
Refined Graph Encoder Embedding via Self-Training and Latent Community Recovery

Cencheng Shen

Department of Applied Economics and Statistics
University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19711
shenc@udel.edu

Jonathan Larson

Microsoft Research
Redmond, WA 98052
jolarso@microsoft.com

Ha Trinh

Microsoft Research
Redmond, WA 98052
trinhha@microsoft.com

Carey E. Priebe

Department of Applied Mathematics and Statistics
Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, MD 21218
cep@jhu.edu

Abstract

This paper introduces a refined graph encoder embedding method, enhancing the original graph encoder embedding using linear transformation, self-training, and hidden community recovery within observed communities. We provide the theoretical rationale for the refinement procedure, demonstrating how and why our proposed method can effectively identify useful hidden communities via stochastic block models, and how the refinement method leads to improved vertex embedding and better decision boundaries for subsequent vertex classification. The efficacy of our approach is validated through a collection of simulated and real-world graph data.

1 Intro

Graph data has surged in popularity, serving as an ideal data structure for capturing interactions across diverse domains, including social networks, citation systems, communication networks, and physical and biological systems (Girvan and Newman, 2002; Newman, 2003; Barabási and Oltvai, 2004; Boccaletti et al., 2006; Varshney et al., 2011; Ugander et al., 2011). This rise is driven by the increasing availability of public graph datasets (Leskovec and Krevl, 2014; Rossi and Ahmed, 2015; Hu et al., 2020), coupled with growing interest in graph learning techniques such as graph convolutional networks (GCN) (Kipf and Welling, 2017; Wu et al., 2019; Xu et al., 2019; Wang

and Leskovec, 2022), as well as a plethora of literature exploring graph data, including theoretical foundations and modern applications.

In the field of graph learning literature, spectral embedding stands out as a fundamental approach for analyzing graph data. It projects graph data into a d -dimensional space using either the graph adjacency or graph Laplacian (Rohe et al., 2011; Sussman et al., 2012; Priebe et al., 2019). While many graph learning methods offer low-dimensional representations, spectral embedding stands out for its interpretability, as its vertex embedding converges to the underlying latent position under popular random graph models (Sussman et al., 2014; Athreya et al., 2018; Rubin-Delanchy et al., 2022). Consequently, spectral embedding provides a versatile and theoretically sound graph learning technique, with applications including vertex classification (Tang et al., 2013; Mehta et al., 2021), community detection (Mu et al., 2022; Gallagher et al., 2023), vertex nomination (Zheng et al., 2022), and the analysis of multiple graphs and time-series (Arroyo et al., 2021; Gallagher et al., 2021).

However, the scalability of spectral embedding has been a major bottleneck due to its use of singular value decomposition (SVD), which can be time-consuming for moderate to large graphs. When vertex labels are available for at least part of the vertex set, a recent method called one-hot graph encoder embedding (Shen et al., 2023), which can be viewed as a supervised version of spectral embedding, is significantly faster. Its vertex embedding converges to the block probability vector in the case of the stochastic block model (Holland et al., 1983), which is similar to the convergence of spectral embedding. Due to the use of additional label input, the graph encoder embedding can outperform spectral embedding in finite-sample performance across a range of applications, such as vertex classification, clustering (Shen et al., 2023), multiple-graph inference (Shen et al., 2023), and dynamic-graph analysis (Shen et al., 2024). The most important advantage of GEE is its simplicity and scalability: it involves only one matrix multiplication and a single pass over the adjacency matrix (or edgelist), resulting in linear computational complexity with respect to the number of edges and vertices, with a constant overhead of 1. It is able to process 100 million edges within seconds, making it much faster than other graph learning methods such as spectral embedding, GCN, and node2vec (Grover and Leskovec, 2016).

In this paper, we propose an enhanced version of the graph encoder embedding that incorporates self-training and latent community recovery. The refined graph encoder embedding can detect hidden sub-communities within the given labels. It has the capability to detect all sub-communities if desired, or to selectively detect latent communities that can benefit subsequent vertex classification and prevent over-refinement. Using stochastic block models with varying parameter choices, we provide illustrative examples to show what the refined method can detect, the meaning of the recovered communities in context, and why detection shall be restricted for the benefit of vertex classification. Theoretical rationale is provided, and the proposed method is validated through simulations and a wide range of real graph data. The appendix includes theorem proofs, additional numerical evaluations on computational scalability, community refinement visualizations on two real graphs, and multiple-graph experiments. All experiments are carried out on a local desktop with MATLAB2024a, Windows 10, an INTEL 16-core CPU, and 64GB of memory.

2 Review

In this section, we briefly review the stochastic block model (SBM), a classical random graph model (Holland et al., 1983; Snijders and Nowicki, 1997; Karrer and Newman, 2011). This is followed by an overview of the adjacency spectral embedding and the original graph encoder embedding.

2.1 Graph Adjacency and Stochastic Block Models

A graph consists of a set of vertices $v_i, i = 1, \dots, n$ and a set of edges $e_j, j = 1, \dots, s$, which can be succinctly represented by an $n \times n$ adjacency matrix \mathbf{A} . In this matrix, $\mathbf{A}(i, j) = 0$ indicates the absence of an edge between vertex i and j , while $\mathbf{A}(i, j) = 1$ indicates the existence of an edge. The adjacency matrix can also be weighted to reflect a weighted graph and, more generally, can represent any similarity or dissimilarity matrix, such as pairwise distance or kernel matrices.

Under SBM, each vertex i is assigned a label $\mathbf{Y}(i) \in 1, \dots, K$. The probability of an edge between a vertex from class k and a vertex from class l is determined by a block probability matrix

$\mathbf{B} = [\mathbf{B}(k, l)] \in [0, 1]^{K \times K}$. For any $i \neq j$, it holds that

$$\mathbf{A}(i, j) \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{Y}(i), \mathbf{Y}(j))).$$

To generate an undirected graph, simply set $\mathbf{A}(j, i) = \mathbf{A}(i, j)$ for all $i < j$.

The degree-corrected stochastic block model is an extension of the SBM that accounts for the sparsity observed in real graphs (Zhao et al., 2012). It assigns a degree parameter $\theta_i \in [0, 1]$ to each vertex i . Given the degrees, each edge from vertex i to another vertex j is independently generated as follows:

$$\mathbf{A}(i, j) \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\theta_i \theta_j \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{Y}(i), \mathbf{Y}(j))).$$

2.2 Spectral Embedding and Encoder Embedding

Given an adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, let

$$\mathbf{U}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{V}^T = \mathbf{A}$$

be the singular value decomposition. Let \mathbf{S}_d be the first $d \times d$ submatrix of \mathbf{S} , and \mathbf{V}_d be the first $n \times d$ submatrix of \mathbf{V} , the adjacency spectral embedding (ASE) is

$$\mathbf{Z}^{ASE} = \mathbf{V}_d \mathbf{S}_d^{0.5} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}.$$

The Laplacian spectral embedding (LSE) has the exact same formulation, except the adjacency matrix \mathbf{A} is replaced by the corresponding graph Laplacian \mathbf{L} .

The encoder embedding requires an additional input, a label vector $\mathbf{Y} \in [0, 1, \dots, K]^n$, where there are a total of K classes and a label of 0 means unknown vertex label, thus allowing partial label vector. It then computes the number of known observations per class as

$$n_k = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}(\mathbf{Y}(i) = k)$$

for $k = 1, \dots, K$. This is followed by a normalized one-hot encoding matrix $\mathbf{W} \in [0, 1]^{n \times K}$ as follows: for each vertex $i = 1, \dots, n$, set

$$\mathbf{W}(i, k) = 1/n_k$$

if and only if $\mathbf{Y}(i) = k$, and 0 otherwise. The encoder embedding is then computed by a simple matrix multiplication:

$$\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{W} \in [0, 1]^{n \times K}.$$

For the embedding, we use $\mathbf{Z}(i, :)$ to represent the row vector, which is the embedding for vertex i . Note that the encoder embedding can be computed without any ground-truth labels by using random label initialization and iterative k-means (Shen et al., 2023). Additionally, an extra normalization step per vertex can be beneficial in sparse graph analysis, i.e., normalizing $\mathbf{Z}(i, :)$ by its L2 norm for every i .

3 Refined Graph Encoder Embedding

3.1 Linear Transformation for Self-Training

The refined GEE algorithm is shown in Algorithm 2 in pseudo-code, which relies on a linear transformation of the original GEE, as detailed in Algorithm 1.

The purpose of Algorithm 1 is to transform the original GEE such that the dimension attaining the maximum value can be properly used to determine the class assignment for each vertex. While one could apply a neural network and use the softmax output for this purpose, the encoder embedding is approximately normally distributed, as stated in Theorem 1. Therefore, linear discriminant analysis (LDA) is a suitable and faster choice to estimate the conditional probability and align the embedding.

Specifically, the LDA function in Algorithm 1 is as follows. Denote the original GEE as \mathbf{Z} . Let $\mu_k \in \mathbb{R}^K$ be the class-conditional mean of $\mathbf{Z}(i, :)|\mathbf{Y}(i) = k$ for $k = 1, \dots, K$, $\mu = [\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_K] \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$ be the concatenated means, and $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$ be the estimated common covariance matrix

of \mathbf{Z} . Let Σ^+ be the pseudo-inverse, \vec{n}_K be a row vector where the k th entry is n_k , and diag mean extracting the diagonal terms as a row vector. Then

$$\mathbf{Z}_1 = \mathbf{Z}\Sigma^+ \mu - (\text{diag}(\mu' \Sigma^+ \mu) - \log(\vec{n}_K/n)) \quad (1)$$

is the linear transformed GEE embedding, where the entire term after the first minus sign should be understood as a row vector and subtracted per row. It follows that

$$\mathbf{Y}_1(i) = \arg \max_{k=1, \dots, K} \mathbf{Z}_1(i, k)$$

is the self-trained new label. One can then calculate a mismatched index between the input label vector \mathbf{Y} and the self-trained label vector \mathbf{Y}_1 .

Algorithm 1 GEE Self Training via Linear Discriminant Analysis (GEELDA)

Require: The graph adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and a label vector $\mathbf{Y} \in \{0, 1, \dots, K\}^n$, where 1 to K represent known labels, and 0 is a dummy category for vertices with unknown labels.

Ensure: A linear transformed encoder embedding $\mathbf{Z}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times K}$, self-trained new label $\mathbf{Y}_1 \in \{0, 1, \dots, K\}^n$, and a logical vector $\text{idx} \in [0, 1]^n$ where 1 indicates mismatched labels.

function GEELDA(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{Y})

$\mathbf{Z} = \text{GEE}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{Y});$ ▷ original one-hot graph encoder embedding
 $\mathbf{Z}_1 = \text{LDA}(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{Y});$ ▷ transform the encoder embedding by Equation 1
 $[\cdot, \mathbf{Y}_1] = \text{rowmax}(\mathbf{Z}_1);$ ▷ the maximum dimension per vertex
 $\text{ind} = \text{find}(\mathbf{Y} == 0);$
 $\mathbf{Y}_1(\text{ind}) = 0;$ ▷ omit vertices with unknown labels
 $\text{idx} = (\mathbf{Y} \neq \mathbf{Y}_1);$

end function

3.2 Refined GEE via Self-Training and Latent Community Recovery

Given the linear transformation in Algorithm 1, Algorithm 2 refines the label vector via iterative self-training and latent community assignment. The iterative self-training part is standard, with two parameters, ϵ and ϵ_n , that stop self-training when the mismatch between training labels and self-trained labels no longer reduces. For the iterative community assignment, we reassign mismatched training data in each class into a new class each time and stop the refinement when the mismatch between training labels and self-trained labels no longer reduces. Finally, the original encoder embedding, along with all the refined embedding from self-training and hidden community assignment prior to stopping, are concatenated.

Note that the parameters ϵ and ϵ_n control how aggressive the refinement is. The user may adjust them for cross-validation purposes or other tasks. For example, if the downstream task is to visualize all hidden communities or detect outliers, one may set ϵ and ϵ_n to smaller values, say 0, and γ_K and γ_Y to large values (e.g., 100). This ensures that the refinement will continue as long as the mismatched indices continue to decrease. Our default parameter choice is designed to be slightly conservative, which performed well throughout simulations and real data experiments for vertex classification.

Finally, the refined graph encoder embedding retains the same scalability advantage as the original graph encoder embedding. See Appendix B and Figure 3 for a running time comparison.

4 Theoretical Rationale

In this section, we provide the theoretical rationale for the self-training by linear transformation and the latent community assignment, explaining why the proposed method works and when community refinement helps improve embedding quality.

Theorem 1. *The graph encoder embedding is asymptotically normally distributed under SBM. Specifically, as n increases, for a given i th vertex of class y , it holds that*

$$\text{diag}(\vec{n}_K)^{0.5} \cdot (\mathbf{Z}(i, \cdot) - \mu_y) \xrightarrow{n} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_y).$$

The expectation and covariance are: $\mu_y = \mathbf{B}(y, \cdot)$ and $\Sigma_y(k, k) = \mathbf{B}(y, k)(1 - \mathbf{B}(y, k))$. Assuming Σ_y is the same across all $y \in [1, K]$, the transformation in Equation 1 satisfies

$$\mathbf{Z}_1(i, k) \xrightarrow{n} \text{Prob}(Y = k | X = \mathbf{Z}(i, \cdot)).$$

Algorithm 2 Refined Graph Encoder Embedding (R-GEE)

Require: The graph adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and a label vector $\mathbf{Y} \in \{0, 1, \dots, K\}^n$; number of refinement γ_K and γ_Y , set to 5 by default; stopping criterion $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$ and $\epsilon_n \in \mathbb{N}$, set to 0.3 and 5 by default.

Ensure: The refined graph encoder embedding $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, a concatenated label matrix \mathbf{Y} .

```
function R-GEE( $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{Y}, \gamma_K, \gamma_Y, \epsilon, \epsilon_n$ )
  [ $\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{Y}_1, \text{idx}_1$ ] = GEELDA( $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{Y}$ );  $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{Y}_1$ ;
  for  $k = 1, \dots, \gamma_Y$  do
    [ $\mathbf{Z}_2, \mathbf{Y}_2, \text{idx}_2$ ] = GEELDA( $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{Y}_1$ );
    if  $\text{sum}(\text{idx}_1) - \max(\text{sum}(\text{idx}_1) * \epsilon, \epsilon_n) < \text{sum}(\text{idx}_1 \& \text{idx}_2)$  then
      Break;
    else
       $\mathbf{Z} = [\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{Z}_2]$ ;  $\mathbf{Y}_1 = \mathbf{Y}_2$ ;  $\mathbf{Y} = [\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Y}_1]$ ;
       $\text{idx}_1 = \text{idx}_1 \& \text{idx}_2$ ;
    end if
  end for
  for  $k = 1, \dots, \gamma_K$  do
    [ $\mathbf{Z}_2, \mathbf{Y}_2, \text{idx}_2$ ] = GEELDA( $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{Y}_1 + \text{idx}_1 * K$ );
    if  $\text{sum}(\text{idx}_1) - \max(\text{sum}(\text{idx}_1) * \epsilon, \epsilon_n) < \text{sum}(\text{idx}_1 \& \text{idx}_2)$  then
      Break;
    else
       $\mathbf{Z} = [\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{Z}_2]$ ;  $\mathbf{Y}_1 = \mathbf{Y}_2$ ;  $\mathbf{Y} = [\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Y}_1]$ ;
       $\text{idx}_1 = \text{idx}_1 \& \text{idx}_2$ ;
    end if
  end for
end function
```

Theorem 1 shows that the original graph encoder embedding is asymptotically normally distributed. As a result, the proposed linear transformation approximates the conditional probability, making it an appropriate choice for subsequent self-training.

Theorem 2. *Suppose the graph is distributed as the stochastic block model with block probability $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$ and observed label vector $\mathbf{Y} \in [1, \dots, K]$. Then for any two vertices i, j , the encoder embedding \mathbf{Z} using observed labels satisfies:*

$$\|\mathbf{Z}(i, :) - \mathbf{Z}(j, :)\|_2 - \|\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{Y}(i), :) - \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{Y}(j), :)\|_2 \xrightarrow{n} 0$$

Suppose the same graph can be viewed as a realization of a latent stochastic block model with $\mathbf{B}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{K' \times K'}$ and a latent label vector $\mathbf{Y}_0 \in [1, \dots, K]$ where K' . Then for the same two vertices i, j , the resulting encoder embedding \mathbf{Z}_0 using the latent labels satisfies:

$$\|\mathbf{Z}_0(i, :) - \mathbf{Z}_0(j, :)\|_2 - \|\mathbf{B}_0(\mathbf{Y}_0(i), :) - \mathbf{B}_0(\mathbf{Y}_0(j), :)\|_2 \xrightarrow{n} 0$$

Theorem 2 suggests that when comparing the encoder embedding using observed labels versus the encoder embedding using latent labels, the margin of separation fully depends on the block probability vector between the observed model and the latent model. This means that, from a margin separation perspective, the encoder embedding using latent communities could perform better or worse than the original encoder embedding using observed communities. Therefore, for the refined algorithm to improve over the original encoder embedding, it needs to properly decide whether to refine the given labels or not. Moreover, it is important to concatenate the embedding in each refinement, because the concatenated embedding retains previous embedding information and is more robust against slight over-refinement.

Under the stochastic block model, this theorem can help verify whether the latent community leads to an improvement or deterioration in the margin of separation over the observed community. Note that the theorem focuses on asymptotic behavior. In finite-sample performance, the embedding variance certainly plays a role in the decision boundary. In this paper, we only considered the mean difference to illustrate the key idea, for simplicity of presentation and to avoid overly complicating mathematical expressions. This is because the variance is generally similar across the groups and bounded above by 0.25 in SBM.

5 Simulations

We start with three stochastic block models, each serving as a representative case, and use Theorem 2 to verify whether the latent community leads to better embedding separation among groups. We then use embedding visualization, vertex classification, and precision/recall metrics to verify the results and assess the effectiveness of the refined algorithm.

5.1 Model Parameters

Simulated Graph 1

For each vertex, we set the latent communities as $Y_0 = 1, 2, 3, 4$ with probability 0.25 each, and set the latent block probability matrix as

$$\mathbf{B}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.5, 0.2, 0.1, 0.1 \\ 0.2, 0.2, 0.1, 0.1 \\ 0.1, 0.1, 0.2, 0.2 \\ 0.1, 0.1, 0.2, 0.5 \end{bmatrix},$$

then set the degree parameter to be $\theta_i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{Uniform}(0.1, 1)$. Next, we set the observed communities as $Y = 1$ if $Y_0 = 1, 2$, and $Y = 2$ if $Y_0 = 3, 4$. Namely, the first two latent communities are observed as one group, while the last two latent communities are observed as another group. Therefore, the observed block probability matrix can be computed as

$$\mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.275, 0.1 \\ 0.1, 0.275 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Now we use Theorem 2 to check the margin of separation. When using the latent labels, the margin of separation between classes 2 and 3 equals $\|(0.2, 0.2, 0.1, 0.1) - (0.1, 0.1, 0.2, 0.2)\| = 0.2$. When using the observed labels, the difference is $\|(0.275, 0.1) - (0.1, 0.275)\| = 0.25$. Therefore, using the observed labels actually provides a larger margin of separation between these vertices. Note that if we consider the separation between classes 1 and 4, then the latent communities are better; however, those two latent groups are less important than the separation between latent classes 2 and 3.

Simulated Graph 2

The latent communities and block probability matrix are exactly the same as in simulated graph 1. However, the observed communities are set up as follows: $Y = 1$ if $Y_0 = 1, 3$, and $Y = 2$ if $Y_0 = 2, 4$. As a result, the observed block probability matrix can be computed as

$$\mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.225, 0.15 \\ 0.15, 0.225 \end{bmatrix}.$$

In this case, the latent communities have a margin of 0.2 between latent class 2 and 3, which becomes 0.11 when using observed communities. Therefore, this simulation provides an example where label refinement is necessary and significantly improves the embedding quality.

Simulated Graph 3

In this simulation, we set the latent communities as $Y_0 = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$ with probability 0.2 each, and set the latent block probability matrix as

$$\mathbf{B}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.5, 0.2, 0.2, 0.1, 0.1 \\ 0.1, 0.2, 0.1, 0.2, 0.1 \\ 0.1, 0.1, 0.2, 0.1, 0.2 \\ 0.1, 0.2, 0.1, 0.5, 0.1 \\ 0.1, 0.1, 0.2, 0.1, 0.5 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The observed communities are: $Y = 1$ if $Y_0 = 1, 2, 3$; $Y = 2$ if $Y_0 = 4$; and $Y = 3$ if $Y_0 = 5$. Then the observed block probability matrix can be computed as

$$\mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.178, 0.133, 0.133 \\ 0.133, 0.500, 0.100 \\ 0.133, 0.100, 0.500 \end{bmatrix}$$




Figure 1: This figure visualizes the graph using latent labels (left panel), observed labels (center panel), and GEE-refined labels using one label refinement (right panel).

This simulation is somewhat similar to simulated graph 1 but presents a more interesting mixed situation where some decision boundaries are improved using latent groups, while others are worse. For example, the difference between vertices in latent group 2 and 4 is 0.3 using latent labels, which is enlarged to 0.37 using observed labels. However, class 1 and 4 are separated by 0.5745 using latent labels, which is reduced to 0.37 using observed labels, and similarly for class 1 versus 5, or class 4 versus 5.

5.2 Latent Community Recovery

Figure 1 shows the graph connectivity for simulated graphs 1 and 2, with vertices colored by latent community (left), observed community (center), and GEE-refined community (right) using one label refinement ($\gamma_K = 1$ and $\gamma_Y = 0$).

Since the latent communities do not improve the embedding separation for simulated graph 1, we expect GEE refinement to largely ignore the latent communities. This is indeed the case in the top row of Figure 1, where the refinement only highlights a few vertices in the middle, and most vertices remain in their observed groups.

The situation is different for simulated graph 2, where the latent communities significantly improve the embedding quality and decision boundary. In this case, GEE refinement successfully identifies the latent communities, assigning most vertices in latent communities 2 and 3 to different groups, so the right panel closely matches the left panel in the bottom row of Figure 1. To maintain a clear and consistent visualization, simulation graph 3 is not shown here, as it merely represents a mixed case between graph 1 and graph 2.

5.3 Vertex Classification Evaluation

The top row of Figure 2 reports the 5-fold cross-validation for the simulated graphs using 30 replicates. For each replicate, we generate a simulated graph of increasing vertex size, along with the corresponding latent and observed labels.

GEE0 computes the original GEE using the latent community labels Y_0 . GEE computes the original GEE using the observed community labels Y . R-GEE uses the proposed algorithm with default parameters and the observed community labels Y as input. ASE stands for adjacency spectral embedding into $d = 20$. Each method is then evaluated via an LDA classifier for the observed labels Y . Note that the classification task is always for the observed labels Y , and the latent labels Y_0 are only used for embedding. Moreover, for all GEE methods, the labels of testing observations are assigned to 0 prior to the embedding.

For simulated graph 1, GEE0 using the latent labels has the worst classification error, while all other methods perform well and similarly to each other. This result matches the model setting and our previous verification that latent communities yield worse embedding quality. For simulated graph 2, GEE using the observed labels performed the worst, while R-GEE, GEE0, and ASE all performed very well. This is a reversal of simulated graph 1 and also matches the model setting and previous verification that latent communities improve the embedding quality in this case. For simulated graph 3, it is a mixed case where some refinement helps marginally, and GEE0, GEE, and R-GEE all performed relatively well with some small differences.

The bottom row of Figure 2 shows the precision and recall of R-GEE. In simulated graphs 1 and 3, the vertex classification results indicate that latent communities are not important, so while the precision is high (all discovered new communities belong to the true latent communities), the recall is relatively low (many vertices from the latent communities are not discovered). For simulated graph 2, discovering the latent communities is critical, and indeed both precision and recall are very high, showing that R-GEE is performing as intended.

Overall, this figure shows that the proposed algorithm works as designed, recovering latent communities only when they are useful for vertex classification, and retaining excellent embedding quality that is not overly refined, as evidenced by the good classification error that converges to 0 in every case.

6 Real Data Evaluation

We collected a diverse set of real graphs with associated labels from various sources, including the Network Repository¹ (Rossi and Ahmed, 2015), Stanford network data², and other public graph data. Specifically, we experimented on the AdjNoun graph (Newman, 2003), *C. elegans* neuron data, which provides two binary graphs (Pavlovic et al., 2014), the EU Email Network (Yin et al., 2017), the karate club graph (Zachary, 1977), the LastFM Asia social network (Rozemberczki and Sarkar, 2020), the letter graph, the political blogs graph (Adamic and Glance, 2005), a political retweet graph, the Pubmed Citation network, and a Wikipedia article graph (Shen et al., 2014) with four graphs.

For a more comprehensive evaluation in the real data experiments, we compared GEE, refined GEE (R-GEE), adjacency spectral embedding (ASE), Laplacian spectral embedding (LSE), and node2vec (Grover and Leskovec, 2016). R-GEE used the default parameters; ASE and LSE project into $d = 20$ dimensions; node2vec uses the graspy package (Chung et al., 2019) with default parameters and 128 dimensions. For each dataset and each method, we carried out 10-fold validation and reported the average classification error using LDA, along with one standard deviation, in Table 1 with 30 random seeds. Any directed graph was transformed to undirected, and any singleton vertex was removed. Note that unlike the simulated graphs, real graphs do not come with any known latent communities.

Table 1 clearly shows that refined GEE is able to preserve or improve the classification error compared to original GEE. In a few cases where it is worse, the difference is only marginal. Moreover, GEE and R-GEE are either the best or very close to the best in terms of classification error across all real data experiments. It should be noted that all methods with parameters could attain better performance if we tuned the parameters for each real dataset, but we chose to use consistent parameter choices

¹<http://networkrepository.com/>

²<https://snap.stanford.edu/>




Figure 2: The first row of the figure reports the 5-fold cross-validation error and standard deviation for the three simulated graphs, using 30 replicates. The bottom row of the figure reports the precision and recall for refined GEE in recovering the latent communities.

throughout the experiments. Therefore, the results reported here should be viewed as a conservative illustration of the proposed method, not the best possible error.

Due to space limitations, additional experiments, such as refined community visualization for two representative cases and multiple-graph simulations, are provided in Appendix C and Appendix D to further highlight the advantages of the method.

7 Conclusion

This paper introduces a refined graph encoder embedding, provides a theoretical rationale for its usefulness, and explains when and how latent communities may improve subsequent vertex classification. The method and theorems are supported by both simulations and real data experiments.

Acknowledgments and Disclosure of Funding

This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation HDR TRIPODS 1934979, the National Science Foundation DMS-2113099, and by funding from Microsoft Research. The authors declare no competing interests.

References

Adamic, L. and N. Glance (2005). The political blogosphere and the 2004 us election: Divided they blog. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Workshop on Link Discovery*, New York, pp. 36–43. ACM Press.

	(n, K)	R-GEE	GEE	ASE	LSE	N2v
AdjNoun	(112, 2)	14.9 ± 2.1	14.6 ± 2.0	18.7 ± 1.3	14.2 ± 1.4	45.9 ± 3.3
C-Elegans Ac	(253, 3)	37.1 ± 2.7	49.7 ± 1.5	38.4 ± 1.3	35.3 ± 1.3	45.3 ± 2.0
C-Elegans Ag	(253, 3)	38.0 ± 2.3	40.8 ± 1.7	42.3 ± 1.1	42.6 ± 1.2	40.2 ± 2.3
Coil-RAG	(11687, 100)	19.5 ± 1.1	19.5 ± 1.1	97.3 ± 0.1	95.5 ± 0.1	79.1 ± 0.2
Email	(1005, 42)	29.4 ± 1.1	33.1 ± 0.5	44.4 ± 0.4	88.5 ± 0.4	28.9 ± 0.4
Karate	(34, 2)	9.5 ± 2.3	9.5 ± 2.3	17.4 ± 4.6	16.6 ± 4.2	13.8 ± 2.7
LastFM	(7624, 18)	17.5 ± 0.5	18.1 ± 0.2	48.9 ± 0.1	23.1 ± 0.1	14.7 ± 0.1
Letter	(10482, 26)	3.2 ± 0.2	3.2 ± 0.2	89.9 ± 0.2	88.9 ± 0.2	74.7 ± 0.2
PolBlogs	(1224, 2)	5.3 ± 0.3	5.0 ± 0.3	9.5 ± 0.2	4.9 ± 0.2	5.1 ± 0.1
PolTweet	(1847, 2)	2.6 ± 0.1	2.7 ± 0.1	29.8 ± 0.1	4.6 ± 0.1	38.8 ± 0.1
PubMed	(19716, 3)	20.3 ± 0.1	20.4 ± 0.1	37.4 ± 0.1	34.0 ± 0.1	58.8 ± 0.2
Wiki TE	(1382, 5)	16.0 ± 0.5	20.4 ± 0.3	26.2 ± 0.2	26.6 ± 0.2	n/a
Wiki TF	(1382, 5)	15.8 ± 0.5	20.9 ± 0.3	27.7 ± 0.3	27.7 ± 0.3	n/a
Wiki GE	(1382, 5)	33.5 ± 0.9	41.2 ± 0.5	46.4 ± 0.4	53.8 ± 0.4	40.2 ± 0.5
Wiki GF	(1382, 5)	42.9 ± 0.8	50.6 ± 0.8	47.1 ± 0.3	56.7 ± 0.5	46.6 ± 0.4

Table 1: This table reports the 10-fold vertex classification error and standard deviation for real graphs, using 30 random replicates. All numbers are in percentile. Note that there are two text dissimilarity datasets (Wiki TE and Wiki TF, which are cosine dissimilarity of the underlying articles) where node2vec is not applicable.

Arroyo, J., A. Athreya, J. Cape, G. Chen, C. E. Priebe, and J. T. Vogelstein (2021). Inference for multiple heterogeneous networks with a common invariant subspace. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 22(142), 1–49.

Athreya, A., D. E. Fishkind, M. Tang, C. E. Priebe, Y. Park, J. T. Vogelstein, K. Levin, V. Lyzinski, Y. Qin, and D. L. Sussman (2018). Statistical inference on random dot product graphs: a survey. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 18(226), 1–92.

Barabási, A.-L. and Z. N. Oltvai (2004). Network biology: Understanding the cell’s functional organization. *Nature Reviews Genetics* 5(2), 101–113.

Boccaletti, S., V. Latora, Y. Moreno, M. Chavez, and D.-U. Hwang (2006). Complex networks: Structure and dynamics. *Physics Reports* 424(4-5), 175–308.

Chung, J., P. B. D., E. W. Bridgeford, B. K. Varjavand, H. S. Helm, and J. T. Vogelstein (2019). Graspy: Graph statistics in python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 20(158), 1–7.

Devroye, L., L. Györfi, and G. Lugosi (1996). *A Probabilistic Theory of Pattern Recognition*.

Gallagher, I., A. Jones, A. Bertiger, C. E. Priebe, and P. Rubin-Delanchy (2023). Spectral clustering of weighted graphs. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*.

Gallagher, I., A. Jones, and P. Rubin-Delanchy (2021). Spectral embedding for dynamic networks with stability guarantees. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.

Girvan, M. and M. E. J. Newman (2002). Community structure in social and biological networks. *Proceedings of National Academy of Science* 99(12), 7821–7826.

Grover, A. and J. Leskovec (2016). node2vec: Scalable feature learning for networks. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pp. 855–864.

Holland, P., K. Laskey, and S. Leinhardt (1983). Stochastic blockmodels: First steps. *Social Networks* 5(2), 109–137.

Hu, W., M. Fey, M. Zitnik, Y. Dong, H. Ren, B. Liu, M. Catasta, and J. Leskovec (2020). Open graph benchmark: Datasets for machine learning on graphs. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Volume 33, pp. 22118–22133.

- Karrer, B. and M. E. J. Newman (2011). Stochastic blockmodels and community structure in networks. *Physical Review E* 83, 016107.
- Kipf, T. N. and M. Welling (2017). Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Leskovec, J. and A. Krevl (2014, June). SNAP Datasets: Stanford large network dataset collection. <http://snap.stanford.edu/data>.
- Mehta, K., R. F. Goldin, D. Marchette, J. T. Vogelstein, C. E. Priebe, and G. A. Ascoli (2021). Neuronal classification from network connectivity via adjacency spectral embedding. *Network Neuroscience* 5(3), 689–710.
- Mu, C., A. Mele, L. Hao, J. Cape, A. Athreya, and C. E. Priebe (2022). On spectral algorithms for community detection in stochastic blockmodel graphs with vertex covariates. *IEEE Transactions on Network Science and Engineering* 9(5), 3373–3384.
- Newman, M. E. J. (2003). The structure and function of complex networks. *SIAM Review* 45(2), 167–256.
- Pavlovic, D., P. Vertes, E. Bullmore, W. Schafer, and T. Nicholas (2014). Stochastic blockmodeling of the modules and core of the caenorhabditis elegans connectome. *PLoS ONE* 9(9), e97584.
- Priebe, C., Y. Parker, J. Vogelstein, J. Conroy, V. Lyzinskic, M. Tang, A. Athreya, J. Cape, and E. Bridgeford (2019). On a 'two truths' phenomenon in spectral graph clustering. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 116(13), 5995–5600.
- Rohe, K., S. Chatterjee, and B. Yu (2011). Spectral clustering and the high-dimensional stochastic blockmodel. *Annals of Statistics* 39(4), 1878–1915.
- Rossi, R. A. and N. K. Ahmed (2015). The network data repository with interactive graph analytics and visualization. In *AAAI*.
- Rozemberczki, B. and R. Sarkar (2020). Characteristic functions on graphs: Birds of a feather, from statistical descriptors to parametric models. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM '20)*, pp. 1325–1334. ACM.
- Rubin-Delanchy, P., J. Cape, M. Tang, and C. E. Priebe (2022). A statistical interpretation of spectral embedding: The generalised random dot product graph. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* 84(4), 1446–1473.
- Shen, C., J. Larson, H. Trinh, X. Qin, Y. Park, and C. E. Priebe (2024). Discovering communication pattern shifts in large-scale labeled networks using encoder embedding and vertex dynamics. *11(2)*, 2100 – 2109.
- Shen, C., Y. Park, and C. E. Priebe (2023). Graph encoder ensemble for simultaneous vertex embedding and community detection. In *2023 2nd International Conference on Algorithms, Data Mining, and Information Technology (ADMIT 2023), Chengdu, China, September 2023*. ACM.
- Shen, C., C. E. Priebe, J. Larson, and H. Trinh (2023). Synergistic graph fusion via encoder embedding. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.18051>.
- Shen, C., M. Sun, M. Tang, and C. E. Priebe (2014). Generalized canonical correlation analysis for classification. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* 130, 310–322.
- Shen, C., Q. Wang, and C. E. Priebe (2023). One-hot graph encoder embedding. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 45(6), 7933 – 7938.
- Snijders, T. and K. Nowicki (1997). Estimation and prediction for stochastic blockmodels for graphs with latent block structure. *Journal of Classification* 14(1), 75–100.
- Sussman, D., M. Tang, D. Fishkind, and C. Priebe (2012). A consistent adjacency spectral embedding for stochastic blockmodel graphs. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 107(499), 1119–1128.

- Sussman, D., M. Tang, and C. Priebe (2014). Consistent latent position estimation and vertex classification for random dot product graphs. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 36(1), 48–57.
- Tang, M., D. L. Sussman, and C. E. Priebe (2013). Universally consistent vertex classification for latent positions graphs. *Annals of Statistics* 41(3), 1406–1430.
- Ugander, J., B. Karrer, L. Backstrom, and C. Marlow (2011). The anatomy of the facebook social graph. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1111.4503*.
- Varshney, L., B. Chen, E. Paniagua, D. Hall, and D. Chklovskii (2011). Structural properties of the caenorhabditis elegans neuronal network. *PLoS Computational Biology* 7(2), e1001066.
- Wang, H. and J. Leskovec (2022). Combining graph convolutional neural networks and label propagation. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems* 40(4), 1–27.
- Wu, Z., S. Pan, F. Chen, G. Long, C. Zhang, and P. S. Yu (2019). A comprehensive survey on graph neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* 32, 4–24.
- Xu, K., W. Hu, J. Leskovec, and S. Jegelka (2019). How powerful are graph neural networks? In *Proc. ICLR*, pp. 1–17.
- Yin, H., A. R. Benson, J. Leskovec, and D. F. Gleich (2017). Local higher-order graph clustering. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pp. 555–564.
- Zachary, W. (1977). An information flow model for conflict and fission in small groups. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 33, 452–473.
- Zhao, Y., E. Levina, and J. Zhu (2012). Consistency of community detection in networks under degree-corrected stochastic block models. *Annals of Statistics* 40(4), 2266–2292.
- Zheng, R., V. Lyzinski, C. E. Priebe, and M. Tang (2022). Vertex nomination between graphs via spectral embedding and quadratic programming. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 31(4), 1254–1268.

Appendix

A Theorem Proofs

Theorem 1. *The graph encoder embedding is asymptotically normally distributed under SBM. Specifically, as n increases, for a given i th vertex of class y , it holds that*

$$\text{diag}(\bar{n}_K)^{0.5} \cdot (\mathbf{Z}(i, :) - \mu_y) \xrightarrow{n} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_y).$$

The expectation and covariance are: $\mu_y = \mathbf{B}(y, :)$ and $\Sigma_y(k, k) = \mathbf{B}(y, k)(1 - \mathbf{B}(y, k))$. Assuming Σ_y is the same across all $y \in [1, K]$, the transformation in Equation 1 satisfies

$$\mathbf{Z}_1(i, k) \xrightarrow{n} \text{Prob}(Y = k | X = \mathbf{Z}(i, :)).$$

Proof. The central limit theorem for the original graph encoder embedding under the stochastic block model is proved in Shen et al. (2023) Theorem 1. So here we simply provide a brief overview.

First, a necessary assumption is that as n goes to infinity, so does n_k ; i.e., as the number of vertices goes to infinity, the number of vertices per class also increases to infinity. This is a standard regularity assumption in pattern recognition because, without it, the class would become trivial as n increases.

Under SBM, each dimension $k = 1, \dots, K$ of the vertex embedding satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Z}(i, k) &= \mathbf{A}(i, :)\mathbf{W}(:, k) \\ &= \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n I(\mathbf{Y}(j) = k)\mathbf{A}(i, j)}{n_k} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{j=1, j \neq i, \mathbf{Y}(j)=k}^n \text{Bern}(\mathbf{B}(y, k))}{n_k}. \end{aligned}$$

If $k = y$, the numerator is a summation of $(n_k - 1)$ i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables, since the summation includes a diagonal entry of \mathbf{A} , which is always 0. Otherwise, $k \neq y$ and the numerator is a summation of n_k i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables.

Checking the Lyapunov condition and applying the central limit theorem, we have

$$\sqrt{n_k}(\mathbf{Z}(i, k) - \mathbf{B}(y, k)) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{B}(y, k)(1 - \mathbf{B}(y, k))).$$

for each dimension k .

Note that $\mathbf{Z}(i, k)$ and $\mathbf{Z}(i, l)$ are always independent when $k \neq l$. This is because every vertex belongs to a unique class, so the same Bernoulli random variable never appears in another dimension. Concatenating every dimension yields that

$$\text{Diag}(\bar{\mathbf{n}})^{0.5} \cdot (\mathbf{Z}(i, :) - \mathbf{B}(y, :)) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_y).$$

For more detailed steps, as well as cases for other random graph models, please refer to Theorem 1 in Shen et al. (2023).

Now, given $\mathbf{Z}(i, :)$ is normally distributed for n large, it follows immediately from classical pattern recognition (Devroye et al., 1996) that under the normality assumption and a common variance across all k , the linear transformation in Equation 1 estimates the conditional probability. This is because the LDA transformation directly estimates $\text{Prob}(Y|X)$ when $X|Y$ is normally distributed. Specifically,

$$\mathbf{Z}_1(i, k) = \mathbf{Z}(i, k)\Sigma^+ \mu_k - ((\mu'_k \Sigma^+ \mu_k) - \log(n_K/n))$$

is the exact LDA transformation for each class $k = 1, \dots, K$. Writing it into a matrix expression for all k leads to Equation 1. \square

Theorem 2. *Suppose the graph is distributed as the stochastic block model with block probability $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$ and observed label vector $\mathbf{Y} \in [1, \dots, K]$. Then for any two vertices i, j , the encoder embedding \mathbf{Z} using observed labels satisfies:*

$$\|\mathbf{Z}(i, :) - \mathbf{Z}(j, :)\|_2 - \|\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{Y}(i), :) - \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{Y}(j), :)\|_2 \xrightarrow{n} 0$$

Suppose the same graph can be viewed as a realization of a latent stochastic block model with $\mathbf{B}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{K' \times K'}$ and a latent label vector $\mathbf{Y}_0 \in [1, \dots, K']$ where K' . Then for the same two vertices i, j , the resulting encoder embedding \mathbf{Z}_0 using the latent labels satisfies:

$$\|\mathbf{Z}_0(i, :) - \mathbf{Z}_0(j, :)\|_2 - \|\mathbf{B}_0(\mathbf{Y}_0(i), :) - \mathbf{B}_0(\mathbf{Y}_0(j), :)\|_2 \xrightarrow{n} 0$$

Proof. From Theorem 1, it is immediate that the encoder embedding satisfies the law of large numbers, such that

$$\|\mathbf{Z}(i, :) - \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{Y}(i), :)\|_2 \xrightarrow{n} 0.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbf{Z}(i, :) - \mathbf{Z}(j, :)\|_2 - \|\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{Y}(i), :) - \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{Y}(j), :)\|_2 \\ & \leq \|\mathbf{Z}(i, :) - \mathbf{Z}(j, :) - (\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{Y}(i), :) - \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{Y}(j), :))\|_2 \\ & = \|(\mathbf{Z}(i, :) - \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{Y}(i), :)) - (\mathbf{Z}(j, :) - \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{Y}(j), :))\|_2 \\ & \leq \|\mathbf{Z}(i, :) - \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{Y}(i), :)\|_2 + \|\mathbf{Z}(j, :) - \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{Y}(j), :)\|_2 \\ & \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since the graph encoder embedding is fully dependent on the given labels, when the latent labels are used, we also have

$$\|\mathbf{Z}_0(i, :) - \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{Y}_0(i), :)\|_2 \xrightarrow{n} 0,$$

so the same derivation and convergence apply to the encoder embedding using latent labels as well. \square

B Running Time Analysis

The original GEE has a time complexity of $O(nK + s)$, where s is the number of edges, making it linear with respect to the number of vertices and edges. Let K_M be the largest possible number of refined classes, the refined GEE has a time complexity of $O(nK_M + nK_M^2 + s)$, where the quadratic term K_M^2 comes from using linear discriminant. As $K_M = \gamma_K K$, or at most $5K$ in the default parameter, the method remains linear with respect to the number of vertices and edges, though it requires more iterations.

Figure 3 shows the running time using simulation model 3 with sparse adjacency matrix input, as n increases from 3000 to 30000. The average running time and one standard deviation are reported, using 10 Monte-Carlo replicates. It is clear that the refined method, although slower than the original encoder embedding, is still vastly faster than singular value decomposition (SVD), which is the major computational step of spectral embedding. At $n = 30000$, the number of edges is about 50 million; a single SVD into $d = 20$ requires about 200 seconds, while the graph encoder embedding takes 0.4 second and the refined method takes 1.2 second.

C Refinement Visualization on Real Data

Figure 4 illustrates the community refinement results for two representative cases: the karate club graph and the political blogs graph. These examples clearly demonstrate how the refinement algorithm works. It identifies vertices that are misclassified in the encoder embedding using the observed labels and then assigns them to a new class. Visually, the method successfully detects useful hidden communities with just one refinement.

For the karate club graph, the algorithm identifies an anomaly vertex that always connects with the other group, and another vertex located at the intersection between the two classes. For the political blogs, our algorithm identifies blogs that are dominantly connected to the other party. Whether these are "swinger" blogs or "imposter" blogs is an issue of practical importance.

D Vertex Classification on Multiple Matched Graphs

Some of the real data, specifically the *C. elegans* data and the Wikipedia data, come with multiple graphs of a common vertex set. The graph encoder embedding can be directly used for multiple




Figure 3: This figure shows the running time comparison between GEE, Refined GEE, and SVD. The X-axis represents the approximate number of edges, and the Y-axis represents the running time on a log-10 scale.

	R-GEE	GEE	U-ASE	U-LSE	N2v
C-Elegans Ac+Ag	33.7 \pm 2.2	40.2 \pm 1.7	34.7 \pm 1.3	40.2 \pm 1.3	51.9 \pm 2.8
Wiki TE+TF	14.6 \pm 0.5	18.0 \pm 0.3	20.7 \pm 0.3	21.1 \pm 0.3	n/a
Wiki TE+GE	14.6 \pm 0.6	17.8 \pm 0.4	21.2 \pm 0.3	30.2 \pm 0.3	n/a
Wiki TF+GF	15.7 \pm 0.5	18.7 \pm 0.3	21.1 \pm 0.3	31.3 \pm 0.4	n/a
Wiki GE+GF	32.2 \pm 0.8	39.2 \pm 0.8	43.7 \pm 0.3	50.8 \pm 0.5	39.9 \pm 0.7
Wiki TE+TF+GE+GF	13.3 \pm 0.5	16.1 \pm 0.3	18.0 \pm 0.3	27.9 \pm 0.4	n/a


Table 2: This table reports the vertex classification results for multiple-graph data with a common vertex set. All numbers are in percentile.

graph inputs (Shen et al., 2023) by concatenating the embeddings, as can the refined version. LDA classifier can then be applied to measure the quality of the joint embedding via vertex classification.


For the spectral embedding, we use the unfolded spectral embedding (Gallagher et al., 2021): Given M graphs of matched common vertices, the unfolded version concatenates all adjacency matrices by rows into $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times Mn}$, and applies SVD to yield $\mathbf{Z}^{UASE} = \mathbf{V}_d \mathbf{S}_d^{0.5} \in \mathbb{R}^{Mn \times d}$, where each $n \times d$ matrix is the embedding for the corresponding graph. We then reshape and concatenate the embedding into $\mathbb{R}^{n \times Md}$ and carry out the vertex classification using linear discriminant analysis.

For node2vec, we simply apply node2vec to each graph, concatenate their embeddings, and apply LDA. Everything else is exactly the same as in Section 6, and Table 2 reports the average vertex classification error and the standard deviation for different combinations of the graph data. The results are consistent with those in Table 1, where refined GEE always improves over the original GEE, and is the best performer throughout all combinations. Additionally, using multiple matched graphs improves over single graph results.

Karate Club Graph




Observed Community




GEE-Refined Community

Political Blog Graph



Observed Community



GEE-Refined Community

Figure 4: This figure visualizes two real graphs, Karate Club and Political Blogs, using observed labels (left panel) and GEE-refined labels with one label refinement (right panel).