

CLAUSE: AGENTIC NEURO-SYMBOLIC KNOWLEDGE GRAPH REASONING VIA DYNAMIC LEARNABLE CONTEXT ENGINEERING

Yang Zhao* Chengxiao Dai* Wei Zhuo Yue Xiu Dusit Niyato

ABSTRACT

Knowledge graphs provide structured context for multi-hop question answering, but deployed systems must balance answer accuracy with strict latency and cost targets while preserving provenance. Static k -hop expansions and “think-longer” prompting often over-retrieve, inflate context, and yield unpredictable runtime. Thus, we introduce CLAUSE, an agentic three-agent neuro-symbolic framework that treats context construction as a sequential decision process over knowledge graphs, deciding what to expand, which paths to follow or backtrack, what evidence to keep and when to stop. Latency (interaction steps) and prompt cost (selected tokens) are exposed as user-specified budgets or prices, allowing per-query adaptation to trade-offs among accuracy, latency, and cost without retraining. CLAUSE employs the proposed Lagrangian-Constrained Multi-Agent Proximal Policy Optimization (LC-MAPPO) algorithm to coordinate three agents: *Subgraph Architect*, *Path Navigator*, and *Context Curator*, so that subgraph construction, reasoning paths discovery, and evidence selection are jointly optimized under per-query’s resource budgets on edge edits, interaction steps, and selected tokens. Across HotpotQA, MetaQA, and FactKG, CLAUSE yields higher EM@1 while reducing subgraph growth and end-to-end latency at equal or lower token budgets. On MetaQA-2-hop, relative to the strongest RAG baseline (GraphRAG), CLAUSE achieves +39.3 EM@1 with 18.6% lower latency, and 40.9% lower edge growth. The resulting contexts are compact, provenance-preserving, and deliver predictable performance under deployment constraints.

1 INTRODUCTION

Large language models (LLMs) benefit from external structure for knowledge graph questions answering (KGQA) that require multi-hop reasoning and provenance (Lewis et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2018; Pan et al., 2023). Knowledge graphs (KGs) are a natural substrate: they expose typed entities and relations, support symbolic traversals, and yield auditable context trails (Yasunaga et al., 2021; Das et al., 2018). A common design is to build a query-based local neighborhood in the KG, and then condition a reader language model to produce the answer (Sun et al., 2019; Ding et al., 2024).

How the graph context is assembled often misaligns with both answer quality and runtime constraints. Fixed k -hop expansions serialize many triples, inflating token mass and latency (Zhou et al., 2024; Wan et al.) and introducing distractors that depress accuracy (Jiang & Bansal, 2019). Extending chain-of-thought (Wei et al., 2022; Kojima et al., 2022) lengthens per-step reasoning without changing *which* evidence is visible and offers little control over end-to-end latency (Zhou et al., 2024). In practice, systems are constrained not only by prompt length but also by the number of interaction steps, how often we edit, traverse, and curate, yet most pipelines expose only heuristic knobs (hop depth, degree caps, top- k).

Our view is to make context construction itself as the learning problem: decide which edges to add or delete, which paths to pursue or backtrack, which snippets to keep, and when to stop, all under explicit caps or prices on interaction steps and selected tokens. This replaces brittle k -hop heuristics with a learned, budget-aware controller and makes accuracy–latency–cost trade-offs explicit and tunable. We then propose CLAUSE, an *agentic neuro-symbolic* framework with three agents—*Subgraph*

*Equal contribution.

Architect, *Path Navigator*, and *Context Curator*. Decisions unfold sequentially on a symbolic state (nodes, edges, paths) through discrete, auditable actions (edit, traverse, curate), while compact neural scorers prioritize entities, relations, and neighborhoods. In this design, step and token usage enter the training objective directly, so stopping rules and exploration depth are learned rather than hard-coded.

Specifically, three cooperative agents operate on the KG: *Subgraph Architect* constructs a question-anchored subgraph that preserves answer-supporting paths while avoiding over-expansion; the *Path Navigator* discovers and revises reasoning paths while respecting a step budget; and *Context Curator* assembles a minimal set of textualized snippets sufficient for accurate responses from LLMs under a token budget. We coordinate three agents with LC-MAPPO—a Lagrangian-constrained centralized training with decentralized execution (CTDE) variant of PPO that uses a centralized critic and Lagrangian dual variables to learn decentralized policies, which maximize task reward while enforcing per-query budgets on edge edits, interaction steps, and selected tokens (Foerster et al., 2018; Rashid et al., 2020; Schulman et al., 2017; Yu et al., 2022; Achiam et al., 2017; Stooke et al., 2020). During inference, a single checkpoint runs under hard budgets (caps) or fixed prices (soft trade-offs), adapting per query without retraining.

Empirically, CLAUSE framework produces compact, targeted contexts and predictable runtime. In HotpotQA, MetaQA, and FactKG, it reduces edge counts and end-to-end latency while improving exact match at the matched token mass, as shown in Sect. 5. Requirement sweeps reveal clear accuracy–latency–cost Pareto frontiers: shifting budget from per-step reasoning to interaction improves accuracy at fixed tokens, and tightening the step budget reduces latency with little or no loss in accuracy.

Contributions. (1) *Problem framing.* Formulate KGQA as *requirements-conditioned* context assembly with per-query budgets/prices, enabling predictable accuracy–latency–cost trade-offs. (2) *Framework.* CLAUSE: proposed agentic neuro-symbolic controller that *jointly* builds compact subgraphs, explores paths, and curates minimal, auditable context with learned STOP. (3) *Subgraph Architect.* Reversible, *price-aware* graph editing with a *multi-signal* edge scorer; accepts edits only when utility exceeds the learned edge price—replacing fixed k -hop/top- k pruning. (4) *Path Navigator.* *Price-conditioned* exploration that encodes the question, path prefix, and local neighborhood to produce human-readable traces under a step budget. (5) *Context Curator.* *Constrained listwise* reranking with a learned STOP to select a minimal, non-redundant set of textualized paths under a token budget. (6) *Training.* LC-MAPPO: proposed constrained CTDE PPO with *separate* cost heads and duals (edges/steps/tokens) for resource control while preserving decentralized execution. (7) *Results.* On HotpotQA, MetaQA, and FactKG, attains higher or matched EM at equal or lower budgets, while producing compact, provenance-preserving traces.

2 PRELIMINARIES AND RELATED WORK

2.1 PRELIMINARIES

Neuro-symbolic definition. We view *neuro-symbolic inference* as coupling an explicit symbolic calculus (Boolean, first-order, or soft/fuzzy) with a learned scoring/belief module; differentiable logic is unnecessary—only a principled linkage between symbols and learned scores is required (De Smet & De Raedt, 2025). **KGQA as neuro-symbolic.** KGQA operates on typed entity–relation graphs and commonly targets (i) single-relation queries, (ii) multi-hop path queries, and (iii) compositional-logic queries (e.g., conjunction/disjunction/negation) (Zhang et al., 2021). Surveys group approaches into (1) logic-informed embeddings, (2) embeddings trained with logical constraints, and (3) *rule/path learning* where a neural controller searches over symbolic paths/rules (DeLong et al., 2024). We adopt (3): a dynamic learnable agentic framework edits a KG for reasoning.

2.2 RELATED WORK

Existing Multi-hop KGQA Solutions. Multi-hop KGQA must balance accuracy and provenance with strict constraints on latency and prompt cost. In practice, two resources dominate deployment behavior: the number of *interaction steps* taken while assembling context and the *selected tokens* ultimately shown to the reader LLM. Static k -hop expansions often over-retrieve, inflate prompts, and surface distractors (Zhou et al., 2024; Wan et al.; Jiang & Bansal, 2019), while typical pipelines expose

only heuristic knobs rather than learned, per-query control. A long line of *symbolic/neuro-symbolic* KGQA operates directly on entity–relation structure. Path-following and rule-learning systems (e.g., MINERVA, NeuralLP, TensorLog, RNNLogic) traverse the graph to derive answers (Das et al., 2018; Yang et al., 2017; Cohen, 2016; Qu et al., 2021); graph-aware readers (e.g., QAGNN) inject KG signals into the encoder (Yasunaga et al., 2021). Question-conditioned subgraph builders such as GraftNet and PullNet assemble local neighborhoods for a downstream reader (Sun et al., 2019). These approaches typically set expansion depth/degree and filtering thresholds a priori, which makes runtime behavior sensitive to manual tuning and obscures the accuracy–efficiency trade-off. Then, work on *context engineering* shows that prompt composition strongly affects both cost and accuracy (Zhou et al., 2024; Wan et al.). Chain-of-thought prompting can help certain tasks (Wei et al., 2022; Kojima et al., 2022), yet it primarily lengthens the reasoning text without changing *which* evidence is visible, offering limited leverage over end-to-end latency (Zhou et al., 2024). Moreover, *Retrieval-augmented generation* (RAG) conditions generation on external evidence (Lewis et al., 2020; Karpukhin et al., 2020; Izacard et al., 2023). Recent variants interleave reasoning and retrieval (ReAct) (Yao et al., 2023), incorporate self-feedback (SELF-RAG) (Asai et al., 2024), or adapt retrieval frequency to difficulty/confidence (Jeong et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024). Graph-guided pipelines (e.g., GraphRAG; Think-on-Graph 2.0) leverage entity–relation structure for multi-hop collection (Edge et al., 2024; Ma et al.). These systems often rely on fixed hop limits or hand-tuned schedules; optimization of construction, traversal, and selection is rarely carried out jointly under explicit step/token costs. Finally, *agentic LLMs* plan, call tools, and decide when to act versus reflect (Press et al., 2022; Yao et al., 2023; Shinn et al., 2023; Schick et al., 2023; Shen et al.; Liu et al.; Wang et al., 2023). Their flexibility comes with multi-step deliberation that can raise interaction cost, and per-episode resource control is implicit.

MARL and constrained optimization. Multi-agent reinforcement learning (MARL) addresses decentralized coordination under partial observability and non-stationarity, where multiple local-view actors must produce joint behavior that optimizes a global objective subject to deployment constraints (e.g., latency, token budget, graph edits). A widely used recipe is centralized training with decentralized execution (CTDE), which stabilizes learning and credit assignment via a centralized value while keeping actors decentralized at test time; representative instances include COMA, which introduces a counterfactual baseline for per-agent credit, and QMIX, which learns a monotonic mixing network to factorize joint values into per-agent utilities (Foerster et al., 2018; Rashid et al., 2020). Building on PPO (Schulman et al., 2017), MAPPO shows that PPO-style updates with a centralized critic are strong, simple baselines on standard cooperative benchmarks (Yu et al., 2022). Existing methods largely fall into two families: value factorization (e.g., QMIX), which is efficient and scalable but restricted by the monotonic mixing constraint and can misattribute credit when joint action values are non-monotonic; and policy-gradient CTDE (e.g., COMA/MAPPO), which is flexible but higher-variance/sample-hungry and, in vanilla form, lacks principled mechanisms to enforce per-episode resource constraints. Single-penalty constrained RL such as Reward-Constrained Policy Optimization (RCPO) (Tessler et al., 2019) further conflates heterogeneous costs, making it difficult to independently control edge growth, interaction steps, and selected tokens. Preference-optimization methods (GRPO/DPO) instead learn from static pairwise/group preferences over complete responses in bandit-like, text-only settings without explicit environment state transitions (Rafailov et al., 2023; Shao et al., 2024); they neither decompose multi-agent credit nor estimate shaped values on graph states, and they provide no handle for enforcing per-episode constraints.

Positioning. Unlike prior work, we propose a dynamic learnable multi-hop KGQA framework that jointly optimizes the end-to-end retrieval–and–reasoning workflow, producing compact, auditable provenance under explicit accuracy–latency–cost trade-offs.

3 PROBLEM FORMULATION

Given a knowledge graph $\mathcal{K} = (V, R, E)$ and a question q , the system must output an answer y together with a compact, auditable context. We track three episode-level costs relevant to deployment: (i) *subgraph growth* (edge edits), (ii) *interaction steps* (latency proxy), (iii) *selected tokens* (prompt cost).

Let $G_t = (V_t, E_t)$ be the question-conditioned subgraph after t decisions, $\mathcal{F}_t \subseteq V_t$ the traversal frontier, and \mathcal{P}_t a pool of textualized units. We summarize the partially observed state as

$$s_t = (q, G_t, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathcal{C}_t, b_t), \quad a_t \in \{\text{EDIT, TRAVERSE, CURATE}\},$$

where b_t encodes remaining budgets. Let $R_{\text{acc}}(\tau)$ be episode-level answer reward and $C_{\text{edge}}, C_{\text{lat}}, C_{\text{tok}}$ the cumulative costs for edits, steps, and tokens. We pose KGQA as a constrained Markov decision process (CMDP):

$$\max_{\pi} \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \pi} [R_{\text{acc}}(\tau)] \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mathbb{E}[C_{\text{edge}}] \leq \beta_{\text{edge}}, \mathbb{E}[C_{\text{lat}}] \leq \beta_{\text{lat}}, \mathbb{E}[C_{\text{tok}}] \leq \beta_{\text{tok}}. \quad (1)$$

The Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(\pi, \lambda) = \mathbb{E}[R_{\text{acc}} - \lambda^\top C]$ uses nonnegative multipliers $\lambda = (\lambda_{\text{edge}}, \lambda_{\text{lat}}, \lambda_{\text{tok}})$ to *price* resources. At inference, users may specify either budgets β (caps) or prices λ (soft trade-offs), yielding predictable bounds on subgraph size, interaction horizon, and prompt length.

4 METHOD

4.1 CLAUSE OVERVIEW

We propose **CLAUSE**, an *agentic neuro-symbolic* framework for multi-hop KGQA that learns to *edit*, *traverse*, and *curate* compact, query-specific graph contexts under explicit per-episode budgets. CLAUSE operates over KG symbols (entities/relations/paths) with lightweight neural controllers, yielding auditable traces. Three agents act on the evolving subgraph G_t and are trained *jointly* with LC-MAPPO (centralized training with a constrained multi-head critic; §4.4): (i) **Subgraph Architect** for conservative, reversible edits to keep G_t compact; (ii) **Path Navigator** that decides CONTINUE/BACKTRACK/STOP along symbolic paths; and (iii) **Context Curator** that performs budget-aware evidence selection with an explicit STOP. CLAUSE exposes deployable controls via per-query budgets $(\beta_{\text{edge}}, \beta_{\text{lat}}, \beta_{\text{tok}})$ or equivalent prices λ , enabling accuracy–efficiency trade-offs without retraining. The Algorithms are given in the Appendix ??.




Figure 1: The CLAUSE workflow. Three agents (*Architect*, *Navigator*, *Curator*) operate on a symbolic KG state under per-episode budgets; LC-MAPPO trains task and cost heads jointly and provides deployable dials at inference.

4.2 DESIGN PRINCIPLES

Per-episode budgets. Each query carries budgets $(\beta_{\text{edge}}, \beta_{\text{lat}}, \beta_{\text{tok}})$ (or prices λ ; see §3).

Joint control. Editing, traversal, and curation are optimized together, replacing k -hop/degree/top- k heuristics.

Learned stopping. The agents keep going only if another hop or another snippet is worth its cost;

otherwise they stop.

Neuro-symbolic transparency. Actions are discrete KG edits/moves; neural modules provide the scores; traces are auditable.

4.3 AGENTIC WORKFLOW

At each decision round, CLAUSE executes a three-stage loop—*edit* \rightarrow *traverse* \rightarrow *curate*—conditioned on $(\beta_{\text{edge}}, \beta_{\text{lat}}, \beta_{\text{tok}})$ or λ . After every action, counters $(C_{\text{edge}}, C_{\text{lat}}, C_{\text{tok}})$ update, remaining budgets are recomputed, and any agent may issue STOP; the episode ends when all modules stop or a budget is exhausted. We train three agents jointly with LC-MAPPO (Sec. 4.4).

(1) Subgraph Architect (edit). Anchored by entity/alias mentions in q (with a lightweight dense-retrieval fallback), the architect maintains a frontierized subgraph G_t and proposes *reversible*, budget-aware edits $a_t \in \{\text{ADD}, \text{DELETE}, \text{STOP}\}$ on frontier candidates. Each edge $e = (u, r, v)$ gets a fused score

$$s(e \mid q, G_t) = w_1 \phi_{\text{ent}} + w_2 \phi_{\text{rel}} + w_3 \phi_{\text{nbr}} + w_4 \phi_{\text{deg}},$$

weighting ϕ_{ent} (question–entity match), ϕ_{rel} (relation–text match), ϕ_{nbr} (neighborhood cues), and ϕ_{deg} (degree prior). Decisions follow a gain–price rule

$$(a_t, e_t) = \arg \max_{a \in \{\text{ADD}, \text{DELETE}, \text{STOP}\}, e \in \mathcal{C}_t} [s(e \mid q, G_t) - \lambda_{\text{edge}} C_{\text{edge}}(a, e)],$$

accepting only with positive shaped gain and remaining budget; accepted edits accrue C_{edge} and update (G_t, \mathcal{F}_t) . Unlike static k -hop/top- k pruning, construction is *auditable*, *reversible*, and *budget-conditioned*.

(2) Path Navigator (traverse). Given G_t , the navigator maintains a path prefix p_t and observes $(q, v_t, \mathcal{A}_t, \text{summary}(p_t))$, where \mathcal{A}_t are typed outgoing candidates. A light encoder outputs (i) a termination head over $\{\text{STOP}, \text{CONTINUE}\}$ and (ii) candidate logits over \mathcal{A}_t when continuing; BACKTRACK is modeled as an explicit action. Each hop increments C_{lat} , so continuation occurs only when expected shaped value exceeds the current step price. We cap the horizon by a small H and retain log-probabilities for credit assignment. Discovered paths $\Pi = \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$ serve as human-readable provenance.

(3) Context Curator (curate). From a pool \mathcal{C}_t (textualized nodes/edges/paths and optional retrieval hits), the curator performs listwise selection with an explicit STOP:

$$\max_{\pi_S} R^{\text{task}}(S) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{c \in S} \text{tok}(c) \leq \beta_{\text{tok}}, \quad S = \text{Curate}(\mathcal{C}_t; \pi_S).$$

Beyond independent passage thresholds, we use *listwise, redundancy-aware* scoring with a learned STOP head *conditioned on the token price* (dual λ_{tok}), aligning selection with C_{tok} and producing compact, complementary evidence sets that are both efficient and auditable.

Observations and cost attribution. Agents receive compact summaries of $(G_t, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathcal{C}_t)$ and the remaining budgets. Costs are attributed at source—edits $\rightarrow C_{\text{edge}}$, steps $\rightarrow C_{\text{lat}}$, curations $\rightarrow C_{\text{tok}}$ —which simplifies credit assignment and supplies the cost signals used by LC-MAPPO.

4.4 LEARNING: LC-MAPPO

To enforce per-episode budgets in *edges*, *steps*, and *tokens* while preserving accuracy, we propose LC-MAPPO, a Lagrangian-constrained CTDE variant of MAPPO that *jointly* learns task value and multiple cost processes with deployable test-time dials. A centralized critic estimates one task head Q^{task} and three cost heads $(Q^{\text{edge}}, Q^{\text{lat}}, Q^{\text{tok}})$ over joint actions; a monotonic mixer aggregates per-agent utilities for each head (Rashid et al., 2020). Let $c_t^{(k)}$ denote instantaneous cost increments whose episode sums yield C_k in Eq. 1, for $k \in \{\text{edge}, \text{lat}, \text{tok}\}$. The PPO surrogate uses COMA-style counterfactual advantages (Foerster et al., 2018; Schulman et al., 2017; Yu et al., 2022) on the *shaped* return

$$r'_t = r_t^{\text{acc}} - \lambda_{\text{edge}} c_t^{\text{edge}} - \lambda_{\text{lat}} c_t^{\text{lat}} - \lambda_{\text{tok}} c_t^{\text{tok}}, \quad (2)$$

which instantiates the *per-step Lagrangian* of the CMDP in Eq. 1. At optimum, the duals λ^* equal the partial derivatives of the optimal value w.r.t. budgets (shadow-price property), and therefore predict the local slope of the accuracy–latency–cost frontiers (Appendix ??).

Rather than fixing a single penalty, LC-MAPPO maintains *separate* dual variables $\lambda_{\text{edge}}, \lambda_{\text{lat}}, \lambda_{\text{tok}}$ and updates them by projected ascent,

$$\lambda_k \leftarrow [\lambda_k + \eta(\widehat{\mathbb{E}}[C_k] - \beta_k)]_+, \quad k \in \{\text{edge, lat, tok}\},$$

optionally stabilized with PID control (Achiam et al., 2017; Stooke et al., 2020). This is stochastic dual ascent on the Lagrangian of Eq. 1, moving λ to enforce $\mathbb{E}[C_k] \leq \beta_k$ while actors ascend the shaped objective. The separation of a task head from cost heads improves credit assignment and exposes explicit accuracy–efficiency trade-offs at test time (tune λ or β without retraining). Convergence is stated in Appendix ??.

4.5 INFERENCE AND DEPLOYMENT CONTROLS

At test time, agents act greedily with learned STOP. Operators may run in *cap* mode (set $(\beta_{\text{edge}}, \beta_{\text{lat}}, \beta_{\text{tok}})$) for hard guarantees or in *price* mode (fix λ) for smooth trade-offs—both from a single checkpoint. Symbolic decisions yield step-level traces (what was added, explored, selected, and where we stopped) for audit and ablation.

5 EXPERIMENTS

Dataset. We evaluate on three multi-hop KGQA datasets, including METAQA (Puerto et al., 2023), HOTPOTQA (Yang et al., 2018), and FACTKG (Kim et al., 2023).

Baselines. We compare three families under a shared retriever/reader and decoding (except the no-retrieval group). **Pretrained LLMs (no retrieval):** GPT-OSS-120B; LLaMA3.3-70B; Qwen3-32B. **RAG methods (Qwen3-32B):** Vanilla RAG (Lewis et al., 2020); Hybrid RAG (Robertson & Zaragoza, 2009; Karpukhin et al., 2020; Nogueira & Cho, 2019); LightRAG; GraphRAG. **Agent-based methods (Qwen3-32B):** ReAct (Yao et al., 2023); Graph-of-Thoughts (GoT) (Besta et al., 2024); AutoGen (Wu et al.); KG-Agent (Jiang et al., 2024). Additionally, LC-MAPPO is compared with MAPPO (Yu et al., 2022), fixed-penalty PPO (Schulman et al., 2017) and single-multiplier RCPO (Tessler et al., 2019)

Metrics. **Accuracy** is reported as **EM@1**. **Efficiency** is measured by (i) **Average latency**, normalized so that Vanilla RAG = 1.0× per dataset/hop; and (ii) **Average edge budget**, i.e., the mean number of graph edges explored, also normalized to Vanilla RAG = 1.0×.

5.1 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Exact Match. Table 1 reports EM@1 in HotpotQA (distractor), FactKG, and MetaQA. **CLAUSE** achieves the best accuracy on all datasets and hops (71.7 on HotpotQA, 84.2 on FactKG, and 91.0/87.3/85.5 on MetaQA 1/2/3-hop), consistently surpassing both RAG baselines (e.g., Hybrid RAG 66.0 on HotpotQA) and agent baselines (e.g., KG-Agent 68.7 on HotpotQA, 87.3/78.0/75.4 on MetaQA). Pure pretrained LLMs perform markedly worse, highlighting the value of budget-aware, neuro-symbolic control over subgraph editing, traversal, and evidence curation.

Latency. Table 2 shows average latency normalized to Vanilla RAG = 1.0×. Among RAG methods, LightRAG is fastest but sacrifices accuracy; GraphRAG is slowest due to graph construction overheads. Agent baselines incur higher latency than RAG (e.g., AutoGen and GoT are the slowest) because of multi-step tool/use deliberations. **CLAUSE** achieves *agent-level accuracy with competitive efficiency*: its latency is close to or below Hybrid/GraphRAG and substantially lower than typical agent systems (e.g., 1.48× on HotpotQA vs. 2.43× for AutoGen), and even dips below Vanilla on MetaQA 1-hop (0.98×), reflecting effective *learned stopping* and budgeted context construction; the slight rise at 2/3-hop mirrors increased multi-hop exploration while remaining well under other agentic baselines.

Average Edge Budget. Table 3 reports the average edge budget normalized to Vanilla RAG (1.0×), which reflects how much the working subgraph grows during context construction. Within RAG baselines, LightRAG is the most frugal (0.75–0.82) and GraphRAG the most expansive (1.18–1.55),

Table 1: Main QA results: EM@1 on HotpotQA, FactKG, and MetaQA.

Family	Method	HotpotQA (Distractor)	FactKG	MetaQA		
				1-hop	2-hop	3-hop
Pretrained-LLMs	GPT-OSS-120B	44.5	68.0	62.7	41.5	52.3
	LLaMA3.3-70B	41.0	66.7	57.2	29.0	44.2
	Qwen3-32B	37.9	60.1	52.5	22.8	39.0
RAG-based (Qwen3-32B)	Vanilla RAG	62.1	77.0	60.2	37.6	33.0
	Hybrid RAG	66.0	80.2	63.0	41.5	34.1
	LightRAG	44.3	64.5	54.0	35.0	32.0
	GraphRAG	50.1	72.0	63.5	48.0	44.4
Agent-based (Qwen3-32B)	ReAct	63.5	78.2	82.3	52.1	49.4
	Graph-of-Thoughts	59.2	74.0	79.5	48.4	46.3
	AutoGen	64.0	76.5	85.2	55.7	53.5
	KG-Agent	68.7	82.1	87.3	78.0	75.4
Ours	CLAUSE	71.7	84.2	91.0	87.3	85.5

Table 2: Efficiency results: Average latency (normalized to Vanilla RAG = 1.0×).

Family	Method	HotpotQA (Distractor)	FactKG	MetaQA		
				1-hop	2-hop	3-hop
RAG-based (Qwen3-32B)	Vanilla RAG	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	Hybrid RAG	1.18	1.15	1.12	1.20	1.28
	LightRAG	0.85	0.88	0.80	0.83	0.86
	GraphRAG	1.45	1.35	1.25	1.40	1.60
Agent-based (Qwen3-32B)	ReAct	1.62	1.40	1.25	1.45	1.70
	Graph-of-Thoughts	2.10	1.78	1.65	1.90	2.32
	AutoGen	2.43	2.20	1.81	2.14	2.62
	KG-Agent	1.70	1.54	1.30	1.62	1.90
Ours	CLAUSE	1.48	1.36	0.98	1.14	1.27

while Hybrid RAG sits slightly above Vanilla due to dual-channel retrieval and re-ranking. Agent systems generally consume more edges than RAG (e.g., AutoGen up to 2.10× on MetaQA-3hop) because multi-step deliberation triggers additional expansions. In contrast, **CLAUSE** achieves the smallest edge budgets across all settings (0.74–0.90) while still delivering the best EM (cf. Table 1), indicating that its budget-aware subgraph editing and learned STOP decisions effectively suppress redundant growth. The modest increase from MetaQA 1-hop to 3-hop matches the expected need to explore deeper paths, yet remains well below other agentic approaches.

Table 3: Efficiency results: Average Edge Budget (normalized to Vanilla RAG = 1.0×).

Family	Method	HotpotQA (Distractor)	FactKG	MetaQA		
				1-hop	2-hop	3-hop
RAG-based (Qwen3-32B)	Vanilla RAG	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	Hybrid RAG	1.12	1.08	1.05	1.12	1.20
	LightRAG	0.78	0.80	0.75	0.78	0.82
	GraphRAG	1.35	1.30	1.18	1.32	1.55
Agent-based (Qwen3-32B)	ReAct	1.20	1.13	1.05	1.18	1.35
	Graph-of-Thoughts	1.55	1.40	1.30	1.55	1.85
	AutoGen	1.84	1.72	1.45	1.75	2.10
	KG-Agent	1.30	1.22	1.10	1.32	1.58
Ours	CLAUSE	0.78	0.74	0.77	0.78	0.90

Token Usage. As shown in Fig. 2, across all three datasets, **Qwen3-32B (no RAG)** exhibits the lowest normalized token usage (because no retrieved context is concatenated), while **CLAUSE**, without relying on multi-agent expansion, consistently uses fewer tokens than the family averages of RAG-based and Agent-based methods, indicating better token efficiency. (Note: the MetaQA panel reports the average over the 1/2/3-hop settings.)

Constraint Satisfaction Performance. We evaluate LC-MAPPO against MAPPO (Yu et al., 2022), Fixed-Penalty PPO (Schulman et al., 2017) and RCPO (Tessler et al., 2019) on the MetaQA KGQA task under constrained settings (edge budget = 0.5, latency budget = 0.7). Figure 3 demonstrates LC-




Figure 2: Normalized Token Consumption (Vanilla RAG = 1.0x).

MAPPO’s superior constraint satisfaction capabilities across multiple metrics. LC-MAPPO achieves a 191% improvement in feasibility rate compared to standard MAPPO (0.340 vs. 0.117), indicating significantly better constraint adherence. Furthermore, LC-MAPPO reduces latency violations by 34% (0.577 vs. 0.880) and latency costs by 12% (0.738 vs. 0.838), demonstrating effective latency-aware optimization. LC-MAPPO demonstrates the strongest constraint learning with adaptive dual variables 0.004, outperforming RCPO’s 0.001 and surpassing methods without constraint adaptation, confirming that our multi-head centralized critic successfully learns to balance task performance with constraint satisfaction. These results validate LC-MAPPO’s design for constraint-aware MARL, where the algorithm substantially improved constraint compliance.




Figure 3: Constraint satisfaction performance comparison. (a) Constraint Feasibility. (b) Latency Violations. (c) Latency Cost. (d) Constraint Learning.

5.2 ABLATIONS

Table 4: Core ablations on **MetaQA**. Removing agents or constraint handling degrades accuracy and/or efficiency. All runs use the same reader and settings (normalized to CLAUSE = 1.0x).

Variant	EM@1 \uparrow	Latency \downarrow (avg)	Edge budget \downarrow (avg)
CLAUSE (full)	87.3	1.00	1.00
w/o Subgraph Architect (<i>StaticRAG; no-KG</i>)	74.8	1.32	1.44
w/o Path Navigator (<i>Greedy-Hop; no traversal policy</i>)	82.1	1.18	1.22
w/o Context Curator (<i>Top-k Rerank; no learned stop</i>)	80.6	1.24	1.07
MAPPO (<i>no duals</i>)	85.0	1.08	1.28
Fixed λ (<i>no updates</i>)	84.6	1.06	1.15

As summarized in Table 4, removing any agent or disabling constraint handling hurts both accuracy and efficiency. The full CLAUSE attains the best EM@1 (87.3) at the reference latency and edge budget (both 1.00x). Without the *Subgraph Architect* (StaticRAG; no-KG), EM drops sharply to 74.8 while latency and edge usage rise to 1.32x and 1.44x, indicating severe over-expansion without budget-aware graph editing. Removing the *Path Navigator* (Greedy-Hop) yields EM 82.1 with higher

latency/edges ($1.18 \times / 1.22 \times$), showing that learned continue/backtrack/stop decisions are important for disciplined exploration. Omitting the *Context Curator* (Top- k Rerank) reduces EM to 80.6 and raises latency to $1.24 \times$ (edges $1.07 \times$), reflecting longer, unpruned contexts when the learned stop is absent. Constraint ablations further confirm the role of LC-MAPPO: MAPPO without duals achieves EM 85.0 but overshoots edges ($1.28 \times$), and fixing λ (no updates) reaches EM 84.6 with milder but persistent budget violations ($1.06 \times$ latency, $1.15 \times$ edges). Together, these results demonstrate that all three agents and adaptive dual updates are necessary to jointly optimize EM, latency, and edge growth under requirements.

5.3 CASE STUDY

Question: Who co-starred with Brian Backer?

(1) Subgraph Architect. Anchors: *Brian Backer* (actor).

- Add (Moving Violations, starred_actors, Brian Backer)
- Add (Moving Violations, starred_actors, Jennifer Tilly)
- Add (Moving Violations, starred_actors, John Murray)
- Add (...)
- **Stop** (edge budget nearly met)

(2) Path Navigator Path discovered:

$$\text{Actor_A} \xleftarrow{\text{starred_actors}} \text{Movie} \xrightarrow{\text{starred_actors}} \text{Actor_B}.$$

At hop 2, backtracking is not triggered; STOP fires with high confidence due to saturated utility.

(3) Context Curator. Under a token budget of $\beta_{\text{tok}} = 512$, the curator prioritizes evidence that fits the two-hop co-starring pattern and selects the top contexts: ‘Moving Violations — starred_actors: Jennifer Tilly’ and Moving Violations — starred_actors: John Murray’. The total token mass is ≈ 36 ($36 < \beta_{\text{tok}}$), so STOP is triggered. **End-to-end latency: 238.6 ms.** These two snippets are then passed to the LLM answerer as evidence, which returns the correct co-star set: *Jennifer Tilly & John Murray*. The complete process is illustrated in Fig 4.




Figure 4: End-to-End Case Study Overview.

6 CONCLUSION

This work formulates KGQA as dynamic learnable context construction: instead of a fixed k -hop neighborhood, the system must decide what context to assemble, how to obtain it, and when to stop under per-query limits on edits, interaction steps, and tokens. CLAUSE instantiates this by decomposing context into three components: (i) *subgraph* structure, (ii) *path* traces, and (iii) *textual* evidence, and assigning them to three simple agents (Architect, Navigator, Curator) that make discrete, auditable choices. LC-MAPPO optimizes the overall workflow by pricing resources via a centralized multi-head critic with dual variables, so agents continue only when the predicted marginal utility exceeds the current price. This requirement-conditioned controller yields compact provenance and predictable latency/cost, and empirically traces stronger accuracy–efficiency frontiers than heuristic expansion or unconstrained agent loops.

REFERENCES

- Joshua Achiam, David Held, Aviv Tamar, and Pieter Abbeel. Constrained policy optimization. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 22–31. PMLR, 2017.
- Akari Asai, Zeqiu Wu, Yizhong Wang, Avi Sil, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Self-RAG: Learning to Retrieve, Generate, and Critique through Self-Reflection. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- Maciej Besta, Nils Blach, Ales Kubicek, Robert Gerstenberger, Michal Podstawski, Lukas Gianinazzi, Joanna Gajda, Tomasz Lehmann, Hubert Niewiadomski, Piotr Nyczyk, et al. Graph of Thoughts: Solving Elaborate Problems with Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 38, pp. 17682–17690, 2024.
- William W Cohen. Tensorlog: A differentiable deductive database. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.06523*, 2016.
- Rajarshi Das, Shehzaad Dhuliawala, Manzil Zaheer, Luke Vilnis, Ishan Durugkar, Akshay Krishnamurthy, Alex Smola, and Andrew McCallum. Go for a walk and arrive at the answer: Reasoning over paths in knowledge bases using reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- Lennert De Smet and Luc De Raedt. Defining Neurosymbolic AI. *arXiv*, 2025.
- Lauren Nicole DeLong, Ramon Fernández Mir, and Jacques D. Fleuriot. Neurosymbolic AI for Reasoning over Knowledge Graphs: A Survey. *arXiv*, 2024.
- Wentao Ding, Jinmao Li, Liangchuan Luo, and Yuzhong Qu. Enhancing complex question answering over knowledge graphs through evidence pattern retrieval. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2024*, pp. 2106–2115, 2024.
- Darren Edge, Ha Trinh, Newman Cheng, Joshua Bradley, Alex Chao, Apurva Mody, Steven Truitt, Dasha Metropolitanaky, Robert Osazuwa Ness, and Jonathan Larson. From Local to Global: A Graph RAG Approach to Query-Focused Summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.16130*, 2024.
- Jakob Foerster, Gregory Farquhar, Triantafyllos Afouras, Nantas Nardelli, and Shimon Whiteson. Counterfactual multi-agent policy gradients. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 32, 2018.
- Gautier Izacard, Patrick Lewis, Maria Lomeli, Lucas Hosseini, Fabio Petroni, Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Armand Joulin, Sebastian Riedel, and Edouard Grave. Atlas: Few-shot learning with retrieval augmented language models. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(251):1–43, 2023.
- Soyeong Jeong, Jinheon Baek, Sukmin Cho, Sung Ju Hwang, and Jong C Park. Adaptive-RAG: Learning to adapt retrieval-augmented large language models through question complexity. 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. 7029–7043, 2024.
- Jinhao Jiang, Kun Zhou, Wayne Xin Zhao, Yang Song, Chen Zhu, Hengshu Zhu, and Ji-Rong Wen. KG-Agent: An efficient autonomous agent framework for complex reasoning over knowledge graph. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11163*, 2024.
- Yichen Jiang and Mohit Bansal. Avoiding Reasoning Shortcuts: Adversarial Evaluation, Training, and Model Development for Multi-Hop QA. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 2726–2736, 2019.
- Vladimir Karpukhin, Barlas Oguz, Sewon Min, Patrick Lewis, Ledell Wu, Sergey Edunov, Danqi Chen, and Wen-tau Yih. Dense Passage Retrieval for Open-Domain Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pp. 6769–6781, 2020.

-
- Jiho Kim, Sungjin Park, Yeonsu Kwon, Yohan Jo, James Thorne, and Edward Choi. FactKG: Fact verification via reasoning on knowledge graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06590*, 2023.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35: 22199–22213, 2022.
- Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, et al. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33: 9459–9474, 2020.
- Xiao Liu, Hao Yu, Hanchen Zhang, Yifan Xu, Xuanyu Lei, Hanyu Lai, Yu Gu, Hangliang Ding, Kaiwen Men, Kejuan Yang, et al. AgentBench: Evaluating LLMs as Agents. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Shengjie Ma, Chengjin Xu, Xuhui Jiang, Muzhi Li, Huaren Qu, Cehao Yang, Jiabin Mao, and Jian Guo. Think-on-Graph 2.0: Deep and Faithful Large Language Model Reasoning with Knowledge-guided Retrieval Augmented Generation. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Rodrigo Nogueira and Kyunghyun Cho. Passage Re-ranking with BERT. *arXiv:1901.04085*, 2019.
- Jeff Pan, Simon Razniewski, Jan-Christoph Kalo, Sneha Singhania, Jiaoyan Chen, Stefan Dietze, Hajira Jabeen, Janna Omeljanenko, Wen Zhang, Matteo Lissandrini, et al. Large language models and knowledge graphs: Opportunities and challenges. *Transactions on Graph Data and Knowledge*, 2023.
- Ofir Press, Sewon Zhang, Sewon Min, Ludwig Schmidt, Noah A. Smith, and Yejin Choi. Measuring and narrowing the compositionality gap in language models. In *ACL, 2022*. Introduces *Self-Ask* with tool calls.
- Haritz Puerto, Gozde Gul Sahin, and Iryna Gurevych. MetaQA: Combining expert agents for multi-skill question answering. In *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 3591–3604, Dubrovnik, Croatia, May 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.eacl-main.259>.
- Meng Qu, Junkun Chen, Louis-Peng Guo, Xiaokai Zhang, and Jian Tang. Rnnlogic: Learning logic rules for reasoning on knowledge graphs. In *KDD*, 2021.
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. Direct Preference Optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. In *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- Tabish Rashid, Mikayel Samvelyan, Christian Schroeder De Witt, Gregory Farquhar, Jakob Foerster, and Shimon Whiteson. Monotonic value function factorisation for deep multi-agent reinforcement learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(178):1–51, 2020.
- Stephen Robertson and Hugo Zaragoza. The probabilistic relevance framework: Bm25 and beyond. *Foundations and Trends in Information Retrieval*, 2009.
- Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Roberta Raileanu, et al. Toolformer: Language models can teach themselves to use tools. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04761*, 2023.
- John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017.
- Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, YK Li, et al. DeepSeekMath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03300*, 2024.
- Yongliang Shen, Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Dongsheng Li, Weiming Lu, and Yueting Zhuang. HuggingGPT: Solving AI Tasks with ChatGPT and Its Friends in HuggingFace. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.

-
- Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, Aidan Chen, et al. Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.11366*, 2023.
- Adam Stooke, Joshua Achiam, and Pieter Abbeel. Responsive Safety in Reinforcement Learning by PID Lagrangian Methods. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 9133–9143. PMLR, 2020.
- Haitian Sun, Tania Bedrax-Weiss, and William Cohen. PullNet: Open Domain Question Answering with Iterative Retrieval on Knowledge Bases and Text. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pp. 2380–2390, 2019.
- Chen Tessler, Daniel J. Mankowitz, and Shie Mannor. Reward Constrained Policy Optimization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2019. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=SkfrvsA9FX>.
- Zhongwei Wan, Xin Wang, Che Liu, Samiul Alam, Yu Zheng, Jiachen Liu, Zhongnan Qu, Shen Yan, Yi Zhu, Quanlu Zhang, et al. Efficient large language models: A survey. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- Guanzhi Wang, Shun Ren, Yuxiang Gu, Silvio Savarese, Yuke Xie, and Linxi Fan. Voyager: An open-ended embodied agent with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16291*, 2023.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- Qingyun Wu, Gagan Bansal, Jieyu Zhang, Yiran Wu, Beibin Li, Erkang Zhu, Li Jiang, Xiaoyun Zhang, Shaokun Zhang, Jiale Liu, et al. AutoGen: Enabling Next-Gen LLM Applications via Multi-Agent Conversation. In *First Conference on Language Modeling*.
- Fan Yang, Zhilin Yang, and William W. Cohen. Differentiable learning of logical rules for knowledge base reasoning. In *ICLR*, 2017.
- Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D Manning. Hotpotqa: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 2369–2380, 2018.
- Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. ReAct: Synergizing Reasoning and Acting in Language Models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2023.
- Michihiro Yasunaga, Hongyu Ren, Antoine Bosselut, Percy Liang, and Jure Leskovec. Qa-gnn: Reasoning with language models and knowledge graphs for question answering. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pp. 535–546, 2021.
- Chao Yu, Akash Velu, Eugene Vinitzky, Jiaxuan Gao, Yu Wang, Alexandre Bayen, and Yi Wu. The surprising effectiveness of PPO in cooperative multi-agent games. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24611–24624, 2022.
- J. Zhang, L. Yao, X. Chen, X. Wang, J. Wang, and B. Benatallah. Neural, symbolic and neural-symbolic reasoning on knowledge graphs. *AI Open*, 2:14–35, 2021.
- Zihan Zhang, Meng Fang, and Ling Chen. RetrievalQA: Assessing Adaptive Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Short-form Open-Domain Question Answering. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024*, pp. 6963–6975, 2024.
- Zixuan Zhou, Xuefei Ning, Ke Hong, Tianyu Fu, Jiaming Xu, Shiyao Li, Yuming Lou, Luning Wang, Zhihang Yuan, Xiuhong Li, Shengen Yan, Guohao Dai, Xiao-Ping Zhang, Yuhan Dong, and Yu Wang. A survey on efficient inference for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14294*, 2024.