

PPSGCN: A Privacy-Preserving Subgraph Sampling Based Distributed GCN Training Method

Binchi Zhang
zbc0725@stu.xjtu.edu.cn
Xi'an Jiaotong University
Xi'an, Shaanxi, China

Minnan Luo
minnluo@xjtu.edu.cn
Xi'an Jiaotong University
Xi'an, Shaanxi, China

Shangbin Feng
wind_binteng@stu.xjtu.edu.cn
Xi'an Jiaotong University
Xi'an, Shaanxi, China

Ziqi Liu
ziqiliu@antfin.com
Ant Group
China

Jun Zhou
jun.zhoujun@antfin.com
Ant Group
China

Qinghua Zheng
qhzheng@mail.xjtu.edu.cn
Xi'an Jiaotong University
Xi'an, Shaanxi, China

ABSTRACT

Graph convolutional networks (GCNs) have been widely adopted for graph representation learning and achieved impressive performance. For larger graphs stored separately on different clients, distributed GCN training algorithms were proposed to improve efficiency and scalability. However, existing methods directly exchange node features between different clients, which results in data privacy leakage. Federated learning was incorporated in graph learning to tackle data privacy, while they suffer from severe performance drop due to non-iid data distribution. Besides, these approaches generally involve heavy communication and memory overhead during the training process. In light of these problems, we propose a **Privacy-Preserving Subgraph** sampling based distributed **GCN** training method (**PPSGCN**), which preserves data privacy and significantly cuts back on communication and memory overhead. Specifically, PPSGCN employs a star-topology client-server system. We firstly sample a local node subset in each client to form a global subgraph, which greatly reduces communication and memory costs. We then conduct local computation on each client with features or gradients of the sampled nodes. Finally, all clients securely communicate with the central server with homomorphic encryption to combine local results while preserving data privacy. Compared with federated graph learning methods, our PPSGCN model is trained on a global graph to avoid the negative impact of local data distribution. We prove that our PPSGCN algorithm would converge to a local optimum with probability 1. Experiment results on three prevalent benchmarks demonstrate that our algorithm significantly reduces communication and memory overhead while maintaining desirable performance. Further studies not only demonstrate the fast convergence of PPSGCN, but discuss the trade-off between communication and local computation cost as well.

1 INTRODUCTION

Graphs and network data have been increasingly leveraged in real-world applications such as social network analysis [6, 9], protein structure [7] and recommender systems [5, 11, 28]. Among them, graph convolutional networks (GCNs) are widely adopted to learn representations of nodes and graphs. For large-scale graphs such as PinSage [28] and Aligraph [32] which involve billions of nodes and edges, GCN models could not be sufficiently trained on a single machine due to memory limitations. Besides, large graphs in real-world

applications are often partitioned into different subgraphs which are stored in distributed memory architectures. These problems call for distributed GCN training algorithms that address memory issues and improve GCN scalability.

Existing distributed GCN algorithms generally run in parallel to update a global model with data in all devices. Tripathy et al. [23] proposes CAGNET, a family of parallel GCN training frameworks. CAGNET divides clients into small groups to restrict the broadcast domain. Each group calculates a part of result, which results in lower communication cost. Jiang and Rumi [13] presents a skewed node sampling strategy which samples more local neighbors than remote ones for each node. Similarly, BDS-GCN [25] uniformly samples training subgraphs from the boundary node set. Both sampling-based methods largely reduce the communication overhead. In addition, BDS-GCN exhibits better robustness across different settings of device number due to sampling uniformity.

Although existing distributed GCN training methods were generally successful, they fail to address the challenges of privacy and overhead in the distributed setting. The challenge of privacy requires distributed GCN algorithms to preserve data privacy between clients where different subgraphs are scattered in physically distributed client networks. Existing methods directly exchange raw node features or gradient information between different clients, which induces high risks of privacy leakage. Federated learning is adopted to address this issue [10, 19, 26, 27], whereas these methods severely suffer from a performance drop under non-iid local data distribution. In federated graph learning methods, gradients of local weights are only associated with local nodes. Therefore when data distributions on different clients are uneven, it's difficult for the global model to converge to the global optimum. Besides, the challenge of overhead requires distributed GCN algorithms to significantly reduce communication and memory overhead to improve efficiency and scalability [1, 23]. Existing approaches attempted to reduce communication cost with graph sampling [13, 25] or partition [23], while they fail to strike a balance between communication and memory overhead and maintain desirable performance.

In light of these issues, we propose a **Privacy-Preserving Subgraph** sampling based distributed **GCN** training method (**PPSGCN**), a novel and scalable distributed GCN training algorithm to address privacy concerns and reduce training overhead. Specifically, we develop a matrix-form distributed forward and backward propagation method with encryption technique in a star-topology client-server

system. The training algorithm in each layer could be formulated in three steps. Firstly we sample a local node subset in each client to form a global subgraph for training. Each client then calculates local terms with features and gradients of sampled nodes in GCN steps. Finally, central server aggregates local terms from all clients with homomorphic encryption and sends summations back to clients. In this way, our model hides local structural information and node features from different clients and reliably preserves data privacy during transmission. Moreover, we update model parameters globally with nodes from different clients, which improves the performance compared to federated graph learning methods in non-iid local data distribution. We further prove the unbiasedness of our sampling approach and the convergence of the PPSGCN algorithm in theory. Our main contributions are summarized as follows:

- We propose PPSGCN, a novel distributed GCN training method to learn graph representations in the distributed setting, which preserves data privacy and significantly improves training efficiency. Sufficient theoretical analyses are held on convergence and low training overhead of PPSGCN.
- We propose a novel subgraph sampling approach, which samples local node subsets in all clients to form a global training subgraph. It is an unbiased sampling technique and greatly improves GNN scalability in distributed settings.
- Extensive experiments on three benchmarks demonstrate that PPSGCN significantly reduces communication and memory overhead while maintaining desirable performance.

2 RELATED WORK

Distributed Training of GCN. As graph datasets grow in size, graph neural networks could not be sufficiently trained on a single machine due to memory limitations. Therefore, many researchers proposed to train GCN models in distributed settings. The primary challenge of distributed GCN training methods is their high communication overhead, and many solutions are presented to reduce communication costs. Tripathy et al. [23] present a family of parallel GCN training frameworks (CAGNET). They reduce communication by partitioning adjacency matrices (sparse) and feature matrices (dense) in different ways and distributing calculation of their products to different clients. Among all variants, CAGNET (1.5d) leads to minimum communication cost and decreases it by a constant factor of C while storing redundant node features, which leads to C times more memory overhead. Wan et al. [25] develop graph sampling methods on boundary nodes which are responsible for communication, and boost the throughput by up to 500%. However, their solution stores node features in the boundary sets multiple times and lead to increased memory overhead. Jiang and Rumi [13] propose a skewed node sampling method which samples local node in larger probability to reduce the communication. However, their method encounters a serious performance deterioration when the number of clients increases. In light of these methods' problems, we work to propose a distributed GCN training algorithm that strikes a balance between communication and memory overhead, while being robust to different settings of client numbers.

Federated Graph Learning. With growing concerns of privacy in machine learning, federated learning methods [16, 18, 22] were proposed to train models on data-storing devices. In the federated




Figure 1: Illustration of the PPSGCN algorithm. For step 1, each client independently samples a node subset, which forms a global subgraph across all clients. For step 2, each client calculates the linear transformation of local features or gradient matrices for communication. For step 3, communication matrices in all clients are aggregated to the central server with homomorphic encryption and central server sends corresponding combinations back to each client.

learning setting, it's prohibited to directly transfer raw data among distributed clients. To address privacy concerns in graph-based problems, researchers incorporate federated learning in graph neural networks. Zheng et al. [30] present a federated graph learning model which exploits Bayesian optimization and JS divergence to improve performance. It protects data privacy by secret sharing transmission. Mei et al. [19] propose a similarity-based federated graph learning framework to better leverage distant neighbors with a distance function. Zhou et al. [31] present a federated graph learning framework in vertically partitioned dataset. They calculate the first few layers locally and aggregate local results in the central server to calculate the remaining layers. They only transmit hidden node embeddings after local training, which largely reduces communication cost while preserving data privacy. However, these methods suffer from performance drop on data with non-iid distributions [10], which is common in real-world scenarios.

Sampling on Graph. GCN models are often trained with gradient descent methods and mini-batching. For large graphs and graphs with high average degrees, one minibatch of nodes might over expand to the whole graph as the network goes deeper, which is known as "neighbor explosion". This problem seriously reduces the scalability of vanilla GCN training algorithms. Therefore, researchers resort to sampling methods to address this issue, including node sampling [3, 8], layer sampling [2, 33] and graph sampling [4, 29]. For node sampling methods, Hamilton et al. [8] randomly sample a fixed number of neighbors for each node in a subset and add sampled nodes to the subset in each layer. This method effectively reduces the size of minibatch, while one node might be sampled repeatedly in one layer. For layer sampling methods, Chen et al. [2] randomly sample a fixed number of nodes for minibatch in each layer. It solves the repetitive sampling problem, while one node might be repeatedly calculated in different minibatches, leading to lower training efficiency. For subgraph sampling methods, Zeng

et al. [29] propose several sampling approaches which directly sample the training graph for all layers. With the help of sampling, GCN models achieves better efficiency and state-of-the-art performance on larger graph datasets in centralized settings. In this paper, we explore ways to incorporate graph sampling for distributed GCN training to improve efficiency and scalability.

3 PROPOSED METHOD

Following commonly used notations, we adopt square brackets to represent corresponding partitions in a matrix e.g., $X[u, v]$ denotes the element in u^{th} row and v^{th} column. Furthermore, we adopt colons to represent corresponding row or column in a matrix e.g., $X[u, :]$ denotes the u^{th} row of matrix X and $X[:, v]$ denotes the v^{th} column of matrix X . Then we provide some preliminary concepts used in this paper. Denote $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ as the global undirected graph with n nodes $v_i \in \mathcal{V}$ and edges $e_{ij} = (v_i, v_j) \in \mathcal{E}$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, n$. The adjacency matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ indicates edge connections. In distributed setting, we assume the global graph \mathcal{G} are stored in m remote clients C_1, \dots, C_m . The i^{th} client C_i holds subgraph $\mathcal{G}_i = \{\mathcal{V}_i, \mathcal{E}_i\}$, where \mathcal{V}_i collects n_i local nodes such that $\sum_{i=1}^m n_i = n$; \mathcal{E}_i represents the edges between nodes in \mathcal{V}_i . In such a way, each client C_i is associated with a corresponding feature matrix $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times d}$ and label matrix $Y_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times c}$, where d and $c \in \mathbb{R}$ represent the dimension of features and the amount of node classes, respectively. We use $\mathcal{E}_{ij} = \{(u, v) | u \in \mathcal{V}_i, v \in \mathcal{V}_j\}$ to represent the edge set between C_i and C_j ($i \neq j$). According to the partition of the m clients, the adjacency matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, feature matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and label matrix $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times c}$ are partitioned as

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & \cdots & A_{1m} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A_{m1} & \cdots & A_{mm} \end{bmatrix}, X = \begin{bmatrix} X_1 \\ \vdots \\ X_m \end{bmatrix}, Y = \begin{bmatrix} Y_1 \\ \vdots \\ Y_m \end{bmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

where A_{ij} is formed by \mathcal{V}_i 's corresponding rows and \mathcal{V}_j 's corresponding columns of the adjacency matrix A .

3.1 Model Backbone

The architecture of PPSGCN is shown in Figure 1. Our distributed framework is based on a star-topology client-server system in federated learning setting, where a reliable central server is leveraged to securely aggregate information from different clients.

The goal of graph representation learning is to learn an encoder $f_W : \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times c}$, such that the high-level representations of the nodes in the i^{th} client is obtained by $H_i = f_W(X, A)$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$, where model parameter W is shared by all clients. Formally, with an L -layer matrix-form GCN model partitioned by rows as the encoder f_W , the l^{th} layer hidden representation matrix in client C_i is calculated by

$$Z_i^l = \sigma(H_i^l), \quad (2)$$

$$H_i^l = \sum_{j=1}^m L_{ij} Z_j^{l-1} W^l = L_{ii} O_i^{l-1} + \sum_{j \neq i} L_{ij} O_j^{l-1}$$

for $l = 1, \dots, L$, where $O_i^l = Z_i^l W^{l+1}$ could be calculated locally within client C_i ; σ is an adaptable activation function e.g. $ReLU$. $W^l \in \mathbb{R}^{d^{l-1} \times d^l}$ denotes the parameters in the l^{th} layer. d^l is the

dimension of hidden representation of the i^{th} layer for $l = 0, \dots, L$, and we have $d^0 = d$ and $d^L = c$ especially. L_{ij} is a block of the normalized Laplacian matrix $L = (D + I)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (A + I) (D + I)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ corresponding to the rows of nodes in \mathcal{V}_i and columns of nodes in \mathcal{V}_j . $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ refers to the degree diagonal matrix of the global graph \mathcal{G} . For the privacy concern, the block of degree diagonal matrix corresponding to the i^{th} client, denoted as a diagonal matrix $D_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}$, is unknown for other client C_j ($j \neq i$). As a result, the block of the normalized Laplacian matrix L_{ij} ($j \neq i$) can not be calculated in any single client individually. To this issue, we reformulate $L_{ij} = (D_i + I)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \tilde{L}_{ij}$ with $\tilde{L}_{ij} = A_{ij} (D_j + I)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, and rewrite Equation (2) as

$$H_i^l = L_{ii} O_i^{l-1} + (D_i + I)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j \neq i} \tilde{L}_{ij} O_j^{l-1}. \quad (3)$$

for $l = 1, \dots, L$, where both \tilde{L}_{ij} and O_j could be locally calculated within client C_j . Equation (3) is split into two parts by \sum , where the front part with $L_{ii} O_i^{l-1}$ and $(D_i + I)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ could be calculated locally within client C_i , then each term $\tilde{L}_{ij} O_j$ in the hind part could be calculated within corresponding client C_j . In such a way, we could learn the representations of nodes over each client without exchanging local graph structure information.

Given a global graph \mathcal{G} consists of n nodes scattered in m clients, our distributed training objective is to optimize a weighted sum of loss over m clients, i.e.,

$$\min_W \mathcal{L}(W) = \sum_{i=1}^m p_i \text{Loss}_i(Z_i^L, W), \quad (4)$$

where $W = \{W^1, \dots, W^L\}$ collects the parameters in all layers of GCN. $p_i \geq 0$ refers to the weight coefficient of C_i for $i = 1, \dots, m$. The local loss function is defined as

$$\text{Loss}_i(Z_i^L, W) = -\frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_i} Y_i[v, :] \log(Z_i^L[v, :])^T. \quad (5)$$

To solve the optimization problem (4), we develop a distributed backward propagation process. It is evident that the gradient of loss \mathcal{L} with respect to the L^{th} layer representation Z_i^L could be calculated locally in C_i . Recursively, the gradient of loss function \mathcal{L} with respect to the l^{th} , $l = L - 1, \dots, 1$ layer representation Z_i^l is derived as

$$\nabla_{Z_i^{l-1}} \mathcal{L} = L_{ii} P_i^l + (D_i + I)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j \neq i} \tilde{L}_{ij} P_j^l \quad (6)$$

where $P_i^l = (\nabla_{Z_i^l} \mathcal{L} \circ \sigma'(H_i^l)) (W^l)^T$ can be calculated locally within client C_i ; \circ is the Hadamard product of matrices. It's evident that we could calculate Equation (6) in the same way as Equation (3) because of their identical forms. Then the gradient of loss function \mathcal{L} with respect to the l^{th} layer weight matrix can be derived as

$$\nabla_{W^l} \mathcal{L} = \sum_{j=1}^m (Z_j^{l-1})^T \nabla_{Z_j^{l-1}} \mathcal{L} \quad (7)$$

for $l = 1, \dots, L$, where each term of summation could be calculated locally within the corresponding client.

In the training process, we should conduct communication between clients and central server to compute these equations in

forward and backward propagation. Intuitively, the communication overhead in our training process is considerable when training on a large graph. Furthermore, we require large memory overhead to store hidden representation matrices Z_i^l for $l = 1, \dots, L$ in the computation graph. Details of training overhead are analyzed in Section 4.2. To improve the training efficiency, we resort to a subgraph sampling method in distributed setting introduced subsequently.

3.2 Sampling Technique

For each client C_i , we independently sample s_i nodes according to an adaptable probability distribution \mathcal{Q}_i , and collect them into set $\mathcal{V}_{S_i} \subseteq \mathcal{V}_i$. Let $\mathcal{V}_S = \bigcup_{i=1}^m \mathcal{V}_{S_i}$ be the union of nodes sampled over all clients, and $p(v) = P(v \in \mathcal{V}_S) = 1 - (1 - \mathcal{Q}_i(v))^{s_i}$ as the probability of node $v \in \mathcal{V}_i$ is sampled.

To ensure the unbiasedness of our subgraph sampling method, we exploit probability $p(v)$ to normalize the hidden node embedding $\hat{H}_i^l[v, :]$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_i^l[v, :] &= \sum_{u \in \mathcal{V}_i} \frac{L_{ii}[v, u]}{p(u)} \mathcal{O}_i^{l-1}[u, :] \\ &+ (D_i[v, v] + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j \neq i} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{V}_j} \frac{\hat{L}_{ij}[v, u]}{p(u)} \mathcal{O}_j^{l-1}[u, :] \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

for $v \in \mathcal{V}_{S_i}$ and $\hat{H}_i^l[v, :] = 0^T$ otherwise. With Equation (8), we could obtain an estimator of hidden representation matrix H_i^l as $\hat{H}_i^l \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times d^l}$. The following theorem verifies the unbiasedness of the estimator \hat{H}_i^l .

THEOREM 1. *Matrix \hat{H}_i^l defined in Equation (8) is an unbiased estimator of hidden representation matrix H_i^l , i.e.,*

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{H}_i^l] = H_i^l$$

for $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $l = 1, \dots, L$.

PROOF. According to the estimator of hidden representation matrix \hat{H}_i^l in Equation (8), we consider the independence of sampling of different nodes, and derive

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{H}_i^l[v, :]] = \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{u \in \mathcal{V}_j} \frac{L_{ij}[v, u]}{p(u)} Z_j^{l-1}[u, :] \mathbf{W}^l \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}_u]$$

where $\mathbb{I}_u = 1$ if $u \in \mathcal{V}_S$, and $\mathbb{I}_u = 0$, otherwise. Through the result $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}_u] = p(u)$, it is evident to derive $\mathbb{E}[\hat{H}_i^l] = H_i^l$. \square

THEOREM 2. *The variance of the matrix estimator \hat{H}_i^l defined in Equation (8) is bounded, i.e.,*

$$\sigma = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_i} \sum_{k=1}^{d^l} \text{Var}(\hat{H}_i^l[v, k]) \leq wzn_i d^l \|L\|_\infty^2 \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{u \in \mathcal{V}_j} \left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{Q}_j(u)} - 1 \right)$$

where $w = \sup_{l, k} \{\|\mathbf{W}^l[:, k]\|_2^2\}$, $z = \sup_{l, i, v} \{\|Z_i^l[v, :]\|_2^2\}$.

PROOF. $\forall v \in \mathcal{V}_i$ and $k = 1, \dots, d^l$, according to the estimator of hidden representation matrix \hat{H}_i^l in Equation (8), we consider the independence of sampling of different nodes, and derive

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(\hat{H}_i^l[v, k]) &= \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{u \in \mathcal{V}_j} \frac{L_{ij}^2[v, u]}{p(u)^2} \mathcal{O}_j^{l-1}[u, k]^2 \text{Var}(\mathbb{I}_u) \\ &\leq wz \|L\|_\infty^2 \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{u \in \mathcal{V}_j} \frac{1 - p(u)}{p(u)} \end{aligned}$$

Substitute $p(u) = 1 - (1 - \mathcal{Q}_j(u))^{s_j}$ into the inequality, known that $s_j > 1$ and $\mathcal{Q}_j(u) < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(\hat{H}_i^l[v, k]) &\leq wz \|L\|_\infty^2 \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{u \in \mathcal{V}_j} \left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{Q}_j(u)} - 1 \right) \\ \sigma &= \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_i} \sum_{k=1}^{d^l} \text{Var}(\hat{H}_i^l[v, k]) \leq wzn_i d^l \|L\|_\infty^2 \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{u \in \mathcal{V}_j} \left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{Q}_j(u)} - 1 \right) \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Through Theorem 1, we have \hat{H}_i^l as an accurate estimator of H_i^l , neglecting the non-linear activation function $\sigma(\cdot)$. Removing zero rows in \hat{H}_i^l , we could exploit the l^{th} layer estimators $H_{S_i}^l$ to calculate the $l+1^{\text{th}}$ layer estimators recursively for $l = 1, \dots, L$ on the sampled subgraph as

$$\begin{aligned} H_{S_i}^l[v, :] &= \sum_{u \in \mathcal{V}_{S_i}} \frac{L_{S_i i}[v, u]}{p(u)} \mathcal{O}_{S_i}^{l-1}[u, :] \\ &+ (D_i[v, v] + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j \neq i} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{V}_j} \frac{\hat{L}_{S_i j}[v, u]}{p(u)} \mathcal{O}_{S_j}^{l-1}[u, :] \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $\mathcal{O}_{S_i}^l = Z_{S_i}^l \mathbf{W}^{l+1}$, $Z_{S_i}^l = \sigma(H_{S_i}^l)$. We present the overall PPS-GCN training algorithm in Algorithm 1, where the weight matrix in the l^{th} iteration is denoted as \mathbf{W}^l , $l = 1, \dots, L$. To implement Algorithm 1 on our sampled global subgraph, we should adapt our local loss function $\text{Loss}_i(Z_i^l, \mathbf{W})$ to the node subset \mathcal{V}_S as

$$\text{Loss}_{S_i}(Z_{S_i}^l, \mathbf{W}) = -\frac{1}{s_i} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_{S_i}} Y_i[v, :] \log(Z_{S_i}^l[v, :])^T \quad (10)$$

Consequently, our objective function $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{W})$ could be reformulated as $\mathcal{L}_S(\mathbf{W}) = \sum_{i=1}^m p_i \text{Loss}_{S_i}(Z_{S_i}^l, \mathbf{W})$.

For communication in the training process, we adopt Paillier encryption technique [20] to preserve local data privacy. The encrypted communication steps in Algorithm 1 could be formulated as follows,

- (1) Clients and central server request key pairs (pk, sk) .
- (2) Each client C_j encrypts local terms $\{X_{ij}\}_{i=1, \dots, m}$ with public key as $\text{Enc}(X_{ij}, pk)$, then sends to the central server.
- (3) Central server sums up the ciphertext of local terms $SUM_i = \text{Enc}(\sum_{j=1}^m X_{ij}, pk)$ and sends SUM_i to client C_i for $i = 1, \dots, m$.
- (4) Each client C_i receives SUM_i and decrypts it with secret key as $\sum_{j=1}^m X_{ij} = \text{Dec}(SUM_i, sk_i)$.

Algorithm 1 PPSGCN Training Algorithm

Input: normalized Laplacian matrices $\{\tilde{L}_{ij}\}$; degree matrices $\{D_i\}$; initial weight matrices $\{W_0^l\}_{l=1,\dots,L}$; Learning rate η
Output: Weight matrices after T iterations $\{W_T^l\}_{l=1,\dots,L}$

```

1: for  $t = 1$  to  $T$  do
2:   for  $i = 1$  to  $m$  do
3:     Sample and broadcast a local subset  $\mathcal{V}_{S_i}$ .
4:     forward propagation:
5:     for  $l = 1$  to  $L$  do
6:       Calculate  $H_{S_i}^l$  with encrypted communication by Equation (9);  $Z_{S_i}^l = \sigma(H_{S_i}^l)$ .
7:     end for
8:     Calculate loss  $Loss_{S_i}(Z_{S_i}^l, W)$  by Equation (10).
9:     backward propagation:
10:    Calculate  $\nabla_{Z_{S_i}^l} \mathcal{L}_S$  locally according to Equation (10).
11:    Calculate  $\nabla_{W^L} \mathcal{L}_S$  with encrypted communication by Equation (7) on  $V_S$ .
12:    for  $l = L$  to  $1$  do
13:      Calculate  $\nabla_{Z_{S_i}^{l-1}} \mathcal{L}_S$  with encrypted communication by Equation (6) on  $V_S$  and preserve it locally
14:      Calculate  $\nabla_{W^{l-1}} \mathcal{L}_S$  with encrypted communication by Equation (7) on  $V_S$ .
15:    end for
16:     $W_{t+1}^l \leftarrow W_t^l - \eta \nabla_{W^L} \mathcal{L}_S$ ,  $l = 1, \dots, L$ 
17:  end for
18: end for

```

With encryption, our PPSGCN framework achieves reliable privacy preservation in the star-topology client-server system. To the best of our knowledge, our framework is the first to address privacy concerns in distributed training of graph neural networks.

4 THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

In this section, we prove the convergence of the PPSGCN algorithm and analyze its training overhead in comparison to baselines.

4.1 Convergence

We have the following theorem to guarantee for the convergence of our proposed PPSGCN algorithm.

THEOREM 3. Let $\|\overline{\nabla \mathcal{L}(W_T)}\|_2 = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \|\nabla \mathcal{L}(W_t)\|_2$. With a proper learning rate $\eta \leq \frac{1}{\rho}$, Algorithm 1 would converge to a local optimum with probability 1, i.e.,

$$\|\overline{\nabla \mathcal{L}(W_T)}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{L}(W_0) - \mathcal{L}(W_T)}{T\eta \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}\rho\eta\right)}}.$$

PROOF. Since the loss function \mathcal{L} defined in Equation (4) has ρ -continuous gradient, the follow inequality holds for the parameters W_{t+1} and W_t , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L}(W_{t+1}) \leq \mathcal{L}(W_t) + \nabla \mathcal{L}(W_t)^T (W_{t+1} - W_t) + \frac{\rho}{2} \|W_{t+1} - W_t\|_2^2.$$

Substitute $W_{t+1} = W_t - \eta \nabla \mathcal{L}_S(W_t)$ into the right side of the inequality above and take mathematical expectation on both sides,

then we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(W_{t+1}) &\leq \mathcal{L}(W_t) - \eta \nabla \mathcal{L}(W_t)^T \mathbb{E}[\nabla \mathcal{L}_S(W_t)] \\ &\quad + \frac{\rho\eta^2}{2} \|\mathbb{E}[\nabla \mathcal{L}_S(W_t)]\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbb{E}[\nabla \mathcal{L}_S(W_t)] = \nabla \mathcal{L}(W_t) + (\mathbb{E}[\nabla \mathcal{L}_S(W_t)] - \nabla \mathcal{L}(W_t))$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(W_{t+1}) &\leq \mathcal{L}(W_t) - \left(\eta - \frac{\rho\eta^2}{2}\right) \|\nabla \mathcal{L}(W_t)\|_2^2 \\ &\quad + \left(\eta - \rho\eta^2\right) \delta \mathcal{L}_t \|\nabla \mathcal{L}(W_t)\|_2 + \frac{\rho\eta^2}{2} \delta \mathcal{L}_t^2 \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

for $\eta \leq \frac{1}{\rho}$, where $\delta \mathcal{L}_t = \|\nabla \mathcal{L}(W_t) - \mathbb{E}[\nabla \mathcal{L}_S(W_t)]\|_2$.

According to the strong law of large numbers, for any $v \in \mathcal{V}_{S_i}$, we have $H_{S_i}^l[v, :] \rightarrow H_i^l[v, :]$ as the number of sampled nodes from each client go to infinity. As a result, we get $\delta \mathcal{L}_t \rightarrow 0$ with probability 1, moreover, $\delta \mathcal{L}_t \leq \epsilon_0$ holds for a small enough $\epsilon_0 > 0$. In this sense, the inequality Equation (11) turns to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(W_{t+1}) &\leq \mathcal{L}(W_t) - \left(\eta - \frac{\rho\eta^2}{2}\right) \|\nabla \mathcal{L}(W_t)\|_2^2 \\ &\quad + \epsilon_0 \left(\eta - \rho\eta^2\right) \|\nabla \mathcal{L}(W_t)\|_2 + \frac{1}{2} \rho\eta^2 \epsilon_0^2. \end{aligned}$$

Sum up all terms from $t = 0$ to $T - 1$ on both sides, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \|\nabla \mathcal{L}(W_t)\|_2^2 &\leq \frac{\epsilon_0(1 - \rho\eta)}{1 - \frac{1}{2}\rho\eta} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \|\nabla \mathcal{L}(W_t)\|_2 \\ &\quad + \frac{(\mathcal{L}(W_0) - \mathcal{L}(W_T))}{\eta - \frac{1}{2}\rho\eta^2} + \frac{\rho\eta\epsilon_0^2 T}{2 - \rho\eta} \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we substitute $\|\overline{\nabla \mathcal{L}(W_T)}\|_2 = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \|\nabla \mathcal{L}(W_t)\|_2$ into the inequality above to get

$$\|\overline{\nabla \mathcal{L}(W_T)}\|_2 \leq \frac{\epsilon_0(1 - \rho\eta)}{2 - \rho\eta} + \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_0^2}{(2 - \rho\eta)^2} + \frac{\mathcal{L}(W_0) - \mathcal{L}(W_T)}{T\eta \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}\rho\eta\right)}}$$

for $\eta \leq \frac{1}{\rho}$. In the ideal condition that ϵ_0 is small enough, we could approximately neglect the terms with ϵ_0 in the inequality above, and therefore the following inequality

$$\|\overline{\nabla \mathcal{L}(W_T)}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{L}(W_0) - \mathcal{L}(W_T)}{T\eta \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}\rho\eta\right)}}$$

holds for $\eta \leq \frac{1}{\rho}$. \square

4.2 Training Overhead

4.2.1 Communication Overhead. Communication steps are shown in Algorithm 1. In the forward propagation, each client C_j sends $m - 1$ local terms $L_{ij} O_j^{l-1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$ to the central server. Then the central server adds them up as $SUM_i = \sum_{j \neq i} L_{ij} O_j^{l-1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$. Finally, central server sends SUM_i to client C_i , $Z_{S_i}^l$ is consequently calculated within C_i . The communication volume required for forward propagation in Equation (9) is $Lmnsd$ per iteration. In the backward propagation, calculation of $\nabla_{Z_{S_i}^l} \mathcal{L}$ requires no communication because $\nabla_{Z_{S_j}^L} Loss_i = 0$, $i \neq j$. For

Table 1: Communication cost in the forward pass and memory cost in each iteration of different models. For CAGNET [23], we choose the method with least communication overhead, namely the 1.5d version. For CES-GCN [13], we exploit concepts in [25], inner set \mathcal{I} and boundary set \mathcal{B} , to express the communication and memory overhead globally. $c < m$ is a partition factor; t is the number of sampled neighbours for each node and t_b is the average number of boundary nodes in sampling neighbours; n_S is the size of sampling subgraph/layer; n_B is the size of boundary node set; n_{BS} is the number of boundary nodes in sampling subgraph; n_{IS} is the number of inner nodes in sampling subgraph.

| | CAGNET [23] | CES-GCN [13] | BDS-GCN [25] | Ours |
|----------|---|---------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|
| Sampling | × | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Privacy | × | × | × | ✓ |
| Comm | $\left(\frac{1}{c} + \frac{1}{m/c}\right)nLd$ | $n_S t_b^L d$ | $n_{BS} Ld$ | $m n_S Ld$ |
| Memory | $\frac{c}{m} nLd + cLd^2$ | $n_S t^L d + mLd^2$ | $(3n_{IS} + n_{BS})Ld + mLd^2$ | $n_S Ld + mLd^2$ |

Table 2: Statistics and details of three adopted node classification datasets.

| Dataset | Nodes | Edges | Node Features | Node Classes | Train / Val / Test |
|---------------|-----------|-------------|---------------|--------------|------------------------------|
| Pubmed | 19,717 | 44,338 | 500 | 3 | 18,217 / 500 / 1,000 |
| Reddit | 232,965 | 11,606,919 | 602 | 41 | 153,431 / 23,831 / 55,703 |
| Ogbn-products | 2,449,029 | 123,718,280 | 100 | 47 | 196,615 / 39,323 / 2,213,091 |

Equation (6), we follow the same communication steps as forward propagation with $L_{ij}P_j^l$ as local terms. $Lmn_S d$ communication volume is required by Equation (6) to aggregate gradient information. For Equation (7), we save the result $\nabla_{Z_{S_i}^{l-1}} \mathcal{L}_S$ locally and each client

C_i sends only one local gradient $\left(Z_{S_i}^{l-1}\right)^T \nabla_{Z_{S_i}^{l-1}} \mathcal{L}_S$ to the central server. Then the central server sums them up and derives global gradient as $SUM = \sum_{i=1}^m \left(Z_{S_i}^{l-1}\right)^T \nabla_{Z_{S_i}^{l-1}} \mathcal{L}_S$. Finally, central server scatters SUM to all clients to update local models with the same global gradient. The communication volume for Equation (7) is $2Lmd^2$. Therefore, the total communication cost in one iteration of PPSGCN is $2Lmd(n_S + d)$.

4.2.2 Memory Overhead. In each training epoch, a partition of the feature matrix is sampled and stored in memory. Therefore, our training data size is $n_S d$, and $n_S Ld$ in total for L layers. Besides, the model parameters are held in each client and call for mLd^2 of memory in total. Therefore, the overall memory overhead of PPSGCN is $n_S Ld + mLd^2$.

4.2.3 Model Comparison. We compare PPSGCN with existing distributed GCN algorithms in Table 1. As Table 1 shows, typically we have $BDS-GCN \leq PPSGCN$, $CES-GCN \leq CAGNET$ for communication overhead and $PPSGCN \leq BDS-GCN \leq CES-GCN \leq CAGNET$ for memory overhead. Specifically, $L < t_b^L$ holds in most cases, so PPSGCN has lower communication overhead than CES-GCN when clients number m is small. Therefore, we achieve the lowest memory and communication overhead without introducing redundant memory of feature data in the training process. For BDS-GCN [25], the reason for their lower communication overhead is that they reduce communication overhead by introducing redundant memory of boundary node features in different devices. In fact, BDS-GCN could be seen as a specific option in our sampling step where $p_v = 1$

Table 3: Micro F1-score of different methods on three datasets. "-" indicates that training faces out-of-memory problem. "*" denotes that we quote the result from their original papers. "N/A" means we could find neither the source code nor the result.

| Methods | PubMed | Reddit | Ogbn-products |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|
| GCN [15] | 87.70% | 93.3%* | 75.64%* |
| GAT [24] | 86.80% | - | - |
| LinkDist [17] | 89.58%* | - | - |
| GraphSAINT [29] | 88.50% | 96.6%* | 79.08%* |
| CAGNET [23] | 87.60% | 93.73% | 75.36% |
| CES-GCN [13] | N/A | 92.4%* | N/A |
| BDS-GCN [25] | N/A | 97.07%* | 79.44%* |
| PPSGCN | 90.10% | 96.05% | 79.15% |

when $v \in \mathcal{B}$ and $p_v = \frac{1}{n_S}$ otherwise. Moreover, through results shown in Table 1, sampling technique largely reduces both training and memory overhead and makes GCN training more scalable in distributed setting. Furthermore, subgraph sampling methods (PPSGCN, BDS-GCN) better mitigate neighbour explosion problems and improve training efficiency with lower communication and memory overhead, compared to node sampling. Besides, our proposed PPSGCN is the only method that achieves the goal of preserving data privacy.

5 EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we empirically evaluate the proposed PPSGCN with three prevalent node classification tasks and compare it with various centralized and distributed GCN training methods on both model

Table 4: Communication overhead, local computation time and memory overhead in an epoch. We adopt 5,000, 50,000 and 500,000 as the sampling size for Pubmed, Reddit and Ogbn-products respectively.

| Method | Communication time/s | | | Local computation time/s | | | Memory cost/MB | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|
| | Pubmed | Reddit | Products | Pubmed | Reddit | Products | Pubmed | Reddit | Products |
| CAGNET [23] (4 Clients) | 0.0438 | 0.6564 | 2.4193 | 0.2625 | 20.4794 | 35.9695 | 20.20 | 281.15 | 489.96 |
| PPSGCN (4 Clients) | 0.0209 | 0.1825 | 0.7676 | 0.0317 | 5.3505 | 2.1761 | 3.50 | 60.85 | 100.15 |
| CAGNET [23] (8 Clients) | 0.0842 | 1.0906 | 4.6355 | 0.3236 | 14.1883 | 31.3158 | 10.10 | 140.58 | 244.98 |
| PPSGCN (8 Clients) | 0.1095 | 0.2442 | 0.9490 | 0.0606 | 4.2031 | 1.6867 | 1.75 | 30.43 | 50.08 |

Table 5: Ablation study of graph sampling and normalization in the PPSGCN algorithm where PPSGCN-full represents the full-batch version of PPSGCN, and PPSGCN* denotes a variant of PPSGCN without normalization.

| Method | sampling | Normalization | Pubmed | Reddit | Ogbn-products |
|-------------------------|----------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| PPSGCN-full (4 Clients) | × | × | 87.60% | 94.63% | 74.01% |
| PPSGCN* (4 Clients) | ✓ | × | 89.73% | 95.96% | 78.10% |
| PPSGCN (4 Clients) | ✓ | ✓ | 90.30% | 96.02% | 79.11% |
| PPSGCN-full (8 Clients) | × | × | 87.60% | 94.61% | 74.10% |
| PPSGCN* (8 Clients) | ✓ | × | 89.70% | 95.89% | 78.04% |
| PPSGCN (8 Clients) | ✓ | ✓ | 90.10% | 96.05% | 79.15% |

performance and training overhead. We also conduct ablation study and analyze the effect of batch size and normalization.

5.1 Experimental Set-up

5.1.1 Dataset. We adopt three prevalent datasets in previous works [8, 12, 21] to evaluate PPSGCN: Pubmed¹, Reddit² and Ogbn-products³. PubMed is a citation network with nodes as scientific papers and edges as citations; Reddit is a large social network consisting of reddit posts in different communities, with nodes as posts and two posts share an edge when they are commented by one Reddit user; Ogbn-products is an Amazon product co-purchasing network where nodes represent products and edges indicate that the products are purchased together. We present details and statistics of these datasets in Table 2.

5.1.2 Baseline. We compare PPSGCN with existing methods in both centralized and distributed settings. For centralized methods,

- GCN [15], which introduces convolutional layers to graph neural networks.
- GAT [24], which introduces the attention mechanism to graph neural networks.
- LinkDist [17], which substitutes message-passing neighbour aggregation with MLP in graph neural networks.
- GraphSAINT [29], which proposes an inductive GCN training method with subgraph sampling and normalization.

For distributed methods, we have

- CAGNET [23], which presents several distributed GCN training techniques where computation is conducted on small client groups in parallel.

- a communication-efficient sampling method [13], denoted as CES-GCN, which proposes a skewed sampling technique for distributed GCN training.
- BDS-GCN [25], which proposes a boundary node sampling technique for distributed GCN training.

5.1.3 Implementation. We implement PPSGCN and existing baselines with the CPU version of Pytorch. To simulate a distributed learning setting, we use the communication primitives of the "Gloo" backend in torch.distributed. We randomly partition datasets into different subsets as in Equation (1) and assign each subset to a training process. We use the Adam optimizer [14] to learn model parameters. We make our code available at Dropbox.⁴

5.2 Experiment Results

We present the performance of PPSGCN and baselines on three datasets in Table 3. For all methods, we fix the hidden feature dimension at 128, and the dropout probability at 0.2. We independently search for the optimal learning rate among 0.1, 0.01 and 0.001 in each case. We train a 2-layer PPSGCN model on PubMed, and 3-layer model for Reddit and Ogbn-products. For centralized baselines, we run 2-layer GCN and GAT models in our transductive setting for 200 epochs on the Pubmed dataset. For distributed baselines, we fix the number of clients at 8 to ensure the fairness.

Table 3 demonstrates that our proposed PPSGCN generally outperforms existing baselines, which bears out the effectiveness of our method in the distributed setting. Especially, we achieve state-of-the-art performance on PubMed dataset with transductive setting, and outstrip most centralized methods on the largest dataset Ogbn-products. Moreover, experiment results verify the effectiveness of

¹<https://linqs.so.eucsc.edu/data>

²<http://snap.stanford.edu/graphsage/>

³<https://github.com/snap-stanford/ogb>

⁴https://www.dropbox.com/sh/hetdibd8x3ktjtc/AAAxpr8fsEMR12_pBMk4S5lxa?dl=0




Figure 2: Convergence curves of PPSGCN and PPSGCN-full on three datasets.

sampling methods (GraphSAINT, BDS-GCN and PPSGCN) on both training scalability and performance, especially on large graphs.

5.3 Training Overhead Study

PPSGCN aims to tackle the issues of heavy training overhead in existing methods. We analyze whether our proposed PPSGCN successfully reduces communication and memory overhead in its training process.

5.3.1 Communication Overhead. We firstly study PPSGCN’s communication overhead and compare it with existing methods. Model training time in these methods could be partitioned into local computation and communication over processes. For communication overhead, we record the time of communication function calls such as broadcast and reduce. We compare our proposed method with CAGNET [23] and present the results in Table 4. It is demonstrated that PPSGCN involves consistently lower communication overhead in both 4-client and 8-client settings. Especially in large datasets, e.g. Ogbn-products, PPSGCN reduces communication overhead for over 80% and local computation time for over 90% compared with CAGNET. Moreover, the communication overhead in the 8-client setting increases a little with regard to 4-client, while local communication time exhibits a significant decrease, which leads to lower training time cost even with more clients.

5.3.2 Memory Overhead. Besides, we also examine whether PPSGCN reduces memory overhead in the training process. The memory cost primarily consists of two parts, node features in pytorch computational graphs and model parameters, which are distributed in different clients. We record memory costs in one epoch for each client in Table 4. As Table 4 shows, PPSGCN largely reduces memory overhead for over 80% decrease in each case.

5.4 Ablation Study

We observe that sampling and normalization greatly impact the performance of PPSGCN. Thus, we design ablation experiments to remove them separately and run experiments with ablated versions. Results in Table 5 demonstrate that PPSGCN has the best performance in most cases. And PPSGCN* has a bit lower performance but still better than PPSGCN-full. Since the normalization coefficient satisfies $\frac{1}{\alpha} > 1$, PPSGCN has a larger variance on performance than




Figure 3: Local computation time and communication overhead with different batch sizes on Reddit.

PPSGCN*. As a result, both sampling and normalization steps are crucial to PPSGCN’s desirable performance.

5.5 Discussion

5.5.1 Convergence Study. Besides low training overhead, our proposed PPSGCN also has high convergence rate, and both factors are significant to the overall training efficiency. To prove the fast convergence of PPSGCN, we record the micro f1-score and training time in each epoch. In Figure 2, we illustrate the convergence curves of PPSGCN and its full-batch counterpart PPSGCN-full, namely the change in micro f1-score with training time. It is demonstrated that PPSGCN requires significantly less time to converge while achieving similar or even better performance. This indicates that our subgraph sampling method greatly contributes to the algorithm’s rapid convergence.

5.5.2 Batch Size Study. In the experiments, we observed that the batch size in PPSGCN has significant effect on model efficiency. We further conduct experiments with different batch size and present the results in Figure 3. For each epoch, we fix the number of training nodes at 100,000. When step length equals 2, batch size equals 50,000 and model parameters are updated twice per epoch. After training for 10 epochs, we obtain the average communication cost and local computation time. Figure 3 illustrates that as we augment the step length, communication time keeps increasing and local computation time decreases with a decaying rate. In particular, total

training time reaches minimum when step length equals 12. This indicates that step length (and consequently batch size) governs the trade-off between local computation and communication overhead, where the optimal value varies in different experiment settings.

6 CONCLUSION

We presented PPSGCN, a novel distributed GCN training method. Specifically, we sample a local node subset in each client to form a global subgraph. After local computation with features or gradients of the sampled nodes, all clients combine local results by securely communicating with the central server with homomorphic encryption. We analyzed that training on subgraphs largely reduces the communication and memory overhead, while encrypted communication successfully preserves data privacy. We also proved the convergence of our PPSGCN algorithm. Finally, we conducted extensive experiments to compare PPSGCN with various baselines, which demonstrates that our proposed PPSGCN method largely reduces training overhead while maintaining desirable performance.

A future direction is to further examine the relationship between distributed GNN models and federated graph learning. It's possible to propose a paradigm that jointly incorporates them in a profound perspective to better solve real-world problems.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alexandra Angerd, Keshav Balasubramanian, and Murali Annavam. 2020. Distributed Training of Graph Convolutional Networks using Subgraph Approximation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.04930* (2020).
- [2] Jie Chen, Tengfei Ma, and Cao Xiao. 2018. Fastgcn: fast learning with graph convolutional networks via importance sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.10247* (2018).
- [3] Jianfei Chen, Jun Zhu, and Le Song. 2017. Stochastic training of graph convolutional networks with variance reduction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.10568* (2017).
- [4] Wei-Lin Chiang, Xuanqing Liu, Si Si, Yang Li, Samy Bengio, and Cho-Jui Hsieh. 2019. Cluster-gcn: An efficient algorithm for training deep and large graph convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. 257–266.
- [5] Chantat Eksombatchai, Pranav Jindal, Jerry Zitao Liu, Yuchen Liu, Rahul Sharma, Charles Sugnet, Mark Ulrich, and Jure Leskovec. 2018. Pixie: A system for recommending 3+ billion items to 200+ million users in real-time. In *Proceedings of the 2018 world wide web conference*. 1775–1784.
- [6] Shangbin Feng, Zhaoxuan Tan, Rui Li, and Minnan Luo. 2021. Heterogeneity-aware Twitter Bot Detection with Relational Graph Transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.02927* (2021).
- [7] Alex M Fout. 2017. *Protein interface prediction using graph convolutional networks*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Colorado State University.
- [8] William L Hamilton, Rex Ying, and Jure Leskovec. 2017. Inductive representation learning on large graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.02216* (2017).
- [9] William L Hamilton, Rex Ying, and Jure Leskovec. 2017. Representation learning on graphs: Methods and applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.05584* (2017).
- [10] Chaoyang He, Keshav Balasubramanian, Emir Ceyani, Yu Rong, Peilin Zhao, Junzhou Huang, Murali Annavam, and Salman Avestimehr. 2021. Fedgraphnn: A federated learning system and benchmark for graph neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.07145* (2021).
- [11] Xiangnan He, Kuan Deng, Xiang Wang, Yan Li, Yongdong Zhang, and Meng Wang. 2020. Lightgcn: Simplifying and powering graph convolution network for recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval*. 639–648.
- [12] Weihua Hu, Matthias Fey, Marinka Zitnik, Yuxiao Dong, Hongyu Ren, Bowen Liu, Michele Catasta, and Jure Leskovec. 2020. Open graph benchmark: Datasets for machine learning on graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.00687* (2020).
- [13] Peng Jiang and Masuma Akter Rumi. 2021. Communication-Efficient Sampling for Distributed Training of Graph Convolutional Networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.07706* (2021).
- [14] Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2014. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980* (2014).
- [15] Thomas N Kipf and Max Welling. 2016. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.02907* (2016).
- [16] Tian Li, Anit Kumar Sahu, Manzil Zaheer, Maziar Sanjabi, Ameet Talwalkar, and Virginia Smith. 2018. Federated optimization in heterogeneous networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.06127* (2018).
- [17] Yi Luo, Aiguo Chen, Ke Yan, and Ling Tian. 2021. Distilling Self-Knowledge From Contrastive Links to Classify Graph Nodes Without Passing Messages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.08541* (2021).
- [18] Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Aguerre y Arcas. 2017. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*. PMLR, 1273–1282.
- [19] Guangxu Mei, Ziyu Guo, Shijun Liu, and Li Pan. 2019. Sgnn: A graph neural network based federated learning approach by hiding structure. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*. IEEE, 2560–2568.
- [20] Pascal Paillier. 1999. Public-key cryptosystems based on composite degree residuosity classes. In *International conference on the theory and applications of cryptographic techniques*. Springer, 223–238.
- [21] Prithviraj Sen, Galileo Namata, Mustafa Bilgic, Lise Getoor, Brian Galligher, and Tina Eliassi-Rad. 2008. Collective classification in network data. *AI magazine* 29, 3 (2008), 93–93.
- [22] Virginia Smith, Chao-Kai Chiang, Maziar Sanjabi, and Ameet Talwalkar. 2017. Federated multi-task learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.10467* (2017).
- [23] Alok Tripathy, Katherine Yelick, and Aydin Buluc. 2020. Reducing communication in graph neural network training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.03300* (2020).
- [24] Petar Veličković, Guillem Cucurull, Arantxa Casanova, Adriana Romero, Pietro Lio, and Yoshua Bengio. 2017. Graph attention networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.10903* (2017).
- [25] Cheng Wan, Youjie Li, Nam Sung Kim, and Yingyan Lin. 2020. BDS-GCN: Efficient Full-Graph Training of Graph Convolutional Nets with Partition-Parallelism and Boundary Sampling. (2020).
- [26] Binghui Wang, Ang Li, Hai Li, and Yiran Chen. 2020. Graphfl: A federated learning framework for semi-supervised node classification on graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.04187* (2020).
- [27] Chuhan Wu, Fangzhao Wu, Yang Cao, Yongfeng Huang, and Xing Xie. 2021. Fedgcn: Federated graph neural network for privacy-preserving recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.04925* (2021).
- [28] Rex Ying, Ruining He, Kaifeng Chen, Pong Eksombatchai, William L Hamilton, and Jure Leskovec. 2018. Graph convolutional neural networks for web-scale recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. 974–983.
- [29] Hanqing Zeng, Hongkuan Zhou, Ajitesh Srivastava, Rajgopal Kannan, and Viktor Prasanna. 2019. Graphsaint: Graph sampling based inductive learning method. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.04931* (2019).
- [30] Longfei Zheng, Jun Zhou, Chaochao Chen, Bingzhe Wu, Li Wang, and Benyu Zhang. 2021. ASFGNN: Automated separated-federated graph neural network. *Peer-to-Peer Networking and Applications* (2021), 1–13.
- [31] Jun Zhou, Chaochao Chen, Longfei Zheng, Huiwen Wu, Jia Wu, Xiaolin Zheng, Bingzhe Wu, Ziqi Liu, and Li Wang. 2020. Vertically Federated Graph Neural Network for Privacy-Preserving Node Classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.11903* (2020).
- [32] Rong Zhu, Kun Zhao, Hongxia Yang, Wei Lin, Chang Zhou, Baole Ai, Yong Li, and Jingren Zhou. 2019. Aligraph: a comprehensive graph neural network platform. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.08730* (2019).
- [33] Difan Zou, Ziniu Hu, Yewen Wang, Song Jiang, Yizhou Sun, and Quanquan Gu. 2019. Layer-dependent importance sampling for training deep and large graph convolutional networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.07323* (2019).