

EVALUATING KNOWLEDGE GRAPH BASED RETRIEVAL AUGMENTED GENERATION METHODS UNDER KNOWLEDGE INCOMPLETENESS

**Dongzhuoran Zhou^{1,2*}, Yuqicheng Zhu^{2,3*}, Yuan He⁴, Jiaoyan Chen⁵,
Evgeny Kharlamov^{1,2}, Steffen Staab^{3,6}**

¹University of Oslo, ²Bosch Center for AI, ³University of Stuttgart,

⁴University of Oxford, ⁵The University of Manchester, ⁶University of Southampton

dongzhuoran.zhou@de.bosch.com

ABSTRACT

Knowledge Graph based Retrieval-Augmented Generation (KG-RAG) is a technique that enhances Large Language Model (LLM) inference in tasks like Question Answering (QA) by retrieving relevant information from knowledge graphs (KGs). However, real-world KGs are often incomplete, meaning that essential information for answering questions may be missing. Existing benchmarks do not adequately capture the impact of KG incompleteness on KG-RAG performance. In this paper, we systematically evaluate KG-RAG methods under incomplete KGs by removing triples using different methods and analyzing the resulting effects. We demonstrate that KG-RAG methods are sensitive to KG incompleteness, highlighting the need for more robust approaches in realistic settings.

1 INTRODUCTION

Large Language Models (LLMs) have achieved remarkable success across various natural language processing tasks such as Question Answering (QA) (Achiam et al., 2023; Touvron et al., 2023; Jiang et al., 2023). However, they face several limitations, including outdated knowledge (Dhingra et al., 2022), insufficient domain-specific expertise (Li et al., 2023), and a tendency to generate plausible but incorrect information, known as hallucination (Ji et al., 2023).

Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) mitigates these issues by integrating information retrieval mechanisms, allowing LLMs to access up-to-date and reliable information without requiring modifications to their architecture or parameters (Khandelwal et al., 2019; Ram et al., 2023; Borgeaud et al., 2022; Izacard & Grave, 2021). While conventional RAG approaches rely on unstructured text corpora, recent studies (Chen et al., 2023; Han et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2025) have started to explore knowledge graphs (KGs) as knowledge resources by exploring different retrieval methods, such as neighborhood extraction after entity linking and similarity-based entity search in the embedding space, as well as different prompting methods like knowledge re-writting (Wu et al., 2024). Such KG-based RAG (KG-RAG for shortness) methods can reduce text redundancy (Li et al., 2024), enable flexible updates (Paulheim, 2016), and provide structured reasoning evidence (Luo et al., 2024). Despite these benefits, KGs are often incomplete in real-world applications (Min et al., 2013; Ren et al., 2020; Pflueger et al., 2022), raising a crucial question: *Can KG-RAG methods remain effective when the given KG is incomplete?*

LLMs have demonstrated substantial knowledge retention and reasoning capabilities Achiam et al. (2023); Guo et al. (2025). Consequently, KG-RAG methods (Luo et al., 2024; Sun et al., 2024; He et al., 2024) are expected to leverage LLMs to infer relevant facts that extend beyond explicitly retrieved triples. For instance, from the retrieved triples $\langle \text{JustinBieber}, \text{has_parent}, \text{JeremyBieber} \rangle$ and $\langle \text{JeremyBieber}, \text{has_child}, \text{JaxonBieber} \rangle$, LLMs can infer that Jaxon Bieber is Justin Bieber’s brother by recognizing the underlying semantic path. In this way, KG-RAG methods can effectively compensate for missing direct evidence and mitigate the impact of incomplete KGs.

* Equal contribution.




Figure 1: **Illustration of the running example.** The question “Who is the brother of Justin Bieber?” has the expected answer *Jaxon Bieber*. While the direct evidence path *Justin Bieber* $\xrightarrow{\text{has_brother}}$ *Jaxon Bieber* provides a straightforward answer, it is often missing in practice. A robust KG-RAG method should leverage alternative reasoning paths, such as *Justin Bieber* $\xrightarrow{\text{has_parent}}$ *Jeremy Bieber* $\xrightarrow{\text{has_child}}$ *Jaxon Bieber*, to derive the correct answer.

However, existing KG-RAG studies directly adopt KG QA benchmarks (Yih et al., 2016; Talmor & Berant, 2018) for evaluation. In these benchmarks, the ground truth answer of each question can be directly inferred from the knowledge in the KG, failing to reflect real-world scenarios where KGs are incomplete for answering the question. Thus the current evaluation does not reflect KG-RAG methods’ performance facing incomplete knowledge. In this paper, we systematically assess three popular KG-RAG methods under varying levels of KG incompleteness. Our findings reveal that **these methods still benefit significantly from incomplete KGs, but are sensitive to missing knowledge with performance drops**, emphasizing the need for more robust approaches for KG-RAG.

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 BACKGROUND AND NOTATIONS

Knowledge Graph. Given two finite sets E and R , whose elements are called *entities* and *relations*, a KG G is a directed multi-relational graph represented as a subset of $E \times R \times E$, where each element $\langle h, r, t \rangle \in G$ is called a *triple*.

Reasoning Path. A reasoning path in a KG is a directed sequence of entities and relations that connect a source entity to a target entity, forming a logical pathway for inference:

$$e_0 \xrightarrow{r_1} e_1 \xrightarrow{r_2} \dots \xrightarrow{r_l} e_l, \quad (1)$$

where $e_i \in E$, $r_i \in R$, and l denotes the length of the reasoning path. For example, given the question “Who is the brother of Justin Bieber?”, a possible reasoning path to the answer, as shown in Figure 1, is:

$$\text{Justin Bieber} \xrightarrow{\text{has_parent}} \text{Jeremy Bieber} \xrightarrow{\text{has_child}} \text{Jaxon Bieber}.$$

2.2 BENCHMARK DATASETS

We build our experimental datasets based on two KGQA benchmarks that are mostly used by current KG-RAG methods: WebQuestionsSP (WebQSP) (Yih et al., 2016) and Complex WebQuestions (CWQ) (Talmor & Berant, 2018). These datasets consist of natural language questions designed to be answered using a KG. The questions are open-domain and require retrieval of structured information from Freebase (Bollacker et al., 2008), a large-scale KG with 88 million entities and 126 million triples. Each question in these datasets is annotated with a *topic entity* and an *answer entity*.

- **Topic Entity:** This is the primary entity mentioned in the question, serving as the starting point for retrieving triples from the KG. In the running example, “*Justin Bieber*” is the topic entity.

- **Answer Entity:** This is the specific entity within the KG that answers the given question. In our running example, the answer entity would be “*JaxonBieber*”, representing Justin Bieber’s brother. Note that we might have multiple answer entities for the same question.

2.3 DELETION STRATEGIES

To evaluate the robustness of three popular KG-RAG methods (TOG (Sun et al., 2024), ROG (Luo et al., 2024) and G-Retrieve (He et al., 2024)) under KG incompleteness, we simulate missing knowledge by systematically removing triples from the KG of WebQSP and CWQ. For ToG we choose LLama2-70B-Chat as backbone model. We employ two different deletion strategies: **random triple deletion** and **reasoning path disruption**, each designed to model different levels of KG incompleteness.

Random Triple Deletion. We randomly remove a specified percentage of triples from the KG. This approach provides a baseline for understanding the general impact of missing knowledge. By varying the deletion percentage, we analyze how KG-based RAG performance degrades as more information is lost.

Reasoning Path Disruption. To simulate more severe knowledge incompleteness, this strategy selectively disrupts reasoning paths that support LLMs’ inference. For each question, we identify the shortest reasoning paths between the topic and answer entities using the breadth-first search algorithm (Moore, 1959). We then randomly select **one** such path and remove a randomly chosen triple from it. This deliberately breaks a critical step in the reasoning chain, emulating real-world scenarios where essential intermediate knowledge may be missing.

2.4 EVALUATION METRICS

The performance of KG-RAG is evaluated by *Accuracy* and *Hits*. Let Q be the set of test questions. For each question $q \in Q$, let $S(q)$ be the set of tokens generated from the prompt and $A(q)$ be the corresponding set of ground truth answer tokens. We define:

$$Accuracy := \frac{1}{|Q|} \sum_{q \in Q} \frac{|S(q) \cap A(q)|}{|A(q)|}, \quad Hits := \frac{1}{|Q|} \sum_{q \in Q} \mathbb{1}[S(q) \cap A(q) \neq \emptyset]$$

3 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

Table 1 presents the performance of three KG-RAG methods under varying levels of KG incompleteness. We evaluate models in multiple settings: a fully intact KG (no deletion), random triple deletion at 5%, 10%, and 20% levels, reasoning path disruption (disabling a key step in the reasoning chain), and a baseline condition where retrieval from the KG is entirely disabled. Our findings highlight three key observations.

First, using KG as retrieval source significantly improves performance compared to the LLM without retrieval. For example, RoG’s accuracy falls from 76.75% to 50.46% (-34.25%) in WebQSP. However, all evaluated KG-RAG methods exhibit **high sensitivity to missing knowledge in the KG**. Notably, even under random deletion, where test question-specific triples may remain unaffected, accuracy consistently declines as the proportion of deleted triples increases across both datasets. The relative accuracy drop is up to 5.99% in WebQSP and 7.41% in CWQ under 20% random triple deletion.

Second, **disrupting a single reasoning path leads to a substantial performance drop**, despite that multiple reasoning paths often exist for a given question. For instance, in WebQSP, RoG’s accuracy drops from 76.75% to 65.43% (-14.70%), and its hits declines from 86.6% to 78.12% (-9.80%). This suggests that current KG-RAG methods often rely on specific paths for reasoning, rather than effectively utilizing alternative reasoning pathways when available. Models required fine-tuning on the KG such as RoG may be particularly dependent on a small set of learned retrieval patterns, making them vulnerable to missing knowledge in those specific paths.

Finally, our results indicate that **KGs remain valuable retrieval sources even when incomplete**. Although performance degrades under KG incompleteness, it still surpasses the baseline where no

Experimental Setting	WebQSP		CWQ	
	Accuracy (%)	Hits (%)	Accuracy (%)	Hits (%)
RoG - w/o deletion	76.75	86.60	57.49	61.79
RoG - 5% random deletion	75.55 (-1.56%)	85.99 (-0.71%)	57.33 (-0.28%)	61.54 (-0.40%)
RoG - 10% random deletion	74.66 (-2.72%)	85.68 (-1.06%)	55.88 (-2.80%)	60.43 (-2.20%)
RoG - 20% random deletion	72.15 (-5.99%)	84.15 (-2.83%)	53.23 (-7.41%)	58.12 (-5.94%)
RoG - reasoning path disruption	65.43 (-14.70%)	78.12 (-9.80%)	52.95 (-7.90%)	57.4 (-7.10%)
RoG - w/o retrieval	50.46 (-34.25%)	65.05 (-24.90%)	35.40 (-38.42%)	40.10 (-35.11%)
ToG - w/o deletion	44.19	67.40	48.94	51.80
ToG - 5% random deletion	43.74 (-1.02%)	67.17 (-0.33%)	48.78 (-0.32%)	51.34 (-0.89%)
ToG - 10% random deletion	43.09 (-1.64%)	66.81 (-0.88%)	47.94 (-2.05%)	50.44 (-2.63%)
ToG - 20% random deletion	41.61 (-3.42%)	66.18 (-1.81%)	46.14 (-5.73%)	49.18 (-5.05%)
ToG - reasoning path disruption	38.25 (-13.44%)	62.70 (-6.97%)	44.56 (-8.95%)	47.31 (-8.67%)
ToG - w/o retrieval	34.63 (-21.60%)	57.24 (-15.08%)	34.39 (-29.73%)	37.40 (-27.80%)
G-Retriever - w/o deletion	53.43	71.49	35.39	41.51
G-Retriever - 5% random deletion	52.33 (-2.06%)	70.91 (-0.81%)	34.63 (-2.15%)	40.55 (-2.31%)
G-Retriever - 10% random deletion	51.87 (-2.92%)	70.76 (-1.02%)	33.98 (-3.98%)	40.27 (-2.99%)
G-Retriever - 20% random deletion	50.88 (-4.78%)	69.70 (-2.51%)	33.78 (-4.55%)	39.98 (-3.69%)
G-Retriever - reasoning path disruption	49.36 (-7.61%)	69.41 (-2.91%)	33.56 (-5.17%)	39.73 (-4.29%)
G-Retriever - w/o retrieval	29.72 (-44.37%)	47.17 (-34.01%)	14.86 (-58.01%)	17.55 (-57.72%)

Table 1: Performance of KG-RAG methods under different levels of KG incompleteness. The numbers in parentheses indicate the relative performance drop compared to the no-deletion setting for each method.

KG retrieval is used. This suggests that addressing KG incompleteness more effectively—rather than discarding KGs entirely—should be the focus when designing more resilient KG-RAG methods.

4 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

This work evaluated three KG-RAG methods under knowledge incompleteness, demonstrating their sensitivity to missing information. Even random triple deletions reduced performance, while reasoning path disruption led to substantial performance drops. Despite this, KGs remained valuable retrieval sources, consistently outperforming retrieval-free baselines.

Beyond incompleteness, real-world KGs also contain noise, such as incorrect triples generated during automatic KG construction process or errors in the original knowledge source (Heindorf et al., 2016; Paulheim, 2016). Additionally, the lack of a standardized evaluation protocol for KG-RAG methods and the inherent factual instability of LLMs (Potyka et al., 2024; He et al., 2025) can lead to inconsistent assessments across studies.

Future work should focus on developing more robust KG-RAG methods that can handle both missing and noisy knowledge, ensuring reliable performance in real-world scenarios. This includes uncertainty-aware retrieval, noise-resistant reasoning mechanisms, and hybrid approaches that integrate structured and unstructured sources. Additionally, creating comprehensive benchmarks and standardized evaluation protocols will enable systematic assessment and foster progress toward more resilient KG-RAG systems.

5 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank the International Max Planck Research School for Intelligent Systems (IMPRS-IS) for supporting Yuqicheng Zhu. The work was partially supported by EU Projects Graph Mas-sivizer (GA 101093202), enRichMyData (GA 101070284) and SMARTY (GA 101140087).

REFERENCES

- Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- Kurt Bollacker, Colin Evans, Praveen Paritosh, Tim Sturge, and Jamie Taylor. Freebase: a collaboratively created graph database for structuring human knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 2008 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data*, pp. 1247–1250, 2008.
- Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Jordan Hoffmann, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Katie Millican, George Bm Van Den Driessche, Jean-Baptiste Lespiau, Bogdan Damoc, Aidan Clark, et al. Improving language models by retrieving from trillions of tokens. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 2206–2240. PMLR, 2022.
- Jiaoyan Chen, Yuan He, Yuxia Geng, Ernesto Jiménez-Ruiz, Hang Dong, and Ian Horrocks. Contextual semantic embeddings for ontology subsumption prediction. *World Wide Web*, 26(5):2569–2591, 2023.
- Bhuvan Dhingra, Jeremy R Cole, Julian Martin Eisenschlos, Daniel Gillick, Jacob Eisenstein, and William W Cohen. Time-aware language models as temporal knowledge bases. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:257–273, 2022.
- Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, et al. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948*, 2025.
- Haoyu Han, Yu Wang, Harry Shomer, Kai Guo, Jiayuan Ding, Yongjia Lei, Mahantesh Halapanavar, Ryan A Rossi, Subhabrata Mukherjee, Xianfeng Tang, et al. Retrieval-augmented generation with graphs (graphrag). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.00309*, 2024.
- Xiaoxin He, Yijun Tian, Yifei Sun, Nitesh V Chawla, Thomas Laurent, Yann LeCun, Xavier Bresson, and Bryan Hooi. G-retriever: Retrieval-augmented generation for textual graph understanding and question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07630*, 2024.
- Yuan He, Bailan He, Zifeng Ding, Alisia Lupidi, Yuqicheng Zhu, Shuo Chen, Caiqi Zhang, Jiaoyan Chen, Yunpu Ma, Volker Tresp, and Ian Horrocks. Supposedly equivalent facts that aren’t? entity frequency in pre-training induces asymmetry in llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.22362*, 2025.
- Stefan Heindorf, Martin Potthast, Benno Stein, and Gregor Engels. Vandalism detection in wikidata. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM International on Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pp. 327–336, 2016.
- Gautier Izacard and Édouard Grave. Leveraging passage retrieval with generative models for open domain question answering. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pp. 874–880, 2021.
- Ziwei Ji, Nayeon Lee, Rita Frieske, Tiezheng Yu, Dan Su, Yan Xu, Etsuko Ishii, Ye Jin Bang, Andrea Madotto, and Pascale Fung. Survey of hallucination in natural language generation. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(12):1–38, 2023.
- Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*, 2023.
- Urvashi Khandelwal, Omer Levy, Dan Jurafsky, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis. Generalization through memorization: Nearest neighbor language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- Mufei Li, Siqi Miao, and Pan Li. Simple is effective: The roles of graphs and large language models in knowledge-graph-based retrieval-augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.20724*, 2024.

- Xianzhi Li, Samuel Chan, Xiaodan Zhu, Yulong Pei, Zhiqiang Ma, Xiaomo Liu, and Sameena Shah. Are chatgpt and gpt-4 general-purpose solvers for financial text analytics? a study on several typical tasks. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Industry Track*, pp. 408–422, 2023.
- Linhao Luo, Yuan-Fang Li, Reza Haf, and Shirui Pan. Reasoning on graphs: Faithful and interpretable large language model reasoning. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- Bonan Min, Ralph Grishman, Li Wan, Chang Wang, and David Gondek. Distant supervision for relation extraction with an incomplete knowledge base. In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pp. 777–782, 2013.
- E. F Moore. The shortest path through a maze. In *Proceedings of the International Symposium on the Theory of Switching*, pp. 285–292, 1959.
- Heiko Paulheim. Knowledge graph refinement: A survey of approaches and evaluation methods. *Semantic web*, 8(3):489–508, 2016.
- Maximilian Pflueger, David J Tena Cucala, and Egor V Kostylev. Gnnq: A neuro-symbolic approach to query answering over incomplete knowledge graphs. In *International Semantic Web Conference*, pp. 481–497. Springer, 2022.
- Nico Potyka, Yuqicheng Zhu, Yunjie He, Evgeny Kharlamov, and Steffen Staab. Robust knowledge extraction from large language models using social choice theory. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, pp. 1593–1601, 2024.
- Ori Ram, Yoav Levine, Itay Dalmedigos, Dor Muhlgay, Amnon Shashua, Kevin Leyton-Brown, and Yoav Shoham. In-context retrieval-augmented language models. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 11:1316–1331, 2023.
- Hongyu Ren, Weihua Hu, and Jure Leskovec. Query2box: Reasoning over knowledge graphs in vector space using box embeddings. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- Jiashuo Sun, Chengjin Xu, Lumingyuan Tang, Saizhuo Wang, Chen Lin, Yeyun Gong, Lionel Ni, Heung-Yeung Shum, and Jian Guo. Think-on-graph: Deep and responsible reasoning of large language model on knowledge graph. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- Alon Talmor and Jonathan Berant. The web as a knowledge-base for answering complex questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.06643*, 2018.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- Yike Wu, Yi Huang, Nan Hu, Yuncheng Hua, Guilin Qi, Jiaoyan Chen, and Jeff Pan. Cotkr: Chain-of-thought enhanced knowledge rewriting for complex knowledge graph question answering. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 3501–3520, 2024.
- Wen-tau Yih, Matthew Richardson, Christopher Meek, Ming-Wei Chang, and Jina Suh. The value of semantic parse labeling for knowledge base question answering. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pp. 201–206, 2016.
- Qinggang Zhang, Shengyuan Chen, Yuanchen Bei, Zheng Yuan, Huachi Zhou, Zijin Hong, Junnan Dong, Hao Chen, Yi Chang, and Xiao Huang. A survey of graph retrieval-augmented generation for customized large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.13958*, 2025.