
Conformal Path Reasoning: Trustworthy Knowledge Graph Question Answering via Path-Level Calibration

Shuhang Lin^{*1} Chuhao Zhou^{*2} Xiao Lin³ Zihan Dong¹ Kuan Lu² Zhencan Peng¹ Jie Yin^{†4}
Dimitris N. Metaxas^{†1}

Abstract

Knowledge Graph Question Answering (KGQA) has shown promise for grounded and interpretable reasoning, yet existing approaches often fail to provide reliable coverage guarantees over retrieved answers. While Conformal Prediction (CP) offers a principled framework for producing prediction sets with statistical guarantees, prior methods suffer from critical limitations in both calibration validity and score discriminability, resulting in violated coverage guarantees and excessively large prediction sets. To address these pitfalls, we propose **Conformal Path Reasoning (CPR)**, a trustworthy KGQA framework with two key innovations. First, we perform query-level conformal calibration over path-level scores, preserving the exchangeability while generating path prediction sets. Second, we introduce the **Residual Conformal Value Network (RCVNet)**, a lightweight module trained via PUCT-guided exploration to learn discriminative path-level non-conformity scores. Experiments on benchmarks show that CPR significantly improves the Empirical Coverage Rate by 34% while reducing average prediction set size by 40% compared to conformal baselines. These results validate the efficacy of CPR in satisfying coverage guarantees with substantially more compact answer sets.

1. Introduction

Knowledge graphs (KGs) represent real-world facts as structured entity-relation triples, facilitating explicit associations across heterogeneous concepts and enabling interpretable

multi-hop inference (Ji et al., 2021). These structural advantages have empowered KGs as a cornerstone for question answering (QA), where reasoning paths can be explicitly traced to identify predicted answers (Lan et al., 2023; Liang et al., 2024). Nevertheless, in high-stakes applications such as medical diagnostics or financial risk assessments, returning a single deterministic answer is often insufficient, as it fails to account for the ambiguity inherent in relational KGs or provide a rigorous basis for reliability assessment. This limitation necessitates a shift toward trustworthy reasoning frameworks that produce set-valued predictions statistically guaranteed to contain the ground truth at a user-specified risk level (Li et al., 2024; Memmesheimer et al., 2025).

To meet this need, Conformal Prediction (CP) provides a principled, distribution-free framework for constructing prediction sets with finite-sample coverage guarantees (Vovk et al., 2005; Shafer & Vovk, 2008). Recent research has explored the use of CP within the graph domain, applying it to KG embeddings (Zhu et al., 2025a), node classification via graph neural networks (Huang et al., 2023), and score prediction in uncertain KGs (Zhu et al., 2025b). While these methods provide formal coverage guarantees, they are primarily confined to atomic node-level assertions, validating individual triples rather than complex reasoning chains. Conversely, alternative approaches such as BetaE (Ren & Leskovec, 2020) and dynamic KG systems (Takahashi et al., 2025) model uncertainty implicitly through probabilistic embeddings or LLM-generated confidence scores, but lack rigorous statistical guarantees. Among others, while UaG (Ni et al., 2025) represents an important step toward integrating CP into KGQA by applying conformal calibration to multi-step retrieval components, bridging the gap between CP’s formal statistical validity and the complexity of multi-hop reasoning paths remains an open challenge.

Despite these advances, extending CP to multi-hop KGQA reveals a fundamental theoretical tension. The statistical guarantees of CP are grounded on the *exchangeability* assumption—that calibration and test samples are drawn from the same distribution and remain invariant under permutation (Shafer & Vovk, 2008). KGs, however, are inherently governed by strong *relational dependencies*: entities and relations form interconnected subgraphs, where

^{*}Equal contribution: Shuhang Lin <shuhang.lin@rutgers.edu>, Chuhao Zhou <zhouchuhao0904@gmail.com> [†]Co-corresponding authors ¹Rutgers University ²Independent Researcher ³University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign ⁴The University of Sydney. Correspondence to: Jie Yin <jie.yin@sydney.edu.au>, Dimitris N. Metaxas <dnm@rutgers.edu>.




Figure 1. Overview of Conformal Path Reasoning (CPR). While hop-level calibration is hindered by sequential dependencies (left), CPR employs RCVNet to learn discriminative path scores based on training trajectories curated via PUCT (middle), achieving valid coverage guarantees with compact prediction sets via path-level calibration (right).

local neighborhoods share information and multi-hop paths exhibit high-order Markovian dependencies (Xiong et al., 2017). Such relational dependencies create two primary challenges. (i) **Sequential dependency chains**: when CP is applied at the hop level, the prediction set at hop k determines which entities are reachable at hop $k+1$. This induces a sequential dependency chain across calibration scores, violating the independence premise required for standard conformal guarantees (Barber et al., 2023). Prior attempts to reconcile CP with graph structure—including transductive CP that avoids data splitting via permutation tests (Vovk, 2013), neighborhood-aware splitting that preserves local topology (Huang et al., 2023), and adaptive scores that adjust nonconformity by node degree (Gazin et al., 2024)—either incur prohibitive computational overhead or introduce distribution shifts that undermine coverage guarantees. (ii) **Non-discriminative scoring**: Even beyond exchangeability, the efficiency of conformal prediction sets depends on the discriminative quality of nonconformity scores (Lei et al., 2018). Scores derived solely from local entity similarity fail to capture path-level relevance in multi-hop reasoning. Consequently, the conformal mechanism must adopt overly conservative quantiles to satisfy coverage requirements, resulting in large prediction sets that lack practical utility for action-oriented QA tasks.

These observations suggest that both the **calibration unit** and the **scoring mechanism** warrant reconsideration. **For calibration**, hop-level approaches exhibit sequential dependencies, as they share intermediate nodes and local neighborhoods, which breaks exchangeability. In contrast, queries from a randomly split calibration and test set are exchange-

able by construction, enabling valid conformal calibration at the query level. This difference motivates a shift from hop-level to path-level calibration, leveraging query independence to preserve exchangeability. **For scoring**, local semantic similarity alone is insufficient to capture path-level correctness. This motivates a learnable mechanism that captures global path coherence to improve discrimination among candidates.

Based on these insights, we propose **Conformal Path Reasoning (CPR)**, a framework that leverages a **Residual Conformal Value Network (RCVNet)** as the scoring backbone. RCVNet distills exploration experience from PUCT-guided trajectory collection, learning discriminative path values that separate correct paths from plausible negatives. Our main contributions are as follows:

- **Query-Exchangeability Conformal Calibration with Path Scores**: By encapsulating the multi-hop reasoning process into path-level scores aggregated per query, CPR bypasses relational dependencies and preserves the exchangeability at the query level, enabling valid conformal guarantees.
- **Learned Discriminative Path Scoring**: We introduce RCVNet, a lightweight residual network that learns path scores from PUCT-collected trajectories contrasting correct paths against plausible negatives, leading to tighter prediction sets while maintaining valid coverage.
- **Empirical Improvements**: Experiments on two real-world benchmarks show that CPR substantially outperforms existing conformal baselines, achieving higher valid coverage with smaller prediction sets.

2. Related Work

2.1. Uncertainty Quantification in KGQA

Recent work has demonstrated the efficacy of path-based reasoning for KGQA. RoG (Luo et al., 2024) is a planning-retrieval-reasoning framework that generates relation paths as faithful plans grounded by KGs. PoG (Tan et al., 2025) extends this paradigm with dynamic multi-hop exploration and beam search pruning to handle multi-entity questions. While these methods achieve strong accuracy, they provide only point predictions without quantifying answer reliability, which is a critical limitation in high-stakes applications.

Uncertainty quantification in KGQA has received increasing attention, driven by the need for providing calibrated confidence to support decision-making. Some approaches model uncertainty implicitly. BetaE (Ren & Leskovec, 2020) embeds queries as Beta distributions for multi-hop logical reasoning, using the differential entropy as a proxy for query uncertainty without formal coverage guarantees. Takahashi et al. (2025) assign LLM-generated confidence scores to triples based on source quality and temporal consistency, enabling confidence-aware retrieval but operating at the triple level. Recent work has leveraged CP to provide statistical guarantees. For KG embeddings, Zhu et al. (2025a) design nonconformity measures that construct answer sets with provable coverage. UnKGCP (Zhu et al., 2025b) extends CP to uncertain KGs using entropy-normalized scores to yield adaptive prediction intervals. Beyond specific KG tasks, CF-GNN (Huang et al., 2023) establishes permutation invariance conditions for transductive node classification with topology-aware efficiency optimization.

More recently, UaG (Ni et al., 2025) extends CP to multi-hop KGQA by designing a stage-wise conformal pipeline across multiple components, including graph traversal and LLM-based answer evaluation. However, its hop-level calibration strategy introduces sequential dependencies that directly violate the exchangeability premise required for standard conformal guarantees. Our work shifts towards path-level calibration enabling valid conformal guarantees. When coupled with highly discriminative path-level scores learned via our proposed RCVNet, our method yields compact prediction sets while maintaining rigorous coverage.

2.2. Conformal Prediction in Large Language Models

Conformal prediction (CP) provides a distribution-free framework for constructing prediction sets with finite-sample coverage guarantees (Angelopoulos & Bates, 2022). Recent work has explored CP for uncertainty quantification in large language models (LLMs) (Geng et al., 2024). Conformal Language Modeling (CLM) extends risk control to sequence-level generation (Quach et al., 2024), while LoFreeCP enables CP for black-box LLM APIs by estimat-

ing nonconformity scores through repeated sampling (Su et al., 2024). These methods have been adopted as baselines in uncertainty-aware NLP evaluation.

However, existing CP methods for LLMs primarily address uncertainty arising from stochastic text generation and treat reasoning as an isolated black box. They do not account for uncertainty induced by structured procedures such as multi-hop graph traversal. Our work extends CP to structured KG reasoning by defining nonconformity scores over complete reasoning paths, enabling coverage guarantees that respect the combinatorial nature of path-based retrieval.

2.3. MCTS and PUCT for Structured Search

Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) is a widely used framework for structured decision-making, balancing exploration and exploitation via upper confidence bounds (Kocsis & Szepesvári, 2006; Świechowski et al., 2022). A prominent extension is Predictor + Upper Confidence Bound applied to Trees (PUCT), popularized by AlphaGo and AlphaZero (Silver et al., 2017; 2018), which incorporates learned prior probabilities to guide search. By combining prior guidance with visit-count-based exploration bonuses, PUCT effectively collects informative search trajectories that can be distilled into parametric models (Silver et al., 2017).

In our work, we leverage PUCT as a trajectory collector during training to collect positive and negative path examples, while relying on conformal prediction to provide coverage guarantees at inference time.

3. Preliminaries

3.1. Problem Formulation: KGQA as Path Reasoning

Given a query q and a set of topic entities $\mathcal{E}_q \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ in a knowledge graph $\mathcal{G} = \{(h, r, t) \mid h, t \in \mathcal{E}, r \in \mathcal{R}\}$, Knowledge Graph Question Answering (KGQA) is formulated as finding a set of valid reasoning paths over \mathcal{G} . A reasoning path $p = (e_0, r_1, \dots, r_H, e_H)$ originates from a topic entity $e_0 \in \mathcal{E}_q$ and terminates at a candidate answer $e_H \in \mathcal{E}$. Let \mathcal{P}_q denote the set of all such paths.

To quantify the reliability of these paths, we define a cost function $V(p)$ for each path $p \in \mathcal{P}_q$. Lower values of $V(p)$ indicate more reliable paths. The final answer set \mathcal{A}_q is then given by

$$\mathcal{A}_q = \{\pi(p) \mid p \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}(q)\}, \quad (1)$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{P}}(q) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_q$ denotes the set of reasoning paths selected after conformal calibration for query q , and $\pi(p)$ denotes the terminal entity of path p .

3.2. Background: Conformal Prediction

Conformal prediction is a practical framework for distribution-free uncertainty quantification (Angelopoulos & Bates, 2022). Under the assumption of data exchangeability, CP provides finite-sample coverage guarantees, ensuring that prediction sets contain the true label at a user-specified risk level α .

Split Conformal Prediction. Among the existing CP variants, Split CP (Shafer & Vovk, 2008) lends itself to KGQA settings, where the scoring model is typically trained before testing, naturally satisfying the requirement that the scoring function be fixed prior to calibration. Specifically, given a calibration set $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cal}} = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ and a nonconformity score function $S(x, y)$ that measures how poorly y conforms to the prediction for x , split CP computes a threshold

$$\tau_\alpha = \text{Quantile}(\{S(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n, \lceil (n+1)(1-\alpha) \rceil / n), \quad (2)$$

and constructs the prediction set $\mathcal{C}(x) = \{y : S(x, y) \leq \tau_\alpha\}$. The validity of this construction relies on *exchangeability*: a sequence $(Z_1, \dots, Z_n, Z_{n+1})$ is exchangeable if its joint distribution is invariant to permutations. Under exchangeability between calibration and test samples, the prediction set achieves coverage $\mathbb{P}(y_{\text{test}} \in \mathcal{C}(x_{\text{test}})) \geq 1 - \alpha$.

3.3. The Pitfall of Hop-Level Calibration

When applying CP to KGQA, a straightforward approach is to perform calibration at the hop level during multi-hop graph traversal (Ni et al., 2025), since multi-hop reasoning proceeds hop by hop (Xiong et al., 2017). However, this approach introduces sequential dependencies that violate the exchangeability requirement of CP.

Formally, let $S_k^{(i)}$ denote the hop- k nonconformity score for calibration query i . Since the hop- k expansion depends on the preceding prediction set $\mathcal{C}_{k-1}^{(i)}$, we have $S_k^{(i)} = f(x_i, \mathcal{C}_{k-1}^{(i)})$, inducing a Markov dependency chain $S_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_1 \rightarrow S_2 \rightarrow \dots$. Crucially, $\mathcal{C}_{k-1}^{(i)}$ is determined by thresholds computed from *all* calibration samples, making $S_k^{(i)}$ entangled across samples rather than a pointwise function of query i alone. This violates exchangeability.

To illustrate, consider the query “Where did the director of *Inception* study?”. If the hop-1 prediction set \mathcal{C}_1 excludes *Christopher Nolan*, the correct answer *UCL* becomes unreachable at hop-2, regardless of subsequent thresholding.

This dependency is intrinsic to hop-level calibration and cannot be addressed by improved scoring alone. However, we observe a key asymmetry: while paths within a query are correlated, individual queries remain independent samples from the same data distribution. This independence restores exchangeability at the query level, enabling valid conformal

calibration. We formalize this approach in Section 4.2.

4. Methodology

We propose **Conformal Path Reasoning (CPR)**, a path-based reasoning framework for KGQA with statistical coverage guarantees. CPR is built upon two key components: (1) **Discriminative Path Scoring Mechanism**: A learning framework that leverages PUCT-guided exploration to collect informative path pairs, and trains RCVNet to produce discriminative path scores that distinguish correct and incorrect paths. (2) **Query-Exchangeable Conformal Prediction (QE-CP)**: A calibration procedure that leverages query-level exchangeability to provide valid coverage guarantees in KGs. The path scores produced by the scoring mechanism serve as nonconformity scores for QE-CP, determining the final prediction set during inference.

4.1. Discriminative Path Scoring Mechanism

A key challenge in incorporating CP into KGQA lies in deriving nonconformity scores with high discriminative capacity. Heuristics based on local semantic matching or surface-level features often fail to distinguish correct paths from plausible but incorrect ones, leading to large prediction set size. We address this through (1) a PUCT-based trajectory collector that generates high-quality training paths and relation-level priors, and (2) **Residual Conformal Value Network (RCVNet)** trained on these collected trajectories to produce discriminative path scores.

4.1.1. PUCT-GUIDED TRAJECTORY COLLECTION

To address the scarcity of ground-truth training paths in multi-hop KGQA, we employ PUCT (Predictor + Upper Confidence bounds applied to Trees) (Silver et al., 2018) as a trajectory collector for RCVNet, to construct positive-negative path pairs. PUCT has two advantages: its exploration bonus encourages visiting under-explored relations, generating negative paths that are semantically plausible yet incorrect; meanwhile, its exploration process accumulates relation-level statistics that serve as structural priors.

Starting from a topic entity, PUCT iteratively expands paths by selecting relations that balance semantic relevance with exploration of under-visited relations. Specifically, at each step of PUCT exploration, let p denote the current partial path ending at entity e . PUCT selects the next relation r^* by balancing exploitation and exploration:

$$r^* = \arg \max_{r \in \mathcal{A}(p)} \left(Q(p, r) + c_{\text{puct}} \cdot P(p, r) \cdot \frac{\sqrt{N(p)}}{1 + N(p, r)} \right), \quad (3)$$

where $Q(p, r)$ is the empirical success rate of traversing relation r from the current context, $N(p, r)$ counts how often r has been explored, and $N(p) = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{A}(p)} N(p, r)$ denotes

the total number of visits to the partial path p . The term $\frac{\sqrt{N(p)}}{1+N(p,r)}$ serves as an exploration bonus that encourages visiting under-explored relations. $P(p, r)$ in Eq. (3) serves as a semantic prior that bootstraps exploration by guiding initial path construction towards query-relevant relations:

$$P(p, r) = \text{softmax}_{r' \in \mathcal{A}(p)} \left(s(\tilde{q}, r') + s(\tilde{q}, r_{1:t}) \right)_r, \quad (4)$$

where $s(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes semantic similarity (negative cosine distance), measuring query alignment with both the candidate relation r' and the path traversed so far $r_{1:t}$. This prevents aimless exploration and enables efficient collection of informative trajectories.

Through the above exploration strategy, the PUCT-guided collector provides two complementary inputs for RCVNet:

(1) Relation-Level Structural Priors. For each relation r , we maintain a Beta-Bernoulli conjugate prior $\text{Beta}(\alpha_r, \beta_r)$, initialized as $\text{Beta}(1, 1)$. After each rollout:

$$(\alpha_r, \beta_r) \leftarrow \begin{cases} (\alpha_r + 1, \beta_r), & \text{if } r \text{ reaches answer,} \\ (\alpha_r, \beta_r + 1), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The posterior mean ρ_r is calculated as:

$$\rho_r = \frac{\alpha_r}{\alpha_r + \beta_r}, \quad (5)$$

which indicates the empirical success rate of relation r , distinguishing structurally relevant relations ($\rho_r \rightarrow 1$) from the peripheral ones ($\rho_r \rightarrow 0$). Therefore, ρ_r provides a complementary structural prior when semantic similarity exhibits limited discriminative power for final path ranking.

(2) Positive-Negative Path Pairs. Let $p^* = (e_0, r_1, \dots, r_H, e_H)$ denote a ground-truth reasoning path for query q , where e_0 is the topic entity and $e_H \in \mathcal{Y}_q$ is the correct answer. Let $\text{pre}_h(p) = (e_0, r_1, \dots, e_{h-1})$ denote the prefix of p up to the hop h . We further define \tilde{p}^* as the path of the same hops H with p^* , which traverses a different sequence of relations while terminating at a correct answer entity. We construct:

- Positive paths: $\mathcal{P}^+ = \{p^*\} \cup \{\tilde{p}^*\}$, comprising ground-truth reasoning paths and other complete reasoning paths of the same length H that terminate at a correct answer entity.
- Negative paths: $\mathcal{P}^- = \bigcup_{p \in \mathcal{P}^+} \{\text{pre}_{H-1}(p) \circ (r', e') : e' \neq \pi(p)\}$, including paths that share a correct prefix but deviate at the last hop.

These positive-negative path pairs serve as training trajectories for RCVNet to learn discriminative path scores.

4.1.2. RESIDUAL CONFORMAL VALUE NETWORK

With the training trajectories collected via PUCT, we introduce Residual Conformal Value Network (RCVNet), a

neural scoring module that learns discriminative path scores.

For each path p , RCVNet takes the feature vector $\mathbf{x}(p)$ and path embedding context vector $\mathbf{c}(p)$ as input and computes a path score:

$$V(p) = \text{RCVNet}_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}(p), \mathbf{c}(p)), \quad (6)$$

where θ denotes the learnable parameters. The input feature vector $\mathbf{x}(p) = [s(\tilde{q}, r_t), s(\tilde{q}, r_{1:t}), \rho_{r_t}] \in \mathbb{R}^3$ integrates semantic similarities with the learned relation prior ρ_{r_t} via Eq. 5. The path embedding context vector $\mathbf{c}(p) = \text{concat}(q_{\text{emb}}, r_{\text{emb}}, p_{\text{emb}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{3d}$ aggregates query, relation, and path embeddings. We employ FiLM layers (Perez et al., 2018) to inject this high-dimensional contextual information into the processing of scalar features, enabling context-aware scoring. Details of the RCVNet architecture are provided in Appendix C.

Using positive-negative path pairs (p^+, p^-) collected by PUCT, RCVNet is optimized with a pairwise ranking loss:

$$\mathcal{L} = \ell(V(p^+) - V(p^-)), \quad (7)$$

which encourages $V(p^+) < V(p^-)$, i.e., correct paths receive lower scores. We use softplus as $\ell(\cdot)$ to provide a smooth margin with stable gradients.

4.2. Query-Exchangeable Conformal Prediction

Based on the path scores produced by RCVNet, we now introduce Query-Exchangeable Conformal Prediction (QE-CP) to provide valid coverage guarantees. QE-CP consists of two components: (1) TreeG, a tree-based retrieval that generates candidate paths, and (2) a query-level calibration procedure that preserves exchangeability for valid conformal guarantees.

TreeG Retrieval. We first introduce TreeG, a tree-based retrieval method that leverages RCVNet scores $V(p)$ alongside LLM-generated relational hints.

Given a query q , an LLM generates relation hints \mathcal{H} using fixed prompts and zero-temperature decoding (ensuring determinism). TreeG expands paths hop-by-hop with branch-out size B and active set size A , using a hint-augmented path score:

$$V'(p) = V(p) - \beta \cdot \sum_{r \in p} \max_{h \in \mathcal{H}} s(r, h), \quad (8)$$

where the second term rewards paths traversing relations aligned with hints. At each step, every active path considers the top- B candidate relations, and resulting paths are globally ranked by $V'(p)$, retaining only the top- A for the next hop.

Query-Level Calibration. As discussed in Section 3.3, hop-level calibration induces sequential dependencies that violate exchangeability. Our key insight is to treat each query’s entire reasoning process as a single calibration unit. We define the structured sample for each query as $Z_i = (q_i, \mathcal{P}_{q_i}, Y_{q_i})$, encapsulating the query, its retrieved paths, and ground-truth answers.

We define the **nonconformity score** $S(q)$ as the minimum path score required to include a correct answer in the retrieved set \mathcal{P}_q :

$$S(q) = \begin{cases} \min_{p \in \mathcal{P}_q^*} V'(p), & \text{if } \mathcal{P}_q^* \neq \emptyset, \\ +\infty, & \text{if } \mathcal{P}_q^* = \emptyset, \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

where $\mathcal{P}_q^* = \{p \in \mathcal{P}_q : \pi(p) \in Y_q\}$ denotes paths terminating at correct entities. Intuitively, $S(q)$ captures the difficulty of covering the correct answer: lower scores indicate easier queries where correct paths rank highly.

The validity of CP relies on the exchangeability between calibration and test samples. Let $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cal}} = \{q_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{cal}}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}} = \{q_j\}_{j=1}^{n_{\text{test}}}$ denote the calibration and test sets. We establish exchangeability through two observations. First, **query-level independence**: since queries are i.i.d. draws from a common distribution, they are exchangeable by construction. Second, **deterministic transformation**: the nonconformity score $S(q)$ is computed via TreeG retrieval, RCVNet scoring, and minimum aggregation (Eq. 9). By Lemma A.1 (Appendix A), deterministic functions preserve exchangeability, so $\{S(q_i)\}$ inherits exchangeability from $\{q_i\}$. This abstraction effectively encapsulates intra-query path dependencies, preserving the exchangeability at the query level.

Calibration and Prediction. Following standard split CP, we compute the conformal threshold as the $(1 - \alpha)$ quantile of calibration scores:

$$\hat{\tau}_\alpha = \text{Quantile}_{1-\alpha}(\{S(q_i)\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{cal}}}). \quad (10)$$

For a test query q , the prediction set includes all paths with scores at or below this threshold:

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}}_\alpha(q) = \{p \in \mathcal{P}_q : V'(p) \leq \hat{\tau}_\alpha\}, \quad (11)$$

which induces the answer set $\mathcal{A}_q = \{\pi(p) : p \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_\alpha(q)\}$.

Theorem 4.1 (Coverage Guarantee). *For any query $q \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$, the prediction set $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_\alpha(q)$ contains at least one correct reasoning path with probability at least $1 - \alpha$:*

$$\mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_\alpha(q) \cap \mathcal{P}_q^* \neq \emptyset) \geq 1 - \alpha. \quad (12)$$

Consequently, the induced answer set satisfies $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_q \cap Y_q \neq \emptyset) \geq 1 - \alpha$.

The proof (Appendix A) follows from rank uniformity under exchangeability: the event $\{S(q) \leq \hat{\tau}_\alpha\}$ guarantees the existence of a correctly-terminating path in $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_\alpha(q)$.

Algorithm 1 Conformal Path Reasoning (CPR)

Input: Training Set $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$, Calibration Set \mathcal{D}_{cal} , Test Set $\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$, KG \mathcal{G} , Risk Level α , Max Hop H

Output: Answer sets $\{\mathcal{A}_q\}_{q \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}}$ with coverage guarantee

// Phase 1: RCVNet Training via PUCT Exploration

- 1: Initialize Beta priors $(\alpha_r, \beta_r) \leftarrow (1, 1)$ for all $r \in \mathcal{R}$
- 2: **for all** $q \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ **do**
- 3: **for** $h = 1, \dots, H$ **do**
- 4: Select path via PUCT (Eq. 3)
- 5: Backup statistics and update Beta priors (Eq. 5)
- 6: **end for**
- 7: Collect positive paths \mathcal{P}_q^+ and negative paths \mathcal{P}_q^-
- 8: **end for**
- 9: Optimize θ by minimizing the loss $\ell(V(p^+) - V(p^-))$

// Phase 2: Calibration

- 10: **for all** $q_i \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{cal}}$ **do**
- 11: $\mathcal{P}_{q_i} \leftarrow \text{TREEGRETRIEVAL}(q_i, \mathcal{G}, H, V)$
- 12: $S(q_i) \leftarrow \min_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{q_i} : \pi(p) \in Y_{q_i}} V(p)$
- 13: **end for**
- 14: $\hat{\tau}_\alpha \leftarrow \text{Quantile}_{1-\alpha}(\{S(q_i)\}_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{D}_{\text{cal}}|})$

// Phase 3: Inference

- 15: **for all** $q \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}$ **do**
 - 16: $\mathcal{P}_q \leftarrow \text{TREEGRETRIEVAL}(q, \mathcal{G}, H, V)$
 - 17: $\mathcal{A}_q \leftarrow \{\pi(p) : p \in \mathcal{P}_q, V(p) \leq \hat{\tau}_\alpha\}$
 - 18: **end for**
 - 19: **return** $\{\mathcal{A}_q\}_{q \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}}$
-

Phase 1 trains RCVNet via PUCT-guided trajectory collection (Eq. 3–7). **Phase 2** calibrates the conformal threshold on \mathcal{D}_{cal} (Eq. 9, 10). **Phase 3** returns prediction sets with coverage guarantee (Theorem 4.1).

5. Experiments

5.1. Experimental Setup

Datasets. We evaluate our method on **WebQSP** (Yih et al., 2016) and **ComplexWebQuestions (CWQ)** (Talmor & Berant, 2018) to assess its effectiveness in *risk-controlled set prediction* for KGQA. To reduce the computational overhead of searching over the full freebase KG while ensuring answer reachability, we construct query-specific subgraphs, following prior studies (He et al., 2021). For each dataset, we derive a held-out calibration set by randomly sampling 10% from the training set provided. Dataset statistics are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Dataset statistics and subgraph properties.

Dataset	Train	Calibration	Test	Avg. #Nodes	Avg. #Edges
WebQSP	2,543	283	1,628	1,378	4,180
CWQ	24,875	2,764	3,531	1,259	3,924

Baseline Methods. We compare our method against LLM conformal baselines and KG reasoning baselines under the

same evaluation protocol, including: **CLM** (Quach et al., 2024): A logit-based CP method that applies the general risk-control framework directly to the output distribution of LLMs; **LoFreeCP** (Su et al., 2024): A CP variant dedicated for handling low-frequency events in language models; and **UaG** (Ni et al., 2025): A state-of-the-art KGQA framework that applies stage-wise CP with a Learn-Then-Test strategy to control error across components.

Evaluation Protocol and Metrics. Given a user-specified risk level $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$, CP constructs a prediction set that guarantees the coverage rate at least $1 - \alpha$. We evaluate performance across risk levels $\alpha \in \{0.3, 0.4 \dots, 0.7, 0.8\}$ using the following metrics:

- **ECR (Empirical Coverage Rate)** measures the proportion of test cases where the prediction set successfully includes the correct answer: $ECR = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_{test}|} \sum_{q \in \mathcal{D}_{test}} \mathbf{1}[A_q \cap Y_q]$. Higher values indicate superior coverage reliability.
- **APSS (Average Prediction Set Size)** quantifies the efficiency of uncertainty quantification by measuring the average cardinality of prediction sets: $APSS = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_{test}|} \sum_{q \in \mathcal{D}_{test}} |A_q|$. Smaller values indicate more discriminative selection.
- **Coverage Efficiency** measures how efficiently the prediction set achieves coverage guarantees, capturing the trade-off between reliability and specificity. Coverage Efficiency is defined as the **ECR/APSS ratio** (Lin et al., 2022). Higher values indicate that the method achieves adequate coverage with more compact prediction sets.

For conformal risk control prediction, the desired objective is to minimize the prediction set size while satisfying the target coverage (Angelopoulos & Bates, 2022). Accordingly, we evaluate ECR, APSS, and Coverage Efficiency achieved by different methods across various risk levels.

Implementation Details. We use Qwen3-8B served for generating relational hints, and all-MiniLM-L6-v2 for encoding queries, relations, and paths embeddings. For PUCT, we set the exploration coefficient $c_{puct} = 2$ and perform 32 rollouts per query. RCVNet is trained using Adam with learning rate 5×10^{-3} , batch size 256, for 6 epochs. Further details on network architecture, prompts, and hyperparameter settings are provided in Appendix C.

5.2. Main Results

Table 2 reports ECR and APSS across various risk levels on WebQSP and CWQ, where entries marked “-” indicate failure to satisfy the coverage guarantee. Across all risk levels, CPR achieves the highest coverage among all methods while maintaining compact prediction sets, consistently outperforming UaG and LLM-based conformal baselines.

On WebQSP, CPR achieves higher coverage than UaG while maintaining substantially smaller set sizes. At a risk level of $\alpha = 0.5$, CPR achieves an ECR of **61.4%** with an APSS of **7.14**, whereas UaG yields a lower ECR of 51.8% despite a much larger APSS of 14.29. Moreover, CPR effectively mitigates the set-size explosion exhibited by UaG at low risk levels: At $\alpha = 0.3$, CPR achieves **76.8%** ECR compared to UaG’s 72.3%, while dramatically reducing APSS from **98.81** to **17.77**.

The performance gains are more pronounced on CWQ, a more challenging dataset due to its longer multi-hop reasoning chains. At $\alpha = 0.6$, CPR achieves an ECR of **50.2%** with an APSS of **8.35**. In contrast, even the best-performing baseline, UaG, achieves only 42.1% ECR with an excessive APSS of 120.20, and fails to satisfy coverage guarantees for $\alpha \leq 0.5$. In addition, CLM and LoFreeCP perform worse, failing for $\alpha \leq 0.6$ as their ECR falls below the target $1 - \alpha$. Consistently, CPR maintains valid coverage across all risk levels on both datasets.

5.3. Ablation Study

We conduct ablation experiments to analyze the contribution of each component in CPR. Table 2 compares the full CPR model against two ablated variants: **CPR (w/o PUCT & RCVNet)**, denoted as **CPR Abl.1**, which removes both the PUCT trajectory collector and RCVNet and relies solely on TreeG retrieval with semantic value scores; and **CPR (w/o PUCT)**, denoted as **CPR Abl.2**, which removes PUCT trajectory collection while retaining TreeG retrieval and RCVNet trained on randomly sampled negative paths.

On WebQSP at $\alpha = 0.5$, TreeG retrieval alone achieves an ECR of 57.3%. Adding RCVNet improves ECR to 61.0%, and adding PUCT guidance further increases ECR to 61.4%. This improvement demonstrates the complementary roles of the three components: TreeG improves answer reachability, RCVNet enhances path score discrimination, and PUCT provides high-quality training trajectories that enable RCVNet to learn more discriminative path scores.

5.4. Coverage Efficiency Analysis

Table 2 also presents Coverage Efficiency across various risk levels on WebQSP and CWQ. CPR consistently outperforms all baselines in terms of Coverage Efficiency on both datasets. For WebQSP at $\alpha = 0.5$, CPR achieves a Coverage Efficiency of **0.086**, yielding an improvement of 140% over UaG at 0.036. CLM and LoFreeCP achieve lower efficiencies of 0.035 and 0.049, respectively. This performance gap widens significantly on CWQ: at $\alpha = 0.6$, CPR achieves **0.060**, a $15\times$ improvement over UaG at 0.004. Notably, UaG fails to provide valid coverage for $\alpha \leq 0.5$ on CWQ, while CLM and LoFreeCP fail at $\alpha \leq 0.6$.

Table 2. The comparison results on WebQSP and CWQ. The best results are highlighted in **bold**. CPR achieves valid coverage across all risk levels with the smallest prediction sets.

Dataset	Method	ECR (%) \uparrow						APSS \downarrow						Coverage Efficiency (%) \uparrow					
		0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8
WebQSP	UaG	72.3	60.4	51.8	41.8	37.4	25.6	98.81	32.52	14.29	8.23	5.58	1.67	0.73	1.86	3.63	5.08	6.70	15.3
	CLM	-	60.2	51.0	40.1	35.6	24.6	-	46.69	14.37	5.74	2.78	1.82	-	1.29	3.55	6.99	12.8	13.5
	LoFreeCP	-	60.0	50.1	41.0	36.7	24.1	-	48.32	10.28	6.89	3.05	1.05	-	1.24	4.87	5.95	12.0	23.0
	CPR (Abl. 1)	76.0	65.5	57.3	53.4	49.8	43.2	22.05	14.84	10.10	8.26	3.80	2.16	3.45	4.41	5.67	6.46	13.1	20.0
	CPR (Abl. 2)	76.0	65.6	61.0	57.3	52.5	50.0	19.76	9.89	7.53	5.50	3.02	1.88	3.85	6.63	8.10	10.4	17.4	26.6
	CPR	76.8	67.3	61.4	58.3	55.1	50.8	17.77	10.10	7.14	5.45	3.01	1.62	4.32	6.66	8.60	10.7	18.3	31.4
CWQ	UaG	-	-	-	42.1	37.3	26.7	-	-	-	120.20	99.16	27.96	-	-	-	0.35	0.38	0.96
	CLM	-	-	-	-	32.2	22.5	-	-	-	-	10.48	5.33	-	-	-	-	3.07	4.22
	LoFreeCP	-	-	-	-	32.0	25.6	-	-	-	-	8.78	3.73	-	-	-	-	3.64	6.86
	CPR (Abl. 1)	72.2	65.5	57.8	50.0	42.2	27.6	33.43	27.84	20.50	14.41	10.96	4.61	2.16	2.35	2.82	3.47	3.85	5.99
	CPR (Abl. 2)	75.9	67.5	58.3	50.0	42.5	28.7	24.51	17.85	13.17	9.60	7.23	3.44	3.10	3.78	4.43	5.21	5.88	8.34
	CPR	76.6	68.1	58.8	50.2	42.8	29.9	23.98	15.28	11.40	8.35	6.08	3.39	3.20	4.46	5.16	6.01	7.04	8.82

“-” indicates failure to satisfy the coverage guarantee ($ECR < 1 - \alpha$)

The ablation results further reveal the contribution of each component. At a higher risk level $\alpha = 0.8$ on WebQSP, CPR achieves a Coverage Efficiency of **0.314**. The ablation of PUCT reduces this to 0.266, and the removal of RCVNet causes a further decline to 0.200. These results indicate that RCVNet improves score discrimination for tighter prediction sets, with high-quality training pairs from PUCT. Overall, CPR achieves superior Coverage Efficiency while satisfying valid coverage guarantees.

5.5. TreeG Search Budget Study

We further study the effect of search budget on WebQSP by varying the branch-out size B and the active-set size A . We conduct this analysis on WebQSP as a case study. As shown in Figure 2, we report the results at $\alpha = 0.5$ as a representative moderate risk level, since the effectiveness of TreeG retrieval is independent of the conformal calibration step and thus largely insensitive to the choice of α . Overall, increasing B and A improves ECR but also increases APSS. Specifically, ECR grows from 0.582 to 0.629 as the configuration scales from (4, 8) to (64, 64), while APSS increases from 3.09 to 9.02, with diminishing marginal returns. Notably, the configuration (16, 8) yields lower ECR than (8, 8) despite comparable APSS, indicating that excessive branching without sufficient global capacity can degrade coverage. Based on this analysis, we select $(B, A) = (32, 32)$ for all subsequent experiments as it offers a favorable trade-off, achieving an ECR of 0.614 with an APSS of 6.79.

Efficiency Analysis. TreeG achieves efficient inference through deterministic tree expansion with bounded complexity. At each hop, TreeG expands from at most A active paths, considering the top- B relations per path, yielding $O(A \times B)$ candidates that are globally ranked to retain the top- A paths. Over H hops, the total complexity is $O(H \cdot A \cdot B \cdot \log(AB))$,




Figure 2. TreeG budget study on WebQSP at risk level $\alpha = 0.5$.

which is linear in the reasoning depth and quadratic in the search budget. In contrast, PUCT-based exploration requires multiple stochastic rollouts per query during training, making it substantially more expensive. By distilling PUCT experience into RCVNet and employing TreeG for inference, CPR achieves a trade-off: PUCT provides high-quality training signal offline, while TreeG enables efficient online retrieval with the learned path scores.

6. Conclusion

This paper presents Conformal Path Reasoning (CPR), a framework for trustworthy knowledge graph question answering with statistical coverage guarantees. By performing path-level conformal calibration that leverages query exchangeability, and introducing RCVNet trained via PUCT trajectory collector, CPR achieves valid coverage guarantees with substantially more compact prediction sets. Experiments on WebQSP and CWQ validate the effectiveness of CPR, demonstrating how conformal prediction can be extended to KGQA with valid coverage guarantees.

Impact Statement

This paper presents Conformal Path Reasoning (CPR), a framework for trustworthy knowledge graph question answering with statistical coverage guarantees. CPR may benefit high-stakes applications such as healthcare and finance, where users need calibrated confidence in retrieved answers. We note that coverage guarantees are statistical in nature and depend on the quality of the underlying knowledge graph. In safety-critical domains, CPR should serve as a decision-support tool rather than a replacement for expert judgment. Beyond these considerations, we foresee no specific negative social consequences that must be highlighted.

References

- Angelopoulos, A. N. and Bates, S. A gentle introduction to conformal prediction and distribution-free uncertainty quantification, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.07511>.
- Barber, R. F., Candes, E. J., Ramdas, A., and Tibshirani, R. J. Conformal prediction beyond exchangeability. *The Annals of Statistics*, 51(2):816–845, 2023.
- Gazin, U., Blanchard, G., and Roquain, E. Transductive conformal inference with adaptive scores. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 1504–1512. PMLR, 2024.
- Geng, J., Cai, F., Wang, Y., Koepl, H., Nakov, P., and Gurevych, I. A survey of confidence estimation and calibration in large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 6577–6595, 2024.
- He, G., Lan, Y., Jiang, J., Zhao, W. X., and Wen, J.-R. Improving multi-hop knowledge base question answering by learning intermediate supervision signals. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining, WSDM '21*, pp. 553–561. Association for Computing Machinery, 2021. doi: 10.1145/3437963.3441753. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3437963.3441753>.
- Huang, K., Jin, Y., Candes, E., and Leskovec, J. Uncertainty quantification over graph with conformalized graph neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pp. 26699–26721, 2023.
- Ji, S., Pan, S., Cambria, E., Marttinen, P., and Yu, P. S. A survey on knowledge graphs: Representation, acquisition, and applications. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 33(2):494–514, 2021.
- Kocsis, L. and Szepesvári, C. Bandit based monte-carlo planning. In Fürnkranz, J., Scheffer, T., and Spiliopoulou, M. (eds.), *Machine Learning: ECML 2006*, pp. 282–293. Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Lan, Y., He, G., Jiang, J., Jiang, J., Zhao, W. X., and Wen, J.-R. Complex knowledge base question answering: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 35(11):11196–11215, 2023. doi: 10.1109/TKDE.2022.3223858.
- Lei, J., G’Sell, M., Rinaldo, A., Tibshirani, R. J., and Wasserman, L. Distribution-free predictive inference for regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(523):1094–1111, 2018.
- Li, S., Park, S., Lee, I., and Bastani, O. TRAQ: Trustworthy retrieval augmented question answering via conformal prediction. In Duh, K., Gomez, H., and Bethard, S. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 3799–3821, Mexico City, Mexico, June 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.naacl-long.210.
- Liang, K., Meng, L., Liu, M., Liu, Y., Tu, W., Wang, S., Zhou, S., Liu, X., Sun, F., and He, K. A survey of knowledge graph reasoning on graph types: Static, dynamic, and multi-modal. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 46(12):9456–9478, 2024.
- Lin, Z., Trivedi, S., and Sun, J. Conformal prediction with temporal quantile adjustments. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pp. 31017–31030, 2022.
- Luo, L., Li, Y.-F., Haffari, R., and Pan, S. Reasoning on graphs: Faithful and interpretable large language model reasoning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- Memmesheimer, P., Heuveline, V., and Hesser, J. A systematic review of conformal inference procedures for treatment effect estimation: Methods and challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.21660*, 2025.
- Ni, B., Wang, Y., Cheng, L., Blasch, E., and Derr, T. Towards trustworthy knowledge graph reasoning: An uncertainty aware perspective. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 39(12):12417–12425, Apr. 2025.
- Perez, E., Strub, F., de Vries, H., Dumoulin, V., and Courville, A. C. Film: Visual reasoning with a general conditioning layer. In AAAI, 2018.

- Quach, V., Fisch, A., Schuster, T., Yala, A., Sohn, J. H., Jaakkola, T. S., and Barzilay, R. Conformal language modeling, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.10193>.
- Ren, H. and Leskovec, J. Beta embeddings for multi-hop logical reasoning in knowledge graphs. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:19716–19726, 2020.
- Shafer, G. and Vovk, V. A tutorial on conformal prediction. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 9:371–421, June 2008. ISSN 1532-4435.
- Silver, D., Schrittwieser, J., Simonyan, K., Antonoglou, I., Huang, A., Guez, A., Hubert, T., baker, L., Lai, M., Bolton, A., Chen, Y., Lillicrap, T. P., Hui, F., Sifre, L., van den Driessche, G., Graepel, T., and Hassabis, D. Mastering the game of go without human knowledge. *Nature*, 550:354–359, 2017.
- Silver, D., Hubert, T., Schrittwieser, J., Antonoglou, I., Lai, M., Guez, A., Lanctot, M., Sifre, L., Kumaran, D., Graepel, T., Lillicrap, T., Simonyan, K., and Hassabis, D. A general reinforcement learning algorithm that masters chess, shogi, and go through self-play. *Science*, 362 (6419):1140–1144, 2018.
- Su, J., Luo, J., Wang, H., and Cheng, L. Api is enough: Conformal prediction for large language models without logit-access. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.01216*, 2024.
- Takahashi, Y., Takeuchi, S., Xin, K., Pelat, G., Ikai, Y., Saito, J., Vitale, J., Berkovsky, S., and Beheshti, A. Uncertainty-aware dynamic knowledge graphs for reliable question answering, 2025.
- Talmor, A. and Berant, J. The web as a knowledge-base for answering complex questions. In Walker, M., Ji, H., and Stent, A. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pp. 641–651, New Orleans, Louisiana, June 2018. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tan, X., Wang, X., Liu, Q., Xu, X., Yuan, X., and Zhang, W. Paths-over-graph: Knowledge graph empowered large language model reasoning. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2025*, pp. 3505–3522, 2025.
- Vovk, V. Transductive conformal predictors. In *IFIP International Conference on Artificial Intelligence Applications and Innovations*, pp. 348–360. Springer, 2013.
- Vovk, V., Gammerman, A., and Shafer, G. *Algorithmic Learning in a Random World*. Springer, 2005.
- Xiong, W., Hoang, T., and Wang, W. Y. DeepPath: A reinforcement learning method for knowledge graph reasoning. In Palmer, M., Hwa, R., and Riedel, S. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 564–573, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 2017. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/D17-1060.
- Yih, W.-t., Richardson, M., Meek, C., Chang, M.-W., and Suh, J. The value of semantic parse labeling for knowledge base question answering. In Erk, K. and Smith, N. A. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pp. 201–206, Berlin, Germany, August 2016. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhu, Y., Potyka, N., Pan, J., Xiong, B., He, Y., Kharlamov, E., and Staab, S. Conformalized answer set prediction for knowledge graph embedding. In Chiruzzo, L., Ritter, A., and Wang, L. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference of the Nations of the Americas Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 731–750, Albuquerque, New Mexico, April 2025a. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhu, Y., Wu, J., Wang, Y., Zhou, H., Chen, J., Kharlamov, E., and Staab, S. Certainty in uncertainty: Reasoning over uncertain knowledge graphs with statistical guarantees. In Christodoulopoulos, C., Chakraborty, T., Rose, C., and Peng, V. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 8730–8752, Suzhou, China, November 2025b. Association for Computational Linguistics. ISBN 979-8-89176-332-6.
- Świechowski, M., Godlewski, K., Sawicki, B., and Mańdziuk, J. Monte carlo tree search: a review of recent modifications and applications. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 56:2497–2562, July 2022. ISSN 1573-7462.

A. Proof of Theorem 4.1

We provide a detailed proof of the coverage guarantee for Query-Exchangeable Conformal Prediction.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. We structure the proof in six steps.

Step 1: Establishing Query-Level Exchangeability. Let q_1, \dots, q_n denote the calibration queries and q_{n+1} the test query. Since they are drawn i.i.d. from the same data source, by definition of exchangeability, for any permutation $\sigma : \{1, \dots, n+1\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n+1\}$:

$$(q_1, \dots, q_n, q_{n+1}) \stackrel{d}{=} (q_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, q_{\sigma(n)}, q_{\sigma(n+1)}).$$

This holds because the joint distribution of i.i.d. random variables depends only on the product of marginal distributions, which is invariant to index ordering.

Step 2: Propagating Exchangeability to Query-Path Tuples. Given a fixed knowledge graph G and scoring function V , define the deterministic retrieval mapping $\mathcal{R} : q \mapsto \mathcal{P}_q$. Since \mathcal{R} is deterministic and the ground-truth answer set Y_q is also deterministically given by the data source, the tuple $(q_i, \mathcal{P}_{q_i}, Y_{q_i})$ is a deterministic function of q_i .

We invoke the following lemma:

Lemma A.1. *If (Z_1, \dots, Z_{n+1}) is exchangeable and f is a deterministic function, then $(f(Z_1), \dots, f(Z_{n+1}))$ is exchangeable.*

Proof of Lemma A.1. For any permutation σ and measurable set A :

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}((f(Z_{\sigma(1)}), \dots, f(Z_{\sigma(n+1)})) \in A) \\ &= \mathbb{P}((Z_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, Z_{\sigma(n+1)}) \in f^{-1}(A)) \\ &= \mathbb{P}((Z_1, \dots, Z_{n+1}) \in f^{-1}(A)) \quad (\text{by exchangeability of } Z_i) \\ &= \mathbb{P}((f(Z_1), \dots, f(Z_{n+1})) \in A). \end{aligned}$$

□

Applying Lemma A.1, we conclude that $\{(q_i, \mathcal{P}_{q_i}, Y_{q_i})\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$ inherits exchangeability from the queries.

Step 3: Exchangeability of Nonconformity Scores. Recall the nonconformity score defined in Eq. (9):

$$S(q) = \begin{cases} \min_{p \in \mathcal{P}_q^*} V'(p), & \text{if } \mathcal{P}_q^* \neq \emptyset, \\ +\infty, & \text{if } \mathcal{P}_q^* = \emptyset, \end{cases}$$

where $\mathcal{P}_q^* = \{p \in \mathcal{P}_q : \pi(p) \in Y_q\}$ is the set of paths terminating at correct answers.

Since $S(\cdot)$ is a deterministic function of (q, \mathcal{P}_q, Y_q) , applying Lemma A.1 again yields that $\{S(q_1), \dots, S(q_n), S(q_{n+1})\}$ is exchangeable.

Step 4: Standard Split Conformal Quantile Argument.

This step constitutes the core of the proof. Let $S_i := S(q_i)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n+1\}$. Following the standard split conformal framework (Angelopoulos & Bates, 2022), we define τ_α as the $\lceil (n+1)(1-\alpha) \rceil$ -th smallest value among the augmented calibration scores $\{S_1, \dots, S_n, +\infty\}$. Formally, let $k = \lceil (n+1)(1-\alpha) \rceil$:

$$\tau_\alpha = \begin{cases} S_{(k)}, & \text{if } k \leq n, \\ +\infty, & \text{if } k > n, \end{cases}$$

where $S_{(k)}$ denotes the k -th order statistic of $\{S_1, \dots, S_n\}$. The augmentation with $+\infty$ ensures the threshold is always well-defined, even when $\lceil (n+1)(1-\alpha) \rceil > n$ (which occurs only for very small α relative to n).

Lemma A.2 (Coverage Under Exchangeability). *If $(S_1, \dots, S_n, S_{n+1})$ is exchangeable, then*

$$\mathbb{P}(S_{n+1} \leq \tau_\alpha) \geq 1 - \alpha.$$

This holds regardless of whether ties exist among the scores.

Proof of Lemma A.2. Consider the augmented sequence $(\tilde{S}_1, \dots, \tilde{S}_{n+1}) := (S_1, \dots, S_n, +\infty)$. By construction, $\tau_\alpha = \tilde{S}_{(k)}$ where $k = \lceil (n+1)(1-\alpha) \rceil$.

For the exchangeable sequence (S_1, \dots, S_{n+1}) , define the indicator $I_i = \mathbf{1}\{S_i \leq \tau_\alpha\}$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n+1\}$. By exchangeability, the joint distribution is invariant under permutations, which implies:

$$\mathbb{P}(I_{n+1} = 1) = \mathbb{P}(I_i = 1) \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \dots, n+1\}.$$

Let $M = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} I_i = |\{i : S_i \leq \tau_\alpha\}|$ denote the total number of scores at or below the threshold. By construction of τ_α from the augmented set, at least $k = \lceil (n+1)(1-\alpha) \rceil$ elements of $\{S_1, \dots, S_n, +\infty\}$ satisfy $\tilde{S}_i \leq \tau_\alpha$. Since $+\infty \leq \tau_\alpha$ only when $\tau_\alpha = +\infty$, and in that case all $S_i \leq +\infty$, we have $M \geq k$ in all cases.

By symmetry:

$$\mathbb{P}(S_{n+1} \leq \tau_\alpha) = \mathbb{E}[I_{n+1}] = \frac{1}{n+1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} I_i \right] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[M]}{n+1}.$$

Since $M \geq \lceil (n+1)(1-\alpha) \rceil$ almost surely:

$$\mathbb{P}(S_{n+1} \leq \tau_\alpha) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[M]}{n+1} \geq \frac{\lceil (n+1)(1-\alpha) \rceil}{n+1} \geq 1 - \alpha. \quad \square$$

Therefore:

$$\mathbb{P}(S(q_{n+1}) \leq \tau_\alpha) \geq 1 - \alpha. \quad (13)$$

Step 5: From Score Coverage to Path Coverage. We show that the event $\{S(q_{n+1}) \leq \tau_\alpha\}$ implies $\{\hat{\mathcal{C}}(q_{n+1}) \cap \mathcal{P}_{q_{n+1}}^* \neq \emptyset\}$.

When $S(q_{n+1}) \leq \tau_\alpha$ holds:

1. By definition of $S(\cdot)$, we must have $\mathcal{P}_{q_{n+1}}^* \neq \emptyset$ (otherwise $S(q_{n+1}) = +\infty > \tau_\alpha$).
2. There exists $p^* \in \mathcal{P}_{q_{n+1}}^*$ such that $V(p^*) = S(q_{n+1}) \leq \tau_\alpha$.
3. By the prediction set definition: $\hat{\mathcal{C}}(q) = \{p \in \mathcal{P}_q : V(p) \leq \tau_\alpha\}$, we have $p^* \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}(q_{n+1})$.
4. Since $p^* \in \mathcal{P}_{q_{n+1}}^*$ (terminates at a correct answer) and $p^* \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}(q_{n+1})$, we conclude $p^* \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}(q_{n+1}) \cap \mathcal{P}_{q_{n+1}}^*$.

Thus:

$$\{S(q_{n+1}) \leq \tau_\alpha\} \subseteq \{\hat{\mathcal{C}}(q_{n+1}) \cap \mathcal{P}_{q_{n+1}}^* \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Taking probabilities and applying Eq. (13):

$$\mathbb{P}(\hat{\mathcal{C}}(q_{n+1}) \cap \mathcal{P}_{q_{n+1}}^* \neq \emptyset) \geq \mathbb{P}(S(q_{n+1}) \leq \tau_\alpha) \geq 1 - \alpha.$$

Step 6: Extension to Answer Entity Coverage. From Step 5, we have $p^* \in \mathcal{P}_{q_{n+1}}^*$, which by definition means $\pi(p^*) \in Y_{q_{n+1}}$. Simultaneously, $p^* \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}(q_{n+1})$ implies $\pi(p^*) \in \mathcal{A}_{q_{n+1}} = \{\pi(p) : p \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}(q_{n+1})\}$.

Therefore $\pi(p^*) \in \mathcal{A}_{q_{n+1}} \cap Y_{q_{n+1}}$, yielding:

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{q_{n+1}} \cap Y_{q_{n+1}} \neq \emptyset) \geq 1 - \alpha.$$

This completes the proof. \square

B. Algorithm Pseudocode

Algorithm 2 details the TreeG retrieval procedure used in Phase 2 and Phase 3. Given a query, TreeG first generates relational hints via an LLM and initializes paths from topic entities. At each hop, it expands the current active paths by selecting the top- B relations according to hint-adjusted scores (Eq. 8), then globally ranks all candidate paths by $V(p)$ and retains the top- A for the next hop.

C. Implementation Details

Environment. All experiments are conducted on a cloud server running Ubuntu 22.04, equipped with one NVIDIA RTX 5090 and 25 vCPUs (Intel Xeon Platinum 8470Q).

Embeddings. We use all-MiniLM-L6-v2, a 6-layer Transformer with approximately 22M parameters, via Sentence-Transformers to encode queries, relations, and paths into 384-dimensional embeddings.

Algorithm 2 TreeG Retrieval

Input: Query q , KG \mathcal{G} , Max Hop H , RCVNet Path Score V , Active Set Size A , Branch-out Size B

Output: Candidate Path Set \mathcal{P}

```

1:  $\mathcal{H} \leftarrow \text{LLM}(q)$  ▷ Generate relation hints
2:  $\mathcal{P} \leftarrow \{(e) : e \in \mathcal{E}_q\}$  ▷ Initialize with topic entities
3: for  $h = 1, \dots, H$  do
4:    $\mathcal{P}' \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
5:   for all  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  do
6:      $\mathcal{R}_p \leftarrow \text{top-}B \text{ relations by Eq. (8)}$ 
7:      $\mathcal{P}' \leftarrow \mathcal{P}' \cup \{p \circ (r, e') : r \in \mathcal{R}_p, (e, r, e') \in \mathcal{G}\}$ 
8:   end for
9:    $\mathcal{P} \leftarrow \text{top-}A \text{ paths from } \mathcal{P}' \text{ by } V(p)$ 
10: end for
11: return  $\mathcal{P}$ 

```

PUCT Parameters. The exploration coefficient is set to $c_{\text{puct}} = 2$. For each query, we perform 32 rollouts with maximum depth H (2 for WebQSP, 4 for CWQ as shown in Table 1). Beta priors are initialized as Beta(1, 1) for all relations and updated according to Eq. 5. The Q-values $Q(p, r)$ and visit counts $N(p, r)$ are initialized to 0 at the start of each query. The semantic prior $P(p, r)$ is computed via softmax over V_{sem} with temperature $\tau = 1.0$. A rollout is considered successful if the terminal entity belongs to the ground-truth answer set Y_q .

RCVNet Architecture. As illustrated in Figure 3, RCVNet is a residual MLP that takes a 3-dimensional scalar input $\mathbf{x}(p) = [s(\tilde{q}, r_t), s(\tilde{q}, r_{1:t}), \rho_{r_t}]$ representing local similarity, path similarity, and relation prior respectively. The network consists of 3 fully-connected layers with hidden dimension 256 and ReLU activations, followed by a linear output layer. We employ FiLM (Feature-wise Linear Modulation) conditioning: the conditioning vector $\mathbf{c}(p) = \text{concat}(q_{\text{emb}}, r_{\text{emb}}, p_{\text{emb}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{3d}$ is passed through a 2-layer conditioner network to produce scale and shift parameters (γ, β) , which modulate each hidden layer via $h \leftarrow h \cdot (1 + \gamma) + \beta$. The output layer is initialized to zero so that the initial residual $\Delta_\theta(p) \approx 0$, ensuring that the model starts from the semantic baseline $V_{\text{sem}(p)}$.

LLM Configuration. We use Qwen3-8B served via vLLM for generating relational hints in TreeG retrieval. The model is queried with temperature 0 and thinking mode disabled to ensure deterministic outputs. Each query generates up to 4 candidate relation chains with maximum hop depth H . We use a one-shot prompt that specifies the output format with an example:

```

You are helping a Freebase-style KGQA system.
Given a question, propose up to 4 likely
relation chains (1 to {H} hops).

```




Figure 3. Architecture of RCVNet.

Relations must be in dot-separated format like "common.topic.image".

Output STRICT JSON ONLY in this exact format:

```
{"chains": [{"relation1"}, {"relationA"}, {"relationB"}]}
```

Example of correct output:

```
{"chains": [{"people.person.place.of.birth"}, {"location.location.contains"}, {"people.person.nationality"}]}
```

Question: {question}

JSON:

Experimental Setup. We evaluate CPR on WebQSP and CWQ dataset. The calibration set is obtained by randomly holding out 10% of training set. RCVNet is trained using Adam optimizer with a learning rate of 5×10^{-3} , a batch size of 256, for 6 epochs.