

Partition and Code: learning how to compress graphs

Giorgos Bouritsas^{*1}, Andreas Loukas^{†2}, Nikolaos Karalias^{‡2}, and Michael M. Bronstein^{§1,3}

¹Imperial College London, UK, ²EPFL, ³Twitter, UK

Abstract

Can we use machine learning to compress graph data? The absence of ordering in graphs poses a significant challenge to conventional compression algorithms, limiting their attainable gains as well as their ability to discover relevant patterns. On the other hand, most graph compression approaches rely on domain-dependent handcrafted representations and cannot adapt to different underlying graph distributions. This work aims to establish the necessary principles a lossless graph compression method should follow to approach the entropy storage lower bound. Instead of making rigid assumptions about the graph distribution, we formulate the compressor as a probabilistic model that can be learned from data and generalise to unseen instances. Our “*Partition and Code*” framework entails three steps: first, a partitioning algorithm decomposes the graph into elementary structures, then these are mapped to the elements of a small dictionary on which we learn a probability distribution, and finally, an entropy encoder translates the representation into bits. All three steps are parametric and can be trained with gradient descent. We theoretically compare the compression quality of several graph encodings and prove, under mild conditions, a total ordering of their expected description lengths. Moreover, we show that, under the same conditions, PnC achieves compression gains w.r.t. the baselines that grow either linearly or quadratically with the number of vertices. Our algorithms are quantitatively evaluated on diverse real-world networks obtaining significant performance improvements with respect to different families of non-parametric and parametric graph compressors.

1 Introduction

Lossless data compression has been one of the most fundamental and long-standing problems in computer science. It is by now well-understood that the intrinsic limits of compression are governed by the entropy of the underlying data distribution [1]. Crucially, these limits expose an intimate connection between compressibility and machine learning: the better one models the underlying data distribution (from limited observations) the more bits can be saved and vice-versa [2].

The compression of ordered data such as text, images, or video, underpins the modern technology from web protocols to video streaming. However, graph-structured data remain a notable exception. As graph data are becoming more prevalent, it becomes increasingly important to invent practical ways to encode them parsimoniously.

There are three main challenges one faces when attempting to compress graphs:

C1. Dealing with graph isomorphism (GI). A key difficulty that distinguishes graphs from conventional data lies in the absence of an inherent ordering of the graph vertices. In order to be able to approach the storage lower bounds, isomorphic graphs should be encoded with the same codeword. However, since the complexity of known algorithms for GI is super-polynomial on the number of vertices [3], a direct use of GI is impractical

^{*}g.bouritsas@imperial.ac.uk

[†]andreas.loukas@epfl.ch

[‡]nikolaos.karalias@epfl.ch

[§]m.bronstein@imperial.ac.uk

for graphs consisting of more than a few hundred vertices. Indeed, an examination of the graph compression literature reveals that most progress has been made by optimising a vertex ordering and adapting methods originally invented for vectored data [4, 5, 6]. Unfortunately, naively encoding graphs as vectors results in a significant loss in compression¹.

C2. Evaluating the likelihood. An optimal encoder [1] would require one to accurately estimate and evaluate the probabilities of all the possible outcomes of the underlying domain. Hence, when dealing with high-dimensional data the probability distribution has to be decomposed by partitioning the underlying data into parts: e.g., images can be compressed by modelling the distribution of pixels or patches [10, 11], and text by focusing on characters or n-grams [12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18]. However, since graphs do not admit an efficiently computable canonical ordering, it is unclear what decomposition one should employ.

C3. Accounting for the description length of the learned model. The trade-off between model complexity and generalisation is of paramount concern for effective compression. Though in typical deep learning applications one can aim to model the data distribution with an overparametrized neural network (NN) that generalises well, utilising such models to compress information is problematic: since decoding is impossible unless the decoder also receives the learned model (i.e., the NN parameters), *overparametrized models are, by definition, suboptimal*. This is a pertinent issue for likelihood-based neural approaches as overparametrization is commonly argued to be a key component of why NNs can be trained [19, 20, 21].

1.1 Contributions: the Partition and Code (PnC) framework

Learning to compress graphs. Our main contribution is PnC, a framework for learning compression algorithms suitable for encoding graphs sampled from an underlying distribution. In the heart of PnC lie two ideas: (a) *Learn to break the problem into parts*. Rather than predicting directly the likelihood, we aim to learn how to decompose graphs into non-overlapping subgraphs, see Fig. 1. (b) *Identify and code recurring subgraphs when possible*. We use a learned dictionary to code subgraphs that appear frequently, whereas rare subgraphs are encoded separately. The dictionary is restricted to contain only a finite number of small recurring subgraphs. This biases the model towards interpretable and well generalising solutions. Both the “partition” and “code” components of PnC are learned directly from the data, by optimising the total description length.




Figure 1: Illustration of the graph decomposition. The subgraph colours correspond to dictionary atoms a_1 , a_2 and a_3 . Cuts are denoted in red.

Our framework provides a solution to the three challenges of graph compression. C1: PnC induces a decomposition of the probability distribution that is invariant to GI and it does so by comparing only subgraphs of constant size (for which GI can be solved efficiently). C2: Structuring learned information into an efficiently enumerable dictionary allows us to have a closed-form expression for the likelihood and thus to compress data using any close-to-optimal entropy coder [22, 23, 24]. C3: Since we use NNs to *decompose* the distribution (and not to predict the likelihood), we can rely on overparametrization without having to relay the NN parameters to the decoder. Also, the complexity of our learned hypothesis (the dictionary) can be computed, and thus optimised, during training.

Theoretical results. Our analysis reveals that PnC can significantly improve upon less sophisticated graph encoders and justifies the usefulness of both the “partition” and “code” components. Specifically, we prove that under mild conditions on the underlying graph distribution, PnC requires in expectation $\Theta(n^2)$ less bits than standard graph encodings, even if the latter are given access to an oracle that solves GI. Further, the dictionary induces additional savings of $\Theta(n)$ bits, with the gain being inversely proportional to the entropy of

¹This follows by a simple counting argument: there are $2^{\binom{n}{2}}$ labelled undirected graphs while the respective number for unlabelled graphs is asymptotically equal to $2^{\binom{n}{2}}/n!$ [7]. Thus, if all graphs of n vertices are equally probable, an encoding that does not consider isomorphism would sacrifice $\log n!$ bits [8, 9].

the distribution of the dictionary atoms. Thus, the more repetitive the patterns in the graph distribution are, the larger will be the compression benefits of PnC.

Practical algorithms. We propose a suite of practical algorithms to learn the best hypothesis, including the following: (a) parametrising directly the probability distribution by a small number of learnable parameters, (b) learning to select the dictionary from a predefined graph universe of finite size, and (c) learning to partition. The latter is a parametric randomised iterative algorithm, the probabilities of which are inferred from a Graph Neural Network (GNN) and optimised with reinforcement learning. Importantly, all algorithms can be jointly trained in order to minimise the total description length in a synergistic manner.

We evaluate our algorithms on diverse real-world graph distributions and showcase compression gains with respect to the baselines, both in observed and unseen data. PnC divides the storage requirements of molecular graphs by a factor of up to 2.6 and 2.4, and social networks by a factor of up to 3.6 and 1.6, w.r.t. the most competitive conventional and advanced baseline compressors respectively.

2 Related work

Engineered codecs. Although graph compression is a fundamental information-theoretic problem, the majority of the approaches are not probabilistic, but heavily rely on hand-engineered encodings that are optimised to take advantage of certain domain-specific properties, such as WebGraphs [4], social networks [25, 26, 6], and biological networks [27]. A common idea used in these approaches is *vertex reordering* [4, 25, 28, 29, 26, 6, 5, 30], where the adjacency matrix is permuted in such a way that makes it “compression-friendly” for mainstream compressors for sequences such as `gzip`. The algorithms used to compute the re-orderings are usually based on heuristics taking advantage of specific network properties, e.g. community structure. Another recurrent idea is to detect or use predefined *frequent substructures* (e.g., cliques) to represent more efficiently different parts of the graph via grammar rules [31]. These approaches do not attempt to model the underlying graph distribution and thus to approach the storage lower bounds, but aim at finding a balance between compression ratios and fast operations on the compressed graphs. Thus, despite their practical importance, they are less relevant to our work. A comprehensive survey can be found in [32].

Theory-driven approaches. From a theoretical perspective, several works have contributed to the foundations of the information content and the complexity of graphs [8, 9, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38]. However, few works have attempted to model the underlying graph distribution (needed for compression). Perhaps the most outstanding progress has been made for graphs modelled by the Stochastic Block Model (SBM) [39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45]. Although originally invented for clustering and network analysis purposes, these approaches can be seamlessly used for compression due to their exact likelihood computation. In fact, as we argue in this work, virtually any graph clustering algorithm can be used successfully for compression, by defining codewords corresponding to a community-based random graph model. However, as our experiments confirm, such approaches are less effective at compressing graphs that do not contain clusters. Finally, graph compression objectives paired with heuristic algorithms have also been used for downstream tasks such as motif finding [46, 47] and graph summarisation [48].

Likelihood-based neural approaches. Given the extraordinary capabilities of deep generative models, there has been an increasing interest for neural approaches to data compression. Usually, a neural network is employed to model the data distribution (e.g., RNNs for text [17, 18, 49, 50], CNNs for images [51, 11, 52]) and then the probability is passed to an entropy coder which translates it into a codeword. Since exact likelihood computation is necessary, the most commonly-used neural networks are VAEs (paired with a technique called bits-back coding [53, 53, 54] and, more recently, normalising flows [55]). Two major difficulties arise when attempting to apply the same rationale to compress graphs: (a) First, current graph generators lack the necessary theoretical properties an effective graph compressor should have: they are not permutation equivariant [56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61] and/or do not provide a likelihood [62, 63, 64, 65]. (b) Second, when attempting to use a neural generative model to predict the data likelihood (and thus to design codes), the data cannot be recovered unless the decoder has access to the neural network itself. However, neural generative models are usually parameter inefficient, while compressing them (especially during training) is a challenging problem [66]. Note that this is significantly different than compressing neural classifiers, since the capacity

to infer the likelihood up to high precision needs to be retained. Therefore, these approaches can have diminishing (or even negative) returns when the dataset size is not large enough.

In contrast, by optimising the total description length (maximum a-posteriori), we design a compressor that is practical even for small datasets, while the learned dictionary makes our compressor interpretable. Importantly, we achieve this without sacrificing the adherence to the theoretical principles of graph probabilistic models.

3 Preliminaries

We use capital letters for sets A, B , bold font for vectors \mathbf{x} and matrices \mathbf{X} , and calligraphic font \mathfrak{X} for families of sets. We express the information content in bits by using a base-2 logarithm \log .

Graphs. Let $G = \{V, E\}$ be a graph with n vertices $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ and m edges, where $e_{ij} \in E$ whenever vertices $v_i, v_j \in V$ are connected by an edge. For simplicity, we assume the graphs to be undirected, though the same methods apply to directed graphs as well with minimal modifications. Let $\text{cut}(A, B) = \{e_{ij} \in E \mid v_i \in A \text{ and } v_j \in B\}$ denote the set of edges with endpoints at two different vertex sets $A, B \subseteq V$.

Information theory. Following the usual terminology in information theory and Minimum Description Length (MDL) theory [2, 67, 68], we assume an *observation space* \mathfrak{G} (in our case a space of possible graphs), and a probability distribution p (sometimes referred to as *probabilistic source*) producing samples from the observation space. We observe a dataset $\mathcal{G} = \{G_1, G_2, \dots, G_{|\mathcal{G}|}\}$ of i.i.d. observations drawn from p . Note that this setting is in contrast with most works on graph compression [4, 29, 5, 6], where the target is to compress a *single* large network, such as a social network or a web graph. Let a *description method* or *symbol code* $\text{CODE} : \mathfrak{G} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$ be a mapping from the observation space to a variable-length sequence of binary symbols, the output of which is a *codeword*.

In the context of graph compression, we are interested in the description length of the code $L_{\text{CODE}}(G)$, or $L(G)$ for brevity, i.e., the number of bits needed to encode the graph G , rather than the code itself, given a single requirement: the code needs to be *uniquely decodable*, meaning that any concatenation of codes can be uniquely mapped to a sequence of observations. This property can be easily verified using only the description lengths by the well-known *Kraft–McMillan inequality* (l.h.s. in formula (1)), an important implication of which is that every uniquely decodable code implies a probability distribution $q(G)$ (r.h.s.):

$$\sum_{G \in \mathfrak{G}} 2^{-L(G)} \leq 1 \quad (\text{code}) \iff q(G) = \frac{2^{-L(G)}}{\sum_{G \in \mathfrak{G}} 2^{-L(G)}} \quad (\text{distribution}) \quad (1)$$

This equivalence allows us to always define underlying probabilistic models when working directly with description lengths. When the Kraft–McMillan inequality holds with equality, we say that the code is *complete*; the case of strict inequality means the code is *redundant*. Moreover, in the case of complete codes, the expected length of the code corresponds to the distribution entropy $\mathbb{H}_p[G]$ (plus a constant term when the code is redundant). Thus, compression is synonymous to defining probabilistic models that have the lowest possible entropy.

An important notion that frequently appears in our theoretical analysis is the *binary* entropy, i.e., the entropy of a bernoulli variable with probability of success p . To distinguish it from the general notion of entropy we will denote it as $H(p) = -p \log p - (1 - p) \log(1 - p)$. It holds that $0 \leq H(p) \leq 1$, where the l.h.s equality is satisfied for $p \in \{0, 1\}$ and the r.h.s. for $p = 1/2$.

Common graph encodings. An important principle that we follow is that whenever we cannot make any assumptions about an underlying distribution, or modelling it is impractical, then the uniform distribution p_{unif} is chosen for encoding. The reason is that uniform distribution is *worst-case optimal* [67]: for any non-uniform unknown distribution p , there always exists a distribution q the corresponding encoding of which will be on expectation worse than the uniform encoding: $\mathbb{E}_{x \sim p}[-\log q(x)] > \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p}[-\log p_{\text{unif}}(x)]$.

In the context of graphs, when we cannot make any assumptions or when enumeration is impossible, we will be using a slightly more informative distribution: the Erdős–Rényi (ER) random graph model. This model assigns equal probability to all labelled graphs with n vertices and m edges. Assuming a uniform probability

over the possible number of vertices n and number of edges m given n , we get:

$$L_{\text{null}}(G) = \log(n_{\text{max}} + 1) + \log\left(\binom{n}{2} + 1\right) + \log\left(\binom{n}{m}\right), \quad (2)$$

where n_{max} is an upper bound on the number of vertices. The “*null*” encoding compresses more efficiently graphs that are either very sparse or very dense (low-surprise) as the number of possible graphs with m edges is maximised when $m = n(n - 1)/4$.

4 The Partition & Code (PnC) graph compression framework

Our pipeline consists of three main modules: a *partitioning* module, a *dictionary* module, and an *entropy encoding* module. (a) The partitioning module is responsible for decomposing the graph into disjoint subgraphs and cross-subgraph edges (or *cuts*). Subgraphs play the role of elementary structures, akin to characters or words in text compression, and pixels or patches in image compression. (b) The dictionary is a small collection of subgraphs (*atoms*) that are recurrent in the graph distribution. The dictionary module maps the partitioned subgraphs to atoms in the dictionary, allowing us to represent the graph as a collection of atom indices and cuts. (c) Finally, this representation is given as input to an entropy encoder that translates it into bits.

Decoding the graph in a lossless way is a straightforward procedure that involves inverting these three steps: initially the atom indices and cuts are decoded using the same probabilistic model with the encoder, then the atoms are retrieved from the dictionary, and finally all elements are composed back to obtain the original structure. The composition becomes possible by making sure that the cuts are encoded w.r.t. an arbitrarily chosen ordering of each atom’s vertices, hence the decoded graph is guaranteed to be isomorphic to the input, but not necessarily with the same vertex ordering.

4.1 Step 1. Partitioning

The first step of PnC is to employ a parametric partitioning algorithm PART_θ to decompose each graph G into b subgraphs of bounded size:

$$\text{PART}_\theta(G) = (\mathcal{H}, C) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H} = \{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_b\}, \quad (3)$$

where $H_i = \{V_i, E_i\}$ is the i -th subgraph and $C = \{V, E_C\}$ is a b -partite graph containing all cut edges $E_C = E - \cup_i E_i$. Variable θ indicates the learnable parameters.

Is partitioning necessary? We argue that such decomposition of a graph into smaller manageable parts should be an essential component of any graph compression method. Graph compression boils down to knowing how likely each graph is under the data distribution. However, there is an important caveat: simply knowing the likelihood of an event is not enough! The reason for that is that entropy encoders [22, 23, 24] need to be able to compute the probability of *any* possible outcome of the distribution (or equivalently to have access to the cumulative distribution function (c.d.f.)) to translate probabilities into codewords (see challenge C2 in Section 1). As we will see in Section 4.3, graph partitioning allows us to decompose the learned distribution and thus to obtain a closed-form expression for the likelihood. Furthermore, as Theorem 1 suggests, partitioning is an appropriate inductive bias for graph-structured data providing significant storage gains compared to distribution-agnostic baselines.

4.2 Step 2. Graph dictionary

Rather than naively compressing each subgraph in (3) under a null model, an effective compression algorithm should exploit regularities in the output of PART_θ . We propose to utilise a dictionary that stores the most commonly occurring subgraphs. Concretely, we define a dictionary D to be a collection of connected subgraphs (or *atoms*) from some universe \mathfrak{U} :

$$D = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{|D|}\}, \quad \text{where} \quad a_i \in \mathfrak{U}. \quad (4)$$

From a probabilistic perspective, the dictionary reflects our prior knowledge with regards to the graph distribution at hand. Opting to prioritise small dictionaries, we encode each atom independently. There are two viable choices for the atom encoding: (a) If the universe is small enough to be efficiently enumerable then we can assume a uniform distribution over \mathcal{U} which yields the description length $L(D) = |D| \log |\mathcal{U}|$. Intuitively, this would amount to storing the index of each atom within a list enumerating \mathcal{U} . (b) On the other hand, when \mathcal{U} is too large to enumerate the atoms can be stored one-by-one based on the null-model encoding given in (2):

$$L(D) = \sum_{a_i \in D} L_{\text{null}}(a_i). \quad (5)$$

It is important to note that, to be as effective as possible the partitioning and the dictionary should be co-designed: D should capture those subgraphs that are most likely, whereas PART_θ should be biased towards subgraphs with similar structure.

The use of a dictionary makes it possible to explicitly account for (and thus optimise) the description length of the learned hypothesis (i.e., equation above). Accounting for both the model and the data is an essential component of any compression algorithm (see challenge C1 in Section 1).

4.3 Step 3. Graph encoding

The last step entails compressing G by encoding the output (\mathcal{H}, C) of PART_θ with the dictionary. As discussed in Section 3, a uniquely decodable encoding implies a probability distribution. In general, we can define a probability distribution on graph decompositions parametrised by ϕ as $q_\phi(G) = q_\phi(\mathcal{H}, C)$ which corresponds to a description length $L_\phi(\mathcal{H}, C) = -\log q_\phi(\mathcal{H}, C)$. In the following we explain how q_ϕ is decomposed.

An essential property that $q_\phi(G)$ should have is that it needs to be invariant to isomorphism, i.e., that a graph should have the same probability regardless of the ordering of its vertices. In our case, this means that decompositions should be assigned the same probability, regardless of the order of the subgraphs, or formally q_ϕ should be *jointly exchangeable* [69] w.r.t. \mathcal{H} and C .

Given that the space of all possible (\mathcal{H}, C) decompositions is enormous, we are unlikely to encounter enough observations to optimise the parameters of an arbitrary jointly exchangeable distribution, but most importantly the outcomes will still be impossible to enumerate. Thus, we choose a parametrisation that is sufficiently flexible to fit the observed data, without compromising enumeration.

Subgraphs. We opt for a dual encoding of subgraphs: one for the subgraphs that belong to the dictionary $\mathcal{H}_{\text{dict}}$, and one for non-dictionary subgraphs $\mathcal{H}_{\text{null}}$ that are encoded with the help of a null model as in Eq. (2). This choice has a dual purpose: (a) It allows PART_θ to choose non-dictionary atoms. This is crucial to our approach, since constraining the partitioning to specific isomorphism classes would significantly complicate optimisation. (b) Further, it enables us to maintain a balance between two common structures found in real-world networks—*frequent subgraphs* (stored in the dictionary), and *low-entropy subgraphs* as implied by the null model (i.e., very sparse or very dense subgraphs). The distribution is therefore decomposed into the following components:

Number of subgraphs. First, we encode the number of dictionary and non-dictionary subgraphs (b_{dict} and b_{null} respectively) as follows:

$$q_\phi(b_{\text{dict}}, b_{\text{null}}) = \text{Binomial}(b_{\text{dict}} | b; \phi) q_\phi(b) = \binom{b}{b_{\text{dict}}} (1 - \delta_\phi)^{b_{\text{dict}}} \delta_\phi^{b - b_{\text{dict}}} q_\phi(b), \quad (6)$$

where $1 - \delta_\phi = \mathbb{P}[H \in D]$ is the probability of an arbitrary subgraph to belong in the dictionary.

Dictionary subgraphs. The dictionary subgraphs are encoded in a permutation invariant way via a *multinomial* distribution, i.e., we encode the histogram of atoms:

$$q_\phi(\mathcal{H}_{\text{dict}} | b_{\text{dict}}, D) = \text{Multinomial}(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{|D|} \mid b_{\text{dict}}; \phi) = b_{\text{dict}}! \prod_{a \in D} \frac{q_\phi(a)^{b_a}}{b_a!}, \quad (7)$$

where $b_a = |\{H \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{dict}} | H \cong a\}|$ and $\sum_{a \in D} b_a = b_{\text{dict}}$.

Non-Dictionary subgraphs. The non-dictionary subgraphs are encoded independently according to the null model:

$$q_\phi(\mathcal{H}_{\text{null}}|b_{\text{null}}, D) = \prod_{H_i \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{null}}} q_{\text{null}}(H_i). \quad (8)$$

Cuts. We encode the cuts conditioned on the subgraphs, using a non-parametric uninformative null model for multi-partite graphs similar to [42] (see supplementary material for the detailed expression) that prioritises low-entropy cuts. In this way we give more emphasis to the subgraphs and an inductive bias towards distinct clusters in the graph.

Overall, the description length of $(\mathcal{H}, C) = \text{PART}_\theta(G)$ is given by

$$L_\phi(\mathcal{H}, C|D) = L_\phi(b_{\text{dict}}, b_{\text{null}}) + L_\phi(\mathcal{H}_{\text{dict}}|b_{\text{dict}}, D) + L_{\text{null}}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{null}}|b_{\text{null}}, D) + L_{\text{null}}(C|\mathcal{H}), \quad (9)$$

and the learnable parameter set is $\left\{ \delta_\phi, \{q_\phi(b)\}_{b=b_{\min}}^{b_{\max}}, \{q_\phi(a)\}_{a \in D} \right\}$.

4.4 Selecting a hypothesis by minimising the total description length

Putting everything together, in order to encode a graph dataset \mathcal{G} sampled i.i.d. from \mathfrak{G} we minimise the total description length

$$\min_{\theta, D, \phi} \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}} L_\phi(\text{PART}_\theta(G) | D) + L(D) \quad (10)$$

with respect to the parameters θ of the parametric partitioning algorithm, the dictionary D , and the parameters ϕ of the probabilistic model.

Minimising the above equation is a typical two-part Minimum Description Length (MDL) objective [70, 67]. Using standard MDL terminology, the tuple (θ, D, ϕ) is a *point hypotheses* and minimising (10) amounts to finding the simplest hypothesis that can best describe the data. Alternatively, this can be seen as maximising the posterior distribution of the parameters.

5 Theoretical analysis: quadratic and linear gains

The following section performs a comparative analysis of the description length growth rate of various graph compressors. Our analysis shows that both the “Partition” and the “Code” components of our algorithm provide significant compression gains against standard graph encodings.

We compare PnC against two strong baselines: (a) The code length L_{part} induced by a pure partitioning-based graph encoding. Here, a graph is decomposed into subgraphs and cuts, but the distribution of subgraphs is not modelled (i.e., both subgraphs and cuts are encoded with a null model $L_{\text{part}}(G) = L_{\text{null}}(\mathcal{H}) + L_{\text{null}}(C|\mathcal{H})$). (b) The code length of encodings that do not rely on partitioning but encode each graph as a whole. Importantly, our results hold even for those baselines that encode the isomorphism class of each graph, rather than the graph itself, such as the Erdős-Renyi model for unlabelled graphs of n vertices: $L_{\text{ER-S}}(G) = \log |\mathfrak{G}_{n,m}| + \log(n^2 + 1)$, where $\mathfrak{G}_{n,m}$ is the set of all graphs with n vertices and m edges. $L_{\text{ER-S}}(G)$ serves as lower bound to typical encodings such as that of Eq. (2), but can be impractical to implement due to the complexity of GI. The analysis of additional baselines can be found in Appendix A.

Our main theorem shows that, under mild conditions on the underlying graph distribution, the expected description lengths of the compared encodings are totally ordered:

Theorem 1. *Consider a distribution p over graphs with n vertices and a partitioning algorithm that decomposes a graph into b blocks of $k = O(1)$ vertices. Then it holds that:*

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[L_{\text{PnC}}(G)] \stackrel{(1b)}{\lesssim} \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[L_{\text{part}}(G)] \stackrel{(1a)}{\lesssim} \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[L_{\text{ER-S}}(G)] \quad (11)$$

under the following conditions:

- (1a) $\frac{\log(k^2+1)}{k^2} + \bar{H}_{m_{ij}} < \bar{H}_m$, where $\bar{H}_{m_{ij}} = \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[\mathbb{H}(\frac{m_{ij}}{k^2})]$ and $\bar{H}_m = \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[\mathbb{H}(\frac{m}{n^2})]$ is the expected binary entropy of the cut size m_{ij} between two subgraphs and that of the total number of edges m , respectively.
- (1b) $|D| < (k^2 + 1)2^{k^2 \bar{H}_{m_i}}$, where $|D|$ is the size of the dictionary and $\bar{H}_{m_i} = \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[\mathbb{H}(\frac{m_i}{k^2})]$ is the expected binary entropy of the number of edges m_i in a subgraph.

The absolute compression gains are:

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[\text{L}_{\text{Part}}(G)] \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[\text{L}_{\text{ER-S}}(G)] - n^2 \left(\bar{H}_m - \frac{\log(k^2 + 1)}{k^2} - \bar{H}_{m_{ij}} \right) \quad (12)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[\text{L}_{\text{PnC}}(G)] \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[\text{L}_{\text{part}}(G)] - nk(1 - \delta) \left(\bar{H}_{m_i} - \frac{\mathbb{H}(D) - \log(k^2 + 1)}{k^2} \right), \quad (13)$$

where $1 - \delta$ is the probability that a subgraph belongs in the dictionary and $\mathbb{H}(D) = \mathbb{H}_{a \sim q_\phi(a)}[a]$ is the entropy of the distribution on dictionary atoms $q_\phi(a)$.

Theorem 1 provides insights on the compressibility of certain graph distributions given their structural characteristics. In particular, we can make the following remarks:

Condition (1a) can be satisfied even for very small values of k as long as the graphs possess community structure. Perhaps counter-intuitively, when $k = O(1)$ we can satisfy the condition even if the communities have $O(n)$ size by splitting them into smaller subgraphs. This is possible because, in contrast to the majority of graph partitioning objectives that are based on minimum cuts, the compression objective attains its minimum when the cuts have “low entropy”. Since communities that are tightly internally connected have large cuts, $\bar{H}_{m_{ij}}$ and the code length will be kept small. This is a key observation that strongly motivates the use of partitioning for graph compression.

Condition (1b) provides an upper bound to the size of the dictionary, which can be easily satisfied for moderately small values of k . More importantly, the dependence of the compression gain on the entropy $\mathbb{H}(D)$, reveals that dictionary atoms should be frequent subgraphs in the distribution, confirming our intuition. The bounds also show that, since the probabilities of the atoms are estimated from the data, PnC does not need to make assumptions about the inner structure of the subgraphs and can adapt to general distributions.

We lastly provide theoretical evidence on the importance of encoding dictionary subgraphs as isomorphism classes instead of adjacency matrices, which is related to challenge C1, mentioned in the introduction. In particular, Theorem 2 shows that, if isomorphism is not taken into account, the number of bits that will be lost will grow linearly with the number of vertices. Formally:

Theorem 2. Let p be a graph distribution that is invariant to isomorphism, i.e., $p(G') = p(G)$ if $G \cong G'$. Moreover, consider any algorithm that partitions G in b subgraphs of k vertices. Denote by $\text{L}_{\text{PnC-G}}$ and $\text{L}_{\text{PnC-S}}$ the description length of a PnC compressor that uses a dictionary of atoms encoded as labelled graphs and as isomorphism classes, respectively. The following holds:

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[\text{L}_{\text{PnC-S}}(G)] \approx \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[\text{L}_{\text{PnC-G}}(G)] - n(1 - \delta) \log k \quad (14)$$

under the condition that almost all graphs in the dictionary are rigid².

Importantly, the compression gains implied by the theorem hold independently of the size of the dictionary, applying e.g., also when the dictionary is equal to the universe and contains all graphs of size k (which amounts to the traditional partitioning baselines).

All proofs and detailed assumptions can be found in Appendix A. We refer the reader to section 7, where both key theoretical findings are reflected in the experimental results. Regarding Theorem (1a), partitioning-based algorithms provided larger improvements for social networks compared to molecules, since in the former distribution, community structure is more pronounced. Regarding Theorem (1b), in every graph distribution we tested, we obtained improvements against all baselines, which agrees with the fact the the resulting dictionaries were relatively small (e.g., for molecules, low entropy dictionaries are learned due to the high repetitiveness of characteristic subgraph patterns).

²A rigid graph has only the trivial automorphism.

6 Optimisation and learning algorithms

We turn our focus to learning algorithms for the optimisation of the MDL objective (10). The following sections explain how each parametric component of PnC is learned.

Subgraph encoding ϕ . The graph encoding is parametrised as follows: $q_\phi(a_i)$ and $q_\phi(b)$ are parametrised by learnable variables that are converted into categorical distributions over the dictionary atoms and the number of vertices respectively, using a softmax function. Similarly, δ_ϕ is parametrised by a learnable variable converted to a probability via the sigmoid function.

Dictionary D . Let $\mathcal{U} = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{|\mathcal{U}|}\}$ be a practically enumerable universe and define $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{|\mathcal{U}|})$ as:

$$x_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a_i \in D \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Thus, x_i indicates whether D contains subgraph a_i . Now, optimising w.r.t the dictionary amounts to finding the binary assignments for \mathbf{x} that minimise (10). To circumvent the combinatorial nature of this problem, we apply the continuous relaxation $\hat{x}_i = \sigma(\psi_i), \forall i \in \{0, 1, \dots, |\mathcal{U}|\}$, where σ is the sigmoid function, ψ_i are learned continuous variables, and $\hat{x}_i \in [0, 1]$ is a fractional alternative to x_i . The supplementary material (Appendix B.3)) shows how (10) can be re-written w.r.t. \mathbf{x} and optimised by using the surrogate gradient w.r.t \hat{x}_i .

It is important to note that, in practice, we do not have to introduce indicator variables for the entire universe: Since most subgraphs a_i will be never encountered in the graph distribution, we build the universe adaptively during training, by progressively adding the different graphs that the partitioning algorithm yields. We also allow the universe to contain subgraphs of size up to $k = O(1)$, in order to ensure that the isomorphism testing between atoms and subgraphs can be efficiently computed.

Parametric graph partitioning algorithm PART_θ . Finding the graph partitions that minimise (10) would, in principle, require searching in the space of all possible partitioning algorithms. Instead, we constrain this space via a differentiable parametrisation that allows us to perform traditional gradient-based optimisation. Currently, learning to partition graphs is an open problem, as to the extend of our knowledge known neural approaches require a fixed number of clusters [71, 72, 73] or do not guarantee that the subgraphs are connected [74]. We propose a neural algorithm that partitions a graphs by iteratively sampling connected subgraphs. The algorithm is parametrised by a graph neural network (GNN). When run on a graph, the GNN outputs a random (\mathcal{H}, C) together with a corresponding probability $p_\theta^{\text{GNN}}(\mathcal{H}, C|G)$ indicating its confidence. We train the GNN by minimising (10) using the REINFORCE [75] algorithm. Please refer to the appendix B.4 for a more detailed explanation of the algorithm and the relevant implementation details. We stress that we mainly consider this algorithm as a proof of concept that we ablate against other non-parametric partitioning algorithms. A plethora of different solutions can be explored in a parametric setting and we welcome future work in this direction.

MDL objective. Given dataset \mathcal{G} , we train all components by minimising the description length:

$$L(\mathcal{G}) = L_{\mathbf{x}}(D) + \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}_{(\mathcal{H}, C) \sim p_\theta^{\text{GNN}}(\mathcal{H}, C|G)} [L_{\phi, \mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{H}, C|D)]. \quad (15)$$

The gradients w.r.t ϕ, θ are, respectively, calculated as follows:

$$\nabla_\phi L(\mathcal{G}) = \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}[\nabla_\phi L_{\phi, \mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{H}, C|D)] \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla_\theta L(\mathcal{G}) = \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}[L_{\phi, \mathbf{x}}(\mathcal{H}, C|D) \nabla_\theta \ln p_\theta^{\text{GNN}}(\mathcal{H}, C|G)] \quad (16)$$

and w.r.t. the indicator variables \mathbf{x} :

$$\nabla_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}} L(\mathcal{G}) = \nabla_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}} L_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}(D) + \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}[\nabla_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}} L_{\phi, \hat{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{H}, C|D)], \quad (17)$$

with the expectation taken over the GNN output $(\mathcal{H}, C) \sim p_\theta^{\text{GNN}}(\mathcal{H}, C|G)$.




Figure 2: PnC + Neural Part. - Left: Most probable graphs in the IMDB-B dataset. Right: Most probable graphs in the attributed MUTAG dataset. Atom types and bond types (single, double, triple, aromatic) are represented as vertex and edge attributes (see Appendix C.2 for quantitative results).

Table 1: Average bits per edge (bpe) for molecular graph datasets. **First**, **Second**, **Third**

Method type	Graph type	Small Molecules								
		MUTAG			PTC			ZINC		
	Dataset name	data	total	params	data	total	params	data	total	params
Null	Uniform (raw adjac.)	-	8.44	-	-	17.43	-	-	10.90	-
	Edge list	-	7.97	-	-	9.38	-	-	8.60	-
	Erdős-Renyi	-	4.78	-	-	5.67	-	-	5.15	-
Partitioning (non-parametric)	SBM-Bayes	-	4.62	-	-	5.12	-	-	4.75	-
	Louvain	-	4.80	-	-	5.27	-	-	4.77	-
	PropClust	-	4.92	-	-	5.40	-	-	4.85	-
Neural (likelihood)	GraphRNN	1.33	1669.77	388K	1.57	698.08	389K	1.62	22.39	388K
	GRAN	0.81	6279.28	1460K	2.18	2636	1470K	1.30	79.50	1461K
PnC	PnC + SBM	3.81	4.11	49	4.38	4.79	155	3.34	3.45	594
	PnC + Louvain	2.20	2.51	47	2.65	3.15	166	1.96	1.99	196
	PnC + PropClust	2.42	3.03	63	3.38	4.02	178	2.20	2.35	726
PnC + Neural Part.		2.17±0.02	2.45±0.02	46±1	2.63±0.26	2.97±0.14	143±31	2.01±0.02	2.07±0.03	384±105

7 Empirical Results

We evaluate our framework in a variety of datasets from different distributions: small molecules, protein and social networks [76, 77, 78, 79, 80].

Experimental setup. Across all methods, we assume an optimal encoder that attains the entropy lower bound, i.e., translates probabilities to codewords computing the negative log likelihood. This assumption is made in order to evaluate the expressive power of each model independently of the encoder. Since modern entropy coders do approach the lower bound, this assumption is not unrealistic. We measure the description length of the data as their negative log-likelihood under each probabilistic model, and most importantly we evaluate the total description length by adding the cost of the parameters which need to be transmitted to the decoder (we assume a 16-bit/parameter representation).

Baselines. We aim to assess representative approaches across the entire spectrum of graph probabilistic models, i.e., from completely uninformative non-parametric distributions to overparametrised neural generative models. We consider the following types of compressors: (a) *Null models*. The graphs are encoded as if they originated from a non-parametric null model. We select the *uniform* model, where all edges are assumed to be sampled independently with probability equal to 0.5, the *edge list* model, a typical graph representation, and the *Erdős-Renyi* model (Eq. (2)). Note that these models are heavily redundant for large graphs, since they are completely oblivious to graph isomorphism. (b) *Partitioning-based*. non-parametric methods that aim at grouping vertices in tightly-connected clusters. They can be used for any type of sparse matrix [81] and are based on the assumption that there exists a hidden community structure in the graph. They can be seen as vertex-reordering methods with the additional information of the cluster sizes. The partitioning algorithms used for graph clustering are *SBM-fitting* [41, 42, 43, 44], the Louvain algorithm [82] and clustering by Label Propagation [83]. The encoding we use to encode the clusters corresponds exactly to the SBM assumptions, hence the partitioning-based results are always superior for this approach. (c) *Likelihood-based*

Table 2: Average bits per edge (bpe) for social and protein graph datasets. **First**, **Second**, **Third**

Method type	Graph type	Biology			Social Networks					
		PROTEINS			IMDB-B			IMDB-M		
	Dataset name	data	total	params	data	total	params	data	total	params
Null (non-parametric)	Uniform (raw adjac.)	-	24.71	-	-	2.52	-	-	1.83	-
	Edge list	-	10.92	-	-	8.29	-	-	7.74	-
	Erdős-Renyi	-	5.46	-	-	1.94	-	-	1.32	-
Partitioning (non-parametric)	SBM-Bayes	-	3.98	-	-	0.80	-	-	0.60	-
	Louvain	-	3.95	-	-	1.22	-	-	0.88	-
	PropClust	-	4.11	-	-	1.99	-	-	1.37	-
Neural (likelihood)	GraphRNN	2.03	79.51	392K	1.03	66.65	395K	0.72	64.28	392K
	GRAN	1.51	304.735	1545K	0.26	244.57	1473K	0.17	237.65	1467K
PnC	PnC + SBM	3.26	3.60	896	0.50	0.54	198	0.38	0.38	157
	PnC + Louvain	3.30	3.58	854	0.96	1.02	202	0.66	0.70	141
	PnC + PropClust	3.40	3.70	866	1.45	1.64	241	0.93	1.04	178
	PnC + Neural Part.	3.34±0.25	3.51±0.23	717±61	1.00±0.04	1.05±0.04	186±25	0.66±0.05	0.72±0.05	178±14

neural compressors. As with any likelihood-based generative model, graph generative models can be transformed into graph compressors. We evaluate graphRNN [57] and GRAN [58], by measuring the negative log-likelihood on the data after training, together with the description length of the network parameters

Results. Tables 1 and 2 report how well each method can compress each dataset. We present four variants of PnC, differing on the type of partitioning algorithm utilised [83, 82, 44]. The compression quality is measured in terms of the average number of bits required to store each edge in a dataset (bpe): the fewer bpe are required, the better the compression quality. The tables report separately the cost of compressing the data as well as the total cost (including the parameters).

Several observations can be made with regards to the baselines: *First off, likelihood-based neural approaches are poor compressors due to failing to address challenge C3*. As seen, these models exhibit an unfavorable trade-off between the data and model complexity, often requiring significantly more bpe than the null models. In Figure 3 in the appendix we provide additional ablation studies on neural generative models by varying their number of parameters. We observe that minimal instantiations, with parameter counts at the same order of magnitude as PnC, severely underfit and even fail to outperform the compression quality of the null models. *In addition, non-parametric clustering algorithms work well when the dataset has a strong community structure, but are not a good choice for more structured datasets*. For instance, the best clustering algorithm requires $2.4\times$ more bpe for ZINC than the best PnC.

PnC variants achieve the best compression in all datasets considered. This confirms our hypothesis that our framework is sufficiently flexible to account for the particularities of each dataset. As seen, neural partitioning performs in every case better, or on par with the combination of PnC with the Louvain algorithm. However, in the social network datasets the combination of PnC with SBM achieves the best performance. This occurs because these networks fit nicely with the SBM inductive bias (which as a matter of fact is exactly that of low-entropy cuts), and most importantly, due to the fact that the clusters recovered by the SBM are small and repetitive (see Figure 2), which makes them ideal for the PnC framework. We also observe that there is room for improvement for the neural partitioning variant, and hypothesise that a more powerful parametrised algorithm can be designed. Since learnable partitioning is still an open problem, we leave this research direction to future work.

Fig. 2 shows the most likely atoms in the dictionary learned for the IMDB-B and the MUTAG dataset (including also node and edge attributes - please refer to the Appendix C.2 for additional experiments). We observe that clique or near-clique substructures and typical molecular substructures, such as carbon cycles and junctions are recovered for social networks and molecules respectively. This clearly highlights the connection between compression and pattern mining and provides evidence for potential applications of our framework.

8 Conclusion

This paper marks a solid step towards learnable entropy-based graph compression. To the best of our knowledge, our work represents the first attempt to address the basic principles for isomorphism-invariant parametric graph compressors learned from observations. In addition, we suggest practical instantiations of our framework that can be trained with gradient-based optimisation, accounting for the total description length, hence aiming for the largest possible parsimony. A number of new research questions arise, such as how to design more expressive, albeit parsimonious, jointly exchangeable distributions, how to improve neural partitioning algorithms that can be incorporated in neural architectures, and how to ensure scalability to single large networks that pose a significant challenge w.r.t the memory constraints of GPUs. We hope that our work will inspire further research in this emerging research area.

Acknowledgements

This project was partially funded by the ERC Consolidator Grant No. 724228 - LEMAN. The research of Giorgos Bouritsas is partially supported by a PhD scholarship from the Department of Computing, Imperial College London. Andreas Loukas and Nikolaos Karalias would like to thank the Swiss National Science Foundation for supporting them in the context of the project “Deep Learning for Graph Structured Data”, grant number PZ00P2 179981. Michael Bronstein acknowledges support from Google Faculty awards and the Royal Society Wolfson Research Merit award.

References

- [1] Claude E Shannon. A mathematical theory of communication. *The Bell system technical journal*, 27(3):379–423, 1948.
- [2] David JC MacKay and David JC Mac Kay. *Information theory, inference and learning algorithms*. Cambridge university press, 2003.
- [3] László Babai. Graph isomorphism in quasipolynomial time. In *Proceedings of the forty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 684–697, 2016.
- [4] Paolo Boldi Sebastiano Vigna and P Boldi. The webgraph framework i: compression techniques. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on World Wide Web*, pages 595–602, 2004.
- [5] Yongsub Lim, U Kang, and Christos Faloutsos. Slashburn: Graph compression and mining beyond caveman communities. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 26(12):3077–3089, 2014.
- [6] Laxman Dhulipala, Igor Kabiljo, Brian Karrer, Giuseppe Ottaviano, Sergey Pupyrev, and Alon Shalita. Compressing graphs and indexes with recursive graph bisection. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 1535–1544, 2016.
- [7] Frank Harary and Edgar M Palmer. *Graphical enumeration*. Elsevier, 2014.
- [8] Moni Naor. Succinct representation of general unlabeled graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 28(3):303–307, 1990.
- [9] Yongwook Choi and Wojciech Szpankowski. Compression of graphical structures: Fundamental limits, algorithms, and experiments. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 58(2):620–638, 2012.
- [10] Jon Sneyers and Pieter Wuille. Flif: Free lossless image format based on maniac compression. In *2016 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, pages 66–70. IEEE, 2016.
- [11] Fabian Mentzer, Eirikur Agustsson, Michael Tschannen, Radu Timofte, and Luc Van Gool. Practical full resolution learned lossless image compression. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 10629–10638, 2019.

- [12] Terry A Welch. A technique for high-performance data compression. *Computer*, 17(06):8–19, 1984.
- [13] Jacob Ziv and Abraham Lempel. A universal algorithm for sequential data compression. *IEEE Transactions on information theory*, 23(3):337–343, 1977.
- [14] Jacob Ziv and Abraham Lempel. Compression of individual sequences via variable-rate coding. *IEEE transactions on Information Theory*, 24(5):530–536, 1978.
- [15] Timothy Bell, Ian H Witten, and John G Cleary. Modeling for text compression. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 21(4):557–591, 1989.
- [16] Michael Burrows and David Wheeler. A block-sorting lossless data compression algorithm. In *Digital SRC Research Report*. Citeseer, 1994.
- [17] Jürgen Schmidhuber and Stefan Heil. Sequential neural text compression. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 7(1):142–146, 1996.
- [18] Matthew V Mahoney. Fast text compression with neural networks. In *FLAIRS conference*, pages 230–234, 2000.
- [19] Simon S Du, Xiyu Zhai, Barnabas Poczos, and Aarti Singh. Gradient descent provably optimizes over-parameterized neural networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [20] Sanjeev Arora, Nadav Cohen, and Elad Hazan. On the optimization of deep networks: Implicit acceleration by overparameterization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 244–253. PMLR, 2018.
- [21] Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, and Zhao Song. A convergence theory for deep learning via over-parameterization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 242–252. PMLR, 2019.
- [22] David A Huffman. A method for the construction of minimum-redundancy codes. *Proceedings of the IRE*, 40(9):1098–1101, 1952.
- [23] Ian H Witten, Radford M Neal, and John G Cleary. Arithmetic coding for data compression. *Communications of the ACM*, 30(6):520–540, 1987.
- [24] Jarek Duda. Asymmetric numeral systems: entropy coding combining speed of huffman coding with compression rate of arithmetic coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1311.2540*, 2013.
- [25] Alberto Apostolico and Guido Drovandi. Graph compression by bfs. *Algorithms*, 2(3):1031–1044, 2009.
- [26] Paolo Boldi, Marco Rosa, Massimo Santini, and Sebastiano Vigna. Layered label propagation: A multiresolution coordinate-free ordering for compressing social networks. In *Proceedings of the 20th international conference on World Wide Web*, pages 587–596, 2011.
- [27] Leonid Peshkin. Structure induction by lossless graph compression. In *2007 Data Compression Conference (DCC’07)*, pages 53–62. IEEE, 2007.
- [28] Flavio Chierichetti, Ravi Kumar, Silvio Lattanzi, Michael Mitzenmacher, Alessandro Panconesi, and Prabhakar Raghavan. On compressing social networks. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 219–228, 2009.
- [29] Francisco Claude and Gonzalo Navarro. Fast and compact web graph representations. *ACM Transactions on the Web (TWEB)*, 4(4):1–31, 2010.
- [30] Ryan A Rossi and Rong Zhou. Graphzip: a clique-based sparse graph compression method. *Journal of Big Data*, 5(1):1–14, 2018.
- [31] Sebastian Maneth and Fabian Peternek. Compressing graphs by grammars. In *2016 IEEE 32nd International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*, pages 109–120. IEEE, 2016.
- [32] Maciej Besta and Torsten Hoefler. Survey and taxonomy of lossless graph compression and space-efficient graph representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.01799*, 2018.

- [33] Ernesto Trucco. On the information content of graphs: compound symbols; different states for each point. *The bulletin of mathematical biophysics*, 18(3):237–253, 1956.
- [34] János Körner. Coding of an information source having ambiguous alphabet and the entropy of graphs. In *6th Prague conference on information theory*, pages 411–425, 1973.
- [35] György Turán. On the succinct representation of graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 8(3):289–294, 1984.
- [36] Matthias Dehmer. Information-theoretic concepts for the analysis of complex networks. *Applied Artificial Intelligence*, 22(7-8):684–706, 2008.
- [37] Matthias Dehmer, Nicola Barbarini, Kurt Varmuza, and Armin Graber. A large scale analysis of information-theoretic network complexity measures using chemical structures. *PLoS One*, 4(12):e8057, 2009.
- [38] Abbe Mowshowitz and Matthias Dehmer. Entropy and the complexity of graphs revisited. *Entropy*, 14(3):559–570, 2012.
- [39] Martin Rosvall and Carl T Bergstrom. Maps of random walks on complex networks reveal community structure. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105(4):1118–1123, 2008.
- [40] Brian Karrer and Mark EJ Newman. Stochastic blockmodels and community structure in networks. *Physical review E*, 83(1):016107, 2011.
- [41] Tiago P Peixoto. Entropy of stochastic blockmodel ensembles. *Physical Review E*, 85(5):056122, 2012.
- [42] Tiago P Peixoto. Parsimonious module inference in large networks. *Physical review letters*, 110(14):148701, 2013.
- [43] Tiago P Peixoto. Nonparametric bayesian inference of the microcanonical stochastic block model. *Physical Review E*, 95(1):012317, 2017.
- [44] Tiago P Peixoto. Bayesian stochastic blockmodeling. *Advances in network clustering and blockmodeling*, pages 289–332, 2019.
- [45] Clement Lee and Darren J Wilkinson. A review of stochastic block models and extensions for graph clustering. *Applied Network Science*, 4(1):1–50, 2019.
- [46] Nikhil S Ketkar, Lawrence B Holder, and Diane J Cook. Subdue: Compression-based frequent pattern discovery in graph data. In *Proceedings of the 1st international workshop on open source data mining: frequent pattern mining implementations*, pages 71–76, 2005.
- [47] Peter Bloem and Steven de Rooij. Large-scale network motif analysis using compression. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 34(5):1421–1453, 2020.
- [48] Danai Koutra, U Kang, Jilles Vreeken, and Christos Faloutsos. Vog: Summarizing and understanding large graphs. In *Proceedings of the 2014 SIAM international conference on data mining*, pages 91–99. SIAM, 2014.
- [49] David Cox. Syntactically informed text compression with recurrent neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.02893*, 2016.
- [50] Mohit Goyal, Kedar Tatwawadi, Shubham Chandak, and Idoia Ochoa. Deepzip: Lossless data compression using recurrent neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.08162*, 2018.
- [51] Emiel Hoogeboom, Jorn W. T. Peters, Rianne van den Berg, and Max Welling. Integer discrete flows and lossless compression. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2019, NeurIPS 2019, December 8-14, 2019, Vancouver, BC, Canada*, pages 12134–12144, 2019.

- [52] Fabian Mentzer, Luc Van Gool, and Michael Tschannen. Learning better lossless compression using lossy compression. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6638–6647, 2020.
- [53] James Townsend, Thomas Bird, and David Barber. Practical lossless compression with latent variables using bits back coding. In *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019, New Orleans, LA, USA, May 6-9, 2019*, 2019.
- [54] Friso Kingma, Pieter Abbeel, and Jonathan Ho. Bit-swap: Recursive bits-back coding for lossless compression with hierarchical latent variables. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3408–3417. PMLR, 2019.
- [55] Yangjun Ruan, Karen Ullrich, Daniel Severo, James Townsend, Ashish Khisti, Arnaud Doucet, Alireza Makhzani, and Chris J Maddison. Improving lossless compression rates via monte carlo bits-back coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.11086*, 2021.
- [56] Thomas N Kipf and Max Welling. Variational graph auto-encoders. In *NIPS Workshop on Bayesian Deep Learning*, 2016.
- [57] Jiaxuan You, Rex Ying, Xiang Ren, William L Hamilton, and Jure Leskovec. Graphrnn: Generating realistic graphs with deep auto-regressive models. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine learning (ICML)*, 2018.
- [58] Renjie Liao, Yujia Li, Yang Song, Shenlong Wang, Will Hamilton, David K Duvenaud, Raquel Urtasun, and Richard Zemel. Efficient graph generation with graph recurrent attention networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 4255–4265, 2019.
- [59] Chence Shi, Minkai Xu, Zhaocheng Zhu, Weinan Zhang, Ming Zhang, and Jian Tang. Graphaf: a flow-based autoregressive model for molecular graph generation. In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26-30, 2020*. OpenReview.net, 2020.
- [60] Yujia Li, Oriol Vinyals, Chris Dyer, Razvan Pascanu, and Peter W. Battaglia. Learning deep generative models of graphs. *CoRR*, abs/1803.03324, 2018.
- [61] Qi Liu, Miltiadis Allamanis, Marc Brockschmidt, and Alexander L. Gaunt. Constrained graph variational autoencoders for molecule design. In Samy Bengio, Hanna M. Wallach, Hugo Larochelle, Kristen Grauman, Nicolò Cesa-Bianchi, and Roman Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2018, NeurIPS 2018, December 3-8, 2018, Montréal, Canada*, pages 7806–7815, 2018.
- [62] Nicola De Cao and Thomas Kipf. Molgan: An implicit generative model for small molecular graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.11973*, 2018.
- [63] Carl Yang, Peiye Zhuang, Wenhan Shi, Alan Luu, and Pan Li. Conditional structure generation through graph variational generative adversarial nets. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1340–1351, 2019.
- [64] Aleksandar Bojchevski, Oleksandr Shchur, Daniel Zügner, and Stephan Günnemann. Netgan: Generating graphs via random walks. In Jennifer G. Dy and Andreas Krause, editors, *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2018, Stockholmsmässan, Stockholm, Sweden, July 10-15, 2018*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 609–618. PMLR, 2018.
- [65] Chenhao Niu, Yang Song, Jiaming Song, Shengjia Zhao, Aditya Grover, and Stefano Ermon. Permutation invariant graph generation via score-based generative modeling. In Silvia Chiappa and Roberto Calandra, editors, *The 23rd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, AISTATS 2020, 26-28 August 2020, Online [Palermo, Sicily, Italy]*, volume 108 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 4474–4484, Online, 26–28 Aug 2020. PMLR.
- [66] Thomas Bird, Friso H. Kingma, and David Barber. Reducing the computational cost of deep generative models with binary. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.

- [67] Peter D Grünwald and Abhijit Grunwald. *The minimum description length principle*. MIT press, 2007.
- [68] Thomas M Cover. *Elements of information theory*. John Wiley & Sons, 1999.
- [69] Benjamin Bloem-Reddy and Yee Whye Teh. Probabilistic symmetries and invariant neural networks. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(90):1–61, 2020.
- [70] Jorma Rissanen. Modeling by shortest data description. *Automatica*, 14(5):465–471, 1978.
- [71] Bryan Wilder, Eric Ewing, Bistra Dilkina, and Milind Tambe. End to end learning and optimization on graphs. In Hanna M. Wallach, Hugo Larochelle, Alina Beygelzimer, Florence d’Alché-Buc, Emily B. Fox, and Roman Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2019, NeurIPS 2019, December 8-14, 2019, Vancouver, BC, Canada*, pages 4674–4685, 2019.
- [72] Azade Nazi, Will Hang, Anna Goldie, Sujith Ravi, and Azalia Mirhoseini. GAP: generalizable approximate graph partitioning framework. *CoRR*, abs/1903.00614, 2019.
- [73] Filippo Maria Bianchi, Daniele Grattarola, and Cesare Alippi. Spectral clustering with graph neural networks for graph pooling. 2020.
- [74] Nikolaos Karalias and Andreas Loukas. Erdos goes neural: an unsupervised learning framework for combinatorial optimization on graphs. In *NeurIPS 2020 34th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, number POST_TALK, 2020.
- [75] Ronald J Williams. Simple statistical gradient-following algorithms for connectionist reinforcement learning. *Machine learning*, 8(3-4):229–256, 1992.
- [76] Pinar Yanardag and SVN Vishwanathan. Deep graph kernels. In *Proceedings of the 21th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 1365–1374, 2015.
- [77] John J Irwin, Teague Sterling, Michael M Mysinger, Erin S Bolstad, and Ryan G Coleman. Zinc: a free tool to discover chemistry for biology. *Journal of chemical information and modeling*, 52(7):1757–1768, 2012.
- [78] Christopher Morris, Nils M. Kriege, Franka Bause, Kristian Kersting, Petra Mutzel, and Marion Neumann. Tudataset: A collection of benchmark datasets for learning with graphs. In *ICML 2020 Workshop on Graph Representation Learning and Beyond (GRL+ 2020)*, 2020.
- [79] Karsten M Borgwardt, Cheng Soon Ong, Stefan Schönauer, SVN Vishwanathan, Alex J Smola, and Hans-Peter Kriegel. Protein function prediction via graph kernels. *Bioinformatics*, 21(suppl_1):i47–i56, 2005.
- [80] Christoph Helma, Ross D. King, Stefan Kramer, and Ashwin Srinivasan. The predictive toxicology challenge 2000–2001. *Bioinformatics*, 17(1):107–108, 2001.
- [81] Deepayan Chakrabarti, Spiros Papadimitriou, Dharmendra S Modha, and Christos Faloutsos. Fully automatic cross-associations. In *Proceedings of the tenth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 79–88, 2004.
- [82] Vincent D Blondel, Jean-Loup Guillaume, Renaud Lambiotte, and Etienne Lefebvre. Fast unfolding of communities in large networks. *Journal of statistical mechanics: theory and experiment*, 2008(10):P10008, 2008.
- [83] Usha Nandini Raghavan, Réka Albert, and Soundar Kumara. Near linear time algorithm to detect community structures in large-scale networks. *Physical review E*, 76(3):036106, 2007.
- [84] Paul Erdős and Alfréd Rényi. Asymmetric graphs. *Acta Mathematica Academiae Scientiarum Hungarica*, 14(3-4):295–315, 1963.
- [85] Tiago P. Peixoto. The graph-tool python library. *figshare*, 2014.

- [86] Manzil Zaheer, Satwik Kottur, Siamak Ravanbakhsh, Barnabás Póczos, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Alexander J. Smola. Deep sets. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017, December 4-9, 2017, Long Beach, CA, USA*, pages 3391–3401, 2017.
- [87] Keyulu Xu, Weihua Hu, Jure Leskovec, and Stefanie Jegelka. How powerful are graph neural networks? In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. OpenReview.net, 2019.
- [88] Christopher Morris, Martin Ritzert, Matthias Fey, William L Hamilton, Jan Eric Lenssen, Gaurav Rattan, and Martin Grohe. Weisfeiler and leman go neural: Higher-order graph neural networks. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 4602–4609. AAAI Press, 2019.
- [89] Zhengdao Chen, Lei Chen, Soledad Villar, and Joan Bruna. Can graph neural networks count substructures? In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2020.
- [90] Clement Vignac, Andreas Loukas, and Pascal Frossard. Building powerful and equivariant graph neural networks with structural message-passing. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2020.
- [91] Giorgos Bouritsas, Fabrizio Frasca, Stefanos Zafeiriou, and Michael M Bronstein. Improving graph neural network expressivity via subgraph isomorphism counting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.09252*, 2020.
- [92] David R Karger. Global min-cuts in rnc, and other ramifications of a simple min-cut algorithm. In *SODA*, volume 93, pages 21–30. Citeseer, 1993.
- [93] Andrew Ng, Michael Jordan, and Yair Weiss. On spectral clustering: Analysis and an algorithm. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 14:849–856, 2001.
- [94] George Karypis and Vipin Kumar. A fast and high quality multilevel scheme for partitioning irregular graphs. *SIAM Journal on scientific Computing*, 20(1):359–392, 1998.
- [95] Asim Kumar Debnath, Rosa L Lopez de Compadre, Gargi Debnath, Alan J Shusterman, and Corwin Hansch. Structure-activity relationship of mutagenic aromatic and heteroaromatic nitro compounds. correlation with molecular orbital energies and hydrophobicity. *Journal of medicinal chemistry*, 34(2):786–797, 1991.
- [96] Nils M. Kriege and Petra Mutzel. Subgraph matching kernels for attributed graphs. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2012, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, June 26 - July 1, 2012*, 2012.
- [97] Paul D Dobson and Andrew J Doig. Distinguishing enzyme structures from non-enzymes without alignments. *Journal of molecular biology*, 330(4):771–783, 2003.
- [98] Matt J. Kusner, Brooks Paige, and José Miguel Hernández-Lobato. Grammar variational autoencoder. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, volume 70 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1945–1954. PMLR, 2017.
- [99] Rafael Gómez-Bombarelli, Jennifer N Wei, David Duvenaud, José Miguel Hernández-Lobato, Benjamín Sánchez-Lengeling, Dennis Sheberla, Jorge Aguilera-Iparraguirre, Timothy D Hirzel, Ryan P Adams, and Alán Aspuru-Guzik. Automatic chemical design using a data-driven continuous representation of molecules. *ACS central science*, 4(2):268–276, 2018.
- [100] Wengong Jin, Regina Barzilay, and Tommi S. Jaakkola. Junction tree variational autoencoder for molecular graph generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2328–2337. PMLR, 2018.
- [101] Vijay Prakash Dwivedi, Chaitanya K Joshi, Thomas Laurent, Yoshua Bengio, and Xavier Bresson. Benchmarking graph neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.00982*, 2020.

- [102] Justin Gilmer, Samuel S Schoenholz, Patrick F Riley, Oriol Vinyals, and George E Dahl. Neural message passing for quantum chemistry. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1263–1272. PMLR, 2017.
- [103] Andreas Loukas. What graph neural networks cannot learn: depth vs width. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. OpenReview.net, 2020.
- [104] Thomas Bonald, Nathan de Lara, Quentin Lutz, and Bertrand Charpentier. Scikit-network: Graph analysis in python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(185):1–6, 2020.
- [105] Boris Weisfeiler and Andrei Leman. The reduction of a graph to canonical form and the algebra which appears therein. *NTI, Series 2*, 9:12–16, 1968. English translation is available at https://www.iti.zcu.cz/wl2018/pdf/wl_paper_translation.pdf.
- [106] Dominique Beaini, Saro Passaro, Vincent Létourneau, William L Hamilton, Gabriele Corso, and Pietro Liò. Directional graph networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2021.
- [107] Christian Steinruecken. *Lossless data compression*. PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, UK, 2015.
- [108] Christian Steinruecken. Compressing combinatorial objects. In *2016 Data Compression Conference (DCC)*, pages 389–396. IEEE, 2016.
- [109] Donald L Kreher and Douglas R Stinson. *Combinatorial algorithms: generation, enumeration, and search*. CRC press, 2020.

A Theoretical analysis

A.1 Preliminaries

Recall the definition of the binary entropy $H(p) = -p \log p - (1-p) \log(1-p)$. A useful approximation that will be used in the analysis is the following:

$$\log \binom{n}{m} \approx n H\left(\frac{m}{n}\right), \quad (18)$$

which holds when both n and m grow at the same rate, i.e., $m \lesssim n$, and can be derived using Stirling's approximation.

For the following comparisons, we will be considering a graph distribution with n vertices. For better exposition, the analysis will be performed for directed graphs. The same trends in the bounds hold also for undirected graphs.

Conventional graph encodings. We consider two types of baseline graph encodings:

- Uniform: $L_{\text{unif-G}}(G) = n^2$. Here no assumptions are made about the graph; all graphs are considered to be equally probable.
- Erdős-Renyi: $L_{\text{ER-G}}(G) = \log \binom{n^2}{m} + \log(n^2 + 1) \approx n^2 H_m + \log(n^2 + 1)$, where m the number of edges and $H_m = H\left(\frac{m}{n^2}\right)$. This baseline is efficient at encoding graphs that are either very sparse or very dense.

Though the above encodings assign the same probability to isomorphic graphs, they map them to different codewords. Hence, they are redundant when dealing with unlabelled graphs. The following variants are more efficient by taking into account isomorphism:

- Uniform - Isomorphism classes: $L_{\text{unif-S}}(G) = \log |\mathfrak{G}_n| \approx n^2 - n \log n$.
- Erdős-Renyi - Isomorphism classes: $L_{\text{ER-S}}(G) = \log |\mathfrak{G}_{n,m}| + \log(n^2 + 1) \approx n^2 H_m + \log(n^2 + 1) - n \log n$,

where \mathfrak{G}_n and $\mathfrak{G}_{n,m}$ are the set of all graphs with n vertices and the set of all graphs with n vertices and m edges, respectively. In both cases, we used the fact that asymptotically almost all graphs are rigid i.e., that they have only the trivial automorphism [84].

Observing that all four encodings asymptotically grow quadratically with the number of nodes we can derive the following lemma:

Lemma 1. *Consider a graph distribution p over graphs with n vertices and denote by $\bar{H}_m = \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[H(\frac{m}{n^2})]$ the expected value of the binary entropy of the number of edges m . If $\bar{H}_m < 1$, then the expected description lengths of the baseline models are asymptotically ordered as follows:*

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[L_{\text{ER-S}}(G)] \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[L_{\text{ER-G}}(G)] \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[L_{\text{unif-S}}(G)] \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[L_{\text{unif-G}}(G)] \quad (19)$$

The compression gain when encoding isomorphism classes instead of labelled graphs is $\Theta(n \log n)$, while that of the Erdős-Renyi encoding compared to the uniform one is $\Theta(n^2(1 - \bar{H}_m))$.

The proof follows directly from the equations above. Since most real-world graphs are sparse, then the condition $\bar{H}_m < 1$ is almost always true.

Partitioning (only). The partitioning models considered in this analysis assume that each graph is clustered into b subgraphs of k vertices each (i.e., $b = \frac{n}{k}$) and that the intra- and inter-subgraph edges are encoded independently³. Note that the preamble terms that encode the number of blocks in the partition and the number of vertices per block are unnecessary since k is fixed. Overall, the code length is given by

$$L_{\text{Part}}(G) = L(\mathcal{H}) + L(C|\mathcal{H}),$$

³To make the analysis more tangible, we examine here a slightly simpler encoding than the one used in the experiments - see Eq. (25).

with the two terms defined respectively as follows:

$$L(\mathcal{H}) = \sum_{i=1}^b \left(\log(k^2 + 1) + \log \binom{k^2}{m_i} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad L(C|\mathcal{H}) = \sum_{i \neq j}^b \left(\log(k^2 + 1) + \log \binom{k^2}{m_{ij}} \right). \quad (20)$$

Above, m_i is the number of edges in subgraph H_i and m_{ij} is the size of the cut between subgraphs H_i and H_j . In both cases, the first term encodes the number of edges, and the second their arrangement across the vertices.

Partition and Code (PnC). We make the same assumptions for PnC as in $L_{\text{Part}}(G)$: the graphs is partitioned into b subgraphs of k vertices and the same encoding of non-dictionary subgraphs \mathcal{H} and cuts C is used. The number of dictionary subgraphs b_{dict} is encoded with a Binomial distribution and the dictionary subgraphs $\mathcal{H}_{\text{dict}}$ themselves with a Multinomial as in Eq. (6) and (7) of the main paper. The overall encoding length is

$$L_{\text{PnC}}(G|D) = L(b_{\text{dict}}) + L(\mathcal{H}_{\text{dict}}|b_{\text{dict}}, D) + L(\mathcal{H}_{\text{null}}|b_{\text{null}}, D) + L(C|\mathcal{H}), \quad (21)$$

Each dictionary atom is encoded using any of the null models mentioned above, hence $L(D) = O(|D|k^2)$.

A.2 Why partitioning? Partitioning vs Null Models

As a warm-up, we will discuss the case of encodings based on pure graph partitioning, such as the Stochastic Block Model (“Partitioning non-parametric” in the tables of the main paper). We remind the reader that these encodings do *not* take into account the isomorphism class of the identified subgraphs but rely on a null model to encode them.

In the following, we derive a sufficient condition for the sparsity of the connections between subgraphs, under which partitioning-based encodings will yield smaller expected description length than the baseline null models. Formally:

Theorem 1a. *Let every $G \sim p$ be partitioned into b blocks of $k = O(1)$ vertices and suppose that the partitioning-based encoding of Eq. (20) is utilised. The following holds:*

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[L_{\text{Part}}(G)] \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[L_{\text{ER-S}}(G)] - n^2 \left(\bar{H}_m - \frac{\log(k^2 + 1)}{k^2} - \bar{H}_{m_{ij}} \right), \quad (22)$$

where $\bar{H}_{m_{ij}} = \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[\mathbb{H}(\frac{m_{ij}}{k^2})]$ and $\bar{H}_m = \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[\mathbb{H}(\frac{m}{n^2})]$ are the expected binary entropy of the cuts and of the total number of edges, respectively.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[L_{\text{part}}(G)] &\approx \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p} \left[\sum_{i=1}^b \left(\log(k^2 + 1) + k^2 \mathbb{H}(\frac{m_i}{k^2}) \right) + \sum_{i \neq j}^b \left(\log(k^2 + 1) + k^2 \mathbb{H}(\frac{m_{ij}}{k^2}) \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{n}{k} \left(\log(k^2 + 1) + k^2 \bar{H}_{m_i} \right) + \left(\frac{n^2}{k^2} - \frac{n}{k} \right) \left(\log(k^2 + 1) + k^2 \bar{H}_{m_{ij}} \right) \\ &= n^2 \left(\frac{\log(k^2 + 1)}{k^2} + \bar{H}_{m_{ij}} \right) + nk \left(\bar{H}_{m_i} - \bar{H}_{m_{ij}} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[L_{\text{ER-S}}(G)] - n^2 \left(\bar{H}_m - \frac{\log(k^2 + 1)}{k^2} - \bar{H}_{m_{ij}} \right) + nk \left(\bar{H}_{m_i} - \bar{H}_{m_{ij}} + \log n \right) - \log(n^2 + 1) \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[L_{\text{ER-S}}(G)] + n^2 \left(\bar{H}_m - \frac{\log(k^2 + 1)}{k^2} - \bar{H}_{m_{ij}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we assumed that $m \lesssim n^2$, $m_i \lesssim k^2$, $m_{ij} \lesssim k^2$, and in the last step we derive an asymptotic inequality using the dominating quadratic term. In other words, partitioning-based encoding is quadratically superior to the best null model whenever there exists a k such that

$$\frac{\log(k^2 + 1)}{k^2} < \bar{H}_m - \bar{H}_{m_{ij}}.$$

The above concludes the proof. \square

A.3 The importance of the dictionary: PnC vs Partitioning

We proceed to mathematically justify why encoding subgraphs with a dictionary (the “Code” part in PnC) can yield extra compression gains compared to pure partitioning-based encodings.

As our main theorem shows, utilising a dictionary allows us to reduce the linear $O(n)$ terms of the partitioning-based description length:

Theorem 1b. *Let every $G \sim p$ be partitioned into b blocks of $k = O(1)$ vertices and suppose that the PnC encoding of Eq. (21) is used. If there exists a dictionary such that $|D| < (k^2 + 1)2^{k^2 \bar{H}_{m_i}}$ with $\bar{H}_{m_i} = \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[H(\frac{m_i}{k^2})]$ being the expected binary entropy of the subgraph edges, then it holds that:*

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[\text{L}_{\text{PnC}}(G)] \lesssim \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[\text{L}_{\text{part}}(G)] - nk(1 - \delta) \left(\bar{H}_{m_i} - \frac{\mathbb{H}(D) - \log(k^2 + 1)}{k^2} \right), \quad (23)$$

where $1 - \delta$ is the probability that a subgraph belongs in the dictionary and $\mathbb{H}(D)$ is the entropy of the distribution q over the dictionary atoms.

Proof. We will analyse the description length of each of the components of Eq. (21).

Number of dictionary subgraphs. The expected description length of the number of subgraphs is equal to the entropy of the binomial distribution:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[\text{L}(b_{\text{dict}})] &= \frac{1}{2} \log \left(2\pi e b \delta (1 - \delta) \right) + O\left(\frac{1}{b}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \log \left(2\pi e \delta (1 - \delta) \right) + \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{n}{k} \right) + O\left(\frac{k}{n}\right) = O\left(\log \frac{n}{k}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Dictionary subgraphs. The expected description length of the subgraphs that belong in the dictionary amounts to the entropy of the multinomial distribution and can be upper bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[\text{L}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{dict}} | b_{\text{dict}}, D)] &= \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p} \left[-\log \frac{b_{\text{dict}}!}{\prod_{a \in D} b_a!} - \sum_{a \in D} b_a \log q(a) \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p} \left[-\sum_{a \in D} b_a \log q(a) \right] \\ &= -\sum_{a \in D} \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[b_a] \log q(a) \\ &= -b(1 - \delta) \sum_{a \in D} q(a) \log q(a) = \frac{n}{k} (1 - \delta) \mathbb{H}(D) \leq \frac{n}{k} (1 - \delta) \log |D|, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $b_{\text{dict}}! \geq \prod_{a \in D} b_a!$. The term $\mathbb{H}(D) = \mathbb{H}_{a \sim q(a)}[a] = -\sum_{a \in D} q(a) \log q(a)$ corresponds to the entropy of the dictionary distribution.

Non-dictionary subgraphs. Assuming that the subgraph edges m_i are independent from the number of non-dictionary subgraphs $b - b_{\text{dict}}$, then the expected description length of the non-dictionary subgraphs becomes:

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[\text{L}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{null}} | b_{\text{null}}, D)] \approx \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{b-b_{\text{null}}} \left(\log(k^2 + 1) + k^2 \bar{H}_{m_i} \right) \right] = \frac{n}{k} \delta \left(\log(k^2 + 1) + k^2 \bar{H}_{m_i} \right)$$

Overall, using the same derivation for the cuts as in Theorem 1a, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[\text{L}_{\text{PnC}}(G|D)] &\lesssim O\left(\log \frac{n}{k}\right) + n^2 \left(\frac{\log(k^2 + 1)}{k^2} + \bar{H}_{m_{ij}} \right) \\ &\quad + n \left(\delta k \bar{H}_{m_i} + (1 - \delta) \left(\frac{\mathbb{H}(D) - \log(k^2 + 1)}{k} \right) - k \bar{H}_{m_{ij}} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[\text{L}_{\text{part}}(G)] + n(1 - \delta) \left(\frac{\mathbb{H}(D) - \log(k^2 + 1)}{k} - k \bar{H}_{m_i} \right) + O\left(\log \frac{n}{k}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Including the description length of the dictionary and amortising it over each graph in a dataset of \mathcal{G} graphs, we conclude

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[\mathbb{L}_{\text{PnC}}(G)] = \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[\mathbb{L}_{\text{part}}(G)] - nk(1 - \delta) \left(\bar{\mathbb{H}}_{m_i} - \frac{\mathbb{H}(D) - \log(k^2 + 1)}{k^2} \right) + O\left(\log \frac{n}{k} + \frac{|D|}{|\mathcal{G}|} k^2\right).$$

Hence, if $k = O(1)$ and $|D| \ll |\mathcal{G}|$ (more precisely, the ratio $\frac{|D|}{|\mathcal{G}|}$ shouldn't grow with n), then a linear compression gain is obtained if:

$$\bar{\mathbb{H}}_{m_i} - \frac{\mathbb{H}(D) - \log(k^2 + 1)}{k^2} > 0 \Leftrightarrow \mathbb{H}(D) < \log(k^2 + 1) + k^2 \bar{\mathbb{H}}_{m_i}.$$

The proof concludes by noting that the above condition is implied by $|D| < (k^2 + 1)2^{k^2 \bar{\mathbb{H}}_{m_i}}$. \square

A.4 The importance of subgraph isomorphism - Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. Let the D_G be a dictionary of *labelled* graphs of k vertices, i.e. graphs whose vertices are ordered, and D_S the corresponding dictionary of *unlabelled* graphs, i.e., where the atoms are isomorphism classes.

In the context of this comparison we are only interested in the description length of the dictionary subgraphs. For simplicity we will assume that these are encoded with a *categorical* distribution instead of multinomial:

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[\mathbb{L}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{dict}}|b_{\text{dict}}, D)] = \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p} \left[- \sum_{a \in D} b_a \log q(a) \right] = -b(1 - \delta) \sum_{a \in D} q(a) \log q(a) = \frac{n}{k}(1 - \delta)\mathbb{H}(D)$$

Hence, in order to compare the two variants, we are interested in the entropy $\mathbb{H}(D)$, which requires enumerating the possible outcomes of the categorical distribution, i.e., the dictionary atoms.

Denote with S_a the isomorphism class of an atom a , i.e., $S_a = \{a' \in \mathfrak{G}_k | a \cong a'\}$. It is known that the size of each S_a is $|S_a| = \frac{k!}{|\text{Aut}(a)|}$ [7], where $\text{Aut}(a)$ the automorphism group of a , i.e., all isomorphisms that map the adjacency matrix onto itself.

Since $p(G)$ is isomorphism invariant, then the same will hold for the subgraphs $H \subseteq G$, i.e. $p(H') = p(H)$ if $H \cong H'$. Hence, regarding PnC-G, it should hold that for each atom a in D_G , then all $a' \cong a$ should be also contained in the dictionary and assigned the same probability, i.e., $q_G(a) = q_G(a')$. Therefore, the corresponding probabilities of isomorphism classes in the context of PnC-S should be as follows: $q_S(S_a) = \sum_{a \in S_a} q_G(a) = |S_a|q_G(a)$.

Then, using a similar argument to [9], we can derive the following for the entropy $\mathbb{H}_G(D)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{H}_G(D) &= - \sum_{a \in D_G} q_G(a) \log q(a) \\ &= - \sum_{a \in D_G} \frac{q_S(S_a)}{|S_a|} \log \frac{q_S(S_a)}{|S_a|} \\ &= - \sum_{S_a \in D_S} \sum_{a \in S_a} \frac{q_S(S_a)}{|S_a|} \log \frac{q_S(S_a)}{|S_a|} \\ &= - \sum_{S_a \in D_S} q_S(S_a) \log \frac{q_S(S_a)}{|S_a|} \\ &= \mathbb{H}_S(D) + \sum_{S_a \in D_S} q_S(S_a) \log |S_a| = \mathbb{H}_S(D) + \log k! - \sum_{S_a \in D_S} q_S(S_a) \log |\text{Aut}(a)| \end{aligned}$$

At this point we will assume that almost all graphs in the dictionary are rigid, or more precisely we require that $\sum_{S_a \in D_S} q_S(S_a) \log |\text{Aut}(a)| \approx 0$, which can be also satisfied when non-rigid dictionary atoms have small probability. In practice, although for very small graphs of up to 4 or 5 vertices, many graphs have non-trivial

automorphisms, this condition is easily satisfied for larger k (but still of constant size w.r.t. n), that were also considered in practice. Then, the result immediately follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[\text{LPnC-G}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{dict}}|b_{\text{dict}}, D)] &\approx \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[\text{LPnC-S}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{dict}}|b_{\text{dict}}, D)] + \frac{n}{k}(1 - \delta) \log k! \implies \\ \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[\text{LPnC-S}(G)] &\approx \mathbb{E}_{G \sim p}[\text{LPnC-G}(G)] - n(1 - \delta) \log k,\end{aligned}$$

where we used Stirling's approximation $\log k! \approx k \log k$. □

B Algorithmic Details

B.1 Cut encoding

Denote the vertex count of subgraph H_i as k_i . Further denote with $\mathbf{m}_c = \{m_{1,1}, m_{1,2}, \dots, m_{b-1,b}\}$ the vector containing the number of edges between each subgraph pair i, j and $m_c = \sum_{i < j}^b m_{ij}$. The b -partite graph C containing the cuts will be encoded hierarchically, i.e. first we encode the total edge count m_c , then the pairwise counts \mathbf{m}_c and finally, for each subgraph pair, we independently encode the arrangement of the edges. For each of these cases, a uniform encoding is chosen, following the rationale mentioned in Section 3 of the main paper. Hence, calculating the length of the encoding boils down to enumerating possible outcomes:

$$\begin{aligned}L(C|\mathcal{H}) &= L(C, m_c, \mathbf{m}_c|\mathcal{H}) = L(m_c|\mathcal{H}) + L(\mathbf{m}_c|m_c, \mathcal{H}) + L(C|\mathbf{m}_c, m_c, \mathcal{H}) \\ &= \log\left(1 + \sum_{j>i}^b k_i k_j\right) + \log\left(\binom{b(b-1)/2 + m_c - 1}{m_c}\right) + \sum_{j>i}^b \log\left(\binom{k_i k_j}{m_{ij}}\right)\end{aligned}\quad (24)$$

We make the following remarks: (a) The encoding is the same regardless of the isomorphism class of the subgraphs, and the only dependence arises from their number, as well as their vertex counts. (b) Small cuts are prioritised, thus the encoding has an inductive bias towards distinct clusters in the graph. (c) Our cut encoding bears resemblance to those used in non-parametric Bayesian inference for SBMs (e.g., see the section B.2 on the baselines and [44] for a detailed analysis of a variety of probabilistic models), although a central difference is that in these works the encodings also take the vertex ordering into account.

B.2 Baseline Encodings

Null models. The description length of the uniform encoding is equal to $L(G) = \log(n_{\max} + 1) + \binom{n}{2}$ and that of the edge list model is $L(G) = \log(n_{\max} + 1) + \log\left(\binom{n}{2} + 1\right) + m \log\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)$.

Clustering. The encoding we used for the clustering baselines is optimal under SBM assumptions and is obtained from [44] with small modifications. It consists of the following uniform encodings: number of graph vertices, number of graph edges, number of blocks, number of vertices in each block, number of edges inside each block and between each pair of blocks, and finally the arrangements of intra- and inter-block edges (a detailed explanation for each term can be found in [44] and [85]):

$$\begin{aligned}L(G) &= \log(n_{\max} + 1) + \log\left(n(n-1)/2 + 1\right) + \log(n) + \log\left(\frac{n-1}{b-1}\right) \\ &\quad + \log\left(\binom{b(b+1)/2 + m - 1}{m}\right) + \sum_{i=1}^b \log\left(\binom{\binom{k_i}{2}}{m_i}\right) + \sum_{i<j}^b \log\left(\binom{k_i k_j}{m_{ij}}\right)\end{aligned}\quad (25)$$

B.3 Dictionary Learning - Continuous Relaxation

In the following section we will relax the Minimum Description Length objective (Eq. (10) in the main paper) by introducing the fractional membership variables $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$.

The dictionary description length, Eq. (5), can be trivially rewritten as follows:

$$L_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}(D) = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{U}} \hat{x}_a L_{\text{null}}(a). \quad (26)$$

Regarding the description length of the graphs, the membership variables are the ones that select when a subgraph is encoded as a dictionary atom or when with the help of the null model. Note that this is an additional explanation for the necessity of the dual encoding: except for giving sufficient freedom to the partitioning algorithm to choose non-dictionary atoms, it is also necessary for optimisation.

The relaxation of the graph description length was done as follows: Let $b_a(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) = \hat{x}_a b_a$, $b_{\text{dict}}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{U}} b_a(\hat{\mathbf{x}})$, and $q_{\phi, \hat{\mathbf{x}}}(a) = -\log\left(\frac{\hat{x}_a e^{\phi_a}}{\sum_{a' \in \mathcal{U}} \hat{x}_{a'} e^{\phi_{a'}}}\right)$. The rest of the components of the graph description length are unaffected from the choice of the dictionary. Now Eq. (6)-(8) can be rewritten:

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\phi, \hat{\mathbf{x}}}(b_{\text{dict}}, b_{\text{null}}) &= -\log\left(\frac{b}{b_{\text{dict}}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})}\right) - b_{\text{dict}}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) \log(1 - \delta_{\phi}) - (b - b_{\text{dict}}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})) \log(\delta_{\phi}) - \log q_{\phi}(b) \\ L_{\phi, \hat{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{H}_D | b_{\text{dict}}, D) &= -\log(b_{\text{dict}}(\hat{\mathbf{x}})!) + \sum_{a \in \mathcal{U}} \log(b_a(\hat{\mathbf{x}})!) - \sum_{a \in \mathcal{U}} b_a(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) \log q_{\phi, \hat{\mathbf{x}}}(a) \\ L_{\text{null}, \hat{\mathbf{x}}}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{null}} | b_{\text{null}}, D) &= -\sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}} \log q_{\text{null}}(H)(1 - \hat{x}_H), \text{ where } \hat{x}_H = \begin{cases} \hat{x}_i & \exists a_i \in \mathcal{U} \text{ s.t. } H \cong a_i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

To obtain a continuous version of the terms where factorials are involved we used the Γ function, where $\Gamma(n+1) = n!$, for positive integers n . The rest of the terms are differentiable w.r.t $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$.

B.4 Learning to Partition

Our randomised partitioning algorithm is an iterative procedure, where at each iteration t a new subgraph H_t is added to the subgraph set \mathcal{H} and the corresponding vertices are removed from the graph G . The algorithm iterates until the graph is empty. In order to select H_t , we first sample its vertex count k_t , and then we sample at most k_t vertices from the remaining graph. The vertices are also sampled iteratively, in order to ensure that the connectivity of H_t is always guaranteed. The complexity of the algorithm is $O(n)$, where n the number of the vertices of the graph.

In order for the algorithm to be able to make decisions, it is necessary to maintain a representation of two states: the *subgraph state* $S_t^H = \{H_1, H_2, \dots, H_t\}$ that summarises the decisions made at the subgraph level (external iteration) up to the step t , and the *vertex state* $S_i^V = \{v_{t_1}, v_{t_2}, \dots, v_{t_i}\}$ that summarises the decisions made at the vertex level (internal iteration) up to the i -th vertex selection. Overall, we need to calculate the probability of S_T , where T is the number of iterations:

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\theta}(S_T | G) &= p_{\theta}(H_T | S_{T-1}^H, G) p_{\theta}(S_{T-1}^H | G) = \prod_{t=1}^T p_{\theta}(H_t | S_{t-1}^H, G) \\ &= \prod_{t=1}^T \left(\prod_{i=1}^{k_t} p_{\theta}(v | S_{i-1}^V, k_t, S_{t-1}^H, G) \right) p_{\theta}(k_t | S_{t-1}^H, G) \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Hence, the parametrisation of the algorithm boils down to defining the vertex count probability $p_{\theta}(k_t | S_{t-1}^H, G)$ and the vertex selection probability $p_{\theta}(v | S_{i-1}^V, k_t, S_{t-1}^H, G)$, where $v \in V_t$ and V_t the set of the remaining vertices at the step t .

Now we explain in detail how we parametrise each term. First, we use a Graph Neural Network (GNN) to embed each vertex into a vector representation $\mathbf{h}(v) = \text{GNN}_v(G)$, while the graph itself is embedded in a similar way $\mathbf{h}(G) = \text{GNN}_G(G)$.

Each subgraph is represented by a permutation invariant function on the embeddings of its vertices, i.e., $\mathbf{h}(H_t) = \text{DeepSets}(\{\mathbf{h}(v) | v \in H_t\})$, where we used DeepSets [86] as a set function approximator. Similarly, the

subgraph state summarises the subgraph representations in a permutation invariant manner to ensure that future decision of the algorithm do not depend on the order of the past ones: $\mathbf{h}(S_t^H) = \text{DeepSets}(\{\mathbf{h}(H_t) | H_t \in S_t^H\})$.

Given the above, the probability of the vertex count at step t is calculated as follows:

$$p_\theta(k_t | S_{t-1}^H, G) = \text{softmax}_{k_t=1}^{|V_t|} \text{MLP}(\mathbf{h}(S_{t-1}^H), \mathbf{h}(G)), \quad (29)$$

where MLP is Multi-layer perceptron.

As mentioned above, the probability of the selection of each vertex is computed in a way that guarantees connectivity:

$$p_\theta(v | S_{i-1}^V, k_t, S_{t-1}^H, G) = \begin{cases} \text{softmax}_{v \in V_t} \text{MLP}(\mathbf{h}(S_{t-1}^H), \mathbf{h}(v)) & i = 0, v \in V_t \\ \text{softmax}_{v \in V_t \cap \mathcal{N}(S_{i-1}^V)} \text{MLP}(\mathbf{h}(S_{t-1}^H), \mathbf{h}(v)) & 0 < i < k_t, v \in V_t \cap \mathcal{N}(S_{i-1}^V) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (30)$$

where $\mathcal{N}(S_{i-1}^V)$ denotes the union of the neighbourhoods of the already selected vertices, excluding themselves: $\mathcal{N}(S_{i-1}^V) = \bigcup_{i'=1}^{i-1} \mathcal{N}(v_{t_{i'}}) - \{v_{t_1}, v_{t_2}, \dots, v_{t_{i-1}}\}$. Overall, the parameter set θ is the set of the parameters of the neural networks involved, i.e., GNNs, DeepSets and MLPs.

In the algorithm 1 we schematically illustrate the different steps described above.

Algorithm 1: Partitioning algorithm

Input: graph G

Output: partition \mathcal{H}

Initialisations: $\mathbf{h}(v) = \text{GNN}_v(G)$, $\mathbf{h}(G) = \text{GNN}_G(G)$, $V_1 = V$, $S_0^H = \emptyset$

$t \leftarrow 1$

while $V_t \neq \emptyset$ **do**

$k_t \sim p_\theta(k_t | S_{t-1}^H, G)$ // sample maximum vertex count

 Initialise $S_0^V = \emptyset$

while $i = 1 \leq k_t$ and $\mathcal{N}(S_{i-1}^V) \neq \emptyset$ **do**

$v_{t_i} \sim p_\theta(v | S_{i-1}^V, k_t, S_{t-1}^H, G)$ // sample new vertex

$S_i^V = S_{i-1}^V \cup \{v_{t_i}\}$

end

$H_t = S_i^V$

$S_t^H = S_{t-1}^H \cup \{H_t\}$

$t \leftarrow t + 1$

end

$\mathcal{H} = S_t^H$

Limitations. Below we list two limitations of the learnable partitioning algorithm that we would like to address in future work. First, it is well known that GNNs have limited expressivity which is bounded by the Weisfeiler Leman test [87, 88]. The most important implication of this is that they have difficulties in detecting and counting substructures [89]. Since in our case subgraph detection is crucial in order to be able to partition the graph into repetitive substructures, the expressivity of the GNN might be an issue. Although iterative sampling may mitigate this behaviour up to a certain extent, the GNN will not be able to express arbitrary randomised algorithms. Modern architectures such as [90, 91] might be more suitable for this task, which makes them good candidates for future exploration on the problem.

Second, more sophisticated inference schemes should be explored, since currently a partition is decoded from the randomised algorithm by taking a single sample from the learned distribution. In particular, currently at each step t the algorithm can only sample k_t vertices as dictated by the initial sampling on the vertex count. However, there might be benefit from expanding the subgraph more, or stopping earlier than k_t when no other vertex addition can contribute towards a smaller description length. However, there is no control on the stopping criterion apart from the initial vertex count prediction. To this end, it is of interest to explore alternatives that will allow the algorithm to choose from a pool of candidate decisions based on the resulting description lengths (e.g., in hindsight). Further inspiration can be taken from a variety of graph clustering and graph partitioning algorithms, e.g. k-means and agglomerative [92, 82].

B.5 Special cases of note

A pertinent question is whether one can determine the optimal way to partition a graph when minimising (10). Though a rigorous statement is beyond our current understanding, in the following we discuss two special cases:

(a) *Small predefined universe.* When the subgraphs are chosen from a small and predefined \mathcal{U} , one may attempt to identify all the possible atom appearances in G by repeatedly calling a subgraph isomorphism subroutine. The minimisation of (10) then simplifies to that of selecting a subset of subgraphs that have no common edges (as per the definition in Section 4.1). The latter problem can be cast as a discrete optimisation problem under an independent set constraint (by building an auxiliary graph the vertices of which are candidate subgraphs and two vertices are connected by an edge when two subgraphs overlap, and looking for an independent set that minimises the description length).

(b) *Unconstrained universe.* When \mathcal{U} contains all possible graphs, the problem can be seen as a special graph partitioning problem. However, contrary to traditional clustering algorithms [93, 94, 82, 92], our objective is not necessarily optimised by finding small cuts between clusters (see Appendix A).

Since most independent set and partitioning problems are NP-hard, we suspect that similar arguments can be put forward for (10). This highlights the need to design learnable alternatives that can provide fast solutions without the need to be adapted to unseen data.

C Additional Experiments

C.1 Ablation study on likelihood-based neural compressors

It is made clear by the experimental results of section 7 that likelihood-based neural compression is particularly costly due to heavy overparametrization. Yet, we also observe that these models achieve strong results in terms of likelihood. Is it possible to strike a better balance between number of parameters and compression cost for a likelihood-based model? To investigate this, we have conducted the following experiment. We trained 5 GRAN models that differ in parameter count, on 3 different datasets, and monitored the total BPE.

In order to consistently scale the number of parameters across these 5 different models, we have fixed the GNN depth for all models to one, and set for each model the size of the embedding, attention, and hidden dimension, to a constant c . Using a different c for each model allows us to explore different scales for the parameter count of the GRAN model. Furthermore, to facilitate comparison with PnC, one of the 5 models is trained without attention and features a reduced amount of mixture components. This is the minimum, in terms of parameter count, working instantiation of GRAN. Finally, we also considered the BPE for the null Erdős-Renyi (ER) model. Figure 3 plots the total BPE of the different models against the number of parameters.

Results. In the low parameter regime, the GRAN models are not capable of outperforming the null models and fall significantly behind PnC. At scales that range from 10^3 to 10^4 parameters, we observe slight improvements in the total BPE of GRAN on the Proteins and the IMDB-Binary datasets. However, the improved likelihood is not able to compensate sufficiently for the increase in the number of parameters. This becomes more pronounced on larger scales, where GRAN experiences diminishing returns as the cost of parameters outpaces the likelihood gains. On the other hand, the results consistently worsen as the number of parameters grows on MUTAG. In this case, the size of the dataset is an additional detrimental factor that weighs against overparametrized models. Overall, the experiment suggests that, as the number of parameter grows, the GRAN model becomes increasingly inefficient and is thus not well suited for compression.

C.2 Vertex and Edge attributes

Our method can be easily extended to account for the presence of discrete vertex and edge attributes, the distribution of which can also be learned from the data. Assuming a vertex attribute domain A_V and an edge




Figure 3: Total BPE of likelihood-based models as a function of the parameter count. *GRAN minimal* refers to the minimum working GRAN model that does not feature attention and multiple mixture components. The non-parametric ER model is represented with dashed lines.

attribute domain A_E , we can use the following simple encodings for a graph with n vertices and m edges:

$$L(\mathbf{X}_V) = n \log |A_V| \text{ and } L(\mathbf{X}_E) = m \log |A_E|, \quad (31)$$

where $\mathbf{X}_V \in \mathbb{N}^{|V| \times |A_V|}$ the vertex attributes and $\mathbf{X}_E \in \mathbb{N}^{|E| \times |A_E|}$ the edge attributes. One could also choose a more sophisticated encoding by explicitly learning the probability of each attribute.

In this case, the dictionary becomes even more relevant, since when simply partitioning the graph, the attributes will still have to be stored in the same manner for each subgraph and each edge in the cut. Hence, in the absence of the dictionary it will be impossible to compress the attributes.

In Table 3, we showcase a proof of concept in the attributed MUTAG and PTC MR datasets, which are variations of those used for structure-only compression in the main paper. Vertex attributes represent atom types and edge attributes represent the type of the bond between two atoms. As mentioned in the previous paragraph, it is clear that non-dictionary methods are hardly improving w.r.t the null model, which is mainly due to the fact that the attributes constitute the largest portion of the total description length. Another interesting observation is that since the clustering algorithms we used are oblivious to the existence of attributes, they are less likely to partition the graph in such a way that the attributed subgraphs will be repetitive, unless structure is strongly correlated with the attributes. This becomes clear in the PTC MR dataset, where between the different PnC variants, the neural partitioning performs considerably better, since the partitioning is optimised in coordination with the dictionary. In Figure 2 of the main paper, we show the most probable substructures that the Neural Partitioning yields for the MUTAG dataset. It is interesting to observe that typical molecular substructures are extracted. This highlights an interesting application of molecular graph compression, i.e., discovering representative patterns of the molecular distribution in question.

Table 3: Experimental evaluation on the attributed MUTAG and PTC MR molecular datasets. **First**, **Second**, **Third**

Method Family	Dataset name	Attributed MUTAG			Attributed PTC MR		
		data	total	params	data	total	params
Null	Uniform (raw adjacency)	-	13.33	-	-	16.32	-
	Edge list	-	12.62	-	-	14.06	-
	Erdős-Renyi	-	9.38	-	-	10.87	-
Clustering	SBM-Bayes	-	9.17	-	-	10.61	-
	Louvain	-	9.37	-	-	10.76	-
	PropClust	-	9.52	-	-	10.80	-
PnC	PnC + SBM	6.56	7.49	78	8.05	9.49	158
	PnC + Louvain	3.52	4.45	78	5.56	7.65	200
	PnC + PropClust	5.21	6.30	54	8.51	9.58	118
	PnC + Neural Part.	3.83±0.06	4.78±0.12	74±6	5.19±0.39	6.49±0.54	170±30

D Implementation Details

Datasets: We evaluated our method on a variety of datasets that are well-established in the GNN literature. In specific, we chose the following from the TUDataset collection [78]: the molecular datasets MUTAG [95, 96] (mutagenicity prediction) and PTC-MR [80, 96] (carcinogenicity prediction), the protein dataset PROTEINS [79, 97] (protein function prediction - vertices represent secondary structure elements and edges either neighbourhoods in the aminoacid sequence or proximity in the 3D space) and the social network datasets IMDBBINARY and IMDBMULTI [76] (movie collaboration datasets where each graph is an ego-net for an actor/actress). We also experimented with the ZINC dataset [77, 98, 99, 100] (molecular property prediction), which is a larger molecular dataset from the dataset collection introduced in [101]. A random split is chosen for the TUDatasets (90% train, 10% test), since we are not interested in the class labels, while for the ZINC dataset we use the split given by the authors of [101] (we unify the test and the validation split, since we do not use the validation set for hyperparameter tuning/model selection).

Model architecture and hyperparameter tuning: The GNN used for the Neural partitioning variant of PnC is a traditional Message Passing Neural Network [102], where a general formulation is employed for the message and the update functions (i.e., we use Multi-layer Perceptrons similar to [103]. We optimise the following hyperparameters: batch size in {16, 64, 128}, network width in {16, 64} number of layers in {2, 4}.

For all PnC variants we further tune the following hyperparameters: the learning rate of the GNN in {0.001, 0.01} (only for the Neural Partitioning), the learning rate of the dictionary and the parameters of the probabilistic model in {0.01, 0.1, 1}, and the maximum number of vertices for the dictionary atoms k in {6, 8, 10, 12}. Note that the last hyperparameter mainly affects the optimisation of the Neural Partitioning variant: small values of k will constrain the possible subgraph choices, but will facilitate the network to find good partitions by exploitation. On the other hand, larger values of k will encourage exploration, but the optimisation landscape becomes significantly more complex, thus in some cases (mainly for social networks, where there is a larger variety of non-isomorphic subgraphs) we observed that the optimisation algorithm could not converge to good solutions.

We optimise each PnC variant for 100 epochs and report the result on the epoch where the description length of the training set is minimum. The best hyperparameter set is also chosen w.r.t the lowest training set description length, and after its selection, we repeat the experiment for 3 different seeds (in total).

The clustering baselines were implemented using graph-tool [85] for the SBM and scikit-network [104] for the Louvain and the Propagation Clustering algorithms.

Isomorphism. In order to speed-up isomorphism testing between dictionary atoms and the subgraphs that the partitioning algorithm yields, we make the following design choices: (a) Dictionary atoms are sorted by their frequencies of appearance (these are computed by an exponential moving average that gets updated

during training). In this way the expected number of comparisons drops to $O(1)$ from $O(|D|)$. (b) We choose the parameter k to be a small constant value (i.e., does not scale with the number of vertices of the graph), as previously mentioned. It becomes clear, that except for the importance of k in the optimisation procedure, it also plays a crucial role for scalability, since as mentioned in the introduction in the main paper, solving the isomorphism problem quickly becomes inefficient when the number of vertices increases. (c) Additionally, one can choose to approximate isomorphism with faster algorithms, such as the Weisfeiler-Leman test [105], or with more expressive Graph Neural Networks, such as [91, 90, 106]. These algorithms, will always provide a correct negative answer whenever two graphs are non-isomorphic, but a positive answer does not always guarantee isomorphism. In that case, exact isomorphism can be employed only when the faster alternatives give a positive answer.

E Translating probabilities into codes

In the following section, we explain how a partitioned graph can be represented into a bitstream using our probabilistic model. The general principle for modern entropy encoders (Arithmetic Coding [23] and Asymmetric Numeral Systems [24]) is that both the encoder and the decoder need to possess the cumulative distribution function (c.d.f.) of each component they are required to encode/decode. Hence, the encoder initially sends to the decoder the parameters of the model ϕ using a fixed precision encoding (e.g., we used 16-bits for our comparisons). The rest of the bitstream is described below:

- **Dictionary.** The dictionary is sent as part of the preamble of the message. It consists of the following:
 - (a) the size of the dictionary (we assume fixed precision for this value),
 - (b) a sequence of dictionary atoms encoded with the null model, i.e., the message includes the number of vertices, the number of edges and finally the adjacency matrix: k_i, m_i, E_i (see Eq. (2) in the main paper).
- **Graphs:** Subsequently, each graph is sequentially transmitted. The message contains the following:
 - (a) the total number of subgraphs and the number of dictionary subgraphs b and b_{dict} that are encoded using the parameters of the categorical distribution $q_\phi(b)$ and the binomial distribution $\text{Binomial}(b_{\text{dict}}|b; \phi)$. The c.d.f. of the binomial distribution can be computed using a factorisation described in [107],
 - (b) the subgraphs that belong in the dictionary, which are encoded using the multinomial distribution $q_\phi(\mathcal{H}_{\text{dict}}|D)$. As above, a factorisation described in [107] can be used to compute the c.d.f.,
 - (c) the non-dictionary subgraphs. These are encoded with the null model (same with the encoding of dictionary atoms as mentioned above),
 - (d) the cuts, which are encoded using Eq. (24).

Several of our encodings involve uniform distributions over combinations of elements (e.g., for the adjacency matrix in the null model). To compute them, we can either factorise the distribution as in [108] in order to efficiently compute the c.d.f, or use a ranking function (and its inverse for the decoder) that maps a combination to its index in lexicographic order (e.g., see [109]).