

AUTHORS: Yonas Sium, Georgios Kollias, Tsuyoshi Ide, Payel Das, Naoki Abe, Aurelie Lozano, Qi Li

TITLE: DIRECTION AWARE POSITIONAL AND STRUCTURAL ENCODING FOR DIRECTED GRAPH NEURAL NETWORKS

Problem Statement

Task Formulation





- GNNs learn structural node representation via message passing between
- GNNs are designed for node classification because it learns node





- the nodes of graphs
- representations directly from k hop neighbors
- GNNs can not learn the latent link information between the linked nodes
 - Nodes in Identical subgraphs get same representation(GIN, Xu et al. 2019)

Positional Encoding: Provides additional features that can help to get the structural information of a link



- Directed Link Prediction has many real-world applications
- For example: Recommender Systems, Citation Networks, Biomedical knowledge graph

Citation networks



- SVD based matrix factorizations is **valid** positional encoding and can capture **directionality** $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U} \mathbf{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}^T$
- For example, for the two directed and undirected subgraphs, SVD



- Example of MP-GNN Failure for Link prediction on food web networks
- MP-GNN mis predict. The potential link from the isomorphic pray in sea and the top predator on the land



SVD based node encoding

provide representation of the nodes based on the incoming and outgoing edges for the directed subgraph and based on the number of links for undirected subgraph

Proposed Solution

Direction Aware Positional Encoding



- Extracting k -hop subgraph around a directed link from $u \mapsto v$.
- we computed **Truncated SVD** and **ranking score using HITS algorithm** as a valid positional encodings
- **Truncated SVD** is an approximation of the $U_d \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ of its left singular subspace

corresponding to its top singular value

- HITS algorithm to compute ranking score using, the authority value *a* and hub value *h*
- Concatenate the computed Positional encodings of node [i] around the subgraph of directed link
- Use the computed positional encoding as initial feature during GNN training

Proposed Framework

Theory:

We prove that our positional encodings concatenated with zero-one labelling trick encodings make up a valid labelling trick. This means that a node-most expressive GNN with this labelling scheme can learn the structural representation of an ordered set of nodes, which is basically our directed edge (joint 2-node structural representation).

Experimental Results

Directed link prediction

AUC performance for Directed Link Prediction, when both truncated SVD and Rank positional encodings are used.

Model	Cornel	Texas	Wisconsin	Citeseer	CoraML
GCN(SVD + Rank)	86.16 ± 1.52	87.27 ± 2.77	82.13 ± 2.26	87.97 ± 0.57	88.15 ± 0.73
GIN(SVD + Rank)	88.01 ± 2.75	90.72 ±2.24	90.72 ± 1.68	89.12 ± 0.57	88.28 ± 0.25
SAGE(SVD + Rank)	88.24 ± 3.2	88.88 ± 2.72	89.13 ± 2.27	87.47 \pm 1.97	87.92 ± 0.23
DGCN	82.24 ± 3.47	84.01 ± 1.67	82.89 ± 1.74	82.02 ± 0.8	82.92 ± 0.37
DiGraphIB	81.93 ± 1.65	82.72 ± 1.58	81.67 ± 1.74	84.89 ± 0.76	85.27 ± 0.62
Magnet	83.32 ± 2.71	83.01 ± 1.72	84.7 ± 1.92	86.72 ± 1.42	85.77 ± 0.42
DGCN(SVD + Rank)	89.24 ± 2.47	87.04 ± 1.92	87.21 ± 1.74	88.75 ± 0.66	90.21 ± 1.37
DiGraphIB(SVD + Rank)	87.58 ± 2.17	87.01 ± 2.87	88.11 ± 2.74	89.82 ± 0.68	89.2 ± 0.58
Magnet(SVD + Rank)	$\textbf{91.98} \pm \textbf{1.62}$	89.98 ± 2.91	$\textbf{90.82} \pm \textbf{1.08}$	$\textbf{91.66} \pm \textbf{0.81}$	$\textbf{93.85} \pm \textbf{1.27}$

Previous Work

Using DRNL distance-based encodings designed for undirected graphs

Model	Cornel	Texas	Wisconsin	Citeseer	CoraML
GCN(DRNL)	79.03	81.27	80.72	80.57	81.05
GIN(DRNL)	81.07	79.50	81.62	81.67	82.02
SAGE(DRNL)	79.92	75.76	82.02	82.12	81.17

AUC performance for Directed Link Prediction, when only truncated SVD positional encoding is

Model	Cornel	Texas	Wisconsin	Citeseer	CoraML
GCN(SVD)	82.03 ± 1.52	82.57 ± 1.7	77.33 ± 1.8	83.87 ± 1.47	82.87 ± 1.7
GIN(SVD)	84.25 ± 2.1	$\textbf{91.35} \pm \textbf{387}$	81.32 ± 2.76	85.58 ± 0.74	87.92 ± 0.42
SAGE(SVD)	83.3 ± 2.77	82.21 ± 2.5	$81.2~9\pm1.92$	82 ± 0.52	84.57 ± 0.75
DGCN(SVD)	84.86 ± 1.6	80.27 ± 1.6	85.65 ± 1.78	81.29 ± 0.87	83.47 ± 1.21
DiGraphIB(SVD)	85.86 ± 2.12	84.27 ± 2.63	87.65 ± 1.78	85.29 ± 0.87	88.87 ± 0.77
Magnet(SVD)	$\textbf{90.14} \pm \textbf{2.7}$	89.69 ± 1.9	$\textbf{91.42} \pm \textbf{2.1}$	$\textbf{88.23} \pm \textbf{1.24}$	$\textbf{89.08} \pm \textbf{1.72}$

AUC performance for Directed Link Prediction, when only Rank positional encodings is used.

Model	Cornel	Texas	Wisconsin	Citeseer	CoraML
GCN(Rank)	79.03±1.52	82.57 ± 1.7	77.33 ± 1.8	83.87 ± 1.47	82.87 ± 1.7
GIN(Rank)	86.15 ± 1.31	83.78 ± 2.1	82.56 ± 1.76	87.52 ± 0.42	86.43 ± 0.78
SAGE(Rank)	82.28 ± 1.97	83.79 ± 2.07	81.72 ± 1.34	87.18 ± 0.48	85.51 ± 0.28
DGCN(Rank)	82.72 ± 2.87	83.22 ± 1.73	83.72 ± 2.34	87.18 ± 0.48	83.42 ± 0.52
DiGraphIB(Rank)	83.04 ± 1.07	81.22 ± 3.34	83.92 ± 1.34	88.18 ± 0.28	87.23 ± 0.72
Magnet(Rank)	85.12 ± 1.89	$\textbf{87.22} \pm \textbf{1.47}$	83.08 ± 0.87	$\textbf{89.18} \pm \textbf{0.48}$	$\textbf{90.08} \pm \textbf{0.65}$

Conclusion

- Adding direction aware positional encoding can help GNNs to predict directed link
- Both Truncated SVD and ranking score using HITS algorithm can make GNNs more powerful for directed link prediction
- Using distance-based encodings designed for undirected graphs (e.g. DRNL) in the directed graph settings yields much inferior performance compared to other baselines
- Using only SVD- or HITS-based positional encodings for initialization is effective; still by combining the two as we do the performance is maximized (ablation studies)