

Lexicalization Is All You Need: Examining the Impact of Lexical Knowledge in a Compositional QALD System

David Maria Schmidt¹[0000-0001-7728-2884], Mohammad Fazleh Elahi¹[0000-0002-8843-9039], and Philipp Cimiano¹[0000-0002-4771-441X]

Semantic Computing Group, CITEC, Technical Faculty, Bielefeld University,
Bielefeld, Germany

{daschmidt,melahi,cimiano}@techfak.uni-bielefeld.de

Abstract. In this paper, we examine the impact of lexicalization on Question Answering over Linked Data (QALD). It is well known that one of the key challenges in interpreting natural language questions with respect to SPARQL lies in bridging the lexical gap, that is mapping the words in the query to the correct vocabulary elements. We argue in this paper that lexicalization, that is explicit knowledge about the potential interpretations of a word with respect to the given vocabulary, significantly eases the task and increases the performance of QA systems. Towards this goal, we present a compositional QA system that can leverage explicit lexical knowledge in a compositional manner to infer the meaning of a question in terms of a SPARQL query. We show that such a system, given lexical knowledge, has a performance well beyond current QA systems, achieving up to a 35.8% increase in the micro F_1 score compared to the best QA system on QALD-9. This shows the importance and potential of including explicit lexical knowledge. In contrast, we show that LLMs have limited abilities to exploit lexical knowledge, with only marginal improvements compared to a version without lexical knowledge. This shows that LLMs have no ability to compositionally interpret a question on the basis of the meaning of its parts, a key feature of compositional approaches. Taken together, our work shows new avenues for QALD research, emphasizing the importance of lexicalization and compositionality.

Keywords: Semantic Composition · Question Answering over Linked Data · Large Language Models · Lexical Knowledge.

1 Introduction

Question Answering over Linked Data (QALD) [63] is the task of automatically mapping a natural language question to an executable SPARQL query such that relevant information can be retrieved from RDF data sources. One of the seven challenges [69] identified by the authors for the development of QALD systems is handling the lexical gap [69], which requires bridging the way users refer to

certain natural language terms and the way they are modeled in a given knowledge base. Consider the question “*Who is the mayor of Moscow?*”. In this case, “*mayor*” needs to be interpreted with respect to DBpedia as `dbo:leaderName`¹ to map the question correctly to the following SPARQL query: `SELECT ?o WHERE { dbr:Moscow dbo:leaderName ?o }`

Another important aspect of QALD is the principle of compositionality. That is, the meaning of a complex expression is determined by the meanings of its parts and the way they are syntactically combined. In the context of QALD, a complex question is represented by a SPARQL query that involves more than one triple pattern, excluding the predicates `rdf:type` or `rdfs:label`. For example, the SPARQL query of the complex question “*Who is the mayor of the capital of Russia?*” is as follows: `SELECT ?uri WHERE { dbr:Russia dbo:capital ?o . ?o dbo:leaderName ?uri }`. To handle complex questions, the QALD system requires using compositional reasoning to obtain the answer, which includes multi-hop reasoning, set operations, and other forms of complex reasoning.

Recent approaches based on machine learning models (e.g., deep neural networks [34, 45, 51, 66], Seq2Seq neural networks [52], transformers [43, 44, 81], sub-graph embeddings [6], probabilistic graphical models [30], bi-directional LSTMs [31], and tree-LSTMs [2]) have achieved promising results, and are currently mostly limited to answering simple questions (i.e., only one triple excluding the predicates `rdf:type` and `rdfs:label`). To deal with complex queries, Hakimov et al. [32] have proposed an approach that uses *Combinatory Categorical Grammar (CCG)* [65] for syntactic representations and typed lambda calculus expressions [8] for semantic representations. Some approaches [68, 70] strongly resemble ours, as the motivation is very similar: using explicit lexical information and *Dependency-based Underspecified Discourse Representation Structures (DUDES)* [10, 14] for semantic composition. However, these approaches generate all possible combinations of SPARQL queries for a natural language sentence, providing no mechanism for disambiguation; therefore, they produce many logically incorrect SPARQL queries.

Some QALD approaches [7, 19, 32, 60, 79] have made only limited use of lexicalization, while others [21, 22, 68] have used lexical knowledge but have not systematically investigated its impact. Recently, LLM-based approaches [3, 4, 28, 29, 41, 53, 55] have proven to be powerful tools for NLP tasks. In particular, ChatGPT [24, 67, 80] has been shown to be an alternative to traditional QALD approaches. To our knowledge, *Generative Pretrained Transformer (GPT)* models have not been tested for their ability to compositionally interpret a question based on the meaning of its parts or the impact of lexical knowledge on their performance. In this paper, we thus address three research questions and provide the corresponding contributions listed below:

¹ We use namespace prefixes that are defined as follows: `dbp:` `http://dbpedia.org/resource/`, `dbo:` `http://dbpedia.org/ontology/`, `dbp:` `http://dbpedia.org/property/`, `rdfs:` `http://www.w3.org/2000/01/rdf-schema#`, `rdf:` `http://www.w3.org/1999/02/22-rdf-syntax-ns#`

- RQ1. How can a QA system leverage explicit lexical knowledge? Towards this goal, we present a new compositional QA system that relies on a dependency parse and bottom-up semantic composition.
- RQ2. What is the impact of explicitly given lexical knowledge? Our experimental results show that our compositional system reaches (micro) F_1 measures of 0.72 on the QALD-9 dataset, which outperforms existing state of the art systems on the task by far (+ 35%).
- RQ3. Can Large Language Models also leverage explicit lexical knowledge? Our experiments show that, when encoding lexical knowledge explicitly in the prompt, state-of-the-art LLMs can benefit from such knowledge, improving results. However, they are far from reaching improvements that match the performance of our compositional approach.

2 System Architecture

In this section, we detail a compositional approach to QALD, using *Dependency-based Underspecified Discourse Representation Structures (DUDES)* [10, 14] for meaning representation and composition behavior, as well as leveraging explicit lexical knowledge, thus answering RQ1. The overall architecture of the pipeline is illustrated in Figure 1 and serves as a blueprint for this section. Although we used DBpedia as a reference, our approach can be adapted to any particular ontology and vocabulary by providing a corresponding lexicon.

2.1 Explicit Lexical Knowledge

A necessary prerequisite for our approach is the availability of a Lemon lexicon [46] that describes by which lexical entries the elements (classes, properties) of a particular knowledge base (KB) can be verbalized in a particular language. We rely on the Lemon lexicon format that contains lexical entries and defines how their meaning is captured with respect to a given ontological vocabulary. A *lexical entry* represents a unit of analysis of the lexicon that consists of a set of grammatically related forms and a set of base meanings that are associated with all of these forms.² The lexicon is context-free in the sense that the possible meanings of words are described independently from their context.

2.2 Dependency Parsing

Our approach relies on a syntactic analysis of an input question by a dependency parser. To increase the chance that at least one correct dependency tree is generated, which is vital for our approach, we use multiple dependency parsing frameworks (i.e., SpaCy³ and Stanza/CoreNLP framework [56]), configurations, and models⁴. Furthermore, some questions contain textual representations of

² Exemplary lexical entries can be found at <https://lemon-model.net/>.

³ <https://spacy.io/>

⁴ `en_core_web_trf` and `en_core_web_lg`




Fig. 1: Schema of the compositional question answering approach using DUDES

numbers that need to be translated into their numerical form to be used with, for example, `FILTER` expressions in SPARQL queries. However, for entities⁵ that contain textual numbers (e.g., `dbr:One_Thousand_and_One_Nights`), this approach might be counterproductive with respect to the entity recognition process. Therefore, we consider both the converted and the original question in our approach if there is something to be converted. To do so, we use the `numerator`⁶ library.

2.3 Tree Merger

Matching nodes in the dependency tree to URIs representing entities and properties (a.k.a. *KB Linking*) is a central challenge in our approach. For this purpose,

⁵ A wide range of subjects, including people, places, organizations, and various concepts, each identified by a unique URI (Uniform Resource Identifier).

⁶ <https://github.com/jaidevd/numerator>

we introduce a number of merging rules over the dependency tree to yield phrases that facilitate matching to KB elements:

- *Generic Rules*: Several generic merge rules based on syntactic properties such as dependency tags⁷ or part-of-speech (POS) tags⁸ are applied, merging nodes based on, e.g., tags like `compound` or `det`, or comparative keywords like “*more*” or “*fewer*”.
- *Lexicon Marker Rules*: If a lexicon entry matches and includes a marker, the node of that marker (typically an ADP node) is merged into the node that bears the written representation of the corresponding lexical entry. For example, if the lexical entry contains a marker “*of*”, it is merged with the written representation “*birth name*”.
- *Entity Merging Rule*: The presented approach uses several methods for entity recognition (as discussed in Section 2.4), and these methods return several candidate entities for a given question. By this rule, the candidate entities, often found at different nodes of the dependency tree, are merged into one node, forming a merged candidate entity. As shown in the tree merger step in Figure 1, the child node “*Angela*” is merged into its parent node “*Merkel*”, resulting in “*Angela Merkel*”.

2.4 Ontology Matcher

In this step, entities and properties are assigned to their respective tree nodes where possible. The matching methods are described below.

Property Matching: This matching method focuses on matching the nodes of the tree with DBpedia properties. First, each node of the tree is matched with the written representations of the lexical entries if possible. If there is no exact match for a node, the approach tries to find candidate lexical entries by applying several heuristics, such as omitting certain tokens from the node, e.g. by excluding trailing adpositions, which typically do not occur in the canonical forms of lexical entries. If the marker of a lexical entry matches with a token from a node, the corresponding candidate entry is prioritized. Finally, if there are remaining ambiguities, the candidate lexical entries are sorted in descending order using a Levenshtein distance-based similarity measure [42].

Entity Matching: To match tree nodes with entities from DBpedia, the approach uses all available `rdfs:label` information of entities, which are stored in a prefix trie [40] for efficient memory representation and lookup of similar labels. The similarities between the entity (e.g., “*Angela Merkel*”) in the tree and the entity labels in DBpedia are calculated using the Levenshtein similarity measure with a threshold set to 0.5. When both a shorter and a longer text span perfectly match certain labels, the longer match is generally prioritized higher. As an off-the-shelf solution, we also include the entity recognition results of DBpedia Spotlight [47] into the set of considered candidates to increase the chance of a correct match.

⁷ <https://universaldependencies.org/u/dep/>

⁸ <https://universaldependencies.org/u/pos/>

2.5 Tree Scorer

Each node of the tree is assigned a score based on matched properties or entities. Additionally, it considers the total number of tree nodes, as well as special terms and keywords which are neither properties nor entities. Two types of matching are taken into account: (i) exact matches, and (ii) matches under relaxed conditions. The scoring relies on a weighted average of three different scores: (i) fraction of nodes with exact matches (weight 3), (ii) fraction of nodes with matches under relaxed conditions (weight 1), and (iii) ratio of the number of nodes to the number of nodes in the dependency tree before merging nodes (weight 2). For (i) and (ii), single node weights (i.e., the number of tokens a node comprises) are multiplied with different multipliers based on whether the node has a matching lexical entry (multiplier 1.0), a matching entity or is a numeral (0.9) or is a special word like an ASK keyword, a comparative or “in” (0.8). Then, the weight is multiplied with that multiplier and added to a total sum. In the end, this sum is compared to the sum of all weights, forming the score value. The weighted average of these three scores forms the total score of a tree, according to which the trees are then prioritized in processing.

2.6 DUDES Creator

Now that we have a tree with KB elements (e.g., entities and properties) assigned to the nodes, the next task is to create *Dependency-based Underspecified Discourse Representation Structures (DUDES)* [10, 14], which are used to compose the atomic meanings of the tree nodes. Our approach is slightly different from the latest version of DUDES [14] as we modify it for use with dependency trees instead of *Lexicalized Tree Adjoining Grammar (LTAG)* trees [36, 62] and do not make use of subordination relations yet:

Definition 1 (Dependency-based Underspecified Discourse Representation Structures (DUDES) [14]). A DUDES is a triple (v, D, S) where:

- $v \in U \cup \{\epsilon\}$ is the main variable (also called referent marker or distinguished variable) where ϵ represents the absence of a main variable
- $D = (U, C)$ is a Discourse Representation Structure (DRS) [14, 33, 37] with
 - set of variables U (also called discourse universe or referent markers)
 - set of conditions C over variables U
- S is a set of selection pairs of the form $(v \in U, m)$ with v being a variable from U and m being a marker word for that variable with ϵ representing the empty marker, i.e. no marker being connected to that variable. Instead of writing ϵ , the second tuple component can also just be left out.

Entity DUDES: The simplest case of representing KB elements from the tree as a DUDES is representing entities (i.e., *Entity DUDES*). In Entity DUDES, an entity is assigned to a variable, for example, by adding a simple expression such as $z = \text{dbr:Angela_Merkel}$. A full example for entity `dbr:Angela_Merkel` is illustrated in Figure 2a.




Fig. 2: Illustration of exemplary DUDES and their composition

Property DUDES: In contrast to entities, properties have variables that are intended to be replaced by entities or combined with other properties during DUDES composition. Additionally, variables can be restricted to certain markers that correspond to the subject or object position of the property. An example of the property `dbo:birthName` is shown in Figure 2b. Note the variable x is associated with the marker “of” as another way of disambiguation which is however not used in this example. For, e.g., “*What is the birth name of Angela Merkel?*”, it would instead be used to determine the subject of the property.

2.7 DUDES Composer

The composition operation of DUDES [14] can be defined as follows:

Definition 2 (DUDES Composition). Let $d_1 = (v_1, D_1 = (U_1, C_1), S_1)$, $d_2 = (v_2, D_2 = (U_2, C_2), S_2)$ be two DUDES with disjoint variable sets, i.e. $U_1 \cap U_2 = \emptyset$. The DUDES composition operation \odot for substituting d_1 into d_2 using selection pair $p = (x \in U_2, m) \in S_2$ and resulting in a composed DUDES $d_c = (v_c, D_c = (U_c, C_c), S_c)$, written $d_c = d_1 \overset{p}{\odot} d_2$, is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 U_c &= U_2[x := v_1] \cup U_1 & S_c &= (S_2 \cup S_1) \setminus p & v_c &= \begin{cases} v_1 & \text{if } x = v_2 \\ v_2 & \text{else} \end{cases} \\
 C_c &= C_2[x := v_1] \cup C_1
 \end{aligned}$$

An example composition of the two DUDES (i.e., Figure 2a and 2b) is shown in Figure 2c. We apply a bottom-up composition strategy, merging child nodes into their parent nodes. DUDES compositions are performed until there is only a single composed DUDES (i.e., final DUDES) left at the root of the tree, representing the meaning of the whole question. For choosing a selection pair for composition, different heuristics and data sources are used. For example, in the case of modifier nodes, the parent DUDES is merged into the child DUDES and not the other way around. Additionally, the syntactic frames of the lexical entries, POS and dependency tags are used for selection pair determination.

Instead of calculating all combinations at once, our approach composes one final DUDES at a time, limiting the effect of combinatorial explosion that would otherwise substantially increase the memory footprint.

2.8 SPARQL Generator

The logical expressions of the final DUDES represent the meaning of the given natural language question. Therefore, they are used to create a corresponding SPARQL query. For instance, the DUDES in Figure 2c shows the triple pattern (i.e., `dbr:Angela_Merkel dbo:birthName ?y`) for the question “*What is Angela Merkel’s birth name?*”. The triple patterns of DUDES contain entities (or literals), and variables. Our approach uses the Z3 SMT solver [49] to determine which variables in the final DUDES are bound to some values. Due to our combinatorial approach to dealing with ambiguities, multiple SPARQL queries are typically generated, from which one is selected by the SPARQL selector.

2.9 SPARQL Selector

For selecting the best SPARQL query, we use an LLM-based approach [58] trained to compare two queries, using the encoder of `flan-t5-small` [9] as a base model. As single LLM-based comparison results are still unreliable, various aggregation strategies are evaluated which make a final decision based on the pairwise comparisons of all candidate queries.

For each of the two candidate queries of a comparison, the model is given the input question, the candidate query, the number of its results, and the final DUDES. From this information, two output features are generated, representing the confidence in the respective queries. In order to reflect in the output how much better one query is than another, the model is trained to predict the F_1 scores of the respective queries.⁹ We evaluate different strategies and configurations to select the final query:

- **BestScore:** Theoretically possible performance of our approach, selecting best queries based on their true F_1 score, clamped like in training data.
- **MostWins _{$p\%$} ^{$top\ n$} :** Compares candidate queries pairwise per question and selects the query that “wins” the most comparisons (with margin of $> p\%$).
- **Accum _{$logits/sigmoid$} ^{$top\ n$} :** For each candidate query, the model outputs are accumulated, either *logits* or *sigmoid* values, largest value is chosen.

If an exponent *top n* is given, the top *n* models (based on training micro F_1 score) are evaluated with their outputs summed together. Otherwise, single models are evaluated and presented with mean and standard deviation. Additionally, queries with no results or with too many results (threshold is the largest number of results for a train question + 10%) are discarded.

⁹ To avoid high numbers of false positives affecting the micro F_1 score, queries with a false to true positive ratio of 10 : 1 or worse are clamped to 0.0 in the training data.

3 Experimental Setup

The experiments were conducted using the well-known QALD-9 benchmark [73]. The dataset contains questions in multiple languages, along with corresponding SPARQL queries and answers from DBpedia. For the experiment, we followed Unger et al. [76] to manually create a lexicon covering the vocabulary elements in the training and test section of QALD-9. In particular, we created a total of 599 lexical entries for five syntactic frames [12]: 311 lexical entries for `NounPPFrame`, 96 lexical entries for `TransitiveFrame`, 143 lexical entries for `InTransitivePPFrame`, 28 lexical entries for `AdjectivePredicateFrame`, and 21 lexical entries for `AdjectiveSuperlativeFrame`. The time required for creating a lexical entry was approximately 2–5 minutes depending on the syntactic frame. The total time required to create our lexicon was approximately 16 hours. All experiments¹⁰ were conducted for the English part of QALD-9 only.

3.1 SPARQL Selection Model Training

In Section 2.8, we presented an LLM-based SPARQL selection approach for disambiguation of the generated SPARQL queries. In order to have training, validation and test data for the query selection model, we ran our approach for about 24h on the QALD-9 benchmark and saved all generated candidate queries, separated by train and test questions. Afterwards, the training data was randomly split into 90% training questions and 10% validation questions.

The corresponding final data elements were generated in three steps for each part of the data (i.e., training, validation, and test). Each step involved generating 100 comparisons for each question and used for training in a symmetric way to avoid some general preference of the model for the first or second query. Comparisons between queries with (i) an F_1 score ≥ 0.01 and (ii) an F_1 score < 0.01 were added to the training data. Additionally, mixed comparisons with one query with an F_1 score ≥ 0.01 and one with an F_1 score < 0.01 were added.

In order to fine-tune the `google/flan-t5-small` model from the Huggingface transformers library [78], we first ran a hyperparameter optimization with 34 trials using Optuna [1], with an epoch search space between 1 and 5, an initial learning rate between $1e^{-5}$ and $1e^{-4}$ (logarithmic scale) and using a lambda learning rate scheduler with a lambda between 0.9 and 1.0 (logarithmic scale). As an optimizer, we used Adam [39] and trained 10 models using the parameters of the trial with the lowest validation loss discovered during the hyperparameter optimization. Each training was performed on a single Nvidia A40 with a batch size of 64. These 10 models were then used for evaluation.

¹⁰ Software artifact: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12610054>, System: AMD Ryzen 9 7900X3D, 96GB RAM, NVIDIA GeForce RTX 4070, Arch Linux 6.9.2-arch1-1, Python 3.12.3, 12 parallel processes, total (elapsed real time) timeout of 10800s for test benchmark, DBpedia version: 2016-10 <https://downloads.dbpedia.org/2016-10/core-i18n/en/>

3.2 Experiments with GPT

We compared different GPT [54] models to our compositional approach. The previous research on QALD with GPT-3 [24] evaluated using the QALD-9 test dataset in three modes: zero-shot, few-shot, and fine-tuned model. In the zero-shot scenario, GPT-3 generated many invalid queries. Performance increased with the five-shot approach and even more with fine-tuning.

All of our experiments with GPT models are performed separately with 5 different prompts describing the task. The first prompt below has been hand-crafted. Afterwards, four additional prompts have been generated using ChatGPT using the prompt *You are a world-class prompt engineer. Refine this prompt: <initial prompt>*. The resulting prompts used in our experiments are therefore:

1. You are a system which creates SPARQL queries for DBPEDIA from 2016-10 from natural language user questions. You answer just with SPARQL queries and nothing else.
2. Generate SPARQL queries from user questions for DBpedia from October 2016. Answer solely with SPARQL queries.
3. Develop a system capable of generating SPARQL queries for DBPedia based on user questions in natural language, with a knowledge base updated until October 2016. The system should exclusively respond with SPARQL queries and no additional information.
4. Craft SPARQL queries from October 2016 based on user questions in natural language, exclusively dedicated to extracting information from DBpedia. Your responses should consist solely of SPARQL queries.
5. Create SPARQL queries to generate responses to user questions by interpreting natural language queries, specifically targeting DBpedia, beginning from October 2016.

For our experiments we, prompted GPT-3.5-Turbo and GPT-4 in a zero-shot fashion and evaluated them on the entire training and test datasets of QALD-9. For the fine-tuned GPT-3.5-Turbo-0125 models, 10% of the original training dataset has been excluded and used as a validation dataset for fine-tuning. All experiments are executed with temperature 0 as well as both with and without lexical information in the prompt, i.e. lexical information was also present during fine-tuning. To the best of our knowledge, no work has investigated the impact of using lexical information (which is crucial for state-of-art performance for QALD) on the benchmark performance in this way yet. For the experiments with lexical information (as detailed in 2.1), we shorten the structure of lexical entries (the structure is detailed in previous work [5]) for prompting and training, as the lexical entries are not well-suited for direct usage.¹¹ This shortened representation consists primarily of pairs of field names and their values, e.g. *“Canonical form: birth name”* or *“Reference: dbp:birthName”*. To fit into the context window of the used models, we restrict the entries appended to the prompt to entries which are relevant to the question.¹² Therefore, only the ability of GPT models to put the pieces together is tested, not whether they select the right entry from a much larger lexicon. The comparison is therefore not fair as our approach figures out the relevant lexical entries itself. The numbers presented in the evaluation section are therefore to be interpreted as “upper

¹¹ Datasets generated this way together with the shortened lexical entries can be found in our software artifact: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12610054>

¹² This means where written representations occur in the question and ontology URIs in the gold standard query.

bounds” on the performance. The OpenAI API has been used for fine-tuning, as the model is not publicly available. The configurable hyperparameters *batch-size*, *learning rate multiplier* as well as *number of epochs* were optimized using the *auto* setting.

4 Evaluation

The evaluation of our approach is presented in three categories: *Single Model*, *Multi Model*, and *Upper Bounds*. The first category shows mean and standard deviation across the 10 trained models for SPARQL selection strategies using a single model. As these results show a high standard deviation for micro scores, we also evaluated the effect of bundling the outputs of multiple models. For bundling the model outputs (i.e., *top n* models), we focused on the strategies and models performing best on the training dataset of QALD-9. We also included *BestScore* strategies in the *Upper Bounds* category, demonstrating the highest achievable scores (i.e., upper bounds on the query selection model performances). Good scores in the *BestScore/Upper Bounds* category therefore indicate that the pipeline in principle generates the correct results, but those queries are not always identified during query selection. However, selecting the best query can be considered a much easier task than generating it from scratch, rendering these scores still reasonably realistic. Nevertheless, when comparing to other approaches, only the best performances achieved by a regular query selection strategy are used for fairness reasons.

During evaluation, all strategies with all 10 SPARQL selection models were tested simultaneously to ensure they were evaluated on the same generated queries. However, as we limited the elapsed real time to 3 hours, this imposed a high overhead w.r.t. single strategies. Evaluating just one strategy and model at once would likely have achieved better results due to more tested candidates.¹³ Illustrating the theoretical potential of the generated queries, a second evaluation with just *BestScore* being executed for 3 hours was conducted (marked with “*single*” in Table 1), generating 815473 instead of 10552 queries and increasing scores from 0.37 to 0.51 (macro F_1).¹⁴

Table 1 shows that the multi-model strategies generally outperform single-model strategies, e.g., 0.43 vs. 0.72 vs. 0.85 for the micro F_1 scores of single-model, multi-model, and upper bound strategies, respectively. More precisely, single-model strategies on average achieve only about half of the upper bound performances, although they exhibit a high standard deviation, indicating their potential to yield substantially different results based on the specific trained model chosen for evaluation. However, aggregating the outputs of multiple models to select a query appears to combine the strengths of the bundled models without being affected by their weaknesses. This results in comparably stable performance across different numbers of bundled models (e.g., 0.59 to 0.72 for

¹³ Generated candidate queries per question: up to 5439, mean: 87.87 ± 495.02 .

¹⁴ Generated candidate queries per question: up to 59310, mean: 5660.98 ± 8268.85 .

Table 1: Results for English QALD-9 test dataset after 3 hours of elapsed real time. P refers to Precision, R to Recall, and F_1 to F_1 score. The best results of each category are marked in bold. “(single)” means running the benchmark without evaluating LLM strategy performance at the same time, reducing the corresponding overhead.

Strategy	Micro			Macro		
	$F_1 \pm \sigma$	P $\pm \sigma$	R $\pm \sigma$	$F_1 \pm \sigma$	P $\pm \sigma$	R $\pm \sigma$
Single Model						
Accum _{logits}	0.30 \pm 0.10	0.24 \pm 0.11	0.59 \pm 0.25	0.31 \pm 0.02	0.31 \pm 0.02	0.34 \pm 0.02
Accum _{sigmoid}	0.39 \pm 0.13	0.31 \pm 0.11	0.61 \pm 0.20	0.32 \pm 0.01	0.32 \pm 0.01	0.35 \pm 0.02
MostWins _{0,0}	0.29 \pm 0.08	0.19 \pm 0.06	0.65 \pm 0.10	0.30 \pm 0.02	0.30 \pm 0.01	0.34 \pm 0.01
MostWins _{0,1}	0.33 \pm 0.08	0.23 \pm 0.07	0.62 \pm 0.14	0.31 \pm 0.01	0.31 \pm 0.01	0.34 \pm 0.01
MostWins _{0,25}	0.40 \pm 0.16	0.32 \pm 0.22	0.65 \pm 0.11	0.32 \pm 0.01	0.32 \pm 0.01	0.35 \pm 0.02
MostWins _{0,5}	0.36 \pm 0.13	0.28 \pm 0.10	0.58 \pm 0.21	0.31 \pm 0.02	0.32 \pm 0.02	0.34 \pm 0.02
MostWins _{0,75}	0.43 \pm 0.19	0.38 \pm 0.23	0.56 \pm 0.21	0.32 \pm 0.02	0.32 \pm 0.02	0.34 \pm 0.02
MostWins _{0,9}	0.42 \pm 0.18	0.36 \pm 0.22	0.56 \pm 0.21	0.32 \pm 0.02	0.32 \pm 0.02	0.34 \pm 0.02
Multi Model						
MostWins _{0,75} ^{top 2}	0.72	0.77	0.67	0.32	0.32	0.33
MostWins _{0,9} ^{top 2}	0.64	0.61	0.67	0.32	0.32	0.34
MostWins _{0,75} ^{top 3}	0.72	0.77	0.67	0.32	0.33	0.33
MostWins _{0,9} ^{top 3}	0.65	0.64	0.68	0.32	0.33	0.35
MostWins _{0,75} ^{top 5}	0.59	0.52	0.68	0.33	0.33	0.35
MostWins _{0,9} ^{top 5}	0.59	0.53	0.68	0.33	0.33	0.35
MostWins _{0,75} ^{top 10}	0.59	0.53	0.67	0.32	0.33	0.34
MostWins _{0,9} ^{top 10}	0.62	0.57	0.68	0.33	0.33	0.34
Upper Bounds						
BestScore	0.81	0.98	0.69	0.37	0.38	0.38
BestScore (single)	0.85	0.95	0.76	0.51	0.51	0.54

micro F_1 scores). In contrast, the macro F_1 scores are consistent across both single and multi-model strategies, indicating strong overall performance.

Comparison with GPT models: The results of our experiments (as shown in Table 2) with QALD-9 and GPT models [54] are examined with two different objectives: comparing the GPT performance with our approach, i.e. Table 1, (research question RQ2) and examining the effect of providing the lexical entries in the prompt (research question RQ3). Table 2 shows the F_1 scores of GPT-3.5-Turbo models with and without fine-tuning, as well as GPT-4 without fine-tuning, with and without a lexicon. Regarding the first objective (RQ2), our approach outperforms GPT models in terms of micro F_1 score, achieving 0.72 compared to 0.35 of the best-performing GPT model.

In contrast, the total best macro F_1 score of all evaluated GPT models outperforms the macro F_1 scores of our approach (0.33 vs. 0.42). However, this is only true for models that were provided with the correct lexical entries in the prompt, a substantial simplification compared to our approach which has to determine the relevant lexical entries from the whole lexicon. Without this advantage, all evaluated GPT models are outperformed by our approach, as the macro F_1 score does not exceed 0.28 then. Additionally, our upper bounds show

Table 2: GPT results for QALD-9 test dataset. P refers to Precision, R to Recall, F_1 to F_1 score, FT to fine-tuned, and Pr# to the prompt number. The best results of each experiment are marked in bold, total best scores of a category are underlined.

Model	FT	Pr#	Without Lexicon						With Lexicon					
			Micro			Macro			Micro			Macro		
			F_1	P	R	F_1	P	R	F_1	P	R	F_1	P	R
GPT-3.5-Turbo	✗	1	0.15	0.19	0.12	0.10	0.11	0.12	0.13	0.09	0.21	0.25	0.27	0.27
GPT-3.5-Turbo	✗	2	0.15	0.21	0.12	0.11	0.10	0.12	0.13	0.09	0.20	0.26	0.26	0.31
GPT-3.5-Turbo	✗	3	0.12	0.18	0.10	0.13	0.13	0.15	0.06	0.04	0.13	0.21	0.21	0.25
GPT-3.5-Turbo	✗	4	0.08	0.06	0.12	0.12	0.11	0.15	0.04	0.02	0.15	0.23	0.22	0.27
GPT-3.5-Turbo	✗	5	0.10	0.17	0.07	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.16	0.45	0.10	0.12	0.12	0.14
GPT-4	✗	1	0.22	0.29	0.18	0.26	0.27	0.28	0.35	0.81	0.22	0.40	0.40	0.42
GPT-4	✗	2	0.34	0.68	0.23	0.28	0.29	0.30	0.31	0.87	0.19	0.39	0.40	0.40
GPT-4	✗	3	0.22	0.25	0.20	0.26	0.27	0.28	0.12	0.09	0.21	0.39	0.40	0.42
GPT-4	✗	4	0.32	0.65	0.21	0.25	0.26	0.29	0.12	0.08	0.20	0.38	0.38	0.40
GPT-4	✗	5	0.19	0.17	0.21	0.20	0.19	0.25	0.24	0.32	0.20	0.26	0.26	0.29
GPT-3.5-Turbo	✓	1	0.28	0.81	0.17	0.24	0.24	0.25	0.22	0.28	0.18	0.42	0.43	0.42
GPT-3.5-Turbo	✓	2	0.35	0.88	0.22	0.24	0.25	0.25	0.11	0.08	0.16	0.40	0.42	0.42
GPT-3.5-Turbo	✓	3	0.26	0.50	0.18	0.25	0.26	0.26	0.09	0.06	0.15	0.37	0.37	0.40
GPT-3.5-Turbo	✓	4	0.35	0.91	0.22	0.23	0.24	0.24	0.10	0.07	0.21	0.41	0.41	0.44
GPT-3.5-Turbo	✓	5	0.34	0.92	0.21	0.24	0.25	0.25	0.31	0.87	0.19	0.38	0.38	0.40

scores up to 0.51. However, our current query selection models do not reach these scores, which remains to be solved in future work.

Regarding the second objective (RQ3), adding lexical entries to the prompt improves the macro scores in almost all cases, whereas the effect on the micro scores is mixed. For the non-fine-tuned GPT-3.5-Turbo model, the macro F_1 scores even doubles from 0.13 to 0.26. This effect is similarly large for GPT-4 (0.28 vs. 0.40) and fine-tuned GPT-3.5-Turbo (0.25 vs. 0.42).

Comparison with SOTA: In Table 3, we compare our approach with the most recent QA systems evaluated on QALD-9. TeBaQA [74] maps NL questions to SPARQL queries through learning templates from the QALD-9 dataset. However, the training dataset is small, consisting of only 403 questions, which limits the approach’s ability to learn templates. gAnswer [83] and EDGQA [35] are graph-based approaches that interpret an NL question into a semantic query graph containing an edge for each relation mentioned in the question. SLING [48] and GenRL [59] are relationship linking frameworks developed for QALD. These approaches achieve the highest F_1 scores (ranging from 0.40 to 0.55) among all systems evaluated on the QALD-9 dataset. Our compositional approach outperforms all these methods, achieving an F_1 score of 0.72.

5 Related Work

Some QALD systems (such as ORAKEL [13], Pythia [68], QueGG [5, 20, 22], and LexExMachinaQA [21]) use Lemon lexica for lexicalization. For instance,

Table 3: Comparison with SOTA evaluated on the QALD-9 test dataset.

QALD System	Micro Precision	Micro Recall	Micro F_1 Score
Galactica [26]	0.14	0.02	0.03
Elon [72]	0.04	0.05	0.10
QASystem [72]	0.09	0.11	0.20
Falcon 1.0 [61]	0.23	0.23	0.23
WDAqua-core1 [16]	0.26	0.26	0.28
EDGQA [35]	0.31	0.40	0.32
TeBaQA [74]	0.24	0.24	0.37
gAnswer [83]	0.29	0.32	0.43
KGQAN [52]	0.49	0.39	0.43
SLING [48]	0.39	0.50	0.44
NSQA [38]	0.31	0.32	0.45
Zheng et al. [82]	0.45	0.47	0.46
GenRL [59]	0.49	0.61	0.53
Our Approach	0.77	0.67	0.72

Pythia [68] is built on Lexicalized Tree Adjoining Grammars [71] (LTAG) as a syntactic formalism and DUDES [11] for specifying semantic representations. The QueGG system [5,22] automatically generates a QA grammar from manually-created Lemon lexica. This grammar is then used to transform questions into SPARQL queries. However, the approach uses manually created sentence templates to cover syntactic variations and has very limited support for complex questions. The QueGG system [20] was compared with GPT-3.5 Turbo in a zero-shot scenario by prompting it with an instruction to generate a SPARQL query for a question related to DBpedia, without providing any lexical information. None of these approaches systematically evaluated the impact of lexical information on QALD performance. In contrast, our compositional approach uses dependency parsing, requiring no handwritten sentence templates. It addresses compositionality in a principled way using DUDES in combination with a tree merging and scoring component, covering a wide variety of complex questions.

WDAqua-core1 system [16] maps natural language sentences to KB elements by comparing an n-gram with the `rdfs:label` of an entity. For instance, the approach maps the natural language term “*writer*” to `dbo:writer` but fails to map it to other variations such as `dbo:creator` or `dbo:composer`. Some QALD systems (such as AskNow [19], DEANNA [79], SemQALD [32], QAKiS [7], QAnswer [60] etc.) use pattern dictionaries (e.g., BOA [25] or similar dictionaries) that map natural language terms to KB elements, while other approaches (Xser [19], gAnswer [19], CASIA [19]) use relational lexicalizations (e.g., PATTY [50]). The resources and dictionaries are very limited, and none of these approaches has investigated the impact of lexicalization on QALD.

One major limitation of state-of-the-art QALD systems is the lack of semantic compositionality for dealing with complex queries. To handle complex questions, Wang et al. [77] proposed a model that uses graph convolutional networks (GCNs) [57] and performs reasoning over multiple KG triples. Similarly, Shekarpour et al. [64] use a combination of KB concepts with a HMM model. The approach first finds the segment (e.g., “*mayor*”, “*capital*”, “*Russia*”) of a

query (e.g., “*Who is the mayor of the capital of Russia?*”) and then maps them to the appropriate resources. Other approaches (such as GETARUNS [15], IBM Watson [27] etc.) generate a logical form from a query. The approach generates triple patterns that are then split up again as properties are referenced by unions, resulting in many combinations of triples and wrong SPARQL queries. In contrast, our compositional approach selects the correct SPARQL query using a SPARQL selector (detailed in Section 2.9) from all possible combinations of SPARQL queries. There are rule-based architectures [17, 18] to deal with complex questions, but the coverage of these approaches is completely limited to the rules added based on linguistic heuristics and observed patterns in the data.

6 Conclusion and Future Work

We have investigated the role and impact of explicitly given lexical knowledge in the context of QALD systems. We have presented a novel compositional system that uses this knowledge and demonstrated that it achieves performances in terms of micro F_1 scores well beyond the current state-of-the-art. In fact, our approach achieves a micro F_1 score of 0.72, which is 0.19 higher than the performance of the best state-of-the-art system on QALD (0.53). In this regard, our work has to be understood as providing a proof of concept that shows the impact of lexical knowledge and of a compositional approach.

Our approach handles complex queries using DUDES for semantic composition, combined with a tree merging and scoring component and a SPARQL selector, thereby covering a wide variety of complex questions. All we need is a lexicon in Lemon format. At the same time, our results show that LLMs are very limited in their ability to compose, as they cannot leverage provided lexical knowledge to the same extent as our proposed approach. Overall, our results suggest new avenues for QALD research by highlighting the role of explicit lexical knowledge and compositionality. However, there are also limitations.

First, a necessary prerequisite for our approach is the availability of a Lemon lexicon [46], which is manually created and takes approximately 16 hours to produce for 599 lexical entries. Therefore, future work will focus on automating this process using one of the approaches, such as LexExMachina [23] and M-ATOLL [75], which automatically create a lexicon for the QA system. Another limitation is combinatorial explosion, i.e., the exponential growth of combinations when multiple candidate DUDES exist across multiple nodes of a tree, which increases response times considerably.

We provided a promising direction of QALD for future work consisting of the development of a hybrid system that combines the benefits of a compositional approach with the generalization abilities of large language models to bridge the lexical gap while leaving composition to a symbolic approach.

Acknowledgements and Funding. This work is partially funded by the Ministry of Culture and Science of the State of North Rhine-Westphalia under grant no NW21-059A (SAIL).

References

1. Akiba, T., Sano, S., Yanase, T., Ohta, T., Koyama, M.: Optuna: A next-generation hyperparameter optimization framework. In: Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (2019)
2. Athreya, R.G., Bansal, S.K., Ngomo, A.C.N., Usbeck, R.: Template-based question answering using recursive neural networks. In: Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Semantic Computing (ICSC). pp. 195–198 (2021)
3. Bai, Y., Ying, J., Cao, Y., Lv, X., He, Y., Wang, X., Yu, J., Zeng, K., Xiao, Y., Lyu, H., Zhang, J., Li, J., Hou, L.: Benchmarking foundation models with language-model-as-an-examiner. In: Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track (2023)
4. Bang, Y., Cahyawijaya, S., Lee, N., Dai, W., Su, D., Wilie, B., Lovenia, H., Ji, Z., Yu, T., Chung, W., Do, Q.V., Xu, Y., Fung, P.: A multitask, multilingual, multimodal evaluation of ChatGPT on reasoning, hallucination, and interactivity. In: Proceedings of the 13th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing and the 3rd Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers). pp. 675–718. Association for Computational Linguistics, Nusa Dua, Bali (Nov 2023)
5. Benz, V., Cimiano, P., Elahi, M.F., Ell, B.: Generating grammars from lemon lexica for questions answering over linked data: a preliminary analysis. In: Proceedings of the 6th Natural Language Interfaces for the Web of Data Workshop (NLIWOD) co-located with the 19th International Semantic Web Conference (ISWC). CEUR Workshop Proceedings, vol. 2722, pp. 40–55 (2020)
6. Bordes, A., Chopra, S., Weston, J.: Question answering with subgraph embeddings. In: Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP) (2014)
7. Cabrio, E., Cojan, J., Palmero Aprosio, A., Magnini, B., Lavelli, A., Gandon, F.: Qakis: an open domain qa system based on relational patterns. In: International Semantic Web Conference, ISWC 2012 (Nov 2012)
8. Carpenter, B.: Type-Logical Semantics. MIT Press, Cambridge (1997)
9. Chung, H.W., Hou, L., Longpre, S., Zoph, B., Tay, Y., Fedus, W., Li, E., Wang, X., Dehghani, M., Brahma, S., Webson, A., Gu, S.S., Dai, Z., Suzgun, M., Chen, X., Chowdhery, A., Narang, S., Mishra, G., Yu, A., Zhao, V.Y., Huang, Y., Dai, A.M., Yu, H., Petrov, S., Chi, E.H., Dean, J., Devlin, J., Roberts, A., Zhou, D., Le, Q.V., Wei, J.: Scaling instruction-finetuned language models. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **25**(70), 1–53 (2024)
10. Cimiano, P.: Flexible semantic composition with DUDES (short paper). In: Bunt, H., Petukhova, V., Wubben, S. (eds.) Proceedings of the Eight International Conference on Computational Semantics, IWCS 2009, Tilburg, The Netherlands, January 7–9, 2009. pp. 272–276. Association for Computational Linguistics (2009)
11. Cimiano, P.: Flexible semantic composition with DUDES (short paper). In: Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Computational Semantics (IWCS). pp. 272–276. Association for Computational Linguistics, Tilburg, The Netherlands (Jan 2009)
12. Cimiano, P., Buitelaar, P., McCrae, J.P., Sintek, M.: Lexinfo: A declarative model for the lexicon-ontology interface. *Journal of Web Semantics* **9**(1), 29–51 (2011)
13. Cimiano, P., Haase, P., Heizmann, J., Mantel, M., Studer, R.: Towards portable natural language interfaces to knowledge bases the case of the orakel system. In: *Data & Knowledge Engineering*. vol. 65, pp. 325–354 (2008)

14. Cimiano, P., Unger, C., McCrae, J.P.: *Ontology-Based Interpretation of Natural Language*. Synthesis Lectures on Human Language Technologies, Morgan & Claypool Publishers (2014)
15. Delmonte, R., et al.: *Computational Linguistic Text Processing–Lexicon, Grammar, Parsing and Anaphora Resolution*. Nova Science Publishers (2008)
16. Diefenbach, D., Both, A., Singh, K., Maret, P.: Towards a question answering system over the semantic web. *Semantic Web* **11**(3), 421–439 (2020)
17. Ding, Z., Li, Z., Qi, R., Wu, J., He, B., Ma, Y., Meng, Z., Chen, S., Liao, R., Han, Z., Tresp, V.: Forecasttkgquestions: A benchmark for temporal question answering and forecasting over temporal knowledge graphs. In: *Proceedings of the 22nd International Semantic Web Conference (ISWC)*. pp. 541–560. Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham (2023)
18. Dubey, M.: *Towards Complex Question Answering over Knowledge Graphs*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Bonn, Germany (2021)
19. Dubey, M., Dasgupta, S., Sharma, A., Höffner, K., Lehmann, J.: Asknow: A framework for natural language query formalization in sparql. In: *The Semantic Web. Latest Advances and New Domains*. pp. 300–316. Springer International Publishing (2016)
20. Elahi, M.F.: *Multilingual Question Answering over Knowledge Graphs building on a Model of the Lexicon-ontology Interface*. Ph.D. thesis, Bielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany (march 2024), PhD thesis
21. Elahi, M.F., Ell, B., Cimiano, P.: Bridging the gap between ontology and lexicon via class-specific association rules mined from a loosely-parallel text-data corpus. In: *Proceedings of the 4th Conference on Language, Data and Knowledge (LDK)* (2023)
22. Elahi, M.F., Ell, B., Grimm, F., Cimiano, P.: Question answering on rdf data based on grammars automatically generated from lemon models. In: *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Semantic Systems (SEMANTiCS)* (2021)
23. Ell, B., Elahi, M.F., Cimiano, P.: Bridging the gap between ontology and lexicon via class-specific association rules mined from a loosely-parallel text-data corpus. In: *Proceedings of the 3rd Conference on Language, Data and Knowledge (LDK)* (2021)
24. Faria, B., Perdigão, D., Gonçalo Oliveira, H.: Question Answering over Linked Data with GPT-3. In: *12th Symposium on Languages, Applications and Technologies (SLATE 2023)*. Open Access Series in Informatics (OASiCS), vol. 113, pp. 1:1–1:15. Dagstuhl, Germany (2023)
25. Gerber, D., Ngonga Ngomo, A.C.: Bootstrapping the linked data web. In: *1st Workshop on Web Scale Knowledge Extraction@ ISWC (01 2011)*
26. Glaese, A., McAleese, N., Trębacz, M., Aslanides, J., Firoiu, V., Ewalds, T., Rauh, M., Weidinger, L., Chadwick, M., Thacker, P.: Improving alignment of dialogue agents via targeted human judgements. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.14375* (2022)
27. Gliozzo, A.M., Kalyanpur, A.: Predicting lexical answer types in open domain qa. *Int. J. Semant. Web Inf. Syst.* **8**(3), 74–88 (jul 2012)
28. Gu, Y., Kase, S., Vanni, M., Sadler, B., Liang, P., Yan, X., Su, Y.: Beyond i.i.d.: Three levels of generalization for question answering on knowledge bases. In: *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021*. p. 3477–3488. WWW '21, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2021)
29. Gu, Y., Su, Y.: ArcaneQA: Dynamic program induction and contextualized encoding for knowledge base question answering. In: *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*. pp. 1718–1731. International Committee on Computational Linguistics, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea (Oct 2022)

30. Hakimov, S., Jebbara, S., Cimiano, P.: AMUSE: multilingual semantic parsing for question answering over linked data. In: Proceedings of the 16th International Semantic Web Conference (ISWC). pp. 329–346 (2017)
31. Hakimov, S., Jebbara, S., Cimiano, P.: Evaluating architectural choices for deep learning approaches for question answering over knowledge bases. In: Proceedings of the 13th IEEE International Conference on Semantic Computing (ICSC). pp. 110–113 (2019)
32. Hakimov, S., Unger, C., Cimiano, P.: Applying semantic parsing to question answering over linked data: Addressing the lexical gap. In: Natural Language Processing and Information Systems (2015)
33. Hans, K.: A theory of truth and semantic representation. Formal Methods in the Study of language (1981)
34. Hao, Y., Zhang, Y., Liu, K., He, S., Liu, Z., Wu, H., Zhao, J.: An end-to-end model for question answering over knowledge base with cross-attention combining global knowledge. In: Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL (2017)
35. Hu, X., Shu, Y., Huang, X., Qu, Y.: Edg-based question decomposition for complex question answering over knowledge bases. In: Proceedings of the 20th International Semantic Web Conference (ISWC). pp. 128–145. Springer International Publishing (2021)
36. Joshi, A.K., Schabes, Y.: Tree-Adjoining Grammars, pp. 69–123. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (1997)
37. Kamp, H., Reyle, U.: From discourse to logic: Introduction to modeltheoretic semantics of natural language, formal logic and discourse representation theory, vol. 42. Springer Science & Business Media (2013)
38. Kapanipathi, P., Abdelaziz, I., Ravishankar, S., Roukos, S., Gray, A., Fernandez Astudillo, R., Chang, M., Cornelio, C., Dana, S., Fokoue, A., Garg, D., Gliozzo, A., Gurajada, S., Karanam, H., Khan, N., Khandelwal, D., Lee, Y.S., Li, Y., Luus, F., Makondo, N., Mihindukulasooriya, N., Naseem, T., Neelam, S., Popa, L., Gangi Reddy, R., Riegel, R., Rossiello, G., Sharma, U., Bhargav, G.P.S., Yu, M.: Leveraging Abstract Meaning Representation for knowledge base question answering. In: Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021. pp. 3884–3894. Association for Computational Linguistics (Aug 2021)
39. Kingma, D.P., Ba, J.: Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In: Bengio, Y., LeCun, Y. (eds.) 3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings (2015)
40. Knuth, D.: The Art Of Computer Programming, vol. 3: Sorting And Searching. Addison-Wesley (1973)
41. Lehmann, J., Meloni, A., Motta, E., Osborne, F., Reforgiato Recupero, D., Salatino, A., Vahdati, S.: Large Language Models for Scientific Question Answering: An Extensive Analysis of the SciQA Benchmark, pp. 199–217 (05 2024)
42. Levenshtein, V.I., et al.: Binary codes capable of correcting deletions, insertions, and reversals. In: Soviet physics doklady. vol. 10, pp. 707–710. Soviet Union (1966)
43. Liu, C., Liu, K., He, S., Nie, Z., Zhao, J.: Generating questions for knowledge bases via incorporating diversified contexts and answer-aware loss. In: Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP) (2019)
44. Lukovnikov, D., Fischer, A., Lehmann, J.: Pretrained transformers for simple question answering over knowledge graphs. In: Proceedings of the 18th International Semantic Web Conference (ISWC). pp. 470–486 (2019)

45. Lukovnikov, D., Fischer, A., Lehmann, J., Auer, S.: Neural network-based question answering over knowledge graphs on word and character level. In: Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on World Wide Web (WWW). p. 1211–1220 (2017)
46. McCrae, J.P., Spohr, D., Cimiano, P.: Linking lexical resources and ontologies on the semantic web with lemon. In: Proceedings of the 8th extended semantic web conference on The semantic web: research and applications (ESWC). vol. 6643, pp. 245–259 (2011)
47. Mendes, P.N., Jakob, M., García-Silva, A., Bizer, C.: Dbpedia spotlight: shedding light on the web of documents. In: Ghidini, C., Ngomo, A.N., Lindstaedt, S.N., Pellegrini, T. (eds.) Proceedings the 7th International Conference on Semantic Systems, I-SEMANTICS 2011, Graz, Austria, September 7-9, 2011. pp. 1–8. ACM International Conference Proceeding Series, ACM (2011)
48. Mihindukulasooriya, N., Rossiello, G., Kapanipathi, P., Abdelaziz, I., Ravishankar, S., Yu, M., Roukos, A.G.S., Gray, A.: Leveraging semantic parsing for relation linking over knowledge bases. In: Proceedings of the 19th International Semantic Web Conference (ISWC). pp. 402–419. Springer International Publishing (2020)
49. de Moura, L., Bjørner, N.: Z3: An efficient smt solver. In: Ramakrishnan, C.R., Rehof, J. (eds.) Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems. pp. 337–340. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2008)
50. Nakashole, N., Weikum, G., Suchanek, F.: PATTY: A taxonomy of relational patterns with semantic types. In: Proceedings of the 2012 Joint Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and Computational Natural Language Learning. pp. 1135–1145. Association for Computational Linguistics, Jeju Island, Korea (Jul 2012)
51. Nikas, C., Fafalios, P., Tzitzikas, Y.: Open domain question answering over knowledge graphs using keyword search, answer type prediction, SPARQL and pre-trained neural models. In: Proceedings of the 20th International Semantic Web Conference (ISWC) (2021)
52. Omar, R., Dhall, I., Kalnis, P., Mansour, E.: A universal question-answering platform for knowledge graphs. In: In Proceedings of the ACM SIGMOD/PODS international conference of Management of Data (2023)
53. Omar, R., Mangukiya, O., Kalnis, P., Mansour, E.: Chatgpt versus traditional question answering for knowledge graphs: Current status and future directions towards knowledge graph chatbots. CoRR **abs/2302.06466** (2023)
54. Ouyang, L., Wu, J., Jiang, X., Almeida, D., Wainwright, C., Mishkin, P., Zhang, C., Agarwal, S., Slama, K., Gray, A., Schulman, J., Hilton, J., Kelton, F., Miller, L., Simens, M., Aspell, A., Welinder, P., Christiano, P., Leike, J., Lowe, R.: Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (2022)
55. Petroni, F., Rocktäschel, T., Riedel, S., Lewis, P., Bakhtin, A., Wu, Y., Miller, A.: Language models as knowledge bases? In: Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP). pp. 2463–2473. Association for Computational Linguistics, Hong Kong, China (Nov 2019)
56. Qi, P., Zhang, Y., Zhang, Y., Bolton, J., Manning, C.D.: Stanza: A Python natural language processing toolkit for many human languages. In: Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations (2020)

57. Ren, H., Lu, W., Xiao, Y., Chang, X., Wang, X., Dong, Z., Fang, D.: Graph convolutional networks in language and vision: A survey. *Know.-Based Syst.* **251**(C) (sep 2022)
58. Rossiello, G., Mihindukulasooriya, N., Abdelaziz, I., Bornea, M., Gliozzo, A., Naseem, T., Kapanipathi, P.: Generative relation linking for question answering over knowledge bases. In: *Proceedings of the the 20th International Semantic Web Conference (ISWC)* (2021)
59. Rossiello, G., Mihindukulasooriya, N., Abdelaziz, I., Bornea, M., Gliozzo, A., Naseem, T., Kapanipathi, P.: Generative relation linking for question answering over knowledge bases. In: *Proceedings of the 20th International Semantic Web Conference (ISWC)*. pp. 321–337. Springer International Publishing (2021)
60. Ruseti, S., Mirea, A., Rebedea, T., Trausan-Matu, S.: Qanswer-enhanced entity matching for question answering over linked data. In: *CLEF* (2015)
61. Sakor, A., Mulang', I.O., Singh, K., Shekarpour, S., Vidal, M.E., Lehmann, J., Auer, S.: Old is gold: Linguistic driven approach for entity and relation linking of short text. In: *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. pp. 2336–2346. Association for Computational Linguistics, Minneapolis, Minnesota (Jun 2019)
62. Schabes, Y., Joshi, A.K.: An Earley-type parsing algorithm for Tree Adjoining Grammars. In: *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. pp. 258–269. Association for Computational Linguistics, Buffalo, New York, USA (Jun 1988)
63. Shekarpour, S., Endris, K.M., Jaya Kumar, A., Lukovnikov, D., Singh, K., Thakkar, H., Lange, C.: Question answering on linked data: Challenges and future directions. In: *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference Companion on World Wide Web (WWW)*. pp. 693–698 (2016)
64. Shekarpour, S., Ngonga Ngomo, A.C., Auer, S.: Query segmentation and resource disambiguation leveraging background knowledge. In: *Proceedings of WoLE Workshop* (2012)
65. Steedman, M.: *Surface structure and interpretation, Linguistic inquiry*, vol. 30. MIT Press (1997)
66. Sun, H., Dhingra, B., Zaheer, M., Mazaitis, K., Salakhutdinov, R., Cohen, W.: Open domain question answering using early fusion of knowledge bases and text. In: *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. pp. 4231–4242. Association for Computational Linguistics (2018)
67. Tan, Y., Min, D., Li, Y., Li, W., Hu, N., Chen, Y., Qi, G.: Can chatgpt replace traditional kbqa models? an in-depth analysis of the question answering performance of the gpt llm family. In: *International Semantic Web Conference*. pp. 348–367. Springer (2023)
68. Unger, C., Cimiano, P.: Pythia: Compositional meaning construction for ontology-based question answering on the semantic web. In: *International Conference on Applications of Natural Language to Data Bases* (2011)
69. Unger, C., Freitas, A., Cimiano, P.: An introduction to question answering over linked data. In: *Reasoning Web*. pp. 100–140. Springer, Athens, Greece (2014)
70. Unger, C., Hieber, F., Cimiano, P.: Generating LTAG grammars from a lexicon/ontology interface. In: *Proceedings of the 10th International Workshop on Tree Adjoining Grammar and Related Frameworks (TAG)*. pp. 61–68. Yale University (2010)

71. Unger, C., Hieber, F., Cimiano, P.: Generating LTAG grammars from a lexicon/ontology interface. In: Proceedings of the 10th International Workshop on Tree Adjoining Grammar and Related Frameworks (TAG). pp. 61–68. Yale University (2010)
72. Usbeck, R., Gusmita, R.H., Ngomo, A.N., Saleem, M.: 9th challenge on question answering over linked data (QALD-9). In: Joint proceedings of the 4th Workshop on Semantic Deep Learning (SemDeep-4) and NLIWoD4: Natural Language Interfaces for the Web of Data (NLIWOD-4) and 9th Question Answering over Linked Data challenge (QALD-9) co-located with 17th International Semantic Web Conference (ISWC). pp. 58–64. California, United States of America (2018)
73. Usbeck, R., Yan, X., Perevalov, A., Jiang, L., Schulz, J., Kraft, A., Möller, C., Huang, J., Reineke, J., Ngomo, A., Saleem, M., Both, A.: Qald-10 — the 10th challenge on question answering over linked data. *Semantic Web* (Feb 2023)
74. Vollmers, D., Jalota, R., Moussallem, D., Topiwala, H., Ngomo, A.C.N., Usbeck, R.: Knowledge graph question answering using graph-pattern isomorphism. In: Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Semantic Systems (SEMANTiCS) (2021)
75. Walter, S., Unger, C., Cimiano, P.: M-atoll: A framework for the lexicalization of ontologies in multiple languages. In: Proceedings of the 13th International Semantic Web Conference (ISWC) (2014)
76. Walter, S., Unger, C., Cimiano, P.: Dblexipedia: A nucleus for a multilingual lexical semantic web. In: Paulheim, H., van Erp, M., Filipowska, A., Mendes, P.N., Brümmer, M. (eds.) Proceedings of the Third NLP&DBpedia Workshop (NLP & DBpedia 2015) co-located with the 14th International Semantic Web Conference 2015 (ISWC 2015), Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, USA, October 11, 2015. *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, vol. 1581, pp. 87–92. CEUR-WS.org (2015)
77. Wang, R., Rossetto, L., Cochez, M., Bernstein, A.: Qagcn: Answering multi-relation questions via single-step implicit reasoning over knowledge graphs. In: Meroño Peñuela, A., Dimou, A., Troncy, R., Lisena, P., Hartig, O., Acosta, M., Alam, M., Paulheim, H. (eds.) *The Semantic Web. Lecture Notes in Computer Science* (including subseries *Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence* and *Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics*), vol. 1, pp. 41–58. Springer Science and Business Media Deutschland GmbH, Germany (2024)
78. Wolf, T., Debut, L., Sanh, V., Chaumond, J., Delangue, C., Moi, A., Cistac, P., Rault, T., Louf, R., Funtowicz, M., Davison, J., Shleifer, S., von Platen, P., Ma, C., Jernite, Y., Plu, J., Xu, C., Scao, T.L., Gugger, S., Drame, M., Lhoest, Q., Rush, A.M.: Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing. In: Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations. pp. 38–45. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online (Oct 2020)
79. Yahya, M., Berberich, K., Elbassuoni, S., Ramanath, M., Tresp, V., Weikum, G.: Natural language questions for the web of data. In: Proceedings of the 2012 Joint Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and Computational Natural Language Learning (EMNLP-CoNLL). pp. 379–390. Association for Computational Linguistics (2012)
80. Yih, W.t., Richardson, M., Meek, C., Chang, M.W., Suh, J.: The value of semantic parse labeling for knowledge base question answering. In: Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL). pp. 201–206. Association for Computational Linguistics, Berlin, Germany (Aug 2016)

81. Yin, X., Gromann, D., Rudolph, S.: Neural machine translating from natural language to SPARQL. *Future Generation Computer Systems* **117**, 510–519 (2021)
82. Zheng, W., Zhang, M.: Question answering over knowledge graphs via structural query patterns. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.09760* (2019)
83. Zou, L., Huang, R., Wang, H., Yu, J.X., He, W., Zhao, D.: Natural language question answering over rdf: a graph data driven approach. In: 2014 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data (2014)