
Disentangling Node Attributes from Graph Topology for Improved Generalizability in Link Prediction

Ayan Chatterjee

Network Science Institute
Northeastern University
Boston, MA 02115
chatterjee.ayan@northeastern.edu

Robin Walters

Khoury College of Computer Sciences
Northeastern University
Boston, MA 02115
r.walters@northeastern.edu

Giulia Menichetti

Brigham and Women's Hospital
Harvard Medical School
Boston, MA 02115
giulia.menichetti@channing.harvard.edu

Tina Eliassi-Rad

Khoury College of Computer Sciences
Northeastern University
Boston, MA 02115
t.eliassirad@northeastern.edu

Abstract

Link prediction is a crucial task in graph machine learning with diverse applications. We explore the interplay between node attributes and graph topology and demonstrate that incorporating pre-trained node attributes improves the generalization power of link prediction models. Our proposed method, *UPNA* (Unsupervised Pre-training of Node Attributes), solves the inductive link prediction problem by learning a function that takes a pair of node attributes and predicts the probability of an edge, as opposed to Graph Neural Networks (GNN), which can be prone to topological shortcuts in graphs with power-law degree distribution. In this manner, *UPNA* learns a significant part of the latent graph generation mechanism since the learned function can be used to add incoming nodes to a growing graph. By leveraging pre-trained node attributes, we overcome observational bias and make meaningful predictions about unobserved nodes, surpassing state-of-the-art performance ($3\times$ to $34\times$ improvement on benchmark datasets). *UPNA* can be applied to various pairwise learning tasks and integrated with existing link prediction models to enhance their generalizability and bolster graph generative models.

1 Introduction

Graph datasets are prevalent in various domains, such as friendship networks (Ball and Newman, 2013), collaboration networks (Wang et al., 2020), protein interaction networks (Qi et al., 2006), power grids (Pagani and Aiello, 2011), and transportation networks (Lordan and Sallan, 2020). These real-world graphs are often sparse and partially observed, making link prediction for unobserved links an important problem (Liben-Nowell and Kleinberg, 2007). Link prediction appears in many applications from predicting protein interactions (Kovács et al., 2019), to exploring drug responses (Stanfield et al., 2017), to recommending products (Lakshmi and Bhavani, 2021), to completing knowledge graphs (Nickel et al., 2016), and suggesting friends in social networks (Adamic and Adar, 2003).

Link prediction has been extensively studied, resulting in various methods including similarity-based indices, probabilistic approaches, and dimensionality reduction techniques (Kumar et al., 2020). For link prediction, latent representations such as Node2Vec (Grover and Leskovec, 2016) are commonly employed, capturing graph topology in low-dimensional feature vectors (Cao et al., 2015; Perozzi

et al., 2014; Tang et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2016). Recent research highlights the significance of both graph topology and node attributes in link prediction (Ai et al., 2022).

Most existing link prediction approaches and benchmarks focus on transductive scenarios, where the train and test graphs share the same set of nodes (Wang et al., 2019a; Dwivedi et al., 2020; Hu et al., 2020). However, transductive link prediction is primarily driven by the training graph’s topology and biased by the observed graph’s degree distribution (Bonner et al., 2022; Chatterjee et al., 2023). Similar observations have been made in node classification tasks, where label propagation often achieves comparable or superior performance compared to deep models (Huang et al., 2020b). Real-world applications often require semi-inductive and inductive link predictions on newly observed nodes, necessitating learning from node attributes independently of the graph topology. Existing models like GraIL (Teru et al., 2019) encode neighborhood information. These methods cannot deal with isolated nodes. To make accurate predictions in semi-inductive and inductive scenarios, a latent graph generation model without observational bias is crucial. These scenarios resemble the cold-start problem in recommendation systems, where suggesting a new product to an existing user resembles a semi-inductive setting, and predicting links with both unseen nodes resembles an inductive setting (Maksimov et al., 2020; Chatterjee et al., 2023; Menichetti, 2022). Inductive link prediction in knowledge graphs has gained significant attention recently (Galkin et al., 2022).

Temporal networks necessitate a broader understanding of dynamic complex systems, surpassing the limitations of static graphs (Holme and Saramäki, 2012). Analyzing networks in a static manner can yield misleading insights into spreading processes and community structures (Scholtes et al., 2016). To comprehend the intricate dynamics of processes on networks, it is essential to uncover the evolution mechanism of temporal graphs. In discrete-time systems, newly arrived nodes connect to the previous temporal snapshot of the graph, creating semi-inductive or inductive link prediction scenarios (Holme and Saramäki, 2012; Scholtes et al., 2016).

Identifying useful node attributes is crucial for enhancing node classification, link prediction, graph data augmentation, and graph generative models (Jin et al., 2020; Simonovsky and Komodakis, 2018; Shi et al., 2020). Deep adversarial learning and variational auto-encoder-based approaches have been proposed to leverage real-world attributes for improving these tasks (Chen et al., 2019). However, there is a lack of understanding regarding the interplay between graph topology and node attributes and the need for a formal quantification of attribute quality to effectively enhance and generalize these downstream tasks.

Contributions: (1) We address the issue of observational bias and poor performance on low-degree and unobserved nodes in transductive link prediction, highlighting the influence of topological shortcuts. (2) We emphasize the significance of learning the latent graph generation mechanism from node attributes to achieve accurate predictions for newly arrived isolated nodes. (3) We quantify the generalization power of link prediction models by assessing their inductive test performance and establishing the relationship with node attribute information. (4) We propose *UPNA* (Unsupervised Pre-training of Node Attributes), a method that improves link prediction generalizability by training on large corpora independent of the training graph. We validate our approach on both static and time-evolving graphs.

2 Problem Formulation

2.1 Static Graphs

Consider a graph instance $G = (V, E, X)$, where V represents the set of vertices (or nodes), E represents the set of edges (or links), and the node attributes are captured in the matrix X . We focus on undirected unipartite graphs, although this formulation can be extended to encompass directed, bipartite, and multilayered graphs as well. For instance, G could represent a protein-protein interaction network, where nodes correspond to proteins, links represent interactions between proteins, and node attributes are molecular structure embeddings obtained using ProtVec (Asgari and Mofrad, 2015).

We construct a link prediction model w using supervised learning on the set of links E . The edge set is partitioned into observed and unobserved edges during training as $E = E_o \cup E_u$. Our goal is to learn a function that maps the observed nodes and node attributes (V_o, X_o) to the observed edges E_o , with the hope that it will generalize to the unobserved edges E_u . We also define three types

of link prediction scenarios based on the observed and unobserved nodes, denoted as V_o and V_u , respectively:

- Transductive: Predicting $(a, b) \in E_u$, where $a, b \in V_o$,
- Semi-inductive: Predicting $(a, b) \in E_u$, where $a \in V_o$ and $b \in V_u$ or vice-versa,
- Inductive: Predicting $(a, b) \in E_u$, where $a, b \in V_u$.

In this work, we explore the semi-inductive and inductive link prediction scenarios. The link prediction model takes input $\{V_o, X_o, E_o\}$, and makes predictions on E_u induced by V_u .




Figure 1: **(a)** Transductive, semi-inductive, and inductive link prediction tasks in static graphs. **(b)** Semi-inductive and inductive link prediction tasks in discrete temporal graphs.

2.2 Temporal Graphs

We consider discrete-time temporal graphs (Holme and Saramäki, 2012), where the graph instances are captured at intervals of Δt , with time stamps $t_0, t_1 = t_0 + \Delta t, \dots, t_n = t_0 + (n - 1)\Delta t$.

The temporal graph instances of the evolving network are denoted as $G_{t_0} = (V_{t_0}, E_{t_0}, X_{t_0}), G_{t_1} = (V_{t_1}, E_{t_1}, X_{t_1}), \dots, G_{t_n} = (V_{t_n}, E_{t_n}, X_{t_n})$, corresponding to time stamps t_0, t_1, \dots, t_n , respectively. We define the unobserved node set from time t_j to t_{j+1} as $V_u = V_{t_{j+1}} \setminus V_{t_j}$, and the unobserved edge set as $E_u = E_{t_{j+1}} \setminus E_{t_j}$. In this setting, the link prediction model takes input $G_{t_j} = (V_{t_j}, E_{t_j}, X_{t_j})$ and makes predictions on E_u induced by V_u .

3 Topological Shortcuts

The influence of observation bias on link prediction in static graphs is significant. We demonstrate that state-of-the-art models heavily rely on graph topology, which can be replicated by simpler non-machine learning algorithms. Our experiments on Open Graph Benchmark (OGB) datasets (Hu et al., 2020) reveal that top deep models’ performance on the ogbl-ddi link prediction benchmark (drug-drug interaction network) can be matched by traditional configuration models (such as the traditional configuration model (Barabási, 2016) and unipartite duplex configuration model (Menichetti et al., 2014)). These simpler models ignore node attributes and rely solely on the degree sequence of the training graph, indicating a dependence on topological shortcuts while disregarding node attributes. However, such reliance on graph topology hinders generalization to unseen nodes in semi-inductive and inductive tests. Chatterjee et al. (Chatterjee et al., 2023) demonstrated that even a duplex bipartite configuration model, using only degree sequences of proteins and ligands in the training drug-target interaction network, achieves comparable test performance in predicting transductive protein-ligand interactions compared to state-of-the-art deep neural networks (Huang et al., 2020a,c). Similar observations have been made for block-approximated exponential random graph models (Adriaens et al., 2020; Mara et al., 2022) and simple link prediction heuristics (Mara et al., 2020; Ferrari Dacrema et al., 2019).

Table 1 compares the performance of traditional and duplex configuration models with three top-performing models: Adaptive Graph Diffusion Networks (AGDN, (Sun et al., 2020)), Path-aware Siamese Graph Neural Network (PSG, (Lv et al., 2022)), and Pairwise Learning for Neural Link Prediction (PLNLP, (Wang et al., 2021)) in the transductive setting using the OGB-provided benchmark

train-validation-tests split. Notably, the configuration models outperform the state-of-the-art neural network models. A recent work (Stolman et al., 2022) demonstrates that classic graph structural features outperform graph embedding-based methods in community labeling, specifically in terms of Hits@Top K. Similar observations regarding topological shortcuts are made in the Deep Graph Library (DGL) benchmark (Wang et al., 2019b) as well (here). These shortcuts also manifest in other performance metrics such as AUROC and AUPRC (Chatterjee et al., 2023).

Table 1: The traditional and duplex configuration models outperform state-of-the-art neural network models in Hits@Top K on the ogbl-ddi dataset, using K=20 as recommended by the OGB benchmark.

Model	Hits@Top K(%)
Traditional Configuration Model	0.99 ± 0.00
Duplex Configuration Model	0.99 ± 0.00
AGDN	0.95 ± 0.01
PSG	0.93 ± 0.01
PLNLP	0.91 ± 0.03

3.1 Degree Bias in Topological Shortcuts

The presence of high-degree nodes (hubs) (Barabási and Alber, 1999) in power-law degree distributions creates a topological shortcut that influences link prediction performance. Link prediction models primarily learn from the degree information of hubs, resulting in accurate predictions for hub-related links and excellent overall test performance. However, this leads to poor performance for low-degree nodes, as shown in Figure 2 for the ogbl-ddi dataset using a multi-layer perceptron (MLP) model (Check here for model description and reproducibility). In semi-inductive and inductive settings, where there is limited topological information, relying solely on topological shortcuts fails to make predictions for newly arrived nodes. Therefore, inductive tests unveil the true power of machine learning in link prediction, and understanding the latent graph generation mechanism becomes crucial in these scenarios, motivating the focus of this work.




Figure 2: The transductive test performance on the ogbl-ddi dataset varies across degree bins. Low-degree nodes, which have less influence on topological shortcuts, exhibit poorer test performance compared to high-degree nodes (hubs).

4 State-of-the-art Models in Inductive Link Prediction

We investigate semi-inductive and inductive link prediction settings after addressing the limitations of transductive tests. We propose methods for inductive tests on the OGB link prediction benchmark datasets by using a random node split (Teru et al., 2019). In this train-test-validation split method, we

randomly split the nodes of the original graph V into three groups (V_{train} , $V_{validation}$, and V_{test}) at an 80:10:10 ratio. Then, we obtain the subgraphs G_{train} , $G_{validation}$, and G_{test} corresponding to V_{train} , $V_{validation}$, and V_{test} , respectively.

Our findings reveal that state-of-the-art link prediction models perform poorly in inductive tests, achieving lower performances than a simple MLP trained on the node attributes. The non-overlapping topological information between the train and test graphs in the inductive setting necessitates models to rely solely on node attributes to make accurate link predictions for unseen nodes during training.

4.1 State-of-the-art Link Prediction Models Fail in Inductive Tests

We evaluate the importance of node attributes in inductive link prediction using OGB-defined MLPs (here). These MLPs take concatenated attributes of the two nodes at the end of each edge as input. We compare their performance with the state-of-the-art model PLNLP (Wang et al., 2021) on the OGB link prediction leaderboard. In the case of ogbl-ppa, we use 58-dimensional one-hot feature vectors representing the associated species with proteins. For ogbl-collab, we use 128-dimensional features obtained by averaging word embeddings of authors’ published papers. For ogbl-ddi, we utilize 300-dimensional Mol2vec (Jaeger et al., 2018) embeddings of drug structures. Our findings, summarized in Table 2, demonstrate that the inductive performance of PLNLP is significantly lower compared to its transductive performance, while the MLP performs better in the inductive test scenario.

Table 2: PLNLP performs worse in inductive tests compared to its transductive performance and is outperformed by an MLP trained solely on node attributes. Hits@Top K is evaluated with default values: K=100 for ogbl-ppa, K=50 for ogbl-collab, and K=20 for ogbl-ddi. We conduct a 5-fold cross-validation for each dataset.

Dataset	PLNLP in Transductive Test Hits@Top K(%)	PLNLP in Inductive Test Hits@Top K(%)	MLP on node attributes Hits@Top K(%)
ogbl-ppa	32.38 ± 2.58	0.09 ± 0.03	0.39 ± 0.03
ogbl-collab	70.59 ± 0.29	11.56 ± 0.93	36.44 ± 3.11
ogbl-ddi	90.88 ± 3.13	0.01 ± 0.02	0.39 ± 0.02

5 Theoretical Background

In this section, we delve into the theoretical foundations of our proposed node attribute engineering approach, aiming to enhance the performance of semi-inductive and inductive link prediction. Building upon the established framework of statistical learning theory (Shalev-Shwartz and Ben-David, 2014; Xu and Raginsky, 2017), we formalize the performance of semi-inductive and inductive link prediction as the measure of generalization power exhibited by a link prediction model. To this end, we define the instance space, denoted as E , which represents the set of edges, and the hypothesis space, denoted as W , which encompasses the link prediction hypotheses. The loss function, denoted as $l : W \times E \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^+$, is a non-negative function that quantifies the discrepancy between the predicted and true edges. Given an input of n edges, represented as the n -tuple $E = (e_1, \dots, e_n)$, which are assumed to follow an unknown distribution with mean μ characterizing the underlying graph generation process, we can express the population risk (i.e., the expected loss) of a link prediction hypothesis $w \in W$ as follows:

$$L_\mu(w) \triangleq \mathbf{E}[l(w, E)] = \int_E l(w, e)\mu(de) \quad (1)$$

The parameter μ in the aforementioned formulation is closely associated with the underlying graph generation process. In the context of inductive link prediction, the generalization error quantifies the capability of the link prediction algorithm to capture and learn the graph generation mechanism based on the finite set of observed edges E . Specifically, the generalization error on μ can be assessed by examining the discrepancy between $L_\mu(w)$ and $L_E(w)$. Considering the expected value of this generalization error, we obtain the following expression:

$$gen(\mu, P_{w|E}) \triangleq \mathbf{E}[L_\mu(w) - L_E(w)], \quad (2)$$

which measures the gap between learning the latent generation mechanism and learning from the finite set of observed edges.

$$\mathbf{E}[L_\mu(w)] = \mathbf{E}[L_E(w)] + gen(\mu, P_{w|E}) \quad (3)$$

Theorem 1: If $L(w)$ is σ -subgaussian under $P_{E,w} = \mu^{\otimes n} \otimes P_{w|E}$, where \otimes represents the product of two marginal distributions, then

$$|\mathbf{E}[L_\mu(w)] - \mathbf{E}[L_E(w)]| \leq \sqrt{2\sigma^2 I(E; w)}$$

where $I(E; w)$ quantifies the information shared between the edges and the information learned by the link prediction model.

Proof: Please refer to Appendix B.

Rewriting the above inequality in terms of the generalization error of the link prediction models, we get:

$$|gen(\mu, P_{w|E})| \leq \sqrt{2\sigma^2 I(E; w)} \quad (4)$$

The mutual information $I(E; w)$ quantifies the shared information between the link prediction hypothesis and the training data. Specifically, the link prediction hypothesis w consists of two distinct components: w_t , which utilizes the graph topology, and w_a , associated with the node attributes. Consequently, we can partition the mutual information in the following manner:

$$I(E; w) = I(E; w_t, w_a) = I(w_t, w_a) - I(w_t, w_a|E) \quad (5)$$

To minimize the generalization error of the link prediction model, we aim to minimize the mutual information $I(w_t, w_a)$ between node attributes and graph topology, independent of the training dataset E . This requires leveraging node attributes to improve semi-inductive and inductive link prediction performance. Unsupervised pre-training using unlabeled data has been shown to enhance generalization when labeled data is limited (Blum and Mitchell, 1998). Similarly, pre-training node attributes on a large corpus improves the generalizability of link prediction models on unseen nodes. This pre-training enables models to converge faster and achieve better generalization (Erhan et al., 2010).

We measure information in different node attributes using unsupervised clustering and Davies-Bouldin score (Davies and Bouldin, 1979) to identify attributes suitable for inductive link prediction. Adjusted mutual information is used to quantify shared information between graph topology and node attributes, validating the theoretical background developed in Section 5.

6 Experiments

6.1 Methodology

Real-world graphs often exhibit community structures, representing groups with shared characteristics or functions. Social networks have communities based on interest groups, while protein-protein interaction networks organize proteins into communities based on their metabolic functions (Radicchi et al., 2004). Traditional community detection algorithms can identify communities formed by locally dense subgraphs (Girvan and Newman, 2002; Rosvall et al., 2009). Additionally, unsupervised clustering on node attributes aids in detecting communities beyond the graph’s topology (Yang et al., 2013).

UPNA utilizes k-means clustering (MacQueen, 1967) on node attributes to create unsupervised clusters. The quality of the clusters is evaluated using the Davies-Bouldin score (Davies and Bouldin, 1979), where lower scores indicate higher information content in the node attributes. Adjusted mutual

information (AMI) (Vinh et al., 2010) is measured between pre-trained attribute-based clusters and Node2Vec-based clusters to quantify $I(w_t, w_a)$ (Section 5). Low AMI values indicate that the node attributes contain distinct information from the graph topology, making them suitable for inductive prediction. The UPNA methodology is illustrated in Figure 3.

We evaluate the quality of unsupervised node clusters using different node features: (a) Node2Vec encodes graph topology, (b) Pre-trained node attributes independent of the graph topology, (c) Randomly shuffled pre-trained node attributes for each node, and (d) Pre-trained node attributes replaced with random entries from a uniform distribution. Random and shuffled attribute versions provide insights into the relationship between attribute information and inductive link prediction performance.




Figure 3: UPNA methodology selects node attributes essential for various downstream applications by capturing the graph generation mechanism.

6.2 Observations on Inductive Link Prediction

We apply the UPNA methodology to multiple link prediction benchmark datasets and compare it with state-of-the-art models in inductive link prediction.

6.2.1 Static Graphs

We train the node attributes of the OGB graphs in an unsupervised manner. For ogbl-ppa, we use 100-dimensional ProtVec vectors (Asgari and Mofrad, 2015) trained on 546,790 amino acid sequences from the Swiss-Prot database (Bairoch, 1996). For ogbl-collab, we use 128-dimensional Word2Vec embeddings trained on approximately 6 billion tokens from Google news articles (Mikolov et al., 2013). For ogbl-ddi, we use the pre-trained 300-dimensional Mol2vec embeddings (Jaeger et al., 2018) trained on a corpus of 19.9 million chemicals from ZINC (Irwin et al., 2012) and ChEMBL (Gaulton et al., 2011) libraries.

Comparing the Davies-Bouldin scores for different node attributes reveals that pre-trained node attributes achieve the lowest score, indicating more meaningful node clustering (see Figure 4). This suggests that pre-trained node attributes contain valuable information beyond the graph topology, making them suitable for inductive tests. Additionally, Table 3 shows low adjusted mutual information (AMI) between the pre-trained node attributes and Node2Vec, indicating limited shared information with the graph topology and low $I(w_t, w_a)$. This confirms that pre-trained node attributes capture minimal topological information from the training graph, enhancing the generalization power of link prediction models (Eq. 4).

Using the aforementioned node features, we perform inductive link prediction on the OGB benchmark using the provided MLP architectures (here). Figure 5 demonstrates that the pre-trained node attributes, which exhibit the lowest Davies-Bouldin scores and yield the best unsupervised node clustering, achieve superior performance in inductive link prediction.

6.3 Temporal Graphs

We evaluate UNAP on temporal networks for link prediction on newly arrived nodes (see Subsection 2.2.2). We utilize the reddit hyperlink network dataset (Kumar et al., 2018), which spans 3 years (2014-2017) and consists of subreddit communities. The pre-trained node attributes are generated




Figure 4: Comparing the unsupervised clusters using Davies-Bouldin score on OGB link prediction benchmarks, the pre-trained node attributes consistently yield the lowest score. This indicates their suitability for inductive link prediction tasks across different graph datasets. The K-means algorithm with $K=5$ is employed, and similar observations hold for different K values.

Table 3: We compare the adjusted mutual information between the unsupervised clusters obtained using only Node2vec and the pre-trained node attributes. Node2vec uses the graph topology to create the node clusters. Low AMI values ($\ll 1$) indicate that the pre-trained attributes share minimal information with the graph topology.

Dataset	$I(w_t, w_a)$
ogbl-ppa	0.17
ogbl-collab	0.08
ogbl-ddi	0.22

from post content using GloVe word embeddings trained on 840B words (Pennington et al., 2014). For prediction, we employ a 3-layer MLP decoder with hidden layer sizes of 100, a learning rate of 0.001, 200 epochs, ReLU activation, and ADAM solver. The pre-trained node attributes with the lowest Davies-Bouldin score outperform others in predicting links for newly arrived nodes across different years. We also compare UNAP with DyHATR (Xue et al., 2020), a state-of-the-art temporal link prediction model, in inductive link prediction. Table 4 summarizes these findings.

Table 4: We evaluate link prediction performance on newly arrived nodes across various temporal instances of the subreddit network. The performance is correlated with the Davies-Bouldin scores (DB) of node attributes (with K -means clustering, $K = 5$). Lower scores indicate more informative attributes and higher prediction performance. Pre-trained node attributes yield the best performance.

Attributes	2014-2015			2016-2017			2017-2018		
	DB	AUROC	AUPRC	DB	AUROC	AUPRC	DB	AUROC	AUPRC
UPNA	2.9	0.70	0.66	0.2	0.63	0.60	2.8	0.69	0.65
Shuffled	20.5	0.66	0.62	15.04	0.59	0.55	16.9	0.60	0.56
Random	21.9	0.5	0.5	22.3	0.5	0.5	21.3	0.51	0.51
DyHATR	-	0.45	0.25	-	0.45	0.48	-	0.46	0.28

7 Related work

Machine Learning models in link prediction utilize both graph topology and node attributes (Ai et al., 2022). In transductive tests, GraphSAGE (Hamilton et al., 2017) and similar methods perform well when train and test graphs have similar topologies and neighborhood information is known for newly arrived nodes. Random edge splits create similar topologies between train and test graphs, making basic topological features (e.g., degree, centrality) adequate for link prediction (Ghasemian et al., 2020).




Figure 5: We compare AUROC, AUPRC and Hits@Top K performances for different node attributes in inductive tests. The pre-trained node attributes show the highest performance in all of the OGB link prediction datasets.

Joachims (Joachims, 1999) first highlighted the difficulty of inductive tests in various machine learning domains, including graph-based link prediction. Planetoid (Yang et al., 2016), GraIL (Teru et al., 2019), and GraphSAGE (Hamilton et al., 2017) are notable methods for inductive link prediction that rely on neighborhood link information and exploit topological shortcuts. DEAL (Hao et al., 2021) combines topological information and node attributes for link prediction in both transductive and inductive settings. SEG (Ai et al., 2022) employs a one-layer GCN for topology encoding and an MLP on node attributes, improving transductive performance. Recent challenges like ILPC (Galkin et al., 2022) have spurred the development of state-of-the-art inductive models, such as CascadER (Safavi et al., 2022) and Inductive NodePiece (Galkin et al., 2021).

Node attributes play a crucial role in graph stream problems, dynamic network research (Jiang et al., 2015; Li et al., 2018), and cold-start scenarios (Gantner et al., 2010; Li et al., 2021). While pre-training has been used in dynamic network research (Shao et al., 2022) and cold-start problems (Liu et al., 2023; Hao et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2022), it has primarily focused on training GNN model parameters rather than node attributes. Our method, *UPNA*, introduces pre-training for node attributes using large corpora, enabling generalizable embeddings. By integrating *UPNA* into existing models for link prediction in dynamic networks and cold-start problems, we enhance their generalizability.

8 Conclusion and Future Work

Our work derives motivation from the tendency of link prediction models to harness the train graph’s topology, yielding outstanding performance in transductive tests. We have underscored the significance of inductive link prediction, devising a prediction framework for both static and temporal graphs. We have observed a notable decline in the performance of state-of-the-art link prediction models when confronted with the challenges of inductive tests. Astonishingly, their performance often pales in comparison to that of a simple MLP operating solely on the node attributes.

To provide a theoretical underpinning for inductive link prediction, we have delved into the intrinsic relationship between the shared information of node attributes and the graph topology. Additionally, we have crafted a method to quantify the quality of node attributes and conducted empirical experiments that demonstrate the exceptional suitability of pre-trained node attributes in enhancing generalizability for link prediction and capturing the intricate nuances of graph generation.

Moving forward, *UPNA* can be extended by integrating pre-trained node attributes into multiple state-of-the-art link prediction models, aiming to achieve improved overall performance in link prediction. Moreover, we intend to incorporate the Davies-Bouldin score of node attributes into the pre-training objective function, facilitating the attainment of optimal pre-training outcomes. Lastly, delving into the impact of the training corpus size for pre-trained node attributes on inductive link prediction performance will further enrich our understanding of the hypotheses put forth by Erhan et al. regarding unsupervised pre-training (Erhan et al., 2010).

In summary, *UPNA* stands as a powerful tool capable of selecting the most fitting node attributes to enhance the generalizability of link prediction models for newly arrived nodes, while concurrently elevating the capabilities of graph generative models.

Our software and information about the data used in the experiments are at <https://github.com/ChatterjeeAyan/UPNA>.

References

- Lada A Adamic and Eytan Adar. 2003. Friends and neighbors on the Web. *Social Networks* 25, 3 (July 2003), 211–230. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-8733\(03\)00009-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-8733(03)00009-1)
- Florian Adriaens, Alexandru Mara, Jeffrey Lijffijt, and Tijn De Bie. 2020. Block-Approximated Exponential Random Graphs. In *2020 IEEE 7th International Conference on Data Science and Advanced Analytics (DSAA)*. IEEE, Sydney, Australia, 70–80. <https://doi.org/10.1109/dsaa49011.2020.00019>
- Baole Ai, Zhou Qin, Wenting Shen, and Yong Li. 2022. Structure Enhanced Graph Neural Networks for Link Prediction. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2201.05293>
- Ehsaneddin Asgari and Mohammad R. K. Mofrad. 2015. Continuous Distributed Representation of Biological Sequences for Deep Proteomics and Genomics. *PLOS ONE* 10, 11 (Nov. 2015), e0141287. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0141287>
- A Bairoch. 1996. The SWISS-PROT protein sequence data bank and its new supplement TREMBL. *Nucleic Acids Research* 24, 1 (Jan. 1996), 21–25. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/24.1.21>
- Brian Ball and M.E.J. Newman. 2013. Friendship networks and social status. *Network Science* 1, 1 (apr 2013), 16–30. <https://doi.org/10.1017/nws.2012.4>
- Albert-László Barabási. 2016. *Network Science*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Albert-László Barabási and Réka Alber. 1999. Emergence of Scaling in Random Networks. *Science* 286, 5439 (Oct. 1999), 509–512. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.286.5439.509>
- Avrim Blum and Tom Mitchell. 1998. Combining labeled and unlabeled data with co-training. In *Proceedings of the eleventh annual conference on Computational learning theory - COLT' 98*. ACM Press, Madison Wisconsin, USA, 92–100. <https://doi.org/10.1145/279943.279962>
- Stephen Bonner, Ufuk Kirik, Ola Engkvist, Jian Tang, and Ian P Barrett. 2022. Implications of topological imbalance for representation learning on biomedical knowledge graphs. *Briefings in Bioinformatics* 23, 5 (07 2022), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bib/bbac279> arXiv:https://academic.oup.com/bib/article-pdf/23/5/bbac279/45937607/sup_main_bbac279.pdf bbac279.
- Stéphane Boucheron, Gábor Lugosi, and Pascal Massart. 2013. 83Basic Information Inequalities. In *Concentration Inequalities: A Nonasymptotic Theory of Independence*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, England. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199535255.003.0004> arXiv:<https://academic.oup.com/book/0/chapter/195073150/chapter-pdf/43899191/acprof-9780199535255-chapter-04.pdf>
- Shaosheng Cao, Wei Lu, and Qiongkai Xu. 2015. GraRep: Learning Graph Representations with Global Structural Information. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM International on Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (Melbourne, Australia) (CIKM '15)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 891–900. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2806416.2806512>
- Ayan Chatterjee, Robin Walters, Zohair Shafi, Omair Shafi Ahmed, Michael Sebek, Deisy Gysi, Rose Yu, Tina Eliassi-Rad, Albert-László Barabási, and Giulia Menichetti. 2023. Improving the generalizability of protein-ligand binding predictions with AI-Bind. *Nature Communications* 14, 1 (April 2023), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-37572-z>

- Xu Chen, Siheng Chen, Huangjie Zheng, Jiangchao Yao, Kenan Cui, Ya Zhang, and Ivor W. Tsang. 2019. Node Attribute Generation on Graphs. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1907.09708>
- David L. Davies and Donald W. Bouldin. 1979. A Cluster Separation Measure. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* PAMI-1, 2 (April 1979), 224–227. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tpami.1979.4766909>
- Vijay Prakash Dwivedi, Chaitanya K. Joshi, Anh Tuan Luu, Thomas Laurent, Yoshua Bengio, and Xavier Bresson. 2020. Benchmarking Graph Neural Networks. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2003.00982>
- Dumitru Erhan, Yoshua Bengio, Aaron Courville, Pierre-Antoine Manzagol, Pascal Vincent, and Samy Bengio. 2010. Why Does Unsupervised Pre-training Help Deep Learning? *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 11, 19 (2010), 625–660. <http://jmlr.org/papers/v11/erhan10a.html>
- Maurizio Ferrari Dacrema, Paolo Cremonesi, and Dietmar Jannach. 2019. Are We Really Making Much Progress? A Worrying Analysis of Recent Neural Recommendation Approaches. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems* (Copenhagen, Denmark) (*RecSys '19*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 101–109. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3298689.3347058>
- Mikhail Galkin, Max Berrendorf, and Charles Tapley Hoyt. 2022. An Open Challenge for Inductive Link Prediction on Knowledge Graphs. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2203.01520>
- Mikhail Galkin, Etienne Denis, Jiapeng Wu, and William L. Hamilton. 2021. NodePiece: Compositional and Parameter-Efficient Representations of Large Knowledge Graphs. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2106.12144>
- Zeno Gantner, Lucas Drumond, Christoph Freudenthaler, Steffen Rendle, and Lars Schmidt-Thieme. 2010. Learning Attribute-to-Feature Mappings for Cold-Start Recommendations. In *2010 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining*. IEEE, Sydney, Australia, 176–185. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDM.2010.129>
- A. Gaulton, L. J. Bellis, A. P. Bento, J. Chambers, M. Davies, A. Hersey, Y. Light, S. McGlinchey, D. Michalovich, B. Al-Lazikani, and J. P. Overington. 2011. ChEMBL: a large-scale bioactivity database for drug discovery. *Nucleic Acids Research* 40, D1 (Sept. 2011), D1100–D1107. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkr777>
- Amir Ghasemian, Homa Hosseinmardi, Aram Galstyan, Edoardo M. Airolidi, and Aaron Clauset. 2020. Stacking models for nearly optimal link prediction in complex networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 117 (2020), 23393–23400. Issue 38. <https://www.pnas.org/doi/pdf/10.1073/pnas.1914950117>
- M. Girvan and M. E. J. Newman. 2002. Community structure in social and biological networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 99, 12 (June 2002), 7821–7826. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.122653799>
- Aditya Grover and Jure Leskovec. 2016. Node2vec: Scalable Feature Learning for Networks. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining* (San Francisco, California, USA) (*KDD '16*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 855–864. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2939672.2939754>
- William L. Hamilton, Rex Ying, and Jure Leskovec. 2017. Inductive Representation Learning on Large Graphs. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1706.02216>
- Bowen Hao, Hongzhi Yin, Jing Zhang, Cuiping Li, and Hong Chen. 2023. A Multi-Strategy-Based Pre-Training Method for Cold-Start Recommendation. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* 41, 2, Article 31 (jan 2023), 24 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3544107>

- Yu Hao, Xin Cao, Yixiang Fang, Xike Xie, and Sibó Wang. 2021. Inductive Link Prediction for Nodes Having Only Attribute Information. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI'20)*. ACM, Yokohama, Yokohama, Japan, Article 168, 7 pages.
- Petter Holme and Jari Saramäki. 2012. Temporal networks. *Physics Reports* 519, 3 (oct 2012), 97–125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2012.03.001>
- Weihua Hu, Matthias Fey, Marinka Zitnik, Yuxiao Dong, Hongyu Ren, Bowen Liu, Michele Catasta, and Jure Leskovec. 2020. Open Graph Benchmark: Datasets for Machine Learning on Graphs. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2005.00687>
- Kexin Huang, Tianfan Fu, Lucas M Glass, Marinka Zitnik, Cao Xiao, and Jimeng Sun. 2020a. DeepPurpose: a deep learning library for drug–target interaction prediction. *Bioinformatics* 36, 22-23 (Dec. 2020), 5545–5547. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btaa1005>
- Kexin Huang, Cao Xiao, Lucas M Glass, and Jimeng Sun. 2020c. MolTrans: Molecular Interaction Transformer for drug–target interaction prediction. *Bioinformatics* 37, 6 (Oct. 2020), 830–836. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btaa880>
- Qian Huang, Horace He, Abhay Singh, Ser-Nam Lim, and Austin R. Benson. 2020b. Combining Label Propagation and Simple Models Out-performs Graph Neural Networks. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2010.13993>
- John J. Irwin, Teague Sterling, Michael M. Mysinger, Erin S. Bolstad, and Ryan G. Coleman. 2012. ZINC: A Free Tool to Discover Chemistry for Biology. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling* 52, 7 (June 2012), 1757–1768. <https://doi.org/10.1021/ci3001277>
- Sabrina Jaeger, Simone Fulle, and Samo Turk. 2018. Mol2vec: Unsupervised Machine Learning Approach with Chemical Intuition. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling* 58, 1 (Jan. 2018), 27–35. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jcim.7b00616>
- Maosheng Jiang, Yonxiang Chen, and Ling Chen. 2015. Link Prediction in Networks with Nodes Attributes by Similarity Propagation. arXiv:1502.04380 [cs.SI]
- Wengong Jin, Regina Barzilay, and Tommi Jaakkola. 2020. Hierarchical Generation of Molecular Graphs Using Structural Motifs. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML'20)*. JMLR.org, Vienna, Austria, Article 449, 10 pages.
- Thorsten Joachims. 1999. Transductive Inference for Text Classification Using Support Vector Machines. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML '99)*. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., San Francisco, CA, USA, 200–209.
- István A. Kovács, Katja Luck, Kerstin Spirohn, Yang Wang, Carl Pollis, Sadie Schlabach, Wenting Bian, Dae-Kyum Kim, Nishka Kishore, Tong Hao, Michael A. Calderwood, Marc Vidal, and Albert-László Barabási. 2019. Network-based prediction of protein interactions. *Nature Communications* 10, 1 (March 2019), 1240–1248. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-09177-y>
- Ajay Kumar, Shashank Sheshar Singh, Kuldeep Singh, and Bhaskar Biswas. 2020. Link prediction techniques, applications, and performance: A survey. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 553 (Sept. 2020), 124289. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2020.124289>
- Srijan Kumar, William L. Hamilton, Jure Leskovec, and Dan Jurafsky. 2018. Community Interaction and Conflict on the Web. In *Proceedings of the 2018 World Wide Web Conference (Lyon, France) (WWW '18)*. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee, Republic and Canton of Geneva, CHE, 933–943. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3178876.3186141>
- T. Jaya Lakshmi and S. Durga Bhavani. 2021. Link Prediction Approach to Recommender Systems. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2102.09185>
- Jundong Li, Kewei Cheng, Liang Wu, and Huan Liu. 2018. Streaming Link Prediction on Dynamic Attributed Networks. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining (Marina Del Rey, CA, USA) (WSDM '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 369–377. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3159652.3159674>

- Shijun Li, Wenqiang Lei, Qingyun Wu, Xiangnan He, Peng Jiang, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2021. Seamlessly Unifying Attributes and Items: Conversational Recommendation for Cold-Start Users. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* 39, 4, Article 40 (aug 2021), 29 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3446427>
- David Liben-Nowell and Jon Kleinberg. 2007. The link-prediction problem for social networks. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 58, 7 (2007), 1019–1031. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.20591>
- Zemin Liu, Xingtong Yu, Yuan Fang, and Xinming Zhang. 2023. GraphPrompt: Unifying Pre-Training and Downstream Tasks for Graph Neural Networks. arXiv:2302.08043 [cs.LG]
- Oriol Lordan and Jose M. Sallan. 2020. Dynamic measures for transportation networks. *PLOS ONE* 15, 12 (Dec. 2020), e0242875. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0242875>
- Jingsong Lv, Zhao Li, Hongyang Chen, Yao Qi, and Chunqi Wu. 2022. Path-aware Siamese Graph Neural Network for Link Prediction. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2208.05781>
- J. B. MacQueen. 1967. Some Methods for Classification and Analysis of MultiVariate Observations. *Proc. of the fifth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability* 1 (1967), 281–297.
- Ivan Maksimov, Rodrigo Rivera-Castro, and Evgeny Burnaev. 2020. Addressing Cold Start in Recommender Systems with Hierarchical Graph Neural Networks. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2009.03455>
- Alexandru Cristian Mara, Jefrey Lijffijt, and Tijl De Bie. 2022. An Empirical Evaluation of Network Representation Learning Methods. *Big Data* 3:X (March 2022), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1089/big.2021.0107>
- Alexandru Cristian Mara, Jefrey Lijffijt, and Tijl de Bie. 2020. Benchmarking Network Embedding Models for Link Prediction: Are We Making Progress?. In *2020 IEEE 7th International Conference on Data Science and Advanced Analytics (DSAA)*. IEEE, Sydney, Australia, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1109/dsaa49011.2020.00026>
- Giulia Menichetti. 2022. An AI pipeline to investigate the binding properties of poorly annotated molecules. *Nature Reviews Physics* 4, 6 (May 2022), 359–359. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42254-022-00471-1>
- Giulia Menichetti, Daniel Remondini, Pietro Panzarasa, Raúl J. Mondragón, and Ginestra Bianconi. 2014. Weighted Multiplex Networks. *PLoS ONE* 9, 6 (June 2014), e97857. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0097857>
- Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. 2013. Efficient Estimation of Word Representations in Vector Space. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1301.3781>
- Maximilian Nickel, Kevin Murphy, Volker Tresp, and Evgeniy Gabrilovich. 2016. A Review of Relational Machine Learning for Knowledge Graphs. *Proc. IEEE* 104, 1 (jan 2016), 11–33. <https://doi.org/10.1109/jproc.2015.2483592>
- Giuliano Andrea Pagani and Marco Aiello. 2011. The Power Grid as a Complex Network: a Survey. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1105.3338>
- Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher Manning. 2014. GloVe: Global Vectors for Word Representation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Doha, Qatar, 1532–1543. <https://doi.org/10.3115/v1/D14-1162>
- Bryan Perozzi, Rami Al-Rfou, and Steven Skiena. 2014. DeepWalk: Online Learning of Social Representations. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (New York, NY, USA) (KDD '14)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 701–710. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2623330.2623732>

- Yanjun Qi, Ziv Bar-Joseph, and Judith Klein-Seetharaman. 2006. Evaluation of different biological data and computational classification methods for use in protein interaction prediction. *Proteins: Structure, Function, and Bioinformatics* 63, 3 (Jan. 2006), 490–500. <https://doi.org/10.1002/prot.20865>
- Filippo Radicchi, Claudio Castellano, Federico Cecconi, Vittorio Loreto, and Domenico Parisi. 2004. Defining and identifying communities in networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 101, 9 (Feb. 2004), 2658–2663. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0400054101>
- M. Rosvall, D. Axelsson, and C. T. Bergstrom. 2009. The map equation. *The European Physical Journal Special Topics* 178, 1 (Nov. 2009), 13–23. <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjst/e2010-01179-1>
- Tara Safavi, Doug Downey, and Tom Hope. 2022. CascadER: Cross-Modal Cascading for Knowledge Graph Link Prediction. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2205.08012>
- Ingo Scholtes, Nicolas Wider, and Antonios Garas. 2016. Higher-order aggregate networks in the analysis of temporal networks: path structures and centralities. *The European Physical Journal B* 89, 3 (mar 2016), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjb/e2016-60663-0>
- Shai Shalev-Shwartz and Shai Ben-David. 2014. *Understanding Machine Learning - From Theory to Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, New York, USA. I–XVI, 1–397 pages.
- Zezhi Shao, Zhao Zhang, Fei Wang, and Yongjun Xu. 2022. Pre-Training Enhanced Spatial-Temporal Graph Neural Network for Multivariate Time Series Forecasting. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (Washington DC, USA) (KDD '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1567–1577. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3534678.3539396>
- Chence Shi, Minkai Xu, Zhaocheng Zhu, Weinan Zhang, Ming Zhang, and Jian Tang. 2020. GraphAF: a Flow-based Autoregressive Model for Molecular Graph Generation. arXiv:2001.09382 [cs.LG]
- Martin Simonovsky and Nikos Komodakis. 2018. GraphVAE: Towards Generation of Small Graphs Using Variational Autoencoders. arXiv:1802.03480 [cs.LG]
- Zachary Stanfield, Mustafa Coşkun, and Mehmet Koyutürk. 2017. Drug Response Prediction as a Link Prediction Problem. *Scientific Reports* 7, 1 (Jan. 2017), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep40321>
- Andrew Stolman, Caleb Levy, C. Seshadhri, and Aneesh Sharma. 2022. Classic Graph Structural Features Outperform Factorization-Based Graph Embedding Methods on Community Labeling. In *Proceedings of the 2022 SIAM International on Conference on Data Mining (SDM)*. SIAM, Alexandria, VA, USA, 388–396. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.08481>
- Chuxiong Sun, Jie Hu, Hongming Gu, Jinpeng Chen, and Mingchuan Yang. 2020. Adaptive Graph Diffusion Networks. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2012.15024>
- Jian Tang, Meng Qu, Mingzhe Wang, Ming Zhang, Jun Yan, and Qiaozhu Mei. 2015. LINE: Large-Scale Information Network Embedding. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on World Wide Web (Florence, Italy) (WWW '15)*. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee, Republic and Canton of Geneva, CHE, 1067–1077. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2736277.2741093>
- Komal K. Teru, Etienne Denis, and William L. Hamilton. 2019. Inductive Relation Prediction by Subgraph Reasoning. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1911.06962>
- Nguyen Xuan Vinh, Julien Epps, and James Bailey. 2010. Information Theoretic Measures for Clusterings Comparison: Variants, Properties, Normalization and Correction for Chance. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 11 (dec 2010), 2837–2854.
- Daixin Wang, Peng Cui, and Wenwu Zhu. 2016. Structural Deep Network Embedding. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD)*. ACM, San Francisco, CA, USA, 1225–1234. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2939672.2939753>

- Kuansan Wang, Zhihong Shen, Chiyuan Huang, Chieh-Han Wu, Yuxiao Dong, and Anshul Kanakia. 2020. Microsoft Academic Graph: When experts are not enough. *Quantitative Science Studies* 1, 1 (Feb. 2020), 396–413. https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00021
- Minjie Wang, Da Zheng, Zihao Ye, Quan Gan, Mufei Li, Xiang Song, Jinjing Zhou, Chao Ma, Lingfan Yu, Yu Gai, Tianjun Xiao, Tong He, George Karypis, Jinyang Li, and Zheng Zhang. 2019a. Deep Graph Library: A Graph-Centric, Highly-Performant Package for Graph Neural Networks. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1909.01315>
- Minjie Wang, Da Zheng, Zihao Ye, Quan Gan, Mufei Li, Xiang Song, Jinjing Zhou, Chao Ma, Lingfan Yu, Yu Gai, Tianjun Xiao, Tong He, George Karypis, Jinyang Li, and Zheng Zhang. 2019b. Deep Graph Library: A Graph-Centric, Highly-Performant Package for Graph Neural Networks. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1909.01315>
- Yiqi Wang, Chaozhuo Li, Zheng Liu, Mingzheng Li, Jiliang Tang, Xing Xie, Lei Chen, and Philip S. Yu. 2022. An Adaptive Graph Pre-Training Framework for Localized Collaborative Filtering. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* 41, 2, Article 43 (dec 2022), 27 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3555372>
- Zhitao Wang, Yong Zhou, Litao Hong, Yuanhang Zou, Hanjing Su, and Shouzhi Chen. 2021. Pairwise Learning for Neural Link Prediction. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2112.02936>
- Aolin Xu and Maxim Raginsky. 2017. Information-theoretic analysis of generalization capability of learning algorithms. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1705.07809>
- Hansheng Xue, Luwei Yang, Wen Jiang, Yi Wei, Yi Hu, and Yu Lin. 2020. Modeling Dynamic Heterogeneous Network for Link Prediction Using Hierarchical Attention with Temporal RNN. In *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases: European Conference, ECML PKDD 2020, Ghent, Belgium, September 14–18, 2020, Proceedings, Part I* (Ghent, Belgium). Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 282–298. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-67658-2_17
- Jaewon Yang, Julian McAuley, and Jure Leskovec. 2013. Community Detection in Networks with Node Attributes. <https://doi.org/10.1109/icdm.2013.167>
- Zhilin Yang, William W. Cohen, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2016. Revisiting Semi-Supervised Learning with Graph Embeddings. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1603.08861>

Appendix

A Topological Sense Features

Table 5: In the context of ogbl-ddi, we examine the factors that significantly impact the test performance of link prediction. Our findings reveal that the node degree (represented by k) and the triangle count (Δ) for each node emerge as the most influential contributors. Additionally, we consider the local clustering coefficient (CC) and the betweenness centrality (C_B) as higher-order network properties. To conduct our analysis, we utilize the established benchmark train-validation-test split from OGB, ensuring a standardized evaluation setup.

Features	AUROC	AUPRC
$k+CC+\Delta+C_B$	1.0	0.99
$CC+\Delta+C_B$	0.98	0.98
$CC+C_B$	0.57	0.62

B Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. Using Corollary 4.15 in (Boucheron et al., 2013) for the duality of the entropy of general random variables, we can write the following measure-theoretic bounds:

$$I(E; w) = \sup_{\mu} \left\{ \int_{\mu} L(w) d\mu - \log \int_E \exp(L(w)) de \right\} \quad (6)$$

Now, replacing the integrals with expectations and replacing the supremum with \geq , we get:

$$I(E; w) \geq \mathbf{E}[\lambda L_{\mu}(w)] - \log \mathbf{E}[e^{\lambda L_E(w)}] \geq \lambda(\mathbf{E}[L_{\mu}(w)] - \mathbf{E}[L_E(w)]) - \frac{\lambda^2 \sigma^2}{2}, \quad (7)$$

where $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}$ and the second step is derived from the subgaussian nature of $L(w)$ (see Appendix D for the empirical validation of the subgaussian nature of the loss function in link prediction):

$$\log \mathbf{E}[e^{\lambda(L_E(w) - \mathbf{E}[L_E(w)])}] \leq \frac{\lambda^2 \sigma^2}{2}, \forall \lambda \in \mathbf{R} \quad (8)$$

The inequality in Equation 7 generates a non-negative parabola in λ , which has a non-positive discriminant. Thus, we get:

$$|\mathbf{E}[L_{\mu}(w)] - \mathbf{E}[L_E(w)]| \leq \sqrt{2\sigma^2 I(E; w)} \quad (9)$$

□

C Random Node Split on OGB for Inductive Tests

Our investigation reveals a notable discrepancy between the random node split and random edge split methods in terms of the number of lost edges. Specifically, the random node split approach exhibits considerably fewer lost edges. Leveraging this insight, we adopt the random node split method to construct inductive tests for the OGB link prediction datasets. To provide a comprehensive overview, we present the statistics regarding the number of nodes in Table 6 and the number of edges in Table 7 for each of the undirected link prediction datasets. These tables offer valuable insights into the dataset characteristics and facilitate a thorough understanding of the experimental setup.

Table 6: Number of nodes in different OGB datasets for inductive tests.

Dataset	Train Nodes	Validation Nodes	Test Nodes
ogbl-ppa	461,031	57,629	57,629
ogbl-collab	188,694	23,587	23,587
ogbl-ddi	3,413	427	427

Table 7: Edges in OGB link prediction datasets for inductive tests.

Dataset	Train Edges	Validation Edges	Test Edges	Edges lost
ogbl-ppa	19,460,915	296,195	303,563	10,265,600
ogbl-collab	821,974	12,739	12,826	437,926
ogbl-ddi	864,478	13,869	11,433	445,109

D Subgaussian nature of the loss function in link prediction

We delve into an empirical investigation of the subgaussian nature exhibited by the loss function employed in the link prediction model on the subreddit network. The subgaussianity of the loss function leads to the formulation of Eq. 7, which, in turn, enables the derivation of the parabolic form depicted in Eq. 8. Our analysis, as showcased in Figure 6, demonstrates that the loss function during the training phase of the link prediction model decays at a more rapid pace than the Gaussian tail characterized by $L = Ae^{-\sigma x^2}$, where we determine $A = 0.78$ and $\sigma = 0.001$ through an exponential fit. Consequently, we can ascertain that the loss function exhibits a subgaussian nature with a parameter of $\sigma = 0.001$.




Figure 6: The loss function in link prediction decays faster than a Gaussian tail, creating a subgaussian behavior.