

# Large Language Model-Enhanced Symbolic Reasoning for Knowledge Base Completion

Qiyuan He<sup>1</sup> Jianfei Yu<sup>2</sup> Wenya Wang<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>College of Computing and Data Science, Nanyang Technological University

<sup>2</sup>School of Computer Science and Engineering, Nanjing University of Science and Technology  
{qiyuan001,wenya}@ntu.edu.sg jfyu@njust.edu.cn

## Abstract

Integrating large language models (LLMs) with rule-based reasoning offers a powerful solution for improving the flexibility and reliability of Knowledge Base Completion (KBC). Traditional rule-based KBC methods offer verifiable reasoning yet lack flexibility, while LLMs provide strong semantic understanding yet suffer from hallucinations. With the aim of combining LLMs' understanding capability with the logical and rigor of rule-based approaches, we propose a novel framework consisting of a Subgraph Extractor, an LLM Proposer, and a Rule Reasoner. The Subgraph Extractor first samples subgraphs from the KB. Then, the LLM uses these subgraphs to propose diverse and meaningful rules that are helpful for inferring missing facts. To effectively avoid hallucination in LLMs' generations, these proposed rules are further refined by a Rule Reasoner to pinpoint the most significant rules in the KB for Knowledge Base Completion. Our approach offers several key benefits: the utilization of LLMs to enhance the richness and diversity of the proposed rules and the integration with rule-based reasoning to improve reliability. Our method also demonstrates strong performance across diverse KB datasets, highlighting the robustness and generalizability of the proposed framework.<sup>1</sup>

## 1 Introduction

Knowledge bases (KBs) are repositories of structured information that serve foundational roles in a wide range of machine learning applications, such as question-answering, recommendation systems, and semantic search (Wang et al., 2017). Despite their compact and large volume of information storage, KBs are often incomplete, leading to significant gaps in knowledge representation. To tackle

<sup>1</sup>This work will be submitted to the IEEE for possible publication. Copyright may be transferred without notice, after which this version may no longer be accessible.




Figure 1: **LeSR**: LLM-enhanced Symbolic Reasoning for KB Completion, aiming for flexibility, semantic understanding and generalizability.

this challenge, the task of Knowledge Base Completion (KBC) has attracted considerable attention in the research community, aiming to automatically infer missing entities within KBs (Socher et al., 2013).

Existing KBC methods are mostly embedding-based and logic rule-based. Earlier research focuses on embedding-based methods that learn to encode the semantics of entities and relations as vectors, enabling efficient inference through vector operations (Bordes et al., 2013; Yang et al., 2015; Trouillon et al., 2016; Balazevic et al., 2019). These methods have gained popularity due to their effectiveness in capturing latent patterns within large-scale KBs. On the other hand, logic rule-based methods (Khot et al., 2011; Rocktäschel and Riedel, 2017; Yang et al., 2017; Qu et al., 2021) offer an interpretable approach to KBC, contrasting with the often opaque nature of embedding-based methods (Bordes et al., 2013; Yang et al., 2015; Trouillon et al., 2016; Balazevic et al., 2019). They leverage logic rules such as  $parent(A, B) \wedge parent(B, C) \Rightarrow grandparent(A, C)$ , which reads as *if A is B's parent and B is C's parent, then A is C's grandparent*, to infer missing facts based on existing KB.

Nevertheless, most existing KBC methods still suffer from several limitations. Embedding-based methods, while efficient, often lack interpretability and fail to handle new entities unseen during

training. Although rule-based methods excel in providing transparent and verifiable reasoning, either through pattern mining (Galárraga et al., 2013; Wang and Li, 2015; Meilicke et al., 2019) or neural modeling (Rocktäschel and Riedel, 2017; Xiong et al., 2017; Minervini et al., 2020), they struggle to identify quality and diverse rules. The lack of flexibility and diversity limits the effectiveness of these rule-based approaches due to the increasing complexity and scale of modern KBs (Zhou et al., 2023).

To tackle the aforementioned limitations, we consider to leverage large language models in the rule mining process and integrate the power of LLMs into the symbolic reasoning process of KB completion. With vast linguistic knowledge captured from large-scale pre-training, LLMs have been used for KBC by framing it as a sequence generation problem (Yao et al., 2024) where LLMs are used to directly infer missing entities or relationships (Yao et al., 2024) given a query such as “*What is the capital of France?*”. However, treating KBC as a generation task with LLM backbones has raised concerns regarding transparency and accuracy. Namely, these approaches heavily rely on the inherent abilities of LLMs, lacking clarity in the internal reasoning processes. Moreover, LLMs are prone to hallucinations and errors and tend to perform poorly without extensive fine-tuning, especially on domain-specific knowledge (Veseli et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2024; He et al., 2024).

We propose a novel framework, **LeSR** (LLM-enhanced Symbolic Reasoning), which synergizes the comprehensive understanding capabilities of LLMs and the rigorousness of rule-based systems. LeSR consists of a Subgraph Extractor, an LLM Proposer and a Rule Reasoner, designed to enhance the relevancy and diversity of logic rules and maximize the effectiveness and reliability of the knowledge inference process. For each relation in the KB, the Subgraph Extractor is responsible for identifying meaningful subgraphs surrounding the relation, which will be further fed into the LLM Proposer to generate diverse and relevant logic rules. The comprehensive power of LLMs contributes to identifying a wide range of entity-agnostic logic rules, uncovering common patterns behind the extracted subgraphs, but meanwhile, it also brings in unexpected noise, which is harmful to knowledge completion. We thus introduce a Rule Reasoner to refine LLM proposals by learning to score each rule, improving reliability and reducing the halluci-

nation inherent in the LLM Proposer.

The contributions of our work are threefold: (1) We introduce a novel paradigm leveraging LLMs to propose logic rules that are relation-specific and sensitive to subgraph structures. The proposed rules demonstrate sufficient diversity and coverage. (2) We propose a novel framework that effectively integrates LLMs with logic rule reasoning. Our framework combines the power of language understanding and rigorous reasoning, leading to a transparent and more reliable inference process, effectively mitigating the errors produced by LLMs alone. (3) We conduct extensive experiments over five knowledge base benchmarks, covering diverse domains and complexities. Our method achieves comparable results across all datasets and produces adequate interpretable rules, demonstrating its effectiveness as a robust and generalizable solution for KBC.

## 2 Related Work

Knowledge Base Completion (KBC), sometimes known as link prediction, is the task of filling in missing information in knowledge bases (KBs) based on existing data. Existing KBC methods can be broadly and loosely categorized as embedding-based or rule-based strategies.

**Embedding-based KBC** Most embedding-based methods represent entities and relations by vectors with their semantics preserved in the embedding space (Sun et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2022; Bordes et al., 2013; Trouillon et al., 2016; Dettmers et al., 2018; Balazevic et al., 2019). They are black-box in nature and thus lack interpretability. In addition, they heavily rely on data of good quality to excel (Nickel et al., 2011). Furthermore, these embedding-based methods implicitly follow the closed world assumption (Qu et al., 2021; Paulheim, 2017) that all facts not present in the knowledge base dataset are false. However, under real-world scenarios, knowledge bases tend to be inherently incomplete and follow the open-world assumption, i.e. the absence of a fact implies uncertainty instead of falsehood. Because closed-world assumption does not account for the possibility of the unknown, KBC methods based on these methods suffer from incomplete or evolving KBs.

Some works use graph neural networks (GNN) to solve KBC. In general, GNN-based approaches learn embeddings for both entities (nodes) and relationships (edges) in the KB and use message-




Figure 2: An overview of **LeSR**: LLM-enhanced Symbolic Reasoning. The Subgraph Extractor samples relevant subgraphs from the KB, then the LLM uses these subgraphs to propose logical rules, which will be further refined by the Rule Reasoner, learning the significance of the proposed rules and performing KB completion.

passing to aggregate information from neighbouring nodes and edges (Schlichtkrull et al., 2018). However, GNNs may quickly find and optimize for existing link existence information in the training data, potentially leading to overfitting and poor generalizability (Zhang and Chen, 2018).

**Rule-based KBC** Rule-based methods assume relationships between entities, and relations can be explicitly expressed as logical rules or patterns (Nickel et al., 2016). Early representative methods include rule mining (Meilicke et al., 2019), markov logic networks (Khot et al., 2011), relational networks (Natarajan et al., 2010), neuro symbolic models (Yang and Song, 2020; Sadeghian et al., 2019; Qu et al., 2021) and neural theorem provers (Minervini et al., 2020; Rocktäschel and Riedel, 2017). While offering verifiable reasoning, they rely on extensive searching, mining, and application of rules across KBs that are computationally intensive (Zeng et al., 2023). In addition, the rules may be tailored to specific relationships or patterns in the KB, limiting their ability to generalize to new or unseen scenarios (Wu et al., 2023).

Another paradigm adopts reinforcement learning to learn rules (Das et al., 2018; Lin et al., 2018). These methods model the KB reasoning process as a sequential decision-making problem and treat KBC as a Markov Decision Process, where an RL agent explores paths in the KB to validate facts. However, training effective path-finding agents

is particularly difficult due to the sparsity of the reward signal, making them underperform compared to other alternatives (Qu et al., 2021). Moreover, RL agents often struggle to navigate the large search space to identify optimal paths, leading to reliability issues in KB reasoning (Zhou et al., 2023).

**LLMs for KBC** There also exist some works utilizing LLMs for Knowledge Base Completion. The general idea is to treat KBC as a language generation task and use LLMs to generate answers to the query. However, KBC is generally considered knowledge-intensive tasks that require a significant amount of external knowledge as a supplement, and existing works focused either on prompt design or fine-tuning LLMs for performance gain (Veseli et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2024; Yao et al., 2024; He et al., 2024). Notably, commonsense KBs (Sap et al., 2019; Speer et al., 2017) differ from domain-specific KBs as they are inherently very sparse and incomplete. Some research uses LLMs for commonsense KB completion and construction with a focus on capturing the implicit knowledge not reflected in the commonsense KBs (Hwang et al., 2021; Bosselut et al., 2019; Lin et al., 2019).

### 3 Method

We propose a novel framework, **LeSR**, consisting of a Subgraph Extractor, an LLM Proposer, and a Rule Reasoner, as shown in Fig. 2. The Subgraph Extractor samples a set of relevant subgraphs

$\mathcal{G}_r$  surrounding each relation  $r$  in the knowledge base (KB), providing context-rich and structure-preserved inputs to the LLM. The LLM then uses these subgraphs to generate diverse and meaningful rules  $\Phi_r$ , uncovering common patterns inherent with these input subgraphs. Each rule  $\phi \in \Phi_r$  is a logic clause in the form of IF-THEN format, consisting of knowledge triplets as predicates (e.g.,  $(A, r, B)$  with variable  $A$  and  $B$  as placeholders for arbitrary entity  $h, t$  and relation  $r$ ). A simple example of  $\phi$  can be “IF  $(A, r_1, B)$  AND  $(B, r_2, C)$  THEN  $(A, r, C)$ ”, which is read as “If entity  $A$  has relation  $r_1$  to  $B$ , and entity  $B$  has relation  $r_2$  to  $C$ , then  $A$  has relation  $r$  to  $C$ .” The generated rules are subsequently refined and scored by a Rule Reasoner during training to improve their reliability and reduce the likelihood of error and hallucination.

### 3.1 Problem Definition

Knowledge Base Completion refers to the task of inferring missing facts in a knowledge base. A knowledge base is typically represented as a set of triplets  $(h, r, t)$ , where  $h$  (head) and  $t$  (tail) are entities, and  $r$  (relation) represents the relationship between them. In this sense, a KB can be considered as a directed graph with nodes being entities and edges being relations. The goal of KBC is to predict new triplets  $(h, r, t)$  that are likely to be true but are not currently present in the KB, thereby completing the knowledge base.

Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be the set of all entities and  $\mathcal{R}$  be the set of all relations in the knowledge base. The knowledge base is then defined as a set of observed triples:  $\mathcal{G} = \{(h, r, t) \mid h, t \in \mathcal{E}, r \in \mathcal{R}\}$ . The KBC task is to find the most likely  $t$  given an incomplete triplet  $(h, r, ?)$  missing the object. This task can be formulated as finding  $t = \arg \max_{t'} f(h, r, t')$ , where  $f$  is the scoring function that models the plausibility of the triplet  $(h, r, t')$ .

### 3.2 Subgraph Extractor

To maximize the effectiveness of LLMs in generating candidate rules, it is essential to integrate useful information pertinent to a specific relation into the input context of the LLMs. Given a training KB, subgraphs surrounding a specific relation  $r$  serve as a natural source of structure-aware context to be fed into LLMs. Given the diverse coverage of the training KB, we expect that a set of different subgraphs for  $r$  sampled from the KB is able to reflect both diverse and common patterns to inform

the set of plausible logic rules leading to the target relation  $r$ . Concretely, the Subgraph Extractor is designed to output a set of representative subgraphs  $\mathcal{G}_r = \{g_r \mid g_r \subset \mathcal{G}\}$  centring each relation  $r \in \mathcal{R}$ .

We consider all triplets  $(\cdot, r, \cdot)$  in  $\mathcal{G}$  with relation  $r$  and perform random sampling to sample  $m$  triplets to create a set of target triplets of  $r$ :  $\{(h_1, r, t_1), \dots, (h_m, r, t_m)\}$ . Then for each target triplet  $(h_j, r, t_j)$ , we perform a multi-hop traversal starting from its head and tail entities  $h_j, t_j$ . Each hop collects all adjacent entities with an edge directly connected to the pivot entity. The collection of triplets at the  $(k + 1)$ -hop pivoting at triplet  $(h_j, r, t_j)$  is derived as:  $N_{(h_j, r, t_j)}^{k+1} = \{(h, r, t) \in \mathcal{G} \mid h \in E_{(h_j, r, t_j)}^k \text{ or } t \in E_{(h_j, r, t_j)}^k\}$  where  $E_{(h_j, r, t_j)}^k$  represents the entities appeared in  $N_{(h_j, r, t_j)}^k$  which is the  $k$ -hop traversal subgraph of target triplet  $(h_j, r, t_j)$ . To ensure the compactness of the sampled subgraph, we further require that the triplets visited during the last hop of traversal are directly adjacent to the target triplet. In this way, the obtained subgraph  $g_{r,j}$  contains neighbouring entities with multiple closed paths from the target triplet.

### 3.3 LLM Proposer

The LLM Proposer is responsible for generating diverse and meaningful logic rules for KBC. It is designed to leverage the extensive linguistic capabilities of LLMs to create rules that are tailored to target relations within the provided knowledge subgraph. This module improves the flexibility and diversity of the rules compared to traditional rule-based or neural methods.

More specifically, given the set of sampled subgraphs  $\mathcal{G}_r$  corresponding to each relation  $r \in \mathcal{R}$  as discussed in the previous section, we linearize each subgraph into a textual prompt to be fed as the LLM input. The prompt is designed so that the output is of the form “IF X THEN Y,” where  $X$  represents the rule body and  $Y$  the rule head, potentially including conditions with varying logical structures<sup>2</sup>, and the template used for generating these prompts can be found in Appx. C. The LLM is prompted to generate the most relevant logical rules that can

<sup>2</sup>While LLMs are capable of generating more complex logic rules involving disjunctions (OR) and negations (NOT) like “IF (A, headquarters location, B) OR (A, capital, B) THEN (A, country, B)” and “IF (A, shares border with, B) AND NOT (B, shares border with, C) THEN NOT (A, shares border with, C)”, in this work, we focus exclusively on conjunctions (i.e., AND conditions). This decision simplifies the rule induction process while still achieving high-quality predictions.

be used to induce the target relation  $r$ . We denote by  $\Phi_r = \phi_1, \dots, \phi_{n_r}$  the final output from the LLM Proposer consisting of candidate logic rules where each rule  $\phi_i$  can be logically derived as  $X \Rightarrow Y$ .

As LLMs may sometimes produce imprecise outputs, to obtain syntactically meaningful rules  $\Phi_r$ , we refine the generated rules from LLMs via a two-stage filtering process. In the first stage, we filter out rules that do not adhere to the correct format to ensure proper logical structure (e.g. incomplete statements with missing rule heads), rules with irrelevant rule heads (e.g. complete statements but for rules other than the given relation, and rules that are not entity-agnostic (e.g. rules that reference specific entities rather than generalizable concepts)). In the second stage, we further process the filtered rules by mapping all the relations in each rule to their corresponding KB relations in  $\mathcal{R}$  via embedding-based semantic similarity. For example, given a generated rule  $\phi$  expressed as “IF ( $A, r_1, B$ ) AND ( $C, r_2, B$ ), THEN ( $B, r_3, C$ )”, we use the sentence transformer (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019) to map  $r_i, i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  to  $r'_i \in \mathcal{R}$  of the highest similarity score for semantic flexibility. In this way, we take advantage of the linguistic understanding of LLMs to obtain a set of flexible and diverse logical rules  $\Phi_r = \{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_{n_r}\}$  proposed by LLM for each relation  $r \in \mathcal{R}$ , where  $n_r$  is the number of the total logic rules for relation  $r$ .

### 3.4 Rule Reasoner

The Rule Reasoner evaluates, refines, and scores the logic rules proposed by the LLM in the previous stage. It is critical to ensure that these proposed rules are not only plausible but also reliably grounded to the KB, reducing the likelihood of errors or hallucinations that LLMs might introduce. To effectively score the generated logic rules, we propose to ground the general rules in the given knowledge base (*Rule Grounding*) and evaluate their relevancy in the KB (*Rule Evaluation*).

**Rule Grounding** For each logic rule  $\phi_i$  for relation  $r \in \mathcal{R}$ , we perform knowledge base grounding, a process that maps abstract logical rules to specific entities and relationships within the given KB, to identify corresponding pairs of  $h, t \in \mathcal{E}$  so that  $(h, r, t) \in \mathcal{G}$ . This process produces two matrices  $\mathbf{C}_i$  and  $\mathbf{A}_i$ , where  $\mathbf{C}_i$  records the pairs of  $(h, t)$  entities that satisfy the rule body of  $\phi_i$ , and  $\mathbf{A}_i$  records the pairs of  $(h, t)$  that satisfy both the rule body and rule head of  $\phi_i$ , and thus making  $\phi_i$

successfully grounded. For example, given a logic rule  $\phi =$ “IF ( $A, parent, B$ ) AND ( $B, parent, C$ ) THEN ( $A, grandparent, C$ )” and a few KB facts: (Anna, parent, Bob), (Bob, parent, Charlie), (Anna, grandparent, Charlie), we say that (Anna, Charlie) satisfy the entire rule  $\phi$ , whereas (Anna, Bob) and (Bob, Charlie) satisfy the body of  $\phi$ .

Mathematically,  $\mathbf{C}_i = [c_i(h, t)]_{|\mathcal{E}| \times |\mathcal{E}|}$  with  $c_i(h, t)$  being the number of traversing options to traverse over  $\mathcal{G}$ , starting from entity  $h$ , following the rule body of  $\phi_i$ , and ending at entity  $t \in \mathcal{E}$ .  $c_i(h, t) = 0$  if there is no traversing options between  $h$  and  $t$  following  $\phi_i$ . Similarly, we have  $\mathbf{A}_i = [a_i(h, t)]_{|\mathcal{E}| \times |\mathcal{E}|}$  with  $a_i(h, t)$  being the number of available traversal paths over  $\mathcal{G}$  to traverse from entity  $h$  to reach entity  $t$ , following  $\phi_i$ ’s rule body and rule head. We categorize logic rules based on their complexity and traversal structures, e.g. 0th-order inversion ( $A, r_i, B$ ) – ( $B, r_j, A$ ) and 1st-order bidirectional ( $B, r_i, A$ ) – ( $B, r_j, C$ ) – ( $A, r_k, C$ ). As each relation  $r$  corresponds to a matrix  $M_r = \{m_{ht}\}_{|\mathcal{E}| \times |\mathcal{E}|}$  where  $m_{ht} = 1$  if  $(h, r, t) \in \mathcal{G}$  and  $m_{ht} = 0$  otherwise, we can use matrix multiplications to represent the conjunctions of atomic triplets and matrix transpose to represent an inversion. The detailed categorization of logic rules and their corresponding formula to compute  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $\mathbf{A}$  can be found in Appx. D.

**Rule Evaluation** We can further define a scoring function  $s_i$  using  $\mathbf{A}_i$  and  $\mathbf{C}_i$  as a measurement of the grounding quality for an arbitrary  $(h, r, t) \in \mathcal{G}$ :  $s_i(h, t) = \mathbf{A}_i(h, t)$  when  $\mathbf{A}_i(h, t) > 0$ ,  $s_i(h, t) = -\mathbf{C}_i(h, t)$  when  $\mathbf{A}_i(h, t) = 0 \wedge \mathbf{C}_i(h, t) > 0$  and  $s_i(h, t) = 0$  otherwise.

The main idea is to award when  $\phi_i$  can be used to obtain correct  $t$  and penalize if such grounding leads to an incorrect entity. Here  $s_i(h, t)$  measures the grounding quality of  $\phi_i$  in the entity pair  $(h, t)$  with regard to the target relation  $r$ . From the perspective of KBC, answering query  $(h, r, ?)$  with logic rule  $\phi_i$  is to find  $t'$  that maximizes  $f_{\phi_i}(h, r, t') = s_i(h, t')$ . We associate each logical rule  $\phi_i$  with a learnable significance score  $w_i$  and optimize these  $w_i$  using  $L_0 = -\log \sum_{\phi_i} w_i f_{\phi_i}$ .

To account for cases which are not covered by logic rules, we additionally incorporate an embedding-based model RotatE (Sun et al., 2019) that calculates a score  $f_{emb}(h, r, t') = RotatE(h, r, t')$  based on semantic information. The training object of the **LeSR** model is to learn optimal rule significance  $w_i$ ,  $w_{emb}$  and weighting

factor  $\alpha$  for the following loss function:

$$L_1 = -\log \alpha \sum_{\phi_i} w_i f_{\phi_i} + (1 - \alpha) w_{emb} f_{emb}$$

Due to the sparsity of KBs, we focus on nonzero contributions by masking zero  $s_i$  during training. We also use softmax transformation to  $w_i$  and  $w_{emb}$  to ensure they are positive and sum to one.

During inference, the model process query  $(h, r, ?)$  and computes the weighted likelihood of each  $t' \in \mathcal{E}$  being the answer to this query using logical rules and embedding. Entities are ranked based on their weighted likelihood, allowing us to compute the rank of the correct answer entity.

## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Experimental Setup

**Datasets** We choose five KB benchmarks, namely (1) **UMLs**, a biomedical KB (Kok and Domingos, 2007) with many domain-specific entities; (2) **WN18RR**, an English Lexical-focused dataset derived from WordNet (Dettmers et al., 2018) with very few relations; (3) **CN100K**, a commonsense KB derived from ConceptNet (Speer et al., 2017) proposed by Li et al. (2016); (4) **FB15K-237**, a general KB derived from Freebase (Toutanova and Chen, 2015); and (5) **WD15K**, another general KB based on Freebase with additional annotation on rule quality (Lv et al., 2021). As summarized in Tab. 1, these datasets span multiple domains with KBs of varying graph connectivities and sparsity levels, ensuring diversity.

Statistic	Dataset				
	UMLs	WN18RR	FB15K-237	WD15K	CN100
#Train	1,959	86,835	272,115	159,036	100,000
#Valid	1,306	3,134	17,535	8,727	1,200
#Test	3,264	3,034	20,466	8,761	1,200
#Entity	135	40,943	14,541	15,812	78,339
#Relation	46	11	237	179	34
Sparsity	36.100%	0.005%	0.147%	0.071%	0.002%
Avg degree	48.60	2.27	21.33	11.16	1.31

Table 1: Dataset statistics for KGs in use

**Metrics** We follow Galkin et al. (2022) to use the standard train/test/valid partitioning of the complete KB dataset to create the training, testing, and validation KBs. We use the standard evaluation metrics for KBC: mean rank (MR), mean reciprocal rank (MRR) and Hit@K with K=1,3,10 reported in percentage.

To inspect the significance and quality of the learned rule, we borrow the annotation from (Lv

et al., 2021) which provides rule interpretability scores for WD15K, annotating the most significant reasoning paths based on interpretability and reliability. More specifically, for each high-confidence rule, they randomly sample up to ten corresponding real paths and label these paths for interpretability, scoring 0, 0.5 or 1. We define the Rule Clarity Score (RCS) of a single rule as the average interpretability score of its sampled paths, and the RCS of the model being the average RCS of all rules learned by this model. We assess models by examining the total number of learned rules, the number of high-confidence rules (those with interpretability annotations), and their RCS, which reflects the interpretability quality of high-confidence rules. To provide a more comprehensive evaluation, we introduce the Rule Quality Index (RQI), which balances the Rule Clarity Score (RCS) and the High-Confidence Rule Ratio (HCR). Inspired by the F1-score metric, RQI measures a model’s ability to generate a high proportion of high-confidence rules while maintaining strong interpretability:

$$RQI = 2 \cdot \frac{HCR \cdot RCS}{HCR + RCS} \times 100\%,$$

where

$$HCR = \frac{\#High\ Confidence\ Rules}{\#Learned\ Rules} \times 100\%.$$

**Model and Baseline** Under our proposed **LeSR** framework, we consider three different LLMs in the Proposers: GPT-3.5, GPT-4 and Gemini-1.5.

We choose representative baseline models spanning over different paradigms for the task of KBC. For embedding-based methods, we choose the popular **RotatE** (Sun et al., 2019) model, which can implicitly learn simple composition rules, symmetric rules and inverse rules; For traditional non-ML mining methods, we consider **AnyBURL** which efficiently mines logical rules from knowledge bases using a bottom-up strategy (Meilicke et al., 2019); For rule-based methods, we consider **NeuralLP** (Yang et al., 2017) that uses a differentiable process for training logical rules with gradient-based learning, **DRUM**, which extends NeuralLP by incorporating reinforcement learning to optimize rule discovery (Sadeghian et al., 2019), as well as **RNNLogic** (Qu et al., 2021), a probabilistic approach that trains a rule generator and a reasoning predictor using the EM algorithm and uses RotatE to improve the modelling of reasoning paths; For GNN-based methods, we incorporate **RGCN**

Category	Model	UMLs					WN18RR				
		MR ↓	MRR ↑	H@1 ↑	H@3 ↑	H@10 ↑	MR ↓	MRR ↑	H@1 ↑	H@3 ↑	H@10 ↑
Non-ML	AnyBURL	-	0.729	62.5	79.5	93.5	-	0.498	45.8	51.2	57.7
Emb.	RotatE	4.1	0.731	62.4	80.8	93.3	3365.3	0.476	42.8	49.6	57.5
Rule	NeuralLP	4.0	0.735	60.4	84.9	91.7	<b>43.3</b>	0.509	46.2	49.9	62.0
	DRUM	<b>2.2</b>	<b>0.800</b>	65.2	<b>94.5</b>	<b>97.2</b>	43.1	<b>0.515</b>	<b>47.1</b>	50.2	<b>62.1</b>
	RNNLogic	8.0	0.655	53.7	72.5	86.9	5983.3	0.426	39.9	43.4	47.9
GNN	RGCN	-	0.434	26.5	53.0	76.0	-	0.359	31.5	38.5	43.1
GPT-3.5	Inference	-	-	1.2	3.2	11.6	-	-	4.5	19.9	28.2
	LeSR	4.1	0.764	<b>68.2</b>	81.5	91.8	1989.0	0.497	44.0	<b>52.3</b>	61.0
GPT-4	Inference	-	-	1.04	3.74	19.09	-	-	0.14	0.28	0.35
	LeSR	<u>3.8</u>	<u>0.769</u>	<u>67.7</u>	83.1	<u>94.2</u>	1976.8	0.326	22.6	36.4	55.4
Gemini-1.5	Inference	-	-	0.9	4.1	18.1	-	-	10.1	26.8	34.3
	LeSR	6.3	0.723	65.8	75.8	83.2	1987.2	0.489	42.9	<u>51.7</u>	60.9

Table 2: KBC performance on UMLs and WN18RR.

Category	Model	FB15K-237					WD15K				
		MR ↓	MRR ↑	H@1 ↑	H@3 ↑	H@10 ↑	MR ↓	MRR ↑	H@1 ↑	H@3 ↑	H@10 ↑
Non-ML	AnyBURL	-	0.319	23.8	34.9	48.5	-	0.406	33.9	43.7	53.2
Emb.	RotatE	177.1	0.336	24.0	37.2	53.2	258.4	0.401	30.7	45.7	57.1
Rule	NeuralLP	1307.3	0.251	<b>37.4</b>	27.3	18.8	2204.0	0.255	21.8	26.9	32.4
	DRUM	1305.5	0.253	18.9	27.5	37.6	1883.3	0.279	23.6	29.9	35.9
	RNNLogic	736.0	0.392	30.5	43.4	56.0	982.2	0.393	33.0	42.2	52.0
GNN	RGCN	-	0.204	12.4	21.5	36.8	-	0.218	13.8	23.9	37.7
GPT-3.5	Inference	-	-	0.4	0.9	2.0	-	-	23.3	36.6	50.4
	LeSR	<b>124.3</b>	<b>0.420</b>	<u>32.7</u>	<u>46.1</u>	59.8	<b>95.0</b>	<b>0.570</b>	<b>45.3</b>	<b>64.9</b>	<b>77.1</b>
GPT-4	Inference	-	-	3.2	5.0	6.7	-	-	36.1	48.9	64.8
	LeSR	<u>133.1</u>	0.414	32.0	45.7	<u>60.2</u>	99.6	<u>0.549</u>	<u>44.3</u>	<u>61.8</u>	73.1
Gemini-1.5	Inference	-	-	0.5	1.0	1.9	-	-	25.3	39.7	55.8
	LeSR	141.4	<b>0.420</b>	32.3	<b>46.4</b>	<b>61.1</b>	<u>98.5</u>	0.539	43.0	60.7	<u>73.5</u>

Table 3: KBC performance on FB15K-237 and WD15K.

(Schlichtkrull et al., 2018), which leverages GNNs to model relational data for performing message passing across the graph structure.

We also include a baseline approach which directly leverages an LLM to perform KBC inference, denoted as **Inference**. Specifically, for each  $(h, r, ?)$  query, we extract a subject entity  $h$ -centered subgraph and use it as contextual information to prompt the LLMs to generate up to 10 most likely object entity candidates. We have tried different prompt templates and have observed non-significant variations in performance, and the final template can be found in Appx. C. We use GPT-3.5, GPT-4 and Gemini-1.5 as the LLM backbones.

**Implementation** For the Subgraph Extractor, we use the following configuration. To control the size of the subgraph and LLM context length, we set the maximum steps of multi-hop traversal to three and set the maximum number of neighbouring entities to 3. We sample at most 30 subgraphs for each relation. For the LLM Proposer, we utilize the APIs of corresponding LLMs, namely GPT-3.5, GPT-4 and Gemini-1.5. We put the subgraph and the target triplet into a curated prompt template

and fed them into the LLMs to generate the rules. The detailed prompt template for LLMs to propose logic rules can be found in Appx. C.

When learning the score for each rule, all model variants use the AdamW optimizer and share an initial learning rate of 0.001 and a weight decay factor of 0.1. We use a StepLR scheduler with a step size of 100 and a gamma value of 100. An early stopping criteria of 30 epochs is further adopted. For experiments on WD15K, we train all models using the same configurations as FB15K-237 following Lv et al. (2021). The implementation details of baseline models can be found in Appx. A

## 4.2 Result and Analysis

**Comparison with Existing KBC Methods** We present the KBC performance results for smaller more niche datasets UMLs and WN18RR in Tab. 2, for larger more realistic datasets FB15K-237 and WD15K in Tab. 3 and results for commonsense dataset CN100 in Tab. 6.

We can observe that LeSR achieves highly competitive results across all five datasets from diverse knowledge domains. On smaller, relatively niche datasets UMLs and WN18RR, our models con-

Variation	UMLs					WN18RR				
	MR ↓	MRR ↑	H@1 ↑	H@3 ↑	H@10 ↑	MR ↓	MRR ↑	H@1 ↑	H@3 ↑	H@10 ↑
GPT-3.5 w/ WL	<b>5.1</b>	<b>0.722</b>	<b>64.6</b>	<b>75.7</b>	<b>86.0</b>	1989.0	<b>0.497</b>	<b>44.1</b>	<b>52.3</b>	<b>60.9</b>
GPT3.5 w/o WL	10.6	0.364	22.4	40.6	67.7	1985.9	0.460	38.0	50.7	60.5
GPT-4 w/ WL	<u>5.8</u>	0.674	<u>58.6</u>	<u>71.5</u>	<u>83.6</u>	1987.8	0.387	29.5	42.8	58.1
GPT-4 w/o WL	10.7	0.328	19.3	34.8	64.6	<b>1949.4</b>	0.406	31.2	45.4	59.6
Gemini-1.5 w/ WL	7.8	0.640	57.3	65.9	75.3	1987.8	<u>0.489</u>	43.0	51.7	60.9
Gemini-1.5 w/o WL	11.5	0.321	18.1	34.6	63.2	<u>1951.5</u>	0.476	40.8	51.1	60.7

Table 4: Performance on UMLs and WN18RR with and without weight learning.

Variation	FB15K-237					WD15K				
	MR ↓	MRR ↑	H@1 ↑	H@3 ↑	H@10 ↑	MR ↓	MRR ↑	H@1 ↑	H@3 ↑	H@10 ↑
GPT-3.5 w/ WL	<b>122.0</b>	<b>0.412</b>	<b>32.3</b>	<b>45.1</b>	<b>58.0</b>	<b>97.0</b>	<b>0.553</b>	<b>44.6</b>	<b>62.2</b>	<b>74.0</b>
GPT3.5 w/o WL	<u>128.9</u>	0.374	28.1	41.7	55.1	98.4	0.520	41.7	57.4	71.6
GPT-4 w/ WL	134.8	<u>0.401</u>	31.3	43.7	56.9	99.8	<u>0.537</u>	<u>43.3</u>	60.2	<u>72.1</u>
GPT-4 w/o WL	136.4	0.355	26.7	38.5	52.7	98.6	<u>0.523</u>	42.1	57.7	71.6
Gemini-1.5 w/ WL	144.1	0.397	30.9	43.4	<u>56.9</u>	102.8	0.522	42.2	57.9	70.1
Gemini-1.5 w/o WL	140.0	0.354	26.5	38.9	52.6	<u>97.4</u>	0.511	40.5	56.9	71.6

Table 5: Performance on FB15K and WD15K with and without weight learning.

Category	Model	CN100				
		MR ↓	MRR ↑	H@1 ↑	H@3 ↑	H@10 ↑
Non-ML	AnyBURL	-	0.221	14.3	24.4	38.2
Emb.	RotatE	<b>4033.7</b>	0.317	19.4	38.0	55.5
Rule	NeuralLP	-	-	-	-	-
	DRUM	-	-	-	-	-
GNN	RNNLogic	11583.9	0.076	3.3	8.3	16.2
	RGCN	-	0.101	4.3	10.5	21.9
GPT-3.5	Inference	-	-	10.8	17.5	27.1
	LeSR	5866.5	<b>0.345</b>	<b>22.7</b>	<b>41.9</b>	<b>56.7</b>
GPT-4	Inference	-	-	10.0	15.7	29.6
	LeSR	5873.1	0.336	22.7	39.5	54.3
Gemini-1.5	Inference	-	-	16.7	25.2	39.7
	LeSR	<u>5840.5</u>	<u>0.344</u>	<u>23.0</u>	<u>41.2</u>	<u>55.3</u>

Table 6: KBC performance on CN100.

sistently rank among the top three across all metrics. The differences between our approach and pure rule-learning models (NeuralLP and DRUM) are marginal, while the top three methods maintain a substantial lead over the remaining baselines. On larger, more realistic datasets like FB15K-237, WD15K, and CN100, LeSR outperforms all selected baseline models across all evaluation metrics

Compared to the selected pure embedding (RotatE) and pure logic rule (NeuralLP) models, LeSR excels by effectively combining the strengths of both approaches. Against RNNLogic, which integrates logical rules with knowledge embeddings, our models show comparable performance across all datasets without excessive training, indicating their robustness and reliability when combining the complementary strength of embeddings and logical rules for KBC. Additionally, our models surpass RGCN across all five datasets, indicating that they leverage structural information more effectively. When compared to Inference, the superior performance of LeSR highlights the necessity of learning

and refining logical rules rather than relying on relevant subgraphs as LLM context.

We notice that certain baselines show considerable performance drops on the CN100K dataset when compared with other datasets. We speculate this is due to CN100K being a commonsense KB where not all facts are explicitly known and, therefore, violates the closed-world assumption these baselines rely on. In fact, NeuralLP and DRUM both require that all entities in the test set are also in the train set, which CN100K does not satisfy.

**Impact of LLM Backbone** Surprisingly, switching from GPT-3.5 to GPT-4 does not yield a performance boost except on the UMLs dataset. Upon closer inspection, we notice that using GPT-4 as the LLM backbone in the Proposer leads to significantly more logical rule candidates than using GPT-3.5, as shown in Fig. 3. However, the additional rules proposed by GPT-4 tend to be patterns restricted to the knowledge subgraph included in the LLM prompt. This means the models have to additionally learn the significance of ungeneralizable rules, thus impacting the KBC performance.




Figure 3: Numbers of proposed and learnable rules using GPT-3.5 and GPT-4. The y-axis is in log 10.



**Learning of Rule Significance** To investigate the impact of rule significance learning, we conduct experiments so that the model is trained without weight learning (“WL”), i.e., assigns equal values to  $w_i$ .

Variation	CN100				
	MR ↓	MRR↑	H@1↑	H@3↑	H@10↑
GPT-3.5 w/ WL	5867.2	<b>0.342</b>	<b>23.2</b>	<b>40.1</b>	<b>55.5</b>
GPT3.5 w/o WL	5879.6	0.190	9.8	20.5	40.7
GPT-4 w/ WL	5870.9	0.328	23.0	36.7	52.8
GPT-4 w/o WL	5877.7	0.226	13.0	25.1	44.0
Gemini-1.5 w/ WL	<b>5835.3</b>	<b>0.339</b>	22.7	<b>40.1</b>	<b>54.2</b>
Gemini-1.5 w/o WL	5861.2	0.192	9.3	22.3	41.0

Table 7: Performance on CN100 with and without weight learning,

As shown in Tab. 4, 5 and 7, we can see that for models without learning rule significance, the inference results are worse than models with reasoner for all five KB datasets, although the performance gap is relatively small on WN18RR and WD15K. We speculate these may be due to (1) the relatively low quality of logical rules proposed for the WN18RR dataset so that the embedding contributes more to the inference results, and (2) the relatively high quality of LLMs proposed for WD15K, so assigning uniform weights will not introduce too many false deduction results when performing KBC.

**Rule Interpretability** Apart from LeSR, NeuralLP and RNNLogic can explicitly learn logical rules that can be used to perform KBC. We evaluate the quality of learned logical rules using the rule interpretability annotations from WD15K.

The human annotations provided by Lv et al. (2021) score only the high-confidence rules in WD15K between 0 and 1. As shown in Tab. 8, We evaluate models based on the total number of learned rules, the High-Confidence Rule Ratio (HCR), the Rule Clarity Score (RCS) and the Rule Quality Index (RQI), as defined in Sec. 4.1. We also show the distribution of learned rules by their interpretability scores in Fig. 4.

Among the models, AnyBURL generates the largest number of learnable rules (116,938), but with a low High-Confidence Rule Ratio (HCR) of 5.07% and a modest Rule Clarity Score (RCS) of 0.305. This indicates that while AnyBURL is highly productive, the quality and interpretability of its rules are relatively limited. Similarly, RNNLogic produces a considerable number of rules (17,900) but achieves a low RCS of 0.219,

Model	# Lrnd	# HiConf	HCR↑	RCS↑	RQI↑
AnyBURL	116,938	5,930	5.07	0.305	8.70
NeuralLP	1,544	39	2.53	<b>0.764</b>	4.89
RNNLogic	17,900	2,489	13.91	0.219	17.02
LeSR GPT-3.5	794	406	51.13	<b>0.428</b>	<b>46.60</b>
LeSR GPT-4	1,406	1,106	<b>78.66</b>	0.378	<b>51.03</b>
LeSR Gemini-1.5	1,657	840	<b>50.69</b>	0.376	43.18

Table 8: Rule quality evaluation on WD15K for AnyBURL, RNNLogic, NeuralLP and LeSR. Here “HiConf” means high-confidence rules: logical rules considered to be highly reliable and with interpretability annotation in the dataset.




Figure 4: Numbers of learned logical rules of different interpretability scores. The y-axis is in log 10.

with only a small proportion of rules being high-confidence. In contrast, NeuralLP, with only 1,544 rules, excels in interpretability with an RCS of 0.764, focusing on producing a compact set of highly interpretable rules.

Our LeSR models, particularly LeSR GPT-4 and LeSR GPT-3.5, show a more balanced performance, both in terms of the number of rules learned and their interpretability. LeSR GPT-4 stands out with the highest HCR of 78.66% and a solid RCS of 0.378, achieving the highest Rule Quality Index (RQI) of 51.03, demonstrating its ability to generate high-quality, interpretable rules. LeSR GPT-3.5 also performs well with a high HCR of 51.13% and an RCS of 0.428, resulting in a strong RQI of 46.60.

Overall, the LeSR models strike a commendable balance between the quantity and quality of rules, achieving higher RQI scores than other models, which tend to focus too much on generating large rule sets (e.g., AnyBURL) or on producing a smaller set of highly interpretable rules (e.g., NeuralLP). The LeSR models, especially GPT-4, effectively balance the number of rules learned and the quality of rules learned.

## 5 Conclusion

In this work, we present a novel framework that improves the transparency and reliability of Knowledge Base Completion by combining LLMs with symbolic reasoning. Our approach leverages the

linguistic capability and rule-generating ability of LLMs in conjunction with the verifiable reasoning of rule-based approaches. Experimental results show that our proposed method not only improves accuracy but also provides generalizability across diverse KB datasets. By bridging the gap between the interpretability of rule-based reasoning and the adaptability of LLMs, our work offers a potential future direction on enhancing the reliability of KBC while providing a transparent and scalable solution for handling large-scale knowledge bases.

## References

- Ivana Balazevic, Carl Allen, and Timothy Hospedales. 2019. **Tucker**: Tensor factorization for knowledge graph completion. 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)*, pages 5185–5194, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Antoine Bordes, Nicolas Usunier, Alberto Garcia-Duran, Jason Weston, and Oksana Yakhnenko. 2013. **Translating embeddings for modeling multi-relational data**. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 26. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Antoine Bosselut, Hannah Rashkin, Maarten Sap, Chaitanya Malaviya, Asli Celikyilmaz, and Yejin Choi. 2019. **COMET: Commonsense transformers for automatic knowledge graph construction**. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4762–4779, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Rajarshi Das, Shehzaad Dhuliawala, Manzil Zaheer, Luke Vilnis, Ishan Durugkar, Akshay Krishnamurthy, Alex Smola, and Andrew McCallum. 2018. **Go for a walk and arrive at the answer: Reasoning over paths in knowledge bases using reinforcement learning**. *Preprint*, arXiv:1711.05851.
- Tim Dettmers, Pasquale Minervini, Pontus Stenetorp, and Sebastian Riedel. 2018. **Convolutional 2d knowledge graph embeddings**. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 32(1).
- Luis Antonio Galárraga, Christina Teflioudi, Katja Hose, and Fabian Suchanek. 2013. **Amie: association rule mining under incomplete evidence in ontological knowledge bases**. In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on World Wide Web, WWW '13*, page 413–422, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Michael Galkin, Zhaocheng Zhu, Hongyu Ren, and Jian Tang. 2022. **Inductive logical query answering in knowledge graphs**. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 15230–15243. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Zhongmou He, Jing Zhu, Shengyi Qian, Joyce Chai, and Danai Koutra. 2024. **Linkgpt: Teaching large language models to predict missing links**. *Preprint*, arXiv:2406.04640.
- Jena D. Hwang, Chandra Bhagavatula, Ronan Le Bras, Jeff Da, Keisuke Sakaguchi, Antoine Bosselut, and Yejin Choi. 2021. **(comet-) atomic 2020: On symbolic and neural commonsense knowledge graphs**. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 35(7):6384–6392.
- Tushar Khot, Sriraam Natarajan, Kristian Kersting, and Jude Shavlik. 2011. **Learning markov logic networks via functional gradient boosting**. In *2011 IEEE 11th International Conference on Data Mining*, pages 320–329.
- Stanley Kok and Pedro Domingos. 2007. **Statistical predicate invention**. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML '07*, page 433–440, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Xiang Li, Aynaz Taheri, Lifu Tu, and Kevin Gimpel. 2016. **Commonsense knowledge base completion**. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1445–1455, Berlin, Germany. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bill Yuchen Lin, Xinyue Chen, Jamin Chen, and Xiang Ren. 2019. **KagNet: Knowledge-aware graph networks for commonsense reasoning**. 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)*, pages 2829–2839, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xi Victoria Lin, Richard Socher, and Caiming Xiong. 2018. **Multi-hop knowledge graph reasoning with reward shaping**. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3243–3253, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xin Lv, Yixin Cao, Lei Hou, Juanzi Li, Zhiyuan Liu, Yichi Zhang, and Zelin Dai. 2021. **Is multi-hop reasoning really explainable? towards benchmarking reasoning interpretability**. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 8899–8911, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Christian Meilicke, Melisachew Wudage Chekol, Daniel Ruffinelli, and Heiner Stuckenschmidt. 2019. **Any-time bottom-up rule learning for knowledge graph completion**. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-19*, pages 3137–3143. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization.

- Pasquale Minervini, Sebastian Riedel, Pontus Stenetorp, Edward Grefenstette, and Tim Rocktäschel. 2020. [Learning reasoning strategies in end-to-end differentiable proving](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2007.06477.
- Sriraam Natarajan, Tushar Khot, Kristian Kersting, Bernd Gutmann, and Jude W. Shavlik. 2010. [Boosting relational dependency networks](#). In *International Conference on Inductive Logic Programming*.
- Maximilian Nickel, Kevin Murphy, Volker Tresp, and Evgeniy Gaborilovich. 2016. [A review of relational machine learning for knowledge graphs](#). *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 104(1):11–33.
- Maximilian Nickel, Volker Tresp, and Hans-Peter Kriegel. 2011. A three-way model for collective learning on multi-relational data. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-11)*, ICML '11, pages 809–816, New York, NY, USA. ACM.
- Heiko Paulheim. 2017. [Knowledge graph refinement: A survey of approaches and evaluation methods](#). *Semantic web*, 8(3):489–508.
- Meng Qu, Junkun Chen, Louis-Pascal Xhonneux, Yoshua Bengio, and Jian Tang. 2021. [Rnnlogic: Learning logic rules for reasoning on knowledge graphs](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2010.04029.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. [Sentence-BERT: Sentence embeddings using Siamese BERT-networks](#). 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)*, pages 3982–3992, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tim Rocktäschel and Sebastian Riedel. 2017. [End-to-end differentiable proving](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Ali Sadeghian, Mohammadreza Armandpour, Patrick Ding, and Daisy Zhe Wang. 2019. [Drum: End-to-end differentiable rule mining on knowledge graphs](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Maarten Sap, Ronan Le Bras, Emily Allaway, Chandra Bhagavatula, Nicholas Lourie, Hannah Rashkin, Brendan Roof, Noah A. Smith, and Yejin Choi. 2019. [Atomic: An atlas of machine commonsense for if-then reasoning](#). *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 33(01):3027–3035.
- Michael Schlichtkrull, Thomas N. Kipf, Peter Bloem, Rianne van den Berg, Ivan Titov, and Max Welling. 2018. [Modeling relational data with graph convolutional networks](#). In *The Semantic Web: 15th International Conference, ESWC 2018, Heraklion, Crete, Greece, June 3–7, 2018, Proceedings*, page 593–607, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer-Verlag.
- Richard Socher, Danqi Chen, Christopher D Manning, and Andrew Ng. 2013. [Reasoning with neural tensor networks for knowledge base completion](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 26. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Robyn Speer, Joshua Chin, and Catherine Havasi. 2017. [Conceptnet 5.5: An open multilingual graph of general knowledge](#). *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 31(1).
- Zhiqing Sun, Zhi-Hong Deng, Jian-Yun Nie, and Jian Tang. 2019. [Rotate: Knowledge graph embedding by relational rotation in complex space](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1902.10197.
- Kristina Toutanova and Danqi Chen. 2015. [Observed versus latent features for knowledge base and text inference](#). In *Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Continuous Vector Space Models and their Compositionality*, pages 57–66, Beijing, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Théo Trouillon, Johannes Welbl, Sebastian Riedel, Eric Gaussier, and Guillaume Bouchard. 2016. [Complex embeddings for simple link prediction](#). In *Proceedings of The 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 48 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2071–2080, New York, New York, USA. PMLR.
- Blerta Veseli, Sneha Singhania, Simon Razniewski, and Gerhard Weikum. 2023. [Evaluating language models for knowledge base completion](#). In *The Semantic Web: 20th International Conference, ESWC 2023, Hersonissos, Crete, Greece, May 28–June 1, 2023, Proceedings*, page 227–243, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer-Verlag.
- Quan Wang, Zhendong Mao, Bin Wang, and Li Guo. 2017. [Knowledge graph embedding: A survey of approaches and applications](#). *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 29(12):2724–2743.
- Zhichun Wang and Juanzi Li. 2015. [Rdf2rules: Learning rules from rdf knowledge bases by mining frequent predicate cycles](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1512.07734.
- Hong Wu, Zhe Wang, Kewen Wang, Pouya Ghasnezhad Omran, and Jiangmeng Li. 2023. [Rule Learning over Knowledge Graphs: A Review](#). *Transactions on Graph Data and Knowledge*, 1(1):7:1–7:23.
- Wenhan Xiong, Thien Hoang, and William Yang Wang. 2017. [DeepPath: A reinforcement learning method for knowledge graph reasoning](#). In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 564–573, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bishan Yang, Wen tau Yih, Xiaodong He, Jianfeng Gao, and Li Deng. 2015. [Embedding entities and relations for learning and inference in knowledge bases](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1412.6575.

Fan Yang, Zhilin Yang, and William W Cohen. 2017. [Differentiable learning of logical rules for knowledge base reasoning](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc.

Yuan Yang and Le Song. 2020. [Learn to explain efficiently via neural logic inductive learning](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1910.02481.

Liang Yao, Jiazhen Peng, Chengsheng Mao, and Yuan Luo. 2024. [Exploring large language models for knowledge graph completion](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2308.13916.

Zefan Zeng, Qing Cheng, and Yuehang Si. 2023. [Logical rule-based knowledge graph reasoning: A comprehensive survey](#). *Mathematics*, 11(21).

Muhan Zhang and Yixin Chen. 2018. [Link prediction based on graph neural networks](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31. Curran Associates, Inc.

Wen Zhang, Jiaoyan Chen, Juan Li, Zezhong Xu, Jeff Z. Pan, and Huajun Chen. 2022. [Knowledge graph reasoning with logics and embeddings: Survey and perspective](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2202.07412.

Yichi Zhang, Zhuo Chen, Lingbing Guo, Yajing Xu, Wen Zhang, and Huajun Chen. 2024. [Making large language models perform better in knowledge graph completion](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.06671.

Fangfang Zhou, Jiapeng Mi, Beiwen Zhang, Jingcheng Shi, Ran Zhang, Xiaohui Chen, Ying Zhao, and Jian Zhang. 2023. [Reliable knowledge graph fact prediction via reinforcement learning](#). *Visual Computing for Industry, Biomedicine, and Art*, 6.

## A Baseline Implementations

For the baseline models, we utilize the official implementations provided by the authors. Specifically, for RotatE<sup>3</sup>, NeuralLP<sup>4</sup>, DRUM<sup>5</sup> and AnyBURL<sup>6</sup>, we employed the respective official codebases and ran the models using the best hyperparameters reported by the authors. For the RNN-Logic setup, we combined the default hyperparameters provided by RNNLogic<sup>7</sup> with the best RotatE configuration from the RotatE models. Lastly, for RGCN, we re-implemented the model in PyTorch based on the original TensorFlow implementation<sup>8</sup> and executed the models using the best hyperparameters reported by the authors.

<sup>3</sup><https://github.com/DeepGraphLearning/KnowledgeGraphEmbedding>

<sup>4</sup><https://github.com/fanyangxyz/Neural-LP>

<sup>5</sup><https://github.com/alisadeghian/DRUM>

<sup>6</sup><https://web.informatik.uni-mannheim.de/AnyBURL>

<sup>7</sup><https://github.com/DeepGraphLearning/RNNLogic>

<sup>8</sup><https://github.com/tkipf/relational-gcn>

## B Example Rules Learned

Here we present some logical rules learned by the Rule Reasoner, followed by their rule significance score in percentage.

**Relation: “separated from”** ( $\alpha = 0.980$ )

- “IF (A, shares border with, B) AND (B, separated from, C) THEN (A, separated from, C)” (0.32%)
- “IF (A, country, B) AND (B, shares border with, C) THEN (A, separated from, C)” (0.43%)
- “IF (A, country, B) AND (B, diplomatic relation, C) AND (C, shares border with, D) THEN (A, separated from, D)” (25.66%)
- “IF (A, country, B) AND (B, shares border with, C) AND (C, diplomatic relation, D) THEN (A, separated from, D)” (0.25%)
- “IF (A, diplomatic relation, B) AND (B, country, C) THEN (A, separated from, C)” (0.43%)
- “IF (A, shares border with, B) AND (B, shares border with, C) THEN (A, separated from, C)” (72.48%)
- “IF (A, shares border with, B) AND (B, country, C) THEN (A, separated from, C)” (0.43%)

**Relation: “performer”** ( $\alpha = 0.878$ )

- “IF (X, creator, Y) AND (Y, professional or sports partner, Z) THEN (X, performer, Z)” (0.21%)
- “IF (A, present in work, B) AND (B, cast member, C) THEN (A, performer, C)” (99.80%)

**Relation: “language used”** ( $\alpha = 0.707$ )

- “IF (A, diplomatic relation, B) AND (B, official language, C) THEN (A, language used, C)” (99.29%)

## C LLM Prompt Templates

The bolded parts are places to insert relevant sub-graphs and target triplets.

**Prompt Template for Rule Proposing** The following template is designed to guide LLMs to generate logical rules that can deduce a specific target fact  $(h, r, t)$  based on a given knowledge subgraph. The prompt provides example rules to illustrate the format where logical operators are used to describe how multiple conditions involving entities lead to the deduction of a new triplet.

A knowledge subgraph describes relationships between entities using a set of triplets. Each triplet is written in the form of triplet (SUBJ, REL, OBJ), which states that entity SUBJ is of relation REL to entity OBJ.

A logic rule can be applied to known triplets to deduce new ones. Each rule is written in the form of a logical implication, which states that if the conditions on the right-hand side are satisfied, then the statement on the left-hand side holds true. Here are some example rules where A, B, C are entities:

IF (A, parent, B) AND NOT (A, father, B) THEN (A, mother, B)

IF (A, father, B) OR (A, mother, B) THEN (A, parent, B)

IF (A, mother, B) AND (A, sibling, C) THEN (C, mother, B)

Now we have the following triplets: **knowledge subgraph**

Please generate as many of the most important logical rules based on the above knowledge subgraph to deduce triplet **target fact**. The rules provide general logic implications instead of using specific entities. Return the rules only without any explanations.

### Prompt Template for Direct KBC Inferring

This prompt template is designed to instruct LLMs to predict the most likely entity candidates that can complete a given query  $(h, r, ?)$  query given a list of triplets from its relevant knowledge subgraph. We use the generated entity candidates to compute Hit@K metrics for evaluation.

A knowledge subgraph describes relationships between entities using a set of triplets. Each triplet is written in the form of triplet (SUBJ, REL, OBJ), which states that entity SUBJ is of relation REL to entity OBJ.

Now we have the following triplets:

**relevant knowledge subgraph**

Please generate 10 most likely OBJ candidates to complete **query**. Return only the entity candidates without any additional text.

## D Logic Rules by Traversal Structure

The logical rule structures are categorized into three main groups based on the complexity and traversal structure of relations: two-node (0th-order), three-node (1st-order), and four-node (2nd-order) cases. These categories encapsulate different relational

patterns, where relation direction and node connectivity play crucial roles in defining the logic. Each logical rule structure can be represented using a matrix-based approach, where  $M_r$  denotes the matrix for  $(h, t)$  pairs satisfying relation  $r$ . The computation of  $\mathbf{C}$ , representing the satisfiability of the rule body, involves matrix multiplication for conjunction ( $M_{r_i} M_{r_j}$  represents  $(h, t)$  pairs so that there exists some  $e \in \mathcal{E}$  so that  $(h, r_i, e), (e, r_j, t) \in \mathcal{G}$ ) and matrix transpose for relation inversion ( $M_r^\top$  represents  $(h, t)$  pairs so that  $(t, r, h) \in \mathcal{G}$ ). Elementwise multiplication  $\circ$  is used to compute  $\mathbf{A}$  by evaluating  $(h, t)$  pairs against the rule head.

**0th-order Structures** These two cases represent simple rules involving two entities with direct or inverted relations.

**Case 0-1:**  $(A, r_i, B) - (A, r_j, B)$  with example rule  $\phi = \text{"IF (A, place of birth, B)} \text{ THEN (A, country of citizenship, B)}$ ":

$$\mathbf{C} = M_{r_i}, \text{ and } \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C} \circ M_{r_j}$$

**Case 0-2:**  $(A, r_i, B) - (B, r_j, A)$  with example rule  $\phi = \text{"IF (A, award received, B)} \text{ THEN (B, winner, A)}$ ":

$$\mathbf{C} = M_{r_i}^\top, \text{ and } \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C} \circ M_{r_j}$$

**1st-order Structures** The following cases introduce a third entity node, adding complexity with various chain structures that either converge or diverge, providing greater diversity in logical structures.

**Case 1-1:**  $(A, r_i, B) - (B, r_j, C) - (A, r_k, C)$  with example rule  $\phi = \text{"IF (A, genre, B)} \text{ AND (B, subclass of, C)} \text{ THEN (A, genre, C)}$ ":

$$\mathbf{C} = M_{r_i} M_{r_j}, \text{ and } \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C} \circ M_{r_k}$$

**Case 1-2:**  $(B, r_i, A) - (B, r_j, C) - (A, r_k, C)$  with example rule  $\phi = \text{"IF (B, composer, A)} \text{ AND (B, country of origin, C)} \text{ THEN (A, country of citizenship, C)}$ ":

$$\mathbf{C} = M_{r_i}^\top M_{r_j}, \text{ and } \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C} \circ M_{r_k}$$

**Case 1-3:**  $(A, r_i, B) - (C, r_j, B) - (A, r_k, C)$  with example rule  $\phi = \text{"IF (A, nominated for, B)} \text{ AND (C, award received, B)} \text{ THEN (A, performer, C)}$ ":

$$\mathbf{C} = M_{r_i} M_{r_j}^\top, \text{ and } \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C} \circ M_{r_k}$$

**Case 1-4:**  $(B, r_i, A) - (C, r_j, B) - (A, r_k, C)$  with example rule  $\phi =$ “IF ( $A$ , *owner of*,  $B$ ) AND ( $B$ , *parent organization*,  $C$ ) THEN ( $C$ , *owned by*,  $A$ )”:

$$\mathbf{C} = M_{r_i}^\top M_{r_j}^\top, \text{ and } \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C} \circ M_{r_k}$$

**2nd-order Structures** These four-node structures exhibit the highest structural diversity. Eight distinct patterns include sequences of relations that form complex structures that cannot be easily captured using simple chain and relation inversion.

**Case 2-1:**  $(A, r_i, B) - (B, r_j, C) - (C, r_k, D) - (A, r_l, D)$  with example rule  $\phi =$ “IF ( $A$ , *twinned administrative body*,  $B$ ) AND ( $B$ , *twinned administrative body*,  $C$ ) AND ( $C$ , *country*,  $D$ ) THEN ( $A$ , *country*,  $D$ )”:

$$\mathbf{C} = M_{r_i} M_{r_j} M_{r_k}, \text{ and } \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C} \circ M_{r_l}$$

**Case 2-2:**  $(A, r_i, B) - (B, r_j, C) - (D, r_k, C) - (A, r_l, D)$  with example rule  $\phi =$ “IF ( $A$ , *diplomatic relation*,  $B$ ) AND ( $B$ , *continent*,  $C$ ) AND ( $D$ , *continent*,  $C$ ) THEN ( $A$ , *shares border with*,  $D$ )”:

$$\mathbf{C} = M_{r_i} M_{r_j} M_{r_k}^\top, \text{ and } \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C} \circ M_{r_l}$$

**Case 2-3:**  $(A, r_i, B) - (C, r_j, B) - (C, r_k, D) - (A, r_l, D)$  with example rule  $\phi =$ “IF ( $A$ , *country for sport*,  $B$ ) AND ( $C$ , *country of citizenship*,  $B$ ) AND ( $C$ , *participant of*,  $D$ ) THEN ( $A$ , *participant of*,  $D$ )”:

$$\mathbf{C} = M_{r_i} M_{r_j}^\top M_{r_k}, \text{ and } \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C} \circ M_{r_l}$$

**Case 2-4:**  $(B, r_i, A) - (B, r_j, C) - (C, r_k, D) - (A, r_l, D)$  with example rule  $\phi =$ “ IF ( $A$ , *country*,  $B$ ) AND ( $A$ , *shares border with*,  $C$ ) AND ( $C$ , *located on terrain feature*,  $D$ ) THEN ( $B$ , *located on terrain feature*,  $D$ )”:

$$\mathbf{C} = M_{r_i}^\top M_{r_j} M_{r_k}, \text{ and } \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C} \circ M_{r_l}$$

**Case 2-5:**  $(A, r_i, B) - (C, r_j, B) - (D, r_k, C) - (A, r_l, D)$  with example rule  $\phi =$ “ IF ( $A$ , *participant*,  $B$ ) AND ( $C$ , *diplomatic relation*,  $B$ ) AND ( $D$ , *diplomatic relation*,  $C$ ) THEN ( $A$ , *participant*,  $D$ )”:

$$\mathbf{C} = M_{r_i} M_{r_j}^\top M_{r_k}^\top, \text{ and } \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C} \circ M_{r_l}$$

**Case 2-6:**  $(B, r_i, A) - (B, r_j, C) - (D, r_k, C) - (A, r_l, D)$  with example rule  $\phi =$  “IF ( $B$ , *characters*,  $A$ ) AND ( $B$ , *cast member*,  $C$ ) AND ( $D$ , *performer*,  $C$ ) THEN ( $A$ , *partner*,  $D$ )”:

$$\mathbf{C} = M_{r_i}^\top M_{r_j} M_{r_k}^\top, \text{ and } \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C} \circ M_{r_l}$$

**Case 2-7:**  $(B, r_i, A) - (C, r_j, B) - (C, r_k, D) - (A, r_l, D)$  with example rule  $\phi =$  “IF ( $B$ , *diplomatic relation*,  $A$ ) AND ( $C$ , *diplomatic relation*,  $B$ ) AND ( $C$ , *currency*,  $D$ ) THEN ( $A$ , *currency*,  $D$ )”:

$$\mathbf{C} = M_{r_i}^\top M_{r_j}^\top M_{r_k}, \text{ and } \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C} \circ M_{r_l}$$

**Case 2-8:**  $(B, r_i, A) - (C, r_j, B) - (D, r_k, C) - (A, r_l, D)$  with example rule  $\phi =$  “IF ( $B$ , *diplomatic relation*,  $A$ ) AND ( $C$ , *country*,  $B$ ) AND ( $D$ , *educated at*,  $C$ ) THEN ( $A$ , *head of government*,  $D$ )”:

$$\mathbf{C} = M_{r_i}^\top M_{r_j}^\top M_{r_k}^\top, \text{ and } \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{C} \circ M_{r_l}$$