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Abstract

Graph classification is a fundamental but challenging problem due to the non-Euclidean property of graph. In this work, we jointly leverage the powerful representation ability of random walk and the essential success of standard convolutional network work (CNN), to propose a random walk based convolutional network, called walk-steered convolution (WSC). Different from those existing graph CNNs with deterministic neighbor searching, we randomly sample multi-scale walk fields by using random walk, which is more flexible to the scalability of graph. To encode each-scale walk field consisting of several walk paths, specifically, we characterize the directions of walk field by multiple Gaussian models so as to better analogize the standard CNNs on images. Each Gaussian implicitly defines a directions and all of them properly encode the spatial layout of walks after the gradient projecting to the space of Gaussian parameters. Further, a graph coarsening layer using dynamical clustering is stacked upon the Gaussian encoding to capture high-level semantics of graph. Comprehensive evaluations on several public datasets well demonstrate the superiority of our proposed graph learning method over other state-of-the-arts for graph classification.

1 Introduction

Graph as a prevalent tool is widely-used to express and analyze these irregular/non-Euclidean data, such as social network, biological protein-protein interaction network, molecular graph structures, text data and so on. A crucial issue therein is to predict a probable label of graph or node, which we broadly name as graph classification. For example, in protein or enzyme data, we might be interested in discovering the apparition of diseases or defective compounds, or in a social network, we might be interested in predicting the interests of users.

Recently, convolutional neural network on graphs raises a promising direction to graph classification \cite{Goyal2017,Hamilton2017}. The existing graph CNNs generally fall into spectral methods \cite{Henaff2015} and spatial methods \cite{Niepert2016}. The former mainly inspires from spectral graph theory, a generalization from the classic signal theory. Accordingly, some variants \cite{Deferrard2016,Niepert2016} attempt to fix some problems (e.g., reduce computational complexity) of the spectral convolution process. For the latter, the local neighborhoods are usually sorted or/and aggregated to cater for local convolutional filtering according to spatial edge connections. Taking a deterministic measure for local neighborhood, however, these methods lack of the salability to different graphs, especially for large graphs. More importantly, as a tied projection shared on all nodes within a local receptive fields, these methods can not well encode the local variations like standard CNNs on images, although PSCN \cite{Niepert2016} attempted to directly sort those neighbor nodes.

To address the above problems, in this paper, we propose a convolutional neural network based on random walk, called walk-steered convolution (WSC), to deal with the general graph classification task. Random walk is popular in depicting many properties of graphs due to its flexible and stochastic measure. Just due to its powerful ability of preserving graph structures, we use it to construct local receptive fields of graph filters. A local receptive field anchored at a node consists of some sampled walk pathes started from this node with a specified hop step. To characterize different path distances, multi-scale receptive fields are constructed as \( T \) sets of walk pathes with path lengths \( \{1, \cdots, T\} \). That means, the \( t \)-th receptive field defines a set of walk pathes of path length \( t \). To well model the variations of walks for each receptive field, we implicitly characterize their “directions” by using multiple Gaussian models, which is analogous to images with spatial directions (e.g., topleft, topright). The different convolutional filters are imposed different Gaussian models to perform untied filtering on each direction, like CNN on images, e.g., 9 different filter vectors respectively for 9 spatial positions within a receptive filed of \( 3 \times 3 \) pixels. But the filters are tied for node-wise convolution to avoid the dependency of different nodes. That is, for receptive fields of \( T \) scales, we only need to define \( T \) groups of Gaussian mixture model.\footnote{Note the first receptive field only contains the node itself, we may not define Gaussian models in practice.} To bypass the complicated EM algorithm, we derive the gradients of Gaussian parameters as the output responses,
so as to make the network propagation forward. Finally, a multi-layer graphical convolutional network can be stacked by interlacing with graph coarsening (e.g., graph cut or clustering algorithm) if necessary. Thus, this convolutional network ensembles the advantages of random walks, which can well suit to large-scale graphs or partially observed graphs, and the essential successes of standard convolutional neural networks on images, which can well encode the local variations by implicitly defining the filtering directions with untied filters. Extensive experiments on graph classification demonstrated that our proposed convolutional network can achieve the state-of-the-art performance on most datasets.

In summary, our contributions are three-fold: i) propose a novel convolutional neural network well catering to random walk for graph classification; ii) propose to use Gaussian models to encode local variations of a subgraphs (i.e., receptive field), which should be more exactly analogy to standard CNNs for graphs; iii) report the state-of-the-art results on some datasets.

## 2 Related Work

Numerous methods are proposed for graph classification in past few decades, especially the classic kernel based methods [Kashima et al., 2003; Morris et al., 2017] Shervashidze et al., 2009; Yanardag and Vishwanathan, 2015; Morris et al., 2017]. Due to space limitation, below we focus on the recent deep learning based methods, which are most related to ours.

Generally, deep learning based methods fall into two categories: spectral methods [Henaff et al., 2011; Kipf and Welling, 2016] and spatial methods [Niepert et al., 2016; Li et al., 2015]. Spectral methods often spend high-computational burden due to the decomposition requirement of graph Laplacian. The polynomial approximation in [Defferrard et al., 2016] mitigate such a problem. Spatial methods define local spatial structures by using adjacent vertices, and then deeply encode these structured subgraphs. Diffusion CNNs [Atwood and Towsley, 2016] scanned a diffusion process across each node. PSCN [Niepert et al., 2016] linearized neighbors by sorting weights of edges and deriving convolutional filtering on graphs. Similarly, NgramCNN [Luo et al., 2017] serialize each graph by introducing the concept of n-gram block. GraphSAGE [Hamilton et al., 2017a] and EP-B [García-Durán and Niepert, 2017] learned graph representation from the aggregation or propagation of local neighbor nodes. For our work, there mainly exist two different points: i) employ random walk to construct local receptive fields, which is thus more flexible to large-scale graphs or partially observed graphs; ii) explicitly define the directions of local receptive fields by using multiple Gaussian models, which produces more accurate representation for local subgraphical variations as an analogy to standard CNNs on images. Besides, some random walk based methods [Perozzi et al., 2014; Grover and Leskovec, 2016] also attempted to encode the graph representations. But different from them, we more focus on how to perform the multi-layer convolutional filtering on random walk paths, so as to extract more abstract graphical features like the standard CNN.

## 3 The Network

An undirected/directed graph is denoted as a tuple \( G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{A}, \mathbf{X}) \), where \( \mathcal{V} = \{v_i\}_{i=1}^{m} \) is a finite set of \( m \) vertices, \( \mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m} \) is a (weight) adjacency matrix, \( \mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d} \) is an attribute (or signal) matrix of graph vertices. The adjacency matrix \( \mathbf{A} \) depicts the connection relationship between vertices. \( A(v_i, v_j) = 0 \) if and only if vertices \( v_i, v_j \) are not connected, otherwise \( A(v_i, v_j) \neq 0 \). Sometimes we simplify \( A(v_i, v_j) \) as \( A_{ij} \). The attribute matrix \( \mathbf{X} \) is associated with the vertex set \( \mathcal{V} \), whose \( i \)-th row \( \mathbf{X}_{v_i} \) (or \( \mathbf{X}_i \)) represents the attribute of the \( i \)-th vertex (i.e., \( v_i \)). That is to say, the \( i \)-th vertex \( v_i \in \mathcal{V} \) is assigned to a vector of \( d \) dimensions.

### 3.1 Overview

Given one graph, we perform multi-layer convolutional filtering on local subgraphs, in conjunction with graph coarsening if necessary. The graph convolution (Fig.1) consists of two basic modules: the definition of receptive field in Section 3.2, and the Gaussian encoding in Section 3.3. To abstract high-level semantics, the coarsening operation of graphs may be stacked upon the convolution filtering like the standard pooling on images, please refer to Section 3.4. Here we focus on the supervised representation learning (Section 3.5), which contains graph classification.

Taking the local filtering and downsampling models, we may iteratively stack them into a multi-layer Gaussian network. With the increase of layers, the receptive field size of filters will become larger, thus the top layer can extract more global graph information. In the supervised case, e.g., graph classification, we finally concatenate with a full connection layer followed by a softmax function.

### 3.2 Multi-Scale Walk Fields

Random walk samples uniformly a random vertex \( v_i \) as the root of a random walk. Then, the walk would be to sample neighbors of the last vertex visited based on the edge possibility. Formally, let \( v_k \) denote a vertex in this walk, the next selected node are generated by the following distribution:

\[
P(v_j | v_k) = \begin{cases} 
\pi_{kl}, & \text{if } (v_k, v_l) \text{ has an edge,} \\
0, & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]

\( \pi_{kl} \) is the transition possibility between vertices \( v_k \) and \( v_l \). Considering the adjacency matrix \( \mathbf{A} \), whose non-zero items describe the strengthen of edge connections, we employ the normalized adjacency matrix as the random walk transition matrix, i.e.,

\[
\Pi = \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{A},
\]

where \( \mathbf{D} \) is the degree matrix of \( \mathbf{A} \) with only non-zeros diagonal elements, \( D_{ii} = \sum_j A_{ij} \). That means, the sum of the walk probability for each vertex moving to all the connected vertices is equal to 1.

If we terminate the walk until the walk length \( t \) is reached, this walk is definitely a path of \( t \)-hop neighbors anchored at the root vertex. For a receptive field of \( t \)-hop neighborhood (named a \( t \)-scale receptive field), however, one random walk path can’t accurately depict its local topology structure. To
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Figure 1: An illustration of our convolutional filtering on graphs. Given one graph, we sample multi-scale walk fields by random walk. The \( t \)-scale walk field consisting of several walks depicts the topology structure of a local subgraph within \( t \)-hop neighborhood. To encode the local variations within a walk field, we introduce multiple Gaussian models to characterize its directions by aggregating Gaussian models. The aggregate gradient features are mapped into a low-dimension space for each scale, followed by a global mapping on concatenated features of all scales.

To enrich the structures of local neighborhood, we employ a strategy of multi-scale walk fields, as shown in Fig. 1. Concretely, we specify a number of random walks \( K \) with different receptive field scales \( t = 1, 2, \ldots, T \), where \( T \) is the scale number of receptive fields. Thus, the walks at the \( t \)-th receptive field forms a path set, formally, \( W^v_t = \{ P^v_{t,k} = (v_{i_0} = v_t, v_{i_1}, \ldots, v_{i_0}) | k = 1, 2, \ldots, K \} \), where \( P^v_{t,k} \) denotes the \( k \)-th walk of length \( t \) starting at the root vertex \( v_t \).

### 3.2 Gaussian Mixture Encoding

According to the reconstruction of walk fields, given a vertex \( v_t \), we can obtain a path set \( W^v_t = \{ P^v_{t,1}, \ldots, P^v_{t,K} \} \) of \( K \) walks with length \( t \) at the \( t \)-th receptive field. A simple solution to encode the receptive field is the summation of walks’ responses, i.e.,

\[ \tilde{X}^v_t = \sum_{k=1}^{K} f(P^v_{t,k}), \tag{3} \]

where \( f \) is a filtering function tied on the \( K \) walks and \( \tilde{X}^v_t \) is the output response. However, the distribution of \( K \) walks cannot be well modeled, although the vertices of a walk are ordered by depth traversal. In contrast, the standard convolution on images has different filtering functions on different pixel position within a receptive field, e.g., a convolution kernel of \( 3 \times 3 \) pixels assign different filtering operations on 9 pixels. An advantage of such a unified filtering is that the local variations within the receptive field can be well encoded.

In analogy, we expect to format the “directions” of walks to encode local variations by imposing unified filtering functions.

To address the problem, we model the distribution of a walk set as Gaussian mixture models (GMMs), each of which be principal components of the distribution. Formally, let \( X_{P^v_{t,k}} \) denote the representation of the path \( P^v_{t,k} \), where \( X_{P^v_{t,k}} = [X_{v_{i_0}}, \ldots, X_{v_{i_0}}] \) may be the concatenation of node attributions along with the walk path. Therefore, the walk set of scale \( t \) centered at \( v_t \) may be rewritten as a feature set \( \{ X_{P^v_{t,1}}, \ldots, X_{P^v_{t,K}} \} \). Thus, for any one walk path \( P^v_{t,k} \), we can estimate the probability density with \( C \)-component GMMs.

\[
p(P^v_{t,k}; \Theta_t) = \sum_{c=1}^{C} w_{t,c} \mathcal{N}(X_{P^v_{t,k}}; \mu_{t,c}, \Sigma_{t,c}) \tag{4}
\]

s.t. \( w_{t,c} > 0, \sum_{c=1}^{C} w_{t,c} = 1 \),

where \( \Theta_t = \{ w_{t,1}, \ldots, w_{t,C}, \mu_{t,1}, \ldots, \mu_{t,C}, \Sigma_{t,1}, \ldots, \Sigma_{t,C} \} \) are the mixture parameters, \( \{ w_{t,c} \} \) are the mixture coefficients, \( \{ \mu_{t,c}, \Sigma_{t,c} \} \) are the parameters of the \( c \)-th component.

Note that, the Gaussian parameters are tied with each vertex, but are taken differently across different-scale receptive fields.

In what follows, we assume all attributes of nodes are independent on each other, as a simplification used in the signal processing. That is, the covariance matrix \( \Sigma_{t,c} \) is diagonal, and we denote it as diag(\( \sigma_{g,c}^2 \)). Further, to remove the explicit constraints for \( w_{t,c} \), we adopt a soft-max normalization by parameterizing as the variable \( \alpha_{t,c} \).

\[
\alpha_{t,c} = \frac{\exp(\alpha_{t,c})}{\sum_{c=1}^{C} \exp(\alpha_{t,c})}. \tag{5}
\]

Thus, the log-likelihood of a \( t \)-scale receptive field w.r.t. \( v_t \) can be written as

\[
\xi(W^v_t) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{c=1}^{C} w_{t,c} \mathcal{N}(X_{P^v_{t,k}}; \mu_{t,c}, \Sigma_{t,c}). \tag{6}
\]

To implement a forward inference, instead of the expectation-maximization (EM) algorithm, we use the gradients of the log-likelihood with regard to the parameters of
the GMM model $\Theta$, motivated by the recent Fisher vector work [Sánchez et al., 2013]. For convenience, we simplify the notations, $N_{t,k,c} = N(X_{t,k,c}, \mu_{t,k,c}, \sigma^2_{t,k,c})$ and $Q_{t,k,c} = \frac{w_{t,k,c}N_{t,k,c}}{\sum_{i,j} w_{t,j}N_{t,j,k}}$, then we can derive the gradients of model parameters $F^t_i \in \mathbb{R}^{(2d+1)C}$ as

$$F^t_i = (Q_{w_{t,1},c}^{t,c}, Q_{w_{t,2},c}^{t,c}, \cdots, Q_{w_{t,r},c}^{t,c}, Q_{\mu_{t,1},c}^{t,c}, Q_{\mu_{t,2},c}^{t,c}, \cdots, Q_{\mu_{t,r},c}^{t,c}, Q_{\sigma_{t,1},c}^{t,c}, Q_{\sigma_{t,2},c}^{t,c}, \cdots, Q_{\sigma_{t,r},c}^{t,c})$$

(7)

where $Q_{w_{t,1},c}^{t,c}, Q_{w_{t,2},c}^{t,c}, \cdots, Q_{w_{t,r},c}^{t,c}$ are the expression for the normalized gradients as follows:

$$Q_{w_{t,1},c}^{t,c} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{w_{t,c}}} \sum_{k=0}^{r} (Q_{t,k,c} - w_{t,c}),$$

$$Q_{\mu_{t,1},c}^{t,c} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{w_{t,c}}} \sum_{k=0}^{r} Q_{t,k,c}(X_{t,k,c} - \mu_{t,c}),$$

$$Q_{\sigma_{t,1},c}^{t,c} = \frac{1}{2w_{t,c}} \sum_{k=0}^{r} Q_{t,k,c}\left[\frac{(X_{t,k,c} - \mu_{t,c})^2}{\sigma^2_{t,c}} - 1\right].$$

For each node, finally, the aggregated gradient feature cross all scales is collected as $F^i = [X_i, F^1_i, \cdots, F^T_i]$, which has a high dimension. To address this problem, we factorize them to separately project them a low dimension space. Formally, the convolution filtering is defined as follows:

$$F^i = f([g_1(X_i), g_2(F^1_i), \cdots, g_T(F^T_i)]),$$

(9)

where $g_t$ is the transform function at the $t$-scale to be learnt, $f$ is imposed on all scale features. In practice, we set $g_t$ and $f$ as a fully-collected layer.

### 3.4 Graph Coarsening

Like the standard pooling in CNNs, we need to downsample graphs so as to abstract the graph in a larger receptive field region. However, the widely-used pooling on images are tailored for gridded structures, and cannot be used for general graphs due to irregular geometric structures. As a solution, we may employ the clustering algorithms to cut the vertex set to several clusters, and then produce a new vertex from each cluster and rearrange the corresponding edges. To implicitly incorporate the information of edges, here we use the weighted clustering algorithm [Dhillon et al., 2007], where each node is assigned to a weight marking the importance of node. That is, the clustering is dynamic with the node weight computed from $\phi(F^i, \cdot)$ to be learnt as a network parameter. For the node aggregation, we use max-pooling like CNN.

### 3.5 Loss Function

In this paper, we focus on the supervised graph classification. Given $n$ training samples of attribute graphs $G = \{G_1, G_2, \cdots, G_n\}$ and their labels $Y = \{y_1, y_2, \cdots, y_n | y_i \in \{0, 1, \cdots, l\}\}$. The optimization problem is formulated as following:

$$\min - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i \ln f(G_i) + (1 - y_i) \ln(1 - f(G_i))$$

(10)

where $f$ is a representation function of graph.

### 4 Experiments

#### 4.1 Datasets

We evaluate our model on several public datasets including bioinformatics and social network datasets, which statistical properties of graph data are summarized in Table 1. The average and maximum number of nodes can reflect the size of the graph data in the dataset. The average nodes and edges can describe the degree of nodes on the graph.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Num graphs</th>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>Node Labels</th>
<th>Avg. nodes</th>
<th>Avg. edges</th>
<th>Max. nodes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUTAG</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTC</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCI1</td>
<td>4110</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENZYMES</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROTEINS</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLAB</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2457</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDDIT-BINARY</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>3782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDDIT-MULTI-5K</td>
<td>5008</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>3648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDDIT-MULTI-12K</td>
<td>11299</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>3782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMDB-BINARY</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMDB-MULTI</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.4 Graph Coarsening

Like the standard pooling in CNNs, we need to downsample graphs so as to abstract the graph in a larger receptive field region. However, the widely-used pooling on images are tailored for gridded structures, and cannot be used for general graphs due to irregular geometric structures. As a solution, we may employ the clustering algorithms to cut the vertex set to several clusters, and then produce a new vertex from each cluster and rearrange the corresponding edges. To implicitly incorporate the information of edges, here we use the weighted clustering algorithm [Dhillon et al., 2007], where each node is assigned to a weight marking the importance of node. That is, the clustering is dynamic with the node weight computed from $\phi(F^i, \cdot)$ to be learnt as a network parameter. For the node aggregation, we use max-pooling like CNN.

#### 3.5 Loss Function

In this paper, we focus on the supervised graph classification. Given $n$ training samples of attribute graphs $G = \{G_1, G_2, \cdots, G_n\}$ and their labels $Y = \{y_1, y_2, \cdots, y_n | y_i \in \{0, 1, \cdots, l\}\}$. The optimization problem is formulated as following:

$$\min - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i \ln f(G_i) + (1 - y_i) \ln(1 - f(G_i))$$

(10)

where $f$ is a representation function of graph.

### 4 Experiments

#### 4.1 Datasets

We evaluate our model on several public datasets including bioinformatics and social network datasets, which statistical properties of graph data are summarized in Table 1. The average and maximum number of nodes can reflect the size of the graph data in the dataset. The average nodes and edges can describe the degree of nodes on the graph.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Num graphs</th>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>Node Labels</th>
<th>Avg. nodes</th>
<th>Avg. edges</th>
<th>Max. nodes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUTAG</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTC</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCI1</td>
<td>4110</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENZYMES</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROTEINS</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLAB</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2457</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDDIT-BINARY</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>3782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDDIT-MULTI-5K</td>
<td>5008</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>3648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDDIT-MULTI-12K</td>
<td>11299</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>3782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMDB-BINARY</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMDB-MULTI</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
datasets. Our graph CNN mainly consists of three graph convolution layers, each of which is followed by a graph coarsening layer, and one fully connected layer with a final softmax layer in our experiment. Its configuration can simply be described as C(64)-P(0.25)-C(128)-P(0.25)-C(256)-P(0.0)-FC(256), where C, P and FC denote the graph convolution layer, graph coarsening layer and fully connected layer respectively and the corresponding number denotes the output channels of each layer and coarsening ratio of graph coarsening layer.

The scale of respective field $T$ and the number of Gaussian components $C$ are both set to 3 in graph convolution layers. The $K$ times of random walk are set 8 in the multi-scale receptive fields. In the former two graph coarsening layers, the coarsening ratio is set to 0.25. In the last coarsening layer, all vertices are reduced to one vertex by using the max-pooling operation. The fully connected layer has 256 hidden units with a dropout rate of 0.5, and is followed with a softmax loss function. The fully connected layer has 256 hidden units.

The experiments are repeated 10 times and the average accuracies as well as standard deviations are reported.

### 4.3 Experimental Results and Comparisons

We compare our WSC with several state-of-the-arts, which contain graph convolution networks (PSCN [Niepert et al., 2016], DCNN [Atwood and Towsley, 2016], ChebNet [Defferrard et al., 2016], NgramCNN [Luo et al., 2017]), neural networks (SAEN [Orsini et al., 2017]), feature based algorithms (DYF [Gomez et al., 2017], FB [Bruna et al., 2015]), random walks based methods (RW [Gätter et al., 2013]), graph kernel approaches (GK [Shervashidze et al., 2009], DGK [Yanardag and Vishwanathan, 2015], WL [Morris et al., 2017]). We present the compared results of the state-of-the-arts and our WSC on bioinformatics and social network datasets, which are summarized in Table 2. Our follow-up results with ChebNet [Defferrard et al., 2016] method are reported here, and other results are cited from these published papers. From these results, we have the following observations:

- Deep graph neural network methods (including DCNN, PSCN, ChebNet, NgramCNN, SAEN and our WSC) achieve a better performance than these conventional methods on benchmark datasets, except NCI1 and REDDIT-BINARY. The conventional methods usually need calculate a big kernel, which has the quadratic complexity in the number of graph samples. The graph neural network approaches including our proposed WSC are driven by the network model with a low complexity, and further boost the discriminative capacity with the increase of network layers.

- Compared with these graph kernel methods (i.e., GK, DGK, WL), the classification performance of our proposed WSC can obtain an improvement, except on NCI1 database. For example, our WSC method achieves a very large gain on MUTAG dataset, e.g., 15.03% over WL, 11.67% over GK and 10.68% over DGK.

- These feature-based approaches (i.e., DYF, FB) can pay more attention to multiplex features for boosting

Table 2: Comparisons with the state-of-the-arts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>PSCN</th>
<th>DCNN</th>
<th>ChebNet</th>
<th>NgramCNN</th>
<th>WL</th>
<th>DyF</th>
<th>SAEN</th>
<th>GK</th>
<th>DGK</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>FB</th>
<th>WSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUTAG</td>
<td>92.63</td>
<td>66.98</td>
<td>89.44</td>
<td>94.99</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>84.99</td>
<td>81.66</td>
<td>82.66</td>
<td>83.72</td>
<td>84.66</td>
<td>93.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>±0.42</td>
<td>±0.30</td>
<td>±5.63</td>
<td>±1.9</td>
<td>±2.37</td>
<td>±1.82</td>
<td>±2.11</td>
<td>±1.45</td>
<td>±1.50</td>
<td>±2.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTC</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>56.60</td>
<td>68.23</td>
<td>68.57</td>
<td>57.15</td>
<td>57.04</td>
<td>57.26</td>
<td>57.32</td>
<td>57.83</td>
<td>55.98</td>
<td>68.82</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>±4.82</td>
<td>±6.28</td>
<td>±1.72</td>
<td>±1.47</td>
<td>±1.30</td>
<td>±1.41</td>
<td>±1.13</td>
<td>±1.30</td>
<td>±2.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCI1</td>
<td>78.39</td>
<td>62.64</td>
<td>75.96</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>68.27</td>
<td>7/8.00</td>
<td>62.28</td>
<td>62.48</td>
<td>48.15</td>
<td>62.90</td>
<td>81.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>±1.89</td>
<td>±1.87</td>
<td>±0.2</td>
<td>±0.34</td>
<td>±0.42</td>
<td>±0.29</td>
<td>±0.25</td>
<td>±0.50</td>
<td>±0.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENZYMES</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>18.10</td>
<td>52.83</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>55.21</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>26.61</td>
<td>27.08</td>
<td>24.16</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>56.16</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROTEINS</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>±7.34</td>
<td>±1.4</td>
<td>±1.20</td>
<td>±0.99</td>
<td>±0.79</td>
<td>±1.64</td>
<td>±1.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLAB</td>
<td>72.60</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>80.61</td>
<td>75.63</td>
<td>72.84</td>
<td>73.09</td>
<td>69.01</td>
<td>76.35</td>
<td>83.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>±2.15</td>
<td>±2.45</td>
<td>±75.3</td>
<td>±1.96</td>
<td>±0.53</td>
<td>±0.18</td>
<td>±0.39</td>
<td>±1.01</td>
<td>±2.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDDIT-B</td>
<td>86.30</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>89.51</td>
<td>86.08</td>
<td>77.34</td>
<td>78.04</td>
<td>67.63</td>
<td>88.98</td>
<td>84.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>±1.58</td>
<td>±0.70</td>
<td>±0.3</td>
<td>±1.92</td>
<td>±0.38</td>
<td>±0.17</td>
<td>±0.18</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>±1.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDDIT-5K</td>
<td>49.10</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>50.31</td>
<td>52.24</td>
<td>41.01</td>
<td>41.27</td>
<td>50.33</td>
<td>52.40</td>
<td>52.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>±0.42</td>
<td>±2.76</td>
<td>±3.37</td>
<td>±0.5</td>
<td>±0.65</td>
<td>±0.70</td>
<td>±0.55</td>
<td>±0.50</td>
<td>±0.42</td>
<td>±1.34</td>
<td>±3.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDDIT-12K</td>
<td>41.32</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>40.30</td>
<td>46.72</td>
<td>31.82</td>
<td>32.22</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>42.37</td>
<td>42.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>±0.42</td>
<td>±2.29</td>
<td>±2.71</td>
<td>±0.5</td>
<td>±4.05</td>
<td>±0.74</td>
<td>±0.98</td>
<td>±0.56</td>
<td>±1.22</td>
<td>±4.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>±3.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMD-B</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>72.87</td>
<td>71.26</td>
<td>65.87</td>
<td>66.96</td>
<td>64.54</td>
<td>72.02</td>
<td>78.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>±2.29</td>
<td>±2.84</td>
<td>±4.10</td>
<td>±3.56</td>
<td>±0.64</td>
<td>±0.38</td>
<td>±0.52</td>
<td>±0.76</td>
<td>±3.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMD-B-M</td>
<td>45.23</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>48.12</td>
<td>49.11</td>
<td>43.89</td>
<td>46.55</td>
<td>34.54</td>
<td>47.34</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>±2.84</td>
<td>±2.84</td>
<td>±4.10</td>
<td>±3.56</td>
<td>±0.64</td>
<td>±0.38</td>
<td>±0.52</td>
<td>±0.76</td>
<td>±3.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the recognition performance of graph data. Graph CNN methods can gain a better performance than these feature-based algorithms on most datasets except REDDIT-BINARY, and our proposed WSC can gain a significant improvement by about 5% recognition accuracy on IMDB-BINARY and IMDB-MULTI datasets. These experimental results indicate that the graph convolution methods including our WSC can focus on the local information and the coarsening operation can provide a hierarchical receptive field so that graph convolution methods can have a robust ability of local representation for the whole graph.

- When comparing with recent graph convolutional neural network methods (e.g., DCNN, PSCN, ChebNet and NgramCNN), our proposed WSC obtains comparable results, and has a better performance on some bioinformatics datasets, such as PTC, PROTEINS and ENZYMES. This may be attributed to adopting multi-scale receptive fields and Gaussian mixture encoding of vertex features in each convolutional layer. What’s more, the multi-scale walk field can capture some important local information and cover more local representations of graph data.

- The proposed WSC achieves state-of-the-art results on most datasets. The best performance is achieved in some bioinformatics datasets and some social network datasets including PTC, ENZYMES, PROTEINS, COLLAB, IMDB-BINARY, IMDB-MULTI, and REDDIT-MULTI-5K. Although NgramCNN, WL, DyF and SEAN approaches have obtained the best performance on MUTAG, NCI1, REDDIT-BINARY and REDDIT-MULTI-12K respectively, our model has a comparable result by better considering the multi-scale receptive fields of graph data.

### 4.4 Parameter Analysis

We now give a thorough analysis of the sensitivity of our proposed WSC to different parameters of Gaussian component $C$, walk fields’ scale $T$ and random walk times $K$. Figure 2(a) shows the recognition accuracies of different Gaussian components on MUTAG dataset. We can see that the number of Gaussian components can influence recognition and the result of 3 (i.e., $C=3$) Gaussian components is better. Less Gaussian components may not enough to encode these local walk fields in the convolution layers, while more Gaussian components will increase the computation complexity of network parameters. A balance between Gaussian components and the computation complexity of network parameter can get a better recognition accuracy. As shown in Figure 2(b), different scale $K$ of walk fields have a certain impact on recognition rates, and the results of adopting $T = 3$ is better than other scales. $T = 3$ scale receptive field may be enough to cover many local information of each graph node with leaning a hierarchical receptive field in the coarsening process. Our proposed WSC can get different accuracies with different random walk times $K$ on MUTAG dataset, and the correspond results are illustrated in Figure 2(c). By the increasing time of random walk from $K = 2$ to $K = 12$, the testing performance gains a big advancement from 69% to 93% and goes to stability in the $K = 8$, which may be enough to obtain these local representation of each receptive field in each convolution layer.

### 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed a novel random walk based convolutional network to learn graph representation for the general graph classification task. We constructed multi-scale walk fields of graph to record the local neighborhood of different receptive fields, and then introduced Gaussian mixture models to encode the local variations of the walks within each receptive field. Further, we employed the weighted clustering algorithm to coarsen the graph, which abstract a hierarchical structure of graph and expand the receptive field region. Extensive experimental results on public graph datasets validated the effectiveness and superiority of the proposed WSC, and meanwhile achieved state-of-the-art performances in some graph classification datasets. In the future, we would like to extend our methods into more applications to irregular data.
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