

# Transformer-Based Multimodal Knowledge Graph Completion with Link-Aware Contexts

Haodi Ma  
University of Florida  
ma.haodi@ufl.edu

Dzmitry Kasinets  
University of Florida  
dkasinets@ufl.edu

Daisy Zhe Wang  
University of Florida  
daisyw@cise.ufl.edu

**Abstract**—Multimodal knowledge graph completion (MMKGC) aims to predict missing links in multimodal knowledge graphs (MMKGs) by leveraging information from various modalities alongside structural data. Existing MMKGC approaches primarily extend traditional knowledge graph embedding (KGE) models, which often require creating an embedding for every entity. This results in large model sizes and inefficiencies in integrating multimodal information, particularly for real-world graphs. Meanwhile, Transformer-based models have demonstrated competitive performance in knowledge graph completion (KGC). However, their focus on single-modal knowledge limits their capacity to utilize cross-modal information. Recently, Large vision-language models (VLMs) have shown potential in cross-modal tasks but are constrained by the high cost of training. In this work, we propose a novel approach that integrates Transformer-based KGE models with cross-modal context generated by pre-trained VLMs, thereby extending their applicability to MMKGC. Specifically, we employ a pre-trained VLM to transform relevant visual information from entities and their neighbors into textual sequences. We then frame KGC as a sequence-to-sequence task, fine-tuning the model with the generated cross-modal context. This simple yet effective method significantly reduces model size compared to traditional KGE approaches while achieving competitive performance across multiple large-scale datasets with minimal hyperparameter tuning.

**Index Terms**—Multi-modal knowledge graph, Multi-hop knowledge graph completion

## I. INTRODUCTION

Knowledge graphs (KGs) represent real-world information as structured triples  $(h, r, t)$ , where  $h$  and  $t$  are entities and  $r$  is a relation connecting them. This representation has proven valuable in various fields, including recommendation systems, question-answering, and drug discovery. KGs are widely used for organizing large-scale data and as auxiliary reasoning sources in systems like retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) [15]. While KGs traditionally store structural and textual information, their extension to incorporate multimodal data, such as images and videos, has led to the development of multimodal knowledge graphs (MMKGs). MMKGs bridge structured knowledge with unstructured content, associating entities with visual data to better ground their properties. Recent advances in natural language processing [19] and multimedia [8] have further highlighted the potential of MMKGs. However, MMKGs face two critical challenges: (1) Incompleteness, where missing links hinder downstream tasks, and (2) Cross-modal integration, where effectively connecting

information across modalities remains non-trivial due to noise and inconsistencies in unstructured data.

To address these challenges, multimodal knowledge graph completion (MMKGC) approaches aim to predict missing links in MMKGs by learning low-dimensional embeddings for entities and relations from visual, textual, and structural information. These methods use the embeddings to score candidate triples and identify missing links. Early works like IKRL [24] and TransAE [23] attempted to blend visual content into traditional knowledge graph embedding (KGE) models. IKRL integrated image features into KGE models by learning visual embeddings for entities, while TransAE introduced an auto-encoder module for multimodal fusion. More recent works, such as LAFA [17] and Mixture of Modality Knowledge Experts [26], have improved multimodal fusion and reasoning in MMKGC. LAFA focuses on integrating multimodal data by considering link-aware fusion and neighborhood aggregation, demonstrating the potential of entity-specific multimodal reasoning.

Despite these advances, existing MMKGC methods have several limitations:

- Scalability of Embeddings: Traditional KGE and multimodal KGE models (e.g., TransE [1], LAFA [17]) require a unique embedding for each entity and relation, leading to linear scaling in both model size and inference time as the graph grows.
- Uniform Treatment of Modalities: Many MMKGC models uniformly incorporate all associated images for an entity, ignoring their varying relevance to different links. While recent works like RSME [23] and MKGformer [2] consider image relevance, they focus on individual entities rather than the specific links between them.
- Insufficient Use of Structural Context: Many existing MMKGC approaches focus on individual triples, neglecting the rich structural information provided by an entity’s neighbors. LAFA [17] partially addresses this issue with neighborhood aggregation but relies on KGE-based embeddings, which lack the flexibility and scalability as stated.

Transformer-based models, such as KGT5 [16], have emerged as promising alternatives for knowledge graph completion. These models frame link prediction as a sequence-to-sequence (seq2seq) task, where the model size is indepen-

dent of the scale of the graph. Transformers also allow for straightforward incorporation of additional entity information without requiring complex model modifications. However, current Transformer-based models focus primarily on single-modal KGC, lacking explicit mechanisms to incorporate visual and relational contexts necessary for MMKGC. Furthermore, while vision-language models (VLMs) like BLIP [7] and InstructBLIP [5] provide powerful pretrained capabilities for visual-related tasks, fine-tuning them for MMKGC is computationally expensive and task-specific. Leveraging these VLMs for multimodal context generation without fine-tuning presents an efficient solution.

Motivated by these challenges, we propose MMKG-T5, a Transformer-based MMKGC model designed to address the limitations of existing approaches. MMKG-T5 incorporates:

- **Link-Aware Multimodal Context:** By leveraging a pretrained multi-image InstructBLIP T5 model [32], our approach selects images based on the query link and generates link-aware textual descriptions from the images of entities and their neighbors.
- **Relation Context Enrichment:** We enhance the model’s relational understanding by including context examples of the query relation from the training data.
- **Neighbor-Aware Aggregation:** MMKG-T5 integrates information from an entity’s neighbors to fully utilize the structural properties of the MMKG.

MMKG-T5 uses a Transformer-based seq2seq framework which enables dynamic context generation, reducing model size and improving scalability. By combining multimodal link context, relation context, and neighbor context, MMKG-T5 achieves competitive performance on large-scale MMKG datasets without the need for large-scale fine-tuning.

The key contributions of this work are summarized as follows:

- We propose MMKG-T5, a novel Transformer-based method for MMKGC, integrating multimodal, relational, and structural information.
- We introduce a link-aware multimodal context generation approach that converts visual content into textual descriptions using a pretrained multi-image InstructBLIP T5 model.
- We enrich the query with relation context examples and neighbor aggregation to improve relational and structural reasoning.
- Our approach achieves competitive performance on large-scale MMKG datasets while maintaining computational efficiency, avoiding the need for large-scale fine-tuning of VLMs.

## II. RELATED WORK

### A. Knowledge Graph Completion

Knowledge graph completion (KGC) aims to predict missing links in knowledge graphs by learning representations of entities and relations. Early approaches include embedding-based models like TransE [1], which uses translation-based

embeddings, and RotatE [18], which models relations as rotations in a complex space. ComplEx [21], as a representative of bilinear models, introduces a diagonal matrix with complex numbers to capture anti-symmetry. DistMult [27] is a bilinear embedding model for knowledge graph completion, scores triples using a dot product, while ComplEx [21] extends this by embedding entities and relations in a complex vector space to handle asymmetric and antisymmetric relations. These methods have successfully handled structural information but lack mechanisms to incorporate multimodal data.

Recent advancements have explored the use of Transformers for KGC. KG-BERT [28] frames KGC as a binary classification task, using Transformer models to predict the plausibility of triples. KGT5 [16] extends this idea by treating KGC as a sequence-to-sequence (seq2seq) task, enabling the use of textual descriptions for entities and relations. These approaches demonstrate improved scalability and flexibility compared to traditional KGE models, as the model size is independent of the number of entities in the graph. Transformers also allow for straightforward integration of additional information, such as textual descriptions or external knowledge, without requiring complex model modifications.

Additionally, recent work [26] demonstrates the potential of large language models (LLMs) such as Llama-2, ChatGPT, and ChatGLM2-6B in generating diverse perspectives for KGC tasks. These works use LLMs to generate supplementary contextual information for reasoning and completion, showcasing their utility even though they were not originally designed for KGC.

### B. Multimodal Knowledge Graph Completion and Reasoning

Multimodal knowledge graph completion (MMKGC) extends KGC by incorporating visual, textual, and structural information. Early models like IKRL [24] and TransAE [23] integrate image features into traditional KGE frameworks. IKRL learns visual embeddings for entities, while TransAE uses an auto-encoder to fuse multimodal features. These methods highlight the potential of visual data in KGC but face challenges in scaling embeddings and integrating multimodal information effectively.

Other works [3], [11] discuss challenges such as modality-specific relevance and structural integration, emphasizing the importance of adaptive approaches for modality-specific reasoning. To tackle such challenges, MoMoK [30] employs a mixture of modality knowledge experts to handle the diverse nature of multimodal data, allowing the model to adaptively select relevant modalities for each prediction. RSME [22] introduces a relevance scoring mechanism for multimodal data, prioritizing more relevant visual information when generating entity representations. MMKGR [33], on the other hand, explores multi-hop reasoning over MMKGs, employing a gate-attention mechanism for feature integration and reinforcement learning for complex reasoning tasks. LAFA [17] introduces link-aware fusion and aggregation mechanisms to enhance entity representations by considering the relevance of multimodal data to specific links. AIKGC [6] proposes to use a relation-

guided dynamic image selection mechanism to select an image of the query entity for more representative visual features in entity embeddings. While these models advance the state of MMKG completion and reasoning, they often rely on static embeddings for entities and relations, which scale poorly with large graphs.

### C. Vision-Language Models for Multimodal Tasks

Vision-language models (VLMs) like CLIP [12], BLIP [7], and InstructBLIP [5] have advanced cross-modal reasoning by jointly learning visual and textual representations. These models excel in tasks such as image captioning and visual question answering, showing potential in multimodal understanding. MMICL [32] further enhances VLMs by introducing multi-modal in-context learning, enabling the model to handle complex prompts involving multiple images and text. These advancements demonstrate the potential of VLMs in bridging visual and textual modalities. However, directly applying VLMs to MMKGC is challenging due to the high computational cost of fine-tuning and their lack of adaptation to graph-based reasoning.

The integration of VLMs into MMKGC remains an active area of exploration, with approaches such as leveraging pretrained models for context generation offering efficient alternatives. Recent works [9], [29] discuss the evolving role of VLMs and other advanced models in addressing challenges specific to multimodal graph reasoning and completion.

## III. PRELIMINARIES

### A. Multimodal Knowledge Graphs (MMKGs)

Multimodal knowledge graphs (MMKGs) extend traditional knowledge graphs by associating entities with multimodal information. Formally, an MMKG is defined as  $\mathcal{G}_{MM} = \{(e_i, r_k, e_j, I_{e_i}, I_{e_j})\}$ , where  $I_{e_i}$  and  $I_{e_j}$  are the sets of multimodal data (e.g., images) associated with the head entity  $e_i$  and tail entity  $e_j$ , respectively. The structural information in MMKGs is represented by triples  $(e_i, r_k, e_j) \subset \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{E}$ , similar to traditional KGs, while the multimodal data  $I_{e_i}$  and  $I_{e_j}$  provide additional context for the entities.

In MMKGs, the adjacency tensor  $\mathcal{X} \in \{0, 1\}^{|\mathcal{E}| \times |\mathcal{R}| \times |\mathcal{E}|}$  remains the same as in traditional KGs, representing the truth values of triples. The associated multimodal data enhances the semantics of the graph, allowing for richer reasoning over entities and relations.

### B. Multimodal Knowledge Graph Completion (MMKGC)

The goal of MMKGC is to predict missing links in MMKGs by leveraging both structural and multimodal information. Given a query  $(e_i, r_k, ?)$  or  $(?, r_k, e_j)$ , the objective is to find the most plausible tail entity  $e_j$  or head entity  $e_i$  to complete the triple, while also utilizing multimodal data  $I_{e_i}$  and  $I_{e_j}$  to enhance predictions.

Similar to KGC, MMKGC relies on a scoring function  $f : \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that assigns a plausibility score to each

candidate triple  $(e_i, r_k, e_j)$ . However, MMKGC extends this function to incorporate multimodal context:

$$s(e_i, r_k, e_j | I_{e_i}, I_{e_j}) = f(e_i, r_k, e_j) + g(I_{e_i}, I_{e_j}), \quad (1)$$

where  $g(I_{e_i}, I_{e_j})$  models the contribution of multimodal data to the overall plausibility score.

## IV. METHODOLOGY

### A. Overview of MMKG-T5

In this section, we provide an overview of our proposed model, MMKG-T5, illustrated in Fig. 1. Building upon the backbone of KGT5, MMKG-T5 incorporates enhancements to address the challenges of multimodal knowledge graph completion (MMKGC). To improve the understanding of the query relation, we introduce additional relation context. Furthermore, we leverage a pre-trained multimodal language model (VLM) to generate link-aware contextual descriptions for images associated with the query entity and its neighbors, ensuring the multimodal context aligns with the structural information in the knowledge graph.

Section IV-B details the process of generating cross-modal context using pre-trained VLMs, focusing on relevant image selection and neighbor-guided contextualization. Section IV-C describes the use of relation context to enhance head entity prediction, combining multimodal and relational information to predict the tail entity effectively. Finally, Section IV-D explains how MMKGC is framed as a sequence-to-sequence task, utilizing KGT5 to integrate the multimodal and relation context.

These enhancements enable MMKG-T5 to address challenges unique to MMKGs, such as integrating multimodal data and understanding complex relations while maintaining computational efficiency. The overall architecture and methodology are described in detail below.

### B. Multimodal Entity Context

Multimodal knowledge graphs provide a diverse collection of images for each entity  $h_i$ , capturing various aspects of the entity in different contexts and scenarios. These visual representations offer rich information that can complement structural data. However, directly incorporating raw visual information into the model risks introducing noise or biases, as images often include extraneous or irrelevant details. To address this, we leverage a pretrained multimodal language model (MMLM) [32] to transform visual content into link-aware textual descriptions. The MMLM, fine-tuned on instruction-following tasks, is adept at analyzing and summarizing the content of images in a manner that aligns with the relational structure of the knowledge graph. This conversion enables the integration of visual data in a format that is interpretable and compatible with sequence-to-sequence models like KGT5.

1) *Relevant Image Selection*: To ensure the generated textual descriptions are relationally meaningful, we prioritize selecting images that are relevant to both the query entity  $h$  and its neighbors. Instead of processing all available images for  $h$ , which could introduce irrelevant information, we first identify




Fig. 1: Pipeline of MMKG-T5. Setting 1 and Setting 2 leverage selected images to generate link-aware multimodal context about the given triple. Setting 3 takes images of each entity separately to generate entity context.

$k$  neighbors of  $h$  from the training set. For each head-tail entity pair  $(h, t_1), (h, t_2), \dots, (h, t_k)$ , we select images that are contextually relevant to both  $h$  and each  $t_i$ .

Specifically, given an entity pair  $(h, t_i)$  and their associated image set  $I_{h,t_i}$ , we employ the pretrained MMLM to classify whether an image contains both entities. This is achieved using a probabilistic approach, where the model generates probabilities for a binary classification (*yes/no*). These probabilities serve as confidence scores for the relevance of each image:

$$p(h, t_i, t_j) = MMLM(prompt_1(h, t_i), t_j), \quad (2)$$

where  $t_j$  is an individual image in  $I_{h,t_i}$ . An image is considered relevant and included as part of the context for  $(h, t_i)$  if:

$$p(h, t_i, t_j) \geq conf_{related}, \quad (3)$$

where  $conf_{related}$  is a predefined threshold for relevance. By focusing only on link-relevant images, this approach excludes extraneous visual information, ensuring that the subsequent cross-modal generation process concentrates on relationally meaningful content. This step not only improves the quality of the generated context but also reduces computational overhead by narrowing down the set of input images.

2) *Cross-Modality Context Generation*: After selecting link-aware images, the next step is to transform these visual representations into textual descriptions that are directly usable in MMKGC. A key challenge here is to ensure that the generated context captures the relational semantics between  $h$  and  $t_i$  without being overwhelmed by the specifics of individual images. To address this, we process the images in  $I_{h,t_i}$  collectively, rather than analyzing them individually. This

reduces computational costs and promotes the generation of a unified relational context.

We feed the selected images into the pretrained MMLM using a structured prompt that guides the model to:

- Analyze the content of the provided images collectively, identifying shared features and entities.
- Describe the relationship depicted in the images between the query entity  $h$  and its neighbor  $t_i$ .

The generated cross-modal context is represented as:

$$context_{cross\_modal} = LM(prompt_2(h, t_i), I_{h,t_i}). \quad (4)$$

This method ensures that the output focuses on relationally significant information shared across the image set  $I_{h,t_i}$ . By emphasizing common relational features, the generated context aligns with the structural patterns of the knowledge graph while minimizing distractions caused by individual image details.

### C. Relation Context

While the multimodal context focuses on the head and tail entities, understanding the role played by the head (tail) entity in the query triple  $(h, r, ?)$  or  $(?, r, t)$  is crucial for accurate prediction. Such understanding requires more than just the name of the query relation  $r$ , as relational semantics often depend on the context in which the relation is used. To enrich the model's comprehension of the query relation  $r$ , we extract  $m$  triples containing the same relation  $r$  from the training corpus.

For example, for a query "Sweden | *country\_of* | ?", we extract triples such as "Philippines | *country\_of* | Bohol" and "Turkmenistan | *country\_of* | Galkynyş\_District". These

### Code 1: Cross-modal Context

```

query: h | r |
entity context: r1 | t1 <context_sep> The
                relation between h and t1 is xxx
                <triple_sep> r2 | t2 ...
relation context: h1,r | r | t1,r <triple_sep>
                h2,r | r | t2,r ...

```

extracted triples provide contextual examples of how the relation  $r$  is used, serving as a semantic explanation for  $r$ . By incorporating this relation context, the model is guided to focus on the specific aspect of the query entity  $h$  (or  $t$ , depending on the query type). This helps disambiguate the relational semantics and improves the model’s ability to make accurate predictions.

The relation context is then concatenated with the multimodal context to form the cross-modal input for our model. This combined input ensures that the model has access to both visual and relational cues, enabling it to make more informed predictions in the MMKGC task.

#### D. MMKG-T5

Given a query  $(h, r, ?)$  and its generated context  $C_{h,r}$ , MMKG-T5 treats link prediction as a sequence-to-sequence (seq2seq) task, following the approach introduced in KGT5 [16]. The architecture of MMKG-T5 is based on the encoder-decoder Transformer model T5 [4], which is well-suited for text-to-text transfer tasks. As multimodal knowledge graphs (MMKGs) provide textual information (mentions) for entities and relations, we leverage this data to verbalize the query into a text sequence of the form:

*query:*  $\langle \text{head\_entity\_mention} \rangle \mid \langle \text{relation\_mention} \rangle$ .

1) *Context Fusion for Query Verbalization:* In addition to the mentions provided in the MMKG, we enrich the verbalization of queries with two types of generated contexts:

- **Link-Aware Multimodal Context:** Generated from the entity label and images of the one-hop neighborhood of the query entity, as described in Section IV-B.
- **Relation Context:** Extracted examples of the query relation from the training corpus, as detailed in Section IV-C.

The enriched query combines these elements, ensuring the model has access to both multimodal and relational cues. The general structure of the verbalized query is illustrated in Code 1. For multimodal neighbors, we sample up to  $k = 20$  neighbors in a random fashion without replacement, following the neighborhood sampling strategy used in prior works [10]. Similarly, we include up to  $m = 5$  triples for relation context to maintain a manageable input size while providing sufficient relational diversity.

2) *Training Procedure:* To train MMKG-T5, we construct training queries based on triples  $(h, r, t)$  from the training set. Specifically, for each triple, we generate two queries:  $(h, r, ?)$  for tail entity prediction and  $(?, r, t)$  for head entity prediction.

These queries are verbalized as described above, with the expected model outputs being the text mentions of the target entities  $h$  and  $t$ .

For head entity prediction, to align with the seq2seq formulation, we modify the query structure. Instead of verbalizing it as “*query: ? | r | t*”, we reverse the triple to “*query: t | reverse\_of\_r | ?*”. This ensures that head and tail entity prediction share the same training process, improving consistency in the seq2seq framework and leveraging the symmetric nature of certain relations. The introduction of reverse relations also addresses imbalances in the training data caused by the natural bias toward tail entity prediction.

3) *Inference and Prediction:* During inference, MMKG-T5 generates candidate answers by sampling text mentions from the decoder, which are then mapped to their corresponding entity IDs. Unlike traditional knowledge graph embedding (KGE) models, MMKG-T5 benefits from the generative nature of the seq2seq framework. Instead of scoring all candidate entities in the MMKG, the model directly generates a ranked list of top- $n$  predictions.

For each decoded entity, the probability of the sequence decoding is used as the confidence score for that entity. Entities not appearing in the sampled predictions are assigned a confidence score of  $-\infty$ . This generative approach significantly reduces computational overhead compared to exhaustive scoring methods in KGE models, particularly for large-scale MMKGs.

To compute standard ranking metrics such as Mean Reciprocal Rank (MRR) and Hits@ $k$ , the generated scores are used to evaluate the quality of predictions. By combining textual, multimodal, and relational cues during training and inference, MMKG-T5 achieves a simple yet efficient framework for multimodal knowledge graph completion.

## V. EXPERIMENTS

### A. Experimental Setup

Dataset	FB15K-237-IMG [20]	MKG-W [25]	MKG-Y [25]
#Entity	14,541	15,000	15,000
#Relation	237	169	28
#Train	272,115	34,196	21,310
#Valid	17,535	4,276	2,665
#Test	20,466	4,274	2,663

TABLE I: Dataset statistics

1) *Datasets:* We evaluate our model in link prediction tasks on three commonly used MMKG benchmarks: FB15k-237 [20], MKG-W [25], and MKG-Y [25]. All datasets contain image and text modalities. The statistics on the datasets are summarized in Table I.

2) *Evaluation Protocol:* We used the train/valid/test splits (from Table I) provided with the MMKG benchmarks. In evaluating the link prediction performance of our model, we utilized standard rank-based evaluation metrics like Mean Reciprocal Rank (MRR) [18] and Hits@K (K=1, 3, 10) [1] over test triples.

3) *Experiment setting*: We used the T5-small model [13] from the previous work, implemented in PyTorch. All our experiments ran on a Linux server (Red Hat Enterprise Linux 8.10) with two NVIDIA A100 GPUs, using a batch size of 128 (effective 256). We set T5-small’s input sequence limit to 512 tokens. To fit our generated multimodal and relation context into the model, we sampled 50 neighbors per entity and 10 triples per relation. We trained for 30 epochs on FB15k-237 [20] and 60 epochs on MKG-W [25] and MKG-Y [25] benchmarks. All model settings used the same number of epochs for a fair comparison.

## B. Baselines

1) *Traditional KGC*: We included traditional uni-modal KGC methods as baselines for a comprehensive comparison. The uni-modal KGC methods work with textual information. The selected models are TransE [1], DistMult [27] and ComplEx [21]. These methods rely solely on the structural information in triples, without additional information.

2) *MMKGC*: We also selected Multi-Modal Knowledge Graph Completion (MMKGC) methods as our baselines. The MMKGC methods work with multimodal entities containing image and text information. The selected models are IRKL [24], RSME [22] and TransAE [23]. These methods add multimodal information to triples to improve the performance.

3) *KGT5*: The MMKGC baseline we pay closer attention to is KGT5 [16]. It models KG link prediction as a sequence-to-sequence task. The model uses a single encoder-decoder Transformer with the same architecture as T5-small [13]. This informs our approach.

## C. Our model

Our model prepends KG link prediction with a step that utilizes VLM to generate textual descriptions from images of entities and their neighbors. We use the pre-trained multi-image InstructBLIP T5 model [32]. Settings 1 and 2 generate link-aware descriptions, while Setting 3 focuses on entity-specific descriptions.

1) *Utilizing Link-Aware Context*: In setting 1, the InstructBLIP T5 model [32] generates one sentence per image, forming a set of sentences. Each sentence describes how the head and tail entities of a KG triple relate to the image content. The provided images are pre-filtered to include only those where the same VLM detects both head and tail entities. In setting 2, instead of generating a sentence for each image, we prompt the InstructBLIP T5 model [32] to produce one summary sentence that describes the relationship between the head and tail entities of a KG triple, as represented across the image set. The input images are pre-filtered like in setting 1, using the VLM to retain only relevant images. We refer to setting 2 as our presented model for this work.

2) *Utilizing Entity Context*: In setting 3, we prompt the InstructBLIP T5 model [32] to generate a sentence summarizing what the images reveal about a single entity in a KG triple. This setting emphasizes entity description rather than link awareness. This setting does not pre-filter images. Instead, it uses all available images in the dataset for a given KG triple.

## D. Performance Comparisons

In this section, we present the evaluation of MMKG-T5 (Setting 2) on three benchmark datasets: FB15k-237-IMG, MKG-W, and MKG-Y. We compare its performance against traditional KGC models (TransE, DistMult, ComplEx), multimodal KGC models (IKRL, RSME, TransAE), and its backbone model, KGT5. Table II summarizes the results.

The results demonstrate that while MMKG-T5 does not achieve state-of-the-art performance across all datasets, it consistently improves over KGT5, showcasing the benefits of incorporating multimodal and relational contexts. These improvements are particularly notable given MMKG-T5’s use of a lightweight Transformer-based architecture, avoiding the heavy reliance on entity-specific embeddings employed by traditional KGC and multimodal models. Furthermore, the analysis reveals dataset-specific factors that influence MMKG-T5’s performance and highlight areas for further refinement.

1) *FB15k-237-IMG*: The FB15k-237-IMG dataset serves as the most multimodal-rich benchmark in our evaluation, with each entity having an average of 12 associated images, of which approximately 8 are utilized for multimodal context generation after filtering. MMKG-T5 achieves an MRR of 0.308 and Hits@10 of 0.488, significantly outperforming its backbone model, KGT5. This improvement underscores the utility of incorporating multimodal and relational contexts for knowledge graph completion.

Compared to traditional KGC baselines like TransE and DistMult, MMKG-T5 leverages the multimodal information effectively, demonstrating its ability to capture cross-modal interactions. However, state-of-the-art multimodal models such as TransAE and RSME achieve comparable or slightly better results, suggesting that MMKG-T5 could benefit from more advanced multimodal fusion mechanisms.

The rich multimodal data in FB15k-237-IMG also facilitates the generation of high-quality link-aware contexts. In setting 2, as shown in Table IV, among the 14,541 entities, 10,865 entities have valid multimodal contexts, with an average of 8 images contributing to the context generation process. The diversity and quality of these images enhance MMKG-T5’s ability to reason over multimodal content effectively, resulting in its relative strong performance on this dataset.

2) *MKG-W*: On the MKG-W dataset, MMKG-T5 achieves an MRR of 0.270 and Hits@1 of 0.224, demonstrating improvements over KGT5. However, its performance lags behind advanced multimodal models such as IKRL and RSME. This performance gap highlights areas where MMKG-T5 could be further optimized, particularly in handling datasets with sparser and lower-quality multimodal data.

As shown in Table IV, MKG-W presents unique challenges due to its limited multimodal content. Of the 15,000 entities, only 9,302 have associated images, and many of these images are duplicates with varying resolutions. After link-aware filtering, in setting 2, valid multimodal contexts are generated for only 4,739 entities, using an average of two images per entity. This scarcity of diverse and relevant multimodal data directly impacts the quality of context generation, thereby

TABLE II: Performance comparison of MMKG-T5 (Setting 2) and baselines on FB15k-237-IMG, MKG-W, and MKG-Y datasets. The best results for each dataset are highlighted in bold. The results are taken from [31], [14], [17] and [30].

Model	FB15k-237-IMG				MKG-W		MKG-Y	
	MRR	Hits@1	Hits@3	Hits@10	MRR	Hits@1	MRR	Hits@1
<b>TransE</b> [1]	0.261	0.173	0.291	0.437	0.291	0.210	0.307	0.234
<b>DistMult</b> [27]	0.241	0.155	0.263	0.419	0.209	0.159	0.250	0.193
<b>Complex</b> [21]	0.247	0.158	0.275	0.428	0.249	0.190	0.287	0.222
<b>IKRL</b> [24]	0.268	0.177	0.301	0.449	0.323	<b>0.261</b>	0.332	0.303
<b>RSME</b> [22]	-	<b>0.242</b>	0.344	0.467	0.292	0.233	<b>0.344</b>	<b>0.317</b>
<b>TransAE</b> [23]	-	0.199	0.317	0.463	<b>0.300</b>	0.212	0.281	0.253
<b>KGT5</b> [16]	0.247	0.173	0.277	0.397	0.248	0.203	0.234	0.213
<b>MMKG-T5</b> (Ours)	<b>0.308</b>	0.237	<b>0.347</b>	<b>0.488</b>	0.270	0.224	0.214	0.164

affecting MMKG-T5’s performance. Additionally, MKG-W contains only 169 relations, limiting the diversity of relational contexts that can contribute to the reasoning process.

Despite these limitations, MMKG-T5’s improvements over KGT5 demonstrate the robustness of its multimodal and relational context mechanisms. The results suggest that even with limited multimodal data, MMKG-T5 can extract meaningful insights to enhance link prediction.

3) *MKG-Y*: The MKG-Y dataset poses additional challenges for MMKG-T5, as it provides the sparsest multimodal data among the evaluated datasets as presented in Table IV. MMKG-T5 achieves an MRR of 0.214 and Hits@1 of 0.164, even lower than KGT5. In comparison, state-of-the-art models perform significantly better, highlighting MMKG-T5’s limitations in leveraging sparse multimodal data effectively.

Of the 15,000 entities in MKG-Y, 14,481 have associated images, but the majority of these images are duplicates, offering limited diversity. After link-aware filtering, valid multimodal contexts are generated for only 3,043 entities in setting 2, with an average of 2 images per entity. Moreover, MKG-Y contains only 28 relations, significantly fewer than FB15k-237-IMG (237 relations) and MKG-W (169 relations). This lack of relation diversity further limits the effectiveness of relational contexts in guiding the reasoning process.

The results suggest that MMKG-T5’s current approach to context generation is more effective on datasets with richer multimodal and relational diversity. For datasets like MKG-Y, future work could explore adaptive multimodal context generation strategies that account for sparsity and redundancy in the available data.

4) *Overall Observations of multimodal context summarized as follows:*

- Across FB15K-237-IMG and MKG-W which have relatively sufficient multimodal information, MMKG-T5 consistently improves upon KGT5, validating the effectiveness of multimodal and relational contexts in enhancing Transformer-based KGC models. The improvements are particularly pronounced on FB15k-237-IMG, where the

rich multimodal data allows MMKG-T5 to generate high-quality contexts.

- MMKG-T5’s performance varies significantly across datasets, reflecting its sensitivity to the quality and diversity of multimodal and relational data. The model performs best on FB15k-237-IMG, benefiting from its extensive multimodal content and relational diversity while struggling on MKG-W and MKG-Y due to data sparsity and redundancy.
- Comparison with Advanced Models: While MMKG-T5 achieves competitive results, it does not outperform state-of-the-art multimodal models such as IKRL and RSME. This suggests opportunities for further refinement in multimodal fusion and adaptive context generation to bridge the performance gap.
- The analysis highlights the challenges posed by datasets like MKG-W and MKG-Y, where the scarcity and redundancy of multimodal data limit the quality of generated contexts. Addressing these challenges is crucial for extending the applicability of MMKG-T5 to a broader range of multimodal knowledge graphs.

### E. Ablation Study

To investigate the effectiveness of different multimodal context generation strategies, we conduct an ablation study comparing MMKG-T5 configurations (Setting 1 and Setting 3) with the default configuration (Setting 2) and its backbone model, KGT5. The evaluation is performed on two benchmarks: FB15k-237-IMG and MKG-W. Table III summarizes the results.

#### 1) Impact of Context Generation Strategies:

- Setting 1 (Triple-Specific Context): Setting 1 generates multimodal contexts tightly linked to the specific triple  $(h, r, t)$ , focusing on the most relevant images and descriptions for the queried link. This targeted approach results in improved performance over KGT5 (e.g., MRR increases from 0.247 to 0.283 on FB15k-237-IMG and from 0.248 to 0.282 on MKG-W). The strong alignment

TABLE III: Ablation study results for MMKG-T5 on FB15k-237-IMG and MKG-W. The best results for each dataset are highlighted in bold.

Dataset Model	FB15k-237-IMG				MKG-W			
	MRR	Hits@1	Hits@3	Hits@10	MRR	Hits@1	Hits@3	Hits@10
<b>KGT5</b>	0.247	0.173	0.277	0.397	0.248	0.203	0.269	0.336
<b>Setting 1</b>	0.283	0.208	0.304	0.434	<b>0.282</b>	<b>0.245</b>	<b>0.316</b>	<b>0.385</b>
<b>Setting 2 (Default)</b>	<b>0.308</b>	<b>0.237</b>	<b>0.347</b>	<b>0.488</b>	0.270	0.224	0.294	0.373
<b>Setting 3</b>	0.280	0.200	0.320	0.450	0.276	0.232	0.298	0.366

TABLE IV: The table below presents entity context statistics across FB15K-237, MKG-W, and MKG-Y, where S1, S2, and S3 represent Setting 1, Setting 2, and Setting 3, respectively.

Count	FB15K-237-IMG	MKG-W	MKG-Y
<b>Entities</b>	14,541	15,000	15,000
<b>Images</b>	179,341	46,492	72,347
<b>Entities with Images</b>	14,541	9,302	14,481
<b>Entities with Context (S1)</b>	11,951	4,847	3,043
<b>Entities with Context (S2)</b>	10,865	4,739	2,845
<b>Entities with Context (S3)</b>	14,297	9,301	14,466

with the triple-specific semantics enables better reasoning on datasets with relatively complex relational patterns like FB15k-237-IMG. However, the narrow scope of Setting 1 excludes broader relational information, limiting its ability to generalize on datasets with simpler relational structures, such as MKG-W.

- **Setting 3 (General Object Summarization):** In Setting 3, the multimodal context provides general object summaries, focusing on comprehensive descriptions of entities rather than their specific relational roles. This approach achieves better performance than KGT5 (e.g., Hits@10 improves from 0.336 to 0.366 on MKG-W) by leveraging broader descriptions. However, it falls short compared to Setting 2 on FB15k-237-IMG, as it overlooks relational nuances critical for datasets with diverse and complex relations.
- **Setting 2 (Balanced Context):** Setting 2, the default configuration, achieves the best overall performance on FB15k-237-IMG across all metrics (e.g., MRR 0.308, Hits@10 0.488). It balances specificity and generality by combining link-aware filtering with descriptive summaries, allowing it to capture both relational roles and broader entity characteristics effectively. On MKG-W, however, Setting 2 slightly underperforms Setting 3 (e.g., MRR of 0.270 vs. 0.276) due to the sparse and redundant multimodal data in this dataset.

2) *Challenges of Sparse and Redundant Data:* The performance of MMKG-T5 across settings highlights its sensitivity to dataset characteristics:

- **FB15k-237-IMG:** With an average of 12 images per entity (approximately 8 used after link-aware filtering), FB15k-237-IMG offers rich and diverse multimodal data. This

allows Setting 2 to generate high-quality contexts that effectively summarize multimodal and relational information about the triple, resulting in substantial performance improvements.

- **MKG-W:** In contrast, MKG-W provides much fewer images as shown in Table IV. After link-aware filtering, only 4,739 entities have valid multimodal contexts, with an average of 2 images per entity. The limited data reduces the advantages of Setting 2, which harms the quality multimodal contexts. On MKG-W, Setting 3 leverages the provided images better than Setting 2, as it fully considers the limited information, which leads to better predictions.

3) *Discussion for Context Design:* The ablation study underscores the importance of balancing specificity and generality in multimodal context generation. Setting 2 exemplifies this balance, combining link-aware filtering with descriptive summaries to excel on datasets like FB15k-237-IMG. However, its performance on MKG-W suggests that this balance is sensitive to the quality and availability of multimodal data.

A key observation is the trade-off between the focus on triple-specific information (as in Setting 1) and general entity descriptions (as in Setting 3). Triple-specific contexts allow for precise reasoning on complex relations, as demonstrated on FB15k-237-IMG, but their narrow scope may hinder performance on datasets with simpler structures. Conversely, general descriptions fail to capture relational roles, limiting their effectiveness on datasets with rich multimodal and relational diversity. However, they are more efficient and provide broader coverage when multimodal information is limited.

By examining these settings, this study provides actionable insights into how multimodal context generation strategies can be refined to achieve robust performance across diverse MMKG datasets.

## VI. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we proposed MMKG-T5, a Transformer-based approach for multimodal knowledge graph completion. By combining link-aware multimodal contexts, entity-centric descriptions, and relation-specific contexts, MMKG-T5 demonstrated competitive performance on diverse benchmarks, highlighting the potential of Transformer architectures for integrating multimodal and relational information. However, challenges such as sparse or redundant multimodal data,



balancing different context types, and ensuring scalability across diverse datasets remain critical areas for improvement.

Future work will focus on generating higher-quality multimodal contexts, potentially through advanced vision-language models (VLMs) and adaptive fine-tuning strategies tailored to multimodal knowledge graph tasks. Addressing data sparsity and redundancy through adaptive context generation and data augmentation techniques is another key direction. Additionally, optimizing the balance between different contexts will further enhance model reasoning. Finally, scaling MMKG-T5 to handle larger, dynamic knowledge graphs and evaluating its generalizability across multilingual and domain-specific datasets will validate its broader applicability.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. Bordes, N. Usunier, A. Garcia-Duran, J. Weston, and O. Yakhnenko, "Translating embeddings for modeling multi-relational data," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 26, 2013.
- [2] X. Chen, N. Zhang, L. Li, S. Deng, C. Tan, C. Xu, F. Huang, L. Si, and H. Chen, "Hybrid transformer with multi-level fusion for multimodal knowledge graph completion," in *Proceedings of the 45th international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*, 2022, pp. 904–915.
- [3] Y. Chen, X. Ge, S. Yang, L. Hu, J. Li, and J. Zhang, "A survey on multimodal knowledge graphs: Construction, completion and applications," *Mathematics*, vol. 11, no. 8, p. 1815, 2023.
- [4] H. W. Chung, L. Hou, S. Longpre, B. Zoph, Y. Tay, W. Fedus, Y. Li, X. Wang, M. Dehghani, S. Brahma *et al.*, "Scaling instruction-finetuned language models," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 25, no. 70, pp. 1–53, 2024.
- [5] W. Dai, J. Li, D. Li, A. Tiong, J. Zhao, W. Wang, B. Li, P. Fung, and S. Hoi, "InstructBLIP: Towards general-purpose vision-language models with instruction tuning," in *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=vvoWPYqZJA>
- [6] M. Gao, W. Chen, T. Wang, D. Lu, and J. Zheng, "Adaptive image-enhanced knowledge graph completion," in *ICASSP 2024-2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 6160–6164.
- [7] J. Li, D. Li, C. Xiong, and S. Hoi, "Blip: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation," in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2022, pp. 12 888–12 900.
- [8] K. Liang, L. Meng, M. Liu, Y. Liu, W. Tu, S. Wang, S. Zhou, X. Liu, F. Sun, and K. He, "A survey of knowledge graph reasoning on graph types: Static, dynamic, and multi-modal," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2024.
- [9] —, "A survey of knowledge graph reasoning on graph types: Static, dynamic, and multi-modal," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2024.
- [10] G. Niu, Y. Li, C. Tang, R. Geng, J. Dai, Q. Liu, H. Wang, J. Sun, F. Huang, and L. Si, "Relational learning with gated and attentive neighbor aggregator for few-shot knowledge graph completion," in *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, 2021, pp. 213–222.
- [11] C. Peng, J. He, and F. Xia, "Learning on multimodal graphs: A survey," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.05322*, 2024.
- [12] A. Radford, J. W. Kim, C. Hallacy, A. Ramesh, G. Goh, S. Agarwal, G. Sastry, A. Askell, P. Mishkin, J. Clark *et al.*, "Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision," in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 8748–8763.
- [13] C. Raffel, N. Shazeer, A. Roberts, K. Lee, S. Narang, M. Matena, Y. Zhou, W. Li, and P. J. Liu, "Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer," 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.10683>
- [14] A. Sadeghian, M. Armandpour, P. Ding, and D. Z. Wang, "Drum: End-to-end differentiable rule mining on knowledge graphs," 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.00055>
- [15] D. Sanmartin, "Kg-rag: Bridging the gap between knowledge and creativity," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.12035*, 2024.
- [16] A. Saxena, A. Kochsiek, and R. Gemulla, "Sequence-to-sequence knowledge graph completion and question answering," in *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 2022, pp. 2814–2828.
- [17] B. Shang, Y. Zhao, J. Liu, and D. Wang, "Lafa: Multimodal knowledge graph completion with link aware fusion and aggregation," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 38, no. 8, 2024, pp. 8957–8965.
- [18] Z. Sun, Z.-H. Deng, J.-Y. Nie, and J. Tang, "Rotate: Knowledge graph embedding by relational rotation in complex space," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [19] L. Tian, X. Zhou, Y.-P. Wu, W.-T. Zhou, J.-H. Zhang, and T.-S. Zhang, "Knowledge graph and knowledge reasoning: A systematic review," *Journal of Electronic Science and Technology*, vol. 20, no. 2, p. 100159, 2022.
- [20] K. Toutanova and D. Chen, "Observed versus latent features for knowledge base and text inference," in *Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Continuous Vector Space Models and their Compositionality*, A. Allauzen, E. Grefenstette, K. M. Hermann, H. Larochelle, and S. W.-t. Yih, Eds. Beijing, China: Association for Computational Linguistics, Jul. 2015, pp. 57–66. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/W15-4007>
- [21] T. Trouillon, J. Welbl, S. Riedel, É. Gaussier, and G. Bouchard, "Complex embeddings for simple link prediction," in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2016, pp. 2071–2080.
- [22] M. Wang, S. Wang, H. Yang, Z. Zhang, X. Chen, and G. Qi, "Is visual context really helpful for knowledge graph? a representation learning perspective," in *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 2021, pp. 2735–2743.
- [23] Z. Wang, L. Li, Q. Li, and D. Zeng, "Multimodal data enhanced representation learning for knowledge graphs," in *2019 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–8.
- [24] R. Xie, Z. Liu, H. Luan, and M. Sun, "Image-embodied knowledge representation learning," in *Proceedings of the 26th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2017, pp. 3140–3146.
- [25] D. Xu, T. Xu, S. Wu, J. Zhou, and E. Chen, "Relation-enhanced negative sampling for multimodal knowledge graph completion," in *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, ser. MM '22. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2022, p. 3857–3866. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3503161.3548388>
- [26] D. Xu, Z. Zhang, Z. Lin, X. Wu, Z. Zhu, T. Xu, X. Zhao, Y. Zheng, and E. Chen, "Multi-perspective improvement of knowledge graph completion with large language models," in *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, 2024, pp. 11 956–11 968.
- [27] B. Yang, W.-t. Yih, X. He, J. Gao, and L. Deng, "Embedding entities and relations for learning and inference in knowledge bases," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6575*, 2014.
- [28] L. Yao, C. Mao, and Y. Luo, "Kg-bert: Bert for knowledge graph completion," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.03193*, 2019.
- [29] J. Zhang, B. Chen, L. Zhang, X. Ke, and H. Ding, "Neural, symbolic and neural-symbolic reasoning on knowledge graphs," *AI Open*, vol. 2, pp. 14–35, 2021.
- [30] Y. Zhang, Z. Chen, L. Guo, Y. Xu, B. Hu, Z. Liu, W. Zhang, and H. Chen, "Multiple heads are better than one: Mixture of modality knowledge experts for entity representation learning," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.16869>
- [31] Y. Zhang and W. Zhang, "Knowledge graph completion with pre-trained multimodal transformer and twins negative sampling," 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.07084>
- [32] H. Zhao, Z. Cai, S. Si, X. Ma, K. An, L. Chen, Z. Liu, S. Wang, W. Han, and B. Chang, "Mmicl: Empowering vision-language model with multimodal in-context learning," in *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [33] S. Zheng, W. Wang, J. Qu, H. Yin, W. Chen, and L. Zhao, "Mmkg: Multi-hop multi-modal knowledge graph reasoning," in *2023 IEEE 39th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 96–109.