

Improving Cognitive Diagnosis Models with Adaptive Relational Graph Neural Networks

Pengyang Shao
Hefei University of Technology
Anhui, China

Chen Gao
Tsinghua University
Beijing, China

Lei Chen
chenlei.hfut@gmail.com
Tsinghua University
Beijing, China

Yonghui yang
Hefei University of Technology
Anhui, China

Kun Zhang
Hefei University of Technology
Anhui, China

Meng Wang
Hefei University of Technology
Anhui, China

ABSTRACT

Web-based online education has emerged as a powerful tool in realizing the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals, particularly in ensuring inclusive and equitable quality education and promoting lifelong learning opportunities for all¹. Educational Cognitive Diagnosis (CD) algorithms are an area of growing research interest in the context of online education. Typically, these CD algorithms assist students by inferring their abilities (i.e., their proficiency levels on various knowledge concepts). The proficiency levels can enable further targeted skill training and personalized exercise recommendations, thereby promoting students' learning efficiency in online education. Recently, researchers have found that building and incorporating a student-exercise bipartite graph is beneficial for enhancing diagnostic performance. However, there are still limitations in their studies. On one hand, researchers overlook the heterogeneity within edges, where there can be both correct and incorrect answers. On the other hand, they disregard the uncertainty within edges, e.g., a correct answer can indicate true mastery or fortunate guessing. To address the limitations, we propose Adaptive Semantic-aware Graph-based Cognitive Diagnosis model (ASG-CD), which introduces a novel and effective way to leverage bipartite graph information in CD. Specifically, we first map students, exercises, and knowledge concepts into a latent representation space and combine these latent representations to obtain student abilities and exercise difficulties. After that, we propose a Semantic-aware Graph Neural Network Layer to address edge heterogeneity. This layer splits the original bipartite graph into two subgraphs according to edge semantics, and aggregates information based on these two subgraphs separately. To mitigate the impact of edge uncertainties, we propose an Adaptive Edge Differentiation Layer that dynamically differentiates edges, followed by keeping reliable edges and filtering out uncertain edges. Extensive experiments on three real-world datasets have demonstrated the effectiveness of ASG-CD. As a bypass, we will release our codes to support the community².

¹<https://sdgs.un.org/goals/goal4>

²The implementation will be publicly available after paper acceptance

Chen Gao and Pengyang Shao contributed equally to this work.
Lei Chen is the corresponding author.

Conference'17, July 2017, Washington, DC, USA
2024. ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM...\$15.00
<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

1 INTRODUCTION

The United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals include ensuring inclusive and equitable quality education, as well as promoting lifelong learning opportunities for all. The emergence of intelligent education, particularly online education, has provided a valuable opportunity for the majority of people to access education. However, unlike traditional teaching methods, online education lacks a role that can analyze students' weaknesses in learning, such as identifying which knowledge concepts students have not yet mastered. This role is significant in education, as it serves as the foundation for other learning tasks, e.g., providing learning recommendations or conducting specific skill training [19, 39].

Educational CD fulfills the aforementioned needs by collecting students' historical behaviors, utilizing trainable parameters to represent student abilities, and then optimizing student abilities to fit their behavioral data [8, 31]. Classic CD models adopt free embeddings to represent student abilities [8, 18, 26], which only allows for response log prediction without providing detailed analyses of students' proficiency levels on concepts. Recently, neural network-based CD models have garnered significant attention in the field of intelligent education due to their detailed diagnoses and easy-to-implementation [12, 20, 30, 31]. As shown in Figure 1 (a), these models take students' responses logs, and expert-labeled exercise-concept relations as input, and output students' abilities (i.e., their proficiency levels on all concepts). The cornerstone of these models lies in a diagnostic function that establishes connections among exercise-concept relations, students' proficiency levels on concepts, and response logs [32].

Recently, researchers have proposed integrating Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) into CD models to improve diagnostic performance [11, 33]. Typically, these methods introduce a new bipartite graph perspective, with students and exercises as nodes and student-exercise response logs as edges. Based on the bipartite graph, GNN aggregates information from neighboring nodes, effectively capturing the similarities among students and exercises for representation enhancements. Figure 1 (b) visually illustrates underlying reasons for the effectiveness of GNN in CD. Suppose that there are two students (Bob and John), and their completed exercises have extensively overlapped. That is, in the bipartite graph, there are numerous second-order connections between Bob and John. As John has not encountered a specific concept k5, we can not accurately estimate his proficiency level on that concept without GNN. The presence of multiple connected edges between Bob and




Figure 1: (a) Process of educational CD. These models take students' responses logs, and exercise-concept relations as input, and output students' proficiency levels on all concepts. (b) A tiny example of two students (Bob and John). Their interactions with exercises have extensively overlapped, leading to numerous second-order connections between them.

John enables GNN to efficiently exchange information between them, resulting in similarity between their abilities. In practical cases, each student will establish second-order connections with a large number of other students. As the number of overlapped response logs between two students increases, their connection will become stronger. In sum, GNN can effectively enhance student abilities by aggregating information based on the bipartite graph.

While graph-based CD models have demonstrated remarkable performance, we contend that they still have inherent limitations. Previous works often overlook certain unique characteristics of response logs, leading to a misunderstanding of edge heterogeneity and uncertainty [11, 33]. For illustration, we take John and Mark in Figure 2 as an example. To display edge heterogeneity, we consider a crucial question: "Should John's proficiency levels on concepts be similar to Mark's?" Current models think that John's and Mark's completed exercises extensively overlap [11, 33], resulting in many second-order connections and a high similarity between these two students (Figure 2 (a)). However, we notice that response logs can be either correct or incorrect. Although Mark and John have extensive overlap in completed exercises, they provide different answers to all these exercises, indicating that their abilities are fundamentally opposite. That is, there should be no second-order connections between these two students. As shown in Figure 2 (b), we split the bipartite graph into two subgraphs according to correct/incorrect answers. Obviously, there are no connections between John and Mark in either of the subgraphs, indicating that GNN will not share their information.

Additionally, we suspect that each edge may involve uncertainty, i.e., fortunate guessing or careless mistakes. In Figure 2 (c), John has answered one exercise related to concept k2 incorrectly but answered the rest correctly, indicating that John may have already mastered concept k2. We further question whether John's incorrect answer to e_5 is due to his lack of concept understanding or a careless mistake. It is difficult to provide a definitive answer. Therefore, we consider differentiating and filtering out these uncertain edges in the graph structure (i.e., edges that cannot accurately reflect




Figure 2: Analyses about how to convert response logs to a bipartite graph. We take student John and Mark as an example. (a) Current methods [11, 33]; (b) Distinguishing edge heterogeneity; (c) Considering edge uncertainties.

students' proficiency levels on concepts). It is worth noting that although some studies have introduced heterogeneous edges in student performance prediction, they have not considered how to diagnose students' proficiency levels on concepts or address uncertainty, leading to suboptimal diagnostic performance [21, 39].

To explore edge heterogeneity and uncertainty in the bipartite graph, in this paper, we propose a novel Adaptive Semantic-aware Graph-based Cognitive Diagnosis model (ASG-CD). Specifically,

we first adopt an embedding module that maps students, exercises, and knowledge concepts to a latent representation space [32]. Then, we utilize a matrix factorization layer with inputting students' and concepts' latent representations to obtain students' proficiency levels on concepts. Similarly, exercise difficulties can be obtained in an analogous way. In the following, we devise two layers for addressing edge heterogeneity and uncertainty in the bipartite graph, respectively. One is the Semantic-aware GNN Layer, which is designed to distinguish the different edge semantics. Inspired by graph convolutional matrix completion [2], we split the bipartite graph into two subgraphs based on different edge semantics (correct answers and incorrect answers), and then aggregate information based on these two subgraphs separately. The other layer is the Adaptive Edge Differentiation Layer, in which we dynamically differentiate and filter out uncertain edges for a reliable graph structure. As CD can predict students' proficiency levels on concepts by analyzing their response logs, we calculate the deviations between the predicted and real response logs to differentiate uncertain edges. In the following, to filter out uncertain edges, we select edges with lower deviations to construct the bipartite graph. Obviously, this layer can help us differentiate student-exercise edges that are more consistent with model predictions. Note that, we consider that those edges can better reflect the students' true abilities. Conversely, other uncertain edges contradict true abilities. Inspired by adaptive learning in machine learning [1, 22], during each epoch, we first dynamically differentiate each edge, and then filter out uncertain edges. Extensive experiments on three real-world datasets have clearly demonstrated the effectiveness of our proposed ASG-CD. In summary, the major contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

- We observe edge heterogeneity and uncertainty in the student-exercise bipartite graph. We argue that previous works neglect their negative effects, leading to suboptimal diagnostic performance of CD models.
- We propose a novel ASG-CD model. Specifically, to address edge heterogeneity, we propose Semantic-aware GNN Layer which models diverse semantics of edges. To avoid effects of edge uncertainty, we devise Adaptive Edge Differentiation Layer by adaptively differentiating and filtering out uncertain edges in the bipartite graph.
- Extensive experiments on three real-world datasets have demonstrated the effectiveness of ASG-CD. We achieve an improvement of over 1% than best baselines on accuracy metrics on the ASSIST dataset and Junyi dataset. Moreover, we achieve an improvement of over 17% on DOA metric on the Junyi dataset.

2 RELATION WORKS

As we focus on how to apply graph information for better diagnostic performance, in this section, we summarize prior works in educational CD, and graph-based models for edge prediction.

2.1 Educational Cognitive Diagnosis

Researches on educational CD have primarily emerged from the field of psychology. Two classic methods in this area are Item Response Theory (IRT) [8] and DINA [7]. IRT utilizes continuous

one-dimensional parameters to represent student and exercise entities. Further, it employs a logistic function to infer students' performance on exercises. Multidimensional item response theory (MIRT) has been proposed for better ability estimations by extending parameter dimensions [3, 26]. DINA represents student and exercise entities with binary discrete variables. Then, it introduces slip and guess parameters to better fit real-world scenarios [7].

With the recent advancements in neural networks, researchers have turned their attention on leveraging neural networks in educational CD [12, 16, 29, 33]. NCDM framework first utilizes high-dimensional continuous representations to model students' abilities and exercise difficulties, and proposes a novel diagnostic functions to incorporate all parameters to obtain final results [31]. Building upon the NCDM framework, graph-based CD models integrate graph structure information into CD models [11, 33]. Compared to these CD models, our distinction lies in further exploring the semantic heterogeneity and uncertainty within edges in the bipartite graph to further enhance diagnostic performance.

2.2 Graph-based Models for Edge Prediction

Considering that student-exercise response logs can form a bipartite graph, student-exercise interaction prediction can also be seen as an edge prediction task in the bipartite graph [21]. GNN leverages graph structures to propagate information, enabling effective analysis in various domains [15, 41, 42]. NGCF first consider introducing attention-based graph neural networks to better handle interaction data [36]. Further researches have demonstrated that simplifying GNN is beneficial for effectively capturing graph structural information from interaction data [6, 13]. For edges with multiple semantic information, it has been proven effective to constructing sub-graphs based on edge semantics [2, 27, 28].

To further exploit the graph information, researchers have studied adaptive learning, a classic method in machine learning for feature completion or selection [1, 22, 37]. This idea has been widely applied in graphs [5, 34], such as completing node features [40], exploring potential connected edges [43], or design specific activation functions [45]. Researchers have proposed adaptively modifying and fulfilling node features for better graph representations [40]. In this paper, inspired by adaptive learning, we propose dynamically distinguishing and filtering out uncertain edges during the training process. This operation can ensure that the bipartite graph is reliable and stable, thereby improving diagnostic performance.

3 THE PROPOSED MODEL

In this section, we first present important notations and task formulation, followed by the overall structure of our proposed ASG-CD. After that, we introduce each component of ASG-CD in detail.

3.1 Important Notations and Task Formulation

In CD, there are students $S(|S| = M)$, exercises $E(|E| = N)$, and knowledge concepts $K(|K| = T)$. Two types of relationships are utilized among these entities. First, students practice some exercises, forming response logs, denoted as a set of triplets $\{(s, e, r_{se})\}$. If student s answers exercise e correctly, $r_{se} = 1$. Otherwise, $r_{se} = 0$. R_{train} and R_{test} denote the training and testing triplets, respectively. Second, the relations between exercises and concepts are




Figure 3: The overall structure of our proposed ASG-CD.

denoted by $\mathbf{Q} = \{q_{ek}\}_{N \times T}$. Usually, \mathbf{Q} is pre-defined by experts. If exercise e is related to concept k , $q_{ek} = 1$; otherwise, $q_{ek} = 0$. Another perspective for the input data R_{train} is a student-exercise bipartite graph with the adjacency matrix \mathbf{X} . If student s answers exercise e correctly, $x_{se} = 1$. If student s answers exercise e incorrectly, $x_{se} = 0$. Otherwise, x_{se} is missing. Current neural network-based CD models mainly adopt the NCDM framework [11, 12, 20, 30, 31]. Specifically, NCDM framework uses $\mathbf{A} = [a_1, \dots, a_s, \dots, a_M]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times T}$ to represent all students' abilities (i.e., proficiency levels on all concepts) $\mathbf{a}_s = [a_{s1}, \dots, a_{sk}, \dots, a_{sT}]$. Note that, each dimension of \mathbf{a}_s has independent meaning, e.g., a_{sk} denotes student s 's proficiency level on concept k . NCDM framework also introduces exercise difficulties $\mathbf{D} = [d_1, \dots, d_e, \dots, d_N]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times C}$ and discriminations $\mathbf{h}^{disc} = [h_1^{disc}, \dots, h_e^{disc}, \dots, h_N^{disc}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 1}$.

Based on above notations, we formulate the CD task as follows, **Input:** The response logs R_{train} and exercise-concept relations \mathbf{Q} . **Output:** A CD model to infer students' abilities \mathbf{A} (i.e., proficiency levels on all concepts) through response prediction.

3.2 Overall Structure

Figure 3 illustrates the overall structure of our proposed ASG-CD. Note that, apart from treating student-exercise response logs as input, we further focus on building and utilizing a reliable student-exercise bipartite graph to enhance student abilities \mathbf{A} in CD. The following parts in this section provide detailed discussions about each component of ASG-CD, as follows:

- **Embedding Module and Matrix Factorization Layer.** We first embed entities (i.e., students, exercises, and concepts) into latent embeddings, and utilize matrix factorization techniques to obtain student abilities and exercise difficulties by combining these latent embeddings [14, 18].
- **Semantic-aware GNN Layer.** Inspired by previous works [2], we devise a semantic-aware GNN layer that respectively aggregates information based on edges with different semantics. This layer can capture edge heterogeneity to better enhance student abilities and exercise difficulties.
- **Prediction Layer.** We adopt a widely-used diagnostic function which incorporates student abilities and exercise parameters into

student-exercise hidden representations, followed by mapping hidden representations to predicted responses [31, 32].

- **Adaptive Edge Differentiation Layer.** This layer is designed to differentiate and filter out uncertain edges, mitigating adverse impacts in GNN. With the aid of this layer, we can adaptively build a reliable graph to enhance diagnostic performance.

3.3 Embedding Module and Matrix Factorization Layer

Traditional methods directly model student abilities with variables whose dimension equal to the number of concepts [7, 11, 31]. They can successfully represent proficiency levels on all concepts, however, they have an obvious drawback: dimensions of abilities \mathbf{A} are independent in the process of optimization. This is not the ideal situation. Obviously, knowledge concepts are related, therefore, some dimensions of \mathbf{A} are correlated. E.g., persons who understand reflection of light may already understand reflection of light. Directly extracting such correlations from the data is complex. Alternatively, we borrow the success of capturing student-concept collaborative information [23, 32], implicitly modeling student and concept similarities for CD. Specifically, we apply choose Matrix Factorization techniques in CD [14, 18].

The process can be divided into two parts. First, we adopt an embedding module, which embeds entities into: student latent embeddings $\mathbf{U} = [u_1, \dots, u_s, \dots, u_M]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times Z}$, exercise latent embeddings $\mathbf{V} = [v_1, \dots, v_e, \dots, v_N]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times Z}$ and concept latent embeddings $\mathbf{O} = [o_1, \dots, o_k, \dots, o_T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times Z}$. Z denotes the dimension of free embeddings. Second, we utilize a simple yet effective PMF model as the matrix factorization layer [18], formulated as:

$$a_{sk}^{(0)} = \sigma(\langle \mathbf{u}_s, \mathbf{o}_k \rangle), \quad d_{ek}^{(0)} = \sigma(\langle \mathbf{v}_e, \mathbf{o}_k \rangle), \quad (1)$$

where \langle, \rangle denotes the inner dot of corresponding representations. $a_{sk}^{(0)}$ denotes the student s 's ability on concept k . The original ability $\mathbf{a}_s^{(0)}$ of student s can be formulated as $\mathbf{a}_s^{(0)} = [a_{s1}^{(0)}, \dots, a_{sk}^{(0)}, \dots, a_{sT}^{(0)}]$. Similarly, $d_e^{(0)}$ denotes exercise e 's original difficulty, and $\mathbf{d}_e^{(0)} = [d_{e1}^{(0)}, \dots, d_{ek}^{(0)}, \dots, d_{eT}^{(0)}]$.

3.4 Semantic-aware GNN Layer

Recently, researchers have found that response logs naturally form a student-exercise bipartite graph, and the graph structure has been proven beneficial for diagnosis [11, 21, 33]. In the student-exercise bipartite graph, there are two types of edges with fundamentally different semantic meanings: correct answers and incorrect answers. The key to the success of GNN lies in information propagation among connected nodes in the graph structure. For a student node, its subgraph structure can help capture similar students' information from its second-order connected students, thereby enhancing its representation capability. When considering second-order connections between student nodes, we argue that there should only be a second-order edge if two students have the same response on an exercise. On the contrary, if two students have different responses, it is inappropriate to establish a second-order edge between them. Ignoring this edge heterogeneity poses a risk of confounding semantic information in GNN. We have observed that attention modules do not always accurately capture the semantics of these distinct edges, leading to suboptimal diagnostic performance of graph-based CD models [11, 33].

To capture the heterogeneity, we follow a classic GCMC model by splitting the bipartite graph into subgraphs based on edge semantics [2], and devise a Semantic-aware GNN Layer. In the following, we introduce the layer from the perspective of message passing and aggregation.

3.4.1 Message Passing. The student-exercise adjacency matrix X consists of three states: correct answers (forming set X_1), incorrect answers (forming set X_0), and non-interactions (missing values). To capture edge heterogeneity in message passing, we can allocate a unique transformation to each certain type of edge semantics, resulting in edge-specific messages μ from exercise e to student s of the following form:

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_{e \rightarrow s,1}^{(l)} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{N}_{s,1}| |\mathcal{N}_{e,1}|}} W_1 d_e^{(l-1)}, \\ \mu_{e \rightarrow s,0}^{(l)} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{N}_{s,0}| |\mathcal{N}_{e,0}|}} W_0 d_e^{(l-1)},\end{aligned}\quad (2)$$

where $\mu_{e \rightarrow s,1}^{(l)}$ and $\mu_{e \rightarrow s,0}^{(l)}$ denote message passed by 1 edges (correct answers) and message passed by 0 edges (incorrect answers), respectively. $\sqrt{|\mathcal{N}_{s,1}| |\mathcal{N}_{e,1}|}$ and $\sqrt{|\mathcal{N}_{s,0}| |\mathcal{N}_{e,0}|}$ denotes the normalization constant called symmetric normalization. $\mathcal{N}_{s,1}$, $\mathcal{N}_{e,1}$ denote the neighbor sets of student s and exercise e with 1 edges. Similarly, $\mathcal{N}_{s,0}$, $\mathcal{N}_{e,0}$ denote the neighbor sets with 0 edges. Obviously, $\mathcal{N}_{s,1}$, $\mathcal{N}_{e,1}$ and $\mathcal{N}_{s,0}$, $\mathcal{N}_{e,0}$ can be obtained from X_1 and X_0 , respectively. W_1 and W_0 are edge-type specific parameter matrices for edge 1 and edge 0, respectively. $d_e^{(l-1)}$ denotes exercise e 's difficulty at layer $(l-1)$, and d_e^0 is the exercise e 's original difficulty. Messages from student s to exercise e can be processed in an analogous way, which can be formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_{s \rightarrow e,1}^{(l)} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{N}_{s,1}| |\mathcal{N}_{e,1}|}} W_1 a_s^{(l-1)}, \\ \mu_{s \rightarrow e,0}^{(l)} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{N}_{s,0}| |\mathcal{N}_{e,0}|}} W_0 a_s^{(l-1)},\end{aligned}\quad (3)$$

where $a_s^{(l-1)}$ denotes student s 's ability at layer $(l-1)$. Eq.(2) and Eq.(3) can be understood as splitting the original graph into different subgraphs according to edge types, and then propagating information based on each subgraph.

3.4.2 Message Aggregation. After message passing, we can obtain incoming messages at every node from two types of edges. In message aggregation, for each node, we first sum incoming messages over all neighbors under a specific edge-type. Subsequently, we accumulate the messages from all edge-types into vector representations at the l -th layer, formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned}a_s^{(l)} &= \mathbf{W}^{(l)} \left(\sum_{e \in \mathcal{N}_{s,1}} \mu_{e \rightarrow s,1} + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{N}_{s,0}} \mu_{e \rightarrow s,0} \right), \\ d_e^{(l)} &= \mathbf{W}^{(l)} \left(\sum_{s \in \mathcal{N}_{s,1}} \mu_{s \rightarrow e,1} + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{N}_{s,0}} \mu_{s \rightarrow e,0} \right).\end{aligned}\quad (4)$$

After stacking L layers of message passing and aggregation, we treat the vector representations at the L -th layer as the final student ability and exercise difficulty:

$$a_s = a_s^{(L)}, d_e = d_e^{(L)}.\quad (5)$$

After obtaining the final student abilities and exercise difficulties, the next step is to establish connections between these representations and student-exercise response logs for optimization.

3.5 Prediction Layer

In this layer, we adopt the NCDM framework to map parameters into predicted response logs [31]. For a student-exercise response log, we tend to believe that a student is more likely to answer an exercise correctly when the student's ability exceeds the exercise difficulty on corresponding knowledge concepts. Additionally, the exercise discriminations are taken into consideration. Finally, the diagnostic function can be formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned}p_{se} &= Q_e \odot (a_s - d_e) \times h_e^{disc}, \\ \hat{r}_{se} &= \sigma(MLP_s(p_{se})),\end{aligned}\quad (6)$$

where p_{se} denotes the hidden representation between student s and exercise e . The framework further utilizes p_{se} to infer response logs. Q_e denotes the relations between concepts and exercise e , and \odot denotes the element-wise product. \hat{r}_{se} denotes the predicted student s 's response log on exercise e . Then, we have opted to utilize BCE loss function for model optimization, formulated as:

$$Loss = - \sum_{s,e,r_{se} \in R_{train}} (r_{se} \log(\hat{r}_{se}) + (1 - r_{se}) \log(1 - \hat{r}_{se})).\quad (7)$$

With the aids of Eq.(6) and Eq.(7), we can successfully optimize all the parameters of students and exercises.

3.6 Adaptive Edge Differentiation Layer

How to distinguish fortunate guesses (careless mistakes) from mastery (no mastery) is a remaining question. For example, a student answers multiple different exercises related to the same knowledge concept. Only one of the exercises is answered incorrectly but the others are answered correctly. In this case, the incorrect answer does not accurately reflect the student's proficiency level on that concept. This is crucial for GNNs because these uncertain edges may propagate incorrect information during aggregation, affecting diagnostic performance. One intuitive approach is to first train a model to identify which edges are uncertain, and then construct a reliable graph to retrain CD models. However, this two-stage design is too time-consuming. Inspired by adaptive learning in machine learning [4, 34], we propose dynamically selecting to re-construct the bipartite graph structure. The graph structure in each epoch consists of two edge sets:

$$X_1 = \{(s, e) | \hat{r}_{se} > \epsilon \wedge x_{se} = 1\}, X_0 = \{(s, e) | \hat{r}_{se} < 1 - \epsilon \wedge x_{se} = 0\},\quad (8)$$

Table 1: The detailed statistics of three datasets.

Dataset	ASSIST	Junyi	MOOC-Radar
#Students	2,493	10,000	14,224
#Exercises	17,746	734	2,513
#Knowledge concepts	123	734	580
#Response logs	267,415	408,057	898,933
#Response logs per student	107.266	40.8	63.198
#Knowledge concepts per exercise	1.192	1	1
#Sparsity in student-concept interactions	92.212%	94.441%	98.985%
#Sparsity in student-exercise logs	99.396%	94.441%	97.485%

where hyperparameter ϵ denotes the threshold for adaptively distinguishing uncertain edges. Eq.(8) aligns with our example: for a specific concept, if a student answers corresponding exercises correctly multiple times and only answers incorrectly once, CD models will infer that the student has already mastered the concept. Here, the incorrect answer will be considered as an uncertain edge. Considering that we can not fully determine or figure out the true semantics of these uncertain edges, we choose not to utilize them in GNN rather than assigning them specific semantics. Note that, modifications of edge sets (X_0, X_1) would affect GNN process by updating neighbor sets ($\mathcal{N}_{s,1}, \mathcal{N}_{s,0}, \mathcal{N}_{e,1}, \mathcal{N}_{e,0}$) in Eq.(2-3).

4 EXPERIMENTS

In the section, we try to answer these Research Questions (RQ):

RQ1: Does ASG-CD have consistently superior performance on three datasets? (Section 4.2)

RQ2: Are all components in ASG-CD important? (Section 4.3)

RQ3: What is the impact of different hyperparameters on the model? Can ASG-CD consistently achieve better diagnostic performance than the second-best CD model? (Section 4.4)

4.1 Experimental Settings

4.1.1 Datasets. In the experimental part, we choose three real-world datasets, i.e., ASSIST dataset (ASSISTments 2009-2010 "skill builder"³), Junyi dataset (Junyi Academy Math Practicing Log)⁴, and MOOC-Radar dataset⁵. ASSIST is a public available dataset collected by the ASSISTments online tutoring systems [9]. It contains a wealth of student-exercise response logs and expert-labeled exercise-concept relations Q . In the pre-processing step, we remove students with fewer than 15 logs to ensure an adequate amount of data for effective cognitive diagnosis. Junyi dataset is an open dataset collected by an e-learning website, Junyi Academy. The unique characteristic of Junyi dataset lies in one-to-one correspondence between knowledge concepts and exercises. Similar to previous work [20], we remove students that has less than 15 response logs, and then randomly choose 10,000 students from the remaining students. MOOC-Radar is a recently collected dataset from students' learning records in MOOCs [44], which contains abundant response logs. After data pre-processing, we randomly split historical student-exercise response logs into training, and testing parts with a certain ratio of 8:2 on all three datasets. We record the detailed statistics in Table 1.

³<https://sites.google.com/site/assistmentsdata/feng2009>

⁴<https://pslcdatashop.web.cmu.edu/DatasetInfo?datasetId=1198>

⁵<https://github.com/THU-KEG/MOOC-Radar>

4.1.2 Metrics. A challenge in CD lies in the lack of ground truth for students' proficiency levels on various concepts. Similar to previous studies [11, 20, 31, 33], we evaluate the prediction performance of response logs as an alternative approach. Three commonly-used accuracy metrics have been adopted for performance evaluation: Accuracy (ACC), Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) [38], and Area Under the Curve (AUC) [25]. Additionally, we employ a widely-used metric in educational CD called Degree of Agreement (DOA) [10, 31, 32]. Note that, DOA measures the consistency between the predicted proficiency levels on concepts and the observed patterns in the student-exercise response logs. By employing these evaluation metrics, we can assess accuracy performance and consistency performance of our proposed ASG-CD in predicting student proficiency levels based on response logs. These above metrics provide a comprehensive evaluation of model utilities.

4.1.3 Baselines. We select the following models as baselines:

- **IRT** [8]. Item Response Theory (IRT) utilizes one-dimensional parameters to represent students and exercises, respectively.
- **MIRT** [26]. Compared to IRT, Multidimensional Item Response Theory (MIRT) further utilizes high-dimensional parameters to represent students and exercises.
- **PMF** [24]. It treats response log prediction as interactive behavior prediction by utilizing matrix factorization techniques.
- **EKLN** [21]. Compared to PMF, it incorporates the student-exercise bipartite graph to enhance diagnostic performance.
- **DINA** [7]. As a classic CD model, it adopts binary variables to represent students and exercises. Guess and slip parameters are also introduced to fit the real-world situation.
- **NCDM** [31]. It applies neural networks into CD, and uses high-dimensional representations to represent students' abilities.
- **RCD** [11]. Compared to NCDM, it further incorporates complex student-exercise bipartite graph structure information and concept relationships into CD models.
- **CWNCD** [35]. Compared to NCDM, it assign learnable weights as importance degrees of different concepts in each exercise.
- **KaNCd** [32]. It adopts matrix factorization techniques on representations of student abilities and exercise difficulties.

Note that, IRT, MIRT, PMF and EKLN only adopt inner dot or subtraction among student and exercise embeddings to fit student-exercise response logs. These models cannot infer students' proficiency levels on all concepts.

4.1.4 Hyperparameter Settings. We set all models to randomly sample 8,192 student-exercise response logs per batch. Additionally, we use the Adam optimizer and search the learning rate from {0.0001, 0.0005, 0.001, 0.005, 0.01} for each model. For the number of GNN layers, we search from {1, 2, 3, 4, 5} and select the best result. For the thresholds of reliable and uncertain answers, we search ϵ from {0.01, 0.05, 0.1, 0.25, 0.5}. Finally, all experiments are conducted on a single NVIDIA 3090 graphics card with 24G memory.

4.2 Overall Performance (RQ1)

We report overall performance in Table 2, Table 3 and Table 4. There are several observations from these three tables.

- **First of all, ASG-CD has the best performance on three datasets.** On three datasets, ASG-CD achieves an improvement

Table 2: Overall performance on the ASSIST dataset. We use bold font to emphasize the best results and underline to indicate the second-best results. The improvement is derived from the second-best results on each metric.

Model \ Metric	IRT	MIRT	PMF	EKLN	DINA	NCDM	RCD	CWNCD	KaNCD	ASG-CD	Impro
ACC ↑	0.7160	0.7170	0.7065	0.7288	0.6737	0.7232	0.7279	0.7264	<u>0.7304</u>	0.7392	1.205%
RMSE ↓	0.4366	0.4352	0.4429	0.4324	0.4672	0.4350	0.4333	0.4341	<u>0.4319</u>	0.4212	2.477%
AUC ↑	0.7445	0.7458	0.7469	0.7611	0.7294	0.7559	0.7602	0.7583	<u>0.7650</u>	0.7765	1.503%
DOA ↑	-	-	-	-	0.6235	0.6422	0.6525	0.6486	<u>0.6563</u>	0.6657	1.432%

Table 3: Overall performance on the Junyi dataset. We use bold font to emphasize the best results and underline to indicate the second-best results. The improvement is derived from the second-best results on each metric.

Model \ Metric	IRT	MIRT	PMF	EKLN	DINA	NCDM	RCD	CWNCD	KaNCD	ASG-CD	Impro
ACC ↑	0.7511	0.7576	0.7650	<u>0.7668</u>	0.4993	0.7426	0.7496	0.7462	0.7550	0.7768	1.304%
RMSE ↓	0.4071	0.4062	0.4017	<u>0.3997</u>	0.5246	0.4174	0.4126	0.4255	0.4100	0.3918	1.976%
AUC ↑	0.7878	0.7904	0.8019	<u>0.8042</u>	0.6314	0.7806	0.7824	0.7861	0.7898	0.8192	1.865%
DOA ↑	-	-	-	-	0.4896	0.5075	0.5332	0.5419	<u>0.6030</u>	0.7115	17.993%

Table 4: Overall performance on the MOOC-Radar dataset. We use bold font to emphasize the best results and underline to indicate the second-best results. The improvement is derived from the second-best results on each metric.

Model \ Metric	IRT	MIRT	PMF	EKLN	DINA	NCDM	RCD	CWNCD	KaNCD	ASG-CD	Impro
ACC ↑	0.8486	0.8576	0.8504	0.8586	0.7798	0.8541	0.8590	0.8604	<u>0.8613</u>	0.8686	0.848%
RMSE ↓	0.3263	0.3198	0.3247	0.3179	0.3752	0.3231	0.3171	0.3151	<u>0.3144</u>	0.3079	2.067%
AUC ↑	0.8573	0.8663	0.8634	0.8723	0.8127	0.8700	0.8751	0.8776	<u>0.8785</u>	0.8862	0.876%
DOA ↑	-	-	-	-	0.6080	0.6044	0.6724	0.7062	<u>0.7135</u>	0.7189	0.757%

of nearly 1% on accuracy performance (ACC, RMSE, AUC). Furthermore, ASG-CD has an improvement of over 10% on the DOA metric on Junyi dataset. This clearly demonstrates the stable and strong modeling ability of our proposed ASG-CD.

- **Second, compared to another graph-based CD model (RCD), ASG-CD achieves significant improvements on all three datasets.** Specifically, compared to RCD, ASG-CD has an improvement of over 3% on accuracy performance and over 30% on the DOA metric on the Junyi dataset. This indicates that ASG-CD can better make use of graph structure for diagnosis.
- **Third, compared to state-of-the-art KaNCD model, our proposed ASG-CD achieves the most accuracy improvement on the Junyi dataset.** The reason is the unique characteristic of Junyi dataset, i.e., one-to-one correspondence between concepts and exercises. That is to say, concepts that we encountered in the testing set will be totally different from those in the training set. This indicates that our proposed ASG-CD can better handle some extreme data situations.
- **Last but not least, we find that PMF and EKLN achieve better performance than current NN-based CD models on the Junyi dataset.** This indicates a promising future direction: when faced with diagnosing new knowledge concepts, researchers can leverage the collaborative information between students and exercises.

Due to page limitations, in remaining parts of this section, we present the results of the ablation studies and hyperparameter analyses on two smaller datasets, ASSIST and Junyi.


4.3 Ablation Studies (RQ2)

We have conducted ablation experiments about three layers of ASG-CD, and results are presented in Table 5. The first row does not take any additional layers into consideration, therefore, it corresponds to the NCDM model [31]. The last row considers all layers, therefore, it corresponds to our proposed ASG-CD.

There are several observations derived from Table 5. First, compared to NCDM, Matrix Factorization Layer serves as a strong foundation, leading to an accuracy improvement of over 1% across both datasets. The reason for this improvement is that students would not cover all concepts in the training data [32]. For students, their proficiency levels on their uncovered knowledge concepts are close to the initial value, therefore, predicted students' performance on relevant exercises would be inaccurate. Factorization can solve this problem because it can implicitly model the collaborative signals to fill students' proficiency levels on their uncovered concepts. Second, Semantic-aware GNN Layer demonstrates remarkable adaptability to CD by combining state-of-the-art model paradigms [31, 32]. Compared to some models that sacrifice diagnostic capabilities for accuracy improvements [21, 33], it not only achieves a remarkable over 2.5% accuracy improvement but also retains its diagnostic capabilities intact. Third, Adaptive Edge Differentiation Layer makes precise adjustments to the graph structure, resulting in consistent accuracy improvements on both datasets. This layer builds on the aforementioned foundations, showcasing its ability to further enhance diagnostic performance.

Table 5: Ablation studies on ASSIST and Junyi datasets. The last row corresponds to our proposed ASG-CD.

Factorization Eq.(1)	GNN Eq.(2-4)	Differentiation Eq.(8)	ASSIST dataset				Junyi dataset			
			ACC \uparrow	RMSE \downarrow	AUC \uparrow	DOA \uparrow	ACC \uparrow	RMSE \downarrow	AUC \uparrow	DOA \uparrow
\times	\times	\times	0.7232	0.4350	0.7559	0.6422	0.7426	0.4174	0.7806	0.5075
\checkmark	\times	\times	0.7320	0.4296	0.7647	0.6569	0.7606	0.4067	0.7937	0.6426
\times	\checkmark	\times	0.7370	0.4249	0.7707	0.6638	0.7717	0.3969	0.8112	0.6845
\checkmark	\checkmark	\times	0.7388	0.4230	0.7758	0.6662	0.7741	0.3927	0.8185	0.7087
\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	0.7392	0.4212	0.7765	0.6657	0.7768	0.3918	0.8192	0.7115


**Figure 4: Diagnostic performance with varying number of GNN layers L on the ASSIST and Junyi datasets.**

4.4 Hyperparameters Analyses (RQ3)

4.4.1 Number of GNN Layers. In this part, we focus on studying the impacts of multi-layer GNN on diagnostic performance. The results are in Figure 4. Firstly, we find that smaller number of GNN layers ($L < 4$) achieves better performance than the bigger number ($L = 4$ or 5). Specifically, on the ASSIST dataset, when number of GNN layers is bigger than three, diagnostic performance is slightly worse than the second-best model (KaNCD). The phenomenon suggests that we need to be cautious about the over-smoothing caused by multiple GNN layers [17]. Secondly, comparing two datasets, we observe that accuracy performance (AUC, ACC) on the ASSIST dataset occurs when $L = 1$, while the optimal results on the Junyi dataset occur when $L = 3$. Note that, Junyi dataset has a one-to-one correspondence between concepts and exercises. This indicates that graph algorithms have a clear advantage in extreme data scenarios where CD models need to assess a student’s proficiency levels on concepts they haven’t encountered.

4.4.2 Thresholds for Adaptive Learning. We investigate the impact of removing uncertain edges by adjusting the thresholds for determining uncertainty, and the corresponding results are shown in Figure 3. Specifically, we test results for $\epsilon \in \{0, 0.01, 0.05, 0.1, 0.25, 0.5\}$, where $\epsilon = 0$ means no edges are removed.

Firstly, we find that thresholds $\epsilon \in \{0, 0.01, 0.05, 0.1, 0.25\}$ lead to an improvement in diagnostic performance. This confirms that there are instances where students make careless mistakes or fortunate guesses, and removing these uncertain edges is beneficial for diagnosis. Secondly, we observe a decrease in performance when $\epsilon = 0.5$. This is because we remove a wide range of edges, and some removed edges may carry correct semantic information. In summary, our findings suggest that adjusting the thresholds for

**Figure 5: Diagnostic performance with varying threshold ϵ on the ASSIST and Junyi datasets.**

removing uncertain edges can have a positive impact, but the selection of thresholds should be done carefully to avoid removing semantically important edges. Further research is needed to explore more methods for identifying uncertain edges in the bipartite graph.

5 CONCLUSION

As one of the United Nations’ Sustainable Development Goals, online education has received widespread attention. Educational Cognitive diagnosis is a critical task in online education. In this paper, we proposed ASG-CD to capture the edge heterogeneity and uncertainty in the bipartite graph. Firstly, we designed an embedding module and a matrix factorization layer to obtain student abilities and exercise difficulties. These components enabled us to represent students and exercises, with each dimension corresponding to a specific concept. Then, we introduced a Semantic-aware GNN Layer to aggregate information separately to capture edge heterogeneity. This layer allowed us to utilize different semantic relationships among different nodes, enhancing the diagnostic capability. Furthermore, we observed that some response logs would contradict the model predictions, indicating uncertainties of corresponding edges. Therefore, we proposed an Adaptive Edge Differentiation Layer to dynamically filter out uncertain edges and construct a reliable graph during model training. This layer helped improve the robustness and accuracy of the diagnostic process. Extensive experimental results on three datasets have demonstrated the superiority of ASG-CD.

REFERENCES

- [1] Prasanna V Balachandran, Dezhen Xue, James Theiler, John Hogden, James E Gubernatis, and Turab Lookman. Importance of feature selection in machine learning and adaptive design for materials. In *Materials discovery and design: by means of data science and optimal learning*, pages 59–79. Springer, 2018.
- [2] Rianne van den Berg, Thomas N Kipf, and Max Welling. Graph convolutional matrix completion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.02263*, 2017.
- [3] Wes Bonifay. *Multidimensional item response theory*. Sage Publications, 2019.
- [4] Venkatesh Botu and Rampi Ramprasad. Adaptive machine learning framework to accelerate ab initio molecular dynamics. *International journal of quantum chemistry*, 115(16):1074–1083, 2015.
- [5] Jiawei Chen, Junkang Wu, Jiancan Wu, Xuezhi Cao, Sheng Zhou, and Xiangnan He. Adap-r: Adaptively modulating embedding magnitude for recommendation. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023*, pages 1085–1096, 2023.
- [6] Lei Chen, Le Wu, Richang Hong, Kun Zhang, and Meng Wang. Revisiting graph based collaborative filtering: A linear residual graph convolutional network approach. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 34, pages 27–34, 2020.
- [7] Jimmy De La Torre. Dina model and parameter estimation: A didactic. *Journal of educational and behavioral statistics*, 34(1):115–130, 2009.
- [8] Susan E Embretson and Steven P Reise. *Item response theory*. Psychology Press, 2013.
- [9] Mingyu Feng, Neil Heffernan, and Kenneth Koedinger. Addressing the assessment challenge with an online system that tutors as it assesses. *User modeling and user-adapted interaction*, 19:243–266, 2009.
- [10] Francois Fouss, Alain Pirotte, Jean-Michel Renders, and Marco Saerens. Random-walk computation of similarities between nodes of a graph with application to collaborative recommendation. *IEEE Transactions on knowledge and data engineering*, 19(3):355–369, 2007.
- [11] Weibo Gao, Qi Liu, Zhenya Huang, Yu Yin, Haoyang Bi, Mu-Chun Wang, Jianhui Ma, Shijin Wang, and Yu Su. Rcd: Relation map driven cognitive diagnosis for intelligent education systems. In *Proceedings of the 44th international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*, pages 501–510, 2021.
- [12] Weibo Gao, Hao Wang, Qi Liu, Fei Wang, Xin Lin, Linan Yue, Zheng Zhang, Rui Lv, and Shijin Wang. Leveraging transferable knowledge concept graph embedding for cold-start cognitive diagnosis. In *Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 983–992, 2023.
- [13] Xiangnan He, Kuan Deng, Xiang Wang, Yan Li, Yongdong Zhang, and Meng Wang. Lightgcn: Simplifying and powering graph convolution network for recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval*, pages 639–648, 2020.
- [14] Xiangnan He, Lizi Liao, Hanwang Zhang, Liqiang Nie, Xia Hu, and Tat-Seng Chua. Neural collaborative filtering. In *Proceedings of the 26th international conference on world wide web*, pages 173–182, 2017.
- [15] Hui Hu, Lu Cheng, Jayden Parker Vap, and Mike Borowczak. Learning privacy-preserving graph convolutional network with partially observed sensitive attributes. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*, pages 3552–3561, 2022.
- [16] Jie Huang, Qi Liu, Fei Wang, Zhenya Huang, Songtao Fang, Runze Wu, Enhong Chen, Yu Su, and Shijin Wang. Group-level cognitive diagnosis: A multi-task learning perspective. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*, pages 210–219. IEEE, 2021.
- [17] Nicolas Keriven. Not too little, not too much: a theoretical analysis of graph (over) smoothing. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:2268–2281, 2022.
- [18] Yehuda Koren, Robert Bell, and Chris Volinsky. Matrix factorization techniques for recommender systems. *Computer*, 42(8):30–37, 2009.
- [19] George D Kuh, Jillian Kinzie, Jennifer A Buckley, Brian K Bridges, and John C Hayek. *Piecing together the student success puzzle: Research, propositions, and recommendations: ASHE higher education report*, volume 116. John Wiley & Sons, 2011.
- [20] Jiatong Li, Fei Wang, Qi Liu, Mengxiao Zhu, Wei Huang, Zhenya Huang, Enhong Chen, Yu Su, and Shijin Wang. Hiercdf: A bayesian network-based hierarchical cognitive diagnosis framework. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 904–913, 2022.
- [21] Mengfan Liu, Pengyang Shao, and Kun Zhang. Graph-based exercise-and knowledge-aware learning network for student performance prediction. In *Artificial Intelligence: First CAAI International Conference, CICA 2021, Hangzhou, China, June 5–6, 2021, Proceedings, Part I 1*, pages 27–38. Springer, 2021.
- [22] Xinpu Liu, Yanxin Ma, Ke Xu, Jianwei Wan, and Yulan Guo. Agfa-net: Adaptive global feature augmentation network for point cloud completion. *IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Letters*, 19:1–5, 2022.
- [23] Haiping Ma, Manwei Li, Le Wu, Haifeng Zhang, Yunbo Cao, Xingyi Zhang, and Xuemin Zhao. Knowledge-sensed cognitive diagnosis for intelligent education platforms. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*, pages 1451–1460, 2022.
- [24] Andriy Mnih and Russ R Salakhutdinov. Probabilistic matrix factorization. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 20, 2007.
- [25] Joel Myerson, Leonard Green, and Missaka Warusawitharana. Area under the curve as a measure of discounting. *Journal of the experimental analysis of behavior*, 76(2):235–243, 2001.
- [26] Mark D Reckase. The past and future of multidimensional item response theory. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 21(1):25–36, 1997.
- [27] Michael Schlichtkrull, Thomas N Kipf, Peter Bloem, Rianne Van Den Berg, Ivan Titov, and Max Welling. Modeling relational data with graph convolutional networks. In *The Semantic Web: 15th International Conference, ESWC 2018, Heraklion, Crete, Greece, June 3–7, 2018, Proceedings 15*, pages 593–607. Springer, 2018.
- [28] Jie Shuai, Kun Zhang, Le Wu, Peijie Sun, Richang Hong, Meng Wang, and Yong Li. A review-aware graph contrastive learning framework for recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 1283–1293, 2022.
- [29] Shiwei Tong, Qi Liu, Runlong Yu, Wei Huang, Zhenya Huang, Zachary A Pardos, and Weijie Jiang. Item response ranking for cognitive diagnosis. In *IJCAI*, pages 1750–1756, 2021.
- [30] Fei Wang, Zhenya Huang, Qi Liu, Enhong Chen, Yu Yin, Jianhui Ma, and Shijin Wang. Dynamic cognitive diagnosis: An educational priors-enhanced deep knowledge tracing perspective. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*, 2023.
- [31] Fei Wang, Qi Liu, Enhong Chen, Zhenya Huang, Yuying Chen, Yu Yin, Zai Huang, and Shijin Wang. Neural cognitive diagnosis for intelligent education systems. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 34, pages 6153–6161, 2020.
- [32] Fei Wang, Qi Liu, Enhong Chen, Zhenya Huang, Yu Yin, Shijin Wang, and Yu Su. Neuralcd: a general framework for cognitive diagnosis. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 2022.
- [33] Shanshan Wang, Zhen Zeng, Xun Yang, and Xingyi Zhang. Self-supervised graph learning for long-tailed cognitive diagnosis. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pages 110–118, 2023.
- [34] Shiqiang Wang, Tiffany Tuor, Theodoros Salonidis, Kin K Leung, Christian Makaya, Ting He, and Kevin Chan. When edge meets learning: Adaptive control for resource-constrained distributed machine learning. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2018-IEEE conference on computer communications*, pages 63–71. IEEE, 2018.
- [35] Shunfeng Wang, Peng Fu, Muhui Fu, Bingke Li, Bingyu Zhang, Zian Chen, Zhuonan Liang, and Yunlong Chen. Continuous weighted neural cognitive diagnosis method for online education. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Security*, pages 142–150. Springer, 2022.
- [36] Xiang Wang, Xiangnan He, Meng Wang, Fuli Feng, and Tat-Seng Chua. Neural graph collaborative filtering. In *Proceedings of the 42nd international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in Information Retrieval*, pages 165–174, 2019.
- [37] Zhihao Wen and Yuan Fang. Trend: Temporal event and node dynamics for graph representation learning. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*, pages 1159–1169, 2022.
- [38] Cort J Willmott and Kenji Matsuura. Advantages of the mean absolute error (mae) over the root mean square error (rmse) in assessing average model performance. *Climate research*, 30(1):79–82, 2005.
- [39] Kaifang Wu, Yonghui Yang, Kun Zhang, Le Wu, Jing Liu, and Xin Li. Multi-relational cognitive diagnosis for intelligent education. In *CAAI International Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 425–437. Springer, 2022.
- [40] Le Wu, Yonghui Yang, Kun Zhang, Richang Hong, Yanjie Fu, and Meng Wang. Joint item recommendation and attribute inference: An adaptive graph convolutional network approach. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval*, pages 679–688, 2020.
- [41] Jun Xia, Lirong Wu, Jintao Chen, Bozhen Hu, and Stan Z Li. Simgrace: A simple framework for graph contrastive learning without data augmentation. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*, pages 1070–1079, 2022.
- [42] Liang Yang, Wenmiao Zhou, Weihang Peng, Bingxin Niu, Junhua Gu, Chuan Wang, Xiaochun Cao, and Dongxiao He. Graph neural networks beyond compromise between attribute and topology. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*, pages 1127–1135, 2022.
- [43] Yonghui Yang, Le Wu, Richang Hong, Kun Zhang, and Meng Wang. Enhanced graph learning for collaborative filtering via mutual information maximization. In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 71–80, 2021.
- [44] Jifan Yu, Mengying Lu, Qingyang Zhong, Zijun Yao, Shangqing Tu, Zhengshan Liao, Xiaoya Li, Manli Li, Lei Hou, Hai-Tao Zheng, et al. Moocradar: A fine-grained and multi-aspect knowledge repository for improving cognitive student modeling in moocs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.02205*, 2023.
- [45] Yifei Zhang, Hao Zhu, Ziqiao Meng, Piotr Koniusz, and Irwin King. Graph-adaptive rectified linear unit for graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*, pages 1331–1339, 2022.