Adversarially Regularized Graph Autoencoder for Graph Embedding

Shirui Pan[1*]**, Ruiqi Hu**[1*]**, Guodong Long**[1]**, Jing Jiang**[1]**, Lina Yao**[2]**, Chengqi Zhang**[1]

[1] Centre for Artificial Intelligence, FEIT, University of Technology Sydney, Australia
[2] School of Computer Science and Engineering, University of New South Wales, Australia
shirui.pan@uts.edu.au, ruiqi.hu@student.uts.edu.au, guodong.long@uts.edu.au,
jing.jiang@uts.edu.au, lina.yao@unsw.edu.au, chengqi.zhang@uts.edu.au

Abstract

Graph embedding is an effective method to represent graph data in a low dimensional space for graph analytics. Most existing embedding algorithms typically focus on preserving the topological structure or minimizing the reconstruction errors of graph data, but they have mostly ignored the data distribution of the latent codes from the graphs, which often results in inferior embedding in real-world graph data. In this paper, we propose a novel adversarial graph embedding framework for graph data. The framework encodes the topological structure and node content in a graph to a compact representation, on which a decoder is trained to reconstruct the graph structure. Furthermore, the latent representation is enforced to match a prior distribution via an adversarial training scheme. To learn a robust embedding, two variants of adversarial approaches, *adversarially regularized graph autoencoder* (ARGA) and *adversarially regularized variational graph autoencoder* (ARVGA), are developed. Experimental studies on real-world graphs validate our design and demonstrate that our algorithms outperform baselines by a wide margin in link prediction, graph clustering, and graph visualization tasks.

1 Introduction

Graphs are essential tools to capture and model complicated relationships among data. In a variety of graph applications, including protein-protein interaction networks, social media, and citation networks, analyzing graph data plays an important role in various data mining tasks including node or graph classification [Kipf and Welling, 2017; Pan *et al.*, 2016a], link prediction [Wang *et al.*, 2017c], and node clustering [Wang *et al.*, 2017a]. However, the high computational complexity, low parallelizability, and inapplicability of machine learning methods to graph data have made these graph analytic tasks profoundly challenging [Cui *et al.*, 2017]. Recently *graph embedding* has emerged as a general approach to these problems.

Graph embedding converts graph data into a low dimensional, compact, and continuous feature space. The key idea is to preserve the topological structure, vertex content, and other side information. This new learning paradigm has shifted the tasks of seeking complex models for classification, clustering, and link prediction to learning a robust representation of the graph data, so that any graph analytic task can be easily performed by employing simple traditional models (e.g., a linear SVM for the classification task). This merit has motivated a number of studies in this area [Cai *et al.*, 2017; Zhang *et al.*, 2017a].

Graph embedding algorithms can be classified into three categories: probabilistic models, matrix factorization-based algorithms, and deep learning-based algorithms. Probabilistic models like DeepWalk [Perozzi *et al.*, 2014], node2vec [Grover and Leskovec, 2016] and LINE [Tang *et al.*, 2015] attempt to learn graph embedding by extracting different patterns from the graph. The captured patterns or walks include global structural equivalence, local neighborhood connectivities, and other various order proximities. Compared with classical methods such as Spectral Clustering [Tang and Liu, 2011], these graph embedding algorithms perform more effectively and are scalable to large graphs.

Matrix factorization-based algorithms, such as HOPE [Ou *et al.*, 2016] and M-NMF [Wang *et al.*, 2017b] pre-process the graph structure into an adjacency matrix and get the embedding by decomposing the adjacency matrix. Recently it has been shown that many probabilistic algorithms are equivalent to matrix factorization approaches [Qiu *et al.*, 2017]. Deep learning approaches, especially autoencoder-based methods, are also widely studied for graph embedding. SDNE [Wang *et al.*, 2016] and DNGR [Cao *et al.*, 2016] employ deep autoencoders to preserve the graph proximities and model positive pointwise mutual information (PPMI). The MGAE algorithm utilizes a marginalized single layer autoencoder to learn representation for clustering [Wang *et al.*, 2017a].

The approaches above are typically unregularized approaches which mainly focus on preserving the structure relationship (probabilistic approaches), or minimizing the reconstruction error (matrix factorization or deep learning methods). They have mostly ignored the data distribution of the latent codes. In practice unregularized embedding approaches often learn a degenerate *identity* mapping where the latent

---

*These authors contribute equally to this work.

code space is free of any structure [Makhzani *et al.*, 2015], and can easily result in poor representation in dealing with real-world sparse and noisy graph data. One common way to handle this problem is to introduce some regularization to the latent codes and enforce them to follow some prior data distribution [Makhzani *et al.*, 2015]. Recently generative adversarial based frameworks [Donahue *et al.*, 2016; Radford *et al.*, 2015] have also been developed for learning robust latent representation. However, none of these frameworks is specifically for graph data, where both topological structure and content information are required to embed to a latent space.

In this paper, we propose a novel adversarial framework with two variants, namely *adversarially regularized graph autoencoder* (ARGA) and *adversarially regularized variational graph autoencoder* (ARVGA), for graph embedding. The theme of our framework is to not only minimize the reconstruction errors of the graph structure but also to enforce the latent codes to match a prior distribution. By exploiting both graph structure and node content with a graph convolutional network, our algorithms encodes the graph data in the latent space. With a decoder aiming at reconstructing the topological graph information, we further incorporate an adversarial training scheme to regularize the latent codes to learn a robust graph representation. The adversarial training module aims to discriminate if the latent codes are from a real prior distribution or from the graph encoder. The graph encoder learning and adversarial regularization are jointly optimized in a unified framework so that each can be beneficial to the other and finally lead to a better graph embedding. The experimental results on benchmark datasets demonstrate the superb performance of our algorithms on three unsupervised graph analytic tasks, namely link prediction, node clustering, and graph visualization. Our contributions can be summarized below:

- We propose a novel adversarially regularized framework for graph embedding, which represent topological structure and node content in a continuous vector space. Our framework learns the embedding to minimize the reconstruction error while enforcing the latent codes to match a prior distribution.

- We develop two variants of adversarial approaches, *adversarially regularized graph autoencoder* (ARGA) and *adversarially regularized variational graph autoencoder* (ARVGA) to learn the graph embedding.

- Experiments on benchmark graph datasets demonstrate that our graph embedding approaches outperform the others on three unsupervised tasks.

2 Related Work

Graph Embedding Models. From the perspective of information exploration, graph embedding algorithms can be also separated into two groups: topological embedding approaches and content enhanced embedding methods.

Topological embedding approaches assume that there is only topological structure information available, and the learning objective is to preserve the topological information

maximumly. Perozzi et al. propose a DeepWalk model to learn the node embedding from a collection of random walks [Perozzi *et al.*, 2014]. Since then, a number of probabilistic models such as node2vec [Grover and Leskovec, 2016] and LINE [Tang *et al.*, 2015] have been developed. As a graph can be mathematically represented as an adjacency matrix, many matrix factorization approaches such as HOPE [Ou *et al.*, 2016] and M-NMF [Wang *et al.*, 2017b] are proposed to learn the latent representation for a graph. Recently deep learning models have been widely exploited to learn the graph embedding. These algorithms preserve the first and second order of proximities [Wang *et al.*, 2016], or reconstruct the positive pointwise mutual information (PPMI) [Cao *et al.*, 2016] via different variants of autoencoders.

Content enhanced embedding methods assume node content information is available and exploit both topological information and content features simultaneously. TADW [Yang *et al.*, 2015] presents a matrix factorization approach to explore node features. TriDNR [Pan *et al.*, 2016b] captures structure, node content, and label information via a tri-party neural network architecture. UPP-SNE employs an approximated kernel mapping scheme to exploit user profile features to enhance the embedding learning of users in social networks [Zhang *et al.*, 2017b].

Unfortunately the above algorithms largely ignore the latent distribution of the embedding, which may result in poor representation in practice. In this paper, we explore adversarial training methods to address this issue.

Adversarial Models. Our method is motivated by the generative adversarial network (GAN) [Goodfellow *et al.*, 2014]. GAN plays an adversarial game with two linked models: the generator $\mathcal{G}$ and the discriminator $\mathcal{D}$. The discriminator can be a multi-layer perceptron which discriminates if an input sample comes from the data distribution or from the generator we built. Simultaneously, the generator is trained to generate the samples to convince the discriminator that the generated samples come from the prior data distribution. Due to its effectiveness in many unsupervised tasks, recently a number of adversarial training algorithms have been proposed [Donahue *et al.*, 2016; Radford *et al.*, 2015].

Recently Makhzani et al. proposed an adversarial autoencoder (AAE) to learn the latent embedding by merging the adversarial mechanism into the autoencoder [Makhzani *et al.*, 2015]. However, it is designed for general data rather than graph data. Dai et al. applied the adversarial mechanism to graphs. However, their approach can only exploit the topological information [Dai *et al.*, 2017]. In contrast, our algorithm is more flexible and can handle both topological and content information for graph data.

3 Problem Definition and Framework

A graph is represented as $\mathbf{G} = \{\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{X}\}$, where $\mathbf{V} = \{\mathbf{v}_i\}_i = 1, \cdots, n$ consists of a set of nodes in a graph and $\mathbf{e}_{i,j} = <\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j> \in \mathbf{E}$ represents a linkage encoding the citation edge between the nodes. The topological structure of graph $\mathbf{G}$ can be represented by an adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A}$, where $\mathbf{A}_{i,j} = 1$ if $\mathbf{e}_{i,j} \in \mathbf{E}$, otherwise $\mathbf{A}_{i,j} = 0$. $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbf{X}$ indicates the content features associated with each node $\mathbf{v}_i$.

Figure 1: The architecture of the adversarially regularized graph autoencoder (ARGA). The upper tier is a ==graph convolutional autoencoder== that reconstructs a graph $\mathbf{A}$ from an embedding $\mathbf{Z}$ which is generated by the encoder which exploits graph structure $\mathbf{A}$ and the node content matrix $\mathbf{X}$. The lower tier is an adversarial network trained to discriminate if a sample is generated from the embedding or from a prior distribution. The adversarially regularized variational graph autoencoder (ARVGA) is similar to ARGA except that it employs a *variational* graph autoencoder in the upper tier (See Algorithm 1 for details).

Given a graph $\mathbf{G}$, our purpose is to map the nodes $\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathbf{V}$ to low-dimensional vectors $\mathbf{z}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with the formal format as follows: $f : (\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{X}) \rightarrowtail \mathbf{Z}$, where $\mathbf{z}_i^\top$ is the i-th row of the matrix $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$. n is the number of nodes and d is the dimension of embedding. We take $\mathbf{Z}$ as the embedding matrix and the embeddings should well preserve the topological structure $\mathbf{A}$ as well as content information $\mathbf{X}$.

3.1 Overall Framework

Our objective is to learn a robust embedding given a graph $\mathbf{G} = \{\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{X}\}$. To this end, we leverage an adversarial architecture with a graph autoencoder to directly process the entire graph and learn a robust embedding. Figure 1 demonstrates the workflow of ARGA which consists of two modules: the graph autoencoder and the adversarial network.

- **Graph Convolutional Autoencoder**. The autoencoder takes in the structure of graph $\mathbf{A}$ and the node content $\mathbf{X}$ as inputs to learn a latent representation $\mathbf{Z}$, and then reconstructs the graph structure $\mathbf{A}$ from $\mathbf{Z}$.

- **Adversarial Regularization.** The adversarial network forces the latent codes to match a prior distribution by an adversarial training module, which discriminates whether the current latent code $\mathbf{z}_i \in \mathbf{Z}$ comes from the encoder or from the prior distribution.

4 Proposed Algorithm

4.1 Graph Convolutional Autoencoder

The graph convolutional autoencoder aims to embed a graph $\mathbf{G} = \{\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{X}\}$ in a low-dimensional space. Two key questions arise (1) how to integrate both graph structure $\mathbf{A}$ and node content $\mathbf{X}$ in an encoder, and (2) what sort of information should be reconstructed via a decoder?

Graph Convolutional Encoder Model $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$. To represent both graph structure $\mathbf{A}$ and node content $\mathbf{X}$ in a unified framework, we develop a variant of the graph convolutional network (GCN) [Kipf and Welling, 2017] as a graph encoder. Our graph convolutional network (GCN) extends the operation of *convolution* to graph data in the spectral domain, and learns a layer-wise transformation by a spectral convolution function $f(\mathbf{Z}^{(l)}, \mathbf{A}|\mathbf{W}^{(l)})$:

$$\mathbf{Z}^{(l+1)} = f(\mathbf{Z}^{(l)}, \mathbf{A}|\mathbf{W}^{(l)}) \tag{1}$$

Here, $\mathbf{Z}^l$ is the input for convolution, and $\mathbf{Z}^{(l+1)}$ is the output after convolution. We have $\mathbf{Z}^0 = \mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ (n nodes and m features) for our problem. $\mathbf{W}^{(l)}$ is a matrix of filter parameters we need to learn in the neural network. If $f(\mathbf{Z}^{(l)}, \mathbf{A}|\mathbf{W}^{(l)})$ is well defined, we can build arbitrary deep convolutional neural networks efficiently.

Each layer of our graph convolutional network can be expressed with the function $f(\mathbf{Z}^{(l)}, \mathbf{A}|\mathbf{W}^{(l)})$ as follows:

$$f(\mathbf{Z}^{(l)}, \mathbf{A}|\mathbf{W}^{(l)}) = \phi(\widetilde{\mathbf{D}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}\widetilde{\mathbf{D}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{Z}^{(l)}\mathbf{W}^{(l)}), \tag{2}$$

where $\widetilde{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{I}$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{D}}_{ii} = \sum_j \widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_{ij}$. $\mathbf{I}$ is the identity matrix of $\mathbf{A}$ and ϕ is an activation function such as $\text{Relu}(t) = \max(0, t)$ or $\text{sigmoid}(t) = \frac{1}{1+e^t}$. Overall, the graph encoder $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$ is constructed with a two-layer GCN. In our paper, we develop two variants of encoder, e.g., Graph Encoder and Variational Graph Encoder.

The *Graph Encoder* is constructed as follows:

$$\mathbf{Z}^{(1)} = f_{\text{Relu}}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}|\mathbf{W}^{(0)}); \tag{3}$$
$$\mathbf{Z}^{(2)} = f_{\text{linear}}(\mathbf{Z}^{(1)}, \mathbf{A}|\mathbf{W}^{(1)}). \tag{4}$$

$\text{Relu}(\cdot)$ and linear activation functions are used for the first and second layers. Our graph convolutional encoder $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{A}) = q(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$ encodes both graph structure and node content into a representation $\mathbf{Z} = q(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{Z}^{(2)}$.

A *Variational Graph Encoder* is defined by an inference model:

$$q(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} q(\mathbf{z_i}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}), \tag{5}$$

$$q(\mathbf{z_i}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{z}_i|\boldsymbol{\mu}_i, \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2)) \tag{6}$$

Here, $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{Z}^{(2)}$ is the matrix of mean vectors $\boldsymbol{z}_i$; similarly $\log\boldsymbol{\sigma} = f_{\text{linear}}(\mathbf{Z}^{(1)}, \mathbf{A}|\mathbf{W}'^{(1)})$ which share the weights $\mathbf{W}^{(0)}$ with $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ in the first layer in Eq. (3).

Decoder Model. Our decoder model is used to reconstruct the graph data. We can reconstruct either the graph structure $\mathbf{A}$, content information $\mathbf{X}$, or both. In our paper, we propose to reconstruct graph structure $\mathbf{A}$, which provides more flexibility in the sense that our algorithm will still function properly even if there is no content information $\mathbf{X}$ available (e.g., $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{I}$). Our decoder $p(\hat{\mathbf{A}}|\mathbf{Z})$ predicts whether there is a link between two nodes. More specifically, we train a link prediction layer based on the graph embedding:

$$p(\hat{\mathbf{A}}|\mathbf{Z}) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \prod_{j=1}^{n} p(\hat{\mathbf{A}}_{ij}|\mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{z}_j); \tag{7}$$

$$p(\hat{\mathbf{A}}_{ij} = 1|\mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{z}_j) = \text{sigmoid}(\mathbf{z}_i^{\top}, \mathbf{z}_j), \tag{8}$$

Graph Autoencoder Model. The embedding $\mathbf{Z}$ and the reconstructed graph $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ can be presented as follows:

$$\hat{\mathbf{A}} = \text{sigmoid}(\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^{\top}), \text{ here } \mathbf{Z} = q(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}) \tag{9}$$

Optimization. For the graph encoder, we minimize the reconstruction error of the graph data by:

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{Z}|(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}))}[\log p(\hat{\mathbf{A}}|\mathbf{Z})] \tag{10}$$

For the variational graph encoder, we optimize the variational lower bound as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_1 = \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{Z}|(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}))}[\log p(\hat{\mathbf{A}}|\mathbf{Z})] - \mathbf{KL}[q(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}) \parallel p(\mathbf{Z})] \tag{11}$$

where $\mathbf{KL}[q(\bullet)||p(\bullet)]$ is the Kullback-Leibler divergence between $q(\bullet)$ and $p(\bullet)$. We also take a Gaussian prior $p(\mathbf{Z}) = \prod_i p(\mathbf{z}_i) = \prod_i \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{z}_i|0, \mathbf{I})$.

4.2 Adversarial Model $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{Z})$

The key idea of our model is to enforce latent representation $\mathbf{Z}$ to match a prior distribution, which is achieved by an adversarial training model. The adversarial model is built on a standard multi-layer perceptron (MLP) where the output layer only has one dimension with a sigmoid function. The adversarial model acts as a discriminator to distinguish whether a latent code is from the prior p_z (positive) or from graph encoder $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$ (negative). By minimizing the cross-entropy cost for training the binary classifier, the embedding will finally be regularized and improved during the training process. The cost can be computed as follows:

$$-\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}\sim p_z}\log\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{Z}) - \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}}\log(1 - \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}))), \tag{12}$$

In our paper, we use simple Gaussian distribution as p_z.

Algorithm 1 Adversarially Regularized Graph Embedding

Require: GCN
   $\mathbf{G} = \{\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{E}, \mathbf{X}\}$: a Graph with links and features;
   T: the number of iterations;
   K: the number of steps for iterating discriminator;
   d: the dimension of the latent variable
Ensure: $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$
 1: **for** iterator = 1,2,3, $\cdots\cdots$, T **do**
 2:    Generate latent variables matrix $\mathbf{Z}$ through Eq.(4);
 3:    **for** k = 1,2, $\cdots\cdots$, K **do**
 4:       Sample m entities $\{\mathbf{z}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathbf{z}^{(m)}\}$ from latent matrix $\mathbf{Z}$
 5:       Sample m entities $\{\mathbf{a}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathbf{a}^{(m)}\}$ from the prior distribution p_z
 6:       Update the discriminator with its stochastic gradient:

$$\nabla \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} [\log \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{a}^i) + \log (1 - \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{z}^{(i)}))]$$

    end for
 7:    Update the graph autoencoder with its stochastic gradient by Eq. (10) for ARGA or Eq. (11) for ARVGA;
    end for
 8: **return** $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$

Adversarial Graph Autoencoder Model. The equation for training the encoder model with Discriminator $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{Z})$ can be written as follows:

$$\min_{\mathcal{G}} \max_{\mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}\sim p_z}[\log\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{Z})] + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x}\sim p(\mathbf{x})}[\log(1-\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})))] \tag{13}$$

where $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$ and $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{Z})$ indicate the generator and discriminator explained above.

4.3 Algorithm Explanation

Algorithm 1 is our proposed framework. Given a graph $\mathbf{G}$, the step 2 gets the latent variables matrix $\mathbf{Z}$ from the graph convolutional encoder. Then we take the same number of samples from the generated $\mathbf{Z}$ and the real data distribution p_z in step 4 and 5 respectively, to update the discriminator with the cross-entropy cost computed in step 6. After K runs of training the discriminator, the graph encoder will try to confuse the trained discriminator and update itself with generated gradient in step 7. We can update Eq. (10) to train the **adversarially regularized graph autoencoder (ARGA),** or Eq. (11) to train the **adversarially regularized variational graph autoencoder (ARVGA)**, respectively. Finally, we will return the graph embedding $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ in step 8.

5 Experiments

We report our results on three unsupervised graph analytic tasks: link prediction, node clustering, and graph visualization. The benchmark graph datasets used in the paper are summarized in Table 1. Each data set consists of scientific publications as nodes and citation relationships as edges. The features are unique words in each document.

5.1 Link Prediction

Baselines. We compared our algorithms against state-of-the-art algorithms for the link prediction task:

Data Set	# Nodes	# Links	# Content Words	# Features
Cora	2,708	5,429	3,880,564	1,433
Citeseer	3,327	4,732	12,274,336	3,703
PubMed	19,717	44,338	9,858,500	500

Table 1: Real-world Graph Datasets Used in the Paper

- **DeepWalk** [Perozzi *et al.*, 2014]: is a network representation approach which encodes social relations into a continuous vector space.

- **Spectral Clustering** [Tang and Liu, 2011]: is an effective approach for learning social embedding.

- **GAE** [Kipf and Welling, 2016]: is the most recent autoencoder-based unsupervised framework for graph data, which naturally leverages both topological and content information.

- **VGAE** [Kipf and Welling, 2016]: is a variational graph autoencoder approach for graph embedding with both topological and content information.

- **ARGA**: Our proposed adversarially regularized autoencoder algorithm which uses graph autoencoder to learn the embedding.

- **ARVGA**: Our proposed algorithm, which uses a *variational* graph autoencoder to learn the embedding.

Metrics. We report the results in terms of AUC score (the area under a receiver operating characteristic curve) and average precision (AP) [Kipf and Welling, 2016] score. We conduct each experiment 10 times and report the mean values with the standard errors as the final scores. Each dataset is separated into a training, testing set and validation set. The validation set contains 5% citation edges for hyperparameter optimization, the test set holds 10% citation edges to verify the performance, and the rest are used for training.

Parameter Settings. For the Cora and Citeseer data sets, we train all autoencoder-related models for 200 iterations and optimize them with the Adam algorithm. Both learning rate and discriminator learning rate are set as 0.001. As the PubMed data set is relatively large (around 20,000 nodes), we iterate 2,000 times for an adequate training with a 0.008 discriminator learning rate and 0.001 learning rate. We construct encoders with a 32-neuron hidden layer and a 16-neuron embedding layer for all the experiments and all the discriminators are built with two hidden layers(16-neuron, 64-neuron respectively). For the rest of the baselines, we retain to the settings described in the corresponding papers.

Experimental Results. The details of the experimental results on the link prediction are shown in Table 2. The results show that by incorporating an effective adversarial training module into our graph convolutional autoencoder, ARGA and ARVGA achieve outstanding performance: all AP and AUC scores are as higher as 92% on all three data sets. Compared with all the baselines, ARGE increased the AP score from around 2.5% compared with VGAE incorporating with node features, 11% compared with VGAE without node features; 15.5% and 10.6% compared with DeepWalk and Spectral Clustering respectively on the large PubMed data set .


Figure 2: Average performance on different dimensions of the embedding on the Cora dataset. (A) Average precision score; (B) AUC score.

Parameter Study. We vary the dimension of embedding from 8 neurons to 1024 and report the results in Fig 2.

The results from both Fig 2 (A) and (B) reveal similar trends: when adding the dimension of embedding from 8-neuron to 16-neuron, the performance of embedding on link prediction steadily rises; but when we further increase the number of the neurons at the embedding layer to 32-neuron, the performance fluctuates however the results for both the AP score and the AUC score remain good.

It is worth mentioning that if we continue to set more neurons, for examples, 64-neuron, 128-neuron and 1024-neuron, the performance rises markedly.

5.2 Node Clustering

For the node clustering task, we first learn the graph embedding, and then perform K-means clustering algorithm based on the embedding.

Baselines. We compare both embedding based approaches as well as approaches directly for graph clustering. Except for the baselines we compared for link prediction, we also include baselines which are designed for clustering:

1. **K-means** is a classical method and also the foundation of many clustering algorithms.

2. **Graph Encoder** [Tian *et al.*, 2014] learns graph embedding for spectral graph clustering.

3. **DNGR** [Cao *et al.*, 2016] trains a stacked denoising autoencoder for graph embedding.

4. **RTM** [Chang and Blei, 2009] learns the topic distributions of each document from both text and citation.

5. **RMSC** [Xia *et al.*, 2014] employs a multi-view learning approach for graph clustering.

6. **TADW** [Yang *et al.*, 2015] applies matrix factorization for network representation learning.

Here the first three algorithms only exploit the graph structures, while the last three algorithms use both graph structure and node content for the graph clustering task.

Metrics. Following [Xia *et al.*, 2014], we employ five metrics to validate the clustering results: accuracy (Acc), normalized mutual information (NMI), precision, F-score (F1) and average rand index (ARI).

| Approaches	Cora		Citeseer		PubMed	
	AUC	AP	AUC	AP	AUC	AP
SC	84.6 ± 0.01	88.5 ± 0.00	80.5 ± 0.01	85.0 ± 0.01	84.2 ± 0.02	87.8 ± 0.01
DW	83.1 ± 0.01	85.0 ± 0.00	80.5 ± 0.02	83.6 ± 0.01	84.4 ± 0.00	84.1 ± 0.00
GAE*	84.3 ± 0.02	88.1 ± 0.01	78.7 ± 0.02	84.1 ± 0.02	82.2 ± 0.01	87.4 ± 0.00
VGAE*	84.0 ± 0.02	87.7 ± 0.01	78.9 ± 0.03	84.1 ± 0.02	82.7 ± 0.01	87.5 ± 0.01
GAE	91.0 ± 0.02	92.0 ± 0.03	89.5 ± 0.04	89.9 ± 0.05	96.4 ± 0.00	96.5 ± 0.00
VGAE	91.4 ± 0.01	92.6 ± 0.01	90.8 ± 0.02	92.0 ± 0.02	94.4 ± 0.02	94.7 ± 0.02
ARGE	92.4 ± 0.003	$\mathbf{93.2 \pm 0.003}$	91.9 ± 0.003	93.0 ± 0.003	$\mathbf{96.8 \pm 0.001}$	$\mathbf{97.1 \pm 0.001}$
ARVGE	$\mathbf{92.4 \pm 0.004}$	92.6 ± 0.004	$\mathbf{92.4 \pm 0.003}$	$\mathbf{93.0 \pm 0.003}$	96.5 ± 0.001	96.8 ± 0.001

Table 2: Results for Link Prediction. GAE* and VGAE* are variants of GAE, which only explore topological structure, i.e., $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{I}$.

Figure 3: The Cora data visualization comparison. From left to right: embeddings from our ARGA, VGAE, GAE, DeepWalk, and Spectral Clustering. The different colors represent different groups.

Cora	Acc	NMI	F1	Precision	ARI
K-means	0.492	0.321	0.368	0.369	0.230
Spectral	0.367	0.127	0.318	0.193	0.031
GraphEncoder	0.325	0.109	0.298	0.182	0.006
DeepWalk	0.484	0.327	0.392	0.361	0.243
DNGR	0.419	0.318	0.340	0.266	0.142
RTM	0.440	0.230	0.307	0.332	0.169
RMSC	0.407	0.255	0.331	0.227	0.090
TADW	0.560	0.441	0.481	0.396	0.332
GAE	0.596	0.429	0.595	0.596	0.347
VGAE	0.609	0.436	0.609	0.609	0.346
ARGE	**0.640**	0.449	0.619	**0.646**	0.352
ARVGE	0.638	**0.450**	**0.627**	0.624	**0.374**

Table 3: Clustering Results on Cora

Citeseer	Acc	NMI	F1	Precision	ARI
K-means	0.540	0.305	0.409	0.405	0.279
Spectral	0.239	0.056	0.299	0.179	0.010
GraphEncoder	0.225	0.033	0.301	0.179	0.010
DeepWalk	0.337	0.088	0.270	0.248	0.092
DNGR	0.326	0.180	0.300	0.200	0.044
RTM	0.451	0.239	0.342	0.349	0.203
RMSC	0.295	0.139	0.320	0.204	0.049
TADW	0.455	0.291	0.414	0.312	0.228
GAE	0.408	0.176	0.372	0.418	0.124
VGAE	0.344	0.156	0.308	0.349	0.093
ARGE	**0.573**	**0.350**	**0.546**	**0.573**	**0.341**
ARVGE	0.544	0.261	0.529	0.549	0.245

Table 4: Clustering Results on Citeseer

Experimental Results. The clustering results on the Cora and Citeseer data sets are given in Table 3 and Table 4. The results show that ARGA and ARVGA have achieved a dramatic improvement on all five metrics compared with all the other baselines. For instance, on Citeseer, ARGA has increased the accuracy from 6.1% compared with K-means to 154.7% compared with GraphEncoder; increased the F1 score from 31.9% compared with TADW to 102.2% compared with DeepWalk; and increased NMI from 14.8% compared with K-means to 124.4% compared with VGAE. The wide margin in the results between ARGE and GAE (and the others) has further proved the superiority of our adversarially regularized graph autoencoder.

5.3 Graph Visualization

We visualize the Cora data in a two-dimensional space by applying the t-SNE algorithm [Van Der Maaten, 2014] on the learned embedding. The results in Fig 3 validate that by applying adversarial training to the graph data, we can obtained a more meaningful layout of the graph data.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed a novel adversarial graph embedding framework for graph data. We argue that most existing graph embedding algorithms are unregularized methods that ignore the data distributions of the latent representation and suffer from inferior embedding in real-world graph data. We proposed an adversarial training scheme to *regularize* the latent codes and enforce the latent codes to match a prior distribution. The adversarial module is jointly learned with a graph convolutional autoencoder to produce a robust representation. Experiment results demonstrated that our algorithms ARGA and ARVGA outperform baselines in link prediction, node clustering, and graph visualization tasks.

Acknowledgements

References

[Cai *et al.*, 2017] Hongyun Cai, Vincent W Zheng, and Kevin Chang. A comprehensive survey of graph embedding: Problems, techniques and applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.07604*, 2017.

[Cao *et al.*, 2016] Shaosheng Cao, Wei Lu, and Qiongkai Xu. Deep neural networks for learning graph representations. In *AAAI*, pages 1145–1152, 2016.

[Chang and Blei, 2009] Jonathan Chang and David Blei. Relational topic models for document networks. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 81–88, 2009.

[Cui *et al.*, 2017] Peng Cui, Xiao Wang, Jian Pei, and Wenwu Zhu. A survey on network embedding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.08752*, 2017.

[Dai *et al.*, 2017] Quanyu Dai, Qiang Li, Jian Tang, and Dan Wang. Adversarial network embedding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.07838*, 2017.

[Donahue *et al.*, 2016] Jeff Donahue, Philipp Krähenbühl, and Trevor Darrell. Adversarial feature learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.09782*, 2016.

[Goodfellow *et al.*, 2014] Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Generative adversarial nets. In *NIPS*, pages 2672–2680, 2014.

[Grover and Leskovec, 2016] Aditya Grover and Jure Leskovec. node2vec: Scalable feature learning for networks. In *SIGKDD*, pages 855–864. ACM, 2016.

[Kipf and Welling, 2016] Thomas N Kipf and Max Welling. Variational graph auto-encoders. *NIPS*, 2016.

[Kipf and Welling, 2017] Thomas N Kipf and Max Welling. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. In *ICLR*, pages 1–14, 2017.

[Makhzani *et al.*, 2015] Alireza Makhzani, Jonathon Shlens, Navdeep Jaitly, Ian Goodfellow, and Brendan Frey. Adversarial autoencoders. *arXiv:1511.05644*, 2015.

[Ou *et al.*, 2016] Mingdong Ou, Peng Cui, Jian Pei, Ziwei Zhang, and Wenwu Zhu. Asymmetric transitivity preserving graph embedding. In *KDD*, pages 1105–1114, 2016.

[Pan *et al.*, 2016a] Shirui Pan, Jia Wu, Xingquan Zhu, Chengqi Zhang, and Yu S Philip. Joint structure feature exploration and regularization for multi-task graph classification. *TKDE*, 28(3):715–728, 2016.

[Pan *et al.*, 2016b] Shirui Pan, Jia Wu, Xingquan Zhu, Chengqi Zhang, and Yang Wang. Tri-party deep network representation. In *IJCAI*, pages 1895–1901, 2016.

[Perozzi *et al.*, 2014] Bryan Perozzi, Rami Al-Rfou, and Steven Skiena. Deepwalk: Online learning of social representations. In *SIGKDD*, pages 701–710. ACM, 2014.

[Qiu *et al.*, 2017] Jiezhong Qiu, Yuxiao Dong, Hao Ma, Jian Li, Kuansan Wang, and Jie Tang. Network embedding as matrix factorization: Unifying deepwalk, line, pte, and node2vec. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.02971*, 2017.

[Radford *et al.*, 2015] Alec Radford, Luke Metz, and Soumith Chintala. Unsupervised representation learning with deep convolutional generative adversarial networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.06434*, 2015.

[Tang and Liu, 2011] Lei Tang and Huan Liu. Leveraging social media networks for classification. *DMKD*, 23(3):447–478, 2011.

[Tang *et al.*, 2015] Jian Tang, Meng Qu, Mingzhe Wang, Ming Zhang, Jun Yan, and Qiaozhu Mei. LINE: large-scale information network embedding. In *WWW*, pages 1067–1077, 2015.

[Tian *et al.*, 2014] Fei Tian, Bin Gao, Qing Cui, Enhong Chen, and Tie-Yan Liu. Learning deep representations for graph clustering. In *AAAI*, pages 1293–1299, 2014.

[Van Der Maaten, 2014] Laurens Van Der Maaten. Accelerating t-sne using tree-based algorithms. *JMLR*, 15(1):3221–3245, 2014.

[Wang *et al.*, 2016] Daixin Wang, Peng Cui, and Wenwu Zhu. Structural deep network embedding. In *SIGKDD*, pages 1225–1234. ACM, 2016.

[Wang *et al.*, 2017a] Chun Wang, Shirui Pan, Guodong Long, Xingquan Zhu, and Jing Jiang. Mgae: Marginalized graph autoencoder for graph clustering. In *CIKM*, pages 889–898. ACM, 2017.

[Wang *et al.*, 2017b] Xiao Wang, Peng Cui, Jing Wang, Jian Pei, Wenwu Zhu, and Shiqiang Yang. Community preserving network embedding. In *AAAI*, pages 203–209, 2017.

[Wang *et al.*, 2017c] Zhitao Wang, Chengyao Chen, and Wenjie Li. Predictive network representation learning for link prediction. In *SIGIR*, pages 969–972. ACM, 2017.

[Xia *et al.*, 2014] Rongkai Xia, Yan Pan, Lei Du, and Jian Yin. Robust multi-view spectral clustering via low-rank and sparse decomposition. In *AAAI*, pages 2149–2155, 2014.

[Yang *et al.*, 2015] Cheng Yang, Zhiyuan Liu, Deli Zhao, Maosong Sun, and Edward Y Chang. Network representation learning with rich text information. In *IJCAI*, pages 2111–2117, 2015.

[Zhang *et al.*, 2017a] Daokun Zhang, Jie Yin, Xingquan Zhu, and Chengqi Zhang. Network representation learning: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.05852*, 2017.

[Zhang *et al.*, 2017b] Daokun Zhang, Jie Yin, Xingquan Zhu, and Chengqi Zhang. User profile preserving social network embedding. In *IJCAI*, pages 3378–3384, 2017.