

Link Prediction under Heterophily: A Physics-Inspired Graph Neural Network Approach

Andrea Giuseppe Di Francesco*[†]
difrancesco@diag.uniroma1.it

Maria Sofia Bucarelli*
bucarelli@diag.uniroma1.it

Francesco Caso*
caso@diag.uniroma1.it

Fabrizio Silvestri*[†]
fsilvestri@diag.uniroma1.it

ABSTRACT

In the past years, Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) have become the ‘de facto’ standard in various deep learning domains, thanks to their flexibility in modeling real-world phenomena represented as graphs. However, the message-passing mechanism of GNNs faces challenges in learnability and expressivity, hindering high performance on heterophilic graphs, where adjacent nodes frequently have different labels. Most existing solutions addressing these challenges are primarily confined to specific benchmarks focused on node classification tasks. This narrow focus restricts the potential impact that link prediction under heterophily could offer in several applications, including recommender systems. For example, in social networks, two users may be connected for some latent reason, making it challenging to predict such connections in advance. Physics-Inspired GNNs such as GRAFF provided a significant contribution to enhance node classification performance under heterophily, thanks to the adoption of physics biases in the message-passing. Drawing inspiration from these findings, we advocate that the methodology employed by GRAFF can improve link prediction performance as well. To further explore this hypothesis, we introduce GRAFF-LP, an extension of GRAFF to link prediction. We evaluate its efficacy within a recent collection of heterophilic graphs, establishing a new benchmark for link prediction under heterophily. Our approach surpasses previous methods, in most of the datasets, showcasing a strong flexibility in different contexts, and achieving relative AUROC improvements of up to 26.7%.

CCS CONCEPTS

• Information systems → Recommender systems.

KEYWORDS

Link Prediction, Heterophilic Graphs, Graph Neural Networks, Physics-Inspired Inductive Bias

*Sapienza University of Rome, Rome, Italy

[†]ISTI-CNR, Pisa, Italy

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.
Conference acronym 'XX, June 03–05, 2018, Woodstock, NY

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06
<https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

ACM Reference Format:

Andrea Giuseppe Di Francesco, Francesco Caso, Maria Sofia Bucarelli, and Fabrizio Silvestri. 2018. Link Prediction under Heterophily: A Physics-Inspired Graph Neural Network Approach. In *Proceedings of Make sure to enter the correct conference title from your rights confirmation email (Conference acronym 'XX)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 7 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 INTRODUCTION

Over the last decade, Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) have contributed heavily to several areas of Deep Learning (DL), such as Recommendation Systems [17, 52, 59, 63], Natural Language Processing [6, 11, 37, 44, 48, 62], Computer Vision [19, 27, 50, 56], and Knowledge graphs [24, 60]. In the DL domain, GNNs work as feature extractors that can be trained to perform some typical task on graphs such as *link prediction*, and *node or graph classification*.

Among these, link prediction aims to develop a system capable of computing the probability of two nodes sharing a link.

Most GNNs rely on the *message-passing* formalism [20] and are often referred to in the literature as *message-passing neural networks* (MPNNs) [7, 25, 32, 34, 54]. Despite their popularity, the MPNNs present some flaws, like over-smoothing [39, 40, 47], which causes the node representation to be undistinguishable in the limit of many layers. In addition, in heterophilic graphs where connected nodes tend to have different labels, MPNNs may struggle in the classification task as they tend to generate similar representations for adjacent nodes [43, 46, 68].

Efforts have been made to enhance GNN performance on heterophilic graphs [8, 14, 43, 49, 57, 61, 68]. More recently, a physics-inspired approach to designing MPNNs called *gradient flow framework* (GRAFF) was introduced [21]. Although GRAFF shows competitive performance in both heterophilic and homophilic graphs, existing research has solely concentrated on node classification tasks, not investigating its potential in link prediction— which has significant applications in recommendation systems. This task becomes particularly complex for heterophilic graphs, where we may have links between nodes with both similar and dissimilar characteristics. In fact, in heterophilic graphs, unlike homophilic ones where connected nodes are similar, the reason behind connections is latent. For instance, in a financial transaction network [42], where the fraudsters often engage in transactions with non-fraudulent users. Or, in a social network, links might exist between two users who are colleagues but have different interests. Another practical example is the Amazon Ratings dataset [46], where a recommendation system might suggest purchasing two products together despite their differing ratings (labels). Or there may be

question-answering websites where we want to predict the connection between two users who are interested in the same topics, but one is more frequently active on the website than the other, as in the Questions dataset [46]. To the best of our knowledge, the topic of link prediction under heterophily has only been discussed and brought to the community’s attention in [67].

Having become aware of the previous work limitations, both relative to the message-passing formalism and the poor literature on link prediction applied to heterophilic graphs, we propose GRAFF-LP (GRAFF for Link Prediction), a link prediction framework built upon GRAFF for node classification [21]. We tested our model on both traditional and new heterophilic datasets introduced in [46] to overcome the limitations of standard benchmarks. The contributions of our work are the following.

- We present GRAFF-LP, the first Physics-Inspired GNN specialized to perform link prediction under heterophily.
- We demonstrate that GRAFF-LP can achieve competitive performance w.r.t. the other examined methods, showing consistent performance across graphs from different contexts.
- We set a new link prediction baseline on a recently created collection of heterophilic graphs [46], initially designed for node classification. This baseline serves as a foundation for future work in this area.
- Our work enhances the current, yet not well-explored, literature on link prediction in heterophilic graphs.

2 RELATED WORKS

Graph Neural Networks for link prediction. Over the years, link prediction algorithms have evolved and can easily be distinguished between *non-neural-based* and *neural-based* methods. The former mainly consists of heuristics [1, 5, 9, 64] that rely on strong assumptions on the link prediction process. On the other hand, neural-based methods imply the use of learning systems, in particular GNNs. Even though some GNNs cannot be as expressive as most of the heuristics [65], they can learn graph structure features and content features in a unified way, outperforming previous works. An instance of this class are the node-based methods, where the objective is to learn the node representations in a vector form, and then estimate the link existence accordingly. Graph Auto-Encoders are an example of this class [31], and several variants have been proposed in recent years [16, 41, 55].

Most recently, the *subgraph-based* paradigm, pioneered by SEAL [65], pushed the state-of-the-art beyond node-based methods. Computing subgraph representations increases GNN expressivity but makes this approach inefficient and impractical for real-world graphs. [13] tried to alleviate the efficiency-related issues using subgraph sketches. Despite these efforts, the node-based baselines remain a more efficient and scalable solution. For this reason, we designed the GRAFF-LP architecture according to the node-based paradigm.

Link prediction methods have predominantly been compared within homophilic benchmarks, biasing progress in that direction. The heterophilic scenario became a subject of interest for link prediction only recently in [67], where an ‘ad hoc’ method to handle link prediction under heterophily is proposed. This approach outperforms

previous node-based baselines but poorly scales to larger datasets because of the multiple set of features associated with each node.

Physics-Inspired vs. Physics-Informed. Physics-Inspired (PIrd) neural networks belong to the class of Physics-Informed (PI) neural networks. However, a preliminary distinction must be made for clarity’s sake. Generally, the PI paradigm has the objective of providing priors to machine learning models to let them intuit the underlying physical process that can help to improve the task performance. These priors can benefit the neural network training in several ways: through better efficiency in training data requirements, faster training convergence, or the model’s generalizability and interpretability [4, 29, 38]. The methodologies that have been employed to transfer such physical knowledge differ widely [23, 28, 29, 35], and take the form of different types of biases. Among this, we have a bias of the inductive type. Which is what we refer to as PIrd. Some of these are [12, 15, 21, 23].

Physics-Inspired Graph Neural Networks. The class of methods that can be associated with PIrd GNNs are models where the physics bias is encompassed within the network’s architecture in the form of ‘hard’ constraints. From this perspective, we report some examples.

In [21], the GNN is interpreted as a gradient flow, namely, its forward pass minimizes a parametrized energy functional, respecting the properties of gradient flows. In [15], GNNs resemble reaction-diffusion equations which are typically used to model the spatial and temporal change of one or more chemical substance concentrations. These works are experimentally limited to node classification benchmarks, and no practical feedback on their application to link prediction is currently available in the literature. In this work, we provide the first perspective on PIrd biases applied in the context of link prediction.

3 PRELIMINARIES

Notation. Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ be an undirected graph, with \mathcal{V} the set of nodes and $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ be the set of edges. $|\mathcal{V}| = N$ is the number of nodes that belong to \mathcal{G} , and $|\mathcal{E}|$ be the number of edges. $\Gamma(i)$ is the set of the neighborhood of the node i , and $|\Gamma(i)|$ denotes its degree. \mathbf{D} is the diagonal matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$, such that $D_i = |\Gamma(i)|$. $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ represents the features of node i . The node representations can be ordered in a unique matrix, which we refer to as the *instance matrix* $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d}$. \mathbf{X} is defined as

$$\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{x}_1 \quad \mathbf{x}_2 \quad \mathbf{x}_3 \quad \cdots \quad \mathbf{x}_N]^T. \quad (1)$$

$\mathbf{A} \in \{0, 1\}^{N \times N}$ is the adjacency matrix, with $A_{ij} = 1$ if nodes i and j are connected, and $A_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. Moreover, we specify y_i as the label associated with node i .

Homophily measures. The homophily assumption in graphs refers to the tendency of similar nodes to be connected. However, an unambiguous similarity measure is missing in the literature. Those that have been used the most with GNNs are *edge homophily* ξ_{edge} [69] and *node homophily* ξ_{node} [43]. Between these, the former was more considered within the node classification benchmarks [8, 21, 36, 49], and can be computed as

$$\xi_{edge} = \frac{|\{(i, j) \in \mathcal{E} : y_i = y_j\}|}{|\mathcal{E}|} \quad (2)$$




Figure 1: General overview of the link prediction pipeline. The pipeline is organized in three main phases. In the Encoding phase, the initial graph representation is encoded through a linear MLP. In the Message-Passing phase, an update rule in the form of Equation (9) is iteratively applied. Finally, the decoding phase is used to compute the final prediction.

Both ξ_{edge} , and ξ_{node} , are based on the labels associated with the nodes. As an example, Equation (2) measures the fraction of edges that connect nodes from the same class.

Generally, if we record a low homophily, we consider the graph as heterophilic.

More recently, [45, 46] showed that these specific measures are not sufficiently representative of homophily. Even though they are intuitive to compute, they hinder the comparison across different datasets, as they are sensitive to the number of classes and their balance among samples. To bridge this gap, *adjusted homophily* ξ_{adj} was introduced in [45], allowing to compare properly the homophily level between different graphs. ξ_{adj} is defined as follows:

$$\xi_{adj} = \frac{\xi_{edge} - \sum_{k \in S} \mathcal{D}_k^2 / (2|\mathcal{E}|)^2}{1 - \sum_{k \in S} \mathcal{D}_k^2 / (2|\mathcal{E}|)^2}, \quad (3)$$

$S = \{1, \dots, C\}$ is the set of possible labels associated to each node, and $\mathcal{D}_k = \sum_{i: y_i=k} D_i$. While this measure is comparable across graphs and upper-bounded at 1, it lacks a lower bound and doesn't incorporate node features into the similarity.

Graph Neural Networks as gradient flow. Let us consider an N -dimensional dynamic system that follows a certain differential equation $\dot{\mathbf{X}}(t) = F(\mathbf{X}(t))$, with $\mathbf{X}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d}$, and $\mathbf{X}(0)$ as the initial conditions of the system. Provided that exists a function $E: \mathbb{R}^{N \times d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, s.t. $F(\mathbf{X}(t)) = -\nabla E(\mathbf{X}(t))$, we refer to the evolution equation $\dot{\mathbf{X}}(t)$ as the gradient flow of the energy E . Gradient flows are useful to study the underlying dynamics of the system, provided the knowledge of E .

In our specific case, the physical interpretation of the dynamic system is attached to a graph. N are the nodes in the graph, that evolve their representations $\mathbf{X}(t)$ through a GNN over time, while $E(\mathbf{X}(t))$, is an energy functional associated with the node representations. For instance, if we consider $GNN: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ as an intermediate layer of a generic GNN, and the time variable t as the continuous version of its layers s.t. $GNN(\mathbf{X}(t)) = -\nabla E(\mathbf{X}(t))$, this can be described as the gradient flow of the energy functional $E(\mathbf{X}(t))$. E can be selected as the Dirichlet Energy E^{dir} , which is

defined as follows.

$$E^{dir}(\mathbf{X}) := \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}} \|(\nabla \mathbf{X})_{ij}\|^2, \text{ where } (\nabla \mathbf{X})_{ij} := \frac{\mathbf{x}_j}{D_j} - \frac{\mathbf{x}_i}{D_i}. \quad (4)$$

It is commonly believed that poor performances on heterophilic graphs and over-smoothing can be related to the Dirichlet energy of the features decaying to zero as the number of layers increases [10, 66]. In fact, from Equation (4), we deduce that decreasing $E^{dir}(\mathbf{X})$ over time brings adjacent nodes closer in the feature space. Conversely from what was commonly thought, [21] proved that linear graph convolutions with symmetric weights shared among layers can induce edge-wise attraction (repulsion) through their positive (negative) eigenvalues. This control mechanism effectively influences whether the features are smoothed or sharpened, making the model successful in handling node classification within heterophilic graphs. This was possible thanks to a specific choice for a parametrized Dirichlet energy, and a gradient flow that minimize it accordingly. Such gradient flow evolves the node features as follows.

$$\dot{\mathbf{X}}(t) = -\mathbf{X}(t)\mathbf{\Omega} + \mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}(t)\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{X}(0)\tilde{\mathbf{W}}, \quad (5)$$

which can be further modified according to the Euler discretization:

$$\mathbf{X}(t + \tau) - \mathbf{X}(t) = \tau(-\mathbf{X}(t)\mathbf{\Omega} + \mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}(t)\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{X}(0)\tilde{\mathbf{W}}), \quad (6)$$

$$\mathbf{X}(t + \tau) = \mathbf{X}(t) + \tau(-\mathbf{X}(t)\mathbf{\Omega} + \mathbf{A}\mathbf{X}(t)\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{X}(0)\tilde{\mathbf{W}}), \quad (7)$$

where τ is the integration step, $T = \tau L$ is the total integration time and $\mathbf{A} = \tilde{\mathbf{D}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\mathbf{A}} \tilde{\mathbf{D}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, since self-loops are included in \mathbf{A} and $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}$ (i.e. $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}$). Let's denote without loss of generalization: $\mathbf{X}(t) \equiv \mathbf{H}^t$. It follows that (7) becomes

$$\mathbf{H}^{t+\tau} = \mathbf{H}^t + \tau(-\mathbf{H}^t\mathbf{\Omega} + \mathbf{A}\mathbf{H}^t\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{H}^0\tilde{\mathbf{W}}) \quad (8)$$

Equation (8), takes the form of a residual network [26], where $\mathbf{\Omega}$, \mathbf{W} and $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}$ are the trainable matrices, they are symmetric and shared over layers. The interpretation of GNNs as gradient flows is referred to in the literature as PIRD GNN and has proved to be successful

within heterophilic graphs, but confined to node classification experiments. In this paper, we take advantage of these results and build upon this architecture to deal with link prediction.

4 PROPOSED FRAMEWORK: GRAFF-LP

After having described our notation and the concept of PIRD GNNs, we delve into the specifics of our link prediction architecture GRAFF-LP.

4.1 Physics-Inspired Link Prediction

Figure 1 presents a general overview of our approach. The framework operates in a transductive setting, where the graph retains all the nodes both in training and inference. The whole scheme is designed as a node-based method for link prediction [64] and consists of three different phases.

Encoding phase. This is the transition between \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{H}^0 . So far we considered it as the identity, but in the experiments, we used one linear layer followed by dropout for all the models taken into examination. Such relation is expressed as $\mathbf{H}^0 = F_{\text{enc}}(\mathbf{X})$.

Message-Passing phase. This phase is formalized following Equation (8). L , τ and d_h , are hyperparameters of our architecture. The latter is the dimensionality of the intermediate representation that is kept fixed across the layers to keep the dynamic system interpretation. Moreover, we follow the non-linear gradient flow approach denoted in [21], which consists of interleaving non-linear functions between the layers, in particular, we adopt the *Rectified Linear Unit* (ReLU). With nonlinear activations, the network is no longer a discretized gradient flow but still preserves the physics interpretation of the weight matrices [21]. We chose to follow this strategy due to the improved performance w.r.t. the linear counterpart in node classification experiments. Hence, Equation (8) becomes

$$\mathbf{H}^{l+\tau} = \mathbf{H}^l + \tau \sigma(-\mathbf{H}^l \Omega + \mathbf{A} \mathbf{H}^l \mathbf{W} - \mathbf{H}^0 \tilde{\mathbf{W}}), \quad (9)$$

where $\sigma(\cdot)$ is the ReLU operation. To enforce the symmetry in the trainable parameters, we follow the *diagonally-dominant* approach used in [21].

Equation (9), characterizes the message-passing of *GRAFF-LP* (GRAFF for Link Prediction), which is our instance for PIRD GNNs.

Decoding phase. Let $\mathbf{z}_i = \mathbf{H}_i^L$ be the output of the message passing phase for node i . The probability of nodes i and j sharing a link is predicted as:

$$\hat{y}(\mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{z}_j) = F_{\text{dec}}(\mathbf{z}_i \odot \mathbf{z}_j), \quad (10)$$

\odot is the hadamard product. F_{dec} is an MLP of L_{MLP} layers with width d_{MLP} and nonlinear activations (see Figure 1).

5 EXPERIMENTS

In this Section, we detail our experimental set-up and the results aimed at addressing the following research questions:

RQ1: What is the performance of GRAFF-LP when used on graphs with a high level of heterophily?

RQ2: What is the efficiency improvement due to the introduction of PIRD link prediction models when compared to existing non-PIRD solutions?

RQ3: What is the correlation between adjusted and edge homophily and GNN-based solutions for link prediction?

Table 1: Dataset Information

Datasets	N	$ \mathcal{E} $	d	$ C $	ξ_{edge}	ξ_{adj}
Texas	183	574	1703	5	0.09	-0.26
Wisconsin	251	916	1703	5	0.20	-0.15
Cornell	183	557	1703	5	0.13	-0.21
Amazon Ratings	24492	186100	300	5	0.38	0.14
Roman Empire	22662	65854	300	18	0.05	-0.05
Minesweepers	10000	78804	7	2	0.68	0.01
Questions	48921	307080	301	2	0.84	0.02

5.1 Experimental Set-up

5.1.1 Datasets. Table 1 lists some statistics of the graphs used in the experiments. They are computed after the graphs were made undirected, which is a standard procedure with GNNs. The datasets are selected from two collections, one is the WebKB collection [43], which has been extensively used within GNNs benchmarks, specifically to test models in heterophilic settings [21, 43, 67]. The other collection is more recent, and all the datasets within it were introduced in [46] to enrich the current dataset availability for the experimental setting under heterophily. However, they have not been considered for the task of link prediction yet. The details follow.

Texas, Wisconsin, and Cornell [43]: These are heterophilic graphs, where nodes are web pages and the edges represent the hyperlinks between them. Due to the reduced size in both the number of nodes and edges, this collection leads to unstable and statistically insignificant results [46]. However, we decided to consider them anyway, since both ξ_{edge} , and ξ_{adj} remain low. The datasets from [46] are:

Amazon Ratings: Nodes are Amazon products and edges connect them when they are frequently bought together. The class associated with the nodes represents the ratings of each product.

Roman Empire: This graph has been constructed based on the Roman Empire’s Wikipedia article [33]. Here nodes are non-unique words, and they share a link whether there is a connection in the dependency tree of each sentence, or if two nodes are consequent in the text. This graph resembles almost a chain, except for additional shortcuts. The class associated with the words represents their syntactic roles.

Minesweeper: This is a synthetic dataset in the form of a regular grid 100×100 . Each cell in the grid is a node, and the edges for each cell are at most 8. The cells can be labeled as mines or traversable ones. Since mines tend to be connected to the regular cells ξ_{adj} is close to zero.

Questions: This graph is based on data from a question-answering website. Nodes represent users, while edges connect them if they have interacted during a certain interval. The users are classified as active or non-active depending on whether they remained so during that interval of time.

We did not include the Tolokers dataset from this collection because of constraints in our memory capacity.

Table 2: AUROC % for each model in the evaluation datasets. OOM denotes ‘Out Of Memory’. The top result for each dataset is in bold. GRAFF-LP is significantly different from all the baselines if marked with * (Wilcoxon signed-rank test, $p < 0.01$).

Models	Texas	Wisconsin	Cornell	Amazon Ratings	Roman Empire	Minesweepers	Questions
GCN	80.75	52.02	91.42	71.41	52.7	81.03	96.22
GraphSAGE	74.99	50.52	82.11	50.52	55.55	92.47	74.08
GAT	74.33	53.35	93.45	50.25	51.13	91.42	65.53
DisenLink	76.37	55.23	91.78	OOM	OOM	OOM	OOM
GRAFF-LP	* 83.43	* 75.38	93.13	* 72.96	* 71.04	90.33	* 96.54

5.1.2 Baselines. Now we briefly describe the baselines that we compare against GRAFF-LP. We limit our benchmark to node-based methods, that are not physics-inspired and we do not include subgraph-based approaches, since these are built upon MPNNs like node-based ones but additionally include a subgraph feature extraction module that helps improve their expressivity at the cost of efficiency. Our baselines are:

GCN and GraphSAGE [25, 32]: These are both MPNNs of the convolutional type [53]. For GraphSAGE [25] we consider both its *mean* and *max* variants.

GAT [54]: This is an example of MPNNs of the attentional type [53], since it uses an attention mechanism [3] to aggregate the neighbors features. We decided to take into examination this method since the attention mechanism is more appropriate for heterophilic graphs by design.

Disenlink [67]: This is an example of a node-based method with disentangled representations. The idea is to compute multiple and finite representations for each node in the graph, in order to capture its different aspects and deal better with heterophily. This method is the only one designed specifically for link prediction in heterophilic scenarios among our baselines, and also the only one available in literature.

5.1.3 Data Preprocessing and Hyperparameters. Graphs have been split into training, validation, and test positive edges (N_{pos}) with 80%, 10%, and 10% percentages. Negative edges (N_{neg}) for each split were also sampled, and in the experiments, several ratios N_{neg}/N_{pos} we adopted since there is not a specific policy to follow when selecting N_{neg} [2]. We select negative edges through the random negative sampling routine implemented by PyTorch Geometric [18]. To reduce the variance in the test splits of the WebKB datasets, we used 60%, 20%, and 20% as percentages.

5.1.4 Implementation Details. We chose AUROC since is commonly used in link prediction tasks with GNNs [51, 65]. We trained them using negative log-likelihood. The loss function is optimized using Adam [30] with early stopping [22], with patience of 10 epochs, monitoring the AUROC.

5.2 Results

5.2.1 Effectiveness. To address **RQ1**, we refer to Table 2, which reports the performance of the models for all the datasets. As regards the results on the WebKB datasets [43], the mean is computed based on 50 trials: 5 train splits and 10 random seeds each. While in the remaining datasets, the performance is averaged from 10 random

seeds. We adopted a single split since the graphs are larger and less sensitive to high variance in the data. GRAFF-LP significantly outperforms the baselines in 5 out of 7 datasets, and in most cases, the gap from the second best model is neat, specifically in Wisconsin and the Roman Empire, where the percentage differences are 26.7% and 21.08%, respectively. As reported in Table 2, the Wilcoxon test [58], computed on the accuracy of positive and negative edges in the test set, supports the statistical significance of GRAFF-LP performing equally or worse than the other baselines; details can be found in the code. In the datasets where GRAFF-LP is not the best-performing model, consistently ranks among the top 3 models, exhibiting a natural adaptability to diverse contexts. In Table 2, DisenLink goes out of memory due to implementation issues in its official repository [67].

5.2.2 Efficiency. Unlike GCN and GraphSAGE methods, our method, GAT, and DisenLink have an intrinsic mechanism to tackle heterophily, which is what we mainly refer to as expressivity. GAT uses attention, DisenLink allows for multiple node representation, and GRAFF-LP uses the gradient flow bias. Among these, GRAFF-LP is more consistent in performance within the variety of network types in our benchmark (see Table 2). Generally, in terms of computational complexity, all node-based methods are comparable. However, DisenLink requires computing multiple and finite representations for each node, while GRAFF-LP requires a single one. Similarly, GCN, GraphSAGE, and GAT require increasing the number of parameters as the network’s depth increases. Differently, GRAFF-LP uses symmetric and shared weights, allowing for scaling efficiency in terms of space complexity and mitigating the over-smoothing phenomenon [21]. Thanks to this specific PIRD architecture, we can increase the number of layers without increasing the number of parameters by enhancing the long-range dependencies between nodes and the model’s capacity. This is an advantage in the specific case of link prediction under heterophily, where the reasons for a connection could be associated with further nodes rather than closer ones. In our experiments with GRAFF-LP, we have empirical evidence of better performance correlated with deeper architectures. In fact, GRAFF-LP performs better using values of $L = 12$ in Amazon Ratings and $L = 9$ in Roman Empire, while the baselines achieve their best performance with limited and smaller L . According to these considerations, we answer to **RQ2**.

5.2.3 Measuring homophily in link prediction. To address **RQ3** we need to understand whether our current homophily measures, originally designed for the node classification task, are also appropriate for link prediction. Results show that GCN and GraphSAGE, not designed to handle heterophily, achieve competitive performance

on Amazon Ratings, Minesweepers, and Questions. These datasets exhibit low ξ_{adj} while having the highest ξ_{edge} . To shed light on this, we decided to quantify how the gap in performance between GRAFF-LP and the best between GCN and GraphSAGE correlates with ξ_{edge} or ξ_{adj} . Utilizing Pearson correlation we found that both ξ_{edge} and ξ_{adj} negatively correlate with the performance gap, with ξ_{edge} (-0.49) showing a stronger correlation than ξ_{adj} (-0.20). This suggests that ξ_{edge} correlates more with link prediction performance than ξ_{adj} , questioning adjusted homophily for link prediction. Our analysis emphasizes more qualitative assessment over quantitative evaluation since it is conducted on a small set of datasets. Nevertheless, we contend that introducing new homophily measures tailored for link prediction and relying on node attributes more relevant to link prediction rather than labels is needed.

6 CONCLUSIONS

This paper presented GRAFF-LP, a link prediction model built upon GNNs and driven by a PIRD bias. Our method is designed to handle heterophilic graphs, enriching the current literature available, which is often confined to node classification. By merging past benchmarks with a more recent one [46], we showed through an extensive set of experiments that GRAFF-LP significantly outperforms the baselines in 5 out of 7 datasets, ranking within the best 3. We also argue that our method has enhanced expressivity and efficiency due to its architectural design. Further analysis of the results highlighted that some models not designed to handle heterophily perform similarly to those specialized. Moreover, our experiments show that GRAFF-LP and the other baselines perform similarly for graphs with high edge homophily, while the gap increases under heterophily. Future works should bridge the need for consistent homophily measures among tasks, possibly based on node features. Additionally, we advocate that investigating link prediction, node, and graph classification under heterophily as a whole may steer toward developing models suitable for multiple contexts and tasks.

REFERENCES

- [1] Lada A Adamic and Eytan Adar. 2003. Friends and neighbors on the Web. *Social Networks* 25, 3 (2003), 211–230. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-8733\(03\)00009-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-8733(03)00009-1)
- [2] Pranjal Awasthi, Nishanth Dikkala, and Pritish Kamath. 2022. Do More Negative Samples Necessarily Hurt in Contrastive Learning? arXiv:2205.01789 [cs.LG]
- [3] Dzmitry Bahdanau, Kyunghyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio. 2016. Neural Machine Translation by Jointly Learning to Align and Translate. arXiv:1409.0473 [cs.CL]
- [4] Chayan Banerjee, Kien Nguyen, Clinton Fookes, and Maziar Raissi. 2023. A Survey on Physics Informed Reinforcement Learning: Review and Open Problems. arXiv:2309.01909 [cs.LG]
- [5] Barabasi and Albert. 1999. Emergence of Scaling in Random Networks. *Science* 286, 5439 (oct 1999), 509–512. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.286.5439.509>
- [6] Jasmijn Bastings, Ivan Titov, Wilker Aziz, Diego Marcheggiani, and Khalil Sima'an. 2020. Graph Convolutional Encoders for Syntax-aware Neural Machine Translation. arXiv:1704.04675 [cs.CL]
- [7] Peter W. Battaglia, Razvan Pascanu, Matthew Lai, Danilo Rezende, and Koray Kavukcuoglu. 2016. Interaction Networks for Learning about Objects, Relations and Physics. arXiv:1612.00222 [cs.AI]
- [8] Cristian Bodnar, Francesco Di Giovanni, Benjamin Paul Chamberlain, Pietro Liò, and Michael M. Bronstein. 2023. Neural Sheaf Diffusion: A Topological Perspective on Heterophily and Oversmoothing in GNNs. arXiv:2202.04579 [cs.LG]
- [9] Sergey Brin and Lawrence Page. 1998. The anatomy of a large-scale hypertextual Web search engine. *Computer Networks and ISDN Systems* 30, 1 (1998), 107–117. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-7552\(98\)00110-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-7552(98)00110-X) Proceedings of the Seventh International World Wide Web Conference.
- [10] Chen Cai and Yusu Wang. 2020. A Note on Over-Smoothing for Graph Neural Networks. arXiv:2006.13318 [cs.LG]
- [11] Nicola De Cao, Wilker Aziz, and Ivan Titov. 2022. Question Answering by Reasoning Across Documents with Graph Convolutional Networks. arXiv:1808.09920 [cs.CL]
- [12] Benjamin Paul Chamberlain, James Rowbottom, Maria Gorinova, Stefan Webb, Emanuele Rossi, and Michael M. Bronstein. 2021. GRAND: Graph Neural Diffusion. arXiv:2106.10934 [cs.LG]
- [13] Benjamin Paul Chamberlain, Sergey Shirobokov, Emanuele Rossi, Fabrizio Frasca, Thomas Markovich, Nils Hammerla, Michael M. Bronstein, and Max Hansmire. 2023. Graph Neural Networks for Link Prediction with Subgraph Sketching. arXiv:2209.15486 [cs.LG]
- [14] Eli Chien, Jianhao Peng, Pan Li, and Olgica Milenkovic. 2021. Adaptive Universal Generalized PageRank Graph Neural Network. arXiv:2006.07988 [cs.LG]
- [15] Jeongwhan Choi, Seoyoung Hong, Noseong Park, and Sung-Bae Cho. 2023. GREAD: Graph Neural Reaction-Diffusion Networks. arXiv:2211.14208 [cs.LG]
- [16] Tim R. Davidson, Luca Falorsi, Nicola De Cao, Thomas Kipf, and Jakub M. Tomczak. 2022. Hyperspherical Variational Auto-Encoders. arXiv:1804.00891 [stat.ML]
- [17] Wenqi Fan, Yao Ma, Qing Li, Yuan He, Eric Zhao, Jiliang Tang, and Dawei Yin. 2019. Graph Neural Networks for Social Recommendation. arXiv:1902.07243 [cs.IR]
- [18] Matthias Fey and Jan Eric Lenssen. 2019. Fast Graph Representation Learning with PyTorch Geometric. arXiv:1903.02428 [cs.LG]
- [19] Victor Garcia and Joan Bruna. 2018. Few-Shot Learning with Graph Neural Networks. arXiv:1711.04043 [stat.ML]
- [20] Justin Gilmer, Samuel S. Schoenholz, Patrick F. Riley, Oriol Vinyals, and George E. Dahl. 2017. Neural Message Passing for Quantum Chemistry. arXiv:1704.01212 [cs.LG]
- [21] Francesco Di Giovanni, James Rowbottom, Benjamin P. Chamberlain, Thomas Markovich, and Michael M. Bronstein. 2023. Understanding convolution on graphs via energies. arXiv:2206.10991 [cs.LG]
- [22] Federico Girosi, Michael Jones, and Tomaso Poggio. 1995. Regularization Theory and Neural Networks Architectures. *Neural Computation* 7, 2 (03 1995), 219–269. <https://doi.org/10.1162/neco.1995.7.2.219> arXiv:https://direct.mit.edu/neco/article-pdf/7/2/219/812917/neco.1995.7.2.219.pdf
- [23] Sam Greisdanus, Misko Dzamba, and Jason Yosinski. 2019. Hamiltonian Neural Networks. arXiv:1906.01563 [cs.NE]
- [24] Takuo Hamaguchi, Hidekazu Oiwa, Masashi Shimbo, and Yuji Matsumoto. 2018. Knowledge Base Completion with Out-of-Knowledge-Base Entities: A Graph Neural Network Approach. *Transactions of the Japanese Society for Artificial Intelligence* 33, 2 (2018), F-H72_1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1527/tjsai.f-h72>
- [25] William L. Hamilton, Rex Ying, and Jure Leskovec. 2017. Inductive Representation Learning on Large Graphs. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems* (Long Beach, California, USA) (NIPS'17). Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA, 1025–1035.
- [26] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. 2015. Deep Residual Learning for Image Recognition. arXiv:1512.03385 [cs.CV]
- [27] Han Hu, Jiayuan Gu, Zheng Zhang, Jifeng Dai, and Yichen Wei. 2018. Relation Networks for Object Detection. arXiv:1711.11575 [cs.CV]
- [28] George Karniadakis, Yannis Kevrekidis, Lu Lu, Paris Perdikaris, Sifan Wang, and Liu Yang. 2021. Physics-informed machine learning. (05 2021), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42254-021-00314-5>
- [29] Karthik Kashinath, M. Mustafa, Adrian Albert, Jinlong Wu, C. Jiang, Soheil Esmailzadeh, Kamyar Azizzadenesheli, R. Wang, Ashesh Chattopadhyay, A. Singh, A. Manepalli, D. Chirila, R. Yu, R. Walters, B. White, Heng Xiao, Hamdi Tchelepi, P. Marcus, Animashree Anandkumar, and Mr Prabhat. 2021. Physics-informed machine learning: Case studies for weather and climate modelling. *Philosophical transactions. Series A, Mathematical, physical, and engineering sciences* 379 (02 2021), 20200093. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2020.0093>
- [30] Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2017. Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization. arXiv:1412.6980 [cs.LG]
- [31] Thomas N. Kipf and Max Welling. 2016. Variational Graph Auto-Encoders. arXiv:1611.07308 [stat.ML]
- [32] Thomas N. Kipf and Max Welling. 2017. Semi-Supervised Classification with Graph Convolutional Networks. arXiv:1609.02907 [cs.LG]
- [33] Quentin Lhoest, Albert Villanova del Moral, Yacine Jernite, Abhishek Thakur, Patrick von Platen, Suraj Patil, Julien Chaumond, Mariama Drame, Julien Plu, Lewis Tunstall, Joe Davison, Mario Šaško, Gunjan Chhablani, Bhavitvya Malik, Simon Brandeis, Teven Le Scao, Victor Sanh, Canwen Xu, Nicolas Patry, Angelina McMillan-Major, Philipp Schmid, Sylvain Gugger, Clément Delangue, Théo Matussière, Lysandre Debut, Stas Bekman, Pierrick Cistac, Thibault Goehringer, Victor Mustar, François Lagunas, Alexander M. Rush, and Thomas Wolf. 2021. Datasets: A Community Library for Natural Language Processing. arXiv:2109.02846 [cs.CL]
- [34] Yujia Li, Daniel Tarlow, Marc Brockschmidt, and Richard Zemel. 2017. Gated Graph Sequence Neural Networks. arXiv:1511.05493 [cs.LG]
- [35] Lu Lu, Pengzhan Jin, Guofei Pang, Zhongqiang Zhang, and George Em Karniadakis. 2021. Learning nonlinear operators via DeepONet based on the universal approximation theorem of operators. *Nature Machine Intelligence* 3, 3 (March 2021), 218–229. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-021-00302-5>

- [36] Sitao Luan, Chenqing Hua, Qincheng Lu, Jiaqi Zhu, Mingde Zhao, Shuyuan Zhang, Xiao-Wen Chang, and Doina Precup. 2022. Revisiting Heterophily For Graph Neural Networks. arXiv:2210.07606 [cs.LG]
- [37] Diego Marcheggiani, Jasmijn Bastings, and Ivan Titov. 2020. Exploiting Semantics in Neural Machine Translation with Graph Convolutional Networks. arXiv:1804.08313 [cs.CL]
- [38] Chuizheng Meng, Sungyong Seo, Defu Cao, Sam Griesemer, and Yan Liu. 2022. When Physics Meets Machine Learning: A Survey of Physics-Informed Machine Learning. arXiv:2203.16797 [cs.LG]
- [39] Hoang NT and Takanori Maehara. 2019. Revisiting Graph Neural Networks: All We Have is Low-Pass Filters. arXiv:1905.09550 [stat.ML]
- [40] Kenta Oono and Taiji Suzuki. 2021. Graph Neural Networks Exponentially Lose Expressive Power for Node Classification. arXiv:1905.10947 [cs.LG]
- [41] Shirui Pan, Ruiqi Hu, Guodong Long, Jing Jiang, Lina Yao, and Chengqi Zhang. 2019. Adversarially Regularized Graph Autoencoder for Graph Embedding. arXiv:1802.04407 [cs.LG]
- [42] Shashank Pandit, Duen Horng Chau, Samuel Wang, and Christos Faloutsos. 2007. Netprobe: A Fast and Scalable System for Fraud Detection in Online Auction Networks. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on World Wide Web (Banff, Alberta, Canada) (WWW '07)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 201–210. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1242572.1242600>
- [43] Hongbin Pei, Bingzhe Wei, Kevin Chen-Chuan Chang, Yu Lei, and Bo Yang. 2020. Geom-GCN: Geometric Graph Convolutional Networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=S1e2ZagrFvS>
- [44] Hao Peng, Jianxin Li, Yu He, Yaopeng Liu, Mengjiao Bao, Lihong Wang, Yangqiu Song, and Qiang Yang. 2018. Large-Scale Hierarchical Text Classification with Recursively Regularized Deep Graph-CNN. In *Proceedings of the 2018 World Wide Web Conference (Lyon, France) (WWW '18)*. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee, Republic and Canton of Geneva, CHE, 1063–1072. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3178876.3186005>
- [45] Oleg Platonov, Denis Kuznedelev, Artem Babenko, and Liudmila Prokhorenkova. 2023. Characterizing Graph Datasets for Node Classification: Homophily-Heterophily Dichotomy and Beyond. arXiv:2209.06177 [cs.SI]
- [46] Oleg Platonov, Denis Kuznedelev, Michael Diskin, Artem Babenko, and Liudmila Prokhorenkova. 2023. A critical look at the evaluation of GNNs under heterophily: are we really making progress? arXiv:2302.11640 [cs.LG]
- [47] T. Konstantin Rusch, Michael M. Bronstein, and Siddhartha Mishra. 2023. A Survey on Oversmoothing in Graph Neural Networks. arXiv:2303.10993 [cs.LG]
- [48] Linfeng Song, Zhiguo Wang, Mo Yu, Yue Zhang, Radu Florian, and Daniel Gildea. 2018. Exploring Graph-structured Passage Representation for Multi-hop Reading Comprehension with Graph Neural Networks. arXiv:1809.02040 [cs.CL]
- [49] Susheel Suresh, Vinith Budde, Jennifer Neville, Pan Li, and Jianzhu Ma. 2021. Breaking the Limit of Graph Neural Networks by Improving the Assortativity of Graphs with Local Mixing Patterns. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3447548.3467373>
- [50] Damien Teney, Lingqiao Liu, and Anton van den Hengel. 2017. Graph-Structured Representations for Visual Question Answering. arXiv:1609.05600 [cs.CV]
- [51] Talip Ucar. 2023. NESS: Node Embeddings from Static SubGraphs. arXiv:2303.08958 [cs.LG]
- [52] Rianne van den Berg, Thomas N. Kipf, and Max Welling. 2017. Graph Convolutional Matrix Completion. arXiv:1706.02263 [stat.ML]
- [53] Petar Veličković. 2023. Everything is Connected: Graph Neural Networks. arXiv:2301.08210 [cs.LG]
- [54] Petar Veličković, Guillem Cucurull, Arantxa Casanova, Adriana Romero, Pietro Liò, and Yoshua Bengio. 2018. Graph Attention Networks. arXiv:1710.10903 [stat.ML]
- [55] Chun Wang, Shirui Pan, Guodong Long, Xingquan Zhu, and Jing Jiang. 2017. MGAE: Marginalized Graph Autoencoder for Graph Clustering. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (Singapore, Singapore) (CIKM '17)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 889–898. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3132847.3132967>
- [56] Xiaolong Wang, Yufei Ye, and Abhinav Gupta. 2018. Zero-shot Recognition via Semantic Embeddings and Knowledge Graphs. arXiv:1803.08035 [cs.CV]
- [57] Xiyuan Wang and Muhan Zhang. 2022. How Powerful are Spectral Graph Neural Networks. arXiv:2205.11172 [cs.LG]
- [58] Frank Wilcoxon. 1945. Individual Comparisons by Ranking Methods. *Biometrics* 1 (1945), 196–202. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:53662922>
- [59] Qitian Wu, Hengrui Zhang, Xiaofeng Gao, Peng He, Paul Weng, Han Gao, and Guihai Chen. 2019. Dual Graph Attention Networks for Deep Latent Representation of Multifaceted Social Effects in Recommender Systems. In *The World Wide Web Conference*. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3308558.3313442>
- [60] Kun Xu, Liwei Wang, Mo Yu, Yansong Feng, Yan Song, Zhiguo Wang, and Dong Yu. 2019. Cross-lingual Knowledge Graph Alignment via Graph Matching Neural Network. arXiv:1905.11605 [cs.LG]
- [61] Yujun Yan, Milad Hashemi, Kevin Swersky, Yaoqing Yang, and Danai Koutra. 2022. Two Sides of the Same Coin: Heterophily and Oversmoothing in Graph Convolutional Neural Networks. arXiv:2102.06462 [cs.LG]
- [62] Liang Yao, Chengsheng Mao, and Yuan Luo. 2018. Graph Convolutional Networks for Text Classification. arXiv:1809.05679 [cs.CL]
- [63] Rex Ying, Ruining He, Kaifeng Chen, Pong Eksombatchai, William L. Hamilton, and Jure Leskovec. 2018. Graph Convolutional Neural Networks for Web-Scale Recommender Systems. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3219819.3219890>
- [64] Muhan Zhang. 2022. Graph Neural Networks: Link Prediction. In *Graph Neural Networks: Foundations, Frontiers, and Applications*, Lingfei Wu, Peng Cui, Jian Pei, and Liang Zhao (Eds.). Springer Singapore, Singapore, 195–223.
- [65] Muhan Zhang and Yixin Chen. 2018. Link Prediction Based on Graph Neural Networks. arXiv:1802.09691 [cs.LG]
- [66] Kaixiong Zhou, Xiao Huang, Daochen Zha, Rui Chen, Li Li, Soo-Hyun Choi, and Xia Hu. 2021. Dirichlet Energy Constrained Learning for Deep Graph Neural Networks. arXiv:2107.02392 [cs.LG]
- [67] Shijie Zhou, Zhimeng Guo, Charu Aggarwal, Xiang Zhang, and Suhang Wang. 2022. Link Prediction on Heterophilic Graphs via Disentangled Representation Learning. arXiv:2208.01820 [cs.LG]
- [68] Jiong Zhu, Yujun Yan, Lingxiao Zhao, Mark Heimann, Leman Akoglu, and Danai Koutra. 2020. Beyond Homophily in Graph Neural Networks: Current Limitations and Effective Designs. arXiv:2006.11468 [cs.LG]
- [69] Jiong Zhu, Yujun Yan, Lingxiao Zhao, Mark Heimann, Leman Akoglu, and Danai Koutra. 2020. Beyond Homophily in Graph Neural Networks: Current Limitations and Effective Designs. arXiv:2006.11468 [cs.LG]