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Abstract

Graph embedding is a general approach to tackling graph-analytic problems by encoding nodes into low-dimensional representations. Most existing embedding methods are transductive since the information of all nodes is required in training, including those to be predicted. In this paper, we propose a novel inductive embedding method for semi-supervised learning on graphs. This method generates node representations by learning a parametric function to aggregate information from the neighborhood using attention mechanism, and hence naturally generalizes to previously unseen nodes. Furthermore, adversarial training serves as an external regularization enforcing the learned representations to match a prior distribution for improving robustness and generalization ability. Experiments on real-world clean or noisy graphs are used to demonstrate the effectiveness of this approach.
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1. Introduction

Graph is a natural representation of data with complicated relationships and rich information, such as those present in social networks (e.g., Twitter and Facebook), biological networks (e.g., BioGRID and BioSNAP) and citation
networks (e.g., PubMed and arXiv). Due to its sparsity, nonlinearity and high-dimensionality, the analysis of graph data is profoundly challenging. Recently, a general approach to tackling this problem is graph embedding which aims at learning the low-dimensional representations of nodes. The key idea is to encode meaningful information like node features and graph structure into the learned representations (i.e., embedding vectors). Based on graph embedding [20], the graph-analytic tasks, such as node classification [25] [29] and link prediction [50] [57], can be easily performed by employing classical machine learning methods, e.g., a linear support vector machine (SVM) classifier [8].

Node classification has many practical applications such as predicting the user types in e-commerce networks [14], assigning topics for papers in citation networks [25] or classifying the protein roles in biological networks [22]. However, in many scenarios, labels are only available for a small subset of nodes due to the high cost and technical difficulty of labeling by human. To lessen the requirement of large amount of labeled training nodes, a recent surge of research interest can be seen in graph-based semi-supervised learning which aims at leveraging the ample unlabeled nodes to train together with very few labeled nodes from each class.

Many previous studies have shown that the learning accuracy can be significantly improved by unlabeled data if used properly [25] [63]. Some classical methods [61] [62] based on label propagation (LP) exploits the graph structure only, but not the node features. To utilize both, there are some successful models based on neural networks such as semi-supervised embedding [51], Planetoid [56] and graph convolutional networks (GCNs) [16] [25]. GCNs generalize the powerful convolutional neural networks (CNNs) on Euclidean data (e.g., sentences, images and 3D volumes) to deal with graph data. The simplified graph convolution proposed by Kipf and Welling [25] shows impressive performance on semi-supervised learning. This pilot work has inspired many follow-up researches [22] [47].

Most of the existing graph embedding approaches focus on embedding nodes in a fixed graph which is inherently transductive. These methods directly opti-
mize the embedding of each node based on random walk [21, 38, 43] or matrix factorization [7, 33, 48]. To predict nodes newly added to the original graph, the transductive methods need non-trivial modifications, consequently suffering from expensive computation, since the additional training is required. However, many real applications involve evolving graphs or unseen nodes. For example, in Twitter and Facebook, members join and leave frequently; their properties like hobbies, occupations and residences change overtime; social relations can establish and remove constantly. Similarly, in PubMed and arXiv, there are massive new publications and citations. An inductive approach [3, 22, 51, 56] which enables embeddings to be quickly generated for unseen nodes is essential for such cases. Compared to transductive learning, the inductive problem is especially difficult since the algorithm would have already been optimized on the existing nodes before the introduction of new nodes.

Furthermore, noise, perturbations or even attacks are commonly seen in graph data. For example, spelling mistakes, missing words and wrong expressions may exist in scientific papers. Criminals tend to hide or make up their personal information in social networks, and fraudsters often manipulate the online reviews about their products to attract customers in e-commerce platform. The general learning objective of existing graph embedding methods is to preserve well the graph structure only, or together with side information like node features. As a result, the noise on structure and features can lead to poor performance of these methods [5, 9, 64]. In semi-supervised learning, a common regularization is to make nearby nodes have similar labels based on the assumption of graph similarity [56]. As shown in [28], the working mechanism of graph convolution [25] is a special form of Laplacian smoothing which mixes the features of a node and its neighbors. Therefore, the relational effect of graph structure [64] is likely to make the performance worse since manipulating one node or edge might misguide the predictions of relational nodes.

To improve the robustness over noisy and sparse graph, some pioneering research [10, 54, 58] employs adversarial training in the graph embedding process. These works are largely inspired by the recent generative adversarial models
which are shown to be effective in learning robust representations. Similar to the principle of adversarial autoencoder (AAE), the basic idea is to match the learned representations to a certain prior distribution using adversarial training. The underlying motivation is to enforce an additional regularization on the latent representations, and to introduce a certain amount of uncertainty in the learning process. This helps improve the robustness, thus upholding the potential to avoid overfitting and achieve relatively promising generalization performance. However, to our knowledge, none of these methods focuses on robust graph embedding under the inductive semi-supervised setting.

Moreover, attention mechanism is now widely adopted in computer vision and natural language processing domains. The reason behind is to attend over important parts of the data, and to improve the performance of a deep learning model. Attention mechanism is implemented in various ways, achieving success in a variety of tasks such as machine translation, image classification and image captioning. Recently, a growing interest can be seen in employing attention models for graph embedding. In graph attention networks (GATs), the hidden representation of a node is the weighted sum of its neighborhood information. The learnable weights are named as attention coefficients indicating the importance of different neighbors. Therefore, attention allows the model to highlight neighbors containing more task-relevant information, and consequently enables a leap in the model capacity. Furthermore, attention is likely to help the model avoid or ignore the noisy parts of a graph, thus improving robustness.

In this paper, we propose a novel method, named as Adversarially regularized Graph Attention networks for Inductive learning on partially labeled graphs (AGAIN). This method aims at performing classification on nodes that are newly added to a partially labeled graph. The objective is to minimize the loss of semi-supervised node classification, and to enforce the node embeddings to match a prior distribution.

More specifically, this method encodes the graph structure and node features into embeddings by learning an aggregator function based on attention.
mechanism. The aggregator function aggregates information from the neighborhood of a given central node and updates the latent representation of this node. The attention mechanism assigns different weights to the neighboring nodes, thus representing their relative importance to the central node. At the inference time, the trained model generates embeddings for previously unseen nodes using the learned aggregator function. An adversarial training component is further employed to force the node embeddings to match a fixed prior. This component can serve as a regularizer for learning stable and robust embeddings.

The proposed method are evaluated on four datasets including three citation networks (i.e., Cora, CiteSeer and PubMed) as well as one social network named as BlogCatalog. The main contributions of this work can be summarized as follows.

- A novel graph embedding method is proposed to tackle the challenging inductive learning problem in semi-supervised setting by incorporating graph attention networks and adversarial training. The proposed method is comparable with or even superior to the state-of-the-art baseline approaches on the benchmark tests.

- Extensive experiments are conducted to investigate information aggregation, attention mechanism as well as adversarial training. Their influences are addressed regarding the model performance and the model robustness against feature noise.

- In addition to the citation networks, which are widely-used benchmark datasets, the proposed method is further tested on BlogCatalog, which is a dense social network containing rich features. The preferable performance of our method on BlogCatalog reveals its potential in many high-impact applications, since feature-rich networks are widely available in real world, such as social networks with user information, and biological networks with functional or molecular markers.

This rest of this paper is organized as follows. The relevant literature is re-
viewed in Section 2. The proposed method is detailedly described in Section 3. The experiments and results are reported in Section 4. Finally, the conclusions are summarized in Section 5.

2. Related work

Our method is conceptually inspired by the previous graph embedding algorithms, the recent advancements of neural networks for graph-structured data, the graph adversarial attacks and defenses, and the generative adversarial models on learning robust representations.

**Graph-based semi-supervised learning.** The objective of semi-supervised learning on graph is to learn a classifier based on both the labeled and unlabeled nodes. The transductive learning \[61, 62\] only aims at classifying the unlabeled nodes that are observed in training time, while inductive learning algorithms such as manifold regularization \[3\] and semi-supervised embedding \[51\] can generalize to unobserved nodes. Planetoid \[56\] has both transductive and inductive variants. The inductive algorithm, Planetoid-I, learns a parameterized classifier based on node features to facilitate predictions on nodes not seen during training.

Graph embedding is a broader research field which generally aims at mapping the nodes to representations in low-dimensional space based on graph topology structure only, or together with side information like node features. There are a number of recent approaches that learn low-dimensional embeddings based on random walk (e.g., DeepWalk \[38\], LINE \[43\] and node2vec \[21\]) and matrix factorization (e.g., GraRep \[7\], HOPE \[33\] and M-NMF \[48\]). The learning objective of these methods is to maximally preserve the topological information. Under the assumption that node features are available, some approaches are capable of exploiting both the topological and feature information, such as TADW \[55\], TriDNR \[35\] and UPP-SNE \[59\]. However, most of the above methods are transductive by training embeddings for individual nodes in a fixed graph, and not designed specifically for semi-supervised learning.
Beyond the classical graph embedding methods, increasing research interests can be seen in neural networks that operate directly on graph data. These methods are known as graph neural networks (GNNs) [53]. One fundamental advancement within these methods is the graph convolutional networks (GCNs), which can be further categorized as spectral and spatial approaches. Spectral-based approaches introduce filters for graph convolutions [6, 11, 25]. Among them, Kipf and Welling [25] simplified the previous spectral convolutions to be a localized first-order approximation for semi-supervised learning. This algorithm depends on the graph Laplacian and all node features during training, and hence lies within the transductive setting. Imitating the convolutional neural networks (CNNs) on image, the spatial approaches define graph convolution directly based on the spatial relations of a node and its neighborhood [13, 16, 22, 47]. The well-known inductive method GraphSAGE [22] computes the node embeddings by sampling a fixed-size neighborhood and then aggregating features. The feature aggregation is based on the elementwise mean of neighborhood (GS-mean), the inductive variant of GCN [25] (GS-GCN), the LSTM architecture (GS-LSTM) and elementwise max-pooling or mean-pooling operation (GS-pool). The performance of GraphSAGE in several large-scale benchmarks is quite impressive. GAT [47] introduces an attention mechanism for assigning learnable weights to the entire neighborhood nodes, and yields improved or matched performance in semi-supervised node classification. The authors also suggested using multi-head attention [16] to improve model capacity and stability. GaAN [60] assigns different learnable weights to different heads in solving the traffic forecasting problem. HAN [49] further proposes a two-level attention (i.e., node level and semantic level) for learning on heterogeneous graphs.

However, the above methods are mostly unregularized ignoring the data distribution of learned representations, which may result in poor performance on sparse and noisy graphs in real applications. In this work, we utilize an adversarial training scheme to address this issue.
Graph adversarial attacks and defenses. Many studies on image [19, 42] and text [24] have shown that neural networks are vulnerable to deliberate adversarial perturbations in the input. There are two dominant types of adversarial attacks [4, 36], namely, poisoning attacks in which the model is trained after the attack, and evasion attacks targeting the test phase in which the learned model is assumed to be fixed. Recently, it is also found that the performance of graph embedding methods including GNNs would drop significantly under malicious manipulations on graph structure or node features [5, 9, 64]. Accordingly, some defense models are proposed to improve the robustness of GNNs [52, 65]. An additional hinge loss is considered in [65] during the training process to achieve certified robustness under perturbations on the node features. Inherited from the principle of information bottleneck [44, 45], GIB [52] learns minimal sufficient node representations that naturally defend against attacks. To evaluate the model robustness, GIB employs adversarial attacks generated using Nettack [64], and simple feature attacks which inject Gaussian noise into the feature vectors. In this work, similar feature attacks are also used for robustness evaluation, due to the generality and simplicity of Gaussian noise injection.

Generative adversarial models. The deep generative model, i.e., generative adversarial networks (GANs) [18], builds a minimax adversarial game for two players: the generator and the discriminator. The discriminator is usually a multi-layer perceptron (MLP) which is trained to tell apart whether an input sample comes from the real data distribution or the generator. Simultaneously, the generator is trained to generate samples as close to the real ones as possible to fool the discriminator. Being inspired by GANs, Makhzani et al. [31] employed adversarial training to perform variational inference by matching the latent codes with a prior distribution. This adversarial autoencoder (AAE) achieves competitive performance in semi-supervised classification on images. Some other generative adversarial models are proposed to learn robust latent codes for images [12, 39] and text [17].

Recently, the adversarial regularization has been applied to graph data in
several studies. The first one is ANE \cite{10} which combines an inductive variant of DeepWalk and the adversarial training for learning robust node representations. ARGA and ARVGA \cite{34} further utilize the node features together with topological information in a similar adversarial learning scheme. NetRA \cite{58} circumvents the need of a pre-defined fixed prior, and further employs Wasserstein GANs \cite{1} to overcome the unstable problem during training. However, the inductive semi-supervised problem that this work focuses on is not considered in these prior arts.

3. Proposed method

In this section, we first introduce the problem and main notations. Then we present an overview of the model architecture, followed by a detailed description of each component. Finally, the training algorithm is provided together with an analysis of its computational complexity.

3.1. Problem definition and notations

An information network can be expressed as an attributed graph $G(V, E, X)$, where $V$ is the set of nodes, $E$ is the set of edges representing the relationships between nodes, and $X \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times D}$ is the feature matrix. $N$ is the number of nodes and $D$ is the feature dimension. $x_v^T$ is one row in the feature matrix $X$ representing the feature vector of node $v \in V$. The topological structure of unweighted graph $G$ can be represented as an adjacency matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ with each element $a_{ij}$ set as 0 or 1 specifying whether an edge exists between two nodes. The degree of the $i$th node $v$ is the number of its connected edges, i.e., $\text{degree}(v) = \sum_j a_{ij}$. The average degree is further defined as $\langle k \rangle = 2 |E| / N$ indicating the density of an undirected graph.

As shown in Figure \ref{fig:1} in this work, we investigate the classification of nodes that are newly added to a partially labeled attributed graph. The main notations used in this paper are summarized in Table \ref{table:notations}. A set of nodes, $V$, consists of labeled nodes $V_L$, and unlabeled nodes $V_U$. Some of the unlabeled
nodes (i.e., $V^o_U$) are observed during training, and the rest (i.e., $V^n_U$) are unobserved. Unobserved nodes, $V^n_U$, are added to the original graph during test phase.

Figure 1: Inductive learning under semi-supervised setting. The classifier is trained on the original graph in which only a small percentage of nodes have labels. Then the learned classifier is directly applied to make predictions on nodes that are newly added and unseen during training.

Graph embedding aims at mapping a node, $v \in V$, to a low-dimensional embedding vector $u_v$. $u_v^T$ is one row within representation matrix $U \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d}$, where $d$ is the embedding dimension. As shown in Figure 1, the attributed graph is partially labeled, that is, only a small percentage of nodes are with labels. To perform node classification on top of embeddings, the semi-supervised learning is defined as learning a classifier, $f : V \rightarrow Y$, using both labeled nodes (i.e., $V^l$) and observed unlabeled nodes (i.e., $V^o_U$). $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times C}$ is the label matrix with binary element $Y_{vk}$ indicating whether node $v$ is associated with class $k$. The total number of classes in $Y$ is $C$. There are two learning paradigms. The transductive learning only aims to predict the observed unlabeled nodes in the graph, that is, $V^o_U$. Inductive learning further seeks to generalize the classifier to nodes that are unseen in the graph during training, that is, $V^n_U$. This work focuses on the inductive semi-supervised learning.

As stated in Section 1, the robustness of a graph embedding model against noisy input is an important issue, since noise and perturbations are commonly
Table 1: Main notations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{G}$</td>
<td>An attributed graph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V, E, A$</td>
<td>Node set, edge set, and binary adjacency matrix of $\mathcal{G}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_v, X$</td>
<td>Feature vector of node $v \in V$ and feature matrix of $\mathcal{G}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u_v, U$</td>
<td>Embedding vector of node $v \in V$ and representation matrix of $\mathcal{G}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y, \hat{Y}$</td>
<td>Label matrix and prediction score matrix of $\mathcal{G}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>Number of nodes in $\mathcal{G}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>Number of labeled nodes per class in $\mathcal{G}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D, d$</td>
<td>Feature dimension and embedding dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C$</td>
<td>Number of classes in $Y$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_\varphi(\cdot), l_\psi(\cdot), d_w(\cdot)$</td>
<td>Representation learner, label classifier, and discriminator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varphi, \psi, w$</td>
<td>Sets of parameters in $f_\varphi(\cdot), l_\psi(\cdot)$ and $d_w(\cdot)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n_{\text{max}}$</td>
<td>Maximum training epoch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n_D$</td>
<td>Number of discriminator training per generator iteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K$</td>
<td>Maximum search depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>A batch of nodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s$</td>
<td>Neighborhood sample size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma$</td>
<td>Nonlinear activation function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{AGG}$</td>
<td>Aggregator function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>Attention coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>Latent representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta$</td>
<td>Percentage of nodes with noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda$</td>
<td>Feature noise ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta$</td>
<td>Performance gap</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
seen in graph data. Therefore, in this work, we assume the inputs to be noisy when evaluating robustness. For an attributed graph, these inputs are usually feature matrix and structural information such as adjacency matrix, PPMI matrix \cite{27} and random walk. Being inspired by the feature attacks in GIB \cite{52}, we randomly select a percentage of nodes in the graph, and add independent Gaussian noise to each dimension of the node features. The Gaussian noise is injected during the test phase in which the model is fixed. As introduced in Section \ref{sec:2} this kind of noise injection belongs to the evasion attacks. As shown in \cite{52}, the resilience to feature attacks, or the lack of it, can be reflected by the consequent performance under feature noise.

3.2. Overview of model architecture

Figure \ref{fig:2} shows the model architecture of the proposed method AGAIN. There are two main components, i.e., inductive learning and adversarial training. Specifically, the Graph Attention networks for INductive learning (GAIN), $f_{\phi}(\cdot)$, encodes the topological information and node features of input graph into low-dimensional embedding vectors based on information aggregation and attention mechanism. The node embeddings are further transformed by a label classifier, $l_{\psi}(\cdot)$, which is a fully-connected layer (i.e., FC layer) followed by a softmax activation, into predictions of node labels. Moreover, the adversarial training imposes a fixed prior distribution on the node embeddings. Discriminator, $d_{w}(\cdot)$, aims at discriminating the prior samples and the embedding vectors. It is a standard multi-layer perceptron (i.e., MLP), in which the output is a single neuron followed by a sigmoid activation, indicating the probability of an input sample to be real.

Note that GAIN also plays the role of generating fake samples (i.e., embedding vectors) in the adversarial networks, hence it is shared by inductive learning and adversarial training components. Three sets of parameters, $\phi$, $\psi$ and $w$, are involved in $f_{\phi}(\cdot)$, $l_{\psi}(\cdot)$ and $d_{w}(\cdot)$, respectively.
Figure 2: Architecture of the proposed method. The upper and lower tiers illustrate inductive learning and adversarial training, respectively.

Figure 3: Illustration of the neighborhood sampling and the subsequent information aggregation process. The sign “×” denotes matrix multiplication. Attention coefficient is activated by the leaky ReLU nonlinearity before softmax operation.
3.3. Inductive learning

As illustrated in Figure 3 in the neighborhood sampling stage, rather than considering the whole neighborhood of a given target node, a fixed size of neighbors are randomly sampled at each search depth. In case that sample size is larger than the node degree, neighbors are sampled with replacement. The sampling is an outward process in which the far neighborhood is gradually discovered. The maximum search depth is denoted as $K$.

Then the nodes aggregate information from their sampled neighbors. Note that the aggregation is an inward process. As the process iterates, more and more information is gained from far neighborhood by the target node.

When aggregating neighborhood information, we introduce an attention mechanism \[47\] to assign different learnable weights to the neighbors, indicating their relative importance in assisting the learning of target node. As shown in Figure 3 at step $k$, attention coefficient $\alpha_{vu}^k$ can be computed as follows.

$$\alpha_{vu}^k = \frac{\exp(\sigma_1 ((a^k)^\top [W^k h_{v}^{k-1}; W^k h_{u}^{k-1}])))}{\sum_{m \in S_v} \exp(\sigma_1 ((a^k)^\top [W^k h_{v}^{k-1}; W^k h_{m}^{k-1}])))} \quad (1)$$

where $S_v$ is the set of immediate neighbors of node $v$; $h_{v}^{k-1}(v \in V)$ and $h_{u}^{k-1}(u \in S_v)$ are the latent representations of target node $v$ and neighboring node $u$ at the previous step (i.e., $k - 1$), respectively; $a^k$ and $W^k$ are the weighting vector and matrix for linear transformations, respectively. Note that the latent representations at step $k = 0$ are node features, that is, the latent representations are initialized with node features and updated step by step. Here, leaky ReLU function (i.e., $\max(0.2x, x)$) is selected as the nonlinear activation $\sigma_1$. In case of multi-head attention, we employ the averaged attention coefficient.

The latent representation of neighborhood can then be derived as follows.

$$h_S^k = \text{AGG}_k(h_{u}^{k-1} \mid u \in S_v) = \sum_{u \in S_v} \alpha_{vu}^k h_{u}^{k-1} \quad (2)$$

in which $\text{AGG}_k$ is the aggregator function at step $k$. Then the latent represen-
tation of node $v$ at step $k$ (i.e., $h^k_v$) can be calculated.

$$h^k_v = \sigma_2([W^k_v h^{k-1}_v; W^k_S h^k_S])$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

$$h^k_v = \frac{h^k_v}{\|h^k_v\|_2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

where $W^k_v$ and $W^k_S$ are also weighting matrices for linear transformations; ReLU function (i.e., $\max(0, x)$) is used as the nonlinear activation $\sigma_2$. The final representation output at step $K$ is denoted as $u_v$, which is the learned representation (i.e., embedding vector) of node $v$.

$$u_v = h^K_v = f_\varphi(x_v, x_S), \forall v \in V$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

in which $x_v$ is the feature vector of node $v$ and $x_S$ is the feature matrix of the sampled neighboring nodes. For notational convenience, in the following descriptions, we simply use $f_\varphi(x_v)$ to denote $u_v$.

Finally, prediction score vector, $\hat{y}_v$, can be calculated by feeding embedding vector $u_v$ into fully-connected layer $l_\psi(\cdot)$.

$$\hat{y}_v = l_\psi(u_v), \forall v \in V$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

$\hat{y}_v$ is one row in the prediction score matrix $\hat{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times C}$. Under semi-supervised setting, the inductive learning component is trained by minimizing the cross-entropy loss of labeled nodes as follows.

$$L_{GAIN} = - \mathbb{E}_{v \in B} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{C} Y_{vk} \log(\hat{Y}_{vk}) \right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

where $B$ is a sampled batch from the training nodes, binary element $Y_{vk}$ within label matrix $Y$ indicates whether a node $v \in B$ belongs to class $k$, and $\hat{Y}_{vk}$ is the corresponding element in prediction score matrix $\hat{Y}$. Note that embedding vector, $u_v$, is also the fake sample in adversarial training indicated by a sign “−” in Figure 2.
3.4. Adversarial training

The adversarial training model is employed to regularize the embedding vectors, thus the learned embeddings can be enforced to match a certain prior distribution. It builds an adversarial training platform for two players, namely, generator $g_{\theta}(\cdot)$ and discriminator $d_w(\cdot)$, to play a minimax game. Specifically, generator, $g_{\theta}(\cdot)$, represents a nonlinear transformation from the input graph to embedding vectors. Here, graph attention networks, $f_{\varphi}(\cdot)$, plays the role of $g_{\theta}(\cdot)$. Real samples are sampled from a prior distribution $P_{g}(z)$, while the embedding vectors are treated as fake samples. Discriminator, $d_w(\cdot)$, is a standard multi-layer perceptron in which the output is only of one dimension, followed by a sigmoid activation, indicating the probability of an input sample to be real.

The value function of adversarial training can be expressed as follows [18].

\[
\min_{\varphi} \max_{w} \mathbb{E}_{z \sim P_{g}(z)} [\log d_w(z)] + \mathbb{E}_{x \sim P_{\text{data}}(x)} [\log (1 - d_w(f_{\varphi}(x)))]
\] (8)

in which $P_{\text{data}}(x)$ is the feature distribution of nodes.

During training, the discriminator is trained to distinguish prior samples from embedding vectors, while the generator aims to fit node embeddings to the prior distribution, thus misguiding the discriminator. We can separate the training of discriminator and generator. As the discriminator, the loss function is defined as

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\text{DIS}}(w; x, z) = -\mathbb{E}_{z \sim P_{g}(z)} [\log d_w(z)] - \mathbb{E}_{x \sim P_{\text{data}}(x)} [\log (1 - d_w(f_{\varphi}(x)))]
\] (9)

and the cost function for generator is

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\text{GEN}}(\varphi; x) = -\mathbb{E}_{x \sim P_{\text{data}}(x)} [\log (d_w(f_{\varphi}(x)))]
\] (10)

In many practices of previous studies [12, 31], the Gaussian or Uniform distribution is chosen as a prior for learning robust representations. Note that, in this work, the prior distribution produces real samples, rather than serving as a source of noise for generating fake samples as in [18].
3.5. Algorithm

AGAIN learns node representations by minimizing the cross-entropy loss of semi-supervised learning in an adversarial training process. In inductive learning phase, graph attention networks $f_{\varphi}(\cdot)$ and fully-connected layer $l_{\psi}(\cdot)$ are updated to minimize the cross-entropy loss of labeled nodes. In adversarial training phase, the adversarial networks first update discriminator $d_{\omega}(\cdot)$ to tell apart real samples (i.e., vectors from prior distribution) from fake samples (i.e., embedding vectors). Then, generator, $f_{\varphi}(\cdot)$, is updated to confuse the discriminator. The joint minibatch training procedure is shown in Algorithm 1.

Given an attributed graph, we first sample neighboring nodes and aggregate information to obtain the embeddings of target nodes as well as their label predictions (Steps 2–10). In the inner loop, $k$ denotes the current step. $h_{vk}$ is the representation of a node at this step. Note that this aggregation process relies on the representations generated in the last step (i.e., $k - 1$). The representation at $k = 0$ is node feature $x_v$. The neighborhood information is aggregated using attention mechanism (i.e., Eq. 2) into a single vector $h_{vk}^S$. Then previous representation $h_{vk}^{k-1}$ and aggregated neighborhood vector $h_{vk}^S$ are concatenated after linear transformations, and further activated by a nonlinear function $\sigma$ to obtain $h_{vk}^k$. The final representation at depth $K$ is embedding vector $u_v$. The embedding vector is further fed through classifier $l_{\psi}(\cdot)$ to obtain label prediction $\hat{y}_v$. Cross-entropy loss is calculated based on the predictions and ground-truth labels using Eq. 7.

Then the same number of samples from the generated embeddings and the prior distribution are fed into discriminator $d_{\omega}(\cdot)$ (Steps 11–16). In addition, graph attention networks, $f_{\varphi}(\cdot)$, serves as a generator to confuse the trained discriminator and update itself (Steps 17–19). Therefore, the parameters of $f_{\varphi}(\cdot)$ are updated by inductive learning and adversarial training alternatively.

Computational analysis. The computational complexity of inductive learning is proportional to the number of parameters $|\varphi|$ and $|\psi|$ in every epoch. Hence, the overall complexity is $O(n_{\text{max}}(|\varphi| + |\psi|))$. Similarly, the computational com-
Algorithm 1 AGAIN Minibatch Training

Require: Graph $G(V, E)$; node features $\{x_v, v \in V\}$; maximum training epoch $n_{\text{max}}$; maximum search depth $K$; number of discriminator training per generator iteration $n_D$; attention aggregator function $\text{AGG}_k$, $k \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$; weight matrices $W^k_v$ and $W^k_S$, $k \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$; nonlinearity $\sigma$.

1: for epoch $< n_{\text{max}}$ do
2: Sample a batch of nodes (i.e., $B$) with initial representations set as $h^0_v = x_v$ ($v \in B$) and sample the neighboring features $x_S$ (including those of the immediate neighbors, i.e., $S_v$).
3: for $k = 1, \ldots, K$ do
4: $h^k_S = \text{AGG}_k(h^{k-1}_u | u \in S_v)$
5: $h^k_v = \sigma([W^k_v h^{k-1}_v; W^k_S h^k_S])$
6: $h^k_v = h^k_v / \| h^k_v \|_2$
7: end for
8: $u_v = h^K_v = f_\varphi(x_v, x_S), \hat{y}_v = l_\psi(u_v)$.
9: Compute the cross-entropy loss using Eq. 7
10: Backpropagate loss and update $\varphi$ and $\psi$
11: for $n < n_D$ do
12: Sample a batch of nodes $x_v$ ($v \in B$) and compute embeddings $u_v$
13: Sample a batch from the prior distribution $z_i \sim P_g(z)$ ($i = 1, \ldots, |B|$)
14: Compute $L_{\text{DIS}}$ using Eq. 9
15: Backpropagate loss and update $w$
16: end for
17: Sample a batch of nodes $x_v$ ($v \in B$) and compute embeddings $u_v$
18: Compute $L_{\text{GEN}}$ using Eq. 10
19: Backpropagate loss and update $\varphi$
20: end for
plexity of generator and discriminator are typically linear with the number of parameters $|\varphi|$ and $|w|$, respectively. Therefore, the complexity of adversarial training is $O(n_{\text{max}}(n_D |w| + |\varphi|))$.

4. Experiments

In this section, we first evaluate the performance of proposed method on inductive node classification in comparison with baseline methods. Then the effectiveness of the learning strategies, including information aggregation, attention mechanism and adversarial training, is investigated. Finally, we analyze the influences of embedding dimension and neighborhood sample size.

4.1. Experiment settings

Datasets. We conduct experiments on four real-world datasets as described in Table 2. The three citation graphs [41] (i.e., Cora, CiteSeer and PubMed) have nodes and edges representing publications and citation links, respectively. These publications are categorized based on their corresponding research topics. For example, Cora consists of machine learning papers which belong to one of the seven classes named as “case based”, “genetic algorithms”, “neural networks”, “probabilistic methods”, “reinforcement learning”, “rule learning” and “theory”. For Cora and CiteSeer, each paper is described by a feature vector with binary values indicating whether each word from a dictionary is present. The publications in PubMed have features described by Term Frequency–Inverse Document Frequency (TF-IDF) vectors drawn from a dictionary consisting of 500 unique words. Therefore, for each citation networks, the feature dimension $D$ of a node is determined by the dictionary size.

BlogCatalog [23] is an online community in which bloggers follow each other. It is modeled as a social network, with nodes and edges representing bloggers and their following relationships, respectively. The feature vector of each blogger is obtained according to the corresponding blog description. The bloggers are categorized into one of the six predefined categories based on their interests.
The goal of node classification in this work is to classify one publication into a certain research topic, or predict the interest of a blogger. Note that we treat all networks here as undirected graphs. In the performance study (Section 4.2), the labeled nodes of each citation graph are the same as the designated ones in the Planetoid paper [56] for fair comparison. In all the other experiments of Section 4, the labeled nodes are randomly selected from the training data. Specifically, we randomly choose the same number of labeled nodes for each class in the training nodes. In [56], the number of labeled nodes per class (i.e., $n$) is fixed as 20. However, in this work, the labeled number, $n$, varies from 20 to 100 for more thorough investigation. The remaining training nodes are unlabeled. Under inductive setting, the test nodes are unobserved during training. Following the setting of [56], the number of test nodes in each graph is fixed as 1000.

**Baselines.** We compare AGAIN with three groups of baselines.

- LR, DeepWalk [38] and DeepWalk+: These unsupervised baselines are followed by the logistic regression classifier. LR is directly trained on the node features. DeepWalk generates embedding vector for each node based on the graph structure. In DeepWalk+, the DeepWalk embeddings are further concatenated with node features.

- ManiReg [3], SemiEmb [51] and Planetoid-I [56]: These baselines are graph-based semi-supervised learning methods. Graph Laplacian regul-
larization is employed in these methods to impose penalty if nearby nodes are predicted to have different labels. Note that these baselines are inductive and can naturally handle unseen nodes.

- GS-GCN, GS-mean, GS-LSTM and GS-pool: These baselines are variants of GraphSAGE \cite{165} with different aggregator functions for information aggregation from sampled neighborhood. Note that the original GraphSAGE method only has unsupervised and fully-supervised versions. We adapt the fully-supervised one to be semi-supervised which only has a few labeled nodes during training. Similar to GCN \cite{166}, since the graph structure is incorporated in the neighborhood sampling process, these baselines are directly trained on the supervised loss of labeled nodes, without having to consider the Laplacian regularization.

**Parameter settings.** For baselines using logistic regression (i.e., LR, DeepWalk and DeepWalk+), we use the logistic SGDClassifier in the scikit-learn Python package \cite{167} with default settings. For DeepWalk, we follow the settings in GraphSAGE \cite{165}, and perform a new round of SGD optimization to update the embeddings of new test nodes before making predictions, while holding the embeddings of already trained nodes fixed. For Planetoid-I, we use the public source code\footnote{https://github.com/kimiyoung/planetoid} provided by the authors with default settings, and sweep learning rate in the set \{0.1, 0.01, 0.001\}.

For methods based on neighborhood sampling and information aggregation (i.e., the variants of GraphSAGE as well as our proposed methods GAIN and AGAIN), as in GraphSAGE \cite{165}, we use the rectified linear unit (ReLU) (i.e., \(\max(0, x)\)) as nonlinearity \(\sigma\) in Algorithm \[1\] and set the maximum search depth as \(K = 2\), with neighborhood sample sizes \(s_1 = 25\) and \(s_2 = 10\). As mentioned in \cite{165}, increasing \(K\) beyond 2 leads to marginal accuracy improvement, while large increment can be seen in the corresponding runtime. The influence of sample size (i.e., \(s\)) on classification accuracy will be discussed in Section 4.4.
Figure 4 shows the implementation details of the architecture of AGAIN presented in Figure 2. For GAIN and AGAIN, representation learner, $f_{\psi}(\cdot)$, is a two-layer graph attention model. In both layers, the attention coefficients are calculated using Eq. 1, with the dimension of the weighting vector $a$ selected in the set $\{64, 128, 256, 512, 1024, 2048\}$. For each layer, the dimension of the output vector $h^k_v$ in Algorithm 1 is set as 256 following the setting of [22]. The number of attention heads in every layer is also the same. Single-head attention is employed in all cases.

Label classifier, $l_{\psi}(\cdot)$, is a fully-connected single-layer neural network (i.e., FC layer) followed by a softmax activation. Its input and output dimensions are the dimension of embedding vector $u_v$ (i.e., 256) and the number of classes in each dataset (i.e., $C$), respectively. Discriminator, $d_w(\cdot)$, is a four-layer neural network (i.e., MLP) with the dimensions of three hidden layers set as 1024, 1024, and 256 in sequence. The output of discriminator is of one dimension, indicating the probability of an input sample to be real. We use leaky ReLU activation.
(i.e., $\max(ax, x), a = 0.2$) in the first three layers, and employ sigmoid activation in the output layer. The default prior of AGAIN is a multivariate Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, 10^p \mathbf{I})$. The dimension of a prior sample is the same as embedding dimension $d$. Power exponent, $p$, is swept in the set \{-2, -1, 0, 1, 2\}.

Both GAIN and AGAIN are implemented in PyTorch using the Adam optimizer with the learning rate set as 0.001. In order to prevent overfitting, $L_2$ regularization is also considered in the loss function for all the learnable weights, with the weight decay term selected in the set \{0.00005, 0.0005, 0.005, 0.05\}. All weights are initialized by the default way provided in PyTorch. We train both models for a maximum of 200 epochs (i.e., $n_{\text{max}} = 200$) and with a batch size (i.e., $|B|$) of 256. Table 3 provides the implementation details of the mini-batch training described in Algorithm 1 for each dataset, with $n$ denoting the number of labeled training nodes per class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$n_{\text{max}}$</th>
<th>$n_D$</th>
<th>$K$</th>
<th>$s^*$</th>
<th>learning rate</th>
<th>weight decay</th>
<th>dropout</th>
<th>batchsize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BlogCatalog</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 {25, 10}</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cora</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 {25, 10}</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CiteSeer</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 {25, 10}</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PubMed</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 {25, 10}</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Neighborhood sample size, $s$, is denoted as a set \{$s_1, \ldots, s_K$\} containing the sample size $s_k$ in each search depth $k$. 

*Table 3: Values of the hyperparameters of AGAIN*
For fair comparison, the embedding dimensions of above methods are set as $d = 256$. All results are averaged by 10 runs with different random seeds. We run the experiments using a machine with one NVIDIA GeForce GTX 1080Ti GPU (11 GB of RAM), an Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-8700K (6 cores, 3.70 GHz) and 32 GB of RAM.

4.2. Performance study

Experiments are conducted on inductive benchmark task to verify the proposed method first. We follow the dataset split in the Planetoid paper [56] for fair comparison. 1000 nodes are selected as test data. There are only 20 labeled nodes for each class in the training nodes, i.e., $n = 20$. The experimental results are summarized in Table 4. For the citation datasets, the accuracies of ManiReg, SemiEmb and Planetoid-I are taken from [56]. Since the results of these methods on BlogCatalog are not reported in [56], the corresponding cells of ManiReg and SemiEmb are left empty. For Planetoid-I, as stated in Section 4.1, its performance is evaluated by executing the source code.

In the first group of baselines, LR obtains much higher accuracy than DeepWalk. This indicates that, for attributed graphs, node features can be more informative than graph structure on learning embeddings. The importance of feature information is further validated by the performance lift of DeepWalk+ compared to DeepWalk, after concatenating node features with the learned embeddings. Note that DeepWalk has poor performance in inductive task, despite the fact that it is far more competitive in transductive learning. Furthermore, DeepWalk performs worst on CiteSeer, which is probably attributed to the low average degree (see Table 2).

Incorporating the information on features, structure and labels of an attributed graph, the graph-based semi-supervised learning methods yield performance generally superior to the first group of baselines. Among them, Planetoid-I is the most competitive one. Further improvements can be seen in the variants of GraphSAGE.

On Cora, the performance of AGAIN and GAIN is comparable with the best
Table 4: Classification accuracy on test data (in percent). For each dataset, the top two values are highlighted in bold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>BlogCatalog</th>
<th>Cora</th>
<th>CiteSeer</th>
<th>PubMed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LR</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeepWalk</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeepWalk+</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ManiReg</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SemiEmb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planetoid-I</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-GCN</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-mean</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-LSTM</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-pool</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td><strong>80.2</strong></td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAIN</td>
<td><strong>79.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>80.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>69.2</strong></td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAIN</td>
<td><strong>80.1</strong></td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td><strong>70.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>77.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GraphSAGE variants (i.e., GS-mean and GS-pool). AGAIN outperforms other methods in the remaining cases, with wide margins obtained on BlogCatalog and CiteSeer. Note that the accuracy of Planetoid-I on PubMed is higher than all GraphSAGE variants as well as GAIN. We conjecture that methods based on information aggregation are more suitable for feature-rich graphs [22]. Since the feature dimension of PubMed is lowest (see Table 2), these methods might suffer in performance.

Figure 5 displays the 2D projected spaces of the embedding vectors of test nodes in Cora and BlogCatalog using t-SNE [30], under the same parameter configuration. We select Planetoid-I and GS-pool as representative baselines, and neglect methods in the first group due to their low accuracies. For quantitative analysis, as shown in Table 5 we further calculate the corresponding Silhouette score [40] for the clusters in a 2D projected space. It is shown that the clusters of AGAIN are separated more clearly with highest Silhouette scores.

Figure 5: Visualization of the embedding spaces of Cora and BlogCatalog (best viewed in color). For Cora, each point corresponds to one paper. Seven colors distinguish different paper classes. For BlogCatalog, each point represents one blogger. Six colors denote different interests.
Table 5: Silhouette score of the clusters in a 2D projected space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Planetoid-I</th>
<th>GS-pool</th>
<th>GAIN</th>
<th>AGAIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cora</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BlogCatalog</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>0.341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3. Ablation study

In this section, we investigate the influences of information aggregation, attention mechanism and adversarial training on learning embeddings step by step. We construct a two-layer MLP, which only uses node features as input, without having to consider graph structure, and outputs predictions. The first layer of MLP is similar to representation learner $f_\phi(\cdot)$ in Figure 2. The second layer can be treated as label classifier $l_\psi(\cdot)$. Therefore, the hidden dimension of MLP is set as embedding dimension $d$. Referring to the neighborhood representation obtained using Eq. 2, GS-mean takes the average of the latent representations of neighbors with equal weights. However, GAIN assigns different learnable weights (i.e., attention coefficients) to these neighboring nodes. Then AGAIN further combines adversarial training with GAIN, constraining the learned embeddings to match a fixed prior.

Table 6 provides the results for comparison. The number of labeled nodes per class $n$ varies from 20 to 100. It shows that the methods based on information aggregation (i.e., GS-mean, GAIN and AGAIN) are superior to MLP which exploits node features solely. Compared with GS-mean, GAIN obtains higher accuracy in most cases. Large margins can be seen on BlogCatalog, where GAIN achieves on average 2.93% relative gain in accuracy over GS-mean. However, the margins are small in citation graphs which are relatively sparse. This indicates that attention mechanism can be more powerful in a dense graph containing rich features. AGAIN outperforms GAIN in more cases, which reveals that, adversarial regularization has the potential to improve generalization ability.

To further investigate the effects of attention mechanism and adversarial
Table 6: Summary of classification accuracy (in percent). The number of labeled nodes per class, $n$, varies from 20 to 100. Bold font denotes the top model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BlogCatalog</th>
<th>Cora</th>
<th>CiteSeer</th>
<th>PubMed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-mean</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>81.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

training on improving the robustness of embeddings, we corrupt the node features in test phase after the models are trained. Referring to GIB [52], a simple noise model for graphs with features is additive Gaussian noise. We randomly choose a percentage of nodes (denoted as $\eta$), and add independent Gaussian noise ($\lambda \cdot r \cdot \epsilon$) to each dimension of their feature vectors, with increasing amplitude. Here, random number, $\epsilon$, is from standard normal distribution $N(0, 1)$. Feature noise ratio, $\lambda$, is selected in the set $\{0, 0.5, 1.0, 1.5\}$. When $\lambda$ equals 0, it is the case without noise. To incorporate the graph property during noise injection, reference amplitude, $r$, is obtained by taking the average of the maximum value in each node’s feature vector. As stated in Section 2, the noise here is similar to the evasion attacks.

In real applications, a frequently encountered situation would be a small fraction of nodes are noisy. Therefore, the percentage of nodes with noise, $\eta$, is first fixed as 10%. The experimental results are reported in Table 7. GAIN outperforms GS-mean in most cases, which indicates the potential of attention mechanism on improving robustness. Moreover, the accuracy of AGAIN is higher than that of GAIN, except those on CiteSeer. This reveals that adversarial training contributes to generating robust embeddings in some degree. For comprehensive evaluation, we also present the results of Planetoid-I and GS-pool, which are found to be mostly inferior to those of our methods. There is
one exception on BlogCatalog, where Planetoid-I performs best when the noise amplitude is high (i.e., $\lambda = 1.5$). The likely reason is that the methods relying on information aggregation are influenced by the relational effect of graph structure [64]. Referring to Figure 3 the noise added on one node might misguide the predictions of other nodes with structural relations, and consequently causing worse model performance, especially when the high-intensity noise is injected into a dense graph.

Table 7: Classification accuracy in percent for the trained models with increasing additive feature noise ($n = 60, \eta = 10\%$). Bold font denotes the top model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>BlogCatalog</th>
<th>Cora</th>
<th>CiteSeer</th>
<th>PubMed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\lambda$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planetoid-I</td>
<td></td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-pool</td>
<td></td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAIN</td>
<td><strong>89.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>82.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>78.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>72.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further investigations are conducted by varying the percentage of nodes with noise (i.e., $\eta$). For the sake of clarity, performance gap, $\Delta$, is obtained through subtracting the accuracy of GAIN from that of GS-mean or AGAIN. As shown in Figure 6 the performance of attention mechanism and adversarial training varies with the node percentage and graph property. In general, as the percentage of nodes with noise increasing, attention brings improvement first but fails gradually. The adversarial training is found to be workable in a wide region, but the performance gain shrinks or even becomes negative when more nodes are corrupted with noise.

4.4. Hyperparameter sensitivity study

In this section, we analyze the classification accuracy of AGAIN with regard to two key hyperparameters, i.e., the embedding dimension $d$ and the neighbor-
Figure 6: Performance gap (i.e., $\Delta$) on Cora and BlogCatalog ($n = 60$). $\eta$ is the percentage of nodes in a graph corrupted with additive feature noise. $\lambda$ is the feature noise ratio.
hood sample size $s$. Except for the hyperparameter under testing (i.e., $d$ or $s$), the others are set as default values (see Table 3). As shown in Figure 7, the prediction accuracy gets saturated as the embedding dimension increases. Similar trends can be seen on Cora and PubMed, when increasing the size of sampled neighbors. However, there are little variations on CiteSeer due to its low average degree (see Table 2). In contrast, when the test is applied on BlogCatalog which has relatively high density, the accuracy increases steadily with the sample size. Note that we select the same size of neighbors in each search depth (i.e., $s_1 = s_2$) when investigating the sample size, as mentioned in Section 4.1.

![Figure 7: Hyperparameter sensitivity analysis (n = 60)](image)

5. Conclusion

An adversarially regularized graph embedding method has been proposed in this work for inductive semi-supervised learning. This method combines inductive learning and adversarial training. In inductive learning, the embeddings are generated based on information aggregation and attention mechanism. In adversarial training, a minimax optimization is employed to impose a prior distribution on the node embeddings. The experimental results on inductive node
classification show that, the proposed method achieves matched or even preferable performance compared with the state-of-the-art baselines. Attention mechanism is found to be more powerful on dense graphs containing rich features. Adversarial training helps improve the generalization ability and robustness to some extent.

More studies on attention mechanism and adversarial training are left for future work, in order to further explore their mechanisms and capabilities regarding graph property and the nature of a task. Furthermore, potential applications remain to be explored, since feature-rich graphs are widely available in real world, such as citation networks with text attributes, social networks with user information, and biological networks with functional or molecular markers.
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