
SigMaNet: One Laplacian to Rule Them All

Stefano Fiorini

University of Milano-Bicocca
Department of Informatics,
Systems and Communication
Milan, Italy
s.fiorini2@campus.unimib.it

Stefano Coniglio

University of Southampton
School of Mathematical Sciences
Southampton, England, United Kingdom

Michele Ciavotta

University of Milano-Bicocca
Department of Informatics,
Systems and Communication
Milan, Italy

Enza Messina

University of Milano-Bicocca
Department of Informatics,
Systems and Communication
Milan, Italy

Abstract

This paper introduces SigMaNet, a generalized Graph Convolutional Network (GCN) capable of handling both undirected and directed graphs with weights not restricted in sign and magnitude. The cornerstone of SigMaNet is the introduction of a generalized Laplacian matrix: the *Sign-Magnetic Laplacian* (L^σ). The adoption of such a matrix allows us to bridge a gap in the current literature by extending the theory of spectral GCNs to directed graphs with both positive and negative weights. L^σ exhibits several desirable properties not enjoyed by the traditional Laplacian matrices on which several state-of-the-art architectures are based. In particular, L^σ is completely parameter-free, which is not the case of Laplacian operators such as the *Magnetic Laplacian* $L^{(q)}$, where the calibration of the parameter q is an essential yet problematic component of the operator. L^σ simplifies the approach, while also allowing for a natural interpretation of the signs of the edges in terms of their directions. The versatility of the proposed approach is amply demonstrated experimentally; the proposed network SigMaNet turns out to be competitive in all the tasks we considered, regardless of the graph structure.

1 Introduction

The dramatic improvement of neural network and deep-learning technology has provided researchers and practitioners with powerful instruments to investigate the world. Increasingly complex phenomena and processes which can often be modeled as graphs or networks, such as, e.g., social networks [Backstrom and Leskovec, 2011], knowledge graphs [Zou, 2020], protein interaction networks [Kashyap et al., 2018], or the World Wide Web (only to mention a few) can be now addressed via Graph Convolutional Networks (GCNs). Compared to other approaches, GCNs effectively manage to represent the data and the relationships between them by explicitly capturing the topology of the underlying graph within a suitably designed convolution operator.

In the literature, GCNs mostly belong to two main categories: spectral-based and spatial-based [Wu et al., 2020]. While spatial GCNs define the convolution operator as a localized aggregation operation [Wang et al., 2019], spectral GCNs define it as a function of the eigenvalue decomposition of the Laplacian matrix associated with the graph [Kipf and Welling, 2016b]. In their basic definition, both methods assume the graph to be undirected and with nonnegative weights. For a comprehensive review, we refer the reader to [Zhang et al., 2019, Wu et al., 2020, He et al., 2022].

Many real systems can be modeled as directed graphs. While spatial-based GCNs have a natural extension to directed graphs, for spectral methods the situation is different. Due to being based on graph signal processing [Sandryhaila and Moura, 2013, Chen et al., 2015], spectral GCNs require three fundamental properties to be satisfied: *a)* the Laplacian matrix must be diagonalizable, i.e., it must admit an eigenvalue decomposition, *b)* the Laplacian matrix must be positive semidefinite [Wu et al., 2020], and *c)* the spectrum of the normalized Laplacian matrix must be upper-bounded by 2 [Kipf and Welling, 2016b]. For these reasons, most spectral methods require the graph to be undirected and to have nonnegative weights. In recent years, however, several approaches have proposed to overcome this limitation by introducing various extensions of the definition of the Laplacian matrix, such as the *Magnetic Laplacian* [Zhang et al., 2021b,a] and the *Approximate Digraph Laplacian* constructed via the PageRank matrix [Tong et al., 2020a].

Due to the fundamental limitations of the underpinning theory (cf. the three aforementioned properties (*a,b,c*)), none of the spectral techniques introduced so far can handle (un)directed graphs with weights unrestricted in sign. To overcome this major limitation, in this paper we introduce SigMaNet, a generalized GCN based on a novel Laplacian matrix, to which we refer as the *Sign-Magnetic Laplacian* (L^σ), which is capable of handling both directed and undirected graphs with weights unrestricted in sign and of arbitrary magnitude.

The contributions in this paper are as follows: *i)* The theory underlying spectral networks is extended by proposing a general approach capable of handling directed and undirected graphs with weights without restrictions in sign or magnitude. This makes the GCN that we build around L^σ , which we refer to as SigMaNet, graph-agnostic, as it does not require prior knowledge of the graph’s structure. *ii)* A novel Laplacian matrix, *Sign-Magnetic Laplacian*, is proposed. We show that L^σ satisfies all the properties that are needed for the definition of a convolution operator, among which being positive semidefinite regardless of the sign and magnitude of the edge weights. Moreover, compared with other proposals, L^σ is parameter-free. The lack of the need for hyperparameter selection makes the process of defining the overall network architecture simpler and dataset agnostic. L^σ also exhibits some useful structural properties, such as being positively homogeneous (which implies that it is proportional to the magnitude of the adjacency matrix) and allowing for a natural interpretation of the signs of the edges in terms of their directions—two properties that other Laplacian matrices do not enjoy (on graphs for which they are well-defined). *iii)* The performance of SigMaNet is assessed by comparing it against several other state-of-the-art methods on node-classification and link-prediction tasks using both real-world and synthetically-generated datasets. The results show that SigMaNet outperforms the competitors in most experiments while being in line with the performance of the best approaches in all the remaining cases.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. Preliminaries and previous works are summarized in Section 2. The *Sign-Magnetic Laplacian* operator is introduced in Section 3 together with its properties. The section also provides an overview of the SigMaNet architecture that we build upon the Sign-Magnetic Laplacian. Computational results are reported in Section 4, where we apply our model to node classification and link prediction tasks and compare it to different state-of-the-art spectral and spatial methods. The proofs of our theorems and further numerical results are provided in the supplementary Appendix.

2 Preliminaries and previous works

For a given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $[n]$ the set of integers $\{1, \dots, n\}$. For a given matrix M of appropriate dimensions with real eigenvalues, we denote its largest eigenvalue by $\lambda_{\max}(M)$. Throughout the paper, e and ee^\top denote the all-one vector and matrix of appropriate dimensions. Undirected and directed graphs are denoted by $G = (V, E)$, where V is the set of vertices and E the set of edges. In the undirected (directed) case, E is a collection of unordered (ordered) pairs of V . G is always assumed not to contain self-loops.

2.1 Generalized convolution matrices

Let, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $M \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ be a positive semidefinite Hermitian matrix¹ with eigenvalue (or spectral) decomposition $M = U\Lambda U^*$, where $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a diagonal matrix of the real eigenvalues

¹A matrix is called Hermitian if its real part is symmetric and its imaginary part skew-symmetric.

of M , $U \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$, and U^* is the complex conjugate of U . For each $i \in [n]$, the i -th column of U coincides with the i -th eigenvector of M corresponding to its i -th eigenvalue Λ_{ii} . The columns of U form a basis of \mathbb{C}^n . We assume $\lambda_{\max}(M) \leq 2$.

Given a *signal* $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$, let \hat{x} be its discrete Fourier transform with basis U , i.e., $\hat{x} = U^*x$. As $U^{-1} = U^*$, the transformation is invertible and the antitransform of \hat{x} reads $x = U\hat{x}$. Given a *filter* $y \in \mathbb{C}^n$, the transform of its convolution with x satisfies the relationship $\widehat{y * x} = \hat{y} \odot \hat{x} = \text{Diag}(\hat{y})\hat{x}$, where $*$ and \odot denote the convolution and the Hadamard (or componentwise) product, respectively. By antitransforming, we have $y * x = U \text{Diag}(\hat{y})U^*x$. Letting $\Sigma := \text{Diag}(\hat{y})$, we call *generalized convolution matrix* the matrix $Y := U\Sigma U^*$, as $y * x = Yx$.

Let $\tilde{\Lambda} := \frac{2}{\lambda_{\max}(M)}\Lambda - I$ be a normalization of Λ . As $UU^* = I$, the same normalization applied to M leads to $\tilde{M} = U\tilde{\Lambda}U^* = \frac{2}{\lambda_{\max}}M - I$. Following Hammond et al. [2011], Kipf and Welling [2016b], we assume that y is such that the entries of \hat{y} are real-valued polynomials in $\tilde{\Lambda}$, i.e., that $\hat{y}_i = \sum_{k=0}^K \theta_k T_k(\tilde{\lambda}_i)$, $i \in [n]$, where $\theta_0, \dots, \theta_K \in \mathbb{R}$, $K \in \mathbb{N}$, and T_k is the Chebyshev polynomial of the first kind of order k . T_k is recursively defined as $T_0(x) = 1$, $T_1(x) = x$, and $T_k(x) = 2xT_{k-1}(x) - T_{k-2}(x)$ for $k \geq 2$, with $x \in \mathbb{R} \cap [-1, 1]$. Thus, we rewrite Σ as $\Sigma = \text{Diag}(\hat{y}) = \sum_{k=0}^K \theta_k T_k(\tilde{\Lambda})$, where T_k is applied componentwise to $\tilde{\Lambda}$, i.e., $(T_k(\tilde{\Lambda}))_{ij} = T_k(\tilde{\Lambda}_{ij})$ for all $i, j \in [n]$. With this, the convolution of x (by y) can be rewritten as $Yx = U\Sigma U^*x = U \left(\sum_{k=0}^K \theta_k T_k(\tilde{\Lambda}) \right) U^*x$. Since, as it is easy to verify, $(U\tilde{\Lambda}U^*)^k = U\tilde{\Lambda}^k U^*$ holds for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, one can also verify that $Yx = U \left(\sum_{k=0}^K \theta_k T_k(\tilde{\Lambda}) \right) U^*x = \sum_{k=0}^K \theta_k T_k(U\tilde{\Lambda}U^*)x = \sum_{k=0}^K \theta_k T_k(\tilde{M})x$.

Assuming $\lambda_{\max} \simeq 2$, we have $\tilde{M} = M - I$. Letting $K = 1$ and $\theta_1 = -\theta_0$, deduce:

$$y * x = Yx = (\theta_0 I - \theta_0(M - I))x = \theta_0(2I - M)x. \quad (1)$$

If M is chosen so as to express the topology of the graph and x coincides with the graph features, Eq. (1) represents the convolution operation underlying a spectral GCN. M should satisfy three properties for Eq. (1) to apply: *i*) it should admit an eigenvalue decomposition, *ii*) it should be positive semidefinite, and *iii*) its spectrum should be upper-bounded by 2. Examples of M are given in the following subsections.

2.2 Spectral convolutions for undirected graphs

Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph with $n = |V|$ without weights nor signs associated with its edges and let $A \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$ be its adjacency matrix, with $A_{ij} = 1$ if and only if $\{i, j\} \in E$. The Laplacian matrix of G is defined [Chung and Graham, 1997] as:

$$L := D - A, \quad (2)$$

where $D := \text{Diag}(Ae)$ is a diagonal matrix and, for each $i \in V$, D_{ii} equal to the degree of node i . The normalized Laplacian matrix is defined as:

$$L_{\text{norm}} := D^{-\frac{1}{2}}LD^{-\frac{1}{2}} = D^{-\frac{1}{2}}(D - A)D^{-\frac{1}{2}} = I - D^{-\frac{1}{2}}AD^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (3)$$

L_{norm} satisfies a variety of properties, among which properties *i*), *ii*) and *iii*).

The spectral convolution on the undirected graph G proposed by Kipf and Welling [2016b] is obtained by letting $M := L_{\text{norm}}$ and defining Y as in Subsection 2.1. Eq. (1) becomes:

$$y * x = Yx = \theta_0(2I - (I - D^{-\frac{1}{2}}AD^{-\frac{1}{2}}))x = \theta_0(I + D^{-\frac{1}{2}}AD^{-\frac{1}{2}})x. \quad (4)$$

To alleviate numerical instabilities and exploding/vanishing gradients when training a GCN built on Eq. (4), Kipf and Welling [2016b] suggest the adoption of the following modified equation with a modified convolution matrix \tilde{Y} :

$$y * x = \tilde{Y}x = \theta_0(\tilde{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{A}\tilde{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}})x, \quad (5)$$

where $\tilde{A} := A + I$ and $\tilde{D} := \text{Diag}(\tilde{A}e)$.

Drawbacks. The Laplacian matrix L is well-defined only for undirected graphs with (if any) non-negative weights. Indeed, if G is a directed graph, the adjacency matrix A (and, thus, L) is, in the

general case, not symmetric. It follows that L does not admit, in general, an eigenvalue decomposition. Moreover, the sum of the rows of A is not necessarily identical to the sum of its columns, and, thus, the matrix D is not well-defined (as $\text{Diag}(Ae) \neq \text{Diag}(e^\top A)$). If, on the other hand, G is undirected but contains edges $(i, j) \in E$ with a negative weight $w_{ij} < 0$, L is not, in the general case, positive semidefinite as, even if $\text{Diag}(Ae) = \text{Diag}(e^\top A)$, $D^{-\frac{1}{2}} \notin \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ if $D_{ii} < 0$ for some $i \in V$.

2.3 Bringing spectral convolutions to directed graphs: the Magnetic Laplacian

Since the adjacency matrix of a directed graph is asymmetric, the Laplacian matrix defined as in Eq (3) does not enjoy properties *i*), *ii*) and *iii*) and, therefore, it is not possible to directly apply Eq. (4) to define a spectral graph convolution. Alternative approaches such as those of Tong et al. [2020b] and Tong et al. [2020a] which split the adjacency matrix A into a collection of symmetric matrices in such a way that the information regarding the direction of the edges is not lost are known, but they typically comes at the cost of increasing the size and complexity of the neural network.

A more direct way to encode the directional information of the edges is resorting to complex-valued matrices that are Hermitian, which, albeit asymmetric in the general case, admit an eigenvalue decomposition with real eigenvalues. The *Magnetic Laplacian* is one such matrix. It was first introduced in particle physics and quantum mechanics by Lieb and Loss [1993] and then applied in the context of community detection by Fanuel et al. [2018], in graph signal processing by Furutani et al. [2019] and, lastly, in the context of spectral GCNs by Zhang et al. [2021b,a].

Let $A_s := \frac{1}{2}(A + A^\top)$ be the symmetrized version of A and let $D_s := \text{Diag}(A_s e)$. The *Magnetic Laplacian* matrix is defined as the following Hermitian positive semidefinite matrix:

$$L^{(q)} := D_s - H^{(q)}, \quad \text{with } H^{(q)} := A_s \odot \exp(\mathbf{i}\Theta^{(q)}), \Theta^{(q)} := 2\pi q(A - A^\top), \quad (6)$$

where \mathbf{i} is the square root of the negative unit, i.e., $\mathbf{i} = \sqrt{-1}$, and $\exp(\mathbf{i}\Theta^{(q)}) = \cos(\Theta^{(q)}) + \mathbf{i}\sin(\Theta^{(q)})$, where $\cos(\cdot)$ and $\sin(\cdot)$ are applied componentwise. Θ is a phase matrix that captures the directional information of the edges [Zhang et al., 2021b]. The parameter $q \geq 0$ is the electric charge parameter. It is typically set to values smaller than 1 such as $[0, \frac{1}{4}]$ as in Zhang et al. [2021b] or $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$ as in Fanuel et al. [2017]. If $q = 0$, $\Theta^{(q)} = 0$ and $L^{(q)}$ boils down to the Laplacian matrix L defined on the symmetrized version of the graph with adjacency matrix A_s (this, incidentally, renders G completely undirected and its directional information is lost).

For unweighted directed graphs, $H^{(q)}$ straightforwardly captures the directional information of the graph. Assuming $q = 0.25$, we have $H_{ij}^{(q)} = H_{ji}^{(q)} = 1 + \mathbf{i}0$ if $(i, j), (j, i) \in E$ and $H_{ij}^{(q)} = 0 + \mathbf{i}\frac{1}{2}$ and $H_{ji}^{(q)} = 0 - \mathbf{i}\frac{1}{2}$ if $(i, j) \in E \wedge (j, i) \notin E$. This way, antiparallel edges are represented as single undirected edges in the real part of $H^{(q)}$, whereas any other edge is represented in the imaginary part of $H^{(q)}$ with a sign encoding its direction.

Drawbacks. The main drawback of the *Magnetic Laplacian* is that it is well-defined only for graphs with nonnegative weights. Indeed, if $(D_s)_{ii} < 0$ for some $i \in V$, in the general case $L^{(q)}$ is not positive semidefinite and $D_s^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ does not belong to $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. Even when restricting ourselves to the graphs with nonnegative weights, $L^{(q)}$ exhibits a crucial sign-pattern inconsistency if the graph weights are sufficiently large. Indeed, while for unweighted graphs $L^{(q)}$ captures the directional information of the edges by the sign of the imaginary part of $H^{(q)}$, this is not necessarily the case for weighted graphs as the sign pattern of $H^{(q)}$ can change drastically by just scaling the weights of the graph by a constant. For instance, assume $(i, j) \in E$ and $(j, i) \notin E$ with $A_{ij} = 1$. Then, we obtain: $H_{ij}^{(0.25)} = 0.40 \cdot 0.31 + \mathbf{i}0.40 \cdot 0.95$ and $H_{ji}^{(0.25)} = 0.40 \cdot 0.31 - \mathbf{i}0.40 \cdot 0.95$ by scaling A_{ij} by 0.8; $H_{ij}^{(0.25)} = -1 + \mathbf{i}0$ by scaling A_{ij} by 2; $H_{ij}^{(0.25)} = 0 + \mathbf{i}\frac{5}{2}$ by scaling A_{ij} by 5; and $H_{ij}^{(0.25)} = \frac{36}{2} + \mathbf{i}0$ by scaling A_{ij} by 36. A full example of this behavior is reported in the Appendix C.

3 Our proposal: the Sign-Magnetic Laplacian and the SigMaNet GCN

In this section, we extend the theory underlying spectral networks by introducing the *Sign-Magnetic Laplacian* matrix, a positive semidefinite Hermitian matrix that well captures the directional as well as the weight information of any directed graph with weights unrestricted in sign nor magnitude.

3.1 Sign-Magnetic Laplacian

We introduce the following Hermitian matrix, which we refer to as the *Sign-Magnetic Laplacian*:

$$L^\sigma := \bar{D}_s - H^\sigma, \text{ where } H^\sigma := A_s \odot \left(ee^\top - \text{sgn}(|A - A^\top|) + \mathbf{i} \text{sgn}(|A| - |A^\top|) \right), \quad (7)$$

where $A_s := \frac{1}{2}(A + A^\top)$, $\bar{D}_s := \text{Diag}(|A_s|e)$, and $\text{sgn} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ is the signum function (applied componentwise).

As one can see, H^σ encodes the direction and weight of every edge $(i, j) \in E$ that does not have an antiparallel edge (j, i) purely in its imaginary part by $H_{ij}^\sigma = -H_{ji}^\sigma = 0 + \mathbf{i}\frac{1}{2}A_{ij}$. Pairs of antiparallel edges with $A_{ij} = A_{ji}$ are encoded purely in the real part by $H_{ij}^\sigma = H_{ji}^\sigma = \frac{1}{2}(A_{ij} + A_{ji}) + \mathbf{i}0$ (as if they coincided with an undirected edge of the same weight). Differently, pairs of antiparallel edges with $A_{ij} \neq A_{ji}$ are encoded purely in the imaginary part by $H_{ij}^\sigma = -H_{ji}^\sigma = 0 + \mathbf{i}\frac{1}{2}(A_{ij} + A_{ji})$ if $|A_{ij}| > |A_{ji}|$ and $H_{ij}^\sigma = -H_{ji}^\sigma = 0 - \mathbf{i}\frac{1}{2}(A_{ij} + A_{ji})$ if $|A_{ij}| < |A_{ji}|$.

We define the normalized version of L^σ as:

$$L_{\text{norm}}^\sigma := \bar{D}_s^{-\frac{1}{2}} L^\sigma \bar{D}_s^{-\frac{1}{2}} = I - \bar{D}_s^{-\frac{1}{2}} H^\sigma \bar{D}_s^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (8)$$

It is easy to see that both L^σ and L_{norm}^σ are Hermitian by construction. Therefore, they admit an eigenvalue decomposition, thus satisfying property *i*) of Subsection 2.1.

Note that L^σ is defined in such a way that, if G is unweighted, it mirrors the behavior of $L^{(q)}$ with $q = 0.25$:

Theorem 1. *If $A \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$ and $q = 0.25$, we have $L^\sigma = L^{(q)}$.*

Differently from $L^{(q)}$, L^σ is well-defined even if G admits negative weights. In particular, with the following two results (whose proofs are reported in the Appendix) we show that L_{norm}^σ enjoys the two remaining properties *ii*) and *iii*) that are required for the construction of a convolution operator:

Theorem 2. *L^σ and L_{norm}^σ are positive semidefinite.*

Theorem 3. *$\lambda_{\max}(L_{\text{norm}}^\sigma) \leq 2$.*

The following result is crucial to show that L^σ encodes the topology of G and its directions in such a way that L^σ is proportional to the magnitude of A . This guarantees that the sign-pattern of L^σ is uniquely determined by the topology of G .

Theorem 4. *Let $L^\sigma(X)$ be the Sign-Magnetic Laplacian matrix of a directed graph with adjacency matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. Given two matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times n}$, L^σ satisfies the following positive homogeneity property:*

$$L^\sigma(A \odot B) = L^\sigma(A) \odot B_s, \quad \text{with } B_s := \frac{1}{2}(B + B^\top).$$

Moreover, given a constant $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $L^\sigma(\alpha A) = \alpha L^\sigma(A)$.

The theorem implies that L^σ does not suffer from the sign-flipping issue that $L^{(q)}$ suffers from, and that it is robust to the scaling applied to the weights of G .

Lastly, we show that the *Sign-Magnetic Laplacian* L^σ satisfies the following invariant:

Theorem 5. *Consider a weighted directed graph $G = (V, E)$ without pairs of antiparallel edges (digons). Given a directed edge $(i, j) \in E$ of weight w_{ij} , let $G' = (V, E)$ be a copy of G obtained by reversing the direction of (i, j) into (j, i) and flipping the sign of its weight by letting $w_{ji} = -w_{ij}$. Let $L^\sigma(G)$ and $L^\sigma(G')$ be the L^σ matrix defined on G and G' , respectively. $L^\sigma(G) = L^\sigma(G')$ holds.*

Theorem 5 shows that the behavior of L^σ is consistent with applications where the graph models a flow relationship in which flipping the sign of an edge coincides with flipping its direction. Indeed, for scenarios where the weights represent flow values, it is reasonable to assume that a negative flow from i to j correspond to a positive flow from j to i .

3.2 The SigMaNet architecture

As discussed in Subsection 2.2, for a well-defined spectral convolution operator the Laplacian must satisfy properties *i*), *ii*), and *iii*). The hermiticity of L_{norm}^σ , Theorem 2, and Theorem 3 prove that L_{norm}^σ possesses those properties. Thus, Eq. (4) can be rewritten as follows:

$$Yx = \theta_0 \left(I + \bar{D}_s^{-\frac{1}{2}} H^\sigma \bar{D}_s^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) x. \quad (9)$$

Following Kipf and Welling [2016a], to avoid numerical instabilities, we adopt Eq. (5) with $\tilde{D}_s^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{H}^\sigma \tilde{D}_s^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ in lieu of $I + \bar{D}_s^{-\frac{1}{2}} H^\sigma \bar{D}_s^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, where \tilde{H}^σ and \tilde{D}_s are defined as in Subsection 3.1 for $\tilde{A} := A + I$ rather than A . The feature vector signal $x \in \mathcal{C}^{n \times 1}$ can be generalized to a feature matrix signal $X \in \mathcal{C}^{n \times c}$ with c input channels (i.e., a c -dimensional feature vector for every node of the graph). Letting $\Theta \in \mathcal{C}^{c \times f}$ be a matrix of learnable filter parameters with f filters and ϕ be an activation function applied componentwise to the input matrix, the output $Z^\sigma \in \mathcal{C}^{n \times f}$ of the convolutional layer is:

$$Z^\sigma(X) = \phi(\tilde{D}_s^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{H}^\sigma \tilde{D}_s^{-\frac{1}{2}} X \Theta). \quad (10)$$

Since the argument of ϕ is a complex matrix and, thus, traditional activation functions cannot be directly adopted, we follow Zhang et al. [2021b] and rely on a complex version of the *ReLU* activation function, defined for a given $z \in \mathcal{C}$ as $\phi(z) = z$ if $\Re(z) \geq 0$ and $\phi(z) = 0$ otherwise. As the output of the convolutional layer Z^σ is complex-valued, to coerce it into the reals without information loss, we apply, as other approaches from the literature [Zhang et al., 2021b], an *unwind* operation by which $Z^\sigma(X) \in \mathcal{C}^{n \times f}$ is transformed into $[\Re(Z^\sigma(X)); \Im(Z^\sigma(X))] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 2f}$ and, to obtain the final results, depending on the task, a linear layer with weights W or a $1D$ convolution is applied.

Considering, e.g., the task of predicting the class of an edge, SigMaNet is defined as:

$$\text{softmax} \left(\text{unwind} \left(Z^{\sigma(2)} \left(Z^{\sigma(1)} \left(X^{(0)} \right) \right) \right) W \right),$$

where $X^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times c}$ is the input feature matrix, $Z^{\sigma(1)} \in \mathcal{C}^{c \times f_1}$ and $Z^{\sigma(2)} \in \mathcal{C}^{n \times f_2}$ are the spectral graph convolutional layers, $W \in \mathbb{R}^{2f_2 \times d}$ are the weights of the linear layer, with d being the number of classes to be predicted, and $\text{softmax} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is the normalized exponential activation function.

We conclude by noting that SigMaNet features a fairly simple and flexible architecture that mainly differs from other proposals in the literature (e.g., MagNet [Zhang et al., 2021b]) in the way the convolutional layer is defined. Nonetheless, being based on L^σ which is parameter-free, SigMaNet does not require fine-tuning to optimize the propagation of topological information through the network, differently from, e.g., DiGraph [Tong et al., 2020a] and MagNet [Zhang et al., 2021b].

4 Numerical experiments

In this section, we report on a set of computational experiments carried out on three tasks: *link sign prediction*, *link prediction*, and *node classification*. The experiments are conducted to assess the performance of SigMaNet on graphs with weights unrestricted in sign on which no other spectral GCNs can be applied (link sign prediction) and to compare it to other state-of-the-art spectral and spatial approaches on graphs with nonnegative weights (link prediction and node classification). For the link sign prediction task, we compare SigMaNet against methods of three categories: *i*) signed network embedding: SiNE [Wang et al., 2017], SIGNet [Islam et al., 2018], BESIDE [Chen et al., 2018]; *ii*) Feature Engineering: FeExtra [Leskovec et al., 2010a]; and *iii*) signed graph neural networks: SGCN [Derr et al., 2018], SiGAT [Huang et al., 2019] and SDGNN [Huang et al., 2021]. For the link prediction and node classification tasks, we compare SigMaNet against the following three categories of methods: *i*) spectral methods designed for undirected graph: ChebNet [Defferrard et al., 2016], GCN [Kipf and Welling, 2016b]; *ii*) spatial methods: APPNP [Klicpera et al., 2018],

SAGE [Hamilton et al., 2017], GIN [Xu et al., 2018], GAT [Veličković et al., 2017]; and *iii*) spectral methods designed for directed graphs: DGCN [Tong et al., 2020b], DiGraph [Tong et al., 2020a] and MagNet [Zhang et al., 2021b]. Throughout the tables contained in this section, the best results are reported in **boldface** and the second best are underlined.

4.1 Datasets

We test SigMaNet on six different real-world datasets from the literature: Bitcoin-OTC and Bitcoin Alpha [Kumar et al., 2016]; Slashdot and Epinions [Leskovec et al., 2010b]; WikiRfa [West et al., 2014]; and Telegram [Bovet and Grindrod, 2020]. In order to better assess SigMaNet performance as the density of the graph increases, in two tasks we also consider a synthetic set of graphs generated via a direct stochastic block model (DSBM) with (unlike in Zhang et al. [2021b]) edge weights greater than 1. These datasets are generated by varying: *i*) n , the number of nodes; *ii*) C , the number of clusters; *iii*) α_{ij} , the probability to create an undirected edge between nodes i and j belonging to different clusters; *iv*) α_{ii} , the probability to create an undirected edge between two nodes in the same cluster, and *v*) β_{ij} , the probability of the edge taking a certain direction. Each node is labeled with the index of the cluster it belongs to. A more detailed description of the datasets we use can be found in the Appendix E.

4.2 Link sign prediction

The link sign prediction task is a classification problem: it consists of predicting the sign of the edges in the graph, either positive or negative. Following Huang et al. [2021], we remove 20% of the edges for testing and use the remaining 80% for training. The experiments are run with k -cross validation with $k = 5$, reporting the average score obtained across the k splits. Connectivity is maintained when building each training set by guaranteeing that the graph used for training in each fold contains a spanning tree. For this task, we restrict ourselves to the Bitcoin Alpha, Bitcoin-OTC, WikiRfa, Slashdot, and Epinions datasets, which are directed graphs with weights of unrestricted sign (which is necessary for the task to be applicable) and of arbitrary magnitude, with the sole exception of the last two, whose weights satisfy $A \in \{-1, +1\}^{n \times n}$. In these five datasets, the classes of positive and negative weighted edges are imbalanced (i.e., nearly 80% are positive edges).

Table 1 presents the results for this experiment.² SigMaNet is the only method based on a spectral GCN contained in the table as the input graphs feature multiple negative weights and, thus, no other spectral GCNs can be applied. We observe that SigMaNet clearly outperforms all competitors on the three datasets whose graphs have unrestricted weights, i.e., Bitcoin Alpha, Bitcoin-OTC, and WikiRfa. On graphs with unit weights, its performance is marginally worse yet in line with the best methods. Crucially, we should note that SigMaNet relies on a general loss function that is not specifically engineered for the link sign prediction task. This is different from each of the models we compared to, each of which actually consists of two models applied in sequence (the first one designed to produce a set of embeddings by adopting a loss function that captures the sign patterns of the edges and a second one which predicts the link sign by feeding the embeddings to a logistics regression model).

4.3 Link prediction

The link prediction task comprises two sub-tasks: *existence prediction* and *direction prediction*. In the first one, the model is asked to predict whether $(u, v) \in E$ for a given pair of vertices $u, v \in V, u \neq v$ provided as input. The second one is a binary task wherein the model is asked to predict whether *a*) $(u, v) \in E$ or *b*) $(v, u) \in E$ or both. Following Zhang et al. [2021b], in each sub-task we reserve 15% of the edges for testing, 5% for validation, and use the remaining ones for training. The experiments are run with k -cross validation with $k = 10$, preserving graph connectivity. The datasets that we consider are: Telegram, Bitcoin Alpha, Bitcoin-OTC, and synthetic DSBM graphs. The latter are generated with $n = 2500$, $C = 5$, $\alpha_{ii} = 0.1$, $\beta_{ij} = 0.2$, with an increasing inter-cluster density $\alpha_{ij} \in \{0.05, 0.08, 0.1\}$. As spectral methods, except for SigMaNet, cannot handle graphs with negative weights, to be able to compare our proposal to them in a setting in which the latter can be applied, in these experiments we pre-process Bitcoin-OTC

²The results reported (except for SigMaNet) have been published in Huang et al. [2021]. Note that they differ from those in He et al. [2022], where the performance of graph neural networks is worse.

Table 1: Link sign prediction results assessed with four metrics

Dataset	Metric (%)	Signed Network Embedding			Feature Engineering		Graph Neural Network		
		SiNE	SIGNet	BESIDE	FeExtra	SGCN	SiGAT	SDGNN	SigMaNet
Bitcoin Alpha	Micro-F1	94.58	94.22	94.89	94.86	92.56	94.56	94.91	95.13
	Binary-F1	97.16	96.96	97.32	97.30	96.07	97.14	97.29	97.44
	Macro-F1	68.69	69.65	73.00	71.67	63.67	70.26	73.90	74.69
	AUC	87.28	89.08	89.81	88.82	84.69	88.72	89.88	92.46
Bitcoin-OTC	Micro-F1	90.95	92.29	93.20	93.61	90.78	92.68	93.57	94.49
	Binary-F1	95.10	95.81	96.28	96.53	94.91	96.02	96.47	97.02
	Macro-F1	68.05	73.86	78.43	78.26	73.06	75.33	80.17	80.53
	AUC	85.71	89.35	91.52	91.21	87.55	90.55	91.24	93.67
WikiRfa	Micro-F1	83.38	83.84	85.89	83.46	84.89	84.57	86.27	86.56
	Binary-F1	89.72	90.01	91.17	89.87	90.69	90.42	91.42	91.64
	Macro-F1	73.19	73.84	78.03	72.35	75.27	75.35	78.49	78.66
	AUC	86.02	86.82	89.81	86.04	85.63	88.29	88.98	90.53
Slashdot	Micro-F1	82.65	83.89	85.90	84.72	82.96	84.94	86.16	85.03
	Binary-F1	89.18	89.83	91.05	90.70	89.26	90.55	91.28	90.59
	Macro-F1	72.73	75.54	78.92	73.99	74.03	76.71	78.92	77.63
	AUC	84.09	87.52	90.17	88.80	85.34	88.74	89.77	89.79
Epinions	Micro-F1	91.73	91.13	93.36	92.26	91.12	92.93	93.55	92.25
	Binary-F1	95.25	94.89	96.15	95.61	94.86	95.93	96.28	95.51
	Macro-F1	81.60	80.60	86.01	81.30	81.05	84.54	86.10	83.41
	AUC	88.72	90.95	93.51	94.17	87.45	93.33	94.11	94.19

and Bitcoin Alpha by removing any edge with a negative weight—in the tables, these datasets are denoted by a ‘*’.

Table 2: Accuracy (%) on datasets of the existence prediction task

	Existence prediction					
	Telegram	Bitcoin Alpha*	Bitcoin-OTC*	$\alpha_{ij} = 0.05$	$\alpha_{ij} = 0.08$	$\alpha_{ij} = 0.1$
ChebNet	75.30±1.54	81.93±0.64	82.07±0.38	50.24±0.35	50.21±0.33	50.25±0.34
GCN	67.88±1.39	81.53±0.57	81.65±0.35	50.26±0.30	50.24±0.26	50.18±0.26
APNP	68.52±5.76	81.62±0.57	81.02±0.51	60.62±0.46	62.61±0.64	63.51±1.93
SAGE	85.36±1.27	82.74±0.48	83.28±0.65	60.92±0.82	61.50±4.05	62.77±1.50
GIN	72.37±3.57	74.64±5.43	77.75±1.15	57.52±4.47	55.50±5.14	55.25±7.14
GAT	78.37±2.11	82.60±0.43	83.43±0.52	55.97±2.58	54.37±0.89	50.24±0.35
DGCN	82.97±2.06	83.13±0.61	83.79±0.36	55.41±3.09	55.70±5.71	56.15±5.65
DiGraph	82.15±1.11	83.24±0.38	84.77±0.83	59.09±3.66	57.64±2.35	58.66±3.28
MagNet	86.32±1.06	83.26±0.50	84.14±0.44	61.27±0.19	63.81±0.20	64.93±0.43
SigMaNet	86.01±1.28	83.27±0.54	84.31±0.38	62.07±0.33	64.21±0.21	65.28±0.30

Table 3: Accuracy (%) on datasets of the direction prediction task

	Direction prediction					
	Telegram	Bitcoin Alpha*	Bitcoin-OTC*	$\alpha_{ij} = 0.05$	$\alpha_{ij} = 0.08$	$\alpha_{ij} = 0.1$
ChebNet	78.56±3.53	53.86±1.15	50.06±1.04	50.13±0.30	50.23±0.25	50.13±0.30
GCN	63.86±1.40	55.32±1.12	49.63±1.82	50.05±0.15	50.24±0.29	50.13±0.30
APNP	75.70±9.08	57.14±1.03	52.61±1.63	66.42±1.35	70.25±1.46	71.93±0.47
SAGE	91.15±0.77	55.82±1.60	55.29±1.23	66.62±1.72	68.84±2.38	69.43±6.79
GIN	80.77±5.01	56.04±1.42	53.31±1.58	60.51±6.88	60.87±9.50	57.66±9.04
GAT	84.06±11.17	55.20±1.06	53.23±0.63	52.71±1.53	57.07±1.50	57.43±1.07
DGCN	89.81±1.20	56.35±0.84	54.06±0.90	55.97±2.58	62.64±6.91	65.53±6.73
DiGraph	87.46±0.84	58.62±1.09	56.37±1.29	65.51±1.71	67.09±1.65	67.43±2.10
MagNet	91.65±0.79	56.84±0.74	55.63±0.74	68.50±0.23	72.01±0.33	73.28±0.37
SigMaNet	91.66±0.86	56.89±0.49	56.42±0.64	68.84±0.25	72.34±0.25	73.59±0.23

Tables 2 and 3 report the results obtained in the existence and direction tasks, respectively. The tables show that SigMaNet achieves significantly good results by outperforming the other methods in the majority of the cases (9 out of 12) and by being the second best in the other ones. It is interesting to note that SigMaNet is consistently better than the state of the art on the synthetic datasets. A possible explanation of this behavior revolves on the positive homogeneity property shown by Theorem 4: as a matter of fact, the synthetic datasets have a significantly wider range of weights, [2, 1000], than the real datasets. For instance, the mean and median values of the weights in the Telegram dataset are 2 and 20.7, while only 96.4% of the weights has value lower than 100.

4.4 Node classification

The node classification task consists in predicting the class label to which each node belongs. We consider the Telegram dataset³ as well as the three synthetic datasets. Bitcoin-OTC and Bitcoin Alpha dataset are not considered as they lack label information. We rely on a the standard 60%/20%/20% split for training/validation/testing across all datasets. The experiments are run with k -cross validation, with $k = 10$.

Table 4: Testing accuracy (%) of node classification.

Node classification				
	Telegram	$\alpha_{ij} = 0.05$	$\alpha_{ij} = 0.08$	$\alpha_{ij} = 0.1$
ChebNet	61.73±4.25	20.06±0.18	20.50±0.77	19.98±0.06
GCN	60.77±3.67	20.06±0.18	20.02±0.06	20.01±0.01
APNP	55.19±6.26	33.46±7.43	34.72±14.98	36.16±14.92
SAGE	65.38±5.15	67.64±9.81	68.28±10.92	82.96±10.98
GIN	72.69±4.62	28.46±8.01	20.12±0.20	20.98±8.28
GAT	72.31±3.01	22.34±3.13	21.90±2.89	21.58±1.80
DGCN	71.15±6.32	30.02±6.57	30.22±11.94	28.40±8.62
DiGraph	71.16±5.57	53.84±14.28	38.50±12.20	34.78±9.94
MagNet	55.96±3.59	78.64±1.29	87.52±1.30	91.58±1.04
SigMaNet	72.31±2.88	85.18±1.64	95.38±0.70	98.16±0.60

The results are reported in Table 4. SigMaNet achieves notable performance on all four datasets, especially on the synthetic ones as the graph density increases, where being able to rely on both edge direction and weight information seems to be paramount for a correct node labeling. This is confirmed by the poor performance attained by ChebNet and GCN, which do not take any edge direction into account. In particular (we recall that all the graphs used for this task are weighted), we observe a strong difference on all the datasets when comparing the performance of MagNet to SigMaNet. This can be ascribed to the positive homogeneity property of SigMaNet, which circumvents the sign-flipping issue MagNet suffers from, which is likely to reduce its ability to adequately propagate the information between nodes.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we have extended the applicability of spectral graph convolutional networks to graphs with edges of weight unrestricted in sign by introducing the *Sign-Magnetic Laplacian* matrix. Thanks to its properties, which we rigorously derived, we embedded the matrix into a generalized convolution operator so as to design the generalized GCN SigMaNet, capable of handling (un)directed graphs with weights not restricted in sign nor magnitude. SigMaNet is the first spectral model ever capable of doing so. Compared with similar approaches presented in the literature, SigMaNet is also immune to the sign-flipping issue, making it capable to handle graphs with large weights. Through an extensive campaign of numerical experiments, we have showed not only the applicability of SigMaNet to graphs with negative weights but also its effectiveness in exploiting in a better way than state-of-the-art solutions the information carried by the direction and weight of the edges. Future works to cope with the limitations of SigMaNet include extending the *Sign-Magnetic Laplacian* to the cases of multi-graphs as well as of temporal (or time-extended) graphs. All data used in the experiments are publicly available and do not include any personally identifiable information or offensive content. The method presented in this paper has no different impact on society than other graph neural network algorithms.

³We point out that Telegram was also used for node classification in Zhang et al. [2021b], but it is treated as an unweighted graph. In contrast, in our experiments the original topology of the graph is maintained.

References

- Lars Backstrom and Jure Leskovec. Supervised random walks: predicting and recommending links in social networks. In *Proceedings of the fourth ACM international conference on Web search and data mining*, pages 635–644, 2011.
- Alexandre Bovet and Peter Grindrod. The activity of the far right on telegram, 2020.
- Siheng Chen, Rohan Varma, Aliaksei Sandryhaila, and Jelena Kovačević. Discrete signal processing on graphs: Sampling theory. *IEEE transactions on signal processing*, 63(24):6510–6523, 2015.
- Yiqi Chen, Tiejun Qian, Huan Liu, and Ke Sun. "Bridge": Enhanced Signed Directed Network Embedding. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pages 773–782, 2018.
- Fan RK Chung and Fan Chung Graham. *Spectral graph theory*. Number 92. American Mathematical Soc., 1997.
- Michaël Defferrard, Xavier Bresson, and Pierre Vandergheynst. Convolutional neural networks on graphs with fast localized spectral filtering. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29, 2016.
- Tyler Derr, Yao Ma, and Jiliang Tang. Signed graph convolutional networks. In *2018 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*, pages 929–934. IEEE, 2018.
- Michaël Fanuel, Carlos M Alaíz, Ángela Fernández, and Johan AK Suykens. Magnetic eigenmaps for the visualization of directed networks. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 44(1): 189–199, 2018.
- Michaël Fanuel, Carlos M. Alaíz, and Johan A. K. Suykens. Magnetic eigenmaps for community detection in directed networks. *Physical Review E*, 95(2), Feb 2017. ISSN 2470-0053. doi: 10.1103/physreve.95.022302. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.95.022302>.
- Satoshi Furutani, Toshiki Shibahara, Mitsuaki Akiyama, Kunio Hato, and Masaki Aida. Graph signal processing for directed graphs based on the hermitian laplacian. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, pages 447–463. Springer, 2019.
- Will Hamilton, Zhitao Ying, and Jure Leskovec. Inductive representation learning on large graphs. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- David K Hammond, Pierre Vandergheynst, and Rémi Gribonval. Wavelets on graphs via spectral graph theory. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 30(2):129–150, 2011.
- Yixuan He, Xitong Zhang, Junjie Huang, Mihai Cucuringu, and Gesine Reinert. Pytorch geometric signed directed: A survey and software on graph neural networks for signed and directed graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.10793*, 2022.
- Junjie Huang, Huawei Shen, Liang Hou, and Xueqi Cheng. Signed graph attention networks. In *International Conference on Artificial Neural Networks*, pages 566–577. Springer, 2019.
- Junjie Huang, Huawei Shen, Liang Hou, and Xueqi Cheng. Sdgnn: Learning node representation for signed directed networks. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 35(1):196–203, May 2021. URL <https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/view/16093>.
- Mohammad Raihanul Islam, B. Aditya Prakash, and Naren Ramakrishnan. Signet: Scalable embeddings for signed networks. In Dinh Phung, Vincent S. Tseng, Geoffrey I. Webb, Bao Ho, Mohadeseh Ganji, and Lida Rashidi, editors, *Advances in Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 157–169, Cham, 2018. Springer International Publishing. ISBN 978-3-319-93037-4.
- Shiridhar Kashyap, Sudeep Kumar, Vikas Agarwal, Durga P Misra, Shubha R Phadke, and Aditya Kapoor. Protein protein interaction network analysis of differentially expressed genes to understand involved biological processes in coronary artery disease and its different severity. *Gene Reports*, 12:50–60, 2018.

- Thomas N. Kipf and Max Welling. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. *CoRR*, abs/1609.02907, 2016a. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1609.02907>.
- Thomas N Kipf and Max Welling. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.02907*, 2016b.
- Johannes Klicpera, Aleksandar Bojchevski, and Stephan Günnemann. Predict then propagate: Graph neural networks meet personalized pagerank. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.05997*, 2018.
- Srijan Kumar, Francesca Spezzano, V. S. Subrahmanian, and Christos Faloutsos. Edge weight prediction in weighted signed networks. In *2016 IEEE 16th International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*, pages 221–230, 2016. doi: 10.1109/ICDM.2016.0033.
- Jure Leskovec, Daniel Huttenlocher, and Jon Kleinberg. Predicting positive and negative links in online social networks. In *Proceedings of the 19th international conference on World wide web*, pages 641–650, 2010a.
- Jure Leskovec, Daniel Huttenlocher, and Jon Kleinberg. Signed networks in social media. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on human factors in computing systems*, pages 1361–1370, 2010b.
- Elliott H Lieb and Michael Loss. Fluxes, Laplacians, and Kasteleyn’s theorem. In *Statistical Mechanics*, pages 457–483. Springer, 1993.
- Bojan Mohar. A new kind of hermitian matrices for digraphs. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 584:343–352, 2020. ISSN 0024-3795. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.laa.2019.09.024>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0024379519304136>.
- Aliaksei Sandryhaila and José MF Moura. Discrete signal processing on graphs. *IEEE transactions on signal processing*, 61(7):1644–1656, 2013.
- Zekun Tong, Yuxuan Liang, Changsheng Sun, Xinke Li, David S. Rosenblum, and Andrew Lim. Digraph inception convolutional networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020-December(NeurIPS):1–12, 2020a. ISSN 10495258.
- Zekun Tong, Yuxuan Liang, Changsheng Sun, David S. Rosenblum, and Andrew Lim. Directed graph convolutional network, 2020b.
- Petar Veličković, Guillem Cucurull, Arantxa Casanova, Adriana Romero, Pietro Lio, and Yoshua Bengio. Graph attention networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.10903*, 2017.
- Suhang Wang, Jiliang Tang, Charu Aggarwal, Yi Chang, and Huan Liu. Signed network embedding in social media. In *Proceedings of the 2017 SIAM international conference on data mining*, pages 327–335. SIAM, 2017.
- Yue Wang, Yongbin Sun, Ziwei Liu, Sanjay E Sarma, Michael M Bronstein, and Justin M Solomon. Dynamic graph cnn for learning on point clouds. *Acm Transactions On Graphics (tog)*, 38(5): 1–12, 2019.
- Robert West, Hristo S Paskov, Jure Leskovec, and Christopher Potts. Exploiting social network structure for person-to-person sentiment analysis. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2:297–310, 2014.
- Zonghan Wu, Shirui Pan, Fengwen Chen, Guodong Long, Chengqi Zhang, and S Yu Philip. A comprehensive survey on graph neural networks. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 32(1):4–24, 2020.
- Keyulu Xu, Weihua Hu, Jure Leskovec, and Stefanie Jegelka. How powerful are graph neural networks? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.00826*, 2018.
- Jie Zhang, Bo Hui, Po-Wei Harn, Min-Te Sun, and Wei-Shinn Ku. smgc: A complex-valued graph convolutional network via magnetic laplacian for directed graphs, 2021a.
- Si Zhang, Hanghang Tong, Jiejun Xu, and Ross Maciejewski. Graph convolutional networks: a comprehensive review. *Computational Social Networks*, 6(1):1–23, 2019.

Xitong Zhang, Yixuan He, Nathan Brugnone, Michael Perlmutter, and Matthew Hirn. Magnet: A neural network for directed graphs, 2021b.

Xiaohan Zou. A survey on application of knowledge graph. In *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, volume 1487, page 012016. IOP Publishing, 2020.

A Code repository and Licensing

The SigMaNet code, together with all the code realized for this research work, is freely available at <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/SigMaNet/> under the MIT license.⁴

As for asset licensing, datasets (except WikiRfa) and some code components provided by the PyTorch Geometric Signed Directed [He et al., 2022] library (provided under the MIT license) have been used in this work. WikiRfa dataset is available at https://networks.skewed.de/net/wiki_rfa under BSD licence.⁵ In addition, the models used in the comparison are available at <https://github.com/matthew-hirn/magnet> under the Apache 2.0 license.⁶

B Properties of the Sign-Magnetic Laplacian

This section presents the proofs of theorems introduced in Subsection 3.1.

Theorem 1. *If $A \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$ and $q = 0.25$, we have $L^\sigma = L^{(q)}$.*

Proof. As $A \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$, D and \bar{D} coincide. Let us consider H^σ and $H^{(q)}$. For each $i, j \in V$, if $A_{ij} = 1$, we have $H_{ij}^\sigma = -H_{ji}^\sigma = 0 + \mathbf{i}\frac{1}{2} = H_{ij}^{(0.25)} = -H_{ji}^{(0.25)}$; if $A_{ij} = 0$, we have $H_{ij}^\sigma = H_{ji}^\sigma = 1 + \mathbf{i}0 = H_{ij}^{(0.25)} = H_{ji}^{(0.25)}$. Thus, we have $L^\sigma = L^{(0.25)}$ and the claim follows. \square

Theorem 2. *L^σ and L_{norm}^σ are positive semidefinite.*

Proof. Following the definition of the *Sign-Magnetic Laplacian*, we have $\Re(L^\sigma) = \bar{D}_s - A_s \odot (ee^\top - \text{sgn}(|A - A^\top|))$ and $\Im(L^\sigma) = -A_s \odot \text{sgn}(|A| - |A^\top|)$. As $\Re(L^\sigma)$ is symmetric and $\Im(L^\sigma)$ is skew symmetric by construction, L^σ is Hermitian. Since L^σ is Hermitian, $x^* \Im(L^\sigma) x = 0$ holds for all $x \in \mathcal{O}^n$. As, by construction, $\bar{D}_s = \text{Diag}(|A_s| e)$ and A_s is symmetric, the following holds for all $x \in \mathcal{O}^n$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2x^* \Re(L^\sigma) x \\
&= 2 \sum_{i,j=1}^n (\bar{D}_s)_{ij} x_i x_j^* - 2 \sum_{i,j=1}^n (A_s)_{ij} x_i x_j^* (1 - \text{sgn}(|A_{ij} - A_{ji}|)) \\
&= 2 \sum_{i=1}^n (\bar{D}_s)_{ii} x_i x_i^* - 2 \sum_{i,j=1}^n (A_s)_{ij} x_i x_j^* (1 - \text{sgn}(|A_{ij} - A_{ji}|)) \\
&= 2 \sum_{i,j=1}^n |(A_s)_{ij}| |x_i|^2 - 2 \sum_{i,j=1}^n (A_s)_{ij} x_i x_j^* (1 - \text{sgn}(|A_{ij} - A_{ji}|)) \\
&= \sum_{i,j=1}^n |(A_s)_{ij}| |x_i|^2 + \sum_{i,j=1}^n |(A_s)_{ji}| |x_j|^2 - 2 \sum_{i,j=1}^n (A_s)_{ij} x_i x_j^* (1 - \text{sgn}(|A_{ij} - A_{ji}|)) \\
&= \sum_{i,j=1}^n |(A_s)_{ij}| |x_i|^2 + \sum_{i,j=1}^n |(A_s)_{ij}| |x_j|^2 - 2 \sum_{i,j=1}^n (A_s)_{ij} x_i x_j^* (1 - \text{sgn}(|A_{ij} - A_{ji}|)) \\
&= \sum_{i,j=1}^n |(A_s)_{ij}| |x_i|^2 + \sum_{i,j=1}^n |(A_s)_{ij}| |x_j|^2 - 2 \sum_{i,j=1}^n |(A_s)_{ij}| \text{sgn}((A_s)_{ij}) x_i x_j^* (1 - \text{sgn}(|A_{ij} - A_{ji}|)) \\
&= \sum_{i,j=1}^n |(A_s)_{ij}| (|x_i|^2 + |x_j|^2 - 2 \text{sgn}(A_{ij}) x_i x_j^* (1 - \text{sgn}(|A_{ij} - A_{ji}|))) \\
&\geq \sum_{i,j=1}^n |(A_s)_{ij}| (|x_i| - \text{sgn}(A_{ij}) |x_j|)^2 \\
&\geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

⁴<https://choosealicense.com/licenses/mit/>

⁵<https://choosealicense.com/licenses/bsd-2-clause/>

⁶<https://www.apache.org/licenses/LICENSE-2.0>

Thus, L^σ is positive semidefinite. Let us now consider the *normalized Sign-Magnetic Laplacian*, which, according to Eq. (8), is defined as $L_{\text{norm}}^\sigma = \bar{D}_s^{-\frac{1}{2}} L^\sigma \bar{D}_s^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. We need to show that $x^* L_{\text{norm}}^\sigma x \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{C}^n$. Letting $y = \bar{D}_s^{-\frac{1}{2}} x$, we have $x^* L_{\text{norm}}^\sigma x = x^* \bar{D}_s^{-\frac{1}{2}} L^\sigma \bar{D}_s^{-\frac{1}{2}} x = y^* L^\sigma y$, which is nonnegative as proven before. \square

Theorem 3. $\lambda_{\max}(L_{\text{norm}}^\sigma) \leq 2$.

Proof. Let $B := \bar{D}_s + H^\sigma$. Let us show that B is positive semidefinite. As B is Hermitian by construction, we have $x^* \Im(L^\sigma)x = 0$. Next, we show that $2x^* \Re(B)x \geq 0$.

$2x^* \Re(B)x$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= 2 \sum_{i,j=1}^n (\bar{D}_s)_{ij} x_i x_j^* + 2 \sum_{i,j=1}^n (A_s)_{ij} x_i x_j^* (1 - \text{sgn}(|A_{ij} - A_{ji}|)) \\
&= 2 \sum_{i=1}^n (\bar{D}_s)_{ii} x_i x_i^* + 2 \sum_{i,j=1}^n (A_s)_{ij} x_i x_j^* (1 - \text{sgn}(|A_{ij} - A_{ji}|)) \\
&= 2 \sum_{i,j=1}^n |(A_s)_{ij}| |x_i|^2 + 2 \sum_{i,j=1}^n (A_s)_{ij} x_i x_j^* (1 - \text{sgn}(|A_{ij} - A_{ji}|)) \\
&= \sum_{i,j=1}^n |(A_s)_{ij}| |x_i|^2 + \sum_{i,j=1}^n |(A_s)_{ji}| |x_j|^2 + 2 \sum_{i,j=1}^n (A_s)_{ij} x_i x_j^* (1 - \text{sgn}(|A_{ij} - A_{ji}|)) \\
&= \sum_{i,j=1}^n |(A_s)_{ij}| |x_i|^2 + \sum_{i,j=1}^n |(A_s)_{ij}| |x_j|^2 + 2 \sum_{i,j=1}^n (A_s)_{ij} x_i x_j^* (1 - \text{sgn}(|A_{ij} - A_{ji}|)) \\
&= \sum_{i,j=1}^n |(A_s)_{ij}| |x_i|^2 + \sum_{i,j=1}^n |(A_s)_{ij}| |x_j|^2 + 2 \sum_{i,j=1}^n |(A_s)_{ij}| \text{sgn}((A_s)_{ij}) x_i x_j^* (1 - \text{sgn}(|A_{ij} - A_{ji}|)) \\
&= \sum_{i,j=1}^n |(A_s)_{ij}| \left(|x_i|^2 + |x_j|^2 + 2 \text{sgn}(A_{ij}) x_i x_j^* (1 - \text{sgn}(|A_{ij} - A_{ji}|)) \right) \\
&\geq \sum_{i,j=1}^n |(A_s)_{ij}| \left(|x_i|^2 + |x_j|^2 \right) \\
&\geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the normalized version of B satisfies

$$x^* B_{\text{norm}} x = x^* \bar{D}_s^{-\frac{1}{2}} B \bar{D}_s^{-\frac{1}{2}} x = y^* B y \geq 0.$$

We have proved that $x^* B_{\text{norm}} x$ is positive semidefinite. Hence, the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
&x^* B_{\text{norm}} x \geq 0 \\
&x^* \left(I + D^{-\frac{1}{2}} H^\sigma D^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) x \geq 0 \\
&-x^* D^{-\frac{1}{2}} H^\sigma D^{-\frac{1}{2}} x \leq x^* x \\
&x^* I x - x^* D^{-\frac{1}{2}} H^\sigma D^{-\frac{1}{2}} x \leq 2x^* x \\
&\frac{x^* L_{\text{norm}}^\sigma x}{x^* x} \leq 2.
\end{aligned}$$

Due to the Courant-Fischer theorem applied to L_{norm}^σ , we have:

$$\lambda_{\max} = \max_{x \neq 0} \frac{x^* L_{\text{norm}}^\sigma x}{x^* x}.$$

Thus, $\lambda_{\max} \leq 2$ holds. \square

Theorem 4. Let $L^\sigma(X)$ be the Sign-Magnetic Laplacian matrix of a directed graph with adjacency matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. Given two matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $B := \alpha ee^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+$, L^σ satisfies the following positive homogeneity property:

$$L^\sigma(A \odot B) = L^\sigma(A) \odot B.$$

Moreover, given a constant $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $L^\sigma(\alpha A) = \alpha L^\sigma(A)$.

Proof. Let $H^\sigma(X)$ and $\bar{D}(X)$ be the H^σ and \bar{D} matrices of a directed graph with adjacency matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} H^\sigma(A \odot B) &= \left(\frac{A \odot B + A^\top \odot B^\top}{2} + \mathbf{i} \frac{A \odot B + A^\top \odot B^\top}{2} \right) \odot \left((ee^\top - \text{sgn}(|A - A^\top|)) + \mathbf{i} \text{sgn}(|A| - |A^\top|) \right) = \\ &= \left(\alpha \frac{(A + A^\top)}{2} + \mathbf{i} \frac{\alpha(A + A^\top)}{2} \right) \odot \left((ee^\top - \text{sgn}(|A - A^\top|)) + \mathbf{i} \text{sgn}(|A| - |A^\top|) \right) = \\ &= \left(\frac{A + A^\top}{2} + \mathbf{i} \frac{A + A^\top}{2} \right) \odot \left((ee^\top - \text{sgn}(|A - A^\top|)) + \mathbf{i} \text{sgn}(|A| - |A^\top|) \right) \odot B = \\ &= H^\sigma(A) \odot B. \end{aligned}$$

$\bar{D}(A \odot B) = \text{Diag}(|A \odot B|e) = \text{Diag}(|A|e) = \bar{D}(A) \odot B$ (the latter by construction of B). The claim follows. \square

Theorem 5. Consider a weighted directed graph $G = (V, E)$ without pairs of antiparallel edges (digons). Given a directed edge $(i, j) \in E$ of weight w_{ij} , let $G' = (V, E)$ be a copy of G obtained by reversing the direction of (i, j) into (j, i) and flipping the sign of its weight by letting $w_{ji} = -w_{ij}$. Let $L^\sigma(G)$ and $L^\sigma(G')$ be the L^σ matrix defined on G and G' , respectively. $L^\sigma(G) = L^\sigma(G')$ holds.

Proof. Let A_G and $A_{G'}$ be the adjacency matrices of G and G' . Let $H^\sigma(X)$ and $A_s(X)$ be the H^σ and A_s matrices defined for a graph with adjacency matrix X . $\Re(H^\sigma(G)) = \Re(H^\sigma(G'))$ holds since both $A_G - A_G^\top$ and $A_{G'} - A_{G'}^\top$ are nonzero in positions i, j and j, i and, thus, $(ee^\top - \text{sgn}(|A_G - A_G^\top|))$ and $(ee^\top - \text{sgn}(|A_{G'} - A_{G'}^\top|))$ are both equal to 0 in these positions. To see that $\Im(H^\sigma(G)) = \Im(H^\sigma(G'))$, we observe that $A_s(A_G)_{ij} = -A_s(A_{G'})_{ij}$ and $A_s(A_G)_{ji} = -A_s(A_{G'})_{ji}$, but also that $\text{sgn}(|A_G| - |A_G^\top|)_{ij} = -\text{sgn}(|A_{G'}| - |A_{G'}^\top|)_{ij}$ and that $\text{sgn}(|A_G| - |A_G^\top|)_{ji} = -\text{sgn}(|A_{G'}| - |A_{G'}^\top|)_{ji}$. Thus, the two differences in sign cancel out and the claim follows. \square

Further observation The results presented in this paper still hold if the imaginary part of H^σ is multiplied by any nonnegative real constant $\epsilon > 0$. If $A \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$, by choosing $\epsilon = \sqrt{3}$, L^σ coincides with the Hermitian matrix “of the second kind” proposed in Mohar [2020] in the context of algebraic graph theory.

C Sign-pattern inconsistency of $L^{(q)}$

In Subsection 2.3, we highlighted that the *Magnetic Laplacian*, $L^{(q)}$, exhibits a crucial sign-pattern inconsistency. Indeed, while, for unweighted graphs, $L^{(q)}$ encodes the directional information of the edges in the sign of the imaginary part of $H^{(q)}$, this is not necessarily the case for weighted graphs as the sign pattern of $H^{(q)}$ can change drastically by just scaling the weights of the graph by a positive constant.

To better illustrate this, we introduce the following example. Consider a directed graph $G = (V, E)$ with $V = \{1, 2\}$ and $E = \{(1, 2)\}$. Let us assume that the weight of the $(1, 2)$ edge can take one of the following four values: 0.8, 2, 5, 36 and let $q = 0.25$. Although the direction of the edge $(1, 2)$ does not change, based on the magnitude of the weight, we observe four different scenarios.

$$1. A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0.8 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, A_s = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0.4 \\ 0.4 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \text{ and } H^{(0.25)} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0.4 \\ 0.4 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \odot \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0.31 \\ 0.31 & 1 \end{bmatrix} + \mathbf{i} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0.40 \\ 0.40 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \odot \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0.95 \\ -0.95 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \text{ We have } \text{sgn}(\Im(H^{(0.25)})_{12}) = -\text{sgn}(\Im(H^{(0.25)})_{21}) =$$

$\text{sgn}(A_{12})$ and, thus, the sign of the imaginary part of $H^{(0.25)}$ encodes the direction of the edge, while $\Re(H^{(0.25)})_{12} = \Re(H^{(0.25)})_{21} \neq 0$.

$$2. A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, A_s = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \text{ and } H^{(0.25)} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \odot \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} + \mathbf{i} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \odot \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We have $\Im(H^{(0.25)})_{12} = \Im(H^{(0.25)})_{21} = 0$ and, thus, the sign of the imaginary part of $H^{(0.25)}$ does not encode at all the direction of the edge. Furthermore, we note that $\text{sgn}(\Re(H^{(0.25)})_{12}) = \text{sgn}(\Re(H^{(0.25)})_{21}) \neq \text{sgn}(A_{12})$. Consequently, the matrix $H^{(0.25)}$ represents the graph as an undirected graph with a negative weight.

$$3. A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 5 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, A_s = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2.5 \\ 2.5 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \text{ and } H^{(0.25)} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2.5 \\ 2.5 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \odot \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} + \mathbf{i} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2.5 \\ 2.5 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \odot \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We have $\text{sgn}(\Im(H^{(0.25)})_{12}) = -\text{sgn}(\Im(H^{(0.25)})_{21}) = \text{sgn}(A_{12})$; thus, the sign of the imaginary part of $H^{(0.25)}$ encodes the direction of the edge (1, 2) consistently with A , while $\Re(H^{(0.25)})_{12} = \Re(H^{(0.25)})_{21} = 0$;

$$4. A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 36 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, A_s = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 18 \\ 18 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \text{ and } H^{(0.25)} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 18 \\ 18 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \odot \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} + \mathbf{i} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 18 \\ 18 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \odot \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We have $\Im(H^{(0.25)})_{12} = \Im(H^{(0.25)})_{21} = 0$ and, thus, the sign of the imaginary part of $H^{(0.25)}$ does not encode the direction of the edge, while $\text{sgn}(\Re(H^{(0.25)})_{12}) = \text{sgn}(\Re(H^{(0.25)})_{21}) = \text{sgn}(A_{12})$. Consequently, the matrix $H^{(0.25)}$ represents the graph as an undirected graph with a positive weight.

D Flow-based pre-processing

If applied an edge at a time, Theorem 5 can be used to transform a given directed graph with digons into a multigraph. For applications where the graph entails a flow-like relationship, it is then natural to aggregate every pair of parallel edges thus obtained into a single edge by summing their weights, thereby obtaining a (simple) weighted graph. In more details, consider two antiparallel edges (i, j) and (j, i) with different weights ($w_{ij} \neq w_{ji}$). By applying Theorem 5 to the (i, j) arc, we reverse its direction into (j, i) and flip the sign of its weight, thus obtaining the edge (j, i) of weight $w_{ji} := -w_{ij}$. As the graph already contains an (j, i) arc, the graph is turned into a multigraph. If the graph models a flow-like relationship, it is reasonable to collapse such a pair of parallel edges into a single edge of weight equal to $w_{ji} := -w_{ij} + w_{ji}$. We carry out this operation as a pre-processing activity for each task except for the link sign prediction task, whose datasets do not entail flow-like information.

In the following, we report a quantitative example to show the positive impact of this technique. In more detail, we consider two scenarios:

1. The flow-based pre-processing is not applied to the graph. As a consequence, some information related to the topology of the graph is lost.
2. The flow-based pre-processing is applied to the graph. No information is lost.

Consider a graph with a pair of antiparallel edges represented by the adjacency matrix $A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$.

1. If we do not apply the flow-based pre-processing, we have $A_s = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$. Thus, L^σ (but also $L^{(a)}$) fails to represent the graph as the entire pair of antiparallel edges is lost.
2. If we apply the flow-based pre-processing to the graph (not applicable for $L^{(a)}$), we obtain the following new adjacency matrix: $A_{\text{new}} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$; thus, we have $A_{s_{\text{new}}} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$. Thanks to this, L^σ consistently represent a graph with one edge, the direction of which is encoded in the imaginary part of L^σ .

E Details on Datasets

Real-world datasets. We test SigMaNet on six real-world datasets: Bitcoin-OTC and Bitcoin Alpha [Kumar et al., 2016]; Slashdot and Epinions [Leskovec et al., 2010b]; WikiRfa [West et al., 2014]; and Telegram [Bovet and Grindrod, 2020]. The first two datasets, Bitcoin-OTC and Bitcoin Alpha, come from exchange operations: Bitcoin-OTC and Bitcoin Alpha. Both of these exchanges allow users to rate the others on a scale of -10 to $+10$ (excluding 0). According to the OTC guidelines, scammers should be given a score of -10 , while at the other end of the spectrum, $+10$ means full trust. Other evaluation values have intermediate meanings. Therefore, these two exchanges explicitly lead to a graph with weights unrestricted in sign. The other two datasets are Slashdot and Epinions. The first comes from a tech news website with a community of users. The website introduced Slashdot Zoo features that allow users to tag each other as friend or foe. The dataset represents a signed social network with friend ($+1$) and enemy (-1) labels. Epinions is an online who-trust-who social network of a consumer review site (*Epinions.com*). Site members can indicate their trust or distrust of other people’s reviews. The network reflects people’s views on others. WikiRfa is a collection of votes given by Wikipedia members collected from 2003 to 2013. Indeed, any Wikipedia member can vote for support, neutrality, or opposition to a Wikipedia editor’s nomination for administrator. This leads to a directed, multigraph (unrestricted in sign) in which nodes represent Wikipedia members and edges represent votes, which is then transformed into a simple graph by condensing any parallel edges into a single edge of weight equal to the sum of the weights of the original edges. The graph features a higher number of nodes and edges than the one proposed in Huang et al. [2021]. In these five datasets, the classes of positive and negative edges are imbalanced (see Table 5). The last dataset is Telegram, an influence network that analyses the interactions and influences between distinct groups and actors who associate and propagate political ideologies. This is a pairwise-influence network between 245 Telegram channels with 8912 links. The labels are generated following the method discussed in Bovet and Grindrod [2020], with a total of four classes.

Table 5: Statistics of the six datasets

Data set	n	$ \varepsilon^+ $	$ \varepsilon^- $	% pos	Directed	Weighted
Telegram	245	8,912	0	100.00	✓	✓
Bitcoin-Alpha	3,783	22,650	1,536	93.65	✓	✓
Bitcoin-OTC	5,881	32,029	3,563	89.99	✓	✓
WikiRfa	11,381	138,143	39,038	77.97	✓	✓
Slashdot	82,140	425,072	124,130	77.70	✓	✗
Epinion	131,828	717,667	123,705	85.30	✓	✗

Synthetic dataset. The synthetic set of graphs are generated via a direct stochastic block model (DSBM) with (unlike in Zhang et al. [2021b]) edge weights in the range $\mathcal{IN} \cap [2, 1000]$. In detail, in DSBM we define a number of nodes n and a number of clusters C which partition the vertices into communities of equal size. We define a collection of probabilities $\{\alpha_{ij}\}_{1 \leq i, j \leq C}$, where $0 \leq \alpha_{ij} \leq 1$ with $\alpha_{ij} = \alpha_{ji}$, to define the probability that an undirected edge be generated between a node u and a node v that belong to two different clusters, i.e., $u \in C_i$ and $v \in C_j$, and α_{ii} is the probability that an undirected edge is generated between two nodes in the same cluster. As the generated graph is undirected, we follow Zhang et al. [2021b] and introduce a rule to transform the graph from undirected to directed: we define a collection of probabilities $\{\beta_{ij}\}_{1 \leq i, j \leq C}$, where $0 \leq \beta_{ij} \leq 1$ such that $\beta_{i,j} + \beta_{j,i} = 1$. Each edge $\{u, v\}$ is assigned a direction using the rule that the edge points from u to v with probability β_{ij} if $u \in C_i$ and $v \in C_j$, and points from v to u with probability β_{ji} .

F Experiment Details

Hardware. The experiments were conducted on 2 different computers: one with 1 NVIDIA Tesla T4 GPU, 380 GB RAM, and Intel(R) Xeon(R) Gold 6238R CPU @ 2.20GHz CPU, and the other with 1 NVIDIA TITAN Xp GPU, 80 GB RAM, and Intel(R) Xeon(R) Silver 4114 CPU @ 2.20GHz CPU.

Model Settings. We train all the models considered in this paper with a maximum of 3000 epochs and early stop if the validation error does not decrease after 500 epochs for both node classification and link prediction tasks. As in Zhang et al. [2021b], one dropout layer with a probability of 0.5 is created before the last layer. We set the parameter $K = 1$ for ChebNet, MagNet, and SigMaNet. A hyperparameter optimization procedure is adopted to identify the best set of parameters for each model. We tune the number of filters in $\{16, 32, 64\}$ for the graph convolutional layers for all models except for DGCN. We set for both node classification and link prediction a learning rate of 10^{-3} . For link sign prediction task, the learning rate is set in $\{10^{-2}, 5 \cdot 10^{-3}, 10^{-3}\}$. We employ Adam as the optimization algorithm, and set weight decays (regularization hyperparameter) to $5 \cdot 10^{-4}$ to prevent overfitting.

Some further details are reported in the following:

- The coefficient q for MagNet is chosen in $\{0.01, 0.05, 0.1, 0.15, 0.2, 0.25\}$.
- The coefficient α for PageRank-based models (APPNP and DiGraph) is chosen in $\{0.05, 0.1, 0.15, 0.2\}$.
- For APPNP, we set $K = 10$ for node classification (parameter suggested in Klicpera et al. [2018]), and select K in $\{1, 5, 10\}$ for link prediction.
- For GAT, we adopt a number of heads in $\{2, 4, 8\}$.
- DGCN is somewhat different from the other networks because it requires generating three matrices of order proximity, i.e., first-order proximity, second-order *in-degree proximity* and second-order *out-degree proximity*. For this network, the number of filters for each channel is searched in $\{5, 15, 30\}$ for node classification and link prediction.
- In GIN, the parameter ϵ is set to 0 for both tasks.
- In ChebNet and GCN, the symmetrized adjacency matrix $A_s = \frac{A+A^T}{2}$ is used.

Link prediction. In these tasks, we define the feature matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 2}$ in such a way that, for each node $i \in V$, X_{i1} is the in-degree of node i and X_{i2} is the node’s out-degree. This is done to allow the models to learn structural information directly from the adjacency matrix. In particular, for the sign link prediction task, we use in-degree and out-degree by computing the absolute value of their edge weights.

Node classification. In this task, for the Telegram dataset we retain the dataset’s original features, whereas, for the synthetic datasets, we create them via the in-degree and out-degree vector as explained before.