– Transform  $X_c$  into  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{N}^{n \times w \times 2}$

$$\mathbf{X}[k, m] = \begin{cases} x_k[m] & \text{if } m < |x_k| \\ (0, 0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$k$	$\gamma_k$	$\mathbf{X}[k]$
0	$\perp$	$\begin{bmatrix} (0, 0) \\ (0, 0) \end{bmatrix}$
1	$p(a, a)$	$\begin{bmatrix} (0, 0) \\ (0, 0) \end{bmatrix}$
2	$p(a, b)$	$\begin{bmatrix} (0, 0) \\ (0, 0) \end{bmatrix}$
3	$p(b, a)$	$\begin{bmatrix} (0, 0) \\ (0, 0) \end{bmatrix}$
4	$p(b, b)$	$\begin{bmatrix} (0, 0) \\ (0, 0) \end{bmatrix}$

$k$	$\gamma_k$	$\mathbf{X}[k]$
5	$q(a, a)$	$\begin{bmatrix} (0, 0) \\ (0, 0) \end{bmatrix}$
6	$q(a, b)$	$\begin{bmatrix} (0, 0) \\ (0, 0) \end{bmatrix}$
7	$q(b, a)$	$\begin{bmatrix} (0, 0) \\ (0, 0) \end{bmatrix}$
8	$q(b, b)$	$\begin{bmatrix} (0, 0) \\ (0, 0) \end{bmatrix}$

$k$	$\gamma_k$	$\mathbf{X}[k]$
9	$r(a, a)$	$\begin{bmatrix} (1, 5) \\ (2, 7) \end{bmatrix}$
10	$r(a, b)$	$\begin{bmatrix} (1, 6) \\ (2, 8) \end{bmatrix}$
11	$r(b, a)$	$\begin{bmatrix} (3, 5) \\ (4, 7) \end{bmatrix}$
12	$r(b, b)$	$\begin{bmatrix} (3, 6) \\ (4, 8) \end{bmatrix}$

# Differentiable ILP ( $\partial$ ILP)

## [Evans and Grefenstette '18]

– Slicing  $\mathbf{X}$  into  $\mathbf{X}_1$  and  $\mathbf{X}_2$

$$\mathbf{X}_1 = \mathbf{X}[:, :, 0] \quad \mathbf{X}_2 = \mathbf{X}[:, :, 1]$$

$$\text{gather}_2 : \mathbb{R}^a \times \mathbb{N}^{b \times c} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{b \times c}$$

$$\text{gather}_2(x, y)[i, j] = x[y[i, j]]$$

After assembling the elements of  $\mathbf{a}$  according to the matrix of indices in  $\mathbf{X}_1$  and  $\mathbf{X}_2$ , we obtain  $\mathbf{Y}_1$  and  $\mathbf{Y}_2$ :

$$\mathbf{Y}_1 = \text{gather}_2(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{X}_1) \quad \mathbf{Y}_2 = \text{gather}_2(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{X}_2)$$

$$\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{Y}_1 \odot \mathbf{Y}_2$$

$\mathbf{Z}[k, :]$  : the vector of fuzzy conjunctions of all the pairs of atoms that contribute to the truth of  $\gamma_k$ , according to the current clause.

$$F_c(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{a}' \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbf{a}'[k] = \max(\mathbf{Z}[k, :])$$



# Differentiable ILP ( $\partial$ ILP)

## [Evans and Grefenstette ‘18]

$k$	$\gamma_k$	$\mathbf{a}[k]$	$\mathbf{X}_1[k]$	$\mathbf{X}_2[k]$	$\mathbf{Y}_1[k]$	$\mathbf{Y}_2[k]$	$\mathbf{Z}[k]$	$F_c(\mathbf{a})[k]$
0	$\perp$	0.0	[0 0]	[0 0]	[0 0]	[0 0]	[0 0]	0.00
1	$p(a, a)$	1.0	[0 0]	[0 0]	[0 0]	[0 0]	[0 0]	0.00
2	$p(a, b)$	0.9	[0 0]	[0 0]	[0 0]	[0 0]	[0 0]	0.00
3	$p(b, a)$	0.0	[0 0]	[0 0]	[0 0]	[0 0]	[0 0]	0.00
4	$p(b, b)$	0.0	[0 0]	[0 0]	[0 0]	[0 0]	[0 0]	0.00
5	$q(a, a)$	0.1	[0 0]	[0 0]	[0 0]	[0 0]	[0 0]	0.00
6	$q(a, b)$	0.0	[0 0]	[0 0]	[0 0]	[0 0]	[0 0]	0.00
7	$q(b, a)$	0.2	[0 0]	[0 0]	[0 0]	[0 0]	[0 0]	0.00
8	$q(b, b)$	0.8	[0 0]	[0 0]	[0 0]	[0 0]	[0 0]	0.00
9	$r(a, a)$	0.0	[1 2]	[5 7]	[1.0 0.9]	[0.1 0.2]	[0.1 0.18]	0.18
10	$r(a, b)$	0.0	[1 2]	[6 8]	[1.0 0.9]	[0 0.8]	[0 0.72]	0.72
11	$r(b, a)$	0.0	[3 4]	[5 7]	[0 0]	[0.1 0.2]	[0 0]	0.00
12	$r(b, b)$	0.0	[3 4]	[6 8]	[0 0]	[0 0.8]	[0 0]	0.00

# Differentiable ILP ( $\partial$ ILP)

## [Evans and Grefenstette '18]

- **Defining fuzzy conjunction**  $Z = Y_1 \odot Y_2$ 
  - For other choices, need an operator  $*$  :  $[0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$  satisfying the conditions on a t-norm [Esteva & Godo, 2001]
    - commutativity:  $x * y = y * x$
    - associativity:  $(x * y) * z = x * (y * z)$
    - monotonicity (i):  $x_1 \leq x_2$  implies  $x_1 * y \leq x_2 * y$
    - monotonicity (ii):  $y_1 \leq y_2$  implies  $x * y_1 \leq x * y_2$
    - unit (i):  $x * 1 = x$
    - unit (ii):  $x * 0 = 0$
  - Operators satisfying these conditions include:
    - Godel t-norm:  $x * y = \min(x, y)$
    - Lukasiewicz t-norm:  $x * y = \max(0, x + y - 1)$
    - Product t-norm:  $x * y = x \cdot y$

# Differentiable ILP ( $\partial$ ILP)

## [Evans and Grefenstette '18]

- Experiments

Domain	Task	$ P_i $	Recursive	Metagol Performance	$\partial$ ILP Performance
Arithmetic	Predecessor	1	No	✓	✓
Arithmetic	Even / odd	2	Yes	✓	✓
Arithmetic	Even / succ2	2	Yes	✓	✓
Arithmetic	Less than	1	Yes	✓	✓
Arithmetic	Fizz	3	Yes	✓	✓
Arithmetic	Buzz	2	Yes	✓	✓
Lists	Member	1	Yes	✓	✓
Lists	Length	2	Yes	✓	✓
Family Tree	Son	2	No	✓	✓
Family Tree	Grandparent	2	No	✓	✓
Family Tree	Husband	2	No	✓	✓
Family Tree	Uncle	2	No	✓	✓
Family Tree	Relatedness	1	No	×	✓
Family Tree	Father	1	No	✓	✓
Graphs	Undirected Edge	1	No	✓	✓
Graphs	Adjacent to Red	2	No	✓	✓
Graphs	Two Children	2	No	✓	✓
Graphs	Graph Colouring	2	Yes	✓	✓
Graphs	Connectedness	1	Yes	×	✓
Graphs	Cyclic	2	Yes	×	✓

# Differentiable ILP ( $\partial$ ILP)

## [Evans and Grefenstette '18]

- Experiments

Domain	Task	$ P_i $	Recursive	$\partial$ ILP	Godel	Łukasiewicz	Max
Arithmetic	Predecessor	1	No	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Arithmetic	Even / odd	2	Yes	100.0	44.0	52.0	34.0
Arithmetic	Even / succ2	2	Yes	48.5	28.0	6.0	20.5
Arithmetic	Less than	1	Yes	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Arithmetic	Fizz	3	Yes	10.0	1.5	0.0	5.5
Arithmetic	Buzz	2	Yes	14.0	35.0	3.5	5.5
Lists	Member	1	Yes	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Lists	Length	2	Yes	92.5	59.0	6.0	82.0
Family Tree	Son	2	No	100.0	94.5	0.0	99.5
Family Tree	Grandparent	2	No	96.5	61.0	0.0	96.5
Family Tree	Husband	2	No	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Family Tree	Uncle	2	No	70.0	60.5	0.0	68.0
Family Tree	Relatedness	1	No	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Family Tree	Father	1	No	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Graphs	Undirected Edge	1	No	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Graphs	Adjacent to Red	2	No	50.5	40.0	1.0	42.0
Graphs	Two Children	2	No	95.0	74.0	53.0	95.0
Graphs	Graph Colouring	2	Yes	94.5	81.0	2.5	90.0
Graphs	Connectedness	1	Yes	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Graphs	Cyclic	2	Yes	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0