
Tracing the Propagation Path: A Flow Perspective of Representation Learning on Graphs

Menghan Wang

Alibaba Group
xiangyu.wmh@alibaba-inc.com

Kun Zhang

Department of Philosophy
Carnegie Mellon University
kunz1@cmu.edu

Guli Lin

Alibaba Group
guli.ling1@taobao.com

Keping Yang

Alibaba Group
shaoyao@taobao.com

Luo si

Alibaba Group
luo.si@alibaba-inc.com

Abstract

Graph Convolutional Networks (GCNs) have gained significant developments in representation learning on graphs. However, current GCNs suffer from two common challenges: 1) GCNs are only effective with shallow structures; stacking multiple GCN layers will lead to over-smoothing. 2) GCNs do not scale well with large, dense graphs due to the recursive neighborhood expansion. We generalize the propagation strategies of current GCNs as a “*Sink*→*Source*” mode, which seems to be an underlying cause of the two challenges. To address these issues intrinsically, in this paper, we study the information propagation mechanism in a “*Source*→*Sink*” mode. We introduce a new concept “information flow path” that explicitly defines where information originates and how it diffuses. Then a novel framework, namely Flow Graph Network (FlowGN), is proposed to learn node representations. FlowGN is computationally efficient and flexible in propagation strategies. Moreover, FlowGN decouples the layer structure from the information propagation process, removing the interior constraint of applying deep structures in traditional GCNs. Further experiments on public datasets demonstrate the superiority of FlowGN against state-of-the-art GCNs.

1 Introduction

Graph Convolutional Networks (GCNs) have become popular and powerful tools for representation learning on graphs. Motivated by CNNs, GCNs set a node’s one-hop graph neighborhood as its “receptive field” and perform convolution operation to aggregate feature information from the local neighborhood of the node. By stacking multiple such convolutions information can be propagated across far reaches of a graph. However, two potential limitations prevent the further spread of GCNs. First, experiments [14, 21] show that GCNs are only effective with shallow structures (often no more than three layers) and the performance of GCNs drops dramatically when the number of layers increases, which indicates the fine-tuned GCNs are essentially shallow embedding. The shallow structure is still an open problem. Second, the recursive neighborhood expansion across layers poses time and memory challenges for training with large, dense graphs. A popular solution is to sample neighbors based on the ‘importance’ of nodes to improve the scalability of GCNs [7, 4].

The key to aforementioned challenges lies in how we understand and model the information propagation mechanism. Xu et al. [24] showed that the neighborhood aggregation schemes for a K -layer GCN is analogous to the spread of a K -step random walker with some mild assumptions. At a micro level, the representation learning process of one node from another node in GCN can be viewed




Figure 1: (a) and (b) are two examples of information propagation between the *Source* node and the *Sink* node. The orange arrows indicate effective computation paths with order, and the other arrows (brown, red, and blue) indicate the concrete computation operations and their color indicates the *Source* node whose information is expected to be transmitted in the corresponding operation. GCNs (left) recursively request node *a* for information, and finally gets the information of the *Source* node at the 3rd layer (we omit some arrows for simplification). The effective computation path is $\{Sink \rightarrow a \rightarrow c \rightarrow Source\}$. The illustrative case (middle) passes information from the *Source* node to the *Sink* node directly with three hops (The brown arrows). Its effective computation path is $\{Source \rightarrow c \rightarrow a \rightarrow Sink\}$. (c) is an example of FlowGN where the path length is 3.

as computation paths that connect the two nodes. Figure 1a shows an example that a *Sink* node recursively learn information from a *Source* node through one computation path. We generalize this kind of information propagations as a “*Sink*→*Source*” mode, i.e., the learning process starts from the *Sink* node, and seeks source nodes recursively to request information from them. Unfortunately, the “*Sink*→*Source*” mode has two unfavorable characteristics: 1) Potential *Source* nodes are not known to *Sink* nodes in advance. A *Sink* node has to recursively seek *Source* nodes so it needs K neighborhood aggregations in order to learn from the *Source* nodes that are K hops away. 2) The pattern of information diffusion is implicit and difficult to evaluate. It is hard to estimate how much information of a *Source* node is lost (or washed out by aggregation operations) along the computation path before reaching the *Sink* node. These two characteristics restrict the capacity of GCNs together: in order to extend propagation ranges, GCNs have to stack more layers and run numerous aggregation operations to transmit information, which, in turn, leads to more information loss and duplicated computation. The “*Sink*→*Source*” mode may be one of the underlying causes of the shallow embedding and the scalability problems in GCNs.

Alternatively, one can model the information propagation process in a “*Source*→*Sink*” mode: starting from *Source* nodes and seeking *Sink* nodes iteratively in graphs (Figure 1b shows an example). We can explicitly define where information originates and how it diffuses, which could circumvent the limitations of the “*Sink*→*Source*” mode. As we know all the source nodes in advance, we can model information propagation with variable range in one layer; we do not have to perform propagations recursively. Moreover, a proper diffusion mechanism design will reduce unnecessary computation. For instance, we can assume information transmission in a computation path is only dependent on the nodes in the path, removing all the neighborhood aggregations of the nodes along the path. We argue that the “*Source*→*Sink*” mode could be a plausible direction in representation learning on graphs.

Particularly, in this paper, we study the information propagation mechanism of GCNs in a “*Source*→*Sink*” mode. We introduce a new concept, “information flow path”, that explicitly defines where information originates and how it diffuses. Then a novel framework, namely Flow Graph Network (FlowGN), is proposed to learn node representations on graphs. FlowGN is flexible in propagation strategies and computationally efficient. Moreover, FlowGN decouples the layer structure from the information propagation process, removing the interior constraint of applying deep structures in current GCNs. Further experiments on public datasets reveal the superiority of FlowGN.

2 Related Work

In this section, we first introduce some related work on GCNs and random walk-based methods with respect to representation learning. Then we describe some background materials on network flow and centrality measures, which are related to our proposed method.

The core idea behind GCNs is to learn how to iteratively aggregate feature information from local graph neighborhoods. Advances in this direction are often categorized as spectral approaches and non-spectral approaches. Some spectral approaches [3, 11] define convolution operation in the Fourier domain by computing the eigendecomposition of the graph Laplacian. Non-spectral approaches define convolutions directly on graphs and operate on spatially close neighbors. GraphSAGE [7] generates embeddings by sampling and aggregating features from a node’s local neighborhood. The FastGCN model [4] treats graph convolutions as integral transforms of embedding functions. Different from GraphSAGE, FastGCN samples vertices rather than neighbors for aggregation. Huang et al. [9] proposes a layer-wise sampling method to capture between-layer correlations. The GAT model [20] uses a self-attention mechanism to learn content aggregation weights between neighbors and the current node for graph representation learning. Another line of related work of representation learning is random walk methods (e.g., DeepWalk [15], LINE [19], and Node2Vec [6]). They treat nodes as words and the generated random walks on graphs as sentences, and then apply SkipGram model on them. Random walk methods are effective and easy to implement; they have been widely applied in network applications to learn node representations. However, these methods also lead to potential drawbacks: 1) embeddings of nodes are learned independently and parameters are not shared; it is computationally inefficient since the number of parameters grows as $O(|\mathcal{V}|)$. 2) Node attributes are not utilized, which contain rich information w.r.t. node representations. Recently, Klicpera et al. [12] combines neural network with personalized pagerank, which alleviates the above two issues and achieves improvements on representation learning.

Graphs are widely studied in network theory [22] for various problems and the corresponding findings may provide insight to representation learning. Centrality [5], a fundamental concept in network theory, identifies the importance of nodes within a graph. Centrality measures take into account how a node interacts and communicates with the rest of the graph and have proved of value in understanding of the role played by the nodes in the graph. Intuitively, centrality assesses a node’s involvement in the structure of a graph and thus can be utilized for neighborhood aggregation (node importance) in GCNs. Particularly, Borgatti [2] viewed centrality as a node-level outcome of implicit models of flow processes and showed centrality choice should match the flow characteristics of networks, which gave us the initial inspiration that a proper flow process may efficiently model the information propagation for representation learning on graphs.

3 FlowGN

In this section, we introduce our Flow Graph Network (FlowGN) framework in detail. Assume we have a graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ with node feature X_v for $v \in \mathcal{V}$. FlowGN is a K -layer model and its output is feature vector z_v for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$. The quality of learned representations z_v is evaluated by downstream tasks, such as link prediction and node classification. A graphical example of FlowGN is shown in Figure 1c. In the remaining parts of this section, we first introduce the information flow algorithm (Section 3.1). Then we describe the FlowGN embedding generation (i.e., forward propagation) algorithm and its inference (Section 3.2). In Section 3.3 we further discuss the characteristics of FlowGN.

3.1 Information Flow Algorithm

Below we give the definitions of the information flow path and the information propagation mechanism that explicitly describe the information diffusion process in a “*Source*→*Sink*” mode.

Definition 3.1 (Information Flow Path). Given a graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, an information flow path is defined as $P = (s \xrightarrow{e_0} v_1 \xrightarrow{e_1} v_2 \xrightarrow{e_2} \dots v_n \xrightarrow{e_n} t)$, where s is the source node, $\{v_i\}$ is the set of intermediate nodes, t is the sink node, and $\{e_i\}$ is the set of edges that connect nodes along the path. The path length l is set as the number of nodes in P .

Definition 3.2 (Information Propagation mechanism). An information propagation mechanism is a meta template defined on an information flow path and is denoted with three functions: $GenerateFlow(v)$, $TransmitFlow(v, flow)$, and $ConserveFlow(v, flow)$. The procedure of propagation is as follows: the source node s first produces information flow via $GenerateFlow(s)$ and then transmits the information flow along the path. For every intermediate node $\{v_i\}$ along the path, it receives the information flow from the upstream node and calls $ConserveFlow(v, flow)$ and $TransmitFlow(v, flow)$ separately. These two functions indicate the node $\{v_i\}$ conserves

Algorithm 1: Path generation algorithm (PATHGEN)

Input: Graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$; path iteration r ; path length l ; return p ; in-out q
Output: Information flow paths \mathcal{P}_m

```
1 Initialization: set  $\mathcal{P}_m$  to empty;
2 for  $iter = 1 \dots r$  do
3   for  $v \in \mathcal{V}$  do
4      $RestartNum = \text{IMPORTANCE}(\mathcal{G}, v)$ ;           /* Centrality measures */
5     for  $i = 1 \dots RestartNum$  do
6        $path = \text{node2vecWalk}(l, p, q)$ ;           /* Grover and Leskovec [6] */
7       append  $path$  to  $\mathcal{P}_m$ 
8     end
9   end
10 end
```

information and transmits flow to the downstream node. Finally, the flow ends at the sink node t after calling $ConserveFlow(t, flow)$. A detailed implementation of the propagation procedure is shown in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2: Information Propagation (INFOPROPAGATE)

Input: hidden features $\{h_v, \forall v \in \mathcal{V}\}$; information flow paths $\{\mathcal{P}_m, \forall m \in \mathcal{M}\}$
Output: Vector representations $h_{N(v)}$ for all $v \in V$

```
1 Initialization: set  $h_{C(v)}$  to empty for all  $v \in V$ ; /*  $h_{C(v)}$  is a set that stores the conserved
   flows */
2 for  $m = 1 \dots \mathcal{M}$  do
3    $s, \{v_n\}, t = \mathcal{P}_i$ ;
4    $currentflow = \text{GenerateFlow}(s)$ ;           /* current flow is the same size as  $h_s$  */
5   for  $i = 1 \dots n$  do
6      $h_{C(v_i)} \leftarrow \text{ConserveFlow}(v_i, currentflow)$ ;
7      $currentflow = \text{TransmitFlow}(v_i, currentflow)$ ;
8   end
9    $h_{C(t)} \leftarrow \text{ConserveFlow}(t, currentflow)$ ;
10 end
11 for  $v \in \mathcal{V}$  do
12    $h_{N(v)} = \text{AGGREGATE}(h_{C(v)})$ ;           /* neighborhood aggregation */
13 end
```

The formula of our information flow algorithm is inspired by the classical network flow problem [1]. Analogously, we treat feature transmission as flows and the $TransmitFlow(v, flow)$ function is used to control flows (similar to the ‘capacity’ concept in network flow problem). One difference is that FlowGN allows intermediate nodes to conserve flows ($ConserveFlow(v, flow)$) in order to encourage reuse of flow paths.

Flow path generation. The first step of path generation is to choose the source node. In a flow path only the source node’s information is propagated and our goal is to learn node representations with structural information, so we generate information flow paths starting from every node in the graph. Although a naïve approach is to run r paths for each start node, a more reasonable setting is to let “important” nodes generate more flow paths in a graph as they are more influential in the graph. In graph theory, centrality is a measure that identifies the importance of vertices within a graph. Here we choose degree centrality (i.e., the number of edges a node has) to denote the importance score of nodes. After we choose a source node, the rest part of a flow path can be generated with a variety of random walk algorithms, which are computationally efficient in terms of both space and time requirements. We choose node2vec [6] as a base model to generate information flow paths because it flexibly interpolates between depth-first search (DFS) and breadth-first search (BFS) strategies. We fix path length to l for model simplification. The pseudocode of flow path generation is given in Algorithm 1.

3.2 Embedding Learning

We describe the embedding learning of FlowGN in Algorithm 3. Specifically, in k^{th} layer, FlowGN first generates information flow paths, and run Algorithm 2 to propagate information. FlowGN then concatenates the node’s representation in $(k - 1)^{th}$ layer, h_v^{k-1} , with the aggregated neighborhood vector, h_v^k , and this concatenated vector is fed through a fully connected layer with nonlinear activation function σ . The output h_v^k is used as the hidden features of node v in the next layer.

Algorithm 3: FlowGN embedding generation algorithm

Input: Graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$; input features $\{x_v, \forall v \in \mathcal{V}\}$; non-linearity σ ; depth K ; different aggregator functions; number of information flow paths \mathcal{M}

Output: Vector representations z_v for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$

```

1  $h_v^0 \leftarrow x_v, \forall v \in \mathcal{V}$ 
2 for  $k = 1 \dots K$  do
3    $\mathcal{P}_m = \text{PATHGEN}(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{M})$ ; /* Generate flow paths Algorithm 1 */
4    $h_{N(v)}^k \leftarrow \text{INFOPROPAGATE}(\{h_v^{k-1}, \forall v \in \mathcal{V}\}, \{\mathcal{P}_m, \forall m \in \mathcal{M}\})$ ; /* Algorithm 2 */
5    $h_v^k \leftarrow \sigma(W^k \cdot \text{CONCAT}(h_v^{k-1}, h_{N(v)}^k)), \forall v \in \mathcal{V}$ 
6 end
7  $z_v \leftarrow h_v^K, \forall v \in \mathcal{V}$ 

```

Neighborhood aggregation. In each layer of FlowGN, every node only needs one neighborhood aggregation and the neighbors are not limited to adjacent nodes. Due to the randomness of flow paths, the neighbors are not ordered. An ideal aggregator function would be symmetric, i.e., the aggregation results should be invariant to the order of the neighbors. In FlowGN, we choose the mean aggregator function, where we simply take the element-wise mean of the vectors in $h_{C(v)}$.

Inference. FlowGN can be trained with unsupervised or supervised loss functions, depending on the specific tasks, and the parameters can be learned using standard stochastic gradient descent and backpropagation techniques. Similar to GraphSAGE [7], FlowGN learned a set of aggregator functions, which could be further utilized to test unseen nodes. In experiments, we apply a mini-batch learning setting to speed up the model training.

3.3 Comparison with Related Work

Weighted neighborhood aggregation and information flow. Recent studies increased the capacity of GCNs via assigning different importance (weights) to nodes of a same neighborhood. They either use self-attention layers or develop different kinds of neighborhood sampling methods. FlowGN does the same thing but with a different approach; it is implicitly implemented in the information propagation process. Specifically, a *sink* node may receive many flows from the same *source* node through flow paths, and the flow counts can be viewed as unnormalized weights. Compared with other counterparts, FlowGN requires no additional model modification or computation.

Layer structure and information propagation. The propagation range of current GCNs is closely tied to the number of convolutional layers, i.e., in each layer nodes aggregate features from their 1-hop neighbors so the layer number explicitly determines the propagation bounds for all nodes. Once the neural structure is determined, the propagation range for all nodes are fixed. In FlowGN, the propagation is determined by the path length l . Potential benefits are two-fold. On one hand, it’s more flexible to determine the propagation range. On the other hand, we can explore deep structures by stacking layers without any constraint from the information propagation mechanism.

Homogeneous or heterogeneous. Most existing GCNs implicitly assume a homogeneous graph setting, but in real scenarios many graphs are heterogeneous, where multiple types of nodes interact via different types of relationships. Different types of nodes have different feature spaces, which brings two challenges to information propagation: 1) how to define neighbors for a specific node and 2) how to aggregate information among different feature spaces. Unlike GCNs that need complicated model modifications, FlowGN can seamlessly be incorporated with the ‘standard’ approach in heterogeneous settings; we assume $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ is associated with a node type mapping function $\phi : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ and a link type mapping function $\varphi : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ (\mathcal{A} and \mathcal{R} denote the sets of object types and link types). Then a

straightforward approach could be to define the information flow path in a Meta-path manner [18], and assign a type-specific transformation matrix in $ConserveFlow(v, flow)$.

Relation to random walk methods. As opposed to random walk based methods, FlowGN utilizes node attributes and the parameters of FlowGN are shared among nodes to make the model efficient and regularized. With a multi-layer structure, the learned node representations of FlowGN are not limited in shallow embedding. At the same time, FlowGN inherits the merit of random walk methods during its information flow path generation, which is computationally efficient in terms of both time and memory requirements.

4 Therotical Analysis

In this section we probe the relations between GCNs (“Sink→Source”) and FlowGN (“Source→Sink”) in order to provide insight into how FlowGN can learn about graph structure. Xu et al. [24] showed that the process of information propagation in GCNs is analogous to the spread of a random walker. Following their ideas and settings (randomization assumption of ReLU [10] and Influence distribution [13]), we can draw connections between GCNs and FlowGN with the property of random walks, which comes to the following theorem:

Theorem 4.1. *Given a grid graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, and a k -layer GCN with averaging as its neighborhood aggregation scheme, there exists an equivalent version of FlowGN that has the same influence distribution for every node $x \in \mathcal{V}$.*

Theorem 4.1 indicates “Sink→Source” and “Source→Sink” are symmetry in grid graphs with some mild assumptions. The full proof of theorem 4.1 is in the Appendix. From the proof we can also observe FlowGN acquire less computation than GCNs along the computation paths; FlowGN needs one weight matrix in the expected influence distribution while GCNs need a multiplication of K weight matrices. In reality, most graphs are often non-grid and thus the two modes are asymmetry. Consider a task of infection risk prediction in an epidemic network, where some infectious disease spreads from infected individuals to healthy individuals along the network structure. We argue that the “Source→Sink” mode should be chosen in this case as it represents the true mechanism of information propagation (disease diffusion); improper choice may lead to inductive biases. We believe that our work would shed new light on the underlying mechanism of information propagation in graphs for representation learning.

5 Experiments

We implement a simple yet effective version of information propagation mechanism that enables FlowGN to learn better representations with less time complexity. Specifically, we set $GenerateFlow(s) = h_s$, $TransmitFlow(v_i, flow) = flow$, and $ConserveFlow(v_i, flow) = flow$. This setting assumes that information transmits along flow paths with no information loss. We test the performance of FlowGN on four benchmark datasets: *Cora*, *Citeseer*, *Pubmed* [16], and *Coauthor* [17]. The first three datasets are citation datasets, in which every node represents a paper and the edges represent citations between them. The last dataset is about academic coauthor relationships, where nodes indicate authors and edges indicate coauthor relations. Our goal is to classify academic papers into different subjects using the citation datasets. We use prediction accuracy as our main metric. Following the experiment setup in [4], we adjusted the original training/validation/test split of *Cora*, *Citeseer*, and *Pubmed* to align with the supervised learning scenario. Specifically, all labels of the training examples are used for training. The split of *Coauthor* is coherent with that of other datasets. The statistics of the experimental datasets are shown in Table 1.

Dataset	# Nodes	# Edges	# Classes	# Features	# Avg. SP	Train/Vali/Test Nodes
Cora	2,708	5,429	7	1,433	6.31	1,208/500/1,000
Citeseer	3,327	4,732	6	3,703	9.33	1,812/500/1,000
Pubmed	19,717	44,338	3	500	6.34	18,217/500/1,000
CoAuthor	18,333	81,894	15	6,805	5.43	16,833/500/1,000

Table 1: Dataset statistics of experimental datasets. Avg. SP means average shortest path length.

Baselines. We compare FlowGN against node2vec [6], GCN [11], GAT [20], GraphSAGE [7], FastGCN [4], and SGC [23] using the publicly released implementations. All baseline models contain two layers if not specified. Due to space limit, we omit part of experimental settings and results of *Cora* below and please refer to the Appendix for more details.

5.1 Performance

We report the performance of our method and baseline models in Table 2. As shown in the results, we can see FlowGN outperforms other baseline models in average. Node2vec performs worst among baselines because the embeddings are learned independently and node features are not utilized. SGC is competitive but not stable; it achieves best performance in *Cora* but performs poorly in *Pubmed*. FastGCN samples nodes via importance and suffers from a high variance problem, which may introduce biases and influence the prediction accuracy. Note that all baselines except Node2vec actually propagate information in a “Sink→Source” mode. The superiority of FlowGN in prediction accuracy demonstrates the effectiveness of the “Source→Sink” mode.

Model	Cora	Citeseer	Pubmed	CoAuthor CS
node2vec	19.73 ± 0.95	18.02 ± 1.12	33.91 ± 1.32	11.50 ± 1.20
GCN(original)	86.10 ± 0.40	77.60 ± 0.40	86.60 ± 0.30	90.90 ± 0.30
GAT	82.39 ± 0.71	75.49 ± 0.65	84.30 ± 0.33	90.72 ± 0.27
FastGCN	85.90 ± 0.30	76.10 ± 0.60	87.90 ± 0.30	92.90 ± 0.40
SGC	87.00 ± 0.00	76.90 ± 0.00	82.90 ± 0.00	91.40 ± 0.00
GraphSAGE-mean	82.20 ± 0.47	68.56 ± 0.91	88.80 ± 0.56	93.01 ± 0.45
FlowGN	86.32 ± 0.30	79.76 ± 0.42	89.41 ± 0.27	94.85 ± 0.11

Table 2: Test accuracy (%) on four datasets (Results are averaged over 10 runs).

5.2 Analysis of Flow Path

In this section we explore how different flow path generation strategies affect the performance of FlowGN. To encourage flowability, we set the return parameter $p = 1000$ to reduce duplicate nodes in a flow path. We first vary the in-out parameter $q \in \{0.1, 0.5, 1, 2, 4\}$ to interpolate between DFS and BFS strategies, and then vary path length l to evaluate the effectiveness of FlowGN. The experimental results are shown in Figure 2. We observe that FlowGN achieves its best performance when $q = 0.1$ on all datasets, which indicates that DFS plays a more important role than BFS in FlowGN to learn node representations. In network analysis DFS is tied to the homophily hypothesis [8], so we can infer that nodes with similar structural roles in graphs will learn similar representations in FlowGN. Moreover, we find that the optimal l varies across datasets: 8 in *Citeseer*, 6 in *Pubmed*, and 5 in *Coauthor*. Note that in Table 1 we computed the average shortest path length ($Avg.SP$), which are 9.33, 6.34, and 5.43 for the three datasets respectively. $Avg.SP$ and the optimal l seem to be positively correlated, and reasonable explanations are: 1) FlowGN can learn the overall structure of graphs with $l = Avg.SP$. 2) Transmitting information through shortest paths is efficient and longer paths ($l > Avg.SP$) may cause redundant computation and lead to overfitting. On the other hand, GCNs implicitly take a “flooding” strategy to transmit information and the heavy design makes it difficult to explore long propagation ranges. We can conclude that FlowGN is more flexible in propagation strategies.

5.3 Effectiveness of Model Depth

In the following experiments, we investigate the influence of model depth (number of layers) on the classification performance. We vary the layer number $K \in \{1, \dots, 7\}$ to evaluate the effectiveness of FlowGN. The path generation follows the optimal strategies that we discussed in Section 5.2. Figure 3 shows the experimental results on three datasets. We first find that FlowGN is competitive with one-layer structure; it achieves better performance than other baselines with multiple-layer structures. This is because FlowGN supports variable propagation range in one layer while other models are limited to one-hop propagation. Then we can see the performance of FlowGN first increases as we stack more layers on the model, reaching its peak at $K = 5$. After that FlowGN tends to risk the overfitting problem and leads to a steady decrease in performance. In contrast, we observe that the




Figure 2: Prediction accuracy of FlowGN with different path length l and in-out parameter q .




Figure 3: Prediction accuracy of FlowGN with different layer number K

performance of GCN drops dramatically when K increases after 2 (in *Citeseer* and *Pubmed*) or 3 (in *Coauthor*); GraphSAGE performs and SGC also leads to a deterioration when layer number increases. The empirical results reveal the coupling design leads to a performance deterioration. Moreover, the coupling design makes it hard to estimate the effects of model depth and propagation range separately. FlowGN achieves improvements with deeper structures via a decoupling design, showing a promising direction to address the shallow structure problem in GCNs.

5.4 Time Complexity Analysis

We select some state-of-the-art GCNs that support batch learning, and report their average training time per batch on four datasets in Table 3. For fair comparison, we set batch size as 256. Since one sample in FlowGN (i.e., one flow path) has l nodes, we use $256/l$ samples per batch for FlowGN. We can see FlowGN performs competitively; compared with other “Sink→Source”-mode GCNs (GCN and GraphSAGE), FlowGN costs less time due to its explicit information propagation mechanism. We observe that FastGCN outperforms FlowGN on every dataset. Note that FastGCN samples nodes independently across layer and ignores the dependence among nodes that are connected. FastGCN gains a high speedup with its sampling strategy but sacrifices its expressive capacity, which can be revealed from the prediction performance in Table 2.

	Cora	Citeseer	Pubmed	Coauthor
GCN (batched)	0.0282	0.0868	0.0746	1.3286
GraphSAGE-GCN	0.8493	1.8145	0.3565	3.2760
FastGCN	0.0130	0.0237	0.0059	0.0421
FlowGN	0.0185	0.0423	0.0414	0.0601

Table 3: Comparison of per-batch training time (in seconds).

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we study the information propagation mechanism of GCNs in a “*Source*→*Sink*” mode. We introduce a new concept, “information flow path”, that explicitly defines where information originates and how it diffuses. We propose a framework named FlowGN that supports flexible propagation strategies and enables deep structures. Empirical results on real-world datasets show that our method outperform alternatives in prediction accuracy with less time complexity. In the future we will mainly extend FlowGN in two directions. One direction is to design adaptive random walkers to generate flow paths that can transmit information more efficiently. The other direction is to design proper information propagation mechanism for representation learning in heterogeneous graphs.

References

- [1] Ravindra K Ahuja, Thomas L Magnanti, and James B Orlin. Network flows. 1988.
- [2] Stephen P Borgatti. Centrality and network flow. *Social networks*, 27(1):55–71, 2005.
- [3] Joan Bruna, Wojciech Zaremba, Arthur Szlam, and Yann LeCun. Spectral networks and locally connected networks on graphs. In *2nd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2014, Banff, AB, Canada, April 14-16, 2014, Conference Track Proceedings*, 2014.
- [4] Jie Chen, Tengfei Ma, and Cao Xiao. Fastgcn: fast learning with graph convolutional networks via importance sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.10247*, 2018.
- [5] Linton C Freeman. Centrality in social networks conceptual clarification. *Social networks*, 1(3): 215–239, 1978.
- [6] Aditya Grover and Jure Leskovec. node2vec: Scalable feature learning for networks. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 855–864. ACM, 2016.
- [7] Will Hamilton, Zhitao Ying, and Jure Leskovec. Inductive representation learning on large graphs. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1024–1034, 2017.
- [8] Peter D Hoff, Adrian E Raftery, and Mark S Handcock. Latent space approaches to social network analysis. *Journal of the american Statistical association*, 97(460):1090–1098, 2002.
- [9] Wenbing Huang, Tong Zhang, Yu Rong, and Junzhou Huang. Adaptive sampling towards fast graph representation learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 4563–4572, 2018.
- [10] Kenji Kawaguchi. Deep learning without poor local minima. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2016, December 5-10, 2016, Barcelona, Spain*, pages 586–594, 2016.
- [11] Thomas N Kipf and Max Welling. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.02907*, 2016.
- [12] Johannes Klicpera, Aleksandar Bojchevski, and Stephan Günnemann. Predict then propagate: Graph neural networks meet personalized pagerank. 2018.
- [13] Pang Wei Koh and Percy Liang. Understanding black-box predictions via influence functions. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2017, Sydney, NSW, Australia, 6-11 August 2017*, pages 1885–1894, 2017.
- [14] Qimai Li, Zhichao Han, and Xiao-Ming Wu. Deeper insights into graph convolutional networks for semi-supervised learning. In *Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2018.
- [15] Bryan Perozzi, Rami Al-Rfou, and Steven Skiena. Deepwalk: Online learning of social representations. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 701–710. ACM, 2014.

- [16] Prithviraj Sen, Galileo Namata, Mustafa Bilgic, Lise Getoor, Brian Galligher, and Tina Eliassi-Rad. Collective classification in network data. *AI magazine*, 29(3):93–93, 2008.
- [17] Oleksandr Shchur, Maximilian Mumme, Aleksandar Bojchevski, and Stephan Günnemann. Pitfalls of graph neural network evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.05868*, 2018.
- [18] Yizhou Sun, Jiawei Han, Xifeng Yan, Philip S Yu, and Tianyi Wu. Pathsim: Meta path-based top-k similarity search in heterogeneous information networks. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 4(11):992–1003, 2011.
- [19] Jian Tang, Meng Qu, Mingzhe Wang, Ming Zhang, Jun Yan, and Qiaozhu Mei. Line: Large-scale information network embedding. In *Proceedings of the 24th international conference on world wide web*, pages 1067–1077. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee, 2015.
- [20] Petar Velickovic, Guillem Cucurull, Arantxa Casanova, Adriana Romero, Pietro Lio, and Yoshua Bengio. Graph attention networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.10903*, 1(2), 2017.
- [21] Xiaolong Wang, Yufei Ye, and Abhinav Gupta. Zero-shot recognition via semantic embeddings and knowledge graphs. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6857–6866, 2018.
- [22] Stanley Wasserman and Katherine Faust. *Social network analysis: Methods and applications*, volume 8. Cambridge university press, 1994.
- [23] Felix Wu, Tianyi Zhang, Amauri H. Souza Jr., Christopher Fifty, Tao Yu, and Kilian Q. Weinberger. Simplifying graph convolutional networks. *CoRR*, abs/1902.07153, 2019.
- [24] Keyulu Xu, Chengtao Li, Yonglong Tian, Tomohiro Sonobe, Ken-ichi Kawarabayashi, and Stefanie Jegelka. Representation learning on graphs with jumping knowledge networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5449–5458, 2018.