

FedCQA: Answering Complex Queries on Multi-Source Knowledge Graphs via Federated Learning

Qi Hu

Department of CSE, HKUST
Hong Kong SAR, China
quhaf@connect.ust.hk

Weifeng Jiang

SCSE, NTU
Singapore
s220077@e.ntu.edu.sg

Haoran Li

Department of CSE, HKUST
Hong Kong SAR, China
hlibt@connect.ust.hk

Zihao Wang

Department of CSE, HKUST
Hong Kong SAR, China
zwanggc@connect.ust.hk

Jiaxin Bai

Department of CSE, HKUST
Hong Kong SAR, China
jbai@connect.ust.hk

Qianren Mao

Zhongguancun Laboratory
Beijing, China
maoqr@zgclab.edu.cn

Yangqiu Song

Department of CSE, HKUST
Hong Kong SAR, China
yqsong@cse.ust.hk

Lixin Fan

WeBank
Shenzhen, China
fanlixin@webank.com

Jianxin Li

SCSE, Beihang University
Beijing, China
lijx@act.buaa.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

Complex logical query answering is a challenging task in knowledge graphs (KGs) that has been widely studied. The ability to perform complex logical reasoning is essential and supports various graph reasoning-based downstream tasks, such as search engines. Recent approaches are proposed to represent KG entities and logical queries into embedding vectors and find answers to logical queries from the KGs. However, existing proposed methods mainly focus on querying a single KG and cannot be applied to multiple graphs. In addition, directly sharing KGs with sensitive information may incur privacy risks, making it impractical to share and construct an aggregated KG for reasoning to retrieve query answers. Thus, it remains unknown how to answer queries on multi-source KGs. An entity can be involved in various knowledge graphs and reasoning on multiple KGs and answering complex queries on multi-source KGs is important in discovering knowledge cross graphs. Fortunately, federated learning is utilized in knowledge graphs to collaboratively learn representations with privacy preserved. Federated knowledge graph embeddings enrich the relations in knowledge graphs to improve the representation quality. However, these methods only focus on one-hop relations and cannot perform complex reasoning tasks. In this paper, we apply federated learning to complex query-answering tasks to reason over multi-source knowledge graphs while preserving privacy. We propose a Federated Complex Query Answering framework (FedCQA), to reason over multi-source KGs avoiding sensitive raw data transmission to protect privacy. We conduct extensive experiments on three real-world datasets and evaluate retrieval performance on various types of complex queries. The experimental results show that our proposed methods can effectively retrieve answers to cross knowledge graph queries while keeping raw data secret in local devices.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Security and privacy** → **Privacy protections**; • **Information systems** → **Data mining**.

KEYWORDS

privacy preserving, knowledge graph, complex query answering, federated learning

1 INTRODUCTION

Knowledge graphs (KG) are structured knowledge databases representing external knowledge using triplets and describing the relationships between entities. KG plays an important role and has been widely applied in numerous real-world applications, such as recommender systems [9, 45] and search engines [48]. Among them, complex query answering (CQA) is an important but challenging task in knowledge graph reasoning and can be used for supporting various downstream tasks [6, 37]. CQA aims to retrieve answers that satisfy given logical expressions [20, 38], which are often defined in predicate logic forms with relation projection operations, existential quantifiers \exists , logical conjunctions \wedge , disjunctions \vee , etc. For example in Figure 1, given a logical query q , We aim to find all the research topic entities V_2 for which there exists Nobel Prize winners V who were born in Germany and conducted studies in that specific field. CQA is challenging due to the incompleteness of knowledge graphs and the complexity of query matching [6]. To solve these problems, query encoding methods are commonly used in CQA. These methods try to parse complex queries into computation graphs and parameterize both queries and entities using different neural networks simultaneously. After the encoding process, these methods retrieve answers according to the similarity scores between the parameterized embeddings of answer sets and queries [20, 38].

Existing query encoding methods have gained remarkable success in addressing complex query answering tasks. However, these query answering models are limited to the utilization of a single central knowledge graph and cannot be extended to multiple KGs. With the development of knowledge graphs, KGs have grown significantly in size and encompass knowledge from various domains. Consequently, constructing a knowledge graph that includes all




Figure 1: An example of cross knowledge graph queries on distributed knowledge graphs. The relations and entities in a KG complex query can be from multiple knowledge graphs which cannot be solved in a single local knowledge graph.

related entities and relations has become difficult and it is impractical to access a central KG with all the triples needed [12, 35, 52]. Collaborations between various knowledge graph holders are helpful to answer more complicated queries. For example, as shown in Figure 1, there are multiple knowledge graphs from different domains. A complex query may consist of entities and relations from multiple knowledge graphs, preventing a local query answering model on a single knowledge graph from answering that cross-graph queries. However, there are various reasons hindering the data sharing between knowledge graph holders. For example, the growing attention on privacy, regulations such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), and commercial interest between data holders, etc.

To solve the above challenges, federated learning [32, 51] has been proposed which allows multiple participants to distributedly train a global model collaboratively without raw data transmission. Federated learning has been widely applied in various domains [30], including knowledge graph embedding. In such systems, raw knowledge graph triplets are kept on the local devices, participants train local models, and only gradient will be transferred to learn a global knowledge graph embedding model [12, 35, 52]. In the training process, homomorphic encryption (HE) [34], secure multi-party computation (SMPC) [33], and differential privacy [18, 19] are widely applied in federated learning to improve security. FedAvg [32] is a commonly used technique in federated learning that updates global models by averaging local models trained on individual data and has been widely studied in various areas, including federated knowledge graph embedding [12, 52]. Although federated learning can protect raw data, recent studies have indicated that learned

representations can still potentially leak privacy [17, 23], where an attacker can infer sensitive information from the learned embeddings.

While federated learning has been widely applied in knowledge graph embeddings, existing federated knowledge graph embedding works only focus on learning high quality representations for simple downstream tasks, such as knowledge graph completion [12, 25, 40, 52], and lacks the ability of reasoning over knowledge graphs and retrieving answers to complex queries. To solve the constraints, we propose a Federated Complex Query Answering framework (FedCQA), to reason over multi-source KGs avoiding sensitive raw data transmission to protect data privacy. FedCQA can be applied to different central complex query answering models. It leverages federated learning techniques to train local query answering models in local knowledge graphs and align knowledge graph embeddings for global queries. Different from other federated knowledge graph embedding models, FedCQA server not only takes the responsibility of aggregating global models, but decomposing given complex queries to sub-queries to compute the query encoding and retrieve answers from distributed knowledge graphs under the protection of multi-party computation to avoid global model storage. Meanwhile, to better evaluate federated complex query answering systems' performance, we create a benchmark on three widely used knowledge graph datasets. We evaluate our proposed FedCQA on the benchmark and the experiment results show the effectiveness of retrieving answers to complex queries from multi-source knowledge graphs. We summarize our major contributions as follows:

- To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to extend federated knowledge graph embedding systems to complex query answering tasks, which is critical for knowledge graph holders' collaboration.
- Based on three public datasets, we propose a benchmark for evaluating the retrieval performance of federated complex query answering systems. The benchmark systematically evaluates the retrieval performance facing cross knowledge graph queries.
- We propose FedCQA, a federated complex query answering system that can retrieve answers to complex queries from distributed knowledge graphs with privacy preserved. Extensive experiments conducted on three datasets demonstrate its high performance facing cross knowledge graphs queries.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. We review the related works in Section 2. Section 3 introduces the preliminary and definition of the distributed complex query answering systems. Section 4 introduces the framework of FedCQA in detail. Section 5 evaluates the performance of FedCQA on the benchmark based on three real-world datasets. Finally, we make a conclusion of our work in Section 6.

2 RELATED WORK

In this section, we summarize the related work. Our work is closely related to Complex query Answering (CQA) and federated knowledge graph embedding.

2.1 Complex Query Answering

Complex query answering (CQA) is a crucial task in knowledge graphs, where a model is learned to process and answer complex logical queries based on knowledge graph reasoning. Query encoding is effective and efficient for complex query answering. These methods represent complex queries into various structures and effectively search answers among candidate knowledge graph entities. GQE [20], Q2B [38] and HypeE [28] encode queries to vectors, hyper-rectangle and hyperbolic embeddings, respectively. To support negation operators, various encoding methods are proposed: Q2P [5] and ConE [53] use multiple vectors to represent queries. BetaE [39], GammaE [49], PERM [15] propose to use various probabilistic distributions to encode complex logic graph queries. Some methods, like LMPNN [46] CQD [2], Var2Vec [42] take pre-train embeddings on simple link prediction tasks and apply logic operators to answer complex queries. Meanwhile, Neural structures are utilized to encode complex queries: BiQE [26] and KgTransformer [29] are proposed to use transformer, SQE [6] applies sequential encoders, GNN-QE [54] and StarQE [1] use message-passing graph neural networks to encode queries, respectively. There are also encoding methods proposed to encode various knowledge graph types: NRN [4] is proposed to encode numerical values, MEQE [3] extends logical queries over events, states, and activities.

While there are numerous existing complex query answering methods, these methods mainly focus on a single large knowledge graph. There are some methods proposed to reason over multi-view and temporal and varying knowledge graphs: MORA [47] ensembles multi-view knowledge graphs to scale up complex query answering, TTransE [27] and TRESICAL [44] can be applied on temporal knowledge graphs. However, these methods need raw data transmission and privacy protection is not considered. Conducting privacy-preserving complex query answering on multi-source knowledge graphs is still unexplored. With the growing attention on privacy and data protection, sensitive data is unable to freely circulate among data holders, and complex query answering is forced to be conducted on multiple knowledge graphs collaboratively. Our research introduces federated learning to existing complex query answering so that we can apply reasoning over distributed knowledge graphs without raw data sharing.

2.2 Federated Knowledge Graph Embedding

In recent years, federated learning has emerged as a promising approach to address privacy and scalability concerns in machine learning. It allows data owners to participate in model co-construction without raw data transmission to reduce privacy leakage risks [32, 51]. Various studies have been conducted to explore the potential of federated learning in different domains, such as recommender system [50], finance [30] etc. Federated knowledge graph embedding is one of the domains in which federated learning has been widely applied. FedE [12] learns knowledge graph embeddings locally and aggregates all local models in a global server for higher representation quality. FedR [52] proposes to learn representation with privacy-preserving relation aggregation to avoid privacy leakage risks in entity embedding and reduce communication costs. FedCKE [25], FedMKG [40] extend federated learning to learn global representations from different domains and multilingual knowledge

graphs. FedEC [13] applies contrastive learning to tackle data heterogeneity in knowledge graphs. MaKEr [11] and MorseE [14] utilize meta-learning to transfer knowledge among knowledge graphs to train graph neural networks for unseen knowledge extrapolation and inductive learning. DP-FLames [24] quantifies the privacy threats and incorporates private selection in federated knowledge embeddings. FLEST [43] decomposes the embedding matrix and enables the sharing of latent representations to reduce the risks of privacy leakage and communication costs, FedM [21] splits the duty of aggregating entities and relations to reduce the risks of graph reconstruction attacks. FKGE [36] applies differential privacy and avoids the need for a central server.

While existing federated knowledge graph embedding methods are proposed to distributedly learn high quality representations with privacy preservation, there are some works indicate that the learned embeddings are informative and vulnerable to various privacy attacks [22], even in federated scenarios [23, 24]. Besides, these methods all lack the ability to answer complex queries on multi-source knowledge graphs which is critical for more complicated downstream tasks. Our research expands the simple federated knowledge graph embedding to answer complex queries on distributed knowledge graphs.

3 PRELIMINARY AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

3.1 Preliminary

Following the general setting of federated knowledge graph embeddings, we denote a set of knowledge graphs from various data owners as $\mathcal{G} = \{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_N\}$, where N is the total number of knowledge graphs. Data owners have their own KGs and cannot access to other's databases. Let $g_k = (\mathcal{V}_k, \mathcal{R}_k, \mathcal{T}_k)$ denotes the k -th KG in \mathcal{G} , where \mathcal{V}_k denotes the set of vertices representing entities in the knowledge graph g_k , \mathcal{R}_k denotes the set of relations, \mathcal{T}_k denotes the set of triplets. Specifically, $\mathcal{T}_k = \{(v_h, r, v_t)\} \subseteq \mathcal{V}_k \times \mathcal{R}_k \times \mathcal{V}_k$ denotes there is a relation between v_h and v_t , where $v_h, v_t \in \mathcal{V}_k$, $r \in \mathcal{R}_k$. We denote $\mathcal{V} = \cup_{k=1}^N \mathcal{V}_k$, $\mathcal{R} = \cup_{k=1}^N \mathcal{R}_k$, $\mathcal{T} = \cup_{k=1}^N \mathcal{T}_k$ as the set of vertices, relations, and triplets of all knowledge graphs, respectively.

3.2 Complex Logical Query

The complex knowledge graph query is defined in existential positive first-order logic form, consisting of various types of logic expressions like existential quantifiers \exists , logic conjunctions \wedge , and disjunctions \vee . In the logical expression, there is a set of anchor entities $V_a \in \mathcal{V}$ denotes given context, existential quantified variables $V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k \in \mathcal{V}$, and a unique variable $V_?$ denotes our query target. The complex query intends to find the target answers $V_? \in \mathcal{V}$, such that there are $V_1, \dots, V_k \in \mathcal{V}$ in the knowledge graph that can satisfy the given logical expressions simultaneously. Following the definition in [38], the complex query expression can be converted to the disjunctive normal form (DNF) in the following:

$$q[V_?] = V_?.V_1, \dots, V_k : c_1 \vee c_2 \vee \dots \vee c_n \quad (1)$$

$$c_i = e_{i,1} \wedge e_{i,2} \wedge \dots \wedge e_{i,m}$$

where $e_{i,j}$ is the atomic logic expression, which can be the triplet (V, r, V') denotes relation r between entities V and V' , c_i is the conjunction of several atomic logic expressions $e_{i,j}$. V, V' are either anchor entities or existentially quantified variables.

3.3 Knowledge Graph Set Query

Knowledge graphs are owned by different data holders and cannot be shared directly with each other, therefore, a complex query q can involve entities and relations from different knowledge graphs. We define those queries as follows:

Definition 3.1 (Cross-graph Query). A complex query q is a cross-graph query if there exists query answers $V_i \in \mathcal{V}$, such that there are $V_1, \dots, V_k \in \mathcal{V}$ in the knowledge graph that can satisfy the given logical expressions and the atomic expressions in the query can not be found in a single knowledge graph.

For example in figure 1, the entity "Physics" is the answer to the query q because there exists an existentially quantified variable "Einstein" that can satisfy the logical expression. The query q is a cross-graph query as the atomic expressions in the query are from different knowledge graphs and can not be found in a single graph. For example, $\text{Win}(\text{Einstein}, \text{Novel Prize})$ and $\text{BornIn}(\text{Einstein}, \text{Germany})$ are two atomic expressions from different knowledge graphs. When the distributed knowledge graph set faces cross-graph queries, the answer can not be inferred from one single knowledge graph. Besides, We have the definition of in-graph query correspondingly:

Definition 3.2 (In-graph Query). A complex query q is an in-graph query if for all answers $V_i \in \mathcal{V}$ to the query, such that there are $V_1, \dots, V_k \in \mathcal{V}$ in the knowledge graph that can satisfy the given logical expressions and the atomic expressions in the query are from a single knowledge graph.

These in-graph queries can retrieve answers according to one of the knowledge graphs in the KG set and can be solved with existing complex query answering models. However, in a distributed knowledge graph complex query answering system, the in-graph queries may retrieve more answers as more knowledge are provided.

3.4 Problem Formulation

Given a knowledge graph set $\mathcal{G} = \{g_1, \dots, g_N\}$ with N knowledge graphs. Every knowledge graph is owned by independent data holders and can not be shared to construct a unified knowledge graph, which means that the triples in each knowledge graph will stay private at local devices. The knowledge graphs in the \mathcal{G} are related and have part of entities and relation overlapped. There are complex queries involving elements from the knowledge graph set \mathcal{G} and can be classified as cross-graph queries and in-graph queries. We aim to construct a distributed complex query answering system to reason over multi-source knowledge graphs and retrieve answers to the queries while keeping privacy preserved. To achieve this, we assume that there is an honest but curious server managing the federated complex query answering system. Because the learned embeddings are vulnerable to various privacy attacks, the embeddings on the server should be further protected.

4 FEDERATED COMPLEX QUERY ANSWERING

In this section, we introduce the learning and query retrieval process of our proposed FedCQA.

4.1 Model Learning

We first introduce the training of FedCQA. As shown in Figure 2, FedCQA has a central server and a set of clients. Each client has a knowledge graph with overlapping entities of others. The server takes the responsibility of aggregating parameters and organizing the training and retrieval process. The clients train a local CQA model based on their knowledge graph. According to the sensitivity of the parameters, we divide the query encoding methods into two parts: operator function with parameter Θ and entity embeddings E . For the operator function, the client directly sends the parameter to the server for aggregation and receives the global function to update the local operator function, which is similar to FedAvg [32]. Therefore, in the following parts, we only introduce the entity embeddings aggregation in FedCQA.

4.1.1 Secret Aggregation. There are various techniques, like homomorphic encryption (HE) [34], secure multi-party computation (MPC) [33], and differential privacy [18, 19] to protect the uploaded parameters, however the protection of aggregated global model are often ignored. Unfortunately, the global model is informative and vulnerable to privacy attacks [52]. Hence we propose a secret aggregation applied in parameter aggregation which can prevent the global server from knowing the aggregated parameters. Assume that at each client i , a parameter denoted as θ_i is uploaded to a server for aggregating global parameter θ . The procedure of secret aggregation is described in Algorithm 1. In the beginning, each client C_i randomly generates parameters θ_i^r and shares it with other clients with encryption (Shown in Appendix A). Each client has a set of parameters $\{\theta_1^r, \theta_2^r, \dots, \theta_n^r\}$. For each client, C_i uploads perturbed parameter $(\theta_i + \theta_i^r)$ to server. The server collects all perturbed parameters from clients, computes aggregated perturbed parameter θ^r , and sends it back to all clients. Finally, Clients can compute aggregated parameter θ and prevent from exposing it to the server.

4.1.2 Model Training. Similar to [12], the server constructs a set of mapping matrices $\{\mathbf{M}^i \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n_i}\}_{i=1}^N$ and existence vectors $\{\mathbf{v}^i \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times 1}\}_{i=1}^N$ to denote the entities in each client, where n is the number of all unique entities in KG set and n_i is the number of entities from client C_i . $\mathbf{M}_{m,n}^i = 1$ if the m -th entity in entity table corresponds to the n -th entity from client C_i . $\mathbf{v}_m^i = 1$ indicates that the m -th entity in entity table exists in client C_i .

FedCQA performs secret aggregation for entity embeddings. First, the client C_i will randomly initialize the local entity embeddings $\mathbf{E}_0^i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times d}$ and perturbation embeddings $\mathbf{E}_r^i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times d}$. Every client will share the permutation embeddings with all clients. At round t , the server will select part of the clients \mathbf{C} participating in the training. After local training of CQA on respective local knowledge graphs, client C_i sends perturbed local entity embeddings $\mathbf{E}_t^i + \mathbf{E}_r^i$ to the server. The server will aggregate the entity




Figure 2: The training and retrieval process of FedCQA. The blue line denotes the training process, and the green line denotes the retrieval process. In the training, clients’ CQA models are trained on respective knowledge graphs. At each round, local CQAs are aggregated at the server and updated using the global parameters. Among them, the embeddings are protected by secret aggregation so that the server can not access them. In the retrieval, each query is decomposed into sub-queries. Clients compute sub-query embeddings which the server are used to aggregate query embeddings. Answer scores are computed at clients and are aggregated at server to retrieve answers.

Algorithm 1: Secret Aggregation

Require: n clients C_1, C_2, \dots, C_n , client C_i has parameter θ_i
 Each client C_i generates random parameter θ_i^r
 Transmit θ_i^r to all other clients with encryption, each client has a set of parameters $\{\theta_1^r, \theta_2^r, \dots, \theta_n^r\}$

Client C_i :

Upload perturbed parameter $(\theta_i + \theta_i^r)$ to server
 Receive parameters $\sum_{j=1}^n (\theta_j + \theta_j^r)$ from server
 Compute parameters $\theta = [\sum_{j=1}^n (\theta_j + \theta_j^r) - \sum_i \theta_i^r] / n$

Server:

for $i = 1, \dots, n$ **do**

 Receive parameters $(\theta_i + \theta_i^r)$ from client C_i

end for

Compute parameters $\theta^r = \sum_{j=1}^n (\theta_j + \theta_j^r)$

Send parameters θ^r to all clients

embeddings using perturbed local embeddings:

$$\mathbf{E}_{t+1}^r \leftarrow \left(\mathbb{1} \oslash \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \mathbf{v}^i \right) \otimes \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \mathbf{M}^i (\mathbf{E}_{t+1}^i + \mathbf{E}_r^i), \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbb{1}$ denotes all-one vector, \oslash denotes element-wise division for vectors and \otimes denotes element-wise multiply with broadcasting. After aggregation, the server sends the aggregated entity embeddings back to all clients, and the client C_i receives:

$$\mathbf{E}_{t+1}^{r,i} \leftarrow \mathbf{M}^{i\top} \mathbf{E}_{t+1}^r, \quad (3)$$

and the client C_i can compute and update the local entity embeddings as:

$$\mathbf{E}_{t+1}^i \leftarrow \mathbf{E}_{t+1}^{r,i} - \mathbf{M}^{i\top} \left(\mathbb{1} \oslash \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}} \mathbf{v}^j \right) \otimes \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}} \mathbf{M}^j \mathbf{E}_r^j. \quad (4)$$

After secret aggregation, the entity embeddings of all clients are shared without exposing the sensitive information to the server. Besides the training of entity embeddings, the operator networks are trained and aggregated using FedAvg [32], and the detailed descriptions of the FedCQA are shown in Appendix B

4.2 Query Retrieval

After training, the server in FedCQA manages the process of retrieving answers to complex queries.

4.2.1 Query Encoding. Query encoding methods commonly represent queries to embeddings and retrieve answers according to scoring functions where similarity functions are widely used. FedCQA encodes queries and treats two types of queries differently.

For in-graph queries, FedCQA directly encodes queries using corresponding local complex query answering models. For cross-graph queries, as the query involves entities from multiple knowledge graphs, we decompose the queries to atomic expressions and encode these atomic queries using local CQA models, and use global operator function models to compute the representations of the original queries.

4.2.2 Answer Retrieval. Because the entity embeddings are not stored in the central server, we can only retrieve answers from all distributed local knowledge graphs. Given a query encoding q , we score all the candidate entities at each local knowledge graph, at client C_i :

$$S_q^i \leftarrow f_s^i(\mathcal{V}_i, q) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times 1}, \quad (5)$$

where f_s^i is a score function in the client C_i . Then the score will be uploaded to the server to aggregate a score table for all unique entities in the knowledge graph sets:

$$S \leftarrow \left(\mathbb{1} \otimes \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{v}^i \right) \otimes \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{M}^i S^i. \quad (6)$$

The final answers to the queries are retrieved globally from the knowledge graph set according to the score table.

5 EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we create a benchmark for distributed knowledge graph complex query answering problems and evaluate our proposed FedCQA’s performance on the benchmark.

5.1 Datasets and Experiment Setting

We introduce the detailed information of our used datasets and the setting of our experiments.

5.1.1 Datasets. In our experiment, following previous work, we use the three commonly used knowledge graph datasets: FB15k [7, 8], FB15k-237 [41], and NELL995 [10] to construct the distributed query answering benchmark. In each dataset, there are vertices describing entities and edges describing relations. To evaluate the distributed complex query, we conduct experiments assuming having 3 and 5 clients in each federated complex query answering system, respectively. We randomly select relations into clients and split triples into clients according to selected relations as a local knowledge graph. The triplets in each local knowledge graph are separated into training, validation, and testing with a ratio of 8:1:1 respectively. Following previous works [38], we construct training graph \mathcal{G}_{train} , validation graph \mathcal{G}_{val} , and test graph \mathcal{G}_{test} in each client by training edges, training+validation edges, and training+validation+testing edges, respectively. The detailed statistics are listed in the table 1. #Clients denotes the number of clients, #Nodes, #Relations, #Edges denote the average number of nodes, relations, and edges in each client respectively.

5.1.2 Query Sampling. Following previous work [4, 20], we evaluate the complex query answering performance on the following eight general query types with abbreviations of $1p$, $2p$, $2i$, ip , $3i$, pi , $2u$, and up . As shown in figure 3, each subgraph denotes one query type, where each edge represents either a projection or a logical operator,

Table 1: The statistics of three datasets used for experiments.

Graphs	#Clients	#Nodes	#Relations	#Edges
FB15k-237	3	13,651	79	103,359
	5	12,639	47.4	62,015
FB15k	3	14,690	448.3	197,404
	5	14,279	269	118,442
NELL995	3	40,204	66.7	47,601
	5	28,879	40	28,560

Table 2: The statistics of queries sampled from three datasets used for experiments.

Graphs	#C	In-graph			Cross-graph
		Train.	Valid.	Test.	Test.
FB15k-237	3	317,226	11,528	11,539	32,573
	5	180,552	6,619	6,673	31,469
FB15k	3	592,573	19,206	19,267	53,660
	5	344,418	11,409	11,437	53,154
NELL995	3	208,070	8,810	8,750	24,954
	5	117,231	5,177	5,118	24,237

and each node represents either a set of entities, the anchor entities and relations are to be specified to instantiate logical queries. We use the sampling method commonly used in previous works [6, 38] to randomly sample complex queries from knowledge graphs. We randomly sample two sets of queries from the knowledge graph sets: in-graph queries and cross-graph queries to evaluate local and global answer retrieval performance. For local model evaluation, we first obtain training, validation, and testing queries from the formerly constructed local knowledge graphs respectively. Then for the training queries, we conduct a graph search to find corresponding training answers on the local training graph. For the validation queries, we search for the answers on both the training graph and the validation graph and only use those queries that have different numbers of answers on the two graphs. For the testing queries, we use those queries that have different answers on the testing graph from answers on the training graph and validation graph. For global model evaluation, we construct global training, validation, and testing knowledge graphs using all local knowledge graphs, and sample testing queries with atomic expressions from different local knowledge graphs, finally we search for answers on three global knowledge graphs and only use those queries that have different answers on the testing graph from other two graphs. We collect statistics of complex queries in three datasets and the statistics are shown in Table 2. The number of in-graph queries is the average number of the client’s local queries.

5.1.3 Baselines. We can use various existing query encoding methods as our local base model, to evaluate the effectiveness and generalization ability of our proposed FedCQA, we select three commonly used complex encoding methods GQE [20], Q2P [5], tree-LSTM [6] as our base model. GQE is a graph query encoding model




Figure 3: The query structures used for evaluation in the experiments. Naming for each query structure is provided under each subfigure, for brevity, the p, i, and u represent the projection, intersection, and union operations respectively.

Table 3: The retrieval performance of distributed knowledge graph complex query answering models when there are 3 clients. The average results of HR@3 and MRR of all clients are reported. The best results are underlined. The best results of distributed models are in bold.

Graph	Setting	GQE				Q2P				tree-LSTM			
		In-graph		Cross-graph		In-graph		Cross-graph		In-graph		Cross-graph	
		HR@3	MRR	HR@3	MRR	HR@3	MRR	HR@3	MRR	HR@3	MRR	HR@3	MRR
FB15k-237	Local	12.64	12.03	-	-	14.55	13.63	-	-	13.32	12.73	-	-
	Central	13.13	12.39	<u>13.03</u>	<u>12.28</u>	14.93	<u>14.66</u>	<u>15.02</u>	<u>14.81</u>	13.28	12.61	<u>13.36</u>	<u>12.91</u>
	FedE	<u>13.72</u>	<u>13.23</u>	<u>12.74</u>	<u>11.63</u>	14.82	14.27	14.79	13.93	13.12	12.23	12.62	12.08
	FedR	12.89	11.98	-	-	14.32	14.23	-	-	<u>13.92</u>	<u>12.92</u>	-	-
	FedCQA	13.54	12.43	12.63	11.32	<u>15.32</u>	<u>14.32</u>	14.83	14.11	12.93	12.11	12.55	11.96
FB15k	Local	22.05	18.21	-	-	24.32	22.64	-	-	22.87	20.51	-	-
	Central	<u>29.53</u>	25.65	<u>30.21</u>	<u>25.33</u>	38.62	34.14	38.03	34.36	<u>38.87</u>	<u>35.86</u>	<u>37.97</u>	<u>36.13</u>
	FedE	24.31	26.74	27.95	25.21	43.68	<u>39.62</u>	39.72	35.95	34.27	30.18	31.19	26.03
	FedR	20.29	18.61	-	-	25.32	22.71	-	-	23.64	20.97	-	-
	FedCQA	25.63	26.87	24.77	25.17	<u>44.02</u>	39.27	<u>40.27</u>	36.31	34.85	33.83	31.80	28.99
NELL995	Local	11.85	11.03	-	-	15.86	13.02	-	-	13.85	13.85	12.94	-
	Central	12.87	11.95	13.06	12.46	16.74	14.82	<u>16.42</u>	15.63	15.41	14.23	<u>16.27</u>	<u>15.83</u>
	FedE	13.29	12.72	12.46	11.82	<u>17.23</u>	14.12	16.28	14.01	14.27	13.81	14.18	13.71
	FedR	12.01	11.23	-	-	16.04	13.26	-	-	12.48	11.67	-	-
	FedCQA	<u>14.21</u>	<u>13.27</u>	<u>13.76</u>	<u>12.67</u>	16.62	<u>15.28</u>	16.27	<u>16.23</u>	16.28	<u>15.38</u>	16.09	15.27

that encodes a complex query into a vector in embedding space; Q2P represents complex queries using multiple vectors; tree-LSTM recursively represents complex queries and treats all operations, entities, and relations as tokens.

To the best of our knowledge, there are no existing federated complex query answering methods but several federated knowledge graph embedding methods, therefore, we choose to compare our methods with FedE [12] and FedR [52], two commonly used federated knowledge graph embedding methods as baselines. FedE aggregates both entity embeddings and relation embeddings in a server, while FedR only aggregates relation embeddings for privacy concerns and communication efficiency. We utilize these two methods with slight modifications to train a global complex query answering model: FedE aggregates all query encoding parameters and FedR aggregates relation embeddings and query encoding networks. Besides, we also compare our FedCQA with local and central settings. In the local setting, there is no collaboration between clients, while in the central setting, all distributed graphs in the knowledge graph set are aggregated for a global graph for training, we sample complex queries from global training, and validation knowledge graphs for training and validation.

If there is no further statement, we use the following implementation settings in the experiments. We evaluate FedCQA on three base models: GQE, Q2P, and tree-LSTM in FedE, FedR, and our

proposed FedCQA for comparison. We tune hyper-parameters on the validation local queries for the base query encoding methods and set the dimension of entities and relations as 400 for all models for fair comparison and use AdamW [31] as optimizer.


5.1.4 Evaluation Metrics. Following the previous work [4], we evaluate the generalization capability of models by calculating the rankings of answers that cannot be directly retrieved from an observed knowledge graph. Given a testing query q , the training, validation, and public testing answers are denoted as M_{train} , M_{val} , and M_{test} , respectively. We evaluate the quality of retrieved answers using Hit ratio (HR) and Mean reciprocal rank (MRR). HR@K metric evaluates the accuracy of retrieval by measuring the percentage of correct hits among the top K retrieved items. The MRR metric evaluates the performance of a ranking model by computing the average reciprocal rank of the first relevant item in a ranked list of results. The metric can be defined as:

$$\text{Metric}(q) = \frac{1}{|M_{test}/M_{val}|} \sum_{v \in M_{test}/M_{val}} m(\text{rank}(v)), \quad (7)$$

$m(r) = \mathbf{1}[r \leq K]$ if the metric is HR@K and $m(r) = \frac{1}{r}$ if the metric is MRR. Higher values denote better reasoning performance. We train local models at each client by using the in-graph training queries and tune hyper-parameters using the validation queries.

Table 4: The retrieval performance of distributed knowledge graph complex query answering models when there are 5 clients. The average results of HR@3 and MRR of all clients are reported. The best results are in bold.

Graph	Setting	FB15k-237				FB15k				NELL			
		In-graph		Cross-graph		In-graph		Cross-graph		In-graph		Cross-graph	
		HR@3	MRR	HR@3	MRR	HR@3	MRR	HR@3	MRR	HR@3	MRR	HR@3	MRR
GQE	Local	11.44	10.65	-	-	14.65	13.8	-	-	11.23	10.37	-	-
	FedCQA	12.42	11.60	11.20	10.79	16.13	15.78	15.28	14.91	12.48	11.91	11.49	11.02
Q2P	Local	19.83	17.51	-	-	36.10	35.04	-	-	20.03	18.62	-	-
	FedCQA	21.40	20.83	20.71	19.94	40.81	37.96	38.56	35.73	24.59	23.75	23.85	22.90
tree-LSTM	Local	10.48	10.09	-	-	15.26	14.37	-	-	14.52	13.89	-	-
	FedCQA	13.79	13.27	12.74	12.18	15.44	15.81	15.28	14.24	15.68	14.28	14.57	12.89

**Figure 4: The evaluation results of FedCQA-GQE facing different types of cross-graph queries on FB15k-237 (subfigures (a), (b)). The evaluation results of FedCQA-GQE model facing in-graph queries on FB15k-237 (subfigures (c), (d)).**

The evaluation is then finally conducted on the testing queries, including the evaluation of in-graph queries on local query encoding models and cross-graph queries on the global federated knowledge graph query answering system, respectively.

5.2 Performance Evaluation

We evaluate FedCQA’s complex query answering performance on three datasets and compare it to other baselines. We apply FedCQA on three base CQA models and evaluate the average retrieval performance on various queries. The results are summarized in Table 3 and Table 4. Table 3 reports the retrieval performance of various distributed knowledge graph complex query answering models when there are 3 clients. For each model, we evaluate performance facing in-graph queries and cross-graph queries, respectively. For in-graph queries, the average scores of all clients are reported. We report results in HR@3 and MRR which higher scores indicate better performance. The best results are underlined. The best results of distributed models are in bold. As shown in Table 3, our proposed methods can effectively retrieve complex query answers from distributed knowledge graphs. In comparison to local settings, we can see that FedCQA can utilize all participated knowledge graphs and performs better facing in-graph queries. For example, GQE model with FedCQA can retrieve 14.21 HR@3 on average while can only reach 11.85 without collaboration. Besides, in comparison to other federated knowledge graph embedding methods, our proposed FedCQA can reach comparable performance in both in-graph queries and cross-graph queries without exposing sensitive entity embeddings to the server. For example, FedCQA achieves the best

performance in cross-graph queries in more than half of datasets and base CQA models.

In Table 4, we present the performance of FedCQA when there are 5 clients. We compare the performance with local training without collaboration to demonstrate the influence of client numbers. As shown in the table, FedCQA performs well compared to complex query answering models without collaboration, there are performance improvements in all datasets after applying FedCQA to various base CQA models, demonstrating that FedCQA can utilize the intrinsic information in the distributed knowledge sets. The collaboration in distributed knowledge graphs allows FedCQA to reason over various logical paths to improve performance.

5.3 Query Types

FedCQA can globally reason over distributed knowledge graphs and retrieve answers to cross-graph queries. To evaluate FedCQA’s performance on various types of complex queries, we conduct experiments to evaluate the retrieval performance of FedCQA and compare it to central learning on FB15k-237 when there are 3 clients. Figure 4(a) and Figure 4(b) show the FedCQA-GQE’s performance facing cross-graph queries. As we can see from the figure, FedCQA performs well on most various types of queries compared to the central model. For example, on query types ‘2i’ and ‘pi’, FedCQA can reach more than 90% MRR compared to the central model.

5.4 Local Influence

Because the in-graph queries can be processed by a single local knowledge graph CQA model, in this part, we evaluate the performance of FedCQA on these queries to assess the influence of FedCQA on local queries. We conduct experiments on FB15k-237 and the number of clients is 5. We evaluate the performance of FedCQA based on GQE and compare the model with no collaboration. The results are summarized in the Figure 4(c) and Figure 4(d). As shown in the figure, although each client has different performance due to the triplets correlation being different in each sub-dataset, FedCQA can improve all clients' performance compared to the model without collaboration.

6 CONCLUSION

In this work, we present a federated complex query answering framework, FedCQA to reason over distributed knowledge sets with privacy preserved. We define the distributed knowledge graph complex query answering problem. To solve the problem, we propose secret aggregation for federated learning where the aggregated parameters can be kept secret to the server. Besides, we design a distributed query retrieval process for answering queries from distributed knowledge graph sets to protect clients' privacy. To evaluate FedCQA model performance, we construct a benchmark based on three commonly used knowledge graph complex query answering datasets: FB15k-237, FB15k, and NELL. Extensive experiments on the benchmark demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed FedCQA. FedCQA can retrieve answers given a query while keeping the sensitive information secret at local knowledge graphs. In the future, we aim to propose new methods for better answering complex queries by exploiting intrinsic information in the distributed knowledge graphs.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors of this paper were supported by the NSFC Fund (U20B2053) from the NSFC of China, the RIF (R6020-19 and R6021-20) and the GRF (16211520 and 16205322) from RGC of Hong Kong. We also thank the support from UGC Research Matching Grants (RMGS20EG01-D, RMGS20CR11, RMGS20CR12, RMGS20EG19, RMGS20EG21, RMGS23CR05, RMGS23EG08).

REFERENCES

- [1] Dimitrios Alivanistos, Max Berrendorf, Michael Cochez, and Mikhail Galkin. 2021. Query Embedding on Hyper-Relational Knowledge Graphs. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [2] Erik Arakelyan, Daniel Daza, Pasquale Minervini, and Michael Cochez. 2020. Complex Query Answering with Neural Link Predictors. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [3] Jiaxin Bai, Xin Liu, Weiqi Wang, Chen Luo, and Yangqiu Song. 2023. Complex Query Answering on Eventuality Knowledge Graph with Implicit Logical Constraints. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.19068* (2023).
- [4] Jiaxin Bai, Chen Luo, Zheng Li, Qingyu Yin, Bing Yin, and Yangqiu Song. 2023. Knowledge graph reasoning over entities and numerical values. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.01399* (2023).
- [5] Jiaxin Bai, Zihao Wang, Hongming Zhang, and Yangqiu Song. 2022. Query2Particles: Knowledge Graph Reasoning with Particle Embeddings. *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022-Findings* (2022).
- [6] Jiaxin Bai, Tianshi Zheng, and Yangqiu Song. 2023. Sequential query encoding for complex query answering on knowledge graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13114* (2023).
- [7] Kurt Bollacker, Colin Evans, Praveen Paritosh, Tim Sturge, and Jamie Taylor. 2008. Freebase: a collaboratively created graph database for structuring human knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 2008 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data*. 1247–1250.

- [8] Antoine Bordes, Nicolas Usunier, Alberto Garcia-Duran, Jason Weston, and Oksana Yakhnenko. 2013. Translating embeddings for modeling multi-relational data. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 26 (2013).
- [9] Yixin Cao, Xiang Wang, Xiangnan He, Zikun Hu, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2019. Unifying knowledge graph learning and recommendation: Towards a better understanding of user preferences. In *The world wide web conference*. 151–161.
- [10] Andrew Carlson, Justin Betteridge, Bryan Kisiel, Burr Settles, Estevam Hruschka, and Tom Mitchell. 2010. Toward an architecture for never-ending language learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 24. 1306–1313.
- [11] Mingyang Chen, Wen Zhang, Zhen Yao, Xiangnan Chen, Mengxiao Ding, Fei Huang, and Huajun Chen. 2022. Meta-Learning Based Knowledge Extrapolation for Knowledge Graphs in the Federated Setting. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-22*, Lud De Raedt (Ed.). International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, 1966–1972. <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2022/273> Main Track.
- [12] Mingyang Chen, Wen Zhang, Zonggang Yuan, Yantao Jia, and Huajun Chen. 2021. Fede: Embedding knowledge graphs in federated setting. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Joint Conference on Knowledge Graphs*. 80–88.
- [13] Mingyang Chen, Wen Zhang, Zonggang Yuan, Yantao Jia, and Huajun Chen. 2022. Federated knowledge graph completion via embedding-contrastive learning. *Knowledge-Based Systems* 252 (2022), 109459. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knsys.2022.109459>
- [14] Mingyang Chen, Wen Zhang, Yushan Zhu, Hongting Zhou, Zonggang Yuan, Changliang Xu, and Huajun Chen. 2022. Meta-Knowledge Transfer for Inductive Knowledge Graph Embedding. In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 927–937. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3477495.3531757>
- [15] Nurendra Choudhary, Nikhil Rao, Sumeet Katariya, Karthik Subbian, and Chandan Reddy. 2021. Probabilistic entity representation model for reasoning over knowledge graphs. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), 23440–23451.
- [16] Whitfield Diffie and Martin E Hellman. 2022. New directions in cryptography. In *Democratizing Cryptography: The Work of Whitfield Diffie and Martin Hellman*. 365–390.
- [17] Vasih Duddu, Antoine Boutet, and Virat Shejwalkar. 2020. Quantifying privacy leakage in graph embedding. In *MobiQuitous 2020-17th EAI International Conference on Mobile and Ubiquitous Systems: Computing, Networking and Services*. 76–85.
- [18] Cynthia Dwork. 2008. Differential privacy: A survey of results. In *International conference on theory and applications of models of computation*. Springer, 1–19.
- [19] Robin C Geyer, Tassilo Klein, and Moin Nabi. 2017. Differentially private federated learning: A client level perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.07557* (2017).
- [20] Will Hamilton, Payal Bajaj, Marinka Zitnik, Dan Jurafsky, and Jure Leskovec. 2018. Embedding logical queries on knowledge graphs. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 31 (2018).
- [21] Ce Hu, Baisong Liu, Xueyuan Zhang, Zhiye Wang, Chennan Lin, and Linze Luo. 2022. A Federated Multi-Server Knowledge Graph Embedding Framework For Link Prediction. In *2022 IEEE 34th International Conference on Tools with Artificial Intelligence (ICTAI)*. IEEE, 366–371.
- [22] Hui Hu, Lu Cheng, Jayden Parker Vap, and Mike Borowczak. 2022. Learning privacy-preserving graph convolutional network with partially observed sensitive attributes. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*. 3552–3561.
- [23] Qi Hu and Yangqiu Song. 2023. User Consented Federated Recommender System Against Personalized Attribute Inference Attack. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.16203* (2023).
- [24] Yuke Hu, Wei Liang, Ruofan Wu, Kai Xiao, Weiqiang Wang, Xiaochen Li, Jinfei Liu, and Zhan Qin. 2023. Quantifying and Defending against Privacy Threats on Federated Knowledge Graph Embedding. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023 (Austin, TX, USA) (WWW '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2306–2317. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3543507.3583450>
- [25] Wei Huang, Jia Liu, Tianrui Li, Shengong Ji, Dexian Wang, and Tianqiang Huang. 2022. FedCKE: Cross-Domain Knowledge Graph Embedding in Federated Learning. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data* (2022).
- [26] Bhushan Kotnis, Carolin Lawrence, and Mathias Niepert. 2021. Answering complex queries in knowledge graphs with bidirectional sequence encoders. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 35. 4968–4977.
- [27] Julien Leblay and Melisachew Wudage Chekol. 2018. Deriving validity time in knowledge graph. In *Companion Proceedings of the The Web Conference 2018*. 1771–1776.
- [28] Lihui Liu, Boxin Du, Heng Ji, ChengXiang Zhai, and Hanghang Tong. 2021. Neural-answering logical queries on knowledge graphs. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*. 1087–1097.
- [29] Xiao Liu, Shiyu Zhao, Kai Su, Yukuo Cen, Jiezhong Qiu, Mengdi Zhang, Wei Wu, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. 2022. Mask and reason: Pre-training knowledge

- graph transformers for complex logical queries. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 1120–1130.
- [30] Guodong Long, Yue Tan, Jing Jiang, and Chengqi Zhang. 2020. Federated learning for open banking. In *Federated Learning: Privacy and Incentive*. Springer, 240–254.
- [31] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. 2018. Decoupled Weight Decay Regularization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [32] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Agüera y Arcas. 2017. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR, 1273–1282.
- [33] Payman Mohassel and Yupeng Zhang. 2017. Secureml: A system for scalable privacy-preserving machine learning. In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 19–38.
- [34] Pascal Paillier. 1999. Public-key cryptosystems based on composite degree residuosity classes. In *International conference on the theory and applications of cryptographic techniques*. Springer, 223–238.
- [35] Hao Peng, Haoran Li, Yangqiu Song, Vincent Zheng, and Jianxin Li. 2021. Differentially private federated knowledge graphs embedding. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*. 1416–1425.
- [36] Hao Peng, Haoran Li, Yangqiu Song, Vincent W. Zheng, and Jianxin Li. 2021. Differentially Private Federated Knowledge Graphs Embedding. In *CIKM 2021*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.07615>
- [37] Hongyu Ren, Mikhail Galkin, Michael Cochez, Zhaocheng Zhu, and Jure Leskovec. 2023. Neural graph reasoning: Complex logical query answering meets graph databases. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.14617* (2023).
- [38] Hongyu Ren, Weihua Hu, and Jure Leskovec. 2020. Query2box: Reasoning over knowledge graphs in vector space using box embeddings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.05969* (2020).
- [39] Hongyu Ren and Jure Leskovec. 2020. Beta embeddings for multi-hop logical reasoning in knowledge graphs. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 19716–19726.
- [40] Wei Tang, Zhiqian Wu, Yixin Cao, Yong Liao, and Pengyuan Zhou. 2023. FedMKGC: Privacy-Preserving Federated Multilingual Knowledge Graph Completion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.10645* (2023).
- [41] Kristina Toutanova and Danqi Chen. 2015. Observed versus latent features for knowledge base and text inference. In *Proceedings of the 3rd workshop on continuous vector space models and their compositionality*. 57–66.
- [42] Dingmin Wang, Yeyuan Chen, and Bernardo Cuenca Grau. 2023. Efficient embeddings of logical variables for query answering over incomplete knowledge graphs. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 37. 4652–4659.
- [43] Maolin Wang, Dun Zeng, Zenglin Xu, Ruocheng Guo, and Xiangyu Zhao. 2023. Federated Knowledge Graph Completion via Latent Embedding Sharing and Tensor Factorization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.10341* (2023).
- [44] Quan Wang, Bin Wang, and Li Guo. 2015. Knowledge base completion using embeddings and rules. In *Twenty-fourth international joint conference on artificial intelligence*.
- [45] Xiang Wang, Xiangnan He, Yixin Cao, Meng Liu, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2019. Kgat: Knowledge graph attention network for recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*. 950–958.
- [46] Zihao Wang, Yangqiu Song, Ginny Wong, and Simon See. 2022. Logical Message Passing Networks with One-hop Inference on Atomic Formulas. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [47] Zhaohan Xi, Ren Pang, Changjiang Li, Tianyu Du, Shouling Ji, Fenglong Ma, and Ting Wang. 2022. Reasoning over Multi-view Knowledge Graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.13702* (2022).
- [48] Chenyan Xiong, Russell Power, and Jamie Callan. 2017. Explicit semantic ranking for academic search via knowledge graph embedding. In *Proceedings of the 26th international conference on world wide web*. 1271–1279.
- [49] Dong Yang, Peijun Qing, Yang Li, Haonan Lu, and Xiaodong Lin. 2022. GammaE: Gamma Embeddings for Logical Queries on Knowledge Graphs. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 745–760.
- [50] Liu Yang, Ben Tan, Vincent W Zheng, Kai Chen, and Qiang Yang. 2020. Federated recommendation systems. *Federated Learning: Privacy and Incentive* (2020), 225–239.
- [51] Qiang Yang, Yang Liu, Tianjian Chen, and Yongxin Tong. 2019. Federated machine learning: Concept and applications. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)* 10, 2 (2019), 1–19.
- [52] Kai Zhang, Yu Wang, Hongyi Wang, Lifu Huang, Carl Yang, Xun Chen, and Lichao Sun. 2022. Efficient federated learning on knowledge graphs via privacy-preserving relation embedding aggregation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.09553* (2022).
- [53] Zhanqiu Zhang, Jie Wang, Jiajun Chen, Shuiwang Ji, and Feng Wu. 2021. Cone: Cone embeddings for multi-hop reasoning over knowledge graphs. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), 19172–19183.
- [54] Zhaocheng Zhu, Mikhail Galkin, Zuobai Zhang, and Jian Tang. 2022. Neural-symbolic models for logical queries on knowledge graphs. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 27454–27478.

A PARAMETER SHARING

In this section, we provide an example of sharing secrets between clients. The parameters can be shared under the protection using various encryption methods, for example, the commonly used is Diffie–Hellman key exchange [16] shown as follows, we consider the sharing process between two clients:

- Client A and client B publicly agree to use a modulus p and base g , p is a prime.
- Client A chooses a secret integer a , then sends client B $m_A = g^a \bmod p$.
- Client B chooses a secret integer b , then sends Alice $n_B = g^b \bmod p$.
- Client A computes $s = m_B^a \bmod p$.
- Client B computes $s = m_A^b \bmod p$.

After D-H key exchange, Client A and B share a secret $s = g^{ab} \bmod p$. The secret s can be used as encryption to share sensitive information between clients.

B ALGORITHM

In this section, we present the pseudo code for FedCQA.

Algorithm 2: FedCQA Framework

Require: The number of clients N ; The fraction of clients selected in each round F ;

Client C_i :

Client C_i initialize entity embeddings \mathbf{E}^i and perturbation embeddings \mathbf{E}_r^i .

Share \mathbf{E}_r^i with other clients with encryption

Receive and decryption to get $\{\mathbf{E}_r^1, \dots, \mathbf{E}_r^N\}$

Upload \mathbf{E}^i to server for secret aggregation, receive \mathbf{E}_0^i

Server:

Server constructs permutation matrices $\{M_i\}_{i=1}^N$, and existence vectors $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^N$ and initialize operator networks Θ_0 , distribute to all clients.

for $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**

Server distributes operator networks to each client.

$C_t \leftarrow$ Randomly select client set with $N \times F$ clients.

for $C_i \in C_t$ **in parallel do**

$(\mathbf{E}_r^i + \mathbf{E}_{t+1}^i), \Theta_{t+1}^i \leftarrow \mathbf{ClientUpdate}(C_i, M^{i\top} \mathbf{E}_r^i, \Theta_t)$

end for

$\mathbf{E}_{t+1}^r \leftarrow (\mathbb{1} \otimes \sum_{i \in C_t} \mathbf{v}^i) \otimes \sum_{i \in C_t} M^i (\mathbf{E}_{t+1}^i + \mathbf{E}_r^i)$

$\Theta_{t+1} \leftarrow 1/|C_t| \sum_{i \in C_t} \Theta_t^i$

end for

ClientUpdate $(C_i, \mathbf{E}^i, \Theta)$:

$\mathbf{E} \leftarrow \mathbf{E}^i - M^{i\top} (\mathbb{1} \otimes \sum_{j \in C} \mathbf{v}^j) \otimes \sum_{j \in C} M^j \mathbf{E}_r^j$

for $e = 1, \dots, E$ **do**

$\mathbf{E}, \Theta \leftarrow \mathbf{LocalUpdate}(\mathbf{E}, \Theta)$

end for

return $\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{E}_r^i, \Theta$
