

Graph Representation Learning in Biomedicine

Michelle M. Li^{1,3}, Kexin Huang², and Marinka Zitnik^{3,4,5,*}

¹Bioinformatics and Integrative Genomics Program, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA 02115, USA

²Health Data Science Program, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA 02115, USA

³Department of Biomedical Informatics, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA 02115, USA

⁴Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Cambridge, MA 02142, USA

⁵Harvard Data Science Initiative, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA

*Correspondence: marinka@hms.harvard.edu

Abstract

Biomedical networks are universal descriptors of systems of interacting elements, from protein interactions to disease networks, all the way to healthcare systems and scientific knowledge. With the remarkable success of representation learning in providing powerful predictions and insights, we have witnessed a rapid expansion of representation learning techniques into modeling, analyzing, and learning with such networks. In this review, we put forward an observation that long-standing principles of networks in biology and medicine—while often unspoken in machine learning research—can provide the conceptual grounding for representation learning, explain its current successes and limitations, and inform future advances. We synthesize a spectrum of algorithmic approaches that, at their core, leverage graph topology to embed networks into compact vector spaces, and capture the breadth of ways in which representation learning is proving useful. Areas of profound impact include identifying variants underlying complex traits, disentangling behaviors of single cells and their effects on health, assisting in diagnosis and treatment of patients, and developing safe and effective medicines.

1 Introduction

Networks (or graphs) are pervasive in biology and medicine, from molecular interaction maps to population-scale social and health interactions. Depending on the type of information encoded in a network, the implications of an “interaction” between two entities can differ. For instance, edges in a protein-protein interaction (PPI) network can indicate physical interactions measured by yeast two-hybrid screens [97, 135]; edges in a regulatory network can indicate causal activating and inhibitory relationships between genes [117]; and edges in an electronic health record (EHR) knowledge network can indicate co-occurrences of medical codes in health records [66, 124, 129]. Because capturing interactions in such complex systems gives rise to a bewildering degree of complexity that can likely only be fully understood through a holistic and integrated view [13, 17, 108], network biology and medicine have identified over the last two decades a series of *organizing principles* that govern networks [12, 54, 68, 190]. Such principles *link network structure to molecular phenotypes, biological roles, disease, and health*, thus providing the conceptual grounding that, we argue, can explain the successes (and limitations) of representation learning for modeling networks and can inform future development of the field. In particular, while the interpretation of an edge in a network depends on the context, interacting entities tend to be more similar than non-interacting entities. For example, in PPI networks, mutations in interacting proteins often lead to similar diseases [12]; in cellular networks, components associated




Figure 1: Representation learning for networks in biology and medicine. Given a biomedical network, a representation learning method transforms the graph to extract patterns and produce compact vector representations that can be optimized for the downstream task. The far right panel shows a local 2-hop neighborhood around node u , illustrating how information (e.g., neural messages) can be propagated along edges in the neighborhood, transformed, and finally aggregated at node u to arrive at the u 's embedding.

with a common phenotype tend to cluster in the same network neighborhood [4].

We posit that *representation learning can realize key principles of network biology and medicine*. Its core idea is to learn how to represent nodes (or larger graph structures) in a network as points in a low-dimensional space, where the geometry of this space is optimized to reflect the structure of interactions between nodes. More concretely, representation learning specifies deep, non-linear transformation functions that map nodes to points in a compact vector space, termed *embeddings*. Such functions are optimized to embed the input graph so that nodes with similar network neighborhoods are embedded close together in the embedding space and algebraic operations performed in this learned space reflect the graph's topology. The implication of the embedding space for understanding biomedical networks (e.g., PPI networks) is that the proximity of points in the space (e.g., distance between protein embeddings) naturally reflects the similarity of entities those points represent (e.g., similarity of proteins' phenotypes), suggesting that embeddings can be thought of as a differentiable manifestation of key principles in network biomedicine.

Network science and graph theoretic techniques have fueled biomedical discoveries, from uncovering relationships between diseases [58, 87, 104, 138] to repurposing drugs [25, 26, 62]. Further algorithmic innovations, such as random walks [24, 157, 170], kernels [51], and network propagation [147], have also played crucial roles in capturing structural and neighborhood information from networks to generate embeddings for downstream predictions. Feature engineering is a commonly used paradigm for machine learning on biomedical networks, including but not limited to hard-coding network features (e.g., higher-order structures, network motifs, degree counts, and common neighbor statistics) and feeding the engineered feature vectors into predictive models. While powerful, it does not fully leverage network information and can fail to generalize to new network types and datasets [183].

Recently, graph representation learning methods have emerged as a leading paradigm for deep learning on biomedical networks. However, deep learning on graphs is challenging because graphs contain complex topographical structure, have no fixed node ordering or reference points, and are comprised of many different kinds of entities (nodes) and various types of interactions (edges) relating them to each other. Classic deep




Figure 2: Predominant paradigms in graph representation learning. (a) Shallow network embedding methods generate a dictionary of representations \mathbf{h}_u for every node u in the input network. This is achieved by learning a mapping function f_z that maps nodes into an embedding space such that nodes with similar network neighborhoods measured by function f_n get embedded closer together (Section 2.1). Given the learned embeddings, an independent decoder method can optimize embeddings for downstream tasks, such as node or link property prediction. Method examples include DeepWalk [116], Node2vec [56], LINE [141], and Metapath2vec [40]. (b) In contrast with shallow network embedding methods, graph neural networks can generate representations for any graph element by capturing both network structure and node attributes and metadata. The embeddings are generated through a series of non-linear transformations, i.e., message-passing layers (L_k denotes transformations at layer k), that iteratively aggregate information from neighboring nodes at the target node u . GNN models can be optimized for performance on a variety of downstream tasks (Section 2.2). Method examples include GCN [82], GIN [162], GAT [146], and JK-Net [164]. (c) Generative graph models estimate a distribution landscape \mathbf{Z} to characterize a collection of distinct input graphs. They use the optimized distribution to generate novel graphs \hat{G} that are predicted to have desirable properties, e.g., a generated graph can be represent a molecular graph of a drug candidate. Generative graph models use graph neural networks as encoders and produce graph representations that capture both network structure and attributes (Section 2.3). Method examples include GCPN [174], JT-VAE [78], and GraphRNN [175]. SI Figure 1 and Note 3 outline other representation learning techniques.

learning methods are unable to consider such diverse structural properties and rich interactions, which are the essence of biomedical networks, because classic deep models are designed primarily for fixed-size grids (e.g., images and tabular datasets) or optimized for text and sequences. Akin to how deep learning on images and sequences has revolutionized image analysis and natural language processing, graph representation learning is poised to transform the study of complex systems in biology and medicine.

In this review, we first provide a technical exposition of prevailing graph learning paradigms and describe their critical impact in accelerating biomedical research. With every current application area of graph representation learning (Figure 3), we demonstrate the potential directions in which graph representation learning could take through four unique prospective studies, each addressing a different prediction problem, including transfer learning, graph classification, and knowledge networks.

2 Graph representation learning

Graph representation learning methods aim to generate vector representations for various types of graph elements such that the learned representations, i.e., embeddings, capture the structure and semantics of a

rich, graph-structured or networked dataset (Box 1). Graph representation learning encompasses a wide range of methods, including graph theoretic techniques rooted in classic network science, manifold learning, topological data analysis, graph neural networks and generative graph models (Figure 2). We first describe elements of graph datasets and outline three main graph machine learning tasks (Box 1). We proceed with an overview of paradigms in modern graph representation learning (Section 2.1-2.3) and provide details on other representation learning approaches in Supplementary Note 3.

Box 1: Fundamentals of graph representation learning

Elements of graph datasets. Graph $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ consists of nodes $v \in \mathcal{V}$ and edges $e_{u,v}^r \in \mathcal{E}$ connecting nodes u and v via a relationship of type r . Subgraph $S = (\mathcal{V}_S, \mathcal{E}_S)$ is a subset of a graph G , where $\mathcal{V}_S \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{E}_S \subseteq \mathcal{E}$. Node attribute vector $\mathbf{x}_u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ describes side information and metadata of node u . The node attribute matrix $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ brings together attribute vectors for all nodes in the graph. Similarly, edge attributes $\mathbf{x}_{u,v}^e \in \mathbb{R}^c$ for edge $e_{u,v}$ can be taken together to form an edge attribute matrix $\mathbf{X}^e \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times c}$. A path from node u_1 to node u_k is given by a sequence of edges $u_1 \xrightarrow{e_{1,2}} u_2 \cdots u_{k-1} \xrightarrow{e_{k-1,k}} u_k$. For node u , we denote its neighborhood $\mathcal{N}(u)$ as nodes directly connected to u in G , and the node degree is the size of $\mathcal{N}(u)$. The k -hop neighborhood of node u is the set of nodes that are exactly k hops away from node u , that is, $\mathcal{N}^k(u) = \{v | d(u, v) = k\}$ where d denotes the shortest path distance (SI Note 1).

Learning tasks on graphs. The main challenge in machine learning on networks is finding a way to extract information about interactions between nodes and incorporate that information into a machine learning model. To extract this information from networks, classic machine learning approaches rely on summary statistics (e.g., degrees or clustering coefficients) or carefully engineered features to measure local neighborhood structures (e.g., network motifs). In contrast to classic approaches, representation learning approaches automatically learn to encode network structure into low-dimensional representations, using transformation techniques based on deep learning and nonlinear dimensionality reduction. The flexibility of learned embeddings for modeling shows in a myriad of tasks that embeddings can be used for (SI Note 2):

- **Node, link, and graph property prediction:** The objective is to learn representations of various graph elements, including nodes, edges, subgraphs, and entire graphs. Representations are optimized to embed the input graph so that performing algebraic operations in the embedding space reflects the graph's topology. Finally, representations can be fed into models to predict the property of graph elements, such as the function of proteins in an interactome network (i.e., node classification task), the binding of a drug to a target protein (i.e., link prediction task), and the toxicity profile of a candidate drug (i.e., graph classification task).
- **Latent graph learning:** Graph representation learning exploits relational inductive biases for data that come in the form of graphs. In some settings, however, the graphs are not readily available for learning. This is typical for many biological problems, where graphs such as gene regulatory networks are only partially known. Latent graph learning is concerned with inferring the graph from the data. The latent graph can be application-specific and optimized for the downstream task. Further, such a graph might be as important as the task itself, as it can convey insights about the data and offer a way to interpret the results.
- **Graph generation:** The objective is to generate a graph G representing a biomedical entity that is likely to have a property of interest, such as high druglikeness. The model is given a set of graphs \mathcal{G} with such a property and is tasked with learning a non-linear mapping function characterizing the distribution of graphs in \mathcal{G} . The learned distribution is used to optimize a new graph G with the same property as input graphs.

2.1 Shallow network embeddings

A desirable property of node embeddings is that they should reflect characteristics in the graph structure around the node. Shallow network embeddings is a framework to optimize a neural network to generate embeddings that preserve such characteristics. An important characteristic is that similarity in the embedding space should approximate the similarity in the original graph (Figure 2). Methods vary given various definitions of similarities. For example, we can define the shortest path length between two nodes as the network similarity and dot product as the embedding space similarity. More sophisticated methods that capture similarity measures of greater complexity can reflect the network structure more accurately. For example, [116] define similarity as co-occurrence in a series of random walk of length k . Unsupervised learning techniques that predict which node belongs to the walk, such as skip-gram [105], are then applied on sampled walks to generate embeddings. A myriad of strategies exists to simulate random walks on graphs, including depth-first search algorithms, breadth-first search walks, and their combinations [56]. In heterogeneous graphs, information on the semantic meaning of edges, i.e., relation types, can be important to inject into learned embeddings. Thus, knowledge graph embedding methods define similarity metrics by considering diverse relations between nodes such that each relation is decomposed into multiple embeddings representing the head node, tail node, and the relation type [15, 40, 111, 139, 143, 167].

2.2 Graph neural networks

Graph neural networks (GNNs) are a type of neural network that models graphs (Figure 2). They learn compact representations of graph components that capture both the graph network structure and the attributes without any feature engineering. [53] summarize and extract a pattern that governs these prevailing GNNs. That is, a GNN consists of a series of propagation layers [53], where propagation at layer l consists of the following three steps: (1) *Neural message passing*. The GNN computes a message $\mathbf{m}_{u,v}^{(l)} = \text{MSG}(\mathbf{h}_u^{(l-1)}, \mathbf{h}_v^{(l-1)})$ for every linked nodes u, v based on their embeddings from the previous layer $\mathbf{h}_u^{(l-1)}$ and $\mathbf{h}_v^{(l-1)}$. (2) *Neighborhood aggregation*. The messages between node u and its neighbors \mathcal{N}_u are aggregated as $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_u^{(l)} = \text{AGG}(\mathbf{m}_{uv}^{(l)} | v \in \mathcal{N}_u)$. (3) *Update*. The GNN applies a non-linear function to update node embeddings as $\mathbf{h}_u^{(l)} = \text{UPD}(\hat{\mathbf{m}}_u^{(l)}, \mathbf{h}_u^{(l-1)})$ using the aggregated message and the embedding from the previous layer.

Following this framework, a diverse set of GNNs define different messages/aggregation/update schemes to augment graph embeddings [36, 42, 82, 149]. For example, [30, 70, 146, 166, 178] assign importance scores for nodes during neighborhood aggregation such that more important nodes play a larger effect in the embeddings. [1, 163] improve GNNs’ ability to capture graph structural information by posing structural priors, such as a higher-order adjacency matrix. Graph pooling techniques [173] learn abstract topological structures of a graph. GNNs designed for molecules [83, 130] inject physics-based scoring functions and domain assumptions by modifying the propagation layers.

As biomedical networks are enormous and complex, special treatments are required to scale GNNs to large and heterogeneous networks. Sampling strategies to intelligently select a subset of nodes to approximate the whole local neighborhood are proposed [28, 179]. To tackle the heterogeneity of biomedical relations, [70, 128, 154] have designed new aggregation layers to integrate multiple relations in curating node embeddings. Also, prevailing GNNs do not work with graphs that change over time. Recently, [70, 114, 126] have proposed dynamic update mechanisms that can take in a sequence of graphs.

Labels in biomedicine are often from expensive experiments, so they are usually of low availability. Strategies to excel given small data are thus essential. Graph meta learning [72] enables fast adaptation using few labels by learning from similar and related graphs. Alternatively, GNN models can be pretrained on a large set of graphs through auxiliary tasks, such as predicting parts of the graph itself to learn the graph structure so that

no label is required. This pretrained model can then transfer and finetune the learned knowledge on a wide range of downstream tasks [69, 176]. As the pretrained model has a basic understanding of graph structures, it often achieves strong performance in small data downstream settings.

2.3 Generative graph models

Generative modeling aims to generate multinode and edge structures—even entire graphs—that are likely to have the desired property, such as a molecule with the desired toxicity profile (Figure 2). Traditionally, many network science models generate new graphs based on how new nodes or edges are added or deleted following some deterministic or probabilistic rules. For instance, the Erdős-Rényi model [43] (e.g., random graph) adds edges with a fixed probability; the Barabási-Albert model [6] adds edges based on node degree to reflect the power-law distribution often observed in networks; to generalize, the configuration model [11] adds edges based on a predefined sequence of degrees to allow arbitrary degree distributions.

While powerful for random graph generation, network science models fail to generalize to arbitrary graphs and cannot optimize graph structure based on predefined properties of interest. Deep generative models address the challenge by estimating distributional graph properties based on a dataset of graphs \mathcal{G} , and inferring graph structures using such optimized distributions. In particular, a generation graph model first learns a latent distribution $P(Z|\mathcal{G})$ that characterizes the input graph set \mathcal{G} . Then, conditioned on this distribution, it decodes a new graph, i.e., generates a new graph \hat{G} . There are different ways to encode the input graphs and learn the latent distribution, such as through variational autoencoders [55, 78, 81] and generative adversarial networks [151]. To decode graphs considering the latent distribution, one can use feed-forward neural networks or auto-regressive decoders that can generate edges for a growing graph in a sequential manner, conditioned on edges added in previous steps [93, 175].

3 Application areas in biology and medicine

Biomedical data involve rich multimodal and heterogeneous interactions that span from molecular to societal levels (Figure 3). In this review, we focus on the following areas in biology and medicine through which graph representation learning has permeated: molecules, genomics, therapeutics, and healthcare.

Molecular-level applications (Section 4). Molecular structure can be translated from atoms and bonds into nodes and edges, respectively. Protein interactions naturally form a network based on the existence of a physical interaction or functional relationship. For instance, a protein can bind to, upregulate, or downregulate another protein in a biological pathway. By learning molecular representations of proteins and their physical interactions, we can leverage graph ML methods to predict protein functions.

Genomic-level applications (Section 5). Genetic elements are incorporated into networks by extracting coding genes' co-dependency and co-expression information from transcriptomic data and investigating the cellular circuitry of molecular functions. Additionally, non-coding RNA elements have been used to construct more comprehensive molecular association networks. With the help of representation learning, it is possible to utilize genome-wide interactions to enhance disease predictions.

Therapeutics-level applications (Section 6). Networks can also be composed of drugs (e.g., small compounds), proteins, and diseases to allow the modeling of drug-drug interactions, binding of drugs to target proteins, and identification of drug-disease therapeutic opportunities. For example, graph ML methods can leverage affinity information between drugs and proteins to improve predictions of candidate drugs for treating a disease and identifying potential off-target effects.

Healthcare-level applications (Section 7). Patient records, such as medical images and EHRs, can be represented as networks. Cell spatial graphs, for instance, can capture the structural information of nuclei in histopathology slides. Given the advances in predicting protein features, genome-wide associations, and therapeutics, we can make personalized predictions for patients by utilizing graph representation learning methods to integrate patient records with molecular (e.g., proteins, small compounds), genomic, and disease networks.




Figure 3: Overview of biomedical applications areas. Networks are prevalent across biomedical areas, from the molecular level to the healthcare systems level. Protein structures and interactions can be represented as molecular level networks (Section 4). Coding and non-coding regions of the genome can be modeled by protein, miRNA, and lncRNA networks to depict genome-wide associations (Section 5). Small compounds' structure, interactions with protein targets and non-coding RNAs, and indications can be represented by therapeutics level networks (Section 6). Patient-specific data, such as medical images and EHRs, can be integrated into a cross-domain knowledge graph of proteins, non-coding RNA, drugs, diseases, and more to enable healthcare systems level applications (Section 7). Each of these data modalities are connected too, as demonstrated by the edges labeled "targets" (directed), "regulates" (undirected), "is associated with" (directed), "is indicated for" (directed), and "has phenotype" (directed).

4 Graph representation learning for molecules

Unlike machine learning approaches designed to analyze data modalities like medical images and biological sequences, graph representation learning methods are uniquely able to leverage and model structural informa-

tion and relational dependencies in datasets [169]. As a result, they have been widely used for predicting protein interactions and function [46, 80]. Specifically, the inductive ability of graph convolution neural networks to generalize to data points unseen during model training (Section 2.2) and even generate new data points from scratch graph by decoding latent representation from the embedding space (Section 2.3) enabled the discovery of new molecules, interactions, and functions [41, 63, 169].

4.1 Modeling protein molecular graphs

Computationally elucidating protein structure has been an ongoing challenge for decades [35]. Since protein structures are folded into complex 3D structures, it is natural to represent them as graphs. For example, we can construct a contact distance graph where nodes are individual residues and edges are determined by a physical distance threshold [71]. Edges can also be defined by the ordering of amino acids in the primary sequence [71]. Spatial relationships between residues (e.g., distances, angles) may be used as features for edges [48].

We can then model such 3D protein structures by capturing dependencies in their sequences of amino acids (e.g., applying GNNs (Section 2.2) to learn each node’s local neighborhood structure) in order to generate protein embeddings [48, 73]. After learning short- and long-range dependencies across sequences corresponding to their 3D structures to produce embeddings of proteins, we can predict primary sequences from 3D structures [73]. We can use a hierarchical process of learning atom connectivity motifs (e.g., at the motif-, connectivity-, and atomic-levels) to capture molecular structure at varying levels of granularity in the protein embeddings, with which we can generate new 3D structures—a difficult task due to computational constraints of being both generalizable across different classes of molecules and flexible to a wide range of sizes [77].

4.2 Quantifying protein interactions

Many have integrated various data modalities, including chemical structure, binding affinities, physical and chemical principles, and amino acid sequences, to improve protein interaction quantification [35]. We can use GNNs (as described in Section 4.1) to generate representations of proteins based on chemical (e.g., free electrons’ and protons donors’ locations) and geometric (e.g., distance-dependent curvature) features to predict protein pocket-ligand and protein-protein interactions sites [49]; intra- and inter-molecule residue contact graphs to predict intra- and inter-molecular energies, binding affinities, and quality measures for a pair of molecular complexes [19]; and ligand- and receptor-protein graphs to predict whether a pair of residues from the ligand and receptor proteins is a part of an interface [48]. We can also combine evolutionary, topological, and energetic information about molecules to score docked conformations based on the similarity of random walks simulated on a pair of protein graphs (refer to graph kernel metrics in SI Note 3) [52].

While experimental methods (e.g., yeast two-hybrid screens) generate the most accurate measurements of protein interaction, the most updated PPI network is still limited in its number of nodes (proteins) and edges (physical interactions) due to the experimental and resource constraints [97]. Topology-based methods for PPI networks have been shown to capture and leverage the dynamics of biological systems, which can then enable further enrichment of existing PPI networks [90]. Predominant methods apply graph convolutions (Section 2.2) to aggregate structure information in the graphs of interest (e.g., PPI networks, ligand-receptor networks), use sequence modeling to learn dependencies in the amino acid sequences, and concatenate the two outputs for predicting whether there is an interaction [96, 169]. Interestingly, the concatenated output from the GNN can be treated as an input “image” for CNNs [96], demonstrating the synergy of graph- and non-graph based machine learning methods. Similar graph convolution methods have also been used to remove less credible protein-protein interactions to construct a more reliable PPI network [171].

4.3 Interpreting protein functions and cellular phenotypes

Characterizing a protein's function in specific biological contexts is a challenging and experimentally intensive task [106, 191]. However, innovating graph representation learning techniques to represent protein structures and interactions can facilitate protein function prediction [187], especially when we leverage existing gene ontologies and transcriptomic data.

Gene Ontology (GO) terms [33] are a standardized vocabulary for describing molecular functions, biological processes, and cellular locations of gene products [186]. They have been built as a hierarchical graph that GNNs can leverage to learn dependencies of the terms [186], or directly used as protein function labels [45, 46]. In the latter case, we typically construct sequence similarity networks, combine them with PPI networks, and integrate protein features (e.g. amino acid sequence, protein domains, subcellular location, gene expression profiles) to predict protein function [45, 46]. Others have even created gene interaction networks using transcriptomic data [41, 65] to capture context-specific interactions between genes, which PPI networks lack.

Alternative graph representation learning methods for predicting protein function include defining a novel diffusion-based distance metric to be applied to PPI networks for predicting protein function [18]; using the theory of topological persistence to compute signatures of a protein based on its 3D structure [38]; and applying topological data analysis to extract features from protein contact networks created from 3D coordinates [103] (refer to SI Note 3). Many have also adopted an attention mechanism for protein sequence embeddings generated by a Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers (BERT) model to enable interpretability [109, 148], showcasing the synergy of graph-based and language models.

Box 2: Opportunity for learning multi-scale representations of proteins and cell types (Figure 4a)

Graph dataset. *Activation of gene products can vary considerably across cells. Single-cell transcriptomic data can capture the heterogeneity of gene expression across diverse types of cells [84]. By leveraging cell type specific expression information as labels on nodes in a gene-gene interaction network, such as a network of physical protein contacts or co-expressed genes, graph representation learning methods can generate protein embeddings that are indicative of cell-type identity.*

Learning task. *With the gene interaction network, we can perform multilabel node classification to predict whether a gene is activated in a specific cell type based on the single-cell RNA sequencing (scRNA-seq) experiments. In particular, if there are N cell types identified in a given experiment, each gene is associated with a vector of length N . Given the gene interaction network and label vectors for a select number of genes, the task is to train a model that can predict every element of the vector for a new gene, such that predicted values indicate probabilities of gene activation in various cell types (Figure 4a).*

Impact. *By generating gene embeddings that consider differential expression at the cell type level, we can begin to make predictions at a single cell resolution. We can consider factors including disease and cell states, and temporal and spatial dependencies. Implications of such cell-type aware gene embeddings extend to cellular function prediction and identification of cell-type-specific disease features.*

5 Graph representation learning for genomics

Diseases are classified based on the presenting symptoms of patients, which are often caused by internal dysfunctions, such as genetic mutations. As a result, diagnosing diseases requires knowledge about alterations in the transcription of coding genes and the interactions between non-coding regions to capture genome-wide associations driving disease acquisition and progression [79, 134, 180]. Advances in graph representation




Figure 4: Representation learning in four areas of biology and medicine. We present a case study on (a) cell-type aware protein representation learning via multilabel node classification (Box 2), (b) disease classification using subgraphs (Box 3), (c) cell-line specific prediction of interacting drug pairs via edge regression with transfer learning across cell lines (Box 4), and (d) integration of health data into knowledge graphs to predict patient diagnoses or treatments via edge regression (Box 5).

learning methods to analyze heterogeneous networks of multimodal data allow us to integrate and make predictions on data across domains, from genomic level data (e.g., gene expression, copy number information) to clinically relevant data (e.g., pathophysiology, tissue localization).

5.1 Leveraging gene expression measurements

Comparing transcriptomic profiles from healthy individuals to those of patients with a specific disease can inform clinicians of its causal genes. Gene expression is the direct readout of the effects of a perturbation. As such, we can model important interactions between genes based on changes in their expression. By injecting gene expression data into PPI networks, we can identify markers that are disease-specific, which can then be used to more accurately classify diseases of interest.

Methods that rely solely on gene expression data typically transform the co-expression matrix into a more topologically meaningful form [64, 102, 112]. We can transform gene expression data into a colored graph that captures the shape of the data (e.g., using TDA [112]; refer to SI Note 3), which then enables downstream analysis using network science metrics and graph machine learning; combine matrix factorization with GCN to draw disease-gene associations, akin to a recommendation task (Section 2.2) [64]; vectorize the topological landscapes present in gene expression data, and feed them into a GCN to classify the disease type [102]; initialize a gene correlation network using a subset of gene expression matrices, and apply a joint GCN, VAE, and GAN framework to generate the desired final graph (Section 2.3) [168].

Because gene expression data can be noisy and variational, recent advances include fusing the co-expression matrices with existing biomedical networks, such as GO annotations and PPI, and feeding the resulting graph into graph convolution layers (Section 2.2) [27, 34, 122]. Doing so has enabled more interpretable disease classification models (e.g., weighting gene interactions based on existing biological knowledge). However, despite the utility of PPI networks, they have been reported to limit models trained solely on PPI networks because they are unable to capture all gene regulatory activities (e.g., in non-coding regions) [120].

5.2 Incorporating non-coding RNA interactions

Coding genes are not the only bioentities driving disease progression, as they account for approximately 2% of the genome [44]. Since non-coding regions also play a significant role [10], modeling the crosstalk of non-coding RNAs has accelerated the discovery of their associations with diseases [10, 134, 180]. Predicting associations between non-coding RNA and diseases has relied heavily on heterogeneous graphs modeling interactions between lncRNAs, miRNAs, and diseases [101, 165, 181]. We can use shallow network embedding approaches (Section 2.1) to vectorize the lncRNA, miRNA, and disease nodes based on network similarity (e.g., shortest path length), and feed them into downstream models (e.g., deep belief networks) [60, 101, 181]. We can also apply GNNs (Section 2.2) to aggregate higher order interactions, which can further enrich representations of non-coding regions [159, 165]. To address the issue of incompleteness in experimentally-derived datasets, we can even combine inductive matrix completion and GCNs [177].

Because drawing genome-wide associations is key to capturing the complete genetic picture of a disease and a patient's risk [79, 134], incorporating associations of both coding and non-coding regions can elucidate genome-wide interactions. We can apply GNNs (Section 2.2) to a gene interaction network to prioritize target genes for lncRNAs [185]; or add a neural layer specifically to fuse gene expression, copy number alteration, and clinical data in a unified GNN framework to make predictions on short- and long-term survival for a cancer patient [50]. Ultimately, considering genome-wide interactions broadens the range of biomedical questions that can be answered, including predictions regarding drug-disease and drug-target associations and even patient-centric prognoses.

Box 3: Opportunity for learning representations of diseases and phenotypes (Figure 4b)

Graph dataset. Symptoms are observable characteristics resulting from interactions between genotypes, as well

as environmental factors. Physicians utilize a standardized vocabulary of symptoms, i.e., phenotypes, to describe human diseases. Thus, we can model diseases as collections of associated phenotypes to diagnose patients based on their presenting symptoms. Consider a graph built from the standardized vocabulary of phenotypes, e.g., the Human Phenotype Ontology [124] (HPO). The HPO forms a directed acyclic graph with nodes representing phenotypes and edges indicating hierarchical relationships between them. A disease described by a set of its phenotypes corresponds to a subset of nodes in the HPO, forming a subgraph of the HPO.

Learning task. Given a dataset of HPO subgraphs and disease labels for a select number of them, the task is to generate an embedding for every subgraph and use the learned subgraph embeddings to predict the disease most consistent with the set of phenotypes that the embedding represents [7] (Figure 4b).

Impact. Modeling diseases as rich graph structures, such as subgraphs, enables a more flexible representation of diseases than relying on individual nodes or edges. As a result, we can better resolve complex phenotypic relationships and improve differentiation of diseases or disorders.

6 Graph representation learning for therapeutics

Modern drug discovery requires elucidating a candidate drug’s chemical structure, identifying its drug targets, quantifying its efficacy and toxicity, and detecting its potential side effects [12, 57, 68, 119]. Because such processes are costly and time-consuming, *in silico* approaches have been adopted into the drug discovery pipeline. However, cross-domain expertise is necessary to develop a drug with the optimal binding affinity and specificity to biomarkers, maximal therapy efficacy, and minimal adverse effects. As a result, it is critical to integrate chemical structure information, protein interactions, and clinically relevant data (e.g., indications and reported side effects) into predictive models for drug discovery and repurposing. Graph representation learning has been successful in characterizing drugs at the systems level without patient data to make predictions about interactions with other drugs, protein targets, side effects, diseases, etc.

6.1 Modeling compound molecular graphs

Similar to proteins, small compounds can easily be modeled as 2D and 3D molecular graphs such that nodes are atoms and edges are bonds. In fact, each atom and bond can include features, such as atomic mass, atomic number, and bond type, to be included in the model [130, 136]. Edges can also be added to indicate pairwise spatial distance between two atoms [53], or directed with information on bond angles and rotations incorporated into the molecular graph [83].

Representing molecules as graphs has improved predictions on various quantum chemistry properties. Intuitively, message passing steps (i.e., in GNNs (Section 2.2)) aggregate information from neighboring atoms and bonds to learn the local chemistry of each atom [136]. For example, we can identify which atoms interact at what angle and direction by generating representations of the atoms, distances, and angles to be propagated along the molecular graph [83]. We can also model the interactions among reactants by using an attention mechanism to produce atom-centered representations based on a weighted combination of their neighbors’ features, and predict the organic reaction outcomes [32]. Alternatively, we can decompose a molecular graph into a “junction tree,” where each node represents a substructure in the molecule, and learn representations of both the molecular graph and the junction tree to generate new molecules with desirable properties (Section 2.3) [78]. Due to the major challenge of finding novel and diverse compounds with specific chemical properties, we can even iteratively edit fragments of a molecular graph during training to better predict high-quality candidates targeting our proteins of interest [161].

6.2 Quantifying drug-drug and drug-target interactions

Corresponding to molecular structure is binding affinity and specificity to biomarkers. Such measurements are important for ensuring that a drug is effective in treating its intended disease, and does not have significant off-target effects [156]. However, quantifying these metrics requires labor- and cost-intensive experiments [35, 156]. Graph representation learning has been widely used to determine the existence, category, and extent of interaction between a given drug and protein target.

We can first learn representations of drugs and targets using TDA [5] or shallow network embedding approaches [56]. Concretely, TDA (refer to SI Note 3) can transform experimental data into a graph where nodes represent compounds and edges indicate a level of similarity between them [5]. Shallow network embedding techniques can be used to generate embeddings for drugs and targets by computing drug-drug, drug-target, and target-target similarities (Section 2.1) [142]. The resulting embeddings can be fed into downstream machine learning models to denoise the original drug-target interaction network [142].

Fusing compound sequence, structure, and clinical implications can significantly improve drug-drug and drug-target interaction predictions. We can apply an attention mechanism on drug graphs, with chemical structures and side effects as features, to predict drug-drug interactions [99]. We can also learn representations of protein and small molecule graphs using two separate GNNs in order to predict drug-target affinity [75]. To be flexible with other graph- and non-graph-based methods, we can combine protein structure representations generated by graph convolutions with protein sequence representations (e.g., shallow network embedding methods or CNNs) to predict the probability of compound-protein interactions [22, 94, 118, 144].

6.3 Identifying drug-disease associations and biomarkers for complex disease

Part of the drug discovery pipeline is minimizing adverse drug events [35, 156]. But, in addition to high financial cost, the experiments required to measure drug-drug interactions and toxicity face a combinatorial explosion problem [35]. Graph representation learning methods have played a major role in ranking candidate drugs for repurposing by considering gene expression data, gene ontologies, drug similarity, and other clinically relevant data regarding side effects and indications.

Drug and disease representations can be learned on homogeneous graphs of drugs, diseases, or targets. We can construct a drug-disease graph using Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms, and learn latent representations of drugs and diseases using various graph embedding algorithms, including DeepWalk and LINE (Section 2.1) [59]. We can also apply TDA (refer to SI Note 3) to construct graphs of drugs, targets, and diseases separately to learn representations of such entities for downstream prediction [152].

To emphasize the systems-level complexity of diseases, recent methods fuse multimodal data to generate a heterogeneous graph. We can aggregate neighborhood information from heterogeneous networks comprised of drug, target, and disease information to predict drug-target interactions (Section 2.2) [150]; combine a PPI network with genomic features to predict drug sensitivity using GNNs [160]; or apply a graph attention propagation mechanism to predict the therapeutic efficacy of kinase inhibitors across tumors [132]. As a result, methods that integrate cross-domain knowledge into their architecture may be able to elucidate drug action.

Box 4: Opportunity for learning representations of drugs and drug combinations (Figure 4c)

Graph dataset. *Combination therapies are increasingly used to treat complex and chronic diseases. However, it is experimentally intensive and costly to evaluate whether two or more drugs interact with each other and lead to effects that go beyond additive effects of individual drugs in the combination. Using graph representation*

learning, we can leverage perturbation experiments on cell lines to predict the response of cell lines with mutation(s) of interest (e.g., disease-causing) to specific drug combinations. Consider a multimodal network of protein-protein, protein-drug, and drug-drug interactions where nodes are proteins and drugs, and edges of different types indicate physical contacts between proteins, the binding of drugs to their target proteins, and interactions between drugs (e.g., synergistic effects, where the effects of the combination are larger than the sum of each drug’s individual effect) [76, 189]. Such a multimodal drug-protein network can be constructed for every cell line, yielding a collection of cell line specific networks (Figure 4c).

Learning task. From a single cell line’s drug-protein network, we can predict whether two or more drugs are interacting in the cell line. To this end, we embed nodes of a drug-protein network into a compact embedding space such that distances between node embeddings correspond to similarities of nodes’ local neighborhoods in the network. We then use the learned embeddings to decode drug-drug edges, and predict probabilities of two drugs interacting based on their embeddings. We can apply transfer learning to leverage the knowledge gained from one cell line specific network to accelerate the training and improve the accuracy across other cell line specific networks (Figure 4c). More concretely, we can develop a model using one cell line’s drug-protein network, “reuse” the model on the next cell line’s drug-protein network, and repeat until we have trained on drug-protein networks from all cell lines.

Impact. Most predictive models for drug combinations do not consider tissue or cell-line specificity of drugs. Because drugs’ effects on the body are not uniform, it is crucial to account for such anatomical differences. Further, the ability to prioritize candidate drug combinations in silico could reduce the cost of developing and testing them experimentally, thereby enabling robust evaluation of the most promising combinatorial therapies.

7 Graph representation learning for healthcare

Beyond generating predictions of novel small compounds and drug-disease associations at the systems level, graph representation learning has been used to fuse multimodal biomedical knowledge with patient records to better enable precision medicine. Two modes of patient data that have been especially successfully integrated into graph representation learning models and networks are histopathological images [14, 23] and EHRs [29, 92]. By representing these data modalities as networks, graph machine learning has improved diagnostic imaging and personalized medicine powered by EHRs.

7.1 Leveraging networks for diagnostic imaging

Medical images of patients, including histopathology slides, enable clinicians to more comprehensively observe the effects of a disease on the patient’s body [61]. Numerous deep learning tools exist for detecting subtle signs of disease progression in the images [39]. To enable graph representation learning, GNNs have been developed to convert medical images into cell spatial graphs, where nodes represent cells in the image and edges indicate that a pair of cells is adjacent in space. Moreover, recent methods have integrated other modalities (e.g., tissue localization [115] and genomic features [23]) to improve the accuracy of predictions on medical images.

Cell-tissue graphs generated from histopathological images are able to encode the spatial context of cells and tissues for a given patient. We can aggregate cell morphology and tissue micro-architecture information from cell graphs to grade cancer histology images (e.g., using GNNs (Section 2.2)) [2, 9, 23, 188]. We can introduce an attention mechanism via pooling to infer relevant patches in the image [2]. We can generate a cell-to-tissue graph representation capable of capturing cell morphology and interactions, tissue morphology and spatial distribution, cell-to-tissue hierarchies, and spatial distribution of cells with respect to tissues, and develop a hierarchical GNN to leverage these different data modalities [115]. Because interpretability is critical for

models aimed to generate patient-specific predictions, we can perform post-hoc graph pruning optimization on a cell graph generated from a histopathology image to define a subgraph explaining the original cell graph analysis [74].

Graph representation learning methods have also been proven successful for classifying other types of medical images. We can apply a GNN to model relationships between lymph nodes to compute the spread of lymph node gross tumor volume based on radiotherapy CT images (Section 2.2) [20]; or convert MRI images into graphs, and apply GCN to classify the progression of Alzheimer’s Disease [8, 133, 155]. Alternatively, we can use TDA to generate graphs of whole-slide images, which include tissues from various patient sources (refer to SI Note 3), and apply a GNN to classify the stage of colon cancer [89].

Finally, since multimodal data enables more robust predictions, we can apply a GCN (Section 2.2) to generate cell spatial graphs from histopathology images and then fuse genomic and transcriptomic data to predict treatment response and resistance, histopathology grading, and patient survival [23].

7.2 Personalizing medical knowledge networks with patient records

Electronic health records are typically represented by ICD (International Classification of Disease) codes [29, 92]. The hierarchical information inherent to ICD codes (medical ontologies) naturally lend itself to creating a rich network of medical knowledge. In addition to ICD codes, medical knowledge can take the form of other data types, including presenting symptoms, molecular data, drug interactions, and side effects. By integrating patient records into our networks, we can use graph representation learning to advance precision medicine, generating predictions tailored to individual patients.

Methods that embed medical entities, including EHRs and medical ontologies, leverage the inherently hierarchical structure in the medical concepts KG [127]. We can generate low dimensional embeddings of EHR data by separately considering medical services (via WORD2VEC), doctors (via GAT), and patients (via LINE) (Sections 2.1 and 2.2) [158]. We can apply an attention mechanism on EHR data and medical ontologies to capture the parent-child relationships [29, 98, 140]. Rather than assuming a certain structure in the EHRs, we can use a Graph Convolution Transformer to learn the hidden EHR structure [30].

EHRs also have underlying spatial and/or temporal dependencies [21] that many methods have recently taken advantage of to perform time-dependent prediction tasks. We can use a mixed pooling multi-view self-attention autoencoder that generates patient representations in order to predict either a patient’s risk of developing a disease in a future visit, or the diagnostic codes of the next visit [31]. Further, a combined LSTM and GNN model can be used to represent patient status sequences and temporal medical event graphs, respectively, to predict future prescriptions or disease codes (Section 2.2) [88, 95]. So, we can construct a patient graph based on the similarity of patients, and apply an LSTM-GNN architecture to learn patient embeddings [125]. We can also design an ST-GCN [166] to generate patient diagnoses to utilize the underlying spatial and temporal dependencies of EHR data [92].

EHRs can be used with other modalities, such as diseases, symptoms, molecular data, drug interactions, etc [21, 85, 110, 184]. We can utilize a probabilistic knowledge graph of EHR data, which can include medical history, drug prescriptions, and laboratory examination results, to consider the semantic relations between EHR entities in a shallow network embedding method (Section 2.1) [91]. To leverage multi-layer message-passing, we can initialize node features for drugs and diseases using Skipgram, and apply GCN to predict adverse drug events [85]. We can integrate drug and disease interactions with EHR data, and combine both RNNs and GCNs to recommend medication combinations [131]. We can also exploit meta-paths in the EHR-derived KG to leverage higher order, semantically important relations for disease classification [67].

Box 5: Opportunity for fusing personalized health information with knowledge graphs (Figure 4d)

Graph dataset. *To realize precision medicine, we need robust methods that can inject biomedical knowledge into patient-specific information to produce actionable and trustworthy predictions. Since EHRs can also be represented by networks, we can fuse patients' EHR networks with biomedical networks, thus enabling graph representation learning to make predictions on patient-specific features. Consider a knowledge graph, where nodes and edges represent different types of bioentities and their various relationships, respectively. Examples of relations may include "up-/down-regulate," "treats," "binds," "encodes," and "localizes" [110]. To integrate patients into the network, we can create a distinct meta node to represent each patient, and add edges between the patient's meta node and its associated bioentity nodes (Figure 4d).*

Learning tasks. *We can learn node embeddings for each patient while predicting (via edge regression) the probability of a patient developing a specific disease or of a drug effectively treating the patient (Figure 4d).*

Impact. *Precision medicine requires an understanding of patient-specific data as well as the underlying biological mechanisms of disease and healthy states. Most networks do not consider patient data, which can prevent robust predictions of patients' conditions and potential responsiveness to drugs. The ability to integrate patient data with biomedical knowledge can address such issues.*

8 Outlook

Without question, multi-omics data integration has accelerated biological research by highlighting important, often even overlooked, relationships between bioentities involved in complex biological processes [137]. Given the utility of graphs in both the biological and medical domains, there has been a major push to further generate biomedical knowledge graphs that integrate multimodal data, from genotype-phenotype associations to population-scale epidemiological dynamics.

As graph representation learning has aided in the mapping of genotypes to phenotypes, leveraging graph representation learning for fine-scale mapping of variants is a promising new direction. By re-imagining GWAS and expression Quantitative Trait Loci (eQTL) studies [145] as networks, we can already begin to discover biologically meaningful modules to highlight key genes involved in the underlying mechanisms of a disease [153]. Additionally, because graphs can model long-range dependencies or interactions, we can model chromatin elements and the effects of their binding to regions across the genome as a network [37, 86].

Due to advances in single cell sequencing techniques, we can use graph learning to model the cellular state space as a graph, thereby enabling us to study the cellular differential process [16, 123], and graph attention neural networks to predict disease state [121]. With dynamic GNNs, we could even better capture changes in expression levels observed in single cell RNA sequencing data over time or as a result of a perturbation.

Effective integration of healthcare data with knowledge about molecular, genomic, disease-level, and drug-level data can help generate more accurate and interpretable predictions about the biological systems of health and disease [47]. Constructing networks of interhospital communication can potentially improve risk assessments for transferring patients between hospitals to increase their survival [107]. In public health, spatial and temporal networks can model space- and time-dependent observations (e.g., disease states, susceptibility to infection [100]) to spot trends, detect anomalies, and interpret temporal dynamics.

Finally, as embeddings output by graph representation learning models are increasingly employed in clinical applications, it is essential to ensure that the representations are explainable, fair, and robust, and that, if necessary, existing algorithms are reformulated to address important sources of algorithmic bias and health

disparities [113]. In the near future, we envision methods that will address the myriad of problems in learning graph representations that are interpretable [172], fair and stable [3], and robust [182].

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge the support of NSF under nos. IIS-2030459 and IIS-2033384, Harvard Data Science Initiative, Amazon Research Award, Bayer Early Excellence in Science award, AstraZeneca Research, and Roche Alliance with Distinguished Scientists (ROADS) Fund award. M.M.L. is supported by T32HG002295 from the National Human Genome Research Institute and a National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship.

References

- [1] S. Abu-El-Haija, B. Perozzi, A. Kapoor, N. Alipourfard, K. Lerman, H. Harutyunyan, G. V. Steeg, and A. Galstyan. MixHop: Higher-order graph convolutional architectures via sparsified neighborhood mixing. In *ICML*, 2019.
- [2] M. Adnan, S. Kalra, and H. R. Tizhoosh. Representation learning of histopathology images using graph neural networks. In *CVPR Workshop*, 2020.
- [3] C. Agarwal, H. Lakkaraju, and M. Zitnik. Towards a unified framework for fair and stable graph representation learning. *arXiv:2102.13186*, 2021.
- [4] M. Agrawal, M. Zitnik, and J. Leskovec. Large-scale analysis of disease pathways in the human interactome. In *Pacific Symposium on Biocomputing*, 2018.
- [5] M. Alagappan, D. Jiang, N. Denko, and A. C. Koong. A multimodal data analysis approach for targeted drug discovery involving topological data analysis (tda). In *Tumor Microenvironment*. 2016.
- [6] R. Albert and A.-L. Barabási. Statistical mechanics of complex networks. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 2002.
- [7] E. Alsentzer, S. G. Finlayson, M. M. Li, and M. Zitnik. Subgraph neural networks. In *NeurIPS*, 2020.
- [8] X. An, Y. Zhou, Y. Di, and D. Ming. Dynamic functional connectivity and graph convolution network for alzheimer’s disease classification. *arXiv:2006.13510*, 2020.
- [9] D. Anand, S. Gadiya, and A. Sethi. Histograms: graphs in histopathology. In *Medical Imaging 2020: Digital Pathology*, 2020.
- [10] T. S. Assmann, F. I. Milagro, and J. A. Martínez. Crosstalk between microRNAs, the putative target genes and the lncRNA network in metabolic diseases. *Molecular Medicine Reports*, 2019.
- [11] A.-L. Barabási et al. *Network Science*. 2016.
- [12] A.-L. Barabási, N. Gulbahce, and J. Loscalzo. Network medicine: a network-based approach to human disease. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 2011.
- [13] A.-L. Barabási. Network medicine — from obesity to the “diseasome”. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 2007.

- [14] L. Barisoni, K. J. Lafata, S. M. Hewitt, A. Madabhushi, and U. G. Balis. Digital pathology and computational image analysis in nephropathology. *Nature Reviews Nephrology*, 2020.
- [15] A. Bordes, N. Usunier, A. García-Durán, J. Weston, and O. Yakhnenko. Translating embeddings for modeling multi-relational data. In *NeurIPS*, 2013.
- [16] D. B. Burkhardt, J. S. Stanley, A. L. Perdigoto, S. A. Gigante, K. C. Herold, G. Wolf, A. J. Giraldez, D. van Dijk, and S. Krishnaswamy. Quantifying the effect of experimental perturbations in single-cell rna-sequencing data using graph signal processing. *bioRxiv*, 2019.
- [17] T. J. Callahan, I. J. Tripodi, H. Pielke-Lombardo, and L. E. Hunter. Knowledge-based biomedical data science. *Annual Review of Biomedical Data Science*, 2020.
- [18] M. Cao, H. Zhang, J. Park, N. M. Daniels, M. E. Crovella, L. J. Cowen, and B. Hescott. Going the distance for protein function prediction: a new distance metric for protein interaction networks. *PLOS One*, 2013.
- [19] Y. Cao and Y. Shen. Energy-based graph convolutional networks for scoring protein docking models. *Proteins: Structure, Function, and Bioinformatics*, 2020.
- [20] C.-H. Chao, Z. Zhu, D. Guo, K. Yan, T.-Y. Ho, J. Cai, A. P. Harrison, X. Ye, J. Xiao, A. Yuille, et al. Lymph node gross tumor volume detection in oncology imaging via relationship learning using graph neural network. In *MICCAI*, 2020.
- [21] I. Y. Chen, M. Agrawal, S. Horng, and D. Sontag. Robustly extracting medical knowledge from ehra: A case study of learning a health knowledge graph. In *PSB*, 2020.
- [22] L. Chen, X. Tan, D. Wang, F. Zhong, X. Liu, T. Yang, X. Luo, K. Chen, H. Jiang, and M. Zheng. TransformerCPI: Improving compound-protein interaction prediction by sequence-based deep learning with self-attention mechanism and label reversal experiments. *Bioinformatics*, 2020.
- [23] R. J. Chen, M. Y. Lu, J. Wang, D. F. Williamson, S. J. Rodig, N. I. Lindeman, and F. Mahmood. Pathomic fusion: An integrated framework for fusing histopathology and genomic features for cancer diagnosis and prognosis. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, 2020.
- [24] Z.-H. Chen, Z.-H. You, Z.-H. Guo, H.-C. Yi, G.-X. Luo, and Y.-B. Wang. Prediction of drug-target interactions from multi-molecular network based on deep walk embedding model. *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology*, 2020.
- [25] F. Cheng, I. A. Kovács, and A.-L. Barabási. Network-based prediction of drug combinations. *Nature Communications*, 2019.
- [26] F. Cheng, W. Lu, C. Liu, J. Fang, Y. Hou, D. E. Handy, R. Wang, Y. Zhao, Y. Yang, J. Huang, et al. A genome-wide positioning systems network algorithm for in silico drug repurposing. *Nature Communications*, 2019.
- [27] H. Chereda, A. Bleckmann, F. Kramer, A. Leha, and T. Beissbarth. Utilizing molecular network information via graph convolutional neural networks to predict metastatic event in breast cancer. In *GMDS*, 2019.
- [28] W. Chiang, X. Liu, S. Si, Y. Li, S. Bengio, and C. Hsieh. Cluster-gcn: An efficient algorithm for training deep and large graph convolutional networks. In *KDD*, 2019.

- [29] E. Choi, M. T. Bahadori, L. Song, W. F. Stewart, and J. Sun. GRAM: graph-based attention model for healthcare representation learning. In *KDD*, 2017.
- [30] E. Choi, Z. Xu, Y. Li, M. Dusenberry, G. Flores, E. Xue, and A. M. Dai. Learning the graphical structure of electronic health records with graph convolutional transformer. In *AAAI*, 2020.
- [31] S. Chowdhury, C. Zhang, P. S. Yu, and Y. Luo. Mixed pooling multi-view attention autoencoder for representation learning in healthcare. *arXiv:1910.06456*, 2019.
- [32] C. W. Coley, W. Jin, L. Rogers, T. F. Jamison, T. S. Jaakkola, W. H. Green, R. Barzilay, and K. F. Jensen. A graph-convolutional neural network model for the prediction of chemical reactivity. *Chemical Science*, 2019.
- [33] G. O. Consortium. The Gene Ontology resource: 20 years and still GOing strong. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 2019.
- [34] J. Crawford and C. S. Greene. Incorporating biological structure into machine learning models in biomedicine. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, 2020.
- [35] L. David, A. Thakkar, R. Mercado, and O. Engkvist. Molecular representations in ai-driven drug discovery: a review and practical guide. *Journal of Cheminformatics*, 2020.
- [36] M. Defferrard, X. Bresson, and P. Vandergheynst. Convolutional neural networks on graphs with fast localized spectral filtering. In *NeurIPS*, 2016.
- [37] J. Dekker and T. Misteli. Long-range chromatin interactions. *Cold Spring Harbor Perspectives in Biology*, 2015.
- [38] T. K. Dey and S. Mandal. Protein classification with improved topological data analysis. In *WABI*, 2018.
- [39] N. Dimitriou, O. Arandjelović, and P. D. Caie. Deep learning for whole slide image analysis: an overview. *Frontiers in Medicine*, 2019.
- [40] Y. Dong, N. V. Chawla, and A. Swami. metapath2vec: Scalable representation learning for heterogeneous networks. In *KDD*, 2017.
- [41] F. Dutil, J. P. Cohen, M. Weiss, G. Derevyanko, and Y. Bengio. Towards gene expression convolutions using gene interaction graphs. *ICML Workshop on Computational Biology*, 2018.
- [42] D. Duvenaud, D. Maclaurin, J. Aguilera-Iparraguirre, R. Gómez-Bombarelli, T. Hirzel, A. Aspuru-Guzik, and R. P. Adams. Convolutional networks on graphs for learning molecular fingerprints. In *NeurIPS*, 2015.
- [43] P. Erdős and A. Rényi. On the evolution of random graphs. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hung. Acad. Sci*, 1960.
- [44] M. Esteller. Non-coding rnas in human disease. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 2011.
- [45] K. Fan, Y. Guan, and Y. Zhang. Graph2go: a multi-modal attributed network embedding method for inferring protein functions. *GigaScience*, 2020.
- [46] K. Fan and Y. Zhang. Pseudo2go: A graph-based deep learning method for pseudogene function prediction by borrowing information from coding genes. *Frontiers in Genetics*, 2020.

- [47] N. Fortelny and C. Bock. Knowledge-primed neural networks enable biologically interpretable deep learning on single-cell sequencing data. *Genome Biology*, 2020.
- [48] A. Fout, J. Byrd, B. Shariat, and A. Ben-Hur. Protein interface prediction using graph convolutional networks. In *NeurIPS*, 2017.
- [49] P. Gainza, F. Sverrisson, F. Monti, E. Rodola, D. Boscaini, M. Bronstein, and B. Correia. Deciphering interaction fingerprints from protein molecular surfaces using geometric deep learning. *Nature Methods*, 2020.
- [50] J. Gao, T. Lyu, F. Xiong, J. Wang, W. Ke, and Z. Li. MGNN: A multimodal graph neural network for predicting the survival of cancer patients. In *SIGIR*, 2020.
- [51] C. Geng, Y. Jung, N. Renaud, V. Honavar, A. M. Bonvin, and L. C. Xue. iscore: a novel graph kernel-based function for scoring protein–protein docking models. *Bioinformatics*, 2020.
- [52] C. Geng, Y. Jung, N. Renaud, V. Honavar, A. M. Bonvin, and L. C. Xue. iscore: a novel graph kernel-based function for scoring protein–protein docking models. *Bioinformatics*, 2020.
- [53] J. Gilmer, S. S. Schoenholz, P. F. Riley, O. Vinyals, and G. E. Dahl. Neural message passing for quantum chemistry. In *ICML*, 2017.
- [54] K.-I. Goh, M. E. Cusick, D. Valle, B. Childs, M. Vidal, and A.-L. Barabási. The human disease network. *PNAS*, 2007.
- [55] R. Gómez-Bombarelli, J. N. Wei, D. Duvenaud, J. M. Hernández-Lobato, B. Sánchez-Lengeling, D. Sheberla, J. Aguilera-Iparraguirre, T. D. Hirzel, R. P. Adams, and A. Aspuru-Guzik. Automatic chemical design using a data-driven continuous representation of molecules. *ACS Central Science*, 2018.
- [56] A. Grover and J. Leskovec. node2vec: Scalable feature learning for networks. In *KDD*, 2016.
- [57] E. Guney, J. Menche, M. Vidal, and A.-L. Barabasi. Network-based in silico drug efficacy screening. *Nature Communications*, 2016.
- [58] M. Guo, Y. Yu, T. Wen, X. Zhang, B. Liu, J. Zhang, R. Zhang, Y. Zhang, and X. Zhou. Analysis of disease comorbidity patterns in a large-scale china population. *BMC Medical Genomics*, 2019.
- [59] Z.-H. Guo, Z.-H. You, D.-S. Huang, H.-C. Yi, K. Zheng, Z.-H. Chen, and Y.-B. Wang. Meshheading2vec: a new method for representing mesh headings as vectors based on graph embedding algorithm. *Briefings in Bioinformatics*, 2020.
- [60] Z.-H. Guo, Z.-H. You, Y.-B. Wang, D.-S. Huang, H.-C. Yi, and Z.-H. Chen. Bioentity2vec: Attribute- and behavior-driven representation for predicting multi-type relationships between bioentities. *GigaScience*, 2020.
- [61] M. N. Gurcan, L. E. Boucheron, A. Can, A. Madabhushi, N. M. Rajpoot, and B. Yener. Histopathological image analysis: A review. *IEEE Reviews in Biomedical Engineering*, 2009.
- [62] D. M. Gysi, Í. D. Valle, M. Zitnik, A. Ameli, X. Gan, O. Varol, H. Sanchez, R. M. Baron, D. Ghiassian, J. Loscalzo, et al. Network medicine framework for identifying drug repurposing opportunities for COVID-19. *arXiv:2004.07229*, 2020.

- [63] W. L. Hamilton, Z. Ying, and J. Leskovec. Inductive representation learning on large graphs. In *NeurIPS*, 2017.
- [64] P. Han, P. Yang, P. Zhao, S. Shang, Y. Liu, J. Zhou, X. Gao, and P. Kalnis. GCN-MF: disease-gene association identification by graph convolutional networks and matrix factorization. In *KDD*, 2019.
- [65] R. Hasibi and T. Michoel. Predicting gene expression from network topology using graph neural networks. *arXiv:2005.03961*, 2020.
- [66] C. Hong, E. Rush, M. Liu, D. Zhou, J. Sun, A. Sonabend, V. M. Castro, P. Schubert, V. A. Panickan, T. Cai, et al. Clinical knowledge extraction via sparse embedding regression (KESER) with multi-center large scale electronic health record data. *medRxiv*, 2021.
- [67] A. Hosseini, T. Chen, W. Wu, Y. Sun, and M. Sarrafzadeh. Heteromed: Heterogeneous information network for medical diagnosis. In *CIKM*, 2018.
- [68] J. X. Hu, C. E. Thomas, and S. Brunak. Network biology concepts in complex disease comorbidities. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 2016.
- [69] W. Hu, B. Liu, J. Gomes, M. Zitnik, P. Liang, V. S. Pande, and J. Leskovec. Strategies for pre-training graph neural networks. In *ICLR*, 2020.
- [70] Z. Hu, Y. Dong, K. Wang, and Y. Sun. Heterogeneous graph transformer. In *WWW*, 2020.
- [71] J. Huan, D. Bandyopadhyay, W. Wang, J. Snoeyink, J. Prins, and A. Tropsha. Comparing graph representations of protein structure for mining family-specific residue-based packing motifs. *Journal of Computational Biology*, 2005.
- [72] K. Huang and M. Zitnik. Graph meta learning via local subgraphs. *NeurIPS*, 33, 2020.
- [73] J. Ingraham, V. K. Garg, R. Barzilay, and T. S. Jaakkola. Generative models for graph-based protein design. In *NeurIPS*, 2019.
- [74] G. Jaume, P. Pati, A. Foncubierta-Rodriguez, F. Feroce, G. Scognamiglio, A. M. Anniciello, J.-P. Thiran, O. Goksel, and M. Gabrani. Towards explainable graph representations in digital pathology. *ICML Workshop on Computational Biology*, 2020.
- [75] M. Jiang, Z. Li, S. Zhang, S. Wang, X. Wang, Q. Yuan, and Z. Wei. Drug–target affinity prediction using graph neural network and contact maps. *RSC Advances*, 2020.
- [76] P. Jiang, S. Huang, Z. Fu, Z. Sun, T. M. Lakowski, and P. Hu. Deep graph embedding for prioritizing synergistic anticancer drug combinations. *Computational and Structural Biotechnology Journal*, 2020.
- [77] W. Jin, R. Barzilay, and T. Jaakkola. Hierarchical generation of molecular graphs using structural motifs. In *ICML*, 2020.
- [78] W. Jin, R. Barzilay, and T. S. Jaakkola. Junction tree variational autoencoder for molecular graph generation. In *ICML*, 2018.
- [79] H. Kagami, T. Akutsu, S. Maegawa, H. Hosokawa, and J. C. Nacher. Determining associations between human diseases and non-coding rnas with critical roles in network control. *Scientific Reports*, 2015.

- [80] S. Kearnes, K. McCloskey, M. Berndl, V. Pande, and P. Riley. Molecular graph convolutions: moving beyond fingerprints. *Journal of Computer-Aided Molecular Design*, 2016.
- [81] T. N. Kipf and M. Welling. Variational graph auto-encoders. *NeurIPS Workshop*, 2016.
- [82] T. N. Kipf and M. Welling. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. In *ICLR*, 2017.
- [83] J. Klicpera, J. Groß, and S. Günnemann. Directional message passing for molecular graphs. In *ICLR*, 2020.
- [84] M. Kondratova, U. Czerwinska, N. Sompairac, S. D. Amigorena, V. Soumelis, E. Barillot, A. Zinovyev, and I. Kuperstein. A multiscale signalling network map of innate immune response in cancer reveals cell heterogeneity signatures. *Nature Communications*, 2019.
- [85] H. Kwak, M. Lee, S. Yoon, J. Chang, S. Park, and K. Jung. Drug-disease graph: Predicting adverse drug reaction signals via graph neural network with clinical data. In *PAKDD*, 2020.
- [86] J. Lanchantin and Y. Qi. Graph convolutional networks for epigenetic state prediction using both sequence and 3d genome data. *Bioinformatics*, 2020.
- [87] D.-H. Le and V.-T. Dang. Ontology-based disease similarity network for disease gene prediction. *Vietnam Journal of Computer Science*, 2016.
- [88] D. Lee, X. Jiang, and H. Yu. Harmonized representation learning on dynamic ehr graphs. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 2020.
- [89] J. Levy, C. Haudenschild, C. Bar, B. Christensen, and L. Vaickus. Topological feature extraction and visualization of whole slide images using graph neural networks. *PSB*, 2020.
- [90] D. Li and J. Gao. Towards perturbation prediction of biological networks using deep learning. *Scientific Reports*, 2019.
- [91] L. Li, P. Wang, Y. Wang, S. Wang, J. Yan, J. Jiang, B. Tang, C. Wang, and Y. Liu. A method to learn embedding of a probabilistic medical knowledge graph: Algorithm development. *JMIR Medical Informatics*, 2020.
- [92] Y. Li, B. Qian, X. Zhang, and H. Liu. Graph neural network-based diagnosis prediction. *Big Data*, 2020.
- [93] R. Liao, Y. Li, Y. Song, S. Wang, W. L. Hamilton, D. Duvenaud, R. Urtasun, and R. S. Zemel. Efficient graph generation with graph recurrent attention networks. In *NeurIPS*, 2019.
- [94] X. Lin, K. Zhao, T. Xiao, Z. Quan, Z.-J. Wang, and P. S. Yu. Deepgs: Deep representation learning of graphs and sequences for drug-target binding affinity prediction. *ECAI*, 2020.
- [95] S. Liu, T. Li, H. Ding, B. Tang, X. Wang, Q. Chen, J. Yan, and Y. Zhou. A hybrid method of recurrent neural network and graph neural network for next-period prescription prediction. *IJMLC*, 2020.
- [96] Y. Liu, H. Yuan, L. Cai, and S. Ji. Deep learning of high-order interactions for protein interface prediction. In *KDD*, 2020.

- [97] K. Luck, D.-K. Kim, L. Lambourne, K. Spirohn, B. E. Begg, W. Bian, R. Brignall, T. Cafarelli, F. J. Campos-Laborie, B. Charlotiaux, et al. A reference map of the human binary protein interactome. *Nature*, 2020.
- [98] F. Ma, Q. You, H. Xiao, R. Chitta, J. Zhou, and J. Gao. KAME: knowledge-based attention model for diagnosis prediction in healthcare. In *CIKM*, 2018.
- [99] T. Ma, C. Xiao, J. Zhou, and F. Wang. Drug similarity integration through attentive multi-view graph auto-encoders. In *IJCAI*, 2018.
- [100] A. Machens, F. Gesualdo, C. Rizzo, A. E. Tozzi, A. Barrat, and C. Cattuto. An infectious disease model on empirical networks of human contact: bridging the gap between dynamic network data and contact matrices. *BMC Infectious Diseases*, 2013.
- [101] M. Madhavan et al. Deep belief network based representation learning for lncrna-disease association prediction. *arXiv:2006.12534*, 2020.
- [102] S. Mandal, A. Guzmán-Sáenz, N. Haiminen, S. Basu, and L. Parida. A topological data analysis approach on predicting phenotypes from gene expression data. In *AICoB*, 2020.
- [103] A. Martino, A. Rizzi, and F. M. F. Mascioli. Supervised approaches for protein function prediction by topological data analysis. In *IJCNN*, 2018.
- [104] J. Menche, A. Sharma, M. Kitsak, S. D. Ghiassian, M. Vidal, J. Loscalzo, and A.-L. Barabási. Uncovering disease-disease relationships through the incomplete interactome. *Science*, 2015.
- [105] T. Mikolov, I. Sutskever, K. Chen, G. S. Corrado, and J. Dean. Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. In *NeurIPS*, 2013.
- [106] Y. Moreau and L.-C. Tranchevent. Computational tools for prioritizing candidate genes: boosting disease gene discovery. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 2012.
- [107] S. K. Mueller, J. Fiskio, and J. Schnipper. Interhospital transfer: Transfer processes and patient outcomes. *Journal of Hospital Medicine*, 2019.
- [108] C. J. Mungall, J. A. McMurry, S. Köhler, J. P. Balhoff, C. Borromeo, M. Brush, S. Carbon, T. Conlin, N. Dunn, M. Engelstad, et al. The monarch initiative: an integrative data and analytic platform connecting phenotypes to genotypes across species. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 2017.
- [109] A. Nambiar, M. Heflin, S. Liu, S. Maslov, M. Hopkins, and A. Ritz. Transforming the language of life: Transformer neural networks for protein prediction tasks. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM-BCB*, 2020.
- [110] C. A. Nelson, A. J. Butte, and S. E. Baranzini. Integrating biomedical research and electronic health records to create knowledge-based biologically meaningful machine-readable embeddings. *Nature Communications*, 2019.
- [111] M. Nickel, V. Tresp, and H. Kriegel. A three-way model for collective learning on multi-relational data. In *ICML*, 2011.
- [112] M. Nicolau, A. J. Levine, and G. Carlsson. Topology based data analysis identifies a subgroup of breast cancers with a unique mutational profile and excellent survival. *PNAS*, 2011.

- [113] Z. Obermeyer, B. Powers, C. Vogeli, and S. Mullainathan. Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations. *Science*, 2019.
- [114] A. Pareja, G. Domeniconi, J. Chen, T. Ma, T. Suzumura, H. Kanezashi, T. Kaler, T. B. Schardl, and C. E. Leiserson. Evolvegc: Evolving graph convolutional networks for dynamic graphs. In *AAAI*, 2020.
- [115] P. Pati, G. Jaume, L. A. Fernandes, A. Foncubierta-Rodríguez, F. Feroce, A. M. Anniciello, G. Scognamiglio, N. Brancati, D. Riccio, M. Di Bonito, et al. Hact-net: A hierarchical cell-to-tissue graph neural network for histopathological image classification. In *Uncertainty for Safe Utilization of Machine Learning in Medical Imaging, and Graphs in Biomedical Image Analysis*. 2020.
- [116] B. Perozzi, R. Al-Rfou, and S. Skiena. Deepwalk: online learning of social representations. In *KDD*, 2014.
- [117] X. Qiu, A. Rahimzamani, L. Wang, B. Ren, Q. Mao, T. Durham, J. L. McFaline-Figueroa, L. Saunders, C. Trapnell, and S. Kannan. Inferring causal gene regulatory networks from coupled single-cell expression dynamics using scribe. *Cell Systems*, 2020.
- [118] Z. Quan, Y. Guo, X. Lin, Z.-J. Wang, and X. Zeng. Graphcpi: Graph neural representation learning for compound-protein interaction. In *BIBM*, 2019.
- [119] A. Rai, P. Shinde, and S. Jalan. Network spectra for drug-target identification in complex diseases: new guns against old foes. *Applied Network Science*, 2018.
- [120] R. Ramirez, Y.-C. Chiu, A. Herrera, M. Mostavi, J. Ramirez, Y. Chen, Y. Huang, and Y.-F. Jin. Classification of cancer types using graph convolutional neural networks. *Frontiers in Physics*, 2020.
- [121] N. Ravindra, A. Sehanobish, J. L. Pappalardo, D. A. Hafler, and D. van Dijk. Disease state prediction from single-cell data using graph attention networks. In *CHIL*, 2020.
- [122] S. Rhee, S. Seo, and S. Kim. Hybrid approach of relation network and localized graph convolutional filtering for breast cancer subtype classification. In *IJCAI*, 2018.
- [123] A. H. Rizvi, P. G. Camara, E. K. Kandrór, T. J. Roberts, I. Schieren, T. Maniatis, and R. Rabadan. Single-cell topological rna-seq analysis reveals insights into cellular differentiation and development. *Nature Biotechnology*, 2017.
- [124] P. N. Robinson, S. Köhler, S. Bauer, D. Seelow, D. Horn, and S. Mundlos. The human phenotype ontology: a tool for annotating and analyzing human hereditary disease. *The American Journal of Human Genetics*, 2008.
- [125] E. Rocheteau, C. Tong, P. Veličković, N. Lane, and P. Liò. Predicting patient outcomes with graph representation learning. *AAAI*, 2021.
- [126] E. Rossi, B. Chamberlain, F. Frasca, D. Eynard, F. Monti, and M. Bronstein. Temporal graph networks for deep learning on dynamic graphs. *ICML Workshop on Graph Representation Learning and Beyond*, 2020.
- [127] M. Rotmensch, Y. Halpern, A. Tlimat, S. Horng, and D. Sontag. Learning a health knowledge graph from electronic medical records. *Scientific Reports*, 2017.
- [128] M. Schlichtkrull, T. N. Kipf, P. Bloem, R. Van Den Berg, I. Titov, and M. Welling. Modeling relational data with graph convolutional networks. In *ESWC*, 2018.

- [129] L. M. Schriml, C. Arze, S. Nadendla, Y.-W. W. Chang, M. Mazaitis, V. Felix, G. Feng, and W. A. Kibbe. Disease ontology: a backbone for disease semantic integration. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 2012.
- [130] K. Schütt, P. Kindermans, H. E. S. Felix, S. Chmiela, A. Tkatchenko, and K. Müller. Schnet: A continuous-filter convolutional neural network for modeling quantum interactions. In *NeurIPS*, 2017.
- [131] J. Shang, C. Xiao, T. Ma, H. Li, and J. Sun. Gamenet: Graph augmented memory networks for recommending medication combination. In *AAAI*, 2019.
- [132] M. Singha, L. Pu, A.-E.-M. Shawky, K. Busch, H.-C. Wu, J. Ramanujam, and M. Brylinski. Graphgr: A graph neural network to predict the effect of pharmacotherapy on the cancer cell growth. *bioRxiv*, 2020.
- [133] T.-A. Song, S. R. Chowdhury, F. Yang, H. Jacobs, G. El Fakhri, Q. Li, K. Johnson, and J. Dutta. Graph convolutional neural networks for alzheimer’s disease classification. In *ISBI*, 2019.
- [134] M. Spielmann and S. Mundlos. Looking beyond the genes: the role of non-coding variants in human disease. *Human Molecular Genetics*, 2016.
- [135] C. Stark, B.-J. Breitkreutz, T. Reguly, L. Boucher, A. Breitkreutz, and M. Tyers. Biogrid: a general repository for interaction datasets. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 2006.
- [136] J. M. Stokes, K. Yang, K. Swanson, W. Jin, A. Cubillos-Ruiz, N. M. Donghia, C. R. MacNair, S. French, L. A. Carfrae, Z. Bloom-Ackermann, et al. A deep learning approach to antibiotic discovery. *Cell*, 2020.
- [137] I. Subramanian, S. Verma, S. Kumar, A. Jere, and K. Anamika. Multi-omics data integration, interpretation, and its application. *Bioinformatics and Biology Insights*, 2020.
- [138] M. Sumathipala, E. Maiorino, S. T. Weiss, and A. Sharma. Network diffusion approach to predict lncrna disease associations using multi-type biological networks: Lion. *Frontiers in Physiology*, 2019.
- [139] Z. Sun, Z. Deng, J. Nie, and J. Tang. Rotate: Knowledge graph embedding by relational rotation in complex space. In *ICLR*, 2019.
- [140] Z. Sun, H. Yin, H. Chen, T. Chen, L. Cui, and F. Yang. Disease prediction via graph neural networks. *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, 2020.
- [141] J. Tang, M. Qu, M. Wang, M. Zhang, J. Yan, and Q. Mei. LINE: Large-scale information network embedding. In *International Conference on World Wide Web*, pages 1067–1077, 2015.
- [142] M. A. Thafar, R. S. Olayan, H. Ashoor, S. Albaradei, V. B. Bajic, X. Gao, T. Gojobori, and M. Essack. Dtigems+: drug–target interaction prediction using graph embedding, graph mining, and similarity-based techniques. *Journal of Cheminformatics*, 2020.
- [143] T. Trouillon, J. Welbl, S. Riedel, É. Gaussier, and G. Bouchard. Complex embeddings for simple link prediction. In *ICLR*, 2016.
- [144] M. Tsubaki, K. Tomii, and J. Sese. Compound–protein interaction prediction with end-to-end learning of neural networks for graphs and sequences. *Bioinformatics*, 2019.
- [145] B. D. Umans, A. Battle, and Y. Gilad. Where are the disease-associated eqtls? *Trends in Genetics*, 2020.
- [146] P. Velickovic, G. Cucurull, A. Casanova, A. Romero, P. Liò, and Y. Bengio. Graph attention networks. In *ICLR*, 2018.

- [147] K. Veselkov, G. Gonzalez, S. Aljifri, D. Galea, R. Mirnezami, J. Youssef, M. Bronstein, and I. Laponogov. Hyperfoods: Machine intelligent mapping of cancer-beating molecules in foods. *Scientific Reports*, 2019.
- [148] J. Vig, A. Madani, L. R. Varshney, C. Xiong, R. Socher, and N. F. Rajani. Bertology meets biology: Interpreting attention in protein language models. *ICLR*, 2021.
- [149] O. Vinyals, S. Bengio, and M. Kudlur. Order matters: Sequence to sequence for sets. In *ICLR*, 2016.
- [150] F. Wan, L. Hong, A. Xiao, T. Jiang, and J. Zeng. Neodti: neural integration of neighbor information from a heterogeneous network for discovering new drug–target interactions. *Bioinformatics*, 2019.
- [151] H. Wang, J. Wang, J. Wang, M. Zhao, W. Zhang, F. Zhang, X. Xie, and M. Guo. Graphgan: Graph representation learning with generative adversarial nets. In *AAAI*, 2018.
- [152] R. Wang, S. Li, L. Cheng, M. H. Wong, and K. S. Leung. Predicting associations among drugs, targets and diseases by tensor decomposition for drug repositioning. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 2019.
- [153] T. Wang, Q. Peng, B. Liu, Y. Liu, and Y. Wang. Disease module identification based on representation learning of complex networks integrated from gwas, eqtl summaries, and human interactome. *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology*, 2020.
- [154] X. Wang, H. Ji, C. Shi, B. Wang, Y. Ye, P. Cui, and P. S. Yu. Heterogeneous graph attention network. In *WWW*, 2019.
- [155] C.-Y. Wee, C. Liu, A. Lee, J. S. Poh, H. Ji, A. Qiu, A. D. N. Initiative, et al. Cortical graph neural network for ad and mci diagnosis and transfer learning across populations. *NeuroImage: Clinical*, 2019.
- [156] O. Wieder, S. Kohlbacher, M. Kuenemann, A. Garon, P. Ducrot, T. Seidel, and T. Langer. A compact review of molecular property prediction with graph neural networks. *Drug Discovery Today: Technologies*, 2020.
- [157] L. Wong, Z.-H. You, Z.-H. Guo, H.-C. Yi, Z.-H. Chen, and M.-Y. Cao. Mipdh: A novel computational model for predicting microRNA–mRNA interactions by DeepWalk on a heterogeneous network. *ACS Omega*, 2020.
- [158] T. Wu, Y. Wang, Y. Wang, E. Zhao, Y. Yuan, and Z. Yang. Representation learning of ehr data via graph-based medical entity embedding. *NeurIPS Graph Representation Learning Workshop*, 2019.
- [159] X. Wu, W. Lan, Q. Chen, Y. Dong, J. Liu, and W. Peng. Inferring lncrna-disease associations based on graph autoencoder matrix completion. *Computational Biology and Chemistry*, 2020.
- [160] Y. Xie, J. Peng, and Y. Zhou. Integrating protein-protein interaction information into drug response prediction by graph neural encoding. 2019.
- [161] Y. Xie, C. Shi, H. Zhou, Y. Yang, W. Zhang, Y. Yu, and L. Li. Mars: Markov molecular sampling for multi-objective drug discovery. *ICLR*, 2021.
- [162] K. Xu, W. Hu, J. Leskovec, and S. Jegelka. How powerful are graph neural networks? In *ICLR*, 2019.
- [163] K. Xu, C. Li, Y. Tian, T. Sonobe, K. Kawarabayashi, and S. Jegelka. Representation learning on graphs with jumping knowledge networks. In *ICML*, 2018.

- [164] K. Xu, C. Li, Y. Tian, T. Sonobe, K.-i. Kawarabayashi, and S. Jegelka. Representation learning on graphs with jumping knowledge networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5453–5462, 2018.
- [165] P. Xuan, S. Pan, T. Zhang, Y. Liu, and H. Sun. Graph convolutional network and convolutional neural network based method for predicting lncrna-disease associations. *Cells*, 2019.
- [166] S. Yan, Y. Xiong, and D. Lin. Spatial temporal graph convolutional networks for skeleton-based action recognition. In *AAAI*, 2018.
- [167] B. Yang, W. Yih, X. He, J. Gao, and L. Deng. Embedding entities and relations for learning and inference in knowledge bases. In *ICLR*, 2015.
- [168] C. Yang, P. Zhuang, W. Shi, A. Luu, and P. Li. Conditional structure generation through graph variational generative adversarial nets. In *NeurIPS*, 2019.
- [169] F. Yang, K. Fan, D. Song, and H. Lin. Graph-based prediction of protein-protein interactions with attributed signed graph embedding. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 2020.
- [170] K. Yang, R. Wang, G. Liu, Z. Shu, N. Wang, R. Zhang, J. Yu, J. Chen, X. Li, and X. Zhou. Hergpred: heterogeneous network embedding representation for disease gene prediction. *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, 2018.
- [171] H. Yao, J. Guan, and T. Liu. Denoising protein-protein interaction network via variational graph auto-encoder for protein complex detection. *Journal of Bioinformatics and Computational Biology*, 2020.
- [172] Z. Ying, D. Bourgeois, J. You, M. Zitnik, and J. Leskovec. Gnnexplainer: Generating explanations for graph neural networks. In *NeurIPS*, 2019.
- [173] Z. Ying, J. You, C. Morris, X. Ren, W. L. Hamilton, and J. Leskovec. Hierarchical graph representation learning with differentiable pooling. In *NeurIPS*, 2018.
- [174] J. You, B. Liu, R. Ying, V. Pande, and J. Leskovec. Graph convolutional policy network for goal-directed molecular graph generation. *NeurIPS*, 2018.
- [175] J. You, R. Ying, X. Ren, W. L. Hamilton, and J. Leskovec. Graphrnn: Generating realistic graphs with deep auto-regressive models. In *ICML*, 2018.
- [176] Y. You, T. Chen, Z. Wang, and Y. Shen. When does self-supervision help graph convolutional networks? In *ICML*, 2020.
- [177] L. Yuan, J. Zhao, T. Sun, X.-S. Jiang, Z.-Y. Yang, X.-G. Wang, and Y.-S. Geng. Lncrna-disease association prediction based on graph neural networks and inductive matrix completion. In *ICIC*, 2020.
- [178] S. Yun, M. Jeong, R. Kim, J. Kang, and H. J. Kim. Graph transformer networks. In *NeurIPS*, 2019.
- [179] H. Zeng, H. Zhou, A. Srivastava, R. Kannan, and V. K. Prasanna. Graphsaint: Graph sampling based inductive learning method. In *ICLR*, 2020.
- [180] F. Zhang and J. R. Lupski. Non-coding genetic variants in human disease. *Human Molecular Genetics*, 2015.

- [181] H. Zhang, Y. Liang, C. Peng, S. Han, W. Du, and Y. Li. Predicting lncrna-disease associations using network topological similarity based on deep mining heterogeneous networks. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 2019.
- [182] X. Zhang and M. Zitnik. GNNGuard: Defending graph neural networks against adversarial attacks. *NeurIPS*, 2020.
- [183] Z. Zhang, P. Cui, and W. Zhu. Deep learning on graphs: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 2020.
- [184] C. Zhao, J. Jiang, Y. Guan, X. Guo, and B. He. Emr-based medical knowledge representation and inference via markov random fields and distributed representation learning. *Artificial Intelligence in Medicine*, 2018.
- [185] T. Zhao, Y. Hu, J. Peng, and L. Cheng. Deeplgp: a novel deep learning method for prioritizing lncrna target genes. *Bioinformatics*, 2020.
- [186] G. Zhou, J. Wang, X. Zhang, and G. Yu. Deepgoa: Predicting gene ontology annotations of proteins via graph convolutional network. In *BIBM*, 2019.
- [187] H. Zhou, F. Beltran, and I. L. Brito. Functions predict horizontal gene transfer and the emergence of antibiotic resistance. *Science Advances*, 7, 2021.
- [188] Y. Zhou, S. Graham, N. Alemi Koohbanani, M. Shaban, P.-A. Heng, and N. Rajpoot. Cgc-net: Cell graph convolutional network for grading of colorectal cancer histology images. In *ICCV Workshops*, 2019.
- [189] M. Zitnik, M. Agrawal, and J. Leskovec. Modeling polypharmacy side effects with graph convolutional networks. *Bioinformatics*, 2018.
- [190] M. Zitnik, M. W. Feldman, J. Leskovec, et al. Evolution of resilience in protein interactomes across the tree of life. *PNAS*, 2019.
- [191] M. Zitnik, E. A. Nam, C. Dinh, A. Kuspa, G. Shaulsky, and B. Zupan. Gene prioritization by compressive data fusion and chaining. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 2015.

Supplementary Information for
Graph Representation Learning in Biomedicine

Michelle M. Li^{1,3}, Kexin Huang², and Marinka Zitnik^{3,4,5,‡}

¹Bioinformatics and Integrative Genomics, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA 02115, USA

²Health Data Science, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA 02115, USA

³Department of Biomedical Informatics, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA 02115, USA

⁴Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Cambridge, MA 02142, USA

⁵Harvard Data Science Initiative, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA

‡Corresponding author. Email: marinka@hms.harvard.edu

This PDF file includes:

Supplementary Notes 1 to 4

Supplementary Figure 1

Supplementary References

Contents

1	Further Information on Graph Notation and Definitions	S3
2	Overview of Graph Machine Learning Tasks	S5
3	Further Details on Representation Learning Approaches	S6
3.1	Graph theoretic techniques	S6
3.2	Network diffusion	S7
3.3	Topological data analysis	S8
3.4	Manifold learning	S8
4	Further Details on Mathematical Formulations	S9
	Supplementary References	S15
	List of Figures	
1	Predominant graph learning paradigms.	S14

1 Further Information on Graph Notation and Definitions

Graph-theoretic elements. Graphs consist of the following key elements:

- *Node* v represents a biomedical entity, ranging from atoms to patients.
- *Edge* $e_{u,v}$ is a relation or link between node entities u and v , such as a bond between atoms, an affinity between molecules, a disease association between phenotypes, and a referral between a patient and a doctor. We denote the edge set in the graph as \mathcal{E} and the complementary non-edge set as \mathcal{E}^c . The edge can be directed, oriented such that it points from a source (or head node) to a destination (or tail node). The edge can also be undirected, where the nodes have two-way relations.
- *Graph* $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ consists of a collection of nodes \mathcal{V} that are connected by an edge set \mathcal{E} , such as a molecular graph or protein interaction network. Adjacency matrix \mathbf{A} is commonly used to represent a graph, where each entry $\mathbf{A}_{u,v}$ is 1 if nodes u, v are connected, and 0 otherwise. $\mathbf{A}_{u,v}$ can also be the edge weight between nodes u, v . We denote the number of the nodes $|\mathcal{V}| = n$ and the number of edges $|\mathcal{E}| = m$.
- *Subgraph* $S = (\mathcal{V}_S, \mathcal{E}_S)$ is a subset of a graph $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{V}_S \subseteq \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_S \subseteq \mathcal{E}$. Examples include disease modules in a protein interaction network or communities in a patient-doctor referral network.
- *Node Feature* $\mathbf{x}_v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ describes attributes of node v . The node feature matrix is denoted as $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$. Similarly, we can have edge features $\mathbf{x}_{u,v}^e \in \mathbb{R}^c$ for edge $e_{u,v}$ collected together into edge feature matrix $\mathbf{X}^e \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times c}$.
- *Label* is a target value associated with either a node Y_v , an edge Y_e , a subgraph Y_S , or a graph Y_G .

Walks and paths in graphs. A walk of length l from node v_1 to node v_l is a sequence of nodes and edges $v_1 \xrightarrow{e_{1,2}} v_2 \cdots v_{l-1} \xrightarrow{e_{l-1,l}} v_l$. A (simple) path is a type of walks where all nodes in the walk are distinct. For every two nodes u, v in the graph G , we define the distance $d(u, v)$ as the length of the shortest path between them. In a heterogeneous graph, a meta-path is a sequence of node types V_i and their edge types $R_{i,j}$: $V_1 \xrightarrow{R_{1,2}} V_2 \cdots V_{l-1} \xrightarrow{R_{l-1,l}} V_l$.

Local neighborhoods. For a node v , we denote its neighborhood $\mathcal{N}(v)$ as the collection of nodes that are connected to v , and its degree is the size of $\mathcal{N}(v)$. The k hop neighborhood of node v is the set of nodes that are exactly k hops away from node v : $\mathcal{N}^k(v) = \{u | d(u, v) = k\}$.

Graph types. The following types of graphs are commonly considered to model complex biomedical systems.

- *Simple, weighted, and attributed graphs.* A simple graph $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ is fully described by nodes \mathcal{V} and edges \mathcal{E} . For example, a set of binary PPIs gives rise to an unweighted PPI network. Further, nodes and edges can be accompanied by single-dimensional (e.g., edge weights) or multi-dimensional attribute vectors describing node and edge properties. For example, each node in a cell-cell interaction network can have a gene expression attribute vector encoding the gene's expression profile.
- *Multimodal or heterogeneous graphs.* Multimodal or heterogeneous graphs consist of nodes of different types (node type set \mathcal{A}) connected by diverse kinds of edges (edge type set \mathcal{R}). For example, in a drug-target-disease interaction network, nodes represent $\mathcal{A} = \{\text{drugs, proteins, diseases}\}$ and edges indicate $\mathcal{R} = \{\text{drug-target binding, disease-associated mutations, treatments}\}$.
- *Knowledge graphs.* A biomedical knowledge graph is a heterogeneous graph that captures knowledge retrieved from literature and biorepositories. A knowledge graph is given by a set of triplets $(u, r, v) \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{V}$, where nodes u, v belong to node types \mathcal{A} and are connected by edges with type $r \in \mathcal{R}$.
- *Multi-layer graphs.* Multi-layer graphs capture hierarchical relations by grouping individual networks into different layers. Formally, we have a set of networks G_1, \dots, G_n and l layers where each layer corresponds to a set of networks. Different layers can represent distinct contexts, such as tissues or diseases. Edges can also be added across layers. For example, each tissue can be represented with a tissue-specific PPI network, and PPIs for every tissue can be organized by tissue taxonomy, where each layer corresponds to a tissue taxonomy. Inter-layer edges can be connected for the same proteins across tissues ¹.
- *Temporal graphs.* Biomedical systems evolve over time. A temporal graph consists of a sequence of graphs G_1, \dots, G_T ordered by time, where at each time step t , we observe a subset of all nodes and their activity. For example, a human brain can be modeled as a temporal graph of brain regions showing task-related increases in neural activity at time t (e.g., greater activity during an experimental task than during a baseline state) and linked based on functional connectivity at t .

- *Spatial graphs.* Nodes or edges in a spatial graph are spatial elements usually associated with coordinates in one, two, or three dimensions, e.g., a spatial representation of cell-cell interactions in the 3-dimensional (3D) Euclidean tissue environment or a 3D point cloud of the protein’s atomic coordinates. Spatial graphs are defined by having nodes or edges with spatial locations. This small modification to aspatial graphs has profound effects on how these graphs are used and interpreted because a spatial graph is a location map of points with the constraints of space rather than an abstract structure.

The graph types described above can be combined to give rise to new objects, such as multi-layer spatial graphs or multimodal temporal graphs.

2 Overview of Graph Machine Learning Tasks

We divide machine learning tasks on biomedical graphs into three broad categories: graph prediction, latent graph learning, and graph generation. Each category is associated with several individual graph machine learning tasks.

Canonical graph prediction. Graph prediction aims to predict a label in the graph. The label can be associated with any unit of the graph. There are four canonical graph learning tasks: (1) *Node classification/regression* aims to find a function $f : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow Y_{\mathcal{V}}$ that predicts the label of a node in the graph; (2) *Link prediction* aims to find a function $f : \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{E}^c \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ to predict whether there exists a link between a given pair of nodes in the graph; (3) *Edge classification/regression* aims to find a function $f : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow Y_{\mathcal{E}}$ that predicts the label of an edge; (4) *Graph classification/regression* aims to find a function $f : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow Y_{\mathcal{G}}$ that maps each graph in a graph set to the correct label.

Other graph prediction tasks. In addition to the four standard prediction tasks on graphs, there are additional tasks that are particularly important for biomedical graphs: (1) *Module detection* aims to detect a subgraph module in the graph that contributes to a variable; (2) *Clustering or community detection* aims to partition the graphs into a set of subgraphs such that each subgraph contains similar nodes; (3) *Subgraph classification/regression* aims to predict a label for the subgraph or module; (4) *Dynamic graph prediction* aims to perform the above prediction tasks in a sequence of dynamic graphs.

Latent graph learning. While graph prediction tasks predict given the graph-structured data, latent graph learning aims to obtain a function $f : \mathcal{V}, \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ to learn the underlying graph structure (e.g., edges) given only the nodes and their feature attributes. The learned graph can be used to (1) perform graph prediction tasks; (2) obtain the inherent topology of the data; and (3)

generate latent low-dimensional representations of the feature attributes.

Graph generation. The objective of graph generation is to generate a never-before-seen graph G with some properties of interest. Given a set of training graphs \mathcal{G} with certain shared characteristics, the task is to learn a function $f : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{G}}$ to obtain a distribution $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{G}}$ that characterizes the training graphs. Then, the learned distribution can be used to generate a new graph G' , which has the same characteristics as or optimized properties compared to the training graphs.

3 Further Details on Representation Learning Approaches

We here review four important graph representation learning approaches beyond those surveyed in the main text. In particular, we describe:

- *Graph theoretic techniques (Section 3.1):* Networks model relations among real world subjects. Such relations form patterns of structures in the network. These patterns can be quantified by expert-defined statistics to characterize the role of nodes, links, or subgraphs. These statistics can be used to represent elements in the graph.
- *Network propagation methods (Section 3.2):* Nodes in a graph influence each other along the paths. Diffusion measures these spreads of influences. By aggregating diffusion from neighboring nodes to the target node, a diffusion profile captures the local connectivity patterns of the target node.
- *Topological data analysis (Section 3.3):* A dataset has an underlying structure. Topological data analysis (TDA) analyzes the topology of the data to generate an underlying graph structure. Two main frameworks exist. One is called persistent homology ², which obtains a vector that quantifies various topological shapes at different spatial resolutions. The other is called Mapper ^{3,4}, which first clusters topologically similar data into a node, where similarity is defined by a filter function, and then connects the clusters as the backbone of the data topology. The output is a graph that characterizes the topology of data.
- *Manifold learning (Section 3.4):* Real-world data is usually high-dimensional. To better interpret them, a mapping to find the low-dimensional characterization of the data is ideal. This mapping is called manifold learning, or non-linear dimensionality reduction.

3.1 Graph theoretic techniques

Networks model relations among real world subjects. Such relations form patterns of structures in the network. Among the network science community, many have studied these patterns of

graph structures, and proposed graph statistics to measure their characteristics. We summarize such statistics into the following three categories: node-, link-, and subgraph-level statistics. See Figure 1a for an illustration of network statistics.

Node-level techniques. The goal of node-level statistics is to measure the role of a node u in a graph. For instance, betweenness⁵ calculates the number of shortest paths that pass through the node. A node with high betweenness is called a bottleneck because it controls the information flow of the network. Various centrality statistics are proposed to measure the various roles of a node regarding its structure and function. For example, k-core⁶ measures the position of the node in the graph.

Link-level techniques. Statistics have been demonstrated as a powerful tool for link prediction. They are used to represent the likelihood that a link exists between two nodes. Classic statistics include common neighbor index, Adamic–Adar index, resource allocation index, etc⁷. Most of them rely on the homophily principle. However,⁸ recently showed that the protein-protein interaction (PPI) network does not follow homophily because interacting proteins are not necessarily similar, and similar proteins do not necessarily interact. They propose L3, which calculates the number of paths of length 3, and it shows strong performance in learning PPI networks. For a complete list of link-level graph statistics methods, we refer readers to⁹.

Subgraph-level techniques. Many subnetwork patterns recur in the network. Such patterns are called motifs, and they are shown to be the basic blocks of complex networks. For instance, a feed-forward loop is an important three-node motif in gene regulatory networks¹⁰. They have functional roles, such as increasing the response to signals¹¹. Individualized motifs for each network can also be computed through frequent subgraph mining algorithms¹².

3.2 Network diffusion

Nodes in a graph influence each other along the paths. Diffusion measures these spreads of influences. The typical resulting outcomes of interest include a scalar ψ between every node v to the source node u that measures the influence, or a diffusion profile ψ_u for source node u , which captures the local connectivity patterns (Figure 1b). Many have studied the effect of diffusion in physics, economics, epidemiology and various formulations have been proposed^{13–15}. On a very related line of work, label propagation leverages connected links to propagate labels¹⁶.

Diffusion state distance. One effective method for biomedical networks is the diffusion state distance¹⁷, which first calculates the number of times a random walk starting at source node will

visit a destination node given a fixed number of steps, and iterates this process for every destination node in the graph.

Unsupervised extension. Recent efforts, such as GraphWave¹⁸, adopt an unsupervised learning method to learn an embedding for each node by leveraging heat wavelet diffusion patterns. The resulting embeddings allow nodes residing in different parts of a graph to have similar structural roles within their local network topology.

3.3 Topological data analysis

For a large and high-dimensional dataset D , it is hard to directly gauge their characteristics or obtain a summary of the data. However, all data have an underlying shape or topology T , which can be considered as a network. Topological data analysis (TDA) analyzes the topology of the data to generate an underlying graph structure. There are two major diagrams in TDA: persistent homology (Figure 1c) and mapper (Figure 1d).

Persistent homology. Persistent homology² obtains a vector that quantifies various topological shapes at different spatial resolutions. As the resolution scale expands, the noise and artifacts would disappear while the important structure persists. Recent works have used neural networks on top of persistent diagrams to learn augmented topological features^{19,20}.²¹ propose a differentiable persistent homology layer in the network to make any GNN topology-aware.

Mapper. While persistent homology provides a vector of topology, mapper generates a topology graph^{3,4}. This graph is obtained by first clustering topologically similar data into a node, where similarity is defined by a filter function, and then connecting the clusters as the backbone of the data topology. The resulting shape can be used to visualize the data and understand data subtypes²² and trajectories of development²³. Mapper is highly dependent on the filter function, and it is usually constructed with domain expertise. Recent works have integrated neural networks to automatically learn the filter function from the data²⁴.

3.4 Manifold learning

Real-world data is usually high-dimensional. To better interpret them, a mapping to find the low-dimensional characterization of the data is ideal. This mapping is called manifold learning, or non-linear dimensionality reduction (Figure 1e). Note that the underlying manifold can be considered as a weighted network such that higher weights are assigned to edges between data points that are closer in the manifold.

In a typical setting, we only have a set of data points, or nodes u_1, \dots, u_n , and their associ-

ated attributes $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$ without any connections among them. To learn the underlying manifold using graphs, the first step is to construct an edge set \mathcal{E} that connects nodes given some distance measure. With this connectivity graph, one approach is to apply a graph statistics operator to directly compute the low-dimensional embedding, such as laplacian eigenmap²⁵ and isomap²⁶. Another approach is to optimize various kinds of cost functions to generate low-dimensional embeddings that preserve distance measures on the graph, such as t-SNE²⁷. However, such methods are all multi-stage processes in which the outcome depends on the defined distance measures. Recently, a line of research has emerged that can generate embeddings in an end-to-end learnable manner, where the manifold is learned by the signals from the downstream prediction task^{28,29}.

4 Further Details on Mathematical Formulations

Formulation 1 Graph theoretic techniques

Graph theoretic techniques are functions that map network components to real-values representing aspects of graph structure, such as node proximity^{30–32} and node centrality³³. We use betweenness as an example.

Example. For node u in graph G , the betweenness is calculated as: $B_u = \sum_{s \neq u \neq t} \frac{\sigma_{s,t}(u)}{\sigma_{s,t}}$, where $\sigma_{s,t}$ is the number of shortest paths between nodes s and t , and $\sigma_{s,t}(u)$ is the number of shortest paths that pass through node u . Basically, the larger the betweenness, the larger the influence of this node u on the network.

Formulation 2 Network diffusion

Network diffusion computes the network influence signatures based on propagation on the networks. We use Diffusion State Distance (DSD)¹⁷ as an example.

Example. For a node u , we calculate its diffusion distance $D(u, v_i)$ from every node $v_i \in \mathcal{V}$ as the expected number of times that p_u , a random walk of length k starting from u , will visit v_i . Formally, $D(u, v_i) = \mathbb{E}[\text{sign}(v_i, p_u)]$, where $\text{sign}(v_i, p_u)$ is 1 if node $v_i \in p_u$ and 0 otherwise. So, we obtain a vector $D(u) = (D(u, v_1), \dots, D(u, v_n))$. Then, the DSD between nodes u and v is defined as $DSD(u, v) = \|D(u) - D(v)\|_1$, the L1-norm of the diffusion vector difference. Intuitively, DSD measures the differences in the node influence from every other node to see if they have similar local connectivity.

Formulation 3 Geometric representations along preassigned guiding functions called filters

A mapper generates the data topology T from the data D ^{4,34}. A standard mapper procedure consists of the following steps:

1. **Reference Map.** Given a set of data D , we first define a continuous filter function $f : D \rightarrow Z$ that assigns every data point in D to a value in Z .
2. **Construction of a Covering.** A finite covering $\mathbb{U} = \{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ is constructed on Z . Each cover consists of a set of points D_α , and is the pre-image of the cover $D_\alpha = f^{(-1)}(U_\alpha)$.
3. **Clustering.** For each subset D_α , we apply a clustering algorithm C that generates N_α clusters.
4. **Topology Graph.** Each cluster forms a node. If two clusters share data points in D , then an edge is formed. The resulting graph is the topology graph T of data D . Formally, the topology graph is defined as the nerve of the cover by the path-connected components.

Formulation 4 Shallow network embedding

Shallow network embedding generates a mapping that preserves the similarity in the network ³⁵. Formally, typical shallow network embeddings are learned in the following three steps:

1. **Mapping to an embedding space.** Given a pair of nodes u, v in network G , we obtain a function f to map these nodes to an embedding space to generate \mathbf{h}_u and \mathbf{h}_v .
2. **Defining network similarity.** We next define the network similarity as $f_n(u, v)$, and the embedding similarity as $f_z(\mathbf{h}_u, \mathbf{h}_v)$.
3. **Computing loss.** Then, we define the loss $\mathcal{L}(f_n(u, v), f_z(\mathbf{h}_u, \mathbf{h}_v))$, which measures whether the embedding preserves the distance in the original networks. Finally, we apply an optimization procedure to minimize the loss $\mathcal{L}(f_n(u, v), f_z(\mathbf{h}_u, \mathbf{h}_v))$.

Formulation 5 Persistent homology

Given a dataset D , persistent homology generates a persistence diagram (often referred to as a barcode) that captures the significant topological features in D , such as connected components, holes, and cavities^{36,37}. It consists of the following steps:

1. **Construction of the Rips Complex.** Consider each data point in the original dataset D as a vertex. For each pair of vertices u, v , create an edge if the distance between them is at most ϵ , i.e., $\mathcal{E} = \{(u, v) | d(u, v) \leq \epsilon\}$, given the distance metric d . Consider a monotonically increasing sequence of $\epsilon_0, \dots, \epsilon_n$, we then generate a filtration of Rips complexes G_0, \dots, G_n .
2. **Homology.** Homology characterizes topological structures (e.g., 0-th order homology measures connected components, 1-st order homology measures holes, 2-nd order homology measures voids). A class in a k -th order homology is an instantiation of the homology. In each Rips complex, we can track the various homology classes, which capture various topological structures. For a rigorous definition of homology, we refer reader to³⁸.
3. **Persistence Diagrams.** At each ϵ , we denote the emergence of a new homology class a as its birth using the current ϵ . Similarly, we denote the disappearance of a previous homology class a as its death. Thus, for each homology class a , we can represent them as $(\epsilon_{\text{Birth}}, \epsilon_{\text{Death}})$. After ϵ reaches the end of the sequence, we have a set of 2-dimensional points (x, y) , each corresponding to the birth and death of a homology class. The persistence diagram is a plot of these points. The farther away from the diagonal, the longer the lifespan of the homology class, implying that the structure is an important shape of the data topology.

Formulation 6 Manifold learning

The goal of manifold learning is to learn a low-dimensional embedding that captures the data manifold from high-dimensional data³⁹. In the following, we use isomap²⁶ as an example.

Example. First, given a set of data points with high-dimensional feature vectors $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$, we apply a k -nearest neighbor algorithm and connect the nearest neighbors to form a neighborhood graph G . Next, we calculate the distance matrix \mathbf{D} , where each entry $\mathbf{d}_{i,j}$ is the length of the shortest path between nodes i and j in the neighborhood graph. Then, we apply an optimization algorithm to obtain a set of low-dimensional vectors $\mathbf{h}_1, \dots, \mathbf{h}_n$ that minimizes $\sum_{i < j} (\|\mathbf{h}_i - \mathbf{h}_j\| - d_{i,j})^2$.

Formulation 7 Graph neural networks

GNNs learn compact representations or embeddings that capture network structure and node features^{40–42}. A GNN generates outputs through a series of propagation layers⁴³, where propagation at layer l consists of the following three steps:

1. **Neural message passing.** The GNN computes a message $\mathbf{m}_{u,v}^{(l)} = \text{MSG}(\mathbf{h}_u^{(l-1)}, \mathbf{h}_v^{(l-1)})$ for every linked nodes u, v based on their embeddings from the previous layer $\mathbf{h}_u^{(l-1)}$ and $\mathbf{h}_v^{(l-1)}$.
2. **Neighborhood aggregation.** The messages between node u and its neighbors \mathcal{N}_u are aggregated as $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_u^{(l)} = \text{AGG}(\mathbf{m}_{uv}^{(l)} | v \in \mathcal{N}_u)$.
3. **Update.** The GNN applies a non-linear function to update node embeddings as $\mathbf{h}_u^{(l)} = \text{UPD}(\hat{\mathbf{m}}_u^{(l)}, \mathbf{h}_u^{(l-1)})$ using the aggregated message and the embedding from the previous layer.

Formulation 8 Generative modeling

Generative models optimize and learn data distributions in order to generate graphs with desirable properties. In the following, we use VGAE⁴⁴ as an example.

Example. VGAE is a graph extension of variational autoencoders⁴⁵. Given a graph G with adjacency matrix \mathbf{A} and node features \mathbf{X} , we use two GNNs to encode the graph and generate the latent mean vector $\mu_{\mathbf{Z}}^u$ and the log-variance $\log(\sigma_{\mathbf{Z}}^u)$ parameters for each node u . Formally, $\mu_{\mathbf{Z}} = \text{GNN}_{\mu}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}| \times d}$, and $\log(\sigma_{\mathbf{Z}}) = \text{GNN}_{\sigma}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}| \times d}$. We can then obtain the latent distribution $q(\mathbf{Z}|G) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{\mathbf{Z}}, (\log(\sigma_{\mathbf{Z}})))$, where we can draw a latent embedding sample $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}| \times d}$ from the latent distribution. Then, given the latent embedding, we feed into

a probabilistic decoder $p_\theta(\hat{\mathbf{A}}|\mathbf{Z})$ to generate a network \hat{G} with adjacency matrix $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$. In VGAE, the decoder is a dot product, i.e., $p_\theta(\hat{\mathbf{A}}_{uv} = 1|\mathbf{Z}) = \text{sigmoid}(\mathbf{z}_u^T \mathbf{z}_v)$. This way, we obtain a newly generated graph \hat{G} . Finally, we optimize the weight using the variational reconstruction loss $\mathcal{L} = \mathbb{E}_{q(\mathbf{Z}|G)}[p(G|\mathbf{Z})] - \text{KL}(q(\mathbf{Z}|G)||p(\mathbf{Z}))$.




Figure 1: Predominant graph learning paradigms. Graph machine learning is a large field with a diverse set of methods. Here, we summarize and categorize seven major graph machine learning methods paradigms. **(a)** Graph theoretic techniques compute a deterministic value that describes patterns in the graph; **(b)** diffusion process captures the importance and influence of nodes through network diffusion; **(c-d)** topological data analysis provides summarized views of the shape of the data; **(e)** manifold learning aims to obtain the underlying graph structure of data and a low-dimensional embedding; **(f)** shallow network embeddings generate node representations through direct encoding of node similarities in the input graph; **(g)** graph neural networks learn graph embeddings through supervised signals by neural networks; **(h)** generative models generate novel graphs that have desirable properties. Note that panels (c) and (d) are two major diagrams of TDA.

Supplementary References

1. Zitnik, M. & Leskovec, J. Predicting multicellular function through multi-layer tissue networks. *Bioinformatics* (2017).
2. Edelsbrunner, H. & Harer, J. Persistent homology-a survey. *Contemporary Mathematics* (2008).
3. Nicolau, M., Levine, A. J. & Carlsson, G. Topology based data analysis identifies a subgroup of breast cancers with a unique mutational profile and excellent survival. *PNAS* (2011).
4. Singh, G., Mémoli, F. & Carlsson, G. E. Topological methods for the analysis of high dimensional data sets and 3d object recognition. *SPBG* (2007).
5. Freeman, L. C. A set of measures of centrality based on betweenness. *Sociometry* (1977).
6. Kitsak, M. *et al.* Identification of influential spreaders in complex networks. *Nature Physics* (2010).
7. Gao, F., Musial, K., Cooper, C. & Tsoka, S. Link prediction methods and their accuracy for different social networks and network metrics. *Scientific Programming* (2015).
8. Kovács, I. A. *et al.* Network-based prediction of protein interactions. *Nature Communications* (2019).
9. Liu, C. *et al.* Computational network biology: Data, models, and applications. *Physics Reports* (2020).
10. Milo, R. *et al.* Network motifs: simple building blocks of complex networks. *Science* (2002).
11. Martin, O. C., Krzywicki, A. & Zagorski, M. Drivers of structural features in gene regulatory networks: From biophysical constraints to biological function. *Physics of Life Reviews* (2016).
12. Jiang, C., Coenen, F. & Zito, M. A survey of frequent subgraph mining algorithms. *Knowledge Engineering Review* (2013).
13. Cowan, R. & Jonard, N. Network structure and the diffusion of knowledge. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* (2004).

14. Raj, A., Kuceyeski, A. & Weiner, M. A network diffusion model of disease progression in dementia. *Neuron* (2012).
15. Akbarpour, M. & Jackson, M. O. Diffusion in networks and the virtue of burstiness. *PNAS* (2018).
16. Wang, F. & Zhang, C. Label propagation through linear neighborhoods. In *ICML* (2006).
17. Cao, M. *et al.* Going the distance for protein function prediction: a new distance metric for protein interaction networks. *PLOS One* (2013).
18. Donnat, C., Zitnik, M., Hallac, D. & Leskovec, J. Learning structural node embeddings via diffusion wavelets. In *KDD* (2018).
19. Hofer, C. D., Kwitt, R., Niethammer, M. & Uhl, A. Deep learning with topological signatures. In *NeurIPS* (2017).
20. Carrière, M. *et al.* Perslay: A neural network layer for persistence diagrams and new graph topological signatures. In *AISTATS* (2020).
21. Hofer, C. D., Graf, F., Rieck, B., Niethammer, M. & Kwitt, R. Graph filtration learning. In *ICML* (2020).
22. De Cecco, L. *et al.* Head and neck cancer subtypes with biological and clinical relevance: Meta-analysis of gene-expression data. *Oncotarget* (2015).
23. Madhobi, K. F. *et al.* A visual analytics framework for analysis of patient trajectories. In *ACM-BCB* (2019).
24. Bodnar, C., Cangea, C. & Liò, P. Deep graph mapper: Seeing graphs through the neural lens. *arXiv:2002.03864* (2020).
25. Belkin, M. & Niyogi, P. Laplacian eigenmaps and spectral techniques for embedding and clustering. In *NeurIPS* (2001).
26. Tenenbaum, J. B., De Silva, V. & Langford, J. C. A global geometric framework for nonlinear dimensionality reduction. *Science* (2000).
27. Maaten, L. v. d. & Hinton, G. Visualizing data using t-sne. *JMLR* (2008).

28. Halcrow, J., Mosoi, A., Ruth, S. & Perozzi, B. Grale: Designing networks for graph learning. In *KDD* (2020).
29. Wang, Y. *et al.* Dynamic graph CNN for learning on point clouds. *ACM Transactions On Graphics* (2019).
30. Menche, J. *et al.* Uncovering disease-disease relationships through the incomplete interactome. *Science* (2015).
31. Baryshnikova, A. Systematic functional annotation and visualization of biological networks. *Cell Systems* (2016).
32. Agrawal, M., Zitnik, M., Leskovec, J. *et al.* Large-scale analysis of disease pathways in the human interactome. In *PSB* (2018).
33. Goh, K.-I. *et al.* The human disease network. *PNAS* (2007).
34. Wang, R., Li, S., Cheng, L., Wong, M. H. & Leung, K. S. Predicting associations among drugs, targets and diseases by tensor decomposition for drug repositioning. *BMC Bioinformatics* (2019).
35. Hosseini, A., Chen, T., Wu, W., Sun, Y. & Sarrafzadeh, M. Heteromed: Heterogeneous information network for medical diagnosis. In *CIKM* (2018).
36. Hofer, C. D., Kwitt, R. & Niethammer, M. Learning representations of persistence barcodes. *JMLR* (2019).
37. Bubenik, P. Statistical topological data analysis using persistence landscapes. *JMLR* (2015).
38. Edelsbrunner, H. & Harer, J. *Computational topology: an introduction* (2010).
39. Burkhardt, D. B. *et al.* Quantifying the effect of experimental perturbations in single-cell rna-sequencing data using graph signal processing. *bioRxiv* (2019).
40. Han, P. *et al.* GCN-MF: disease-gene association identification by graph convolutional networks and matrix factorization. In *KDD* (2019).
41. Ingraham, J., Garg, V. K., Barzilay, R. & Jaakkola, T. S. Generative models for graph-based protein design. In *NeurIPS* (2019).

42. Xie, Y., Peng, J. & Zhou, Y. Integrating protein-protein interaction information into drug response prediction by graph neural encoding (2019).
43. Gilmer, J., Schoenholz, S. S., Riley, P. F., Vinyals, O. & Dahl, G. E. Neural message passing for quantum chemistry. In *ICML* (2017).
44. Kipf, T. N. & Welling, M. Variational graph auto-encoders. *NeurIPS Workshop* (2016).
45. Kingma, D. P. & Welling, M. Auto-encoding variational bayes. In *ICLR* (2014).