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ABSTRACT
Machine learning models that can exploit the inherent structure in data have gained prominence. In particular, there is a surge in deep learning solutions for graph-structured data, due to its wide-spread applicability in several fields. Graph attention networks (GAT), a recent addition to the broad class of feature learning models in graphs, utilizes the attention mechanism to efficiently learn continuous vector representations for semi-supervised learning problems. In this paper, we perform a detailed analysis of GAT models, and present interesting insights into their behavior. In particular, we show that the models are vulnerable to adversaries (rogue nodes) and hence propose novel regularization strategies to improve the robustness of GAT models. Using benchmark datasets, we demonstrate performance improvements on semi-supervised learning, using the proposed robust variant of GAT.
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1. INTRODUCTION
Dealing with relational data is central to a wide-range of applications including social networks [1], epidemic modeling [2], chemistry [3], medicine, energy distribution, and transportation [4]. Consequently, machine learning formalisms for graph-structured data [5] have become prominent, and are regularly being adopted for information extraction and analysis. In particular, graph neural networks [7,8,9] form an important class of approaches, and they have produced unprecedented success in supervised and semi-supervised learning problems. Broadly, these methods generalize convolutional networks to the case of arbitrary graphs [10], through spectral analysis (e.g. Laplacian [12]) or neighborhood based techniques [13]. Graph Attention Networks (GAT) [14] are the recent addition to this class of methods and they rely solely on attention mechanisms for feature learning. In contrast to spectral approaches, attention models do not require the construction of an explicit Laplacian operator and can be readily applied to non-Euclidean data. Further, GATs are highly effective, thanks to the recent advances in attention modeling [15], and easily scalable. Given the wide-spread adoption of attention models in language modeling and computer vision, it is crucial to understand the functioning and robustness of the attention mechanism.

In this paper, we consider the problem of improving the robustness of attention models, in the context of semi-supervised learning with graphs. An attention model parameterizes the local dependencies to determine the most relevant parts of the neighborhood to focus on, while computing the features for a node. Using empirical analysis with GAT, we make an interesting observation that with unweighted graphs, there is a tendency to produce uniform attention weights to all connected neighbors at every node. In other words, all neighbors are chosen with the same importance; consequently nodes with high degree or high valency end up being highly influential to the feature learning. Subsequently, inferencing can be greatly affected by introducing even a small number of “rogue” or “noisy” nodes with high degree into the network structure. For example, in a social network, an entity (node) with an ill intent, can corrupt the network structure by establishing connections with several other nodes even though it does not necessarily share coherent community association. In practice, such noisy nodes can arise due to measurement errors, availability of partial information while constructing the relational database, or the presence of adversaries specifically designed to make inference challenging. This motivates the need to improve robustness of attention models on graphs.

We propose an improved variant of GAT that analyzes the distribution of attention coefficients, and attempts to trade-off between global influence of each node and the tendency to produce uniform attention weights across a neighborhood. We achieve this through the inclusion of regularization strategies. Using experiments with benchmark network datasets, we demonstrate improvements over standard GAT in semi-supervised learning, thus effectively combating structural noise in graphs.

2. GRAPH ATTENTION NETWORKS
We represent an undirected and unweighted graph using the tuple set \( G = (V, E) \), where \( V \) denotes the set of nodes with
cardinality $|\mathcal{V}| = N$, $\mathcal{E}$ denotes the set of edges. Each node $v_i$ is endowed with a $d$-dimensional node attribute vector (also referred as the graph signal), $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$. For a given node $v_i$, its closed neighborhood $\mathcal{N}_c(i)$ is given by $\{i \cup j | e(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}\}$.

An attention head is the most basic unit in GAT [14]. A head basically learns a hidden representation for each node by performing a weighted combination of node attributes in the closed neighborhood, where the weights are trainable. In our setup, we consider a simple dot-product attention, similar to the Transformer architecture [15]. Formally, an attention head is comprised of the following steps:

**Step 1:** Feed-forward layer that transforms each $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ into $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

**Step 2:** A shared trainable dot-product attention mechanism which learns coefficients for each valid edge in the graph. This is carried out using attributes of the connected neighbors, $e_{ij} = \langle \text{Att}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i | \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_j \rangle$, where $\text{Att} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ denotes the parameters of the attention function, and $\|$ represents concatenation of features from nodes $v_i$ and $v_j$ respectively.

**Step 3:** A softmax layer for normalizing the learned attention coefficients across the closed neighborhood, $a_{ij} = \text{softmax}(e_{ij}; \forall j \in \mathcal{N}_c(i))$, s.t. $\sum_j a_{ij} = 1$. For simplicity, we represent the normalized attention coefficients for the entire graph as $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$, where $A_{ij}$ denotes the importance of node $j$’s features in approximating the feature for node $i$.

**Step 4:** A linear combiner that performs weighted combination of node features with the learned attention coefficients followed by a non-linearity: $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_i = \sigma(\mathbf{z}_i)$, where $\mathbf{z}_i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_c(i)} a_{ij} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_j$.

### 3. ANALYSIS OF ATTENTIONS INFERRED BY GAT

In this section, we perform a detailed analysis of the attention coefficients learned by GAT. The presented observations will motivate the need for strategies to improve the robustness of attention models. In contrary to our expectation that an attention head might assign different levels of importance to the nodes in the closed neighborhood, our analysis shows that the distribution of coefficients in a closed neighborhood is almost always uniform in nature.

For this study, we consider the two benchmark citation datasets from our experiments, namely Cora and Citeseer [16] (details can be found in Section 5). Figure 1 illustrates the weight distribution for two nodes from the Cora dataset and one node from the Citeseer dataset, with varying degrees. Interestingly, we find that, irrespective of the degree, the attention mechanism fails to prioritize a node (or subset of nodes) in a closed neighborhood, and learns uniform weights for all nodes. For example, if a node $i$ has a closed neighborhood of cardinality 5, GAT generates a weight of 0.2 for each of them. Although this behavior is reasonable for small neighborhood sizes, we observe this trend even when $|\mathcal{N}_c| = 75$.

In order to quantitatively evaluate this tendency towards uniform weight distribution, we compute the uniformity score $\text{Unif}(v_i)$ as the interquartile range (IQR) of the weights, i.e. $\text{IQR}([A_{ij}, \forall j \in \mathcal{N}_c(i)])$. IQR provides a measure of variability in given set of values by computing the difference between 75th and 25th percentiles. For every node, we measure IQR for the attention coefficients corresponding to its $\mathcal{N}_c$. The other metric we compute is the influence of each node in terms of its participation in the approximation of other nodes’s features. In particular, we count the number of cases a node $v_j$ is assigned a weight larger than a threshold $\tau$: $\text{Inf}(v_j) = \sum_i (A_{ij})$, if $A_{ij} > \tau$. From the visualization in Fig. 2, it can be observed that $\text{Unif}$ scores are heavily concentrated around 0, indicating tendency toward uniform distribution for all nodes. On the other hand, the $\text{Inf}$ metric clearly indicates that nodes with high degree naturally end up being highly influential. This implies that a rogue node with a high degree can impact the feature inferencing significantly.
4. PROPOSED APPROACH

In this section, we describe the proposed regularization strategy, in order improve the robustness of GAT models. The proposed solution will help combat structured noise in graph datasets. Intuitively, our approach attempts to improve the reliability of local attention structure by systematically limiting the influence of nodes globally. To this end, we build upon the observations in the previous section, and propose two additional regularization terms to the original GAT formulation.

As described in Section 3, there is a tendency in GAT models, with unweighted graphs, to produce a uniform weight distribution while training the attention mechanism. For a node with a small closed neighborhood, it is prudent to utilize information from all its neighbors in order to approximate the node’s latent representation. Consequently, producing uniform attention weights can be a reasonable in such cases. However, if the closed neighborhood contains an adversarial node, i.e. a node that cannot be characterized as part of any coherent community in the graph, uniform attention can lead to severe uncertainties in the local approximation. On the other hand, for nodes with relatively large neighborhood sizes, uniform attention structure will significantly control the effect of a few adversaries, by assigning low weights. However, this comes at the price that the closest neighbors are not effectively prioritized and the variance in latent features across the large neighborhoods can result in features, that can be non-discriminatory for subsequent label prediction. In practice, GAT alleviates this discrepancy to an extent by utilizing dropout layers during training. However, as we show in our experiments, the performance of GAT suffers when adversarial nodes are introduced.

We propose to combat this trade-off by optimizing the GAT parameters to jointly produce a uniform weight distribution for every node, while controlling the influence of the nodes in terms of their participation in approximating other nodes. More specifically, we penalize the non-uniformity in the attention weights assigned to each of the neighbors as:

\[
L_{\text{unif}} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \| A_i^k \|_0 - \text{deg}(v_i).
\]  

(1)

Fig. 2: Unif vs Infl plot for the attention weights inferred using a head in the baseline GAT model.

Here, we measure the \( \ell_0 \) norm, i.e. the number of nodes in the neighborhood that have been assigned a non-zero attention weight. By comparing it to the degree of that node, we penalize if not all nodes in the neighborhood participate in the approximation. \( K \) represents the number of independent heads. The second regularization term that we introduce is a penalty for exclusivity, i.e. preventing any one node in the graph to be exclusively influential to the overall feature inference. In other words, this does not allow a node with high degree to arbitrarily participate in the approximation of all its neighbors. This is particularly important when those nodes are noisy or adversarial. For every node \( j \), this term is defined as the \( \ell_1 \)-norm of attention coefficients assigned to that node in an attention head: \( \sum_i |A_{ij}| \). Generalizing this to \( K \) independent heads, we obtain

\[
L_{\text{excl}} = \frac{1}{NK} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} |A_{ij}^k| \]  

(2)

By including the two proposed regularization terms to the original loss function of GAT, we obtain

\[
L = L_{\text{GAT}} + \lambda_1 L_{\text{unif}} + \lambda_2 L_{\text{excl}}
\]  

(3)

where the hyperparameters \( \lambda_1 \) and \( \lambda_2 \) are used to weight the penalty terms with respect to the classification loss. Note that, \( L_{\text{GAT}} \) includes an additional \( \ell_2 \) regularization on the learned model parameters. We refer to this formulations as the Robust GAT. With the proposed modification to the GAT objective, we can now independently control the uniformity of attention coefficients, as well as overall influence of a particular node.

5. EXPERIMENT SETUP AND RESULTS

In this section, we describe the experimental setup for evaluating the impact of adversarial nodes on the GAT model, and present the results from the proposed robust variant. We use two benchmark citation networks: Cora and Citeseer [16]. In both the datasets, documents are treated as nodes, and citations among the documents are encoded as undirected edges. Additionally, each node (document) is endowed with an attribute vector(bag-of-word representations). We follow the experimental setup for training and inferring similar to that of GAT [14] and perform transductive learning. We perturb the graph structure by explicitly introducing rogue nodes which have noisy edges with regular nodes in the graph. This represents a synthetic scenario where the presence of adversaries can make the inference more challenging.

We introduce structured noise to graph datasets in the following manner: First, we sample \( n_0 \) nodes uniformly at random (without replacement) from the validation set, and delete
all the existing edges for each of the selected nodes. We then add a total of $m_0$ arbitrary edges for each of the $n_0$ nodes. Note, the nodes to which the edges were established were also chosen at random, but from the entire graph. We specifically introduced noisy nodes only in the validation set to show the impact of adversaries on the overall performance, even when they are not part of training or testing. For comparison, we generate results from the baseline GAT approach in each of these synthetic cases. For a fair comparison, our architectures and the hyperparameter choices were fixed to be the same for both Baseline GAT and the Robust GAT approaches. Note that, Robust GAT has two additional hyperparameters, $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ which were set to 0.001 and 0.01 respectively. We consider two different cases in our empirical evaluation.

Case 1 - Fixed number of noisy edges: In this case, we vary the number of noisy nodes $n_0$ and fix the number of noisy edges per node, $m_0 = 500$. For each case of $n_0$, we performed 20 independent realizations and report the average. The results from this case study are shown in Tables 1 and 2. We observe that, when the number of noisy edges are fixed at a high value as 500, even 40 or 50 noisy nodes results in severe performance degradation. For example, with the cora dataset, when $n_0$ is increased from 60 to 70, the average accuracy of GAT on the test set decreases by nearly 50%. In comparison, the proposed robust variant produces improvements in range of 3% to 12%, depending on the number of noisy nodes. However, when the number of noisy nodes is increased beyond a certain point, the additional regularizations are not sufficient to combat the large amounts of noise.

Case 2 - Fixed number of noisy nodes: In this study, we vary the number of noisy edges per node $m_0$, and fix the number noisy nodes, $n_0 = 50$, for both datasets. Again, results reported were obtained by averaging 20 independent realizations. We find that, increasing number of noisy edges for a fixed $n_0$ does not have as much of a negative impact, when compared to the previous case. However, in all cases, the proposed approach consistently outperforms the baseline GAT architecture, thus producing highly robust models.

6. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we analyzed the attention mechanism in graph attention networks, and showed that they are highly vulnerable to noisy nodes with high degrees in the graph. This can be attributed to the surprising behavior of GAT in producing uniform attention to all connected neighbors at every node. In order to alleviate this limitation, we proposed a robust variant of GAT, that attempts to trade-off between compromising this uniformity property, while preventing any one node to be exclusively influential to the graph. Using benchmark datasets, we demonstrated significant improvements in the semi-supervised learning performance.
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