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Abstract

This paper studies unsupervised/self-supervised whole-graph representation learning, which is critical in many tasks such as molecule properties prediction in drug and material discovery. Existing methods mainly focus on preserving the local similarity structure between different graph instances but fail to discover the global semantic structure of the entire data set. In this paper, we propose a unified framework called Local-instance and Global-semantic Learning (GraphLoG) for self-supervised whole-graph representation learning. Specifically, besides preserving the local similarities, GraphLoG introduces the hierarchical prototypes to capture the global semantic clusters. An efficient online expectation-maximization (EM) algorithm is further developed for learning the model. We evaluate GraphLoG by pre-training it on massive unlabeled graphs followed by fine-tuning on downstream tasks. Extensive experiments on both chemical and biological benchmark data sets demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed approach.

1. Introduction

Learning informative representations of whole graphs is a fundamental problem in a variety of domains and tasks, such as molecule properties prediction in drug and material discovery (Gilmer et al., 2017; Wu et al., 2018), protein function forecast in biological networks (Alvarez & Yan, 2012; Jiang et al., 2017), and predicting the properties of circuits in circuit design (Zhang et al., 2019). Recently, Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) have attracted a surge of interest and showed the effectiveness in learning graph representations. These methods are usually trained in a supervised fashion, which requires a large number of labeled data. Nevertheless, in many scientific domains, labeled data are very limited and expensive to obtain. Therefore, it is becoming increasingly important to learn the representations of graphs in an unsupervised or self-supervised fashion.

Self-supervised learning has recently achieved profound success for both natural language processing, e.g. GPT (Radford et al., 2018) and BERT (Devlin et al., 2019), and image understanding, e.g. MoCo (He et al., 2019) and SimCLR (Chen et al., 2020). However, how to effectively learn the representations of graphs in a self-supervised way is still an open problem. Intuitively, a desirable graph representation should be able to preserve the local-instance structure, so that similar graphs are embedded close to each other and dissimilar ones stay far apart. In addition, the representations of the entire set of graphs should also reflect the global-semantic structure of the data, so that the graphs with similar semantic properties are compactly embedded, which is able to benefit various downstream tasks such as graph classification or regression. Such global structure can be effectively captured by semantic clusters (Caron et al., 2018; Ji et al., 2019), which can be further organized hierarchically (Li et al., 2020).

There are some recent works that learn graph representation in a self-supervised manner, such as local-global mutual information maximization (Velickovic et al., 2019; Sun et al., 2019), structural-similarity/context prediction (Navarin et al., 2018; Hu et al., 2019; You et al., 2020b), contrastive learning (Hassani & Ahmadi, 2020; Qiu et al., 2020; You et al., 2020a) and meta-learning (Lu et al., 2021). However, all these methods are able to model only the local structure between different graph instances but fail to discover the global-semantic structure. To address this shortcoming, we are seeking for an approach that is sufficient to model both the local and global structure of a set of graphs.

To attain this goal, we propose a Local-instance and Global-semantic Learning (GraphLoG) framework for self-supervised graph representation learning. Specifically, for preserving the local similarity between various graph instances, we seek to align the embeddings of correlated graphs/subgraphs by discriminating the correlated graph/subgraph pairs from the negative pairs. In this locally
smooth latent space, we further introduce the additional model parameters, hierarchical prototypes\(^1\), to depict the latent distribution of a graph data set in a hierarchical way. For model learning, we propose to maximize the data likelihood with respect to both the GNN parameters and hierarchical prototypes via an online expectation-maximization (EM) algorithm. Given a mini-batch of graphs sampled from the data distribution, in the E-step, we infer the embeddings of these graphs with a GNN and sample the latent variable of each graph (i.e., the prototypes associated to each graph) from the posterior distribution defined by current model. In the M-step, we aim to maximize the expectation of complete-data likelihood with respect to the current model by optimizing with a mini-batch-induced objective function. Therefore, in this iterative EM process, the global-semantic structure of the data can be gradually discovered and refined. The whole model is pre-trained with a large number of unlabeled graphs, and then fine-tuned and evaluated on some downstream tasks containing scarce labeled graphs.

To verify the effectiveness of the GraphLoG framework, we apply our method to both the chemistry and biology domains. Through pre-training on massive unlabeled molecular graphs (or protein ego-networks) under the guided local and global objectives, the existing GNN models are able to achieve superior performance on the downstream molecular property (or biological function) prediction benchmarks. In particular, the Graph Isomorphism Network (GIN) (Xu et al., 2019) pre-trained by the proposed method outperforms the previous self-supervised graph representation learning approaches on six of eight downstream tasks of chemistry domain, and it achieves a 2.1% performance gain in terms of average ROC-AUC on eight downstream tasks. In addition, the analytical experiments further illustrate the benefits of global structure learning through conducting ablation studies and visualizing the embedding distributions on a set of graphs.

\(^1\)Hierarchical prototypes are representative cluster embeddings organized as a set of trees.

2. Problem Definition and Preliminaries

2.1. Problem Definition

An ideal representation should preserve the local structure among various data instances. More specifically, we define it as follows:

**Definition 1 (Local-instance Structure).** The local structure aims to preserve the pairwise similarity between different instances after mapping from the high-dimensional input space to the low-dimensional latent space (Roweis & Saul, 2000; Belkin & Niyogi, 2002). For a pair of similar graphs/subgraphs, \(G\) and \(G'\), their embeddings are expected to be nearby in the latent space, as illustrated in Fig. 1(a), while the dissimilar pairs should be mapped to far apart.

The pursuit of local-instance structure alone is usually insufficient to capture the semantics underlying the entire data set. It is therefore important to discover the global-semantic structure of the data, which is concretely defined as follows:

**Definition 2 (Global-semantic Structure).** A real-world data set can usually be organized as various semantic clusters (Furnas et al., 2017; Ji et al., 2019), especially in a hierarchical way for graph-structured data (Ashburner et al., 2000; Chen et al., 2012b). After mapping to the latent space, the embeddings of a set of graphs are expected to form some global structures reflecting the clustering patterns of the original data. A graphical illustration can be seen in Fig. 1(b).

**Problem Definition.** The problem of self-supervised graph representation learning considers a set of unlabeled graphs \(G = \{G_1, G_2, \cdots, G_M\}\), and we aim at learning a low-dimensional vector \(h_{G_m} \in \mathbb{R}^d\) for each graph \(G_m \in G\) under the guidance of the data itself. In specific, we expect the graph embeddings \(H = \{h_{G_1}, h_{G_2}, \cdots, h_{G_M}\}\) follow both the local-instance and global-semantic structure.

2.2. Preliminaries

**Graph Neural Networks (GNNs).** A typical graph can be represented as \(G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, X_{\mathcal{V}}, X_{\mathcal{E}})\), where \(\mathcal{V}\) is a set of
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Figure 1. Illustration of GraphLoG. (a) Correlated graphs are constrained to be adjacently embedded to pursue the local-instance structure of the data. (b) Hierarchical prototypes are employed to discover and refine the global-semantic structure of the data.
nodes, $E$ denotes the edge set, $X_V = \{ X_v | v \in V \}$ stands for the attributes of all nodes, and $X_E = \{ X_{uv} | (u, v) \in E \}$ represents the edge attributes. A GNN aims to learn an embedding vector $h_u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for each node $v \in V$ and also a vector $h_G \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for the entire graph $G$. For an $L$-layer GNN, a neighborhood aggregation scheme is performed to capture the $L$-hop information surrounding each node. As suggested in Gilmer et al. (2017), the $l$-th layer of a GNN can be formalized as follows:

$$h_u^{(l)} = f_U^{(l)}(h_u^{(l-1)}, f_M^{(l)}(\{(h_v^{(l-1)}, h_u^{(l-1)}, X_{uv}) : u \in \mathcal{N}(v)\})),$$

(1)

where $\mathcal{N}(v)$ is the neighborhood set of $v$, $h_u^{(l)}$ denotes the representation of node $v$ at the $l$-th layer, $h_u^{(0)}$ is initialized as the node attribute $X_v$, and $f_M^{(l)}$ and $f_U^{(l)}$ stand for the message passing and update function at the $l$-th layer, respectively. Since $h_v$ summarizes the information of a subgraph centered around node $v$, we will refer to $h_v$ as subgraph embedding to underscore this point. The entire graph’s embedding can be derived as below:

$$h_G = f_R(\{h_v | v \in V\}),$$

(2)

where $f_R$ is a permutation-invariant readout function, e.g. mean pooling or more complex graph-level pooling function (Ying et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2018).

**General EM Algorithm.** The basic objective of EM algorithm (Dempster et al., 1977; Krishnan et al., 1997) is to find the maximum likelihood solution for a model containing latent variables. In such a problem, we denote the set of all observed data as $X$, the set of all latent variables as $Z$ and the set of all model parameters as $\theta$.

In the E-step, using the data $X$ and the model parameters $\theta_{t-1}$ estimated by the last EM cycle, the posterior distribution of latent variables is derived as $p(Z|X, \theta_{t-1})$ which can also be regarded as the responsibility that a specific set of latent variables are taken for explaining the observations.

In the M-step, employing the posterior distribution given by the E-step, the expectation of complete-data log-likelihood, denoted as $Q(\theta)$, is evaluated for the general model parameters $\theta$ as follows:

$$Q(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{p(Z|X, \theta_{t-1})}[\log p(X, Z|\theta)].$$

(3)

The model parameters are updated to maximize this expectation in the M-step, which outputs:

$$\theta_t = \arg \max_{\theta} Q(\theta).$$

(4)

Each cycle of EM can increase the complete-data likelihood expected by the current model, and, considering the whole progress, the EM algorithm has been demonstrated to be capable of maximizing the marginal likelihood function $p(X|\theta)$ (Hathaway, 1986; Neal & Hinton, 1998).

### 3. GraphLoG: Self-supervised Graph-level Representation Learning with Local and Global Structure

In this section, we introduce our approach called Local-instance and Global-semantic Learning (GraphLoG) for self-supervised graph representation learning. The main purpose of GraphLoG is to discover and refine both the local and global structures of graph embeddings in the latent space, such that we can learn useful graph representations for the downstream task like graph classification. Specifically, GraphLoG constructs a locally smooth latent space by aligning the embeddings of correlated graphs/subgraphs. On such basis, the global structures of graph embeddings are modeled by hierarchical prototypes, and the data likelihood is maximized via an online EM algorithm. Next, we elucidate the GraphLoG framework in detail.

#### 3.1. Learning Local-instance Structure of Graph Representations

Following the existing methods for dimensionality reduction (Tenenbaum et al., 2000; Roweis & Saul, 2000; Belkin & Niyogi, 2002), the goal of local-structure learning is to preserve the local similarity of the data before and after mapping to a low-dimensional latent space. In specific, it is expected that similar graphs or subgraphs are embedded close to each other, and dissimilar ones are mapped to far apart. Using a similarity measurement defined in the latent space, we formulate this problem as maximizing the similarity of correlated graph/subgraph pairs while minimizing that of negative pairs.

In specific, given a graph $G = (V, E, X_V, X_E)$ sampled from the data distribution $P_G$, we obtain its correlated counterpart $G' = (V', E', X_{V'}, X_{E'})$ through randomly masking a part of node/edge attributes in the graph (Hu et al., 2019) (see appendix for the detailed scheme). In addition, for a subgraph $G_v$ constituted by node $v$ and its $L$-hop neighborhoods in graph $G$, we regard the corresponding subgraph $G_v'$ in graph $G'$ as its correlated counterpart. Through applying an $L$-layer GNN model GNN$_\theta$ ($\theta$ stands for GNN’s parameters) upon graph $G$ and $G'$, the graph and subgraph embeddings are derived as follows:

$$(h_G, h_G') = \text{GNN}_\theta(G), \quad (h_{G_v}, h_{G_v'}) = \text{GNN}_\theta(G_v'),$$

(5)

where $h_G = \{ h_{G_v} | v \in V \}$ and $h_{G'} = \{ h_{G'_v} | v \in V' \}$ represent the set of subgraph embeddings within graph $G$ and $G'$, respectively.

In this phase, the objective of learning is to enhance the similarity of correlated graph/subgraph pairs while diminish that of negative pairs. Using a specific similarity measure (e.g. cosine similarity $s(x, y) = x^T y / ||x|| ||y||$ in our practice), we seeks to optimize the following two objective functions.
The goal of global-semantic learning is to encourage the graphs to be compactly embedded around corresponding C sesses a set of child nodes, denoted as of trees (Fig. 1(b)), in which each node corresponds to a prototype at the hierarchical prototypes structure cannot be attained via label-induced supervision. However, for the lack of explicit semantic labels in the self-supervised graph representation learning, such global structure exploration, we first pre-train the GNN model and employ the derived GNN model to extract the embeddings of all graphs in the data set, and the K-means clustering is applied upon these graph embeddings to initialize the bottom layer prototypes (i.e., \{c_i^L\}_{i=1}^{M_L} \) with the output cluster centers. The prototypes of upper layers are initialized by iteratively applying K-means clustering to the prototypes of the layer below. For each time of clustering, we discard the output cluster centers assigned less than two samples to avoid trivial solutions (Bach & Harchaoui, 2007; Caron et al., 2018).

Next, we state the details of the E-step and M-step applied in our method.

**E-step.** In this step, we first randomly sample a mini-batch of graphs \( G = \{G_1, G_2, \cdots, G_N\} \) (\( N \) denotes the batch size) from the data set \( G \), and \( Z = \{z_g^1, z_g^2, \cdots, z_g^N\} \) stands for the latent variables corresponding to these sampled graphs. Each latent variable \( z_g^m = \{z_{g_1}^1, z_{g_2}^2, \cdots, z_{g_l}^2\} \) is a chain of prototypes from top layer to bottom layer that best represent graph \( G_m \) in the latent space, and it holds that \( z_{g_l}^1 \) is observed data set \( G = \{G_1, G_2, \cdots, G_M\} \), we consider a latent variable set, i.e. the prototype assignments of all graphs \( Z = \{z_g^1, z_g^2, \cdots, z_g^M\} \) \( \{z_g^m \) is a set of prototypes that best represent \( G_m \) in the latent space. The model parameters in this problem are the GNN parameters \( \theta \) and hierarchical prototypes \( C \). Since the corresponding latent variable of each graph is not given, it is hard to directly maximize the complete-data likelihood function \( p(G, Z|\theta, C) \). Therefore, we seek to maximize the expectation of complete-data likelihood through the EM algorithm.

The vanilla EM algorithm (Dempster et al., 1977; Krishnan et al., 1997) requires a full pass through the data set before each parameter update, which is computationally inefficient when the size of data set is large like in our case. Therefore, we consider an online EM variant (Sato & Ishii, 2000; Cappé & Moulines, 2009; Liang & Klein, 2009) which operates on mini-batches of data. This approach is based on the i.i.d. assumption of the data set, where both the complete-data likelihood and the posterior probability of latent variables can be factorized over each observed-latent variable pair:

\[
p(G, Z|\theta, C) = \prod_{m=1}^{M} p(G_m, z_{g_m}|\theta, C), \\
p(Z|G, \theta, C) = \prod_{m=1}^{M} p(z_{g_m}|G_m, \theta, C).
\]

First, we introduce the initialization scheme of model parameters.

**Initialization of model parameters.** Before triggering the global structure exploration, we first pre-train the GNN by minimizing \( L_{local} \) and employ the derived GNN model as initialization, which establishes a locally smooth latent space. After that, we utilize this pre-trained GNN model to extract the embeddings of all graphs in the data set, and the K-means clustering is applied upon these graph embeddings to initialize the bottom layer prototypes (i.e. \( \{c_i^L\}_{i=1}^{M_L}\) with the output cluster centers. The prototypes of upper layers are initialized by iteratively applying K-means clustering to the prototypes of the layer below. For each time of clustering, we discard the output cluster centers assigned less than two samples to avoid trivial solutions (Bach & Harchaoui, 2007; Caron et al., 2018).

Next, we state the details of the E-step and M-step applied in our method.

**E-step.** In this step, we first randomly sample a mini-batch of graphs \( G = \{G_1, G_2, \cdots, G_N\} \) (\( N \) denotes the batch size) from the data set \( G \), and \( Z = \{z_g^1, z_g^2, \cdots, z_g^N\} \) stands for the latent variables corresponding to these sampled graphs. Each latent variable \( z_g^m = \{z_{g_1}^1, z_{g_2}^2, \cdots, z_{g_l}^2\} \) is a chain of prototypes from top layer to bottom layer that best represent graph \( G_m \) in the latent space, and it holds that \( z_{g_l}^1 \) is...
We would like to point out that $\theta$, $C_t$, and $G$, which cannot be attained in the online setting. As a substitute, we draw a prototype from that layer based on a categorical distribution. Formally, we first sample a prototype from top layer according to a categorical distribution over hierarchical prototypes. Using the factored way of hierarchical prototypes. Formally, we first sample a prototype from top layer according to a categorical distribution over all the top layer prototypes, i.e., $z_G^{(l)} \sim \text{Cat}(z_G^{(l)}|\alpha_{[l]})$ ($\alpha_l = \text{softmax}(s(c^{(l)}, h_G))$, where $G$ denotes the cosine similarity measurement; for the sampling at layer $l$ ($l \geq 2$), we draw a prototype from that layer based on a categorical distribution over all the child nodes of prototype $z_G^{(l-1)}$ sampled from the layer above, i.e., $z_G^{(l)} \sim \text{Cat}(z_G^{(l)}|\alpha_{[l]})$ ($\alpha_c = \text{softmax}(s(c, h_G))$, $\forall c \in \mathbb{C}(z_G^{(l-1)})$), such that we sample a latent variable $z_G = \{z_G^{(1)}, z_G^{(2)}, \cdots, z_G^{(L_p)}\}$ which is a connected chain in hierarchical prototypes. Using the latent variables inferred as above, we seek to maximize the expectation of complete-data log-likelihood in the M-step.

**M-step.** In this step, we aim at maximizing the expected complete-data log-likelihood with respect to the posterior distribution of latent variables, which is defined as follows:

$$Q(\theta, C) = \mathbb{E}_{p(\mathbb{Z}|G, \theta_{t-1}, C_{t-1})} \log p(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{Z}|\theta, C).$$

This expectation needs the computation over all data points, which cannot be attained in the online setting. As a substitute, we propose to maximize the expected log-likelihood on mini-batch $\mathbb{G}$, which can be estimated using the latent variables $\mathbb{Z}_{\text{est}} = \{\hat{z}_{G_n}\}_{n=1}^N$ sampled in the E-step:

$$\tilde{Q}(\theta, C) = \mathbb{E}_{p(\mathbb{Z}|G, \theta_{t-1}, C_{t-1})} \log p(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{Z}|\theta, C)$$

$$\approx \log p(\mathbb{G}, \mathbb{Z}_{\text{est}}|\theta, C)$$

$$\approx \sum_{n=1}^{N} \log p(G_n, \hat{z}_{G_n}|\theta, C).$$

We further scale $\tilde{Q}(\theta, C)$ with the batch size to derive the log-likelihood function $\mathcal{L}(\theta, C)$ that is more stable in terms of computation:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta, C) = \frac{1}{N} \tilde{Q}(\theta, C).$$

To estimate $\mathcal{L}(\theta, C)$, we need to define the joint likelihood of a graph $G$ and a latent variable $z_G$, which is represented with an energy-based formulation in our method:

$$p(G, z_G|\theta, C) = \frac{1}{Z(\theta, C)} \exp(f(h_G, z_G)),$$

where $Z(\theta, C)$ denotes the partition function. We formalize the negative energy function $f$ by measuring the similarities between graph embedding $h_G$ and the prototypes in $z_G$ and also measuring the similarities between the prototypes in $z_G$ that are from consecutive layers:

$$f(h_G, z_G) = \sum_{l=1}^{L_p} s(h_G, z_G^{(l)}) + \sum_{l=1}^{L_p-1} s(z_G^{(l)}, z_G^{(l+1)}).$$

Intuitively, $f$ evaluates how well a latent variable $z_G$ represents graph $G$ in the latent space, and it also measures the affinity between the consecutive prototypes along a chain from top layer to bottom layer in hierarchical prototypes.

It is nontrivial to optimize with $p(G, z_G|\theta, C)$ due to the intractable partition function. Inspired by Noise-Contrastive Estimation (NCE) (Gutmann & Hyvärinen, 2010; 2012), we seek to optimize with the unnormalized likelihoods, i.e., $\tilde{p}(G, z_G|\theta, C) = \exp(f(h_G, z_G))$, by contrasting the positive observed-latent variable pair with the negative pairs sampled from some noise distribution, which defines an objective function that well approximates $\mathcal{L}(\theta, C)$:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{global}} = \mathbb{E}_{p(G^+, z_G^+)} \{\log \tilde{p}(G^+, z_G^+|\theta, C) - \mathbb{E}_{p(G^-, z_G^-)} \{\log \tilde{p}(G^-, z_G^-|\theta, C)\}\},$$

where $p_n(G, z_G)$ is the noise distribution. In practice, we compute the outer expectation with all the positive pairs in the mini-batch, i.e., $(G_n, \hat{z}_{G_n})$ ($1 \leq n \leq N$), and, for computing the inner expectation, we construct $L_p$ negative pairs for the positive pair $(G_n, \hat{z}_{G_n})$ by fixing the graph $G_n$ and randomly substituting one of $L_p$ prototypes in $z_G$ with another prototype at the same layer each time. For global-semantic learning, we aim to minimize the global objective function $\mathcal{L}_{\text{global}}$ with respect to both the GNN parameter $\theta$ and hierarchical prototypes $C$:

$$\min_{\theta, C} \mathcal{L}_{\text{global}}.$$
Algorithm 1 Optimization Algorithm of GraphLoG.

Input: Unlabeled graph data set \( G \), the number of learning steps \( T \).

Output: Pre-trained GNN model \( G_{\theta_T} \).

Pre-train GNN with local objective function (Eq. 9). Initialize model parameters \( \theta_0 \) and \( C_0 \).

for \( t = 1 \) to \( T \) do

\( \diamond \ E\)-step:
Sample a mini-batch \( \tilde{G} \) from \( G \).
Sample latent variables \( \tilde{Z}_{e,t} \) with GNN \( \theta_{t-1} \) and \( C_{t-1} \).

\( \diamond \ M\)-step:
Update model parameters:
\[ \theta_t \leftarrow \theta_{t-1} - \nabla \theta (\mathcal{L}_{\text{local}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{global}}), \]
\[ C_t \leftarrow C_{t-1} - \nabla C (\mathcal{L}_{\text{local}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{global}}). \]

end for

Proposition 1. For each EM cycle, the model parameters \( \theta \) and \( C \) are updated in such a way that increases the marginal likelihood function \( p(G|\theta, C) \), unless a local maximum is reached on the mini-batch log-likelihood function \( Q(\theta, C) \).

The proof of Proposition 1 is provided in the appendix.

3.3. Model Optimization and Downstream Application

The GraphLoG framework seeks to learn the graph representations preserving both the local-instance and global-semantic structure on an unlabeled graph data set \( G \). For model optimization under this framework, we first pre-train the GNN by minimizing the local objective function \( \mathcal{L}_{\text{local}} \) and initialize the model parameters with the pre-trained GNN. After that, for each learning step, we sample a mini-batch \( \tilde{G} \) from the data set and conduct an EM cycle. In the E-step, the latent variables corresponding to the mini-batch, i.e. \( \tilde{Z}_{e,t} \), are sampled from the posterior distribution defined by the current model. In the M-step, model parameters are updated to maximize the expected log-likelihood on mini-batch \( \tilde{G} \). Also, we add the local objective function to the optimization of M-step, which guarantees the local smoothness when pursuing the global-semantic structure and performs well in practice. We summarize the optimization algorithm in Alg. 1.

After the self-supervised pre-training on massive unlabeled graphs, the derived GNN model can be applied to various downstream tasks for producing effective embedding vectors of different graphs. For example, we can first pre-train a GNN model with GraphLoG on a large number of unlabeled molecules (i.e. molecular graphs). After that, for a downstream task of molecular property prediction where a small set of labeled molecules are available, we can learn a linear classifier upon the pre-trained GNN model to perform the specific graph classification task.

4. Related Work

Graph Neural Networks (GNNs). Recently, following the efforts of learning graph representations via optimizing random walk (Perozzi et al., 2014; Tang et al., 2015; Grover & Leskovec, 2016; Narayanan et al., 2017) or matrix factorization (Cao et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2016) objectives, GNNs explicitly derive proximity-preserved feature vectors in a neighborhood aggregation way. As suggested in Gilmer et al. (2017), the forward pass of most GNNs can be depicted in two phases, Message Passing and Readout phase, and various works (Duvenaud et al., 2015; Kipf & Welling, 2017; Hamilton et al., 2017; Velickovic et al., 2018; Ying et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2018; Xu et al., 2019) sought to improve the effectiveness of these two phases. Unlike these methods which are mainly trained in a supervised fashion, our approach aims for self-supervised learning for GNNs.

Self-supervised Learning for GNNs. There are some recent works that explored self-supervised graph representation learning with GNNs. García-Durán & Niepert (2017) learned graph representations by embedding propagation, and Velickovic et al. (2019), Sun et al. (2019) achieved this goal through mutual information maximization. Also, some self-supervised tasks, e.g. edge prediction (Kipf & Welling, 2016), context prediction (Hu et al., 2019; Rong et al., 2020), graph partitioning (You et al., 2020b), edge/attribute generation (Hu et al., 2020) and contrastive learning (Hassani & Ahmadi, 2020; Qi et al., 2020; You et al., 2020a), have been designed to acquire knowledge from unlabeled graphs. Nevertheless, all these methods are only able to model the local relations between different graph instances. The proposed framework seeks to discover both the local-instance and global-semantic structure of a set of graphs.

Self-supervised Semantic Learning. Clustering-based methods (Xie et al., 2016; Yang et al., 2016; 2017; Caron et al., 2018; Ji et al., 2019; Li et al., 2020) are commonly used to learn the semantic information of the data in a self-supervised fashion. Among which, DeepCluster (Caron et al., 2018) proved the strong transferability of the visual representations learnt by clustering prediction to various downstream visual tasks. Prototypical Contrastive Learning (Li et al., 2020) proved its superiority over the instance-level contrastive learning approaches. These methods are mainly developed for images but not for graph-structured data. Furthermore, the hierarchical semantic structure of the data has been less explored in previous works.

5. Experiments

In this section, we evaluate the performance of GraphLoG on both the chemistry and biology domains using the procedure of pre-training followed by fine-tuning. Also, analytical studies are conducted to verify the effectiveness of local and global structure learning.
Table 1. Test ROC-AUC (%) on downstream molecular property prediction benchmarks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>BBBP</th>
<th>Tox21</th>
<th>ToxCast</th>
<th>SIDER</th>
<th>ClinTox</th>
<th>MUV</th>
<th>HIV</th>
<th>BACE</th>
<th>Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Random</td>
<td>65.8 ± 4.5</td>
<td>74.0 ± 4.6</td>
<td>64.1 ± 6.0</td>
<td>57.3 ± 4.6</td>
<td>58.0 ± 4.4</td>
<td>71.8 ± 2.5</td>
<td>75.3 ± 1.9</td>
<td>70.1 ± 5.4</td>
<td>67.0 ± 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdgePred (2016)</td>
<td>67.3 ± 2.4</td>
<td>76.0 ± 0.6</td>
<td>64.1 ± 6.0</td>
<td>60.4 ± 0.7</td>
<td>64.1 ± 3.7</td>
<td>74.1 ± 2.1</td>
<td>76.3 ± 1.0</td>
<td>79.9 ± 0.9</td>
<td>70.4 ± 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoGraph (2019)</td>
<td>68.2 ± 0.7</td>
<td>75.5 ± 0.6</td>
<td>63.1 ± 0.3</td>
<td>59.4 ± 1.0</td>
<td>70.5 ± 1.8</td>
<td>75.6 ± 1.2</td>
<td>77.6 ± 0.4</td>
<td>78.9 ± 1.1</td>
<td>71.1 ± 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AttrMasking (2019)</td>
<td>64.3 ± 2.8</td>
<td>76.7 ± 0.4</td>
<td>64.2 ± 0.5</td>
<td>61.0 ± 0.7</td>
<td>71.8 ± 4.1</td>
<td>74.7 ± 1.4</td>
<td>77.2 ± 1.1</td>
<td>79.3 ± 1.6</td>
<td>71.1 ± 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ContextPred (2019)</td>
<td>68.0 ± 2.0</td>
<td>75.7 ± 0.7</td>
<td>63.9 ± 0.6</td>
<td>60.9 ± 0.6</td>
<td>65.9 ± 3.8</td>
<td>75.8 ± 1.7</td>
<td>77.3 ± 1.0</td>
<td>79.6 ± 1.2</td>
<td>70.9 ± 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GraphPartition (2020b)</td>
<td>70.3 ± 0.7</td>
<td>75.2 ± 0.4</td>
<td>63.2 ± 0.3</td>
<td>61.0 ± 0.8</td>
<td>64.2 ± 0.5</td>
<td>75.4 ± 1.7</td>
<td>77.1 ± 0.7</td>
<td>79.6 ± 1.8</td>
<td>70.8 ± 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GraphCL (2020a)</td>
<td>69.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>75.4 ± 0.9</td>
<td>63.8 ± 0.4</td>
<td>60.8 ± 0.7</td>
<td>70.1 ± 1.9</td>
<td>74.5 ± 1.3</td>
<td>77.6 ± 0.9</td>
<td>78.2 ± 1.2</td>
<td>71.3 ± 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GraphLoG (ours)</td>
<td>72.5 ± 0.8</td>
<td>75.7 ± 0.5</td>
<td>65.5 ± 0.7</td>
<td>61.3 ± 1.1</td>
<td>76.7 ± 3.3</td>
<td>76.0 ± 1.1</td>
<td>77.8 ± 0.8</td>
<td>80.5 ± 1.2</td>
<td>73.3 ± 4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1. Experimental Setup

Pre-training details. Following Hu et al. (2019), we adopt a five-layer Graph Isomorphism Network (GIN) (Xu et al., 2019) with 300-dimensional hidden units and a mean pooling readout function for performance comparisons (Secs. 5.2 and 5.3). We use an Adam optimizer (Kingma & Ba, 2015) (learning rate: $1 \times 10^{-3}$) to pre-train the GNN with $L_{\text{local}}$ for one epoch and then train the whole model with both $L_{\text{local}}$ and $L_{\text{global}}$ for 10 epochs. For each time of K-means clustering in the initialization of hierarchical prototypes, we adopt 50 initial cluster centers. Unless otherwise specified, the batch size $N$ is set as 512, and the hierarchical prototypes’ depth $L_p$ is set as 3. These hyperparameters are selected by the grid search on the validation sets of four downstream molecule data sets (i.e. BBBP, SIDER, ClinTox and BACE), and their sensitivity is analyzed in Sec. 5.4.

Fine-tuning details. For fine-tuning on a downstream task, a linear classifier is appended upon the pre-trained GNN, and an Adam optimizer (learning rate: $1 \times 10^{-3}$, fine-tuning batch size: 32) is employed to train the model for 100 epochs. We utilize a learning rate scheduler with fix step size which multiplies the learning rate by 0.3 every 30 epochs. All the reported results are averaged over five independent runs. The source code is available at https://github.com/DeepGraphLearning/GraphLoG.

Performance comparison. For the experiments on both chemistry and biology domains, we compare the proposed method with existing self-supervised graph representation learning algorithms (i.e. EdgePred (Kipf & Welling, 2016), InfoGraph (Sun et al., 2019), AttrMasking (Hu et al., 2019), ContextPred (Hu et al., 2019), GraphPartition (You et al., 2020b) and GraphCL (You et al., 2020a)) to verify its effectiveness. We report the results of EdgePred, AttrMasking and ContextPred from Hu et al. (2019) and examine the performance of InfoGraph, GraphPartition and GraphCL based on the released source code.

5.2. Experiments on Chemistry Domain

Data sets. For fair comparison, we use the same data sets as in Hu et al. (2019). In specific, a subset of ZINC15 database (Sterling & Irwin, 2015) with 2 million unlabeled molecules is employed for self-supervised pre-training. Eight binary classification data sets in MoleculeNet (Wu et al., 2018) serve as downstream tasks, where the scaffold split scheme (Chen et al., 2012a) is used for data set split.

Results. In Tab. 1, we report the performance of the proposed GraphLoG method compared with other works, where ‘Random’ denotes the GIN model with random initialization. Among all self-supervised learning strategies, our approach achieves the best performance on six of eight tasks, and a 2.1% performance gain is obtained in terms of average ROC-AUC. We deem that this improvement over previous works is mainly from the global structure modeling in GraphLoG, which is not included in existing methods.

5.3. Experiments on Biology Domain

Data sets. For biology domain, following Hu et al. (2019), 395K unlabeled protein ego-networks are utilized for self-supervised pre-training. The downstream task is to predict 40 fine-grained biological functions of 8 species.

Results. Tab. 2 reports the test ROC-AUC of various self-supervised learning techniques. It can be observed that the proposed GraphLoG method outperforms existing ap-
Table 4. Ablation study for different objective functions on downstream biological function prediction benchmark.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$L_{sub}$</th>
<th>$L_{graph}$</th>
<th>$L_{global}$</th>
<th>ROC-AUC (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>70.1 ± 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>71.0 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>71.5 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>71.3 ± 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>71.9 ± 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>72.2 ± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td><strong>72.9 ± 0.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. The t-SNE visualization on ZINC15 database (i.e. the pre-training data set for chemistry domain).

Figure 3. Sensitivity analysis of hierarchical prototypes’ depth $L_p$ and batch size $N$. (All results are evaluated on biology domain.)

5.4. Analysis

**Effect of different objective functions.** In Tab. 4, we analyze the effect of three objective functions on the biology domain, and we continue using the GIN depicted in Sec. 5.1 in this experiment. When each objective function is individually applied (1st, 2nd and 3rd row), the one for global-semantic learning performs best, which probably benefits from its exploration of the semantic structure of the data. Through simultaneously applying different objective functions, the full model (last row) achieves the best performance, which illustrates that the learning of local and global structure are complementary to each other.

**Sensitivity of hierarchical prototypes’ depth $L_p$.** In this part, we discuss the selection of parameter $L_p$, which controls the number of discovered semantic hierarchies. In Fig. 3(a), we plot model’s performance under different $L_p$ values. It can be observed that deeper hierarchical prototypes (i.e. $L_p \geq 3$) achieve stable performance gain compared to the shallow ones (i.e. $L_p \leq 2$).

**Sensitivity of batch size $N$.** In this experiment, we evaluate the effect of the batch size $N$ on our method. Fig. 3(b) shows the test ROC-AUC on downstream task using different batch sizes. From the line chart, we can observe that large batch size (i.e. $N \geq 256$) can promote the performance of GraphLoG. Under such condition, the sampled mini-batches can better represent the whole data set and thus derive more precise likelihood expectation in Eq. 14.

**Visualization.** In Fig. 2, we utilize the t-SNE (Maaten & Hinton, 2008) to visualize the graph embeddings and hierarchical prototypes on ZINC15 data set. Compared with only using the local constraints $L_{sub}$ and $L_{graph}$ (configurations (a) and (b)), more obvious feature separation is achieved after applying the global constraint $L_{global}$ (configuration (c)), which illustrates its effectiveness on discovering the underlying global-semantic structure of the data.

6. Conclusions and Future Work

We design a unified framework called Local-instance and Global-semantic Learning (GraphLoG) for self-supervised graph representation learning, which models the structure of a set of unlabeled graphs both locally and globally. In this framework, we novelly propose to learn hierarchical prototypes upon graph embeddings to infer the global-semantic structure in graphs. Using the benchmark data sets from both chemistry and biology domains, we empirically verify our method’s superior performance over state-of-the-art approaches on different GNN architectures.

Our future works will include further improving the global structure learning technique, unifying pre-training and fine-tuning, and extending our framework to other domains such as sociology, physics and material science.
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A. Theoretical Analysis

**Theorem 1.** Given a mini-batch $\tilde{G}$ (batch size is $N$) randomly sampled from the data set $G$ which contains $M$ graphs, the expected log-likelihood defined on this mini-batch, i.e. $\bar{Q}(\theta, C) = E_{p(\tilde{Z}|G, \theta_{t-1}, C_{t-1})} [\log p(\tilde{G}, \tilde{Z}|\theta, C)]$, is approximately proportional to the expected complete-data log-likelihood, i.e. $Q(\theta, C) = E_{p(Z|G, \theta_{t-1}, C_{t-1})} [\log p(G, Z|\theta, C)]:$

$$\bar{Q}(\theta, C) \approx \frac{N}{M} Q(\theta, C).$$

**Proof.** For each graph $G_n$ in the mini-batch, a latent variable $\hat{Z}_{G_n} \sim p(z_{G_n}|G_n, \theta_{t-1}, C_{t-1})$ is sampled from the posterior distribution for Monte Carlo estimation, and the mini-batch log-likelihood can be estimated as follows:

$$\bar{Q}(\theta, C) \approx \sum_{n=1}^{N} \log p(G_n, \hat{Z}_{G_n}|\theta, C).$$

Since the graphs in both mini-batch $\tilde{G}$ and data set $G$ can be regarded as randomly sampled from the data distribution $P_{G}$, we deduce as below:

$$\bar{Q}(\theta, C) \approx N \cdot \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \log p(G_n, \hat{Z}_{G_n}|\theta, C)$$

$$= N \cdot \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \log p(G_n, z_{G_n}|\theta, C)$$

$$= \frac{N}{M} \cdot M \cdot \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \log p(G_m, \hat{Z}_{G_m}|\theta, C)$$

$$= \frac{N}{M} \cdot \sum_{m=1}^{M} \log p(G_m, \hat{Z}_{G_m}|\theta, C)$$

$$\approx \frac{N}{M} \cdot E_{p(G, \theta_{t-1}, C_{t-1})} [\log p(G, Z|\theta, C)]$$

$$= \frac{N}{M} Q(\theta, C).$$

Here, for each graph $G_m$ in data set $G$, a latent variable $\hat{Z}_{G_m} \sim p(z_{G_m}|G_m, \theta_{t-1}, C_{t-1})$ is sampled from the posterior distribution for Monte Carlo estimation.

**Proposition 2.** For each EM cycle, the model parameters $\theta$ and $C$ are updated in such a way that increases the marginal likelihood function $p(G|\theta, C)$, unless a local maximum is reached on the mini-batch log-likelihood function $\bar{Q}(\theta, C)$.

**Proof.** We verify this claim from the perspective of variational inference. For a mini-batch $\tilde{G}$, we suppose that $q(\tilde{Z})$ is a variational distribution over the true posterior $p(\tilde{Z}|\tilde{G}, \theta, C)$. For any choice of $q(\tilde{Z})$, the following decomposition of the marginal log-likelihood $\log p(\tilde{G}|\theta, C)$ holds:

$$\log p(\tilde{G}|\theta, C) = \mathcal{L}(q, \theta, C) + \text{KL}(q||p),$$

$$\mathcal{L}(q, \theta, C) = E_{q(\tilde{Z})} [\log p(\tilde{G}, \tilde{Z}|\theta, C) - \log q(\tilde{Z})],$$

$$\text{KL}(q||p) = E_{q(\tilde{Z})} \left[ \log \left( \frac{q(\tilde{Z})}{p(\tilde{Z}|\tilde{G}, \theta, C)} \right) \right],$$

where $\mathcal{L}(q, \theta, C)$ is the evidence lower bound (ELBO) of marginal log-likelihood function, i.e. $\mathcal{L}(q, \theta, C) \leq \log p(\tilde{G}|\theta, C)$ (equality holds when $q(\tilde{Z}) = p(\tilde{Z}|\tilde{G}, \theta, C)$).

In the E-step, we set the variational distribution equal to the posterior distribution with respect to the current model parameters, i.e. $q(\tilde{Z}) = p(\tilde{Z}|\tilde{G}, \theta_{t-1}, C_{t-1})$, such that the KL divergence term vanishes, and the ELBO equals to the
marginal log-likelihood $\log p(\tilde{G}|\theta_{t-1}, C_{t-1})$. If we substitute $q(\tilde{Z})$ with $p(\tilde{Z}|\tilde{G}, \theta_{t-1}, C_{t-1})$ in the ELBO term, we see that, after the E-step, it takes the following form:

$$
\mathcal{L}(q, \theta, C) = \mathbb{E}_p(\tilde{Z}|\tilde{G}, \theta_{t-1}, C_{t-1}) [\log p(\tilde{G}, \tilde{Z}|\theta, C)] - \mathbb{E}_q(\tilde{Z}) [\log q(\tilde{Z})]
$$

$$
= \tilde{Q}(\theta, C) + \mathcal{H}(q(\tilde{Z}))
$$

where $\mathcal{H}$ denotes the entropy function.

In the M-step, the variational distribution $q(\tilde{Z})$ is fixed, and thus the ELBO term equals to the expected mini-batch log-likelihood $\tilde{Q}(\theta, C)$ plus a constant:

$$
\mathcal{L}(q, \theta, C) = \tilde{Q}(\theta, C) + \text{const}.
$$

In this step, we seek to maximize $\tilde{Q}(\theta, C)$ with respect to model parameters $\theta$ and $C$, which will increase the value of $\mathcal{L}(q, \theta, C)$ unless a local maximum is reached on $\tilde{Q}(\theta, C)$. Except for the local maximum case, there will be new values of $\theta$ and $C$, denoted as $\theta_t$ and $C_t$, which gives out that:

$$
\text{KL}(q||p) = \text{KL}(p(\tilde{Z}|\tilde{G}, \theta_{t-1}, C_{t-1}) || p(\tilde{Z}|\tilde{G}, \theta_t, C_t)) > 0.
$$

Denoting the increase of the ELBO term after the M-step as $\Delta \mathcal{L}(q, \theta, C) = \mathcal{L}(q, \theta_t, C_t) - \mathcal{L}(q, \theta_{t-1}, C_{t-1}) > 0$, the increase of the marginal log-likelihood satisfies that:

$$
\Delta \log p(\tilde{G}|\theta, C) = \log p(\tilde{G}|\theta_t, C_t) - \log p(\tilde{G}|\theta_{t-1}, C_{t-1})
$$

$$
= \mathcal{L}(q, \theta_t, C_t) + \text{KL}(q||p) - \mathcal{L}(q, \theta_{t-1}, C_{t-1})
$$

$$
> \Delta \mathcal{L}(q, \theta, C),
$$

where the KL term of $\log p(\tilde{G}|\theta_{t-1}, C_{t-1})$ vanishes due to the operation in the E-step. Similar as the deduction in Theorem 1, the complete-data log-likelihood $\log p(G|\theta, C)$ and the mini-batch log-likelihood $\log p(\tilde{G}|\theta, C)$ have the following relation:

$$
\log p(G|\theta, C) = \sum_{n=1}^{M} \log p(G_m|\theta, C)
$$

$$
= M \cdot \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p_G} \log p(G|\theta, C)
$$

$$
= \frac{M}{N} \cdot \sum_{n=1}^{N} \log p(G_n|\theta, C)
$$

$$
= \frac{M}{N} \log p(\tilde{G}|\theta, C).
$$

From this relation, we can derive that:

$$
\Delta \log p(G|\theta, C) = \frac{M}{N} \Delta \log p(\tilde{G}|\theta, C) > \frac{M}{N} \Delta \mathcal{L}(q, \theta, C) > 0,
$$

which illustrates that the EM cycle in our approach is able to increase the complete-data marginal likelihood $p(G|\theta, C)$ except that a local maximum is reached on $\tilde{Q}(\theta, C)$.

\[\square\]

### B. More Implementation Details

**Attribute masking scheme.** For the chemistry domain, given a molecular graph, we randomly mask the attributes of 30% nodes (i.e., atoms) in it to obtain its correlated counterpart. Specifically, we add an extra dimension to the feature of atom type and atom chirality to indicate masked attribute, and the input features of all masked atoms are set to these extra dimensions.

For the biology domain, given a protein ego-network, we randomly mask the attributes of 30% edges in it to derive its correlated counterpart. In specific, we use an extra dimension to indicate masked attribute. For an edge to be masked, the weight of its extra dimension is set as 1, and the weights of all other dimensions are set as 0.
**GNN architecture.** All the GNNs in our experiments (*i.e.* GCN (Kipf & Welling, 2017), GraphSAGE (Hamilton et al., 2017), GAT (Velickovic et al., 2018) and GIN (Xu et al., 2019)) are with 5 layers, 300-dimensional hidden units and a mean pooling readout function. In addition, two attention heads are employed in each layer of the GAT model.