

# From Latent to Lucid: Transforming Knowledge Graph Embeddings into Interpretable Structures

Christoph Wehner<sup>1,2</sup>, Chrysa Iliopoulou<sup>1</sup>, Tarek R. Besold<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Sony AI Barcelona

<sup>2</sup>Cognitive Systems Group, University of Bamberg

{first.second}@sony.com

## Abstract

This paper introduces a post-hoc explainable AI method tailored for Knowledge Graph Embedding models. These models are essential to Knowledge Graph Completion yet criticized for their opaque, black-box nature. Despite their significant success in capturing the semantics of knowledge graphs through high-dimensional latent representations, their inherent complexity poses substantial challenges to explainability. Unlike existing methods, our approach directly decodes the latent representations encoded by Knowledge Graph Embedding models, leveraging the principle that similar embeddings reflect similar behaviors within the Knowledge Graph. By identifying distinct structures within the subgraph neighborhoods of similarly embedded entities, our method identifies the statistical regularities on which the models rely and translates these insights into human-understandable symbolic rules and facts. This bridges the gap between the abstract representations of Knowledge Graph Embedding models and their predictive outputs, offering clear, interpretable insights. Key contributions include a novel post-hoc explainable AI method for Knowledge Graph Embedding models that provides immediate, faithful explanations without retraining, facilitating real-time application even on large-scale knowledge graphs. The method's flexibility enables the generation of rule-based, instance-based, and analogy-based explanations, meeting diverse user needs. Extensive evaluations show our approach's effectiveness in delivering faithful and well-localized explanations, enhancing the transparency and trustworthiness of Knowledge Graph Embedding models.

## 1 Introduction

Knowledge Graphs (KG), despite their vast potential for structuring and leveraging information, are notoriously incomplete (Ji et al. 2022; Eirich et al. 2023). To mitigate this issue, link prediction has emerged as a technique for uncovering previously unknown links within these graphs (Hogan et al. 2021). Knowledge Graph Embedding (KGE) models have become the de facto standard due to their ability to capture the complex relationships and semantics embedded within the graph structure through high-dimensional latent representations (Ji et al. 2022). However, despite their effectiveness, these models are criticized for their black-box nature (Schramm, Wehner, and Schmid 2023), which obscures the underlying mechanisms and rationales behind their predictions (Schwalbe and Finzel 2023), posing challenges for

explainability in critical applications (Wehner et al. 2022; Wehner, Kertel, and Wewerka 2023).

Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) has made significant progress in demystifying the opaque decision-making processes of complex black-box models (Schwalbe and Finzel 2023). Despite the development of explainable methods such as LIME (Ribeiro, Singh, and Guestrin 2016), SHAP (Lundberg and Lee 2017), Layer-wise Relevance Propagation (Montavon et al. 2019), and Integrated Gradients (Sundararajan, Taly, and Yan 2017), applying these methods to KGE models presents a non-trivial challenge. These methods traditionally work by attributing parts of the input as relevant or not to the model's output. However, embedding-based link prediction operates differently. It relies on the latent representations of entities and relations in a triple (head, relation, tail) to compute a score with the help of an interaction function. This score is then used to create an ordinal ranking of the plausibility of different permutations for the head, relation, or tail (Ji et al. 2022). In this context, simply assigning relevance to the latent representations of the triple provides minimal insight into the underlying rationale of the prediction. The inherent complexity of these embeddings and the abstract nature of the relations they capture make it difficult to draw clear, interpretable connections between input features and the model's output.

Our approach leverages the principle that KGE models encode a KG's statistical regularities into latent representations, reflecting the KG's structure and interactions. Central to our method is the notion that entities with similar embeddings behave similarly within the KG. We aim to decode these embeddings by identifying distinct structures in the subgraph neighborhoods of entities with similar embeddings, revealing the model's relied-upon statistical regularities. These structures can be represented as human-understandable symbolic rules and facts, clarifying the predictive patterns in localized subgraphs. Our evaluations show that the proposed method outperforms state-of-the-art methods regarding faithfulness to the model's decision process and that the explainable evidence is better centered around a region of interest.

This work contributes (1) a novel post-hoc explainable AI method for KGEs. In contrast to others, our method is aligned with the operational mechanics of KGE models, ensuring explanations are faithful to the model's decision-




Figure 1: KGEExplainer generates post-hoc explanations of KGE models in five steps. The five steps are discussed in detail in Section 3.

making process, localized around a region of interest and immediate, thereby eliminating the need to retrain the model on occluded training data. This enables real-time, scalable explanations within extensive KGs. (2) Furthermore, our method is versatile, producing explanations in various forms, including rule-based, instance-based, and analogy-based, making it adaptable to diverse user requirements. (3) Through comprehensive evaluations, we demonstrate that our approach performs well compared to existing state-of-the-art methods regarding faithfulness to the model’s decision-making process.

## 2 Preliminaries

This section briefly introduces Knowledge Graphs, Knowledge Graph Completion (KGC) and Knowledge Graph Embeddings and fixes some notations to be used later.

### 2.1 Knowledge Graph

A Knowledge Graph is a directed labeled graph  $G$  (Hogan et al. 2021), consisting of triples (i.e., facts)  $G \subseteq E \times R \times E$  from the entity set  $E$  and relation set  $R$ , allowing the traversal of a triple  $(e^{head}, r, e^{tail})$  from a head to a tail entity. Triples can be expressed as grounded binary predicates  $r(e^{head}, e^{tail})$ . The relation acts as the binary predicate and the entities as the grounding constants. A KG assigns each entity and relation a symbolic label (e.g., name). KGs are structured according to a semantic schema  $s : E \rightarrow C$  (Hogan et al. 2021). This schema categorizes entities into classes  $C$  within the KG’s domain, facilitating the storage and retrieval of semantically rich, relational data. Nonetheless, the construction of KGs demands substantial expert knowledge, leading to the common issue of incomplete knowledge graphs.

### 2.2 Knowledge Graph Completion

Knowledge Graph Completion addresses the challenge of inherently incomplete KGs (Hogan et al. 2021). For KGs, there exists a subset of correct but unknown triples

$G_{unknown} \subseteq E \times R \times E$  that do not intersect with the existing graph  $G$ . KGC aims to uncover these missing facts by exploiting the regularities and patterns inherent in the KG, thus deducing the unknown triples. In practice, KGC models are queried with partial triples  $(e^{head}, r, ?)$ ,  $(?, r, e^{tail})$ , or  $(e^{head}, ?, e^{tail})$ , seeking to complete these by predicting the missing entity or relation. The model then generates a ranked list of candidates. The higher the rank, the more plausible it is for a candidate to complete the triple (Rossi et al. 2021).

### 2.3 Knowledge Graph Embeddings

Knowledge Graph Embedding models enable KGC by focusing on learning latent space representations (i.e., embeddings) for entities and relations within a knowledge graph (Ali et al. 2021). By employing interaction functions, these models assign scores to the embeddings of triples, where higher scores indicate a greater plausibility of the triple being true. This scoring mechanism is crucial for optimizing the embeddings to favor existing triples over corrupted ones, ensuring that the embeddings reflect the KG’s statistical regularities. Consequently, entities exhibiting similar behaviors within the graph are represented by similar embeddings (Rossi et al. 2021; Ji et al. 2022). Models such as TransE (Bordes et al. 2013) optimize embeddings by aligning the sum of entity and relation embeddings with the missing entity’s embedding. DistMult (Yang et al. 2015) and ComplEx (Trouillon et al. 2016) further refine this approach by implementing a trilinear dot product and extending capabilities to capture non-symmetric relationships. Other models like ConvE (Dettmers et al. 2018) utilize convolutions in the interaction function. Despite the advancements in KGE models, the complexity and abstractness of the embeddings pose significant challenges in establishing clear, interpretable links between input features and model outputs.

### 3 Method

The approach is rooted in the understanding that KGE models encapsulate the intrinsic statistical patterns of a KG in their latent representations, encoding the graph’s topology and the interactions between its entities. At the core is the assumption that entities sharing similar embeddings exhibit comparable behavior within the symbolic KG. By analyzing the subgraph neighborhoods of these entities, statistical regularities are discovered, in the form of conjunctive clauses (e.g.,  $r_1(x, Y) \wedge r_2(Y, z)$ ), that KGE models depend on. KGExplainer translates these regularities into symbolic rules, or triples comprehensible to humans, thereby uncovering the rationale behind the models’ predictions in local subgraph contexts. This allows KGExplainer to post hoc explain the predicted triple  $(e_p^{head}, r_p, e_p^{tail})$ , by accessing the knowledge graph and the embeddings learned by the KGE.

The method is build on five steps (cf. Figure 1):

1. get k-nearest neighbors in the latent space of the predicted triple,
2. create positive and negative entity-pairs from the nearest neighbors,
3. mine all possible clauses and their frequency within the subgraph-neighbourhood of the pairs,
4. identify the most descriptive clauses for positive entity-pairs with the help of a surrogate model and
5. create an explanation from the n-most descriptive clauses.

The following section shall step by step introduce the post-hoc explainability method.

#### 3.1 Step 1: Identifying K-Nearest Neighbors

In the initial step of the post-hoc explainability method, the embedding  $t_p$  of a given predicted triple is taken as an input. The k-nearest neighbors  $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_k$  are then retrieved from the set of all KGE model training triple embeddings  $T_{train}$ , based on the Euclidean distance ( $L^2$  norm). The Euclidian distance is used as it demonstrated robust performance in finding similarity-based explanations in previous work conducted on image data (Hanawa et al. 2021). The retrieval is described by the equation:

$$kNN(t_p) = \underset{t \in T}{\operatorname{argmin}}_k \|t_p - t\|_2 \quad (1)$$

In this equation,  $\operatorname{argmin}_k$  identifies the  $k$  embeddings  $t$  that yield the smallest Euclidean distances to  $t_p$ , thus isolating the embeddings in the latent space that are most likely to exhibit significant statistical regularities in common with the predicted triple. This step guarantees that the explanation generated in downstream steps reflects the internal mechanics of the KGE model by localizing the explanation around the instance that the model learned to see and treat similarly. The embeddings are then mapped back to their symbolic triple representations, the relationship symbol is dropped and the entity-pairs are stored in  $N = ((e_1^{head}, e_1^{tail}), (e_2^{head}, e_2^{tail}), \dots, (e_k^{head}, e_k^{tail}))$ . In the next step, positive and negative pairs are created with the help of the pairs in  $N$ .

#### 3.2 Step 2: Create Positive and Negative Entity-Pairs

Step two involves the construction of positive and negative entity-pairs. For each nearest neighbor pair  $(e_i, e_j)$  from the set  $N$ , a pair is a member of the positive entity-pairs  $P^+$  if  $(e_i, r_p, e_i)$  is an existing fact in  $G$ , thereby ensuring that the pair connected by the same type as the predicted relationship is consistent with known facts. Conversely, a negative pair  $(e_k, e_l)$  is member of  $P^-$  if  $(e_k, r_p, e_l)$  does not exist in  $G$ , essentially representing a corrupted version of a positive pair. This is formally expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned} P^+ &= \{(e_i, e_j) \in N \mid (e_i, r_p, e_j) \in G\} \\ P^- &= \{(e_k, e_l) \mid (e_k = e_i \oplus e_l = e_j) \\ &\quad \wedge (e_k, r_p, e_l) \notin G\} \\ &\quad , \text{with } (e_i, e_j) \in P^+ \wedge n \in E \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The process results in two sets,  $P^+$  containing pairs that are connected by the predicted link and have a similar latent representation to the predicted triple, and  $P^-$ , which includes pairs that serve as corrupted versions of the positive pairs. In practice, we sample one corrupted pair for every positive pair in  $P^+$ . This procedure is similar to the stochastic local closed-world assumption (Ali et al. 2021) applied while training KGE models.

#### 3.3 Step 3: Mining Clause Frequencies

In the third step, clauses and their frequencies for the entity pairs in  $P$  are mined within  $G$ .

---

**Algorithm 1** Mining Clauses and Frequencies in Subgraph Neighborhoods of Entity Pairs

---

**Input:** Set of positive pairs  $P^+$ , set of negative pairs  $P^-$ , knowledge graph  $G$

**Parameter:** Maximum walk length  $n$

**Output:** Dictionary  $D$  mapping pairs to unique clauses and their frequencies

```

for  $\forall (e_{head}, e_{tail}) \in P^+ \cup P^-$  do
  Initialize an empty list  $S_{(e_{head}, e_{tail})}$  to store clauses
  for each walk  $w$  of  $(1 \rightarrow n)$ -steps in  $G$  starting/ending
  at  $e_{head}$  or  $e_{tail}$  do
     $c \leftarrow$  clause obtained by applying  $a$  to entities in  $w$ 
    if length of  $w = 1$  then
       $c \leftarrow c \cup w$  with abstracted head and tail entity
    end if
    Append  $c$  to  $S_{(e_{head}, e_{tail})}$ 
  end for
  for each unique clause  $c$  in  $S_{(e_{head}, e_{tail})}$  do
     $f_c \leftarrow \frac{|(c \in S_{(e_{head}, e_{tail})})|}{|S_{(e_{head}, e_{tail})}|}$ 
    Store  $(c, f_c)$  in  $D_{(e_{head}, e_{tail})}$ 
  end for
end for

```

---

For each pair  $(e_{head}, e_{tail})$  in the combined set of positive and negative pairs  $P = \{P^+ \cup P^-\}$ , walks  $w$  of  $(1 \rightarrow n)$ -

steps are constructed in  $G$ , initiating or terminating at either  $e_{head}$  or  $e_{tail}$ .

Each entity in  $w$  undergoes a transformation through a function  $a : E \rightarrow C \cup \{Head, Tail\}$ , which abstracts entities to their respective classes, while assigning  $e_{head}$  and  $e_{tail}$  the class  $Head$  and  $Tail$ . This abstraction acknowledges the predictive significance of paths that either start or finish at the head or tail entities. Each abstracted walk is a clause  $c$ .

Additionally, single-step walks initiating or terminating at either  $e_{head}$  or  $e_{tail}$  are constructed, wherein only the head and tail entities are abstracted, enabling the capture of properties directly related to the head or tail node.

The method thus captures following clause types:

$$r_1(x, W) \wedge r_2(X, Y) \wedge \dots \wedge r_m(Y, y) \quad (3)$$

$$r_1(x, W) \wedge r_2(X, Y) \wedge \dots \wedge r_m(Y, Z) \quad (4)$$

$$r_1(X, Y) \wedge r_2(Y, Z) \wedge \dots \wedge r_m(Z, y) \quad (5)$$

$$r(x, e), \quad (6)$$

where  $x, y \in \{Head, Tail\}$  and  $x \neq y$ , the variable  $m \leq n$  is the actual step length, and  $W, X, Y$ , and  $Z$  are classes.

For each unique clause thus obtained, its entailment frequency  $f_c$  within the subgraph neighborhood of an entity-pair is computed. The frequency of a clause, quantifies the ratio of its groundings within the subgraph neighborhood to the total number of groundings of all clauses within the same locality. This provides a relative measure of prevalence for each clause, reflecting its significance in the subgraph neighborhood of an entity-pair.

The tuple  $(c, f_c)$  is stored in  $D_{(e_{head}, e_{tail})}$  for each pair. Thus, it stores all unique clauses coupled with their frequencies for every pair. Algorithm 1 details the third step.

This process ensures that the frequency landscape of clauses is mapped, which is used in the following step for identifying the statistical regularities, in the form of clauses, the KGE model implicitly relies on for its prediction.

### 3.4 Step 4: Leveraging Surrogate Models for Identifying Descriptive Clauses in Positive Entity Pairings

The dataset  $D$  establishes a classic tabular machine learning setup, wherein instances are represented by entity pairs, features by clauses, and values by the frequency of the clauses (cf. Figure 1). The labels are categorized as positive or negative based on the entity pair’s membership of  $P^+$  or  $P^-$ . The objective is to identify which feature (clause) contributes the most to classifying an entity pair as positive. This is achieved by utilizing surrogate models, which allow to extract the feature important to interpret the complex relationships within the data.

The goal is thus to assign each clause a score by which it is ranked in accordance to its relevance for classifying an entity pair as positive or negative.

For KGEExplainer mean decrease in impurity (Nembrini, König, and Wright 2018), K-Lasso (Ribeiro, Singh, and Guestrin 2016), and HSIC-Lasso (Yamada et al. 2014) are studied and compared to identify feature importance.

The **Mean Decrease in Impurity** (MDI) quantifies each clause’s role in classifying positive or negative sample in  $D$  through an ensemble of decision trees (Nembrini, König, and Wright 2018). This process entails iterative data splitting based on clauses that maximize impurity reduction, employing the Gini impurity (Nembrini, König, and Wright 2018) as a measure of this reduction. The Gini impurity for a dataset  $d \in D$  is defined as:

$$Gini(d) = 1 - \sum_i p(i|t)^2 \quad (7)$$

where  $p(i|t)$  denotes the proportion of class  $i \in \{positive, negative\}$  at tree-node  $d \subseteq D$ , adjusted by weights  $\alpha$  reflecting the  $L^2$  distance of the pair embedding  $t$  to the predicted pairs’s embedding  $t_p$ . The weight is defined as an exponential kernel  $\alpha(t) = \exp(-L^2(t_p, t)^2/\sigma^2)$  with kernel width  $\sigma$ . This assigns a higher impact to pairs that are perceived by the model as similar. The Gini impurity evaluates the likelihood of mislabeling an element if randomly assigned based on the subset’s label distribution, serving as a statistical regularity indicator in  $D$ . Most relevant features reduce the Gini impurity of a dataset by the most over all nodes within the tree.

The impurity reduction ( $\Delta Gini$ ) (Nembrini, König, and Wright 2018) from splitting at tree-node  $d$  on clause  $c$ , yielding “positive” ( $L$ ) and “negative” ( $R$ ) child nodes, is given by:

$$\Delta Gini(d, c) = Gini(d) - \left( \frac{N_L}{N_d} Gini(L) + \frac{N_R}{N_d} Gini(R) \right) \quad (8)$$

Here,  $N_d$ ,  $N_L$ , and  $N_R$  represent the weighted counts of samples at the parent node and in each child node, respectively.

The MDI for a clause across the ensemble is the impurity reductions’ mean, weighted by the samples reaching the nodes where the feature splits the data:

$$MDI(c) = 1 - \frac{\gamma_c}{N} \sum_{d_c \in D} \Delta Gini(d_c, c) N_d \quad (9)$$

where  $d_c$  is a node split on clause  $c$ , and  $N_d$  is the total sample count in  $d_c$ . We add a weighted frequency co-factor  $\gamma$  to the MDI of a clause. It is defined as:

$$\gamma(c) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \sum_{f \in D^+} f \geq \sum_{f \in D^-} f \\ -1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

This allows to weight in if a clause is more frequent in positive pairs or negative pairs.

MDI thereby assesses clause importance, identifying those crucial for positive pair classifications within  $D$ , revealing key statistical patterns in similar sub-graph neighborhoods. Nonetheless, MDI may favor features with higher cardinality, such as those capturing multi-hop regularities, over binary property relations, due to inherent biases toward features with broader variation (Nembrini, König, and Wright 2018).

The **K-Lasso** method uses a linear model, specifically ridge regression (Hoerl and Kennard 2000), to weight each clause contribution in the classification task within dataset  $D$ . The method learns a weight for every feature (clause), employing linear least squares with  $L^2$  regularization to optimize the model (Ribeiro, Singh, and Guestrin 2016). The objective function minimized by this model is formalized as:

$$\min_{(e_i, e_j) \in D} \sum \alpha_{(e_i, e_j)} (y_{(e_i, e_j)} - C_{(e_i, e_j)}^T w) + \beta \|w\|_2^2 \quad (11)$$

Here,  $N$  is the number of instances,  $y \in \{-1, 1\}$  is the label for the entity pair  $(e_i, e_j) \in D$ ,  $C$  is the feature vector holding the frequencies of all clauses of an entity pair, and  $w$  is the vector of weights corresponding to the clauses. The kernel  $\alpha(t) = \exp(-L^2(t_p, t)^2/\sigma^2)$  with kernel width  $\sigma$  scales the impact of pairs that are perceived by the model as similar, allowing for differential emphasis on instances that are perceived by the model as closer to the predicted triple. The term is the weighted sum of squared residuals, where each residual’s contribution is adjusted by the distance-specific weight  $\alpha_{(e_i, e_j)}$ . The parameter  $\beta$  is for the  $L^2$  regularization, penalizing the sum of squared weights to prevent overfitting. After fitting the surrogate model, the learned weights  $w$  for each feature provide a direct measure of feature importance. These weights reflect the contribution of each clause to the prediction task, with larger absolute values indicating greater importance. This enables the identification of the most relevant clauses that contribute to classifying entity pairs as positive or negative, providing insights on the underlying statistical regularities captured by the KGE models.

Compared to MDI, K-Lasso is not biased towards features with high cardinality. However, it permits only linear feature selection, which may not capture complex relationships in certain datasets effectively (Yamada et al. 2014).

The **Hilbert-Schmidt Independence Criterion Lasso** (HSIC-Lasso) is a supervised nonlinear feature selection methodology aimed at identifying a subset of input features relevant to predicting output values. As an extension of the standard Lasso, HSIC-Lasso incorporates a feature-wise kernelized Lasso to capture nonlinear dependencies between inputs and outputs. This enables it to identify non-redundant features with a significant statistical dependence on the output values (Yamada et al. 2014; Huang et al. 2023).

The optimization problem of HSIC-Lasso is formalized as follows (Yamada et al. 2014):

$$\min_{w_1, \dots, w_d} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{L} - \sum_k w_k \tilde{\mathbf{K}}^{(k)}\|_F^2 + \lambda \sum_k |w_k|, \text{ with } w_1, \dots, w_d \geq 0 \quad (12)$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_F$  denotes the Frobenius norm,  $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}^{(k)}$  represents the centered Gram matrix for the  $k$ -th feature, and  $\mathbf{L}$  is the centered Gram matrix for the output  $y$ .

After training the surrogate model, coefficients ( $w$ ) are obtained, which, when multiplied by the frequency co-factor

$\gamma$  (cf. Equation 10), identify clauses predominantly associated with the sub-graph neighborhood of positive entity pairs. The coefficients reflect how relevant each clause is to the prediction.

### 3.5 Step 5: Generating Explanations from the Most Descriptive Clauses

After obtaining the most descriptive clauses from the surrogate model, they are used to generate explanations of the KGE models prediction. The approach allows to generate three explanation types, each catering to different aspects of user needs: rule-based, instance-based, and analogy-based (cf. Table 1).

**Rule-based** explanations are derived by appending an implication to the identified clauses, thus forming a set of symbolic rules. These rules express the statistical regularities that the KGE model has learned to predict a missing link. For instance, if the most descriptive clause extracted for the predicted triple  $(Alice, knows, Bob)$  is  $knows(Head, Y) \wedge works\_with(Y, Tail)$ , the rule is formulated as  $knows(Alice, Y) \wedge works\_with(Y, Bob) \rightarrow knows(Alice, Bob)$ . This implies that if *Alice knows* someone of the class  $Y$ , and this someone *works\_with* *Tom* the triple  $(Alice, knows, Bob)$  is predicted.

**Instance-based** explanations are generated by grounding the literals in the knowledge graph. Grounding, in logical terms, means replacing the variables in a clause with specific constants from the domain, thus instantiating the clause. For example, if  $knows(Head, Y) \wedge works\_with(Y, Tail)$  is a clause and the predicted triple is  $(Alice, knows, Bob)$ , the grounding would be  $knows(Alice, Tom) \wedge works\_with(Tom, Bob)$ . This type of explanation provides the concrete triples that led the model to predict the *knows*-relation between *Alice* and *Bob*.

**Analogy-based** explanations focus on how the model behaves in similar situations by grounding the literals with the head and tail of the pair from  $P^+$  that is closest in terms of  $L^2$  distance to the predicted pair. This approach demonstrates the model’s behavior on similar instances, for which the prediction is confirmed to be true. For example, if the nearest pair to  $(Alice, knows, Bob)$  in  $P^+$  is  $(Carol, Dave)$ , and  $knows(Head, Y) \wedge works\_with(Y, Tail)$  is a clause, the grounding might be  $knows(Carol, Anja) \wedge works\_with(Anja, Dave)$ . This shows an analogous situation where the model applied similar decision-making.

The resultant triples are then presented to the user. This allows the user to uncover the hidden statistical regularities that the KGE model has learned and utilized to predict the missing link. Such explanations not only enhance the transparency of the model but also increase the user’s trust by making the model’s predictions interpretable and verifiable.

## 4 Evaluation

The evaluation section outlines the protocol to assess the faithfulness of KGExplainer to KGE model behavior, comparing it against a local random baseline, a global random

	1st Clause	2nd Clause	...
<b>Clause</b>	$knows(Head, Y)$ $\wedge works\_with(Y, Tail)$	$knows(Head, Y)$ $\wedge sibling\_of(Y, Tail)$	...
<b>Relevance</b>	0.54	0.31	...
<b>Rule-Based Explanation</b>	$knows(Alice, Y)$ $\wedge works\_with(Y, Bob)$ $\rightarrow knows(Alice, Bob)$	$knows(Alice, Y)$ $\wedge sibling\_of(Y, Bob)$ $\rightarrow knows(Alice, Bob)$	...
<b>Instance-Based Explanation</b>	$knows(Alice, Tom)$ $\wedge works\_with(Tom, Bob)$	$knows(Alice, Pedro)$ $\wedge sibling\_of(Pedro, Bob)$	...
<b>Analogy-Based Explanation</b>	$knows(Carol, Anja)$ $\wedge works\_with(Anja, Dave)$	$knows(Carol, Jan)$ $\wedge sibling\_of(Jan, Dave)$	...

Table 1: Comparison of explanation types generated from descriptive clauses, given the predicted triple (*Alice, knows, Bob*) and its closest positive neighbour (*Carol, Dave*) as an example. For simplicity, the table shows only the two most relevant clauses identified by KGExplainer.

	TransE		DistMult		ConvE	
	MRR	Hits@1	MRR	Hits@1	MRR	Hits@1
Local Random	0.93 ± 0.13	0.88 ± 0.15	0.81 ± 0.13	0.75 ± 0.14	0.83 ± 0.18	0.78 ± 0.17
Global Random	1.00 ± 0.00	1.00 ± 0.00	0.93 ± 0.27	0.84 ± 0.17	0.97 ± 0.04	0.77 ± 0.27
AnyBURLExplainer	0.99 ± 0.01	0.98 ± 0.02	0.52 ± 0.41	0.37 ± 0.45	0.41 ± 0.41	0.33 ± 0.47
KGExplainer - K-Lasso	0.92 ± 0.06	0.85 ± 0.11	0.45 ± 0.32	0.23 ± 0.16	0.46 ± 0.38	0.33 ± 0.47
KGExplainer - HSIC-Lasso	0.97 ± 0.03	0.93 ± 0.06	<b>0.37</b> ± 0.26	<b>0.07</b> ± 0.05	<b>0.31</b> ± 0.14	<b>0.00</b> ± 0.00
KGExplainer - MDI	<b>0.88</b> ± 0.02	<b>0.83</b> ± 0.02	<b>0.37</b> ± 0.26	<b>0.07</b> ± 0.05	0.56 ± 0.33	0.33 ± 0.47

Table 2: Results for FB15k-237. The results are the average and standard deviation of the MRR and Hits@1 over three runs—the lower the MRR and Hits@1, the better. The best results are bold.

baseline and the state-of-the-art method by (Betz, Meilicke, and Stuckenschmidt 2022), using the Kinship (Kemp et al. 2006), WN18RR (Bordes et al. 2013), and FB15k-237 (Toutanova et al. 2015) datasets. Due to the better performance of (Betz, Meilicke, and Stuckenschmidt 2022) over adversarial attack methods, which focus on single adversarial triples, these methods were omitted from the evaluation. This allows for a refined evaluation protocol that better assesses the impact of multi-triple explanations derived from grounding complete clauses or rules, improving on the protocol by (Betz, Meilicke, and Stuckenschmidt 2022). Details of this new protocol, along with results and discussion, will follow.

#### 4.1 Evaluation Setting

The evaluation involves the three benchmark datasets FB15k-237, WN18RR, and Kinship designed for evaluating KGE models. FB15k-237 (Toutanova et al. 2015) is derived from FB15k to address the challenge of inverse relation test leakage. Its splits were problematic because many triples were inverses of each other, leading to leakage between training and testing datasets. FB15k-237 improves upon this by excluding inverse relations, thus containing 310,079 triples, 14,505 entities, and 237 relation types.

WN18RR (Bordes et al. 2013) was developed as an improvement over the WN18 dataset, a WordNet semantic network subset. WN18RR was created to eliminate the issue of inverse relation leakage present in WN18. It includes 93,003 triples, maintaining the same set of 40,943 entities, but reduces the number of relations to 11 from the original 18 in

WN18, focusing on enhancing the quality and reliability of the link predictions made using the dataset.

The Kinships (Kemp et al. 2006) dataset maps the kinship relationships within the Alyawarra tribe from Australia. It comprises 10,686 triples, 104 entities, and 26 types of kinship relations. The entities represent tribe members, and the relations are defined by specific kinship terms like *Adiadya* and *Umbaidya*, reflecting the social structure and rules of familial ties within the tribe. Kinship has a high number of inverse relations, making it suboptimal for assessing the performance of KGE models. However, this enables evaluation of whether the explainability method can capture the KGE model’s dependency on inverse relations and its ability to pinpoint explanations in such regions of interest (e.g.,  $brotherOf(Tom, Hans) \rightarrow brotherOf(Hans, Tom)$ ).

For the evaluation the three KGE models TransE, DistMult, ConvE are trained on the datasets. KGExplainer is able to post-hoc explain any KGE model; the three models were chosen as examples of KGE models with diverse interaction functions.

TransE (Bordes et al. 2013) is an energy-based model that produces embeddings by interpreting relationships as translations in a low-dimensional space. If a relationship holds, the embedding of the tail entity should be proximal to the summation of the head entity embedding and the relation embedding.

DistMult (Yang et al. 2015) simplifies the RESCAL model (Nickel, Tresp, and Krieger 2011) by representing relationships with diagonal matrices instead of full matrices. This reduction in computational complexity comes at

the expense of expressive power, as DistMult cannot model anti-symmetric relations.

ConvE (Dettmers et al. 2018) utilizes a convolutional architecture, which includes a single convolution layer, a projection layer, and an inner product layer. It is parameter efficient and effective in modeling nodes with high in-degree, common in complex knowledge graphs.

These models were configured based on a comprehensive hyperparameter optimization study conducted by (Ali et al. 2021), details are provided in the supplementary material. The PyKEEN library (Ali et al. 2021) is used for the models.

The evaluation assesses KGExplainer using the three different surrogate model configurations: MDI, K-Lasso, and HSIC-Lasso (cf. Section 3.4), all utilizing  $k = 80$  for nearest neighbor search in step 1 (cf. Section 3.1). Additionally, the maximal clause length is set to  $t = 2$  in step 3 (cf. Section 3.3). This setup aligns the evaluation with the method by (Betz, Meilicke, and Stuckenschmidt 2022), which generates rules of up to length 2.

The evaluation of KGExplainer is conducted against two random baselines. The global random baseline selects a random path from the training KG as the explanation, which poses the risk of choosing irrelevant paths in large KGs. The local random baseline, however, selects a random path either starting or ending at the predicted head or tail node, utilizing triples close to the predicted triple, thereby impacting the prediction more significantly and creating a stronger baseline. Both baselines are adjusted to a path length of two steps to align with KGExplainer and the method by (Betz, Meilicke, and Stuckenschmidt 2022) for better comparability.

The state-of-the-art method by (Betz, Meilicke, and Stuckenschmidt 2022) is used to compare the KGExplainer against existing literature. The method by (Betz, Meilicke, and Stuckenschmidt 2022) is called AnyBURLExplainer in the following. AnyBURLExplainer utilizes AnyBURL (Meilicke et al. 2019) to learn rules from a training knowledge graph, which are then used to attack and explain predicted triples. AnyBURLExplainer outperformed other state-of-the-art XAI methods for KGE models in a faithfulness evaluation (Betz, Meilicke, and Stuckenschmidt 2022). Thus, a comparison of KGExplainer and AnyBURLExplainer provides a comprehensive review against existing literature. The evaluation of AnyBURLExplainer is based on an implementation provided by its developers, limiting the rule length to 2 and the rule learning time to 10 minutes.

KGExplainer and AnyBURLExplainer provide multiple triples to explain one predicted triple. This allows for an evaluation protocol that captures the full expressiveness of the post-hoc XAI methods.

## 4.2 Evaluation Protocol

The evaluation protocol is designed to fully utilize an XAI method’s expressivity, measuring its faithfulness by incorporating all triples that are part of the explanation. This approach ensures a comprehensive assessment of the method’s performance.

**Faithfulness** (Hedström et al. 2023), in this context, measures the degree to which explanations mirror the predictive

behavior of the model, asserting that more crucial features exert a stronger influence on model decisions. This relationship is traditionally verified in XAI through input perturbation by removing most relevant features and observing any decline in model performance (Hedström et al. 2023); however, input perturbation is not feasible for KGE models.

Instead, the **protocol** adapts by training a KGE model on the complete training set  $D$  and selecting 20 optimal-performing triples  $P$  from the validation set, achieving a Hits@1 (Ali et al. 2021) and MRR (Ali et al. 2021) of 1 on  $P$ . An explanation  $E$  is generated for each triple in  $P$ , incorporating all grounding triples for the explanation rule or clause. These triples are then removed from  $D$  to form a new training set  $D' = D \setminus E$ , on which the model is retrained from scratch. The performance of  $P$  on this retrained model is assessed by Hits@1 and MRR, with values closer to 0 indicating a higher model deterioration and thus a more faithful explanation. As pointed out by (Betz, Meilicke, and Stuckenschmidt 2022), it is crucial that the filter set used to calculate Hits@1 and MRR remains unaltered by  $E$  to avoid artificially deflating model performance and to genuinely measure the impact of the explanation.

## 4.3 Evaluation Results and Discussion

This section presents the evaluation results for the faithfulness evaluation protocol.

The results for **FB15k-237**, as detailed in Table 2, indicate that KGExplainer consistently outperforms AnyBURLExplainer across all tasks. This performance is attributed to KGExplainer’s ability to reconstruct the decision surface of the KGE model locally, providing explanations more aligned with the model’s decision-making process. For TransE, all methods perform comparably poorly, not surpassing the Local Random baseline. This suggests that TransE’s simple interaction function may not effectively capture logic rules or clauses on FB15k-237, relying instead on reconstructing relations directly from the predicted triple’s immediate neighborhood. In the cases of DistMult and ConvE, although a high standard deviation is observed — a phenomenon also reported by (Betz, Meilicke, and Stuckenschmidt 2022) — a discernible trend favors the KGExplainer with the HSIC-Lasso surrogate model.

The results for **WN18RR** in Table 3 indicate a more balanced performance across methods. KGExplainer with the HSIC-Lasso surrogate surpasses AnyBURLExplainer on TransE, but is slightly outperformed by AnyBURLExplainer on DistMult. Both methods show equivalent performance on ConvE, suggesting they identify similar rules or clauses. While a high standard deviation is observed for all methods on TransE, it is lower for DistMult and ConvE.

In the **Kinship** dataset (cf. Table 4), KGExplainer with the MDI surrogate model exhibits the best performance, though the differences among methods are minimal. Kinship involves rule-based familial relationships, which leads to less variance in XAI methods that generate rule or clause-based explanations. TransE and ConvE show greater robustness compared to DistMult when training data deteriorates, highlighting that DistMult better captures and relies on rules in its latent representations. Conversely, TransE and ConvE

	TransE		DistMult		ConvE	
	MRR	Hits@1	MRR	Hits@1	MRR	Hits@1
Local Random	0.76 ± 0.29	0.80 ± 0.36	0.79 ± 0.05	0.72 ± 0.06	0.72 ± 0.09	0.69 ± 0.03
Global Random	0.89 ± 0.20	0.85 ± 0.25	0.95 ± 0.03	0.83 ± 0.04	0.91 ± 0.11	0.87 ± 0.24
AnyBURLExplainer	0.74 ± 0.20	0.60 ± 0.29	<b>0.27</b> ± 0.03	<b>0.20</b> ± 0.04	<b>0.01</b> ± 0.00	<b>0.00</b> ± 0.00
KGExplainer - K-Lasso	0.50 ± 0.16	0.37 ± 0.19	0.66 ± 0.04	0.62 ± 0.02	<b>0.01</b> ± 0.01	<b>0.00</b> ± 0.00
KGExplainer - HSIC-Lasso	<b>0.34</b> ± 0.13	<b>0.20</b> ± 0.14	0.49 ± 0.08	0.43 ± 0.08	0.04 ± 0.03	<b>0.00</b> ± 0.00
KGExplainer - MDI	0.47 ± 0.19	0.32 ± 0.23	0.37 ± 0.05	0.28 ± 0.05	0.18 ± 0.17	<b>0.00</b> ± 0.00

Table 3: Results for WN18RR. The results are the average and standard deviation of the MRR and Hits@1 over three runs—the lower the MRR and Hits@1, the better. The best results are bold.

	TransE		DistMult		ConvE	
	MRR	Hits@1	MRR	Hits@1	MRR	Hits@1
Local Random	0.87 ± 0.05	0.84 ± 0.09	0.86 ± 0.01	0.80 ± 0.01	0.80 ± 0.06	0.75 ± 0.07
Global Random	0.90 ± 0.01	0.87 ± 0.04	0.92 ± 0.04	0.83 ± 0.04	0.91 ± 0.04	0.87 ± 0.08
AnyBURLExplainer	0.69 ± 0.02	0.46 ± 0.02	0.05 ± 0.02	<b>0.00</b> ± 0.00	0.65 ± 0.05	0.50 ± 0.04
KGExplainer - K-Lasso	0.65 ± 0.03	0.39 ± 0.02	0.06 ± 0.05	0.03 ± 0.04	0.65 ± 0.07	0.48 ± 0.10
KGExplainer - HSIC-Lasso	0.66 ± 0.03	0.40 ± 0.05	<b>0.04</b> ± 0.01	<b>0.00</b> ± 0.00	0.76 ± 0.05	0.63 ± 0.05
KGExplainer - MDI	<b>0.57</b> ± 0.05	<b>0.28</b> ± 0.09	0.05 ± 0.03	<b>0.00</b> ± 0.00	<b>0.60</b> ± 0.03	<b>0.40</b> ± 0.04

Table 4: Results for Kinship. The results are the average and standard deviation of the MRR and Hits@1 over three runs—the lower the MRR and Hits@1, the better. The best results are bold.

rely more heavily on inverse relations, ensuring that the removal of one inverse relation still leaves a high likelihood of another inverse relation existing.

Overall, KGExplainer performs best for all models and datasets, highlighting its ability to explain a wide variety of KGE models robustly. The HSIC-Lasso and the MDI surrogate model perform equally well and outperform K-Lasso overall.

## 5 Related Work

Explainable Artificial Intelligence is about mapping the input of a black-box model to its output. That way, XAI methods compute an explanation of the model’s behaviour. The explanation is supposed to justify the model’s output (Adadi and Berrada 2018; Lipton 2018), helping to identify risks and flaws in the black-box model.

A common approach to achieve this are attribution methods. Attribution methods assign a value to input features resembling how relevant they are to the output. Among the notable local post-hoc XAI methods is LIME (Ribeiro, Singh, and Guestrin 2016). It utilizes local surrogate models to approximate the behavior of black-box models around specific instances, thereby providing local interpretability. Extending this concept, SHAP (Lundberg and Lee 2017) employs Shapley values to calculate attributions across all possible coalitions of features. Integrated Gradients (Sundararajan, Taly, and Yan 2017) calculates the path integral of gradients along the straight line from a baseline to the input, highlighting the contribution of each feature to the difference in output. LRP (Montavon et al. 2019) backpropagates the output to the input layer, redistributing relevance scores across layers to identify relevant features. DEEPLift (Shrikumar, Greenside, and Kundaje 2017) compares activation’s to a reference activation, allocating relevance scores based on the

difference, thus observing the shift caused by each input feature. These methods effectively assign the contributions of input features in standard settings such as tabular, image, or textual data. However, they are not trivial to apply to KGE models due to the complex and latent nature of the input triple, where simple attribution to input dimensions offers minimal insights into the predictive mechanisms.

Several XAI methods have been adapted for KGE models that employ graph neural networks (GNNs), yet their application remains constrained by the specific architectures and mechanisms of GNNs. GraphLIME (Huang et al. 2023) leverages local perturbation and the HSIC-Lasso as a surrogate model to approximate decision surfaces within GNNs. PGMExplainer (Vu and Thai 2020) generates a probabilistic graphical model that captures the Markov blanket of the target prediction, though it is computationally expensive due to its reliance on input perturbation. GraphLRP (Schnake et al. 2022) adapts LRP for GNNs by propagating relevance through their aggregation functions. These methods, designed around the unique operations of GNN-based KGEs, are not universally applicable across the broader spectrum of KGE models, which often do not use GNN frameworks.

For that reason, inherently interpretable KGE models were introduced. DistMult (Yang et al. 2015), for example, introduces a unified framework for learning entity and relation representations using neural embeddings, emphasizing the extraction of logical rules from relation embeddings, which is primarily focused on capturing relational semantics through matrix operations. IterE (Zhang et al. 2019b) extends this by iteratively learning embeddings and rules to complement the weaknesses of each method, particularly enhancing the embeddings of sparse entities through rule incorporation. ExCut (Gad-Elrab et al. 2020) similarly combines embeddings with rule mining but shifts its focus to



wards generating interpretable entity clusters and iteratively refining them with rules derived from embedding patterns. However, these approaches are tailored to one specific KGE model and do not generalise to other models.

One stream of work that is applicable to KGE models comes from research on adversarial attacks. The work of (Pezeshkpour, Tian, and Singh 2019) introduces gradient-based adversarial attacks, emphasizing the identification of influential training facts to test model sensitivity and robustness. Similarly, (Zhang et al. 2019a) targets the robustness of KGEs to adversarial attacks by proposing strategies for data poisoning that directly manipulate the knowledge graph. The approach by (Bhardwaj et al. 2021) uses model-agnostic instance attribution methods from interpretable machine learning to select adversarial deletions, focusing on data poisoning to influence KGE predictions. This contrasts with AnyBURLExplainer (Betz, Meilicke, and Stuckenschmidt 2022). Which uses rule learning and abductive reasoning to perform adversarial attacks independent of the model’s internal workings, thus focusing on explanation via adversarial attacks. AnyBURLExplainer outperformed other adversarial methods in its evaluation study. KGExplainer deviates from these methods by focusing not on crafting adversarial inputs to disrupt the model but on decoding and interpreting the latent representations created by KGE models.

Other work, similar to our approach, focuses on explaining KGE models with surrogate models. The work by (Ruschel, Colombini Gusmão, and Gagliardi Cozman 2024; Gusmão et al. 2018) and (Polleti and Cozman 2019) involves surrogate models that attempt to decode the embeddings through global and local perspectives respectively, with the former utilizing context-aware heuristics and the latter focusing on neighborhood features without capturing multi-hop dependencies. Meanwhile, KGEx (Baltatzis and Costabello 2023) leverages multiple training subsets to generate surrogate models that provide explanations based on training data impact. The approach by (Islam, Aridhi, and Smail-Tabbone 2022) incorporates rule mining with embedding learning, independent of the KGE model.

Other work such as OxKBC (Nandwani et al. 2020) and CPM (Stadelmaier and Padó 2019) generate human-understandable explanations through heuristic templates and context paths, respectively, but struggle with scalability and faithfulness to underlying KGE models. KE-X (Zhao et al. 2023) leverages information entropy for subgraph analysis, improving interpretability but lacking clear heuristics for reconstructing model behavior. FeaBI (Ismail et al. 2023) constructs interpretable vectors for entity embeddings to provide model explanations, while (Chandrasah et al. 2020) focuses on semantic interpretability through entity co-occurrence statistics. Additionally, Kelpie (Rossi et al. 2022) introduces a perturbation-based framework requiring retraining, which is resource-intensive. In contrast to these methods, KGExplainer decodes the latent representations of KGE models. It identifies statistical regularities in the subgraph neighborhood of the predicted link to generate rule-based, instance-based and analogy-based explanations. This approach remains faithful to the model’s behavior and is

computationally inexpensive, as it does not depend on perturbing training data or retraining the model.

## 6 Conclusion

This paper presented KGExplainer, a novel post-hoc explainable AI method explicitly designed for KGE models. Despite their significant utility in knowledge graph completion, KGE models often face criticism due to their black-box nature. KGExplainer directly decodes these models’ latent representations by identifying structural patterns within the subgraph neighborhoods of entities with similar embeddings. By translating these patterns into human-readable rules and facts, the method provides clear, interpretable explanations that bridge the gap between the abstract representations and predictive outputs of KGE models. This work contributes a post-hoc explainable AI approach that requires no retraining, is faithful to model predictions and can adapt to various explanation styles (rule-based, instance-based and analogy-based). Extensive evaluations demonstrated that this method outperforms state-of-the-art approaches, offering a distinct advantage by remaining faithful to the underlying predictive mechanisms of KGE models. Future research will apply KGExplainer to knowledge graph domains, such as the biomedical field, where explainability is critical. Here, clear and interpretable results can improve decision-making and foster trust in AI-based predictions. By providing transparent insights into the patterns and rules guiding KGE models, KGExplainer has the potential to drive advances in knowledge graph applications, ensuring understandability and trustworthiness in complex decision processes.

## Acknowledgments

We thank Sony AI for funding the research and Prof. Ute Schmid for enabling the collaboration.

## References

- Adadi, A., and Berrada, M. 2018. Peeking inside the black-box: A survey on explainable artificial intelligence (xai). *IEEE Access* 6:52138–52160.
- Ali, M.; Berrendorf, M.; Hoyt, C. T.; Vermue, L.; Galkin, M.; Sharifzadeh, S.; Fischer, A.; Tresp, V.; and Lehmann, J. 2021. Bringing light into the dark: A large-scale evaluation of knowledge graph embedding models under a unified framework. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 1–1.
- Baltatzis, V., and Costabello, L. 2023. Kgex: Explaining knowledge graph embeddings via subgraph sampling and knowledge distillation.
- Betz, P.; Meilicke, C.; and Stuckenschmidt, H. 2022. Adversarial explanations for knowledge graph embeddings. In Raedt, L. D., ed., *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-22*, 2820–2826. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization. Main Track.
- Bhardwaj, P.; Kelleher, J.; Costabello, L.; and O’Sullivan, D. 2021. Adversarial attacks on knowledge graph embed-

- dings via instance attribution methods. In Moens, M.-F.; Huang, X.; Specia, L.; and Yih, S. W.-t., eds., *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 8225–8239. Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bordes, A.; Usunier, N.; Garcia-Duran, A.; Weston, J.; and Yakhnenko, O. 2013. Translating embeddings for modeling multi-relational data. In Burges, C.; Bottou, L.; Welling, M.; Ghahramani, Z.; and Weinberger, K., eds., *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 26. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Chandrasah, .; Sengupta, T.; Pragadeesh, C.; and Talukdar, P. 2020. Inducing interpretability in knowledge graph embeddings. In Bhattacharyya, P.; Sharma, D. M.; and Sangal, R., eds., *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Natural Language Processing (ICON)*, 70–75. Indian Institute of Technology Patna, Patna, India: NLP Association of India (NLPAD).
- Dettmers, T.; Minervini, P.; Stenetorp, P.; and Riedel, S. 2018. Convolutional 2d knowledge graph embeddings. In *AAAI'18/IAAI'18/EAAI'18*. AAAI Press.
- Eirich, J.; Jäckle, D.; Sedlmair, M.; Wehner, C.; Schmid, U.; Bernard, J.; and Schreck, T. 2023. Manuknowvis: How to support different user groups in contextualizing and leveraging knowledge repositories. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* 29(8):3441–3457.
- Gad-Elrab, M. H.; Stepanova, D.; Tran, T.-K.; Adel, H.; and Weikum, G. 2020. ExCut: Explainable embedding-based clustering over knowledge graphs. In Pan, J. Z.; Tamma, V.; d’Amato, C.; Janowicz, K.; Fu, B.; Polleres, A.; Seneviratne, O.; and Kagal, L., eds., *The Semantic Web – ISWC 2020*, 218–237. Springer International Publishing.
- Gusmão, A. C.; Correia, A. H. C.; De Bona, G.; and Cozman, F. G. 2018. Interpreting embedding models of knowledge bases: a pedagogical approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.09504*.
- Hanawa, K.; Yokoi, S.; Hara, S.; and Inui, K. 2021. Evaluation of similarity-based explanations. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Hedström, A.; Weber, L.; Krakowczyk, D.; Bareeva, D.; Motzkus, F.; Samek, W.; Lapuschkin, S.; and Höhne, M. M. 2023. Quantus: An explainable ai toolkit for responsible evaluation of neural network explanations and beyond. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 24(34):1–11.
- Hoerl, A. E., and Kennard, R. W. 2000. Ridge regression: Biased estimation for nonorthogonal problems. *Technometrics* 42(1):80–86.
- Hogan, A.; Blomqvist, E.; Cochez, M.; D’Amato, C.; Melo, G. D.; Gutierrez, C.; Kirrane, S.; Gayo, J. E. L.; Navigli, R.; Neumaier, S.; Ngomo, A.-C. N.; Polleres, A.; Rashid, S. M.; Rula, A.; Schmelzeisen, L.; Sequeda, J.; Staab, S.; and Zimmermann, A. 2021. Knowledge graphs. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 54(4).
- Huang, Q.; Yamada, M.; Tian, Y.; Singh, D.; and Chang, Y. 2023. Graphlime: Local interpretable model explanations for graph neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 35(7):6968–6972.
- Islam, M. K.; Aridhi, S.; and Smail-Tabbone, M. 2022. Negative sampling and rule mining for explainable link prediction in knowledge graphs. *Knowledge-Based Systems* 250:109083.
- Ismaeil, Y.; Stepanova, D.; Tran, T.-K.; and Blockeel, H. 2023. Feabi: A feature selection-based framework for interpreting kg embeddings. In Payne, T. R.; Presutti, V.; Qi, G.; Poveda-Villalón, M.; Stoilos, G.; Hollink, L.; Kaoudi, Z.; Cheng, G.; and Li, J., eds., *The Semantic Web – ISWC 2023*, 599–617. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.
- Ji, S.; Pan, S.; Cambria, E.; Marttinen, P.; and Yu, P. S. 2022. A survey on knowledge graphs: Representation, acquisition, and applications. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* 33(2):494–514.
- Kemp, C.; Tenenbaum, J. B.; Griffiths, T. L.; Yamada, T.; and Ueda, N. 2006. Learning systems of concepts with an infinite relational model. In *Proceedings of the 21st National Conference on Artificial Intelligence - Volume 1, AAAI’06*, 381–388. AAAI Press.
- Lipton, Z. C. 2018. The mythos of model interpretability: In machine learning, the concept of interpretability is both important and slippery. *Queue* 16:31–57.
- Lundberg, S. M., and Lee, S.-I. 2017. A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. In Guyon, I.; Luxburg, U. V.; Bengio, S.; Wallach, H.; Fergus, R.; Vishwanathan, S.; and Garnett, R., eds., *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30*. Curran Associates, Inc. 4765–4774.
- Meilicke, C.; Chekol, M. W.; Ruffinelli, D.; and Stuckenschmidt, H. 2019. Anytime bottom-up rule learning for knowledge graph completion. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI’19*, 3137–3143. AAAI Press.
- Montavon, G.; Binder, A.; Lapuschkin, S.; Samek, W.; and Müller, K.-R. 2019. *Layer-Wise Relevance Propagation: An Overview*. Cham: Springer International Publishing. 193–209.
- Nandwani, Y.; Gupta, A.; Agrawal, A.; Chauhan, M. S.; Singla, P.; and Mausam. 2020. Ox{kbc}: Outcome explanation for factorization based knowledge base completion. In *Automated Knowledge Base Construction*.
- Nembrini, S.; König, I. R.; and Wright, M. N. 2018. The revival of the Gini importance? *Bioinformatics* 34(21):3711–3718.
- Nickel, M.; Tresp, V.; and Kriegel, H.-P. 2011. A three-way model for collective learning on multi-relational data. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML’11*, 809–816. Madison, WI, USA: Omnipress.
- Pezeshkpour, P.; Tian, Y.; and Singh, S. 2019. Investigating robustness and interpretability of link prediction via adversarial modifications. In Burstein, J.; Doran, C.; and Solorio, T., eds., *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume*

- 1 (*Long and Short Papers*), 3336–3347. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Polletti, G., and Cozman, F. 2019. Faithfully explaining predictions of knowledge embeddings. In *Anais do XVI Encontro Nacional de Inteligência Artificial e Computacional*, 892–903. Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil: SBC.
- Ribeiro, M. T.; Singh, S.; and Guestrin, C. 2016. "why should I trust you?": Explaining the predictions of any classifier. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, San Francisco, CA, USA, August 13-17, 2016*, 1135–1144.
- Rossi, A.; Barbosa, D.; Firmani, D.; Matinata, A.; and Merinaldo, P. 2021. Knowledge graph embedding for link prediction: A comparative analysis. *ACM Trans. Knowl. Discov. Data* 15(2).
- Rossi, A.; Firmani, D.; Merinaldo, P.; and Teofili, T. 2022. Explaining link prediction systems based on knowledge graph embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD '22*, 2062–2075. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery.
- Ruschel, A.; Colombini Gusmão, A.; and Gagliardi Cozman, F. 2024. Explaining answers generated by knowledge graph embeddings. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning* 109183.
- Schnake, T.; Eberle, O.; Lederer, J.; Nakajima, S.; Schütt, K. T.; Müller, K.-R.; and Montavon, G. 2022. Higher-order explanations of graph neural networks via relevant walks. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 44(11):7581–7596.
- Schramm, S.; Wehner, C.; and Schmid, U. 2023. Comprehensive artificial intelligence on knowledge graphs: A survey. *Journal of Web Semantics* 79:100806.
- Schwalbe, G., and Finzel, B. 2023. A comprehensive taxonomy for explainable artificial intelligence: a systematic survey of surveys on methods and concepts. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*.
- Shrikumar, A.; Greenside, P.; and Kundaje, A. 2017. Learning important features through propagating activation differences. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 70, ICML'17*, 3145–3153. JMLR.org.
- Stadelmaier, J., and Padó, S. 2019. Modeling paths for explainable knowledge base completion. In Linzen, T.; Chrupała, G.; Belinkov, Y.; and Hupkes, D., eds., *Proceedings of the 2019 ACL Workshop BlackboxNLP: Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP*, 147–157. Florence, Italy: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sundararajan, M.; Taly, A.; and Yan, Q. 2017. Axiomatic attribution for deep networks. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 70, ICML'17*, 3319–3328. JMLR.org.
- Toutanova, K.; Chen, D.; Pantel, P.; Poon, H.; Choudhury, P.; and Gamon, M. 2015. Representing text for joint embedding of text and knowledge bases. In Màrquez, L.; Callison-Burch, C.; and Su, J., eds., *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 1499–1509. Lisbon, Portugal: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Trouillon, T.; Welbl, J.; Riedel, S.; Gaussier, E.; and Bouchard, G. 2016. Complex embeddings for simple link prediction. In Balcan, M. F., and Weinberger, K. Q., eds., *Proceedings of The 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 48 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 2071–2080. New York, New York, USA: PMLR.
- Vu, M. N., and Thai, M. T. 2020. Pgm-explainer: probabilistic graphical model explanations for graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS '20*. Red Hook, NY, USA: Curran Associates Inc.
- Wehner, C.; Powlesland, F.; Altakrouri, B.; and Schmid, U. 2022. Explainable online lane change predictions on a digital twin with a layer normalized lstm and layer-wise relevance propagation. In Fujita, H.; Fournier-Viger, P.; Ali, M.; and Wang, Y., eds., *Advances and Trends in Artificial Intelligence. Theory and Practices in Artificial Intelligence*, 621–632. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Wehner, C.; Kertel, M.; and Wewerka, J. 2023. Interactive and intelligent root cause analysis in manufacturing with causal bayesian networks and knowledge graphs. In *2023 IEEE 97th Vehicular Technology Conference (VTC2023-Spring)*, 1–7.
- Yamada, M.; Jitkrittum, W.; Sigal, L.; Xing, E. P.; and Sugiyama, M. 2014. High-dimensional feature selection by feature-wise kernelized lasso. *Neural computation* 26(1):185–207.
- Yang, B.; Yih, W.; He, X.; Gao, J.; and Deng, L. 2015. Embedding entities and relations for learning and inference in knowledge bases. In Bengio, Y., and LeCun, Y., eds., *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings*.
- Zhang, H.; Zheng, T.; Gao, J.; Miao, C.; Su, L.; Li, Y.; and Ren, K. 2019a. Data poisoning attack against knowledge graph embedding. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI'19*, 4853–4859. AAAI Press.
- Zhang, W.; Paudel, B.; Wang, L.; Chen, J.; Zhu, H.; Zhang, W.; Bernstein, A.; and Chen, H. 2019b. Iteratively learning embeddings and rules for knowledge graph reasoning. In *WWW*, 2366–2377. ACM.
- Zhao, D.; Wan, G.; Zhan, Y.; Wang, Z.; Ding, L.; Zheng, Z.; and Du, B. 2023. Ke-x: Towards subgraph explanations of knowledge graph embedding based on knowledge information gain. *Knowledge-Based Systems* 278:110772.