

# TEQUILA: Temporal Question Answering over Knowledge Bases

Zhen Jia  
Southwest Jiaotong University, China  
zjia@swjtu.edu.cn

Abdalghani Abujabal  
MPI for Informatics, Germany  
abujabal@mpi-inf.mpg.de

Rishiraj Saha Roy  
MPI for Informatics, Germany  
rishiraj@mpi-inf.mpg.de

Jannik Strötgen  
Bosch Center for AI, Germany  
jannik.stroetgen@de.bosch.com

Gerhard Weikum  
MPI for Informatics, Germany  
weikum@mpi-inf.mpg.de

## ABSTRACT

Question answering over knowledge bases (KB-QA) poses challenges in handling complex questions that need to be decomposed into sub-questions. An important case, addressed here, is that of temporal questions, where cues for temporal relations need to be discovered and handled. We present *TEQUILA*, an enabler method for temporal QA that can run on top of any KB-QA engine. *TEQUILA* has four stages. It detects if a question has temporal intent. It decomposes and rewrites the question into non-temporal sub-questions and temporal constraints. Answers to sub-questions are then retrieved from the underlying KB-QA engine. Finally, *TEQUILA* uses constraint reasoning on temporal intervals to compute final answers to the full question. Comparisons against state-of-the-art baselines show the viability of our method.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

**Motivation and Problem.** Knowledge-based question answering (KB-QA) aims to answer questions over large knowledge bases (e.g., DBpedia, Wikidata, Yago, etc.) or other structured data. KB-QA systems take as input questions such as:

Q1: “Which teams did Neymar play for?”

and translate them into structured queries, in a formal language like SPARQL or SQL, and execute the queries to retrieve answers from the KB. In doing so, KB-QA methods need to address the vocabulary mismatch between phrases in the input question and entities, types, and predicates in the KB: mapping ‘Neymar’ to the uniquely identified entity, ‘teams’ to the KB type `footballClub` and ‘played for’ to the KB predicate `memberOf`. State-of-the-art KB-QA (see surveys [9, 18]) can handle simple questions like the above example very well, but struggle with complex questions that involve multiple conditions on different entities and need to join the results from corresponding sub-questions. For example, the question:

Q2: “After whom did Neymar’s sister choose her last name?”

would require a three-way join that connects Neymar, his sister Rafaella Beckran, and David Beckham.

An important case of complex questions are temporal information needs. Search often comes with explicit or implicit conditions about time [17]. Consider the two examples:

Q3: “Which teams did Neymar play for before joining PSG?”

Q4: “Under which coaches did Neymar play in Barcelona?”

In Q3, no explicit date (e.g., August 2017) is mentioned, so a challenge is to detect its temporal nature. The phrase ‘joining PSG’ refers to an event (Neymar’s transfer to that team). We could detect this, but have to properly disambiguate it to a normalized date. The temporal preposition ‘before’ is a strong cue as well, but words like ‘before’, ‘after’, etc. are also used in non-temporal contexts; Q2 is an example for this. Q4 does not seem to be time-dependent at all, when looking at its surface form. However, it is crucial for correct answers that only coaches are selected whose job periods at FC Barcelona overlap with that of Neymar. Here, detecting the temporal nature is a big challenge. A second challenge is how to decompose such questions and ensure that the execution contains an overlap test for the respective time periods.

**Approach and Contributions.** The key idea of this paper is to judiciously decompose such temporal questions and rewrite the resulting sub-questions so that they can be separately evaluated by a standard KB-QA system. The answers for the full questions are then computed by combining and reasoning on the sub-question results. For example, Q3 should be decomposed and rewritten into Q3.1: “Which teams did Neymar play for?” and Q3.2: “When did Neymar join PSG?”. For the results of Q3.1, we could then retrieve time scopes from the KB, and compare them with the date returned by Q3.2, using a BEFORE operator. Analogously, Q4 would require an OVERLAP comparison as a final step. With the exception of the work by [4], to which we experimentally compare our method, we are not aware of any KB-QA system for such composite questions.

Our solution, called *TEQUILA*, is built on a rule-based framework that encompasses four stages of processing: (i) detecting temporal questions, (ii) decomposing questions and rewriting sub-questions, (iii) retrieving candidate answers for sub-questions, and (iv) temporal reasoning to combine and reconcile the results of the previous stage into final answers. For stage (iii), we leverage existing KB-QA systems (state-of-the-art systems QUINT [2] and AQQU [6] used in experiments), that are geared for answering simple questions.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first paper that presents a complete pipeline specific to temporal KB-QA. Novel contributions also include: (i) a method for decomposing complex questions, and (ii) the time-constraint-based reasoning for combining sub-question results into overall answers. All data and code are

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](mailto:permissions@acm.org).

CIKM’18, October 2018, Turin, Italy

© 2019 Association for Computing Machinery.

ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM...\$15.00

<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

public at <https://qa.mpi-inf.mpg.de/tequila/tequila.zip>, and a demo is available at <https://gate.d5.mpi-inf.mpg.de/tequila/>.

## 2 CONCEPTS

In NLP, the markup language TimeML ([www.timeml.org](http://www.timeml.org)) is widely used for annotating temporal information in text documents. Our definition of *temporal questions* is based on two of its concepts (tags for temporal expressions and temporal signals).

**Temporal expressions.** TIMEX3 tags demarcate four types of temporal expressions. Dates and times refer to points in time of different granularities (e.g., ‘May 1, 2010’ and ‘9 pm’, respectively). They occur in fully- or under-specified forms (e.g., ‘May 1, 2010’ vs. ‘last year’). Durations refer to intervals (e.g., ‘two years’), and sets to periodic events (e.g., ‘every Monday’). Going beyond TimeML, implicit expressions (e.g., ‘the Champions League final’) are used to capture events and their time scopes [14]. Expressions can be normalized into standard format (e.g., ‘May 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2016’ into 2016-05-02).

**Temporal signals.** SIGNAL tags mark textual elements that denote explicit temporal relations between two TimeML entities (i.e., events or temporal expressions), such as ‘before’ or ‘during’. We extend the TimeML definition to also include cues when an event is mentioned only implicitly, such as ‘joining PSG’. In addition, we consider ordinals like ‘first’, ‘last’, etc. These are frequent in questions when entities can be chronologically ordered, such as ‘last’ in ‘Neymar’s last club before joining PSG’.

**Temporal questions.** Based on these considerations, we can now define a temporal question as any question that contains a temporal expression or a temporal signal, or whose answer type is temporal.

**Temporal relations.** Allen [3] introduced 13 temporal relations between time intervals for temporal reasoning: EQUAL, BEFORE, MEETS, OVERLAPS, DURING, STARTS, FINISHES, and their inverses for all but EQUAL. However, for an input temporal question, it is not always straightforward to infer the proper relation. For example, in Q3 the relation should be BEFORE; but if we slightly vary

Q5: “Which team did Neymar play for before joining PSG?”,

the singular form ‘team’ suggests that we are interested in the MEETS relation, that is, only the last team before the transfer. Frequent trigger words suggesting such relations are, for instance, the signals *before*, *prior to* (for BEFORE or MEETS), *after*, *following* (for AFTER), and *during*, *while*, *when*, *in* (for OVERLAP).

## 3 METHOD

Given an input question, TEQUILA works in four stages: (i) detect if the question is temporal, (ii) decompose the question into simpler sub-questions with some form of rewriting, (iii) obtain candidate answers and dates for temporal constraints from a KB-QA system, and (iv) apply constraint-based reasoning on the candidates to produce final answers. Our method builds on ideas from the literature on question decomposition for general QA [2, 5, 20]. Standard NLP tasks like POS tagging, NER, and coreference resolution, are performed on the input question before passing it on to TEQUILA.

### 3.1 Detecting temporal questions

A question is identified as temporal if it contains any of the following: (a) explicit or implicit temporal expressions (dates, times, events), (b) temporal signals (i.e., cue words for temporal relations), (c) ordinal words (e.g., *first*), (d) an indication that the answer type

**Table 1: Decomposition and rewriting of questions. The *constraint* is the fragment after the SIGNAL word. *wh\** is the question word (e.g., *who*), and  $w_i$  are tokens in the question.**

Expected input: $wh^* w_1 \dots w_n$ SIGNAL $w_{n+1} \dots w_p$ ?
<b>Case 1: Constraint has both an entity and a relation</b> <b>Sub-question 1 pattern:</b> $wh^* w_1 \dots w_n$ ? <b>Sub-question 2 pattern:</b> when $w_{n+1} \dots w_p$ ? E.g.: “where did neymar play before he joined barcelona?” <b>Sub-question 1:</b> “where did neymar play?” <b>Sub-question 2:</b> “when neymar joined barcelona?”
<b>Case 2: Constraint has no entity but a relation</b> <b>Sub-question 1 pattern:</b> $wh^* w_1 \dots w_n$ ? <b>Sub-question 2 pattern:</b> when sq1-entity $w_{n+1} \dots w_p$ ? E.g.: “where did neymar live before playing for clubs?” <b>Sub-question 1:</b> “where did neymar live?” <b>Sub-question 2:</b> “when neymar playing for clubs?”
<b>Case 3: Constraint has no relation but an entity</b> <b>Sub-question 1 pattern:</b> $wh^* w_1 \dots w_n$ ? <b>Sub-question 2 pattern:</b> when $w_{n+1} \dots w_p$ $w_1 \dots w_n$ ? E.g.: “who was the brazil team captain before neymar?” <b>Sub-question 1:</b> “who was the brazil team captain?” <b>Sub-question 2:</b> “when neymar was the brazil team captain?”
<b>Case 4: Constraint is an event name</b> <b>Sub-question 1 pattern:</b> $wh^* w_1 \dots w_n$ ? <b>Sub-question 2 pattern:</b> when did $w_{n+1} \dots w_p$ happen? E.g.: “where did neymar play during south africa world cup?” <b>Sub-question 1:</b> “where did neymar play?” <b>Sub-question 2:</b> “when did south africa world cup happen?”

is temporal (e.g., the question starts with ‘When’). We use HeidelTime [23] to tag TIMEX3 expressions in questions. Named events are identified using a dictionary curated from Freebase. Specifically, if the type of an entity is ‘time.event’, its surface forms are added to the event dictionary. SIGNAL words and ordinal words are detected using a small dictionary as per suggestions from Setzer [22], and a list of temporal prepositions. To spot questions whose answers are temporal, we use a small set of patterns like *when*, *what date*, *in what year*, and *which century*.

### 3.2 Decomposing and rewriting questions

TEQUILA decomposes a composite temporal question into one or more *non-temporal sub-questions* (returning candidate answers), and one or more *temporal sub-questions* (returning temporal constraints). Results of sub-questions are combined by intersecting their answers. The constraints are applied to time scopes associated with results of the non-temporal sub-questions. For brevity, the following explanation focuses on the case with one non-temporal sub-question, and one temporal sub-question. We use a set of lexico-syntactic rules (Table 1) designed from first principles to decompose and rewrite a question into its components. Basic intuitions driving these rules are as follows:

- The signal word separates the non-temporal and temporal sub-questions, acting as a pivot for decomposition;
- Each sub-question needs to have an entity and a relation (generally represented using verbs) to enable the underlying KB-QA systems to handle sub-questions;
- If the second sub-question lacks the entity or the relation, it is borrowed from the first sub-question;

**Table 2: Temporal reasoning constraints.**

Relation	Signal word(s)	Constraint
BEFORE	'before', 'prior to'	$end_{ans} \leq begin_{cons}$
AFTER	'after'	$begin_{ans} \geq end_{cons}$
OVERLAP	'during', 'while', 'when' 'since', 'until', 'in' 'at the same time as'	$begin_{ans} \leq end_{cons} \leq end_{ans}$ $begin_{ans} \leq begin_{cons} \leq end_{ans}$ $begin_{cons} \leq begin_{ans} \leq end_{ans} \leq end_{cons}$

- KB-QA systems are robust to ungrammatical constructs, thus precluding the need for linguistically correct sub-questions.

### 3.3 Answering sub-questions

Sub-questions are passed on to the underlying KB-QA system, which translates them into SPARQL queries and executes them on the KB. This produces a result set for each sub-question. Results from the non-temporal sub-question(s) are entities of the same type (e.g., football teams). These are candidate answers for the full question. With multiple sub-questions, the candidate sets are intersected. The temporal sub-questions, on the other hand, return temporal constraints such as dates, which act as constraints to filter the non-temporal candidate set. Candidate answers need to be associated with time scopes, so that we can evaluate the temporal constraints. **Retrieving time scopes.** To obtain time scopes, we introduce additional KB lookups; details depend on the specifics of the underlying KB. Freebase, for example, often associates SPO triples with time scopes by means of compound value types (CVTs); other KBs may use  $n$ -tuples ( $n > 3$ ) to attach spatio-temporal attributes to facts. For example, the Freebase predicate `marriage` is a CVT with attributes including `marriage.spouse` and `marriage.date`. When the predicate `marriage.spouse` is used to retrieve answers, the time scope is retrieved by looking up `marriage.date` in the KB. On the other hand, playing for a football club could be captured in a predicate like `team.players` without temporal information attached, and the job periods are represented as events in predicates like `footballPlayer.team.joinedOnDate` and `footballPlayer.team.leftOnDate`. In such cases, TEQUILA considers all kinds of temporal predicates for the candidate entity, and chooses one based on a *similarity measure* between the non-temporal predicate (`team.players`) and potentially relevant temporal predicates (`footballPlayer.team.joinedOnDate`, `footballPlayer.award.date`). The similarity measure is implemented by selecting tokens in predicate names (`footballPlayer`, `team`, etc.), contextualizing the tokens by computing *word2vec* embeddings for them, averaging per-token vectors to get a resultant vector for each predicate [25], and comparing the cosine distance between two predicate vectors. The best-matching temporal predicate is chosen for use. When time periods are needed (e.g., for a temporal constraint using OVERLAP), a pair of begin/end predicates is selected (e.g., `footballPlayer.team.joinedOnDate` and `leftOnDate`).

### 3.4 Reasoning on temporal intervals

For temporal sub-questions, the results are time points, time intervals, or sets of dates (e.g., a set of consecutive years during which someone played for a football team). We cast all these into intervals with start point  $begin_{cons}$  and end point  $end_{cons}$ . These form the temporal constraints against which we test the time scopes of the non-temporal candidate answers, also cast into intervals [ $begin_{ans}$ ,  $end_{ans}$ ]. The test itself depends on the temporal operator derived from the input question (e.g., BEFORE, OVERLAP, etc.)

(Table 2). For questions with ordinal constraints (e.g., *last*), we sort the (possibly open) intervals to select the appropriate answer.

## 4 EXPERIMENTS

### 4.1 Setup

We evaluate TEQUILA on the *TempQuestions* benchmark [13], which contains 1,271 temporal questions labeled as questions with explicit, implicit, and ordinal constraints, and those with temporal answers. Questions are paired with their answers over Freebase. We use three state-of-the-art KB-QA systems as baselines: AQQU [6], QUINT [2] (code from authors for both), and Bao et al. [4] (detailed results from authors). The first two are geared for simple questions, while Bao et al. handle complex questions, including temporal ones. We use TEQUILA as a plug-in for the first two, and directly evaluate against the system of Bao et al. on 341 temporal questions from the *ComplexQuestions* test set [4]. For evaluating baselines, the full question was fed directly to the underlying system. We report precision, recall, and F1 scores of the retrieved answer sets w.r.t. the gold answer sets, and average them over all test questions.

### 4.2 Results and insights

Results on *TempQuestions* and the 341 temporal questions in *ComplexQuestions* are shown in Table 3. AQQU + TEQUILA and QUINT + TEQUILA refer to the TEQUILA-enabled versions of the respective baseline systems. We make the following observations.

**TEQUILA enables KB-QA systems to answer composite questions with temporal conditions.** Overall and category-wise F1-scores show that TEQUILA-enabled systems significantly outperform the baselines. Note that these systems neither have capabilities for handling compositional syntax nor specific support for temporal questions. Our decomposition and rewrite methods are crucial for compositionality, and constraint-based reasoning on answers is decisive for the temporal dimension. The improvement in F1-scores stems from a systematic boost in *precision*, across most categories.

**TEQUILA outperforms state-of-the-art baselines.** Bao et al. [4] represents the state-of-the-art in KB-QA, with a generic mechanism for handling constraints in questions. TEQUILA-enabled systems outperform Bao et al. on the temporal slice of *ComplexQuestions*, showing that a tailored method for temporal information needs is worthwhile. TEQUILA enabled QUINT and AQQU to answer questions like: “*who is the first husband of julia roberts?*”, “*when did francesco sabatini start working on the puerta de san vicente?*”, and “*who was governor of oregon when shanghai noon was released?*”.

**Error analysis.** Analyzing cases when TEQUILA fails yields insights towards future work: (i) Decomposition and rewriting were incorrect (for example, in “*where did the pilgrims come from before landing in america?*”, ‘*landing*’ is incorrectly labeled as a noun, triggering case 3 instead of case 1 in Table 1); (ii) The correct temporal predicate was not found due to limitations of the similarity function; and (iii) The temporal constraint or the time scope to use during reasoning was wrongly identified.

## 5 RELATED WORK

QA has a long tradition in IR and NLP, including benchmarking tasks in TREC, CLEF, and SemEval. This has predominantly focused on retrieving answers from textual sources. The recent TREC

**Table 3: Detailed performance of TEQUILA-enabled systems on TempQuestions and ComplexQuestions.**

TempQuestions (1,271 questions)	Aggregate results			Explicit constraint			Implicit constraint			Temporal answer			Ordinal constraint		
	Prec	Rec	F1	Prec	Rec	F1	Prec	Rec	F1	Prec	Rec	F1	Prec	Rec	F1
AQQU [6]	24.6	48.0	27.2	27.6	60.7	31.1	12.9	34.9	14.5	26.1	33.5	27.4	28.4	57.4	32.7
AQQU+TEQUILA	<b>36.0*</b>	42.3	<b>36.7*</b>	<b>43.8*</b>	53.8	<b>44.6*</b>	<b>29.1*</b>	34.7	<b>29.3*</b>	<b>27.3*</b>	29.6	<b>27.7*</b>	<b>38.0*</b>	41.3	<b>38.6*</b>
QUINT [2]	27.3	<b>52.8</b>	30.0	29.3	<b>60.9</b>	32.6	25.6	<b>54.4</b>	27.0	25.2	<b>38.2</b>	27.3	21.3	54.9	26.1
QUINT+TEQUILA	<b>33.1*</b>	44.6	<b>34.0*</b>	41.8*	51.3	<b>42.2*</b>	13.8	43.7	15.7	<b>28.6*</b>	34.5	<b>29.4*</b>	<b>37.0*</b>	42.2	<b>37.7*</b>
ComplexQuestions (341 questions)	Aggregate results			Explicit constraint			Implicit constraint			Temporal answer			Ordinal constraint		
	Prec	Rec	F1	Prec	Rec	F1	Prec	Rec	F1	Prec	Rec	F1	Prec	Rec	F1
Bao et al. [4]	34.6	48.4	35.9	41.1	53.2	41.9	26.4	36.5	<b>27.0</b>	18.6	<b>40.2</b>	22.3	31.1	<b>60.8</b>	36.1
AQQU [6]	21.5	50.0	23.3	25.0	<b>60.1</b>	28.4	11.2	31.2	11.4	19.6	35.7	19.2	22.2	54.9	25.3
AQQU+TEQUILA	<b>36.2*</b>	45.9	<b>37.5*</b>	<b>41.2*</b>	54.7	<b>43.5*</b>	<b>27.5*</b>	32.6	<b>27.0*</b>	<b>29.5*</b>	32.1	<b>29.9*</b>	<b>40.2*</b>	45.1	<b>40.8*</b>
QUINT [2]	22.0	<b>50.3</b>	24.5	24.7	54.7	27.5	18.8	<b>47.9</b>	19.0	16.6	37.5	20.7	20.9	51.3	26.0
QUINT+TEQUILA	<b>29.6*</b>	44.9	<b>31.1*</b>	<b>34.6*</b>	47.3	<b>36.3*</b>	12.3	42.1	13.9	<b>33.4*</b>	37.5	<b>33.9*</b>	<b>44.9*</b>	51.6*	<b>45.8*</b>

Aggregate results are averaged over the four categories. The highest value in a column for each dataset is in **bold**. An asterisk (\*) indicates statistical significance of TEQUILA-enabled systems over their standalone counterparts, under the 2-tailed paired  $t$ -test at  $p < 0.05$  level.

CAR (complex answer retrieval) resource [10], explores multi-faceted passage answers, but information needs are still simple. In IBM Watson [12], structured data played a role, but text was the main source for answers. Question decomposition was leveraged, for example, in [12, 20, 29] for QA over text. However, re-composition and reasoning over answers works very differently for textual sources [20], and are not directly applicable for KB-QA. Compositional semantics of natural language sentences has been addressed by [16] from a general linguistic perspective. Although applicable to QA, existing systems support only specific cases of composite questions.

KB-QA is a more recent trend, starting with [7, 8, 11, 24, 27]. Most methods have focused on simple questions, whose SPARQL translations contain only a single variable (and a few triple patterns for a single set of qualifying entities). For popular benchmarks like WebQuestions [7], the best performing systems use templates and grammars [1, 2, 6, 19, 29], leverage additional text [21, 26], or learn end-to-end with extensive training data [15, 26, 28]. These methods do not cope well with complex questions. Bao et al. [4] combined rules with deep learning to address a variety of complex questions.

## 6 CONCLUSION

Understanding the compositional semantics of complex questions is an open challenge in QA. We focused on temporal question answering over KBs, as a major step for coping with an important slice of information needs. Our method showed boosted performance on a recent benchmark, and outperformed a state-of-the-art baseline on general complex questions. Our work underlines the value of building reusable modules that improve several KB-QA systems.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. Abujabal, R. Saha Roy, M. Yahya, and G. Weikum. 2018. Never-Ending Learning for Open-Domain Question Answering over Knowledge Bases. In *WWW*.
- [2] A. Abujabal, M. Yahya, M. Riedewald, and G. Weikum. 2017. Automated template generation for question answering over knowledge graphs. In *WWW*.
- [3] J. F. Allen. 1990. Maintaining knowledge about temporal intervals. In *Readings in qualitative reasoning about physical systems*. Elsevier.
- [4] J. Bao, N. Duan, Z. Yan, M. Zhou, and T. Zhao. 2016. Constraint-based question answering with knowledge graph. In *COLING*.
- [5] J. Bao, N. Duan, M. Zhou, and T. Zhao. 2014. Knowledge-based question answering as machine translation. In *ACL*.
- [6] H. Bast and E. Haussmann. 2015. More Accurate Question Answering on Freebase. In *CIKM*.
- [7] J. Berant, A. Chou, R. Frostig, and P. Liang. 2013. Semantic Parsing on Freebase from Question-Answer Pairs. In *EMNLP*.
- [8] Q. Cai and A. Yates. 2013. Large-scale Semantic Parsing via Schema Matching and Lexicon Extension. In *ACL*.
- [9] D. Diefenbach, V. Lopez, K. Singh, and P. Maret. 2017. Core techniques of question answering systems over knowledge bases: A survey. In *Knowledge and Information systems*.
- [10] L. Dietz and B. Gamari. 2017. TREC CAR: A Data Set for Complex Answer Retrieval. In *TREC*.
- [11] A. Fader, L. Zettlemoyer, and O. Etzioni. 2014. Open question answering over curated and extracted knowledge bases. In *KDD*.
- [12] D. A. Ferrucci et al. 2012. This is Watson. In *IBM Journal of R&D*.
- [13] Z. Jia, A. Abujabal, R. Saha Roy, J. Strötgen, and G. Weikum. 2018. Temp-Questions: A Benchmark for Temporal Question Answering. In *HQA*.
- [14] E. Kuzey, V. Setty, J. Strötgen, and G. Weikum. 2016. As Time Goes By: Comprehensive Tagging of Textual Phrases with Temporal Scopes. In *WWW*.
- [15] H. Li, C. Xiong, and J. Callan. 2017. Natural Language Supported Relation Matching for Question Answering with Knowledge Graphs. In *KG4IR@SIGIR*.
- [16] P. Liang, M. I. Jordan, and D. Klein. 2011. Learning Dependency-Based Compositional Semantics. In *ACL*.
- [17] D. Metzler, R. Jones, F. Peng, and R. Zhang. 2009. Improving Search Relevance for Implicitly Temporal Queries. In *SIGIR*.
- [18] A. Moschitti et al. 2017. Question Answering and Knowledge Graphs. In *Exploiting Linked Data and Knowledge Graphs in Large Organisations*.
- [19] S. Reddy, M. Lapata, and M. Steedman. 2014. Large-scale semantic parsing without question-answer pairs. In *TACL*.
- [20] E. Saquete, J. L. Vicedo, P. Martinez-Barco, R. Muñoz, and H. Llorens. 2009. Enhancing QA Systems with Complex Temporal Question Processing Capabilities. *J. Artif. Int. Res.* (2009).
- [21] D. Savenkov and E. Agichtein. 2016. When a Knowledge Base Is Not Enough: Question Answering over Knowledge Bases with External Text Data. In *SIGIR*.
- [22] A. Setzer. 2002. *Temporal information in Newswire articles: An annotation scheme and corpus study*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Sheffield.
- [23] J. Strötgen and M. Gertz. 2010. HeidelTime: High Quality Rule-Based Extraction and Normalization of Temporal Expressions. In *SemEval*.
- [24] C. Unger, L. Bühmann, J. Lehmann, A. N. Ngomo, D. Gerber, and P. Cimiano. 2012. Template-based question answering over RDF data. In *WWW*.
- [25] J. Wieting, M. Bansal, K. Gimpel, and K. Livescu. 2016. Towards universal paraphrastic sentence embeddings. (2016).
- [26] K. Xu, S. Reddy, Y. Feng, S. Huang, and D. Zhao. 2016. Question answering on freebase via relation extraction and textual evidence. *ACL*.
- [27] M. Yahya, K. Berberich, S. Elbassuoni, M. Ramanath, V. Tresp, and G. Weikum. 2012. Natural language questions for the web of data. In *EMNLP*.
- [28] W. Yih, M. Chang, X. He, and J. Gao. 2015. Semantic Parsing via Staged Query Graph Generation: Question Answering with Knowledge Base. In *ACL*.
- [29] P. Yin, N. Duan, B. Kao, J. Bao, and M. Zhou. 2015. Answering Questions with Complex Semantic Constraints on Open Knowledge Bases. In *CIKM*.