

CatGCN: Graph Convolutional Networks with Categorical Node Features

Weijian Chen,¹ Fuli Feng*,² Qifan Wang,³ Xiangnan He,¹
Chonggang Song,⁴ Guohui Ling,⁴ Yongdong Zhang¹

¹ University of Science and Technology of China

² National University of Singapore

³ Google Research

⁴ Tencent Technology

naure@mail.ustc.edu.cn, fulifeng93@gmail.com, wqfcr@google.com, xiangnanhe@gmail.com,
jerrygcsong@tencent.com, randyling@tencent.com, zhyd73@ustc.edu.cn

Abstract

Recent studies on Graph Convolutional Networks (GCNs) reveal that the initial node representations (i.e., the node representations before the first-time graph convolution) largely affect the final model performance. However, when learning the initial representation for a node, most existing work linearly combines the embeddings of node features, without considering the interactions among the features (or feature embeddings). We argue that when the node features are categorical, e.g., in many real-world applications like user profiling and recommender system, feature interactions usually carry important signals for predictive analytics. Ignoring them will result in suboptimal initial node representation and thus weaken the effectiveness of the follow-up graph convolution. In this paper, we propose a new GCN model named CatGCN, which is tailored for graph learning on categorical node features. Specifically, we integrate two ways of explicit interaction modeling into the learning of initial node representation, i.e., local interaction modeling on each pair of node features and global interaction modeling on an artificial feature graph. We then refine the enhanced initial node representations with the neighborhood aggregation-based graph convolution. We train CatGCN in an end-to-end fashion and demonstrate it on semi-supervised node classification. Extensive experiments on three tasks of user profiling (the prediction of user age, city, and purchase level) from Tencent and Alibaba datasets validate the effectiveness of CatGCN, especially the positive effect of performing feature interaction modeling before graph convolution.

1 Introduction

GCNs have become a promising technique in various applications, such as recommender system (Ying et al. 2018; He et al. 2020), user profiling (Rahimi, Cohn, and Baldwin 2018; Chen et al. 2019) and text mining (Yao, Mao, and Luo 2019). The main idea of graph convolution is to relate the representations of nodes based on the graph structure s.t. connected nodes should have similar representations, which can be seen as enforcing the smoothness constraint in the representation space. For example, the standard GCN (Kipf

and Welling 2017) performs layer-wise representation relating as:

$$\mathbf{H}^{(l+1)} = \sigma(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{H}^{(l)}\mathbf{W}^{(l)}), \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{H}^{(l)}$ is the node representation matrix of the l -th layer, $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ is the normalized graph adjacency matrix, and $\mathbf{W}^{(l)}$ is the weight matrix of the l -th layer (i.e., trainable model parameters of GCN). The $\mathbf{H}^{(0)}$ matrix stores the input features of nodes, e.g., the frequency of words of a document node. We term $\mathbf{H}^{(0)}\mathbf{W}^{(0)}$ as the *initial node representation*, which performs linear transformation on the input features of each node and obtains a representation for the follow-up graph convolution operation.

Assuming the input node features are categorical, the feature matrix $\mathbf{H}^{(0)}$ is then high-dimensional yet sparse, in which each non-zero entry denotes the categorical feature value of a node. We can then understand the initial representation of a node (i.e., a row vector of $\mathbf{H}^{(0)}\mathbf{W}^{(0)}$) as linearly combining the embedding vectors of the node’s categorical features (i.e., the row vectors of $\mathbf{W}^{(0)}$). With such a linear combination, the interactions among feature embeddings are not considered. Although the weight matrices of the following layers (e.g., $\mathbf{W}^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{W}^{(2)}$) may capture some interactions, the process is rather implicit and ineffective for learning cross feature effects (He and Chua 2017; Wang et al. 2017).

Recently, Klicpera et al. (Klicpera, Bojchevski, and Günnemann 2019) propose a new GCN model named APPNP by decoupling the feature transformation and neighborhood aggregation, which are originally tied in each graph convolution layer in GCN (Kipf and Welling 2017) and many other variants (Velickovic et al. 2018; Hamilton, Ying, and Leskovec 2017; Feng et al. 2020). The APPNP first uses a conventional neural network on node features to obtain a representation vector (the same size as the label space) for each node; it then performs *pure neighborhood aggregation* — with no weight matrices and other trainable parameters — to refine the representation vector for prediction. The strong performance of APPNP inspires us to believe that the better the initial node representation is, the more benefits the follow-up graph convolution (or equivalently, neighborhood aggregation) can achieve. This is because that, the ben-

*Corresponding author

efits brought by neighborhood aggregation and feature transformation are orthogonal — one exploits the signal from a node’s neighbors whereas the other mostly depends on the features of a node itself. As such, if better (e.g., more discriminative) representation for a node can be obtained by leveraging its input features, the performance after neighborhood aggregation should be better.

Although much effort has been devoted to inventing new GCN models, they mostly focus on graph convolution operations (Klicpera, Bojchevski, and Günnemann 2019; Wu et al. 2019b). To our knowledge, seldom research has considered improving the ability of GCN from the perspective of initial node representation, especially for categorical node features. In fact, many real-world applications have categorical features as raw data more commonly than continuous features, which are mostly restricted to multimedia content like images and videos. For example, in recommender systems, nodes are users and items that are normally described by user demographics (age, gender, interest tags) and item profiles (category, brand, etc.); in search engines, nodes are queries and documents that are described by bag-of-words or n-grams. For such categorical features, the interactions among features — e.g., the co-occurrence of multiple features — could contain important signal on the node’s properties (He and Chua 2017; Wang et al. 2017; Cheng et al. 2016). However, most GCNs apply a simple sum of feature embeddings as the initial node representation, which we believe is insufficient to model feature interactions and results in suboptimal node representation.

In this work, we explore how improved representation learning from categorical node features benefits GCN. We propose a new model named CatGCN, which integrates two kinds of explicit feature interactions into initial node representation learning: 1) local multiplication-based interaction on each pair of node features, and 2) global addition-based interaction on an artificial feature graph. We prove that in the artificial feature graph, performing one graph convolution layer with tunable self-connections can capture the interactions among all features. We then feed the enhanced initial node representations into a simplified/light GCN (Wu et al. 2019b; He et al. 2020) that performs neighborhood aggregation only to exploit the graph structure for node representation learning. The CatGCN is end-to-end trainable, such that all parameters in the initial node representation learning, and follow-up graph convolution and prediction layers can be optimized towards the final task.

The contributions of the paper are summarized as follows:

- We emphasize the importance of tailoring GCNs for categorical node features, especially by modeling the interactions among features before graph convolution.
- We propose CatGCN, which performs two kinds of feature interaction modeling to enhance the initial node representations.
- We conduct experiments on user profiling tasks on large-scale datasets, verifying the positive effect of performing feature interaction modeling before graph convolution.

2 Methodology

We describe our method under the setting of semi-supervised node classification (Kipf and Welling 2017), whereas the idea is generally applicable to GCNs for other tasks like link prediction (He et al. 2020; Zhang and Chen 2018) and community detection (Chen, Li, and Bruna 2019). The graph structure is represented as an adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{R}^{N \times N}$ where N is the number of nodes. The main consideration of our work is that, each node u in the graph is described by **categorical features** $\mathbf{x}_u \in \mathcal{R}^d$ (d is the number of total features) where an entry $x_i^u = 0$ means the i -th feature value does not exist in the node (e.g., a female user cannot have “male” in her feature values). For a categorical feature vector \mathbf{x}_u , we denote the set of nonzero features as $\mathbb{S}_u = \{i | x_i^u \neq 0\}$.

2.1 Overall framework

The target of CatGCN is to improve initial node representations by explicitly incorporating the interactions of categorical features in a lightweight and efficient manner. As illustrated in Figure 1, CatGCN separately exploits the categorical features of a node itself and the signal from its neighbors. In particular, CatGCN first learns initial node representation \mathbf{h}_u from its categorical features \mathbf{x}_u with dedicated interaction modeling (detailed in Section 2.2). CatGCN then performs *pure neighborhood aggregation* (PNA) over the graph structure, which is formulated as:

$$\mathbf{Y} = PNA(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{H}, L), \quad \tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \hat{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{I}, \quad (2)$$

where \mathbf{H} and $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times C}$ denote the initial node representations and final node representations with L -hop neighbor aggregated. Here, C is the number of prediction classes, $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ is the adjacency matrix \mathbf{A} with self-loops added (corresponding to the identity matrix \mathbf{I}). $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ is normalized by node degrees which are organized into a diagonal degree matrix \mathbf{D} . Along the development of graph convolution operations, the L -hop neighborhood aggregation is either implemented in an iterative manner with L repeats of $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{H}^{(l-1)}$ ($\mathbf{H}^0 = \mathbf{H}$) (Kipf and Welling 2017), or implemented in a simplified manner $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}^L\mathbf{H}$ where $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}^L$ is calculated as a pre-processing (Wu et al. 2019b). Following the principle of lightweight design, CatGCN adopts the simplified implementation to avoid the memory overhead of storing intermediate variables and the repeated computation during training.

Similar as standard GCNs, CatGCN is learned in an end-to-end manner by optimizing an objective function:

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{u \in U} l(\mathbf{g}_u, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_u) + \eta \|\Theta\|_F^2, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_u = \text{softmax}(\mathbf{y}_u), \quad (3)$$

where $l(\cdot)$ is a classification loss such as cross-entropy (Kipf and Welling 2017) over the training node set U . The final node representation \mathbf{y}_u of node u is normalized to be a distribution over prediction labels $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_u$. The one-hot vector $\mathbf{g}_u \in \mathcal{R}^C$ denotes the ground-truth of node u . Θ represents all model parameters, and η is a hyper-parameter to balance the effect of loss and regularization. In the following, the subscript u is omitted for the brevity of notations.




Figure 1: The framework of CatGCN where an example node is taken to demonstrate the procedure of computing the initial node representation. Here, the feature number (d), embedding size (D), and prediction classes are set as 10, 6, and 4, respectively.

2.2 Interaction modeling of categorical features

Inspired by the effectiveness of explicit feature interaction modeling (Rendle 2010; He and Chua 2017; Chen and Guestrin 2016) in predictive analytics with categorical features, CatGCN focuses on improving the quality of initial node representations \mathbf{h} via feature interaction modeling. To thoroughly capture feature interactions, our first belief is that separately modeling the feature interactions of different forms is essential since they convey different signals. Here, we consider the feature interactions of two forms: 1) local interaction between feature pair; and 2) global interaction amongst the whole feature set \mathbb{S} . Although much effort has been devoted to modeling local feature interactions (Rendle 2010; Xiao et al. 2017; He and Chua 2017), seldom research has considered the modeling of global interactions.

To bridge this gap, CatGCN integrates both local and global interactions into initial node representation learning. Specifically, as shown in Figure 1, CatGCN first projects the categorical features into feature embeddings, *i.e.*, $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \mathcal{E} = \{\mathbf{e}_i | i \in \mathbb{S}\}^1$, so as to capture the relative relations among features in the embedding space. Note that $\mathbf{e}_i \in \mathcal{R}^D$ denotes the embedding of categorical feature i . Upon the feature embeddings, CatGCN explicitly models the local interaction and global interaction with multiplication-based operation and addition-based operation, respectively. Lastly, CatGCN is equipped with a fusion module to unify the benefits from both local and global interactions.

Local interaction modeling. For local feature interaction modeling, effective feature combinations can be mined to enrich input information. For example, people with pairwise feature $gender_age = \{male, 20-25\}$ are more likely to be digital enthusiasts. This combination of features is more discriminating than either $gender = \{male\}$ or $age = \{20-25\}$ alone. The multiplication operation has been widely used to

¹ Note that each categorical feature in \mathbb{S} is associated with the same node, and their weight can be regarded as 1, so the embedding weight in the following formulas is omitted. In cases where features come with non-binary weights, they can be used to multiply the corresponding embeddings as a preprocessing operation here.

capture the correlation between entities in various tasks such as machine translation (Vaswani et al. 2017), recommendation system (Rendle 2010), and text classification (Feng et al. 2020). In this way, local feature interactions are typically formulated as the element-wise product of feature embeddings. A representative operation is the bilinear interaction pooling (He and Chua 2017), which is formulated as:

$$\mathbf{h}_l = \sum_{i, j \in \mathbb{S} \ \& \ j > i} \mathbf{e}_i \odot \mathbf{e}_j = \frac{1}{2} \left[\left(\sum_{i \in \mathbb{S}} \mathbf{e}_i \right)^2 - \sum_{i \in \mathbb{S}} (\mathbf{e}_i)^2 \right], \quad (4)$$

which performs element-wise product on each pair of (different) feature embeddings, and sums all pair-products up. \mathbf{h}_l denotes the initial node representation learned through local feature interaction modeling. Directly executing the operation has a quadratic time complexity w.r.t. the feature number (*i.e.*, $O(|\mathbb{S}|^2)$), which can be reduced to linear complexity $O(|\mathbb{S}|)$ with an equivalent reformulation (see the above equation). This is an appealing property of bi-interaction pooling, which models pairwise interactions but with a linear complexity. After this operation, we can obtain more useful interactive features, specifically, $|\mathbb{S}|$ categorical features can be extended to $|\mathbb{S}|(|\mathbb{S}| - 1)/2$, which enriched the available information and was obviously of great value to the sparse features. Note that one can also perform high-order interaction modeling in a similar way (Blondel et al. 2016), but the complexity increases polynomially and might be numerically unstable, so we do not further explore it here.

Global interaction modeling. The purpose of global interaction modeling is to capture the node peculiarity information related to the predicted target. In real scenarios, the categorical features associated with a node are often diverse, potentially reflecting the different peculiarities of the node. For instance, a user’s purchase history includes laptops, cell-phones, drones, running shoes, and sportswear, which indicates the peculiarity information of digital products and sports. Such peculiarities can be closely related to the prediction target, *e.g.*, digital products indicates the user is a “digital enthusiast”. Therefore, we need to filter out the latent peculiarities from the feature set \mathbb{S} to facilitate the pre-

diction. Recall that every feature in \mathbb{S} is represented by an embedding, the structure of the features in the embedding space (e.g., clusters) can be important for mining the latent peculiarities (i.e., global interactions). Therefore, we use an artificial graph (\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{E}) to represent the structure of these features where $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbb{S}| \times |\mathbb{S}|}$ is the adjacency matrix and $\mathbf{E} \in \mathcal{R}^{|\mathbb{S}| \times D}$ includes the embeddings of features in \mathbb{S} . As all features in \mathbb{S} have inherent connections (e.g., co-occurrence), the artificial graph is thus a complete graph by natural, and the adjacency matrix \mathbf{P} is an all-ones matrix (with self-loops). Aiming to capture the global interactions, graph convolution is conducted over the graph. Formally,

$$\mathbf{h}_g = p(\sigma(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}\mathbf{E}\mathbf{W})), \quad \tilde{\mathbf{P}} = \mathbf{Q}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{P} + \rho\mathbf{O})\mathbf{Q}^{-\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{\mathbf{P} + \rho\mathbf{O}}{|\mathbb{S}| + \rho}, \quad (5)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}$ is the normalized adjacency matrix with probe coefficient ρ . $\mathbf{Q} = (|\mathbb{S}| + \rho)\mathbf{O}$ is the degree matrix of artificial graph while \mathbf{O} is identity matrix. \mathbf{h}_g denotes the initial node representation learned through global feature interaction modeling. \mathbf{W} is the weight matrix; $\sigma(\cdot)$ is an activation function such as ReLU; $p(\cdot)$ is a pooling function such as mean pooling to aggregate the global interactions across features. It should be noted that we model global interactions with only one graph convolution layer, which can largely reduce the memory and computation cost. This is because one layer can achieve the equivalent effect of multiple layers.

Theorem. *On graph $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}$, K -hop neighborhood aggregation equals to a 1-hop aggregation with smaller ρ . Formally,*

$$\left(\frac{\mathbf{P} + \rho_1\mathbf{O}}{|\mathbb{S}| + \rho_1}\right)^K = \frac{\mathbf{P} + \rho_2\mathbf{O}}{|\mathbb{S}| + \rho_2}, \quad \rho_1 \geq \rho_2 \geq 0, \quad (6)$$

$$\rho_2 = \frac{\rho_1^K}{\sum_{i=0}^{K-1} C_K^i \rho_1^i |\mathbb{S}|^{K-1-i}}. \quad (7)$$

Rationality. In addition to heuristically understanding the global interactions as feature clusters in the embedding space, we present a more rigorous understanding from the spectral view. As to the artificial graph, the normalized graph Laplacian $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{O} - \tilde{\mathbf{P}} = \mathbf{O} - \mathbf{Q}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{P} + \rho\mathbf{O})\mathbf{Q}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. \mathbf{L} is a symmetric semi-definite matrix and can be decomposed into the form of $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{U}^\top$, where $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbb{S}| \times |\mathbb{S}|}$ is the matrix composed of orthogonal eigenvectors and $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \text{diag}(\lambda_i, 1 \leq i \leq |\mathbb{S}|)$ is a diagonal matrix of its eigenvalues. The spectral convolutions on graphs are defined as:

$$\mathbf{g} * \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{U}((\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{g}) \odot (\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{s})) = \mathbf{U}\hat{\mathbf{G}}\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{s}, \quad (8)$$

where $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbb{S}|}$ denotes a signal to be transformed (each column of \mathbf{E}); \mathbf{g} denotes a filter; and $\hat{\mathbf{G}} = \text{diag}(\hat{g}(\lambda_i), 1 \leq i \leq |\mathbb{S}|)$ represents the diagonal matrix consisting of the spectral filter coefficients $\hat{g}(\lambda_i)$. Functionally, the eigenvalues represent the graph frequencies, and the signal \mathbf{s} can project (decompose) into the frequency subspaces via the Fourier transform $\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{s}$.

For our implementation, $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}\mathbf{E} = (\mathbf{O} - \mathbf{L})\mathbf{E} = (\mathbf{O} - \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{U}^\top)\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{O} - \mathbf{\Lambda})\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{E}$. Thus, for a specific frequency λ_i , its spectral filter coefficient $\hat{g}(\lambda_i) = (1 - \lambda_i)$. Note that the eigenvalues (filter frequencies) of \mathbf{L} are $\lambda_1 = 0$

Dataset	Attribute	Class	Node	Feature	Edge
Tencent	age	7	51,378	309	64,514
Alibaba	purchase	3	166,958	2,820	14,614,182
	city	4			

Table 1: Statistics of the datasets.

and $\lambda_2 = |\mathbb{S}|/(|\mathbb{S}| + \rho)$ ($|\mathbb{S}| - 1$ multiplicities), and the corresponding spectral filter coefficients are 1 and $\rho/(|\mathbb{S}| + \rho)$, respectively. Here, the filter frequency of $\lambda_1 = 0$ preserves the original input information, while $\lambda_2 = |\mathbb{S}|/(|\mathbb{S}| + \rho)$ is adjustable, which can filter out the global interaction signal². That is, we can find the frequency λ_2 where the global interaction signal exists by adjusting probe coefficient ρ . Therefore, it is essential to introduce a probe coefficient ρ into the graph convolution to capture global interactions from the artificial graph. It should be noted that when $\rho = 0$, the corresponding filter coefficients of λ_1 and λ_2 are 1 and 0 and thus cannot make \mathbf{h}_g contain global interactions.

Node representation fusion. Aiming to thoroughly exploit the benefit from both local feature interactions and global feature interactions, CatGCN fuses \mathbf{h}_l and \mathbf{h}_g into an overall node representation \mathbf{h} through an aggregation layer. As aforementioned, $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{R}^C$ is the input of the pure neighborhood aggregation and required to be in the label space. As such, the aggregation layer is also responsible for projecting the representation into label space. Here we perform a late fusion strategy, which adds the two interacted representations after projecting them into the label space:

$$\mathbf{h} = \alpha\mathbf{h}'_g + (1-\alpha)\mathbf{h}'_l, \quad \mathbf{h}'_g = \sigma(\mathbf{W}_g\mathbf{h}_g + \mathbf{b}_g), \quad \mathbf{h}'_l = \sigma(\mathbf{W}_l\mathbf{h}_l + \mathbf{b}_l), \quad (9)$$

where $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ is a hyper-parameter to balance the influence of local and global interaction modeling, \mathbf{W}_g and \mathbf{W}_l are projection matrices. Note that we can take multiple fully connected layers here to enhance the expressiveness of the projection while ensuring the last one's output dimension is consistent with the predicted classes.

2.3 Discussion

Relation with Fi-GNN. Fi-GNN (Li et al. 2019) is a click-through rate (CTR) prediction framework adopting GNN module, which also models the global addition-based interaction on an artificial feature graph. Fi-GNN adopts graph attention to model the structure of the feature graph, which dynamically calculates the strength of connections for each edge in the graph. However, as pointed out in (Knyazev, Taylor, and Amer 2019), graph attention is not suitable for this situation which lacks supervised training on attention weights and is hard to find optimal initialization, leading to inferior performance. Moreover, Fi-GNN further stacks edge information transmission mechanism and recurrent embedding updating mechanism, which poses great challenge on model training, e.g., unaffordable computation

² In order to ensure the consistency of the global detection frequency, we need to fix the size of $|\mathbb{S}|$, that is, we need to sample a fixed number of features for each node.

Dataset Methods	Tencent-age		Alibaba-purchase		Alibaba-city	
	Accuracy	Macro-F ₁	Accuracy	Macro-F ₁	Accuracy	Macro-F ₁
GCN	0.2014(+24.6%)	0.1586(+20.2%)	0.4420(+25.9%)	0.3904(+14.9%)	0.2648(+30.6%)	0.2585(+9.2%)
GAT	0.2347(+ 6.9%)	0.1740(+ 9.5%)	0.4677(+19.0%)	0.4238(+ 5.8%)	0.3313(+ 4.4%)	0.2779(+1.5%)
GraphSAGE	0.2386(+ 5.2%)	0.1769(+ 7.7%)	0.4863(+14.4%)	0.4174(+ 7.4%)	0.2895(+19.4%)	0.2719(+3.8%)
APPNP	0.2472(+ 1.5%)	0.1822(+ 4.4%)	0.4860(+14.5%)	0.3939(+13.8%)	0.3066(+12.8%)	0.2692(+4.8%)
SGC	0.2411(+ 4.1%)	0.1777(+ 7.3%)	0.4832(+15.1%)	0.4167(+ 7.6%)	0.2880(+20.1%)	0.2717(+3.9%)
CrossGCN	0.2238(+12.1%)	0.1721(+10.7%)	0.3980(+39.8%)	0.3593(+24.8%)	0.3114(+11.0%)	0.2776(+1.7%)
CatGCN(ours)	0.2509	0.1906	0.5564	0.4484	0.3458	0.2822

Table 2: Node classification performance of all compared methods.

and memory cost and severe overfitting. By contrast, CatGCN models global feature interactions in a very concise manner, which has the same complexity as a standard fully-connected layer (see Table 3 for an in-depth comparison).

Relation with APPNP. To best of our knowledge, APPNP (Klicpera, Bojchevski, and Günnemann 2019) is the first method that decouples the feature transformation and neighborhood aggregation in GCN layers. The target of APPNP is to alleviate the over-smoothing issue of deep GCN models which can lose focus at the upper layers. Instead of resolving over-smoothing, CatGCN focuses on enhancing the initial node representation which is a dual perspective. More specifically, CatGCN enhances the node representation through integrating two kinds of explicit interactions between categorical features, which has not been studied before. Further experimental results show that if APPNP unitizes our scheme to obtain the initial node representation, it will bring significant performance improvements (see Figure 2 for details).

3 Experiments

Datasets. In order to investigate the actual performance of the model, we select three large-scale node classification datasets from real scenes. **Tencent-age**³ is a social network graph with the target of predicting the user’s age level. Here, categorical node features are user-preferred items, such as celebrities and famous organizations. **Alibaba-purchase** and **Alibaba-city**⁴ (Zhou et al. 2018) are also user profiling tasks on an e-commerce platform user graph, where the consumption level and city level are the prediction labels, respectively. In this scenario, each user node is described by categorical features of the categories of the products that users have clicked on. Statistics for both datasets are shown in Table 1 (see Appendix for more details). For each dataset, we randomly select 80%, 10%, and 10% of the user nodes to form the training, validation, and testing, respectively.

Baseline models. We compare CatGCN with several recent GCN models, including the classical methods GCN (Kipf and Welling 2017), GAT (Velickovic et al. 2018), GraphSAGE (Hamilton, Ying, and Leskovec 2017) and the latest state-of-the-art models APPNP (Klicpera, Bojchevski, and Günnemann 2019), SGC (Wu et al. 2019b) and CrossGCN (Feng et al. 2020). For all

aforementioned models, we re-implemented them using PyTorch Geometric (Fey and Lenssen 2019), which have consistent or even better performance than the original paper. Our implementations are available at <https://github.com/TachiChan/CatGCN>.

Parameter settings. For all models, the dimension of the categorical feature embedding layer and the size of all hidden layers are set to 64 for fair comparison. All trainable parameters are initialized with the Xavier method (Glorot and Bengio 2010) and optimized with Adam (Kingma and Ba 2015). We apply grid search strategy for hyper-parameters: the learning rate is tuned among $\{0.1, 0.01, 0.001\}$, the L_2 regularization coefficient is searched in the range of $\{1e^{-5}, 1e^{-4}, \dots, 1e^{-1}, 0.0\}$, and dropout ratio is tuned in $\{0.0, 0.1, \dots, 0.9\}$. For all baseline methods, their node representations are aggregated from the node’s associated categorical features in the way of mean pooling. For CatGCN, we take ReLU as the activation function σ , and tune the aggregation parameter α within $\{0.0, 0.1, \dots, 0.9, 1.0\}$. For each node, we sample a fixed number of categorical features from \mathbb{S} to accelerate the model training, which is set to 10 in our experiment. In all cases we adopt an early stopping strategy on the validation set with a patience of 10 epochs, and report the testing *Accuracy* and *Macro-F₁* (Chen et al. 2019; Wu et al. 2019a).

3.1 Overall performance comparison

Table 2 shows the testing performance of all compared methods on the three datasets. From the table, we have the following observations:

- In all cases, CatGCN outperforms all baselines with a significant gain of 12.23% on average, which is attributed to incorporating both the local and global feature interactions into the initial node representations. As such, this result validates the rationality of explicit interaction modeling of categorical features in GCN models.
- GAT performs better than the standard GCN, which shows the benefit of graph attention in these tasks. CatGCN may also achieve better performance if enable the usage of graph attention in its PNA module, which is discarded purely for the consideration of computation cost.
- Many SOTA models fail to achieve ideal performance, and none of them can deliver consistently superior performance across all tasks. Note that in Alibaba-city task, GAT exceeds all the benchmark schemes, indicating that

³<https://www.kaggle.com/c/kddcup2012-track1>

⁴<https://tianchi.aliyun.com/dataset/dataDetail?dataId=56>




Figure 2: Impacts of feature interaction modeling.




Figure 3: Impacts of pure neighborhood aggregation.

the adjacent nodes in the dataset may not meet the similarity, which is also a common phenomenon in real scenes. Existing models are designed from the perspective of neighborhood aggregation on the graph, so it is difficult to maintain stable performance in complex scenarios.

- Our feature interaction modeling is equivalent to adding two types of valuable input information to the initial node representation, one is the combination features, and the other is the global peculiarity information. This approach can increase the distinction of node representation and thus alleviate the interference caused by the noisy edge. The corresponding experimental results strongly support this claim (CatGCN consistently exceeds all baselines).

3.2 Ablation study of CatGCN

To further validate the rationality of our model design, we separately test the feature interaction modeling modules and the pure neighborhood aggregation module. To save space, we omit the results *w.r.t.* Accuracy, which have the similar trend as *Macro-F₁*.

Impacts of feature interaction modeling. We equip APPNP with the feature interaction modeling part of CatGCN (i.e., the local and global interaction modeling), which is named as Cat-APPNP. Figure 2 shows the performance of standard APPNP, Cat-APPNP, SGC, and CatGCN (i.e., Cat-SGC). Note that SGC is equivalent to CatGCN without feature interaction modeling. As can be seen, Cat-APPNP and Cat-SGC significantly outperforms the corresponding APPNP and SGC, which further validates the effectiveness of enhancing initial node representation in GCN models and the advantages of modeling categorical features interactions.

Furthermore, we develop two variants of CatGCN by removing the global and local interaction modeling mechanisms, which are named CatGCN_L and CatGCN_G, respectively. Figure 3 shows the performance of CatGCN_L, CatGCN_G, and CatGCN (see blue line), where the best result

performance across all baselines is also depicted for better comparison (see grey line). It can be seen that removing any interaction modeling module from CatGCN will lead to performance degradation. At the same time, both variants outperform or rival all benchmark models. Therefore, both local and global interaction modeling mechanisms are effective for node representation learning, and their roles may be complementary. In addition, we can see that different variants competing on different tasks, which may be related to the different importance of local and global interaction information for different tasks. Note that if we look only at the feature interaction modeling part, our design can be understood as a plug-and-play framework that can be seamlessly integrated with the existing GNN models (e.g., Cat-APPNP).

Impacts of pure neighborhood aggregation. In order to analyze the role of neighborhood aggregation, we remove the PNA module of CatGCN and its two variants CatGCN_L and CatGCN_G. The corresponding result is shown in Figure 3. The dotted line represents the variation without using the pure neighborhood aggregation (i.e., without PNA). The comparison results show that neighborhood aggregation can effectively utilize the network structure to optimize the node representations even if there are no training parameters available, which proves that it can not be ignored in the graph convolution models.

3.3 In-depth analysis on global interaction modeling

To justify the advantages of global interaction modeling, we further study the impacts of probe coefficient (ρ) and perform in-depth comparison between CatGCN and Fi-GNN.

Impacts of probe coefficient (ρ). We first study how the probe coefficient influence the effectiveness of global feature interaction modeling. Figure 4 shows the performance of CatGCN_G as adjusting the probe coefficient ρ from 1 to 30. Note that we test CatGCN_G so as to avoid the interference of local interaction modeling. Moreover, CatGCN_G is




Figure 4: Performance of CatGCN.G ($L=1$) as adjusting the probe coefficient ρ on Alibaba-city task.

set to $L=1$ without stacking multiple fully connected layers. From the figure, we can observe that: 1) the performance of CatGCN.G varies in a large range (0.246-0.268), which indicates the importance of integrating global peculiarity signal; 2) when ρ exceeds 21, the increase is relatively obvious, indicating that the frequency of global peculiarity signal λ_2 is around here under current settings; 3) the performance remains at a high level at $\rho \in [22, 30]$, possibly because the variation of λ_2 in this numerical interval is very limited ($\lambda_2 = |\mathbb{S}|/(|\mathbb{S}| + \rho)$).

Comparisons with Fi-GNN. To demonstrate the superiority of our design in modeling the global feature interactions, we further compare CatGCN with Fi-GNN w.r.t. performance, GPU memory usage and average time per epoch. For fair comparison, we adopt the same PNA module on the node representation outputted by the interaction modeling mechanism of Fi-GNN (named Fi-SGC). Due to the huge computational overhead of Fi-SGC’s feature interaction modeling mechanism, it still cannot directly run on our dataset, which has a large number of categorical features. To tackle this issue, we let Fi-SGC share the field-specific weight matrix to reduce the memory requirements. Even so, the Fi-SGC can only be tested on Tencent dataset, while it will run out of memory on Alibaba dataset. The experiment results of Tencent dataset are shown in Table 3. From the table, we can find the hand-crafted design of Fi-GNN doesn’t obtain higher performance. The complex design of the Fi-GNN not only consumes a lot of memory and increases computation time, but also results in performance degradation (compared to SGC). As a comparison, Cat-SGC (i.e., CatGCN) requires about half GPU memory usage and time cost, while significantly improving performance.

4 Related Work

Graph convolutional networks. Graph convolutional networks have recently made remarkable achievements in a series of tasks such as node classification (Kipf and Welling 2017), link prediction (Zhang and Chen 2018), and community detection (Chen, Li, and Bruna 2019). Through coupling feature transformation and neighborhood aggregation, node features and graph structures are encoded simultaneously on each graph convolution layer, which ensures their ability to integrate information on the graph. To further improve the capability of graph convolutional networks,

Methods	Accuracy	Macro-F1	Memory usage	Time cost
SGC	0.2411	0.1777	989MB	0.03s
Fi-SGC	0.2234	0.1719	4053MB	0.11s
Cat-SGC	0.2509	0.1906	2421MB	0.06s
CatGCN.G	0.2476	0.1873	2295MB	0.05s

Table 3: Comparison with Fi-GNN on Tencent-age task. The testing platform is a Nvidia 2080Ti GPU with an Intel Core i9-9900X CPU (3.70GHz).

some strategies are proposed, such as introducing attention mechanisms to distinguish the node contribution (Velickovic et al. 2018), performing node sampling to increase the model scalability (Hamilton, Ying, and Leskovec 2017; Chen, Ma, and Xiao 2018; Gao, Wang, and Ji 2018), and simplifying the model framework to reduce the computational cost (Wu et al. 2019b). Our work continues the idea of APPNP (Klicpera, Bojchevski, and Günnemann 2019), which implies the separation of feature transformation and neighborhood aggregation is a better choice. We have made an in-depth exploration of the categorical node features, and the proposed framework CatGCN can well adapt to such graph data and obtain the most advanced performance.

Feature interaction modeling. Feature interactions are critical for revealing intrinsic peculiarity of the node that features affiliated, and they have been extensively explored, especially in real-world applications such as recommendation systems. The local feature interaction can help enrich valid feature information, and its effectiveness has been verified in several works (Rendle 2010; Juan et al. 2016; Xiao et al. 2017). On the other hand, plenty of researches (Qu et al. 2016; Xin et al. 2019; Wang et al. 2017) has illustrated the importance of global feature interaction modeling. Further studies (Guo et al. 2017; Lian et al. 2018) demonstrate that the combination of different levels of information can result in improved performance. Recently, with the rise of graph representation learning, the method of using graph neural network to model feature interactions has appeared, which achieves a good performance in the click-through rate prediction task (Li et al. 2019). In our work, we design two different mechanisms to learn the above different levels of information for the categorical node features. Specifically, for local interactions, we absorb the existing mature work bi-interaction pooling (He and Chua 2017), while for global interactions, we design a specific graph convolutional network based on the nature of categorical feature interactions. The proposed model that combines these two mechanisms achieves optimal performance while remaining lightweight.

5 Conclusions

For the scenario of graph learning with categorical node features, we propose a novel GCN model named CatGCN. By designing local and global feature interaction modeling mechanisms explicitly, our proposed model can fully exploit the information of categorical features, and further integrate their advantages through differentiated aggregation, thus achieving significant improvement in multiple tasks on three large public datasets. Our proposed model has two cat-like strengths: lightweight (our design can achieve excellent

performance with few parameters) and flexibility (the feature interaction modeling part can be seamlessly integrated with the existing GNN models to enhance their performance). Therefore, the proposed model has great potential in various real-world applications. In the future, we will incorporate more neighborhood aggregation techniques into CatGCN such as the graph attention and edge dropout (Velickovic et al. 2018). At the same time, we will consider applying CatGCN to more practical applications, such as the recommender system (Wang et al. 2019), which might be an interesting direction.

Ethical Impact

The categorical node feature’s graph is ubiquitous in real life, so the detailed research on it has significant practical significance. At the same time, CatGCN is a general framework, which can learn the superior representation of nodes in such data structure, so it can also be applied to many other downstream tasks, not only the node classification in our paper. Considering the breadth of application scenarios and the diversity of applicable tasks, our proposed model can inspire many aspects of work, such as recommender systems, natural language processing, and medical drug molecular design. However, due to the wide adaptability of CatGCN, it may cause some moral dilemmas in some practical scenarios, as the user profiling task in our paper may involve a violation of user privacy. Nevertheless, we cannot ignore its positive significance. If it can be used to assist in the design of an effective drug molecule, it will bring the hope of health recovery to thousands of people suffering from diseases. We believe that the positive effects of our approach will far outweigh the negative ones, so we are looking forward to the fact that this approach will inspire broader research and bring more practical value.

References

- Blondel, M.; Fujino, A.; Ueda, N.; and Ishihata, M. 2016. Higher-order factorization machines. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 3351–3359.
- Chen, J.; Ma, T.; and Xiao, C. 2018. FastGCN: Fast Learning with Graph Convolutional Networks via Importance Sampling. In *ICLR*.
- Chen, T.; and Guestrin, C. 2016. XGBoost: A Scalable Tree Boosting System. In *KDD*, 785–794.
- Chen, W.; Gu, Y.; Ren, Z.; He, X.; Xie, H.; Guo, T.; Yin, D.; and Zhang, Y. 2019. Semi-supervised User Profiling with Heterogeneous Graph Attention Networks. In *IJCAI*, 2116–2122.
- Chen, Z.; Li, L.; and Bruna, J. 2019. Supervised Community Detection with Line Graph Neural Networks. In *ICLR*.
- Cheng, H.; Koc, L.; Harmsen, J.; Shaked, T.; Chandra, T.; Aradhye, H.; Anderson, G.; Corrado, G.; Chai, W.; Ispir, M.; Anil, R.; Haque, Z.; Hong, L.; Jain, V.; Liu, X.; and Shah, H. 2016. Wide & Deep Learning for Recommender Systems. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Deep Learning for Recommender Systems, DLRS@RecSys*, 7–10.
- Feng, F.; He, X.; Zhang, H.; and Chua, T. 2020. Cross-GCN: Enhancing Graph Convolutional Network with k-Order Feature Interactions. *CoRR* abs/2003.02587.
- Fey, M.; and Lenssen, J. E. 2019. Fast Graph Representation Learning with PyTorch Geometric. In *ICLR Workshop on Representation Learning on Graphs and Manifolds*.
- Gao, H.; Wang, Z.; and Ji, S. 2018. Large-Scale Learnable Graph Convolutional Networks. In *KDD*, 1416–1424.
- Glorot, X.; and Bengio, Y. 2010. Understanding the difficulty of training deep feedforward neural networks. In *AISTATS*, 249–256.
- Guo, H.; Tang, R.; Ye, Y.; Li, Z.; and He, X. 2017. DeepFM: A Factorization-Machine based Neural Network for CTR Prediction. In *IJCAI*, 1725–1731.
- Hamilton, W. L.; Ying, Z.; and Leskovec, J. 2017. Inductive Representation Learning on Large Graphs. In *NeurIPS*, 1025–1035.
- He, X.; and Chua, T. 2017. Neural Factorization Machines for Sparse Predictive Analytics. In *SIGIR*, 355–364.
- He, X.; Deng, K.; Wang, X.; Li, Y.; Zhang, Y.; and Wang, M. 2020. LightGCN: Simplifying and Powering Graph Convolution Network for Recommendation. In *SIGIR*.
- Juan, Y.; Zhuang, Y.; Chin, W.; and Lin, C. 2016. Field-aware Factorization Machines for CTR Prediction. In *RecSys*, 43–50.
- Kingma, D. P.; and Ba, J. 2015. Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization. In *ICLR*.
- Kipf, T. N.; and Welling, M. 2017. Semi-Supervised Classification with Graph Convolutional Networks. In *ICLR*.
- Klicpera, J.; Bojchevski, A.; and Günnemann, S. 2019. Predict then propagate: Graph neural networks meet personalized pagerank. In *ICLR*.
- Knyazev, B.; Taylor, G. W.; and Amer, M. 2019. Understanding Attention and Generalization in Graph Neural Networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 4204–4214.
- Li, Z.; Cui, Z.; Wu, S.; Zhang, X.; and Wang, L. 2019. FiGNN: Modeling Feature Interactions via Graph Neural Networks for CTR Prediction. In *CIKM*, 539–548. ACM.
- Lian, J.; Zhou, X.; Zhang, F.; Chen, Z.; Xie, X.; and Sun, G. 2018. xDeepFM: Combining Explicit and Implicit Feature Interactions for Recommender Systems. In *KDD*, 1754–1763.
- Qu, Y.; Cai, H.; Ren, K.; Zhang, W.; Yu, Y.; Wen, Y.; and Wang, J. 2016. Product-Based Neural Networks for User Response Prediction. In *ICDM*, 1149–1154.
- Rahimi, A.; Cohn, T.; and Baldwin, T. 2018. Semi-supervised User Geolocation via Graph Convolutional Networks. In *ACL*, 2009–2019.
- Rendle, S. 2010. Factorization Machines. In *ICDM*, 995–1000.

Vaswani, A.; Shazeer, N.; Parmar, N.; Uszkoreit, J.; Jones, L.; Gomez, A. N.; Kaiser, L.; and Polosukhin, I. 2017. Attention is All you Need. In *NeurIPS*, 5998–6008.

Velickovic, P.; Cucurull, G.; Casanova, A.; Romero, A.; Liò, P.; and Bengio, Y. 2018. Graph Attention Networks. In *ICLR*.

Wang, R.; Fu, B.; Fu, G.; and Wang, M. 2017. Deep & Cross Network for Ad Click Predictions. In *ADKDD*, 12:1–12:7. ACM.

Wang, X.; He, X.; Wang, M.; Feng, F.; and Chua, T. 2019. Neural Graph Collaborative Filtering. In *SIGIR*, 165–174.

Wu, C.; Wu, F.; Liu, J.; He, S.; Huang, Y.; and Xie, X. 2019a. Neural Demographic Prediction using Search Query. In *WSDM*, 654–662.

Wu, F.; Jr., A. H. S.; Zhang, T.; Fifty, C.; Yu, T.; and Weinberger, K. Q. 2019b. Simplifying Graph Convolutional Networks. In *ICML*, 6861–6871.

Xiao, J.; Ye, H.; He, X.; Zhang, H.; Wu, F.; and Chua, T. 2017. Attentional Factorization Machines: Learning the Weight of Feature Interactions via Attention Networks. In *IJCAI*, 3119–3125.

Xin, X.; Chen, B.; He, X.; Wang, D.; Ding, Y.; and Jose, J. 2019. CFM: Convolutional Factorization Machines for Context-Aware Recommendation. In *IJCAI*, 3926–3932.

Yao, L.; Mao, C.; and Luo, Y. 2019. Graph Convolutional Networks for Text Classification. In *AAAI*, 7370–7377.

Ying, R.; He, R.; Chen, K.; Eksombatchai, P.; Hamilton, W. L.; and Leskovec, J. 2018. Graph Convolutional Neural Networks for Web-Scale Recommender Systems. In *KDD (Data Science track)*, 974–983.

Zhang, M.; and Chen, Y. 2018. Link Prediction Based on Graph Neural Networks. In *NeurIPS*, 5171–5181.

Zhou, G.; Zhu, X.; Song, C.; Fan, Y.; Zhu, H.; Ma, X.; Yan, Y.; Jin, J.; Li, H.; and Gai, K. 2018. Deep Interest Network for Click-Through Rate Prediction. In *KDD*, 1059–1068.

A Proof of Theorem

This theorem can be proved by using mathematical induction twice. We prove the upper half (i.e., formula 6) of this theorem, and the proof of the lower part (i.e., formula 7) is based on the first one.

Proof of formula 6. The normalized adjacency matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}$ of the categorical feature artificial graph is a symmetric matrix, whose elements $(\{\tilde{P}_{ij} | 1 \leq i, j \leq |\mathcal{S}|\})$ have such forms:

$$\tilde{P}_{ij} = \begin{cases} \frac{1 + \rho_1}{|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_1}, & i = j, \\ \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_1}, & i \neq j. \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

Now we prove that the K -power of this matrix satisfies formula 6.

• $K = 2$. The quadratic power of $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}$, i.e., $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^2$, has the entries of:

$$\tilde{P}_{ij}^2 = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{1 + \rho_1}{|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_1} \right)^2 + \frac{|\mathcal{S}| - 1}{(|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_1)^2} \\ = \frac{\rho_1^2 + 2\rho_1 + |\mathcal{S}|}{(|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_1)^2} = \frac{1 + \rho_2}{|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_2}, & i = j, \\ 2 \left(\frac{1 + \rho_1}{|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_1} \right) \left(\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_1} \right) + \frac{|\mathcal{S}| - 2}{(|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_1)^2} \\ = \frac{2\rho_1 + |\mathcal{S}|}{(|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_1)^2} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_2}, & i \neq j, \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

where $\rho_2 = \frac{\rho_1^2}{|\mathcal{S}| + 2\rho_1}$ and $\rho_2 \leq \rho_1$. That is to say, by setting the probe coefficient ρ with a small value ρ_2 , performing 1-hop propagation is equivalent to a 2-hop propagation with probe coefficient of ρ_1 .

• $K > 2$. We assume that the formula 6 is correct for $K = k$, that is, we assume that $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^k$ has the diagonal elements $(1 + \rho_k)/(|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_k)$ and the remaining values $1/(|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_k)$. Under this induction assumption, we must prove that the formula 6 is true for its successor, $K = k + 1$. Based on $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^{k+1} = \tilde{\mathbf{P}}^k \tilde{\mathbf{P}}$ and the above induction assumption, the element \tilde{P}_{ij}^{k+1} of $(k + 1)$ -power of $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}$ equals:

$$\begin{cases} \left(\frac{1 + \rho_k}{|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_k} \right) \left(\frac{1 + \rho_1}{|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_1} \right) + \frac{|\mathcal{S}| - 1}{(|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_k)(|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_1)} \\ = \frac{\rho_k \rho_1 + \rho_k + \rho_1 + |\mathcal{S}|}{(|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_k)(|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_1)}, & i = j, \\ \left(\frac{1 + \rho_k}{|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_k} \right) \left(\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_1} \right) + \left(\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_k} \right) \left(\frac{1 + \rho_1}{|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_1} \right) \\ + \frac{|\mathcal{S}| - 2}{(|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_k)(|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_1)} \\ = \frac{\rho_k + \rho_1 + |\mathcal{S}|}{(|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_k)(|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_1)}, & i \neq j. \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

Now, we need to prove:

$$\tilde{P}_{ij}^{k+1} = \begin{cases} \frac{1 + \rho_{k+1}}{|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_{k+1}}, & i = j, \\ \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_{k+1}}, & i \neq j. \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

Combine formula 12 and 13, we can calculate the probe coefficient ρ_{k+1} that satisfies the formula 6, as follows:

$$\rho_{k+1} = \frac{\rho_k \rho_1}{|\mathcal{S}| + \rho_k + \rho_1} \leq \rho_k. \quad (14)$$

We have now fulfilled both conditions of the principle of mathematical induction. The formula 6 is therefore true for every natural number K . In other words, performing a 1-hop propagation over the graph can achieve the same effect as performing a K -hop propagation.

Proof of formula 7. We follow the same principle to prove the formula. First, according to the inferred value of ρ_2 above, it's easy to find that the formula 7 is true when $K = 2$, as follows:

$$\rho_2 = \frac{\rho_1^2}{|\mathcal{S}| + 2\rho_1} = \frac{\rho_1^2}{\sum_{i=0}^{2-1} C_2^i \rho_1^i |\mathcal{S}|^{2-1-i}}. \quad (15)$$

Next, we assume that the formula 7 is correct for $K = k$, formally:

$$\rho_k = \frac{\rho_1^k}{\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} C_k^i \rho_1^i |\mathcal{S}|^{k-1-i}}. \quad (16)$$

With this assumption, we must show that the rule is true for its successor, $K = k + 1$. Based on the conclusion of formula 14 and formula 16 above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{k+1} &= \frac{\rho_k \rho_1}{|\mathbb{S}| + \rho_k + \rho_1} \\ &= \frac{\rho_1^{k+1}}{\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} C_k^i \rho_1^{i+1} |\mathbb{S}|^{k-1-i} + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} C_k^i \rho_1^i |\mathbb{S}|^{k-i} + \rho_1^k} \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Now, we need to prove:

$$\rho_{k+1} = \frac{\rho_1^{k+1}}{\sum_{i=0}^k C_{k+1}^i \rho_1^i |\mathbb{S}|^{k-i}} \quad (18)$$

Based on the property of combination number, namely, $C_{k+1}^i = C_k^i + C_k^{i-1}$, we can derive the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^k C_{k+1}^i \rho_1^i |\mathbb{S}|^{k-i} &= \sum_{i=0}^k (C_k^i + C_k^{i-1}) \rho_1^i |\mathbb{S}|^{k-i} \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^k C_k^i \rho_1^i |\mathbb{S}|^{k-i} + \sum_{t=1}^k C_k^{t-1} \rho_1^t |\mathbb{S}|^{k-t} \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} C_k^i \rho_1^i |\mathbb{S}|^{k-i} + \rho_1^k + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} C_k^i \rho_1^{i+1} |\mathbb{S}|^{k-i-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Therefore, we can draw the conclusion that the formula 7 is correct for $K = k + 1$. The formula 7 is therefore true for every natural number K .

B Datasets

To evaluate the performance of our model CatGCN, we use two large publicly available datasets from the e-commerce platform Alibaba and social networking platform Tencent. Both datasets have rich categorical features of users and relations between users.

Tencent. This dataset is provided by the social networking platform Tencent Weibo, which includes users' preferences for a variety of items (*e.g.*, celebrities, organizations, and groups). We choose these items as the categorical features of user nodes. In our processing, if one user have followed the item i , we set $x_i = 1$, otherwise $x_i = 0$. In this way, we can obtain the multi-hot categorical features $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}^d$ of this user node, where $d = 309$ in this dataset. Although this dataset is provided for the recommendation task, it also provides information about the user age attribute, from which we selected over fifty thousands of users to perform the user profiling node classification task. Meanwhile, users of social platforms will interact with others in a series of ways, such as thumb up, comment, and forwarding, which leads to straightforward interconnections between users. In our experiment, we use the "follow" relationship to establish edges between user nodes. Note that the difference between the followed and following are ignored in our processing, that is, the edges we create are undirected.

Alibaba. This is a dataset of click-through rates for display ads on Alibaba's Taobao platform. In this scenario, we

choose the categories of products as the categorical features affiliated to user nodes. Particularly, if user have clicked products belonging to the category i , we set $x_i = 1$, otherwise $x_i = 0$. Thus, we acquire the user categorical features $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}^d$ with dimensions $d = 2820$ in Alibaba dataset. For our user profiling task, we screen two user attributes, namely purchase, and city, corresponding to consumption level and city level where the user lives. Since there is no correlation like "follow" between users in the e-commerce platform, we establish the relationship between users based on co-click. In other words, if users jointly click the same product, we establish an edge between the two user nodes. Naturally, the edges between users established through this common behavior are undirected.