

# Pay Attention to Weak Ties: A Heterogeneous Multiplex Representation Learning Framework for Link Prediction

Weiwei Gu\*, Linbi Lv, Gang Lu, Ruiqi Li\*

**Abstract**—Graph neural networks (GNNs) can learn effective node representations that significantly improve link prediction accuracy. However, most GNN-based link prediction algorithms are incompetent to predict weak ties connecting different communities. Most link prediction algorithms are designed for networks with only one type of relation between nodes but neglect the fact that many complex systems, including transportation and social networks, consisting of multi-modalities of interactions that correspond to different nature of interactions and dynamics that can be modeled as multiplex network, where different types of relation are represented in different layers. This paper proposes a Multi-Relations-aware Graph Neural Network (MRGNN) framework to learn effective node representations for multiplex networks and make more accurate link predictions, especially for weak ties. Specifically, our model utilizes an intra-layer node-level feature propagation process and an inter-layer representation merge process, which applies a simple yet effective logistic or semantic attention voting mechanism to adaptively aggregate information from different layers. Extensive experiments on four diversified multiplex networks show that MRGNN outperforms the state-of-the-art multiplex link prediction algorithms on overall prediction accuracy, and works pretty well on forecasting weak ties.

**Index Terms**—Weak tie prediction, Heterogeneous network representation learning, Multiplex networks

## I. INTRODUCTION

**L**INK prediction is important for a wide range of applications spanning various domains, including identifying missing or future connections in social networks [1], potential physical location relationships in climate networks [2], co-location relation in spatio-temporal interaction networks [3]. Over the past three decades, this area of research has garnered significant attention from scholars across different scientific disciplines, leading to extensive investigations and progress [1], [4]–[7].

A long strand of link prediction algorithms has been proposed to predict the missing or upcoming links for networks with only one type of connection. Though they have achieved relatively high prediction accuracy, there is a stagnation in this field. The performance of different link prediction algorithms has shown little discernible variation in terms of accuracy, which is due to a lack of a theoretical breakthrough, as evidenced by several studies [8]–[11]. Despite the emergence of link prediction algorithms equipped with deep learning architectures, which offer enhanced network structure learning capabilities and heightened prediction accuracy, they are still

incompetent for correctly prediction the existence of weak ties that bridge different communities [12]–[14]. To the best of our knowledge, state-of-the-art graph neural network-based link prediction algorithms [8], [15] are incapable of predicting weak ties or not aware of challenges aroused by weak ties (see Fig. 2). Most algorithms often focus solely on the structural information of networks with just one type of link, and neglect the multiplex nature [16], [17] of real-world networks.

In real network applications, weak ties hold significant importance due to their critical roles in preserving global connectivity, enhancing network resilience, and expediting the dissemination of information spreading process [18], [19]. Granovetter posits that strong ties, characterized by close relationships with friends and family, are vital for emotional support, while weak ties, which encompass more distant or casual relationships, offer greater value by granting access to novel information and opportunities from other communities [20]. Weak ties prove to be particularly beneficial in uncovering employment opportunities because they introduce new labor market information to a broader audience in the social network [20]. Typically, strong ties tend to form within the same community, while weak ties act as conduits connecting different communities. To the best of our knowledge, the rigorous identification of weak links based solely on network topology remains a challenging endeavor [21]. A widely adopted approach involves initially partitioning the network into communities and subsequently designating weak links as those connecting different communities [21]. There are a variety of definitions of weak ties, and for the sake of simplicity, in this paper, we define weak ties as edges connecting nodes from different communities, while strong ties refer to links established within the same community [22].

The link prediction accuracy of weak ties can be improved through balancing link weights in homogenous networks and introducing extra intra-layer information in heterogeneous networks. FLIP [23] applies a dyadic-level fairness criterion based on network modularity and uses this criterion as a postprocessing step to generate more heterogeneous links to overcome the low prediction accuracy of cross-community links (a.k.a weak tie) for the homogenous network. FairAdj [24] points that regulating weights on existing edges in a graph contributes to dyadic fairness conditionally and empirically learn a fair adjacency matrix with proper graph structural constraints for fair link (a.k.a weak tie) prediction while preserving predictive accuracy as much as possible. UGE [25] first uncovering an underlying bias-free graph to minimize the

\*Corresponding. weiweigu@mail.buct.edu.cn, lir@mail.buct.edu.cn

impact on the utility of the embeddings, and then learning node embedding on the bias-free graph to mitigate the low prediction accuracy of weak ties. In this paper, we find the above-mentioned algorithms have a higher weak tie prediction accuracy compared with other homogenous link prediction algorithms but a low overall prediction accuracy on strong ties.

To further improve the link prediction accuracy of weak ties, some work leverages the intricate structure of complex systems whose link properties can be effectively characterized as networks comprised of diverse types of interactions. For example, in social networks, there are different types of relation, including friends, colleague, and family tie, that corresponds to different nature of interaction and dynamics [17]. These interactions are typically categorized as links belonging to distinct layers, with each layer representing a unique interaction relationship [26], [27]. We refer to networks that encompass various types of relationships between nodes as multiplex networks. In these networks, inter-layer edges connect the same individual nodes across different layers, while intra-layer edges signify different types of relations within each layer. Nodes within multiplex networks engage in a multitude of diverse relations, and each of these relations encodes unique information. Disregarding or simply aggregating information from different layers might lead to great information loss and is responsible for incompetence in predicting weak ties. It is worth noting that, compared to multiplex networks, multi-layer networks, which also have different layers, is a broader concept, where each layer can represent a different network and dependencies are edges connecting different layers [26].

There also have been a few link prediction algorithms that try to leverage structural information from all layers of multiplex networks. These methods often rely on heuristics and typically define layer similarity based on the topology of the multiplex network. For example, Najari et al. analyze connections between nodes in each layer and utilize inter-layer similarity, which can be measured by degree-degree correlation, to make better link prediction [28]. While heuristic methods can be effective in specific domains, they come with certain limitations. Those algorithms often require manual feature engineering, and some of them do not fully account for the influence of the target layer. Additionally, they may involve tunable parameters that are challenging to set optimally [28], [29]. These drawbacks restrict their applicability and overall performance.

In response to these limitations, inspired by the development of representation learning techniques, multiplex network link prediction algorithms with deep neural architectures have emerged. Wu et.al [30] puts heterogeneous nodes from different layers into one layer and then predicts links in the aggregated layer. Zhang et.al. [31] proposes a high-dimensional global embedding and a layer-specific local embedding based on DNN to jointly optimize the inter-layer and intra-layer embedding to do the link prediction task. Inspired by the deep learning framework, there is a branch of algorithms that first define and utilize meta-paths as an effective way to connect nodes in one line and use GCN to compute different weights over different layers [32]–[34]. Specifically, those

algorithms start by independently learning the representations of each layer and subsequently merge and aggregate these representations from different layers using deep learning modules, which can include techniques like the graph attention mechanism [35] or multi-perceptron neural networks [36]. These methods automatically learn interlayer weight combinations weight via feature concatenation, cross-layer attention mechanism, and other fusion strategies [37], [38]. There are also some association rule-based link prediction algorithms. MELL [39] incorporates the idea of a layer vector to capture and characterize the connectivity of each layer to embed nodes in each layer into the lower embedding space using all layer structures. mGCN [31] applies the graph attention framework to compute a graph-level layer score to quantify the importance from both intra-layer and inter-layer. Incorporating layer-level influence can improve the link prediction accuracy, but a more personalized and flexible nodal-level mechanism can further help in learning-rich nodal representation and improve the link prediction accuracy.

In this work, to address the above challenges, we propose a Multi-Relations-aware Graph Neural Network (MRGNN) to adaptively integrate embeddings from both inter-layer and intra-layer perspectives. MRGNN first employs a series of layer-specific graph convolution networks to obtain an intra-layer representation from neighbors of nodes during a message propagation process in each layer. Since each layer represents a distinct feature space and manifests a unique topology structure, we utilize a multi-faceted linear transformation matrix, rather than relation-specific transformation matrices, to project intra-layer representations into a shared representation space. How to learn normalized inter-layer attention weights to better utilize information from other layers is a non-trivial task. MRGNN introduces a straightforward yet effective node-level attention mechanism, either a logistic or semantic attention voting process, to adaptively aggregate representations of neighbors in other layers. The final representation of a node within a particular layer is a weighted combination of its neighbors’ representations from both intra-layer and inter-layer connections. Extensive experiments demonstrate that MRGNN outperforms state-of-the-art multiplex link prediction algorithms and significantly enhances overall link prediction accuracy, particularly for weak ties in multiplex networks.

## II. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we provide formal definitions and notations that are essential for understanding heterogeneous multiplex network representation learning.

### A. Definition of Multiplex Network and notations

A multiplex network is a network that contains different types of interactions between the same set of nodes. It is generally represented in a multi-layer manner, where for each layer the edges correspond to a certain type of interaction between nodes, and nodes in different layers are the same. A multiplex network can be represented as  $G = (G^{(1)}, G^{(2)}, \dots, G^{(|R|)}) = (V, E)$ , where  $|R|$  is the number of layers,  $V$  is the set of nodes, which are shared by all layers (i.e.,  $V^{(1)} = V^{(2)} =$




Fig. 1: An illustration of a multiplex network that comprises three different types of relation. The coloring scheme represents the community partitions in each layer.

... =  $V^{(lR)} = V$ ),  $E$  is the set of intra-layer relations, where  $E = \{E^{(1)} \cup E^{(2)} \cup \dots \cup E^{(lR)}\} \subseteq |V| \times |V| \times |R|$  and  $E^{(r)}$  is the edge set in the layer  $r$ . In a certain layer  $r$ , the corresponding graph  $G^{(r)} = (V, E^{(r)})$ . Given a multiplex network  $G$ , the adjacency matrices  $A = \{A^{(1)}, A^{(2)}, \dots, A^{(lR)}\}$ , where  $A^{(r)}$  is the adjacency matrix of the network  $G^{(r)}$  in the layer  $r$ . The initial node attributes set is represented as  $X$ , which are shared by nodes in all layers (i.e.,  $X^{(1)} = X^{(2)} = \dots = X^{(lR)}$ ). In order to accelerate the training speed and discriminate different layers, for a certain node  $n$  in the layer  $r$ , we concatenate the initial nodal attributes  $X$  with its adjacency vector (i.e., the  $n$ -th row of  $A^{(r)}$ ), and form the attributes matrix  $X^{(r)}$ .

Figure 1 shows a toy multiplex network that comprises three different types of relations among 10 employees belonging to two divisions within the same department in the work layer. Nodes  $A$  and  $B$  are assumed to be division managers and work as intermediaries connecting two groups. The link between  $A$  and  $B$  in the work layer plays an essential role in the information-spreading process, which would facilitate effective communication between these two divisions. However, predicting the weak connection between  $A$  and  $B$  is difficult since there are no common neighbors between them.

We argue that multi-layer networks inherently encompass a multitude of different types of interactions between nodes, the complementary information contained in other layers can greatly improve the accuracy of link prediction in each layer. For instance, in Figure 1, let us consider a scenario, in which individuals  $A$  and  $B$  have lunch together: while this interaction is different from their professional work relationship, it may exhibit a high degree of correlation with work-related connections and could exert a significant influence on the link between  $A$  and  $B$  within the work layer. Moreover, the facebook layer, which represents social interactions can also provide valuable supplementary insights to enhance the

accuracy of link prediction between individuals such as  $A$  and  $B$  in the work layer. In essence, these multi-layer networks encompass various facets of node interactions, providing a comprehensive perspective that can augment our capacity to forecast connections, especially for predicting weak ties, where information in a single layer might be inadequate.

Within the context of a heterogeneous multiplex network  $G$ , the task of multiplex representation is identifying a mapping function that projects nodes in each layer (i.e.,  $|V| \times |R|$  nodes in total) into the same  $d$ -dimensional vector space. Specifically, for a node  $n$  in layer  $r$ , denoted as  $v_n^{(r)}$ , this mapping yields a vector representation  $\mathbf{z}_n^{(r)} \in \mathbb{R}^{|V| \times d}$ .

### B. Challenges for predicting weak ties

Popular homogeneous link prediction algorithms that employ deep learning architectures (e.g., SEAL [8], VGAE [9], and node2vec [11]) have achieved exceptional accuracy for predicting links that connect nodes in the same community (referred to as “strong ties”), as the prediction probability is generally higher than 0.5 (see orange bars in Fig. 2). However, this is not the case for “weak ties” that connect nodes from two different communities, where roughly half of them are of a prediction probability lower than 0.5 (see red bars in Fig. 2). This observation emphasizes the persistent difficulty in achieving precise forecasts for weak ties that play a vital role in connecting different communities within a network. In addition to a high prediction accuracy, a good algorithm should also have a low false negative rate. For “non-tied nodes in the same community”, whose correct prediction probability should be smaller than 0.5, there are still also some misclassifications (see green bars in Fig. 2). It is a similar case for “non-tied nodes between communities” (see grey bars in Fig. 2).

The challenge of predicting weak ties that connect different communities is mainly posed by the following factors. First, on network structure, nodes connected by weak ties generally have few or even no common neighbors, which would make common neighbor-based link prediction algorithms ineffective [40]. Second, the nodal feature attributes of nodes connected by weak ties are usually different, as they two may highly probably belong to different communities, and this would hinder predictions based on homophily [41], which is a critical concept in social sciences. Homophily principle indicates that nodes with similar attributes would have a higher chance of getting connected, however, the similarity of nodes connected by weak ties is generally low [42]. Third, most link prediction algorithms only pay attention to layer-specific representations but neglect information from other layers, which leads to node representations learned by homogeneous network embedding algorithms being ineffective.

Predicting weak ties with inadequate structure topology and feature properties oversimplifies the prediction complexity, this oversimplification leads to information loss and ultimately contributes to lower prediction accuracy for weak ties. Various interactions among nodes complement each other when it comes to predicting links that span across different communities, indicating the potential for enhancing link prediction accuracy.




Fig. 2: The estimated link prediction probability distribution in the Cora dataset by three popular homogeneous link prediction algorithms – SEAL, VGAE, and Node2Vec. Here, we sample 10% of links and non-tied node pairs, respectively. We refer to links that connect nodes from different communities as “weak ties”, while those ones in the same community as “strong ties”. We use the Louvain algorithm [12] to obtain community partitions. In addition, “non-tied nodes between communities” refer to non-existing edges between nodes from two different communities, and “non-tied nodes in community” refer to the non-existing edge between nodes in the same community. All four types of links are subject to normalization.




Fig. 3: The framework of the MRGNN model for multiplex networks with several layers (Best viewed in color).

### III. METHODOLOGY

In this paper, we propose an end-to-end Multi-Relations-aware Graph Neural Network (MRGNN), which is a novel approach designed to achieve effective aggregation of information from different layers in multiplex networks for making more accurate link prediction, especially for the challenging task that involves weak ties. In this section, we provide a comprehensive description of the MRGNN architecture, which consists of four pivotal constituents: inter-layer feature propagation, multi-layer projection, inter-layer representation aggregation, and supervised optimization (see Figure 3 for a brief overview of MRGNN).

#### A. Intra-layer Node Representation Learning

In the stage of intra-layer feature forward propagation, we employ an inductive transformation function for each node

$v_n^{(r)}$  in each layer  $r$ . This function is designed to aggregate the node’s prior representation with the embeddings of its neighbors. Following the feature forward propagation process [43], our neighbor message passing process is defined in Eq. 1:

$$\mathbf{h}_n^{k,(r)} \leftarrow \sigma \left( \mathbf{W}^{k,(r)} \cdot \text{MEAN} \left( \{\mathbf{h}_n^{k-1,(r)}\} \cup \{\mathbf{h}_j^{k-1,(r)}, \forall j \in N^{k,(r)}(n)\} \right) \right), \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{h}_i^{k,(r)}$  represents the learned embedding of node  $i$  in layer  $r$  for the  $k^{\text{th}}$  forward propagation step,  $\mathbf{W}^{k,(r)}$  denotes an iteration-specific and layer-specific trainable linear transformation weight matrix,  $N^{k,(r)}(n)$  denotes the set of sampled neighbors of node  $n$  in layer  $r$  for the  $k^{\text{th}}$  forward propagation step, and  $\sigma(\cdot)$  represents the activation function, here, we employ  $\text{ReLU}(\cdot) = \max(0, \cdot)$ ,  $\mathbf{h}_j^{k-1,(r)}$  represents the feature representation from the previous  $(k-1)^{\text{th}}$  forward propagation step. And we set the initial representation  $\mathbf{h}_n^{0,(r)}$  of node  $n$  in layer  $r$  as the feature representation  $X_n^{(r)}$ , i.e.,

$\mathbf{h}_n^{0,(r)} = X_n^{(r)}$ . Note that while our approach utilizes a mean aggregator, it remains adaptable to alternative message-passing techniques, such as LSTM aggregator or max-pooling, as discussed in previous work [43].

Many real-world networks exhibit scale-free characteristics, where both the number of links attached to nodes and the strength of connections between nodes vary significantly and follow a power-law [3], [44]. In addition, neighbors of a node are usually not homogeneous and some neighbors may have a higher influence over the focal node. To obtain a comprehensive feature representation of neighboring nodes and incorporate the graph structure into the representation learning process, we employ a weighted neighborhood sampling strategy, which is outlined in Eq 2:

$$\alpha_{n \leftarrow u}^{k,(r)} = \exp\left(\sigma\left(\mathbf{U}^{k-1,(r)} \cdot \left[\mathbf{h}_n^{k-1,(r)} \parallel \mathbf{h}_u^{k-1,(r)}\right]\right)\right), \quad \forall u \in \tilde{N}^{(r)}(n) \quad (2)$$

where  $\alpha_{n \leftarrow u}^{k,(r)}$  denotes the learned sampling weight from node  $u$  to  $n$  in layer  $r$  for the  $k^{\text{th}}$  forward propagation step,  $\parallel$  is the concatenation operation,  $\mathbf{U}^{k-1,(r)}$  is a trainable feed forward linear transformation weight matrix, and  $\tilde{N}^{(r)}(n)$  is the set of all neighbors of  $u$  in layer  $r$ . In order to compute  $\alpha_{n \leftarrow u}^{k,(r)}$ , we first concatenate node  $n$ 's representation  $\mathbf{h}_n^{k-1,(r)}$  in previous step with its neighbor  $u$ 's corresponding representation  $\mathbf{h}_u^{k-1,(r)}$ . Then, we multiply the concatenated representation vector with  $\mathbf{U}^{k-1,(r)}$ . In this study, for nodes with more than 10 neighbors, we first rank neighbors according to the sampling weights  $\alpha_{n \leftarrow u}^{k,(r)}$  and then choose the top 10 neighbors that have the highest sampling weight to get  $N^{k,(r)}(n)$  in Eq. 1.

### B. Multi-layer Projection

Due to the inherent heterogeneity across layers in multiplex networks, we first employ relation-specific transformation matrices  $\mathbf{W}^{k,(r)}$  to get intra-layer node embedding  $\mathbf{h}_n^{k,(r)}$  in each distinct subspaces (see Eq. 1) during the intra-layer feature propagation stage. In order to seamlessly manipulate and aggregate representations derived from various network layers, we establish a consistent embedding space characterized by a shared latent space by the following projection equation:

$$\mathbf{h}_n^{(r)} = \tanh(\mathbf{M} \cdot \mathbf{h}_n^{k,(r)} + \mathbf{b}), \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathbf{M}$  is a trainable fully connected layer, and  $\mathbf{b}$  denotes a bias vector, and hyperbolic tangent ( $\tanh$ ) is the nonlinear activation function. It is important to note that both  $\mathbf{M}$  and  $\mathbf{b}$  are shared for all layers in multiplex networks,  $\mathbf{h}_n^{(r)}$  is the final intra-layer representation of node  $n$ . Through the projection of node representations into a common latent space, we are able to calculate the influence of features from both intra- and inter-layers.

### C. Inter-layer Node Representation Aggregation

In multiplex networks, multiple layers pose mutual influence over each other, and adaptively leveraging information from other layers can yield more comprehensive embeddings for nodes in a certain layer, which may aid downstream tasks, for example, link prediction. For the exemplified multiplex

network in Fig. 1, in order to predict the work relationship between nodes  $A$  and  $B$ , which is a weak tie connecting two divisions, connection patterns of lunch or facebook layer can provide additional information.

In our pursuit of enhancing link prediction accuracy via obtaining more comprehensive node representations in the context of multiplex networks, we introduce a straightforward yet highly effective approach to quantify the influence of layers over each other to make better aggregation with information from other layers. And there are two ways of implementation of MRGNN – MRGNN-logit and MRGNN-semantic.

1) *MRGNN-logit*: A logistic inter-layer-aggregator (see Eq. 4) enables each node to gain flexibility in harnessing the propagated features from both intra-layer and inter-layer neighbors. The inter-layer attention, or termed inter-layer influence, of layer  $q$  over layer  $p$  is calculated as follows:

$$a_n^{(p \leftarrow q)} = \text{softmax}\left(\frac{\sigma\left(\theta^{(p)} \cdot \left(\mathbf{h}_n^{(p)} \otimes \mathbf{h}_n^{(q)}\right)\right)}{\sum_{r=1, r \neq p}^{|R|} \sigma\left(\theta^{(p)} \cdot \left(\mathbf{h}_n^{(p)} \otimes \mathbf{h}_n^{(r)}\right)\right)}\right), \quad (4)$$

where  $\sigma(\cdot)$  is a sigmoid activation function, and  $\theta^{(p)}$  is the inter-layer attention vector of layer  $p$  for aggregating information from other layers, and  $\otimes$  stands for Hadamard product. Instead of averaging the relation-specific representations over all layers, we use the softmax function to normalize weights to derive the inter-layer attention  $a_n^{(p \leftarrow q)}$ , which is affected by both intra-layer representations and the inter-layer weight learning process. Specifically, if  $\mathbf{h}_n^{(p)} \otimes \mathbf{h}_n^{(q)}$  is of a large value, it signifies that node  $n$  in layer  $q$  provides more information for predictions related to node  $n$  in layer  $p$ . It is worth noting that  $a_n$  is asymmetric, i.e.,  $a_n^{(p \leftarrow q)}$  is unnecessarily equal to  $a_n^{(q \leftarrow p)}$ , which indicates that some layer can be more important to another layer, but not vice versa. We name this simple and effective logistic regression model-based inter-layer aggregator as MRGNN-logit, which has a few trainable parameters and expedites convergence during the training process.

2) *MRGNN-semantic*: In order to enable MRGNN to encode more complicated inter-layer information, we propose a semantic inter-layer-aggregator, which involves more trainable parameters than MRGNN-logit but has a better encoding ability. As shown in Eq. 5,  $a_n^{(p \leftarrow q)}$  is the inter-layer attention of layer  $q$  over  $p$  for node  $n$ , which is of the same meaning as in Eq. 4,  $\mathbf{V}$  is a layer-specific trainable matrix, and  $\mathbf{Q}$  is a multiplex network level trainable matrix, which is the same all layers.

$$a_n^{(p \leftarrow q)} = \frac{\exp\left(\text{MEAN}\left(\mathbf{Q}\left[\tanh\left(\mathbf{V}^{(p)} \cdot \mathbf{h}_n^{(p)}\right) + \tanh\left(\mathbf{V}^{(q)} \cdot \mathbf{h}_n^{(q)}\right)\right]\right)}{\sum_{r=1, r \neq p}^{|R|} \exp\left(\text{MEAN}\left(\mathbf{Q}\left[\tanh\left(\mathbf{V}^{(p)} \cdot \mathbf{h}_n^{(p)}\right) + \tanh\left(\mathbf{V}^{(r)} \cdot \mathbf{h}_n^{(r)}\right)\right]\right)} \quad (5)$$

3) *Nodal representation*: Recognizing the significant variability in the importance of nodes across different layers, we introduce Eq. 6 to combine both the intra-layer and inter-layer representations.

$$\mathbf{z}_n^{(p)} = \mathbf{h}_n^{(p)} + \sum_{r=1, r \neq p}^{|R|} \alpha_{n \leftarrow r}^{(p \leftarrow r)} \cdot \mathbf{h}_n^{(r)}, \quad (6)$$

where  $\mathbf{z}_n^{(p)}$  is the final representation of node  $n$  in layer  $p$ ,  $\mathbf{h}_n^{(p)}$  is the final intra-layer feature vectors of node  $n$  in layers  $p$ ,

and  $\alpha_n^{(p \leftarrow r)}$  is a normalized attention coefficient that quantifies the importance of node  $n$  in layer  $r$  for generating the final embedding of node  $n$  in layer  $p$ .  $\alpha_n^{(p \leftarrow r)}$  can be computed via Eq. 4 or Eq. 5. In this way, MRGNN leverages the acquired intra- and inter-layer weights to aggregate layer-specific representations to derive the ultimate nodal representation in each layer.

#### D. MRGNN Joint Training

With comprehensive and robust node representations, we can predict links in multiplex networks in a supervised way. We randomly sample 10% of edges from the original graph  $G^{(r)}$  in each layer as the “positive” samples for the test set, and an equal number of non-tied node pairs to form the “negative” samples. The combination of the “positive” and “negative” sample sets constitutes our test set. Additionally, we sample another 10% of links and non-tied node pairs from the remaining graph to form the validation set. All links in the remaining graph and an equal number of randomly selected non-tied node pairs form our training set, denoted as  $\varepsilon^{(r)}$ . The whole training set  $\varepsilon$  comprise training sets from all layers, i.e.,  $\varepsilon = \{\varepsilon^{(1)}, \dots, \varepsilon^{(r)}, \dots, \varepsilon^{(|R|)}\}$ .

There are several ways to quantify the relation between nodes, including cosine similarity [37], Mahalanobis distance [38], and link connectivity probability using logistic regression [45]. For the joint training of all layer-specific prediction models, in this paper, we utilize layer-specific logistic regression models to represent the probability of connection between nodes. The prediction probability of a link between nodes  $i$  and  $j$  in layer  $r$  is described in Eq. 7, where  $\mu^{(r)}$  represents a layer-specific trainable vector,  $p_{ij}^{(r)}$  denotes the probability of link connection between nodes  $i$  and  $j$  in layer  $r$ .

$$p_{ij}^{(r)} = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(\mu^{(r)} \cdot (\mathbf{z}_i^{(r)} \otimes \mathbf{z}_j^{(r)}))} \quad (7)$$

With the prediction probability of each link, we aim to collectively minimize the overall layer-specific training loss as depicted in Eq. 8:

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{r \in R} -\frac{1}{|\varepsilon^{(r)}|} \sum_{i,j \in \varepsilon^{(r)}} y_{ij}^{(r)} \log p_{ij}^{(r)} + (1 - y_{ij}^{(r)}) \log (1 - p_{ij}^{(r)}), \quad (8)$$

where  $y_{ij}^{(r)}$  is a connection label, which equals 1 if node  $i$  and  $j$  are connected, and equals 0 if disconnected.

## IV. EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we demonstrate the merits of MRGNN in the context of link prediction for both strong and weak ties on four real-world graphs. We compare MRGNN with a diverse set of baseline algorithms, and MRGNN has an outstanding performance. Furthermore, a sensitivity analysis of parameters is performed, we analyze the impact of the embedding dimension of representation on the link prediction accuracy and discover that a not-too-large dimension is sufficient in the context of multiplex embedding. In addition, we also conduct statistical analysis on learned inter-layer attention and find that influence can be asymmetric between layers.

### A. Experimental Setup

1) *Datasets*: We conducted experiments on four datasets, one from a social network (CKM) generated from surveys of doctors in four small towns, and one from a scientific network (ACM), movie network (IMDB), and an e-commerce network (Amazon), which are obtained from Ref. [35].

2) *Baselines*: In recent years, link prediction algorithms with end-to-end representation learning architectures have gained significant attention and have achieved pretty high accuracy in a wide range of downstream tasks. In this paper, we compare MRGNN with two classical and widely adopted homogeneous link prediction algorithms (DeepWalk [46], VGAE [9]) and three cutting-edge weak tie awarded homogeneous network link prediction algorithms, (FLIP [23], FairAdj [24], and UGE [25]) and five heterogeneous link prediction algorithms (PMNE(n) [47], MNE [48], GATNE [31], MELL [39], and mGCN [31]).

DeepWalk employs random walks to explore the underlying network structure and utilizes the skip-gram model for learning network embedding, which is subsequently applied to the link prediction task. VGAE learns latent variables, which typically follow a multivariate Gaussian distribution in the latent space, of networks through a variational auto-encoder [9]. Both DeepWalk and VGAE have demonstrated significant enhancements in predictive performance on various single-layer networks. FLIP [23] employs a dyadic-level fairness criterion grounded in network modularity, which serves as a post-processing step, strategically generating more heterogeneous links. FairAdj [24] highlights the significance of regulating weights on existing edges within a graph as a means to contribute to dyadic fairness under certain conditions. UGE [25] involves the meticulous exploration of an underlying bias-free graph to minimize any adverse effects on the utility of the embeddings.

MNE [37] and GATNE [31] initially acquire an intra-layer node representation for all relations, which is then enhanced with layer-specific representations via random walk and skip-gram [50] algorithm. The distinction between MNE and GATNE lies in the way they combine layer-specific representations: MNE employs a fixed weight for each layer to form the final representation, while GATNE employs a more flexible method to aggregate layer-specific weights. PMNE introduces a unified network embedding model that enables joint learning of multiple relations. As for cutting-edge heterogeneous multiplex link prediction approaches, MELL [39] integrates the concept of a layer vector, designed to comprehensively capture and delineate the connectivity patterns inherent in each layer which involves embedding nodes within each layer into the lower-dimensional embedding space, thereby leveraging the entirety of layer structures. mGCN [31] applies a graph attention framework to compute a graph-level layer score between layers to quantify the neighbors’ importance from both intra-layer and inter-layer.

Parameter setting and evaluation metrics used for comparison are detailed in Appendix B

### B. Link Prediction Performance Analysis

To compute the link prediction accuracy of weak ties across various layers, we perform the link prediction task for each



layer and calculate the mean average metric over all layers as the final measure of link prediction accuracy, the test set contains 10% of links across different communities to form the positive sample as well as the same number of negative samples collected from disconnected node pairs.

In Table I, it is evident that both MRGNN-logit and MRGNN-semantic consistently demonstrate robust and best performance, achieving exceptional accuracy across all evaluation datasets in the prediction of weak ties. Specifically, as shown in Table I, MRGNN-logit and MRGNN-semantic contribute to notable improvements in weak tie prediction accuracy for the IMDB, ACM, and Amazon datasets, with increases of 16%, 3%, and 5%, respectively. Significantly, algorithms explicitly tailored for weak tie prediction, including FairAdj, FLIP, and UGE, consistently attain high link prediction precision across the CKM, ACM, and Amazon separately. Furthermore, it is crucial to underscore that the MELL algorithm’s original training set encompasses test set data. To mitigate potential biases associated with this integration, a prudent approach is adopted wherein node pairs from the test set are systematically excluded during the training phase of MELL.

Table II shows the superior overall link prediction performance of both MRGNN-logit and MRGNN-semantic when compared to various algorithms. Heterogeneous link prediction algorithms, in general, demonstrate higher link prediction accuracy compared with homogenous link prediction algorithms. Specifically, MRGNN-logit and MRGNN-semantic achieve the highest accuracy in link prediction across the CKM, IMDB, and ACM datasets and they ranked second in predictive capability on the ACM dataset.

The outstanding performance of MRGNN can be ascribed to its nodal-level inter-layer attention mechanism that computes the customized influence of inter-layer neighbors for each node. Heterogeneous link prediction algorithms such as mGCN and NMA, have fixed cross-layer weights that are incapable of fully capturing the complex interaction of nodes from different layers. MRGNN-logit offers a straightforward optimization framework with fewer trainable parameters to aggregate information from different layers, while MRGNN-semantic provides a more flexible and versatile framework for autonomously learning the weight of each node in each layer. The embedding aggregation framework of MRGNN-semantic, although more challenging to train than MRGNN-logit, tends to achieve lower error rates and higher link prediction accuracy due to its larger number of trainable parameters, and has achieved a better performance in some cases (e.g., on CKM).

TABLE I: Weak tie prediction accuracy comparison over four datasets.

	Homogeneous Algorithm			Heterogeneous Algorithm			
	FairAdj	UGE	FLIP	MELL	mGCN	MRGNN-logit	MRGNN-semantic
CKM	0.924	0.821	0.734	0.476	0.799	<b>0.918</b>	<b>0.928</b>
IMDB	0.730	0.626	0.405	0.505	0.803	<b>0.954</b>	<b>0.965</b>
ACM	0.518	0.861	0.955	0.504	0.880	<b>0.948</b>	<b>0.981</b>
Amazon	0.651	0.934	0.641	0.51	0.906	<b>0.98</b>	<b>0.952</b>

It is a great challenge to accurately predict missing or forthcoming links when the size of the training set is small and the test set is large, particularly in experimental-based disciplines, where discovering and validating links demands




Fig. 4: Link prediction accuracy comparison of several representation learning algorithms under different training and testing sizes. (A) AUC and (B) Micro-F1 for overall link prediction performance in the testing set, similarly, (C) and (D) are for link prediction performance for predicting weak ties and non-tied node pairs between communities in the testing set.

substantial experimental resources. In Fig. 4, we systematically change the size of the training set, and meanwhile, put all of the remaining links into the testing set. For example, when the training set contains 20% of links in the network, the testing set contains the remaining 80% of the network (and not that we also sample an equivalent number of non-tied node pairs into both the training and testing set). For both overall prediction accuracy for all links (see Fig. 4 A-B) and for only weak ties (see Fig. 4 C-D), MRGNN exhibits a high degree of robustness in this context, consistently outperforming Node2vec and GATNE, even when the training dataset is relatively small. This gives MRGNN a bigger advantage in practice without acquiring a large fraction data of the network.

### C. Performance of MRGNN

By comparing the results in Fig. 4D (which is the Micro-F1 for predicting weak ties) and results in Fig. 4B (which is for predicting all links), we observe that predicting weak ties are harder to predict, which is indicated by a smaller Micro-F1, especially when the training set is small. Yet, still, MRGNN can achieve a much higher performance than GATNE and node2vec.

Generally, weak ties are crucial for maintaining global connectivity, accelerating the information spreading process, and increasing network robustness [20]. To further demonstrate the strength of MRGNN on link prediction and especially for predicting weak ties, we perform an epidemic spreading simulation on a reconstructed network that comprises only 20% of original links and all correctly predicted links by MRGNN, GATNE, and node2vec. Link prediction models are trained with 20% of original links and are applied to make predictions for all remaining node pairs, and if a predicted

TABLE II: Overall link prediction accuracy comparison over four datasets.

	Homogeneous Algorithm					Heterogeneous Algorithm						
	DeepWalk	VGAE	FairAdj	UGE	FLIP	PMNE(n)	MNE	GATNE	MELL	mGCN	MRGNN-logit	MRGNN-semantic
<b>CKM</b>	0.873	0.833	0.768	0.913	0.548	0.940	0.863	0.866	0.545	0.811	0.949	<b>0.955</b>
<b>IMDB</b>	0.942	0.933	0.574	0.649	0.758	0.947	0.890	0.975	0.501	0.882	<b>0.975</b>	<b>0.969</b>
<b>ACM</b>	0.829	<b>0.983</b>	0.518	0.836	0.834	0.963	0.957	0.935	0.502	0.897	0.974	0.974
<b>Amazon</b>	0.837	0.964	0.650	0.921	0.867	0.861	0.961	0.946	0.519	0.867	<b>0.990</b>	<u>0.976</u>




Fig. 5: Epidemic spreading on the reconstructed network of the first layer of CKM network. The red node denotes the initially infected source node and the pink nodes represent the infected ones. This is a snapshot of the epidemic spreading process at its fifth time-step. Links between nodes are either from the original 20% sampling or from the correctly predicted by the MRGNN-logit, GATNE, and Node2Vec algorithms, respectively.

link exists in the original network, we then add it to the reconstructed network. Figure 5 shows such a reconstructed network for the first layer of the CKM network (we have also reconstructed the other two layers without showing its visualization). It is worth noting that the MRGNN-logit model recovers a greater number of links in the network connections, and with more recovered weak ties, the reconstructed network by MRGNN is better connected than the ones reconstructed by GATNE and node2vec. For epidemic spreading simulation, we use a susceptible-infected (SI) model. Nodes in the SI model can exist in one of two states: susceptible or infected. Initially, all nodes are in the susceptible state, and a single source node is randomly selected and marked as infected at the first time step. At each step, infected nodes will infect all of their susceptible neighbors, infected nodes will continue to spread the epidemic until no susceptible nodes remain.

Figure 6 demonstrates the epidemic spreading process occurring on the network reconstructed by MRGNN-logit, GATNE, and node2vec, respectively. We can observe that the eventual infected population size is the largest in the network reconstructed by MRGNN-logit, and more importantly, the spreading speed is also the fastest in the one by MRGNN-logit. This indicates that the largest giant connected components reconstructed using the MRGNN-logit approach are notably larger than those obtained by GATNE and Node2Vec, and the structure is better recovered, especially with more weak ties that connect different communities, which expedites the spreading process from one community to another. This in turn indicates that MRGNN can be valuable for epidemic simulation and forecasting when the underlying contact network is largely unknown.




Fig. 6: Visualization of the epidemic spreading process using the SI dynamics on networks reconstructed by MRGNN, GATNE, and Node2Vec for all layers of the CKM dataset.




Fig. 7: The impact of embedding dimension on link prediction accuracy. Here, we show the case on the CKM dataset.

#### D. Impact of embedding dimension and analysis on inter-layer attention

In this section, we first investigate the impact of embedding dimension on the performance of overall link prediction accuracy (see Fig. 7), and then we analyze the distribution of learned nodal level inter-layer attention  $a_n^{p \leftarrow q}$  in MRGNN-semantic and find that the inter-layer influence over each other can be quite asymmetric (see Fig. 8).

Along with increasing the embedding dimension of ultimate node representation, the performance of link prediction accuracy first increases and then stabilizes when the embedding dimension is greater than 8 (see Fig. 7). This is by discoveries in Ref. [45] that the principled ultimate embedding dimension depends on the network size, for small graphs e.g., the CKM dataset, the optimal embedding dimension is small.

MRGNN-semantic also enables us to study the inter-layer influence over each other via analyzing the distribution of the nodal level inter-layer attention  $a_n^{(p \leftarrow q)}$ . We discover that all the attention distributions follow normal distributions (see Fig. 8), the peak of the normal curve is located around the mean value, which means the attention weights between different relations are quite concentrated. This characteristic leads to a simple attention computation method to take the mean value of attention distribution as the overall inter-layer attention weights. With the fixed inter-layer attention weights, we propose an intuitive and effective multiplex link prediction






Fig. 8: The distribution of nodal level inter-layer attention  $a_n^{(p \leftarrow q)}$  between different layers of the CKM network

probability aggregation method, in this method the final link prediction between two nodes is decided by their intra-level link prediction probability plus the inter-level link prediction probability multiplied by mean attention weights. This characteristic is especially important for evolving networks since most multiplex link prediction models have to retrain when the nodes or links change.

In addition, we also discover that the nodal level attention can be quite asymmetric from one layer to another, for example, the Doctor-Discussion layer (denoted as layer 2) of the CKM multiplex network has a stronger influence for link predictions in the Doctor-Friends layer (layer 3) with an average attention weight around 0.6 (see Fig.8(C)), by contrast, the average attention weight from layer 3 to layer 2 is only around 0.49. A similar asymmetric situation exists between layer 1 (Doctor-Advice layer) and layer 2 (see Fig.8A). In the case of the CKM dataset, only layer 1 and layer 3 have a relatively similar influence over each other (see Fig.8B). Such a discovery also highlights the intrinsic asymmetry in complex networks [14], and can be used to evaluate the influence of one type of relationship over another.

## V. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In this paper, we first point out that although state-of-the-art link prediction algorithms can achieve high overall accuracy, the prediction accuracy for weak ties that connect different communities is low. In order to tackle this challenge, we propose a novel heterogeneous link prediction method MRGNN, which adaptively aggregates both intra-layer and inter-layer information in an efficient way, and significantly enhances the link prediction accuracy of weak ties and overall prediction accuracy. We compare the MRGNN with other homogeneous as well as heterogeneous link prediction algorithms, and extensive experiments show that MRGNN obtains a state-of-the-art performance against a diverse set of baseline algorithms. For future work, we plan to explore the effectiveness of MRGNN on other downstream tasks, such as heterogeneous network node centrality measuring and recommendation with a more comprehensive node representation.

## APPENDIX

### A. Dataset description

**CKM Dataset:** The CKM dataset was collected by asking 246 physicians across four distinct towns, namely Peoria, Bloomington, Quincy, and Galesburg. This survey encompasses the administration of three distinct inquiries, each of

which contributed to the establishment of discrete relation types within the resultant network structure.

**ACM Dataset [35]:** The ACM dataset is compiled from a curated selection of research papers published in KDD, SIGMOD, SIGCOMM, MobiCOMM, and VLDB. These papers have been categorized into three primary classes: Database, Wireless Communication, and Data Mining. Through this categorization, a heterogeneous graph is formulated, comprising 3,025 papers, 5,835 authors, and 56 subject categories. Notably, paper attributes are characterized by elements drawn from a bag-of-words representation of keywords. Experimental investigations are conducted employing the meta-path ensemble, wherein papers are assigned labels corresponding to the specific conference of publication.

**IMDB Dataset [35]:** The IMDB dataset represents a subset of the extensive IMDB repository, encompassing 3,550 distinct movies, 4,441 actors, and 1,726 directors. Classification of the movies is predicated on their genre, thus segregating them into three discernible classes: Action, Comedy, and Drama. Pertinent attributes associated with the movies are articulated through elements drawn from a bag-of-words representation of plot summaries. The experimentation phase is conducted employing meta-path compilations, thereby facilitating a structured evaluation framework.

**Amazon Dataset [35]:** The Amazon dataset, as introduced by He and McAuley (2016), embodies a comprehensive multiplex network paradigm among items within the Amazon platform. This multiplex network contains 7,621 items and is characterized by multiple interrelated relations among items, encompassing facets such as co-viewing, co-purchase, and collaborative purchasing patterns.

### B. Parameter setting and evaluation metrics

We implemented our algorithmic model using PyTorch and employed the Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) optimizer for training and optimization. Initially, when training the model on various datasets, we explored different hyperparameters, including the number of iterations, learning rates, embedding dimensions, and the number of neighbors for aggregation. We observed that the impact of learning rates on performance varied only marginally across different datasets. Consequently, for the sake of fairness and comparison with other baselines, we standardized our choice to a fixed learning rate of 0.7, an embedding dimension of 128, and a consistent number of 10 neighbors for aggregation, across different orders of aggregators. We tailored the number of iterations differently for each dataset to maximize model performance. We run each algorithm 10 times and report the average result. We will release the code after the paper is accepted.

In subsequent experiments, we use AUC (Area Under the Curve) and Micro-F1 score as benchmark metrics for evaluating the performance of algorithms.

## REFERENCES

- [1] D. Liben-Nowell and J. Kleinberg, “The link prediction problem for social networks,” in *Proceedings of the twelfth international conference on Information and knowledge management*, 2003, pp. 556–559.

- [2] A. Pelan, K. Steinhäuser, N. V. Chawla, D. A. de Alwis Pitts, and A. R. Ganguly, "Empirical comparison of correlation measures and pruning levels in complex networks representing the global climate system," in *2011 IEEE Symposium on Computational Intelligence and Data Mining (CIDM)*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 239–245.
- [3] C. Liu, Y. Yang, B. Chen, T. Cui, F. Shang, J. Fan, and R. Li, "Revealing spatio-temporal interacting patterns behind complex cities," *Chaos*, vol. 32, p. 081105, 2022.
- [4] M. De Domenico, "Multilayer modeling and analysis of human brain networks," *Giga Science*, vol. 6, no. 5, p. gix004, 2017.
- [5] M. Craven, D. DiPasquo, D. Freitag, A. McCallum, T. Mitchell, K. Nigam, and S. Slattery, "Learning to construct knowledge bases from the world wide web," *Artificial intelligence*, vol. 118, no. 1-2, pp. 69–113, 2000.
- [6] W. Gu, J. Liu et al., "Exploring small-world network with an elite-clique: Bringing embeddedness theory into the dynamic evolution of a venture capital network," *Social Networks*, vol. 57, pp. 70–81, 2019.
- [7] S. M. Weiss and C. A. Kulikowski, *Computer systems that learn: classification and prediction methods from statistics, neural nets, machine learning, and expert systems*. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., 1991.
- [8] M. Zhang and Y. Chen, "Link prediction based on graph neural networks," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 31, 2018.
- [9] T. N. Kipf and M. Welling, "Variational graph auto-encoders," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.07308*, 2016.
- [10] H. Wang, J. Wang, J. Wang, M. Zhao, W. Zhang, F. Zhang, X. Xie, and M. Guo, "Graphgan: Graph representation learning with generative adversarial nets," in *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, vol. 32, no. 1, 2018.
- [11] A. Grover and J. Leskovec, "node2vec: Scalable feature learning for networks," in *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, 2016, pp. 855–864.
- [12] V. D. Blondel, J.-L. Guillaume, R. Lambiotte, and E. Lefebvre, "Fast unfolding of communities in large networks," *Journal of statistical mechanics: theory and experiment*, vol. 2008, no. 10, p. P10008, 2008.
- [13] S. Fortunato and M. E. Newman, "20 years of network community detection," *Nature Physics*, vol. 18, no. 8, pp. 848–850, 2022.
- [14] F. Shang, D. Shi, B. Chen, P. Expert, L. Lü, A. Yang, H. E. Stanley, R. Lambiotte, T. Evans, and R. Li, "Local dominance unveils clusters in networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.15497*, 2022.
- [15] S. J. Ahn and M. Kim, "Variational graph normalized autoencoders," in *Proceedings of the 30th ACM international conference on information & knowledge management*, 2021, pp. 2827–2831.
- [16] M. Szell, R. Lambiotte, and S. Thurner, "Multirelational organization of large-scale social networks in an online world," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 107, no. 31, pp. 13636–13641, 2010.
- [17] R. Li, M. Tang, and P.-M. Hui, "Epidemic spreading on multi-relational networks," *Acta Physica Sinica*, vol. 62, no. 16, p. 168903, 2013.
- [18] X.-Q. Cheng, F.-X. Ren, H.-W. Shen, Z.-K. Zhang, and T. Zhou, "Bridgeness: a local index on edge significance in maintaining global connectivity," *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, vol. 2010, no. 10, p. P10011, 2010.
- [19] J.-P. Onnela, J. Saramäki, J. Hyvönen, G. Szabó, D. Lazer, K. Kaski, J. Kertész, and A.-L. Barabási, "Structure and tie strengths in mobile communication networks," *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, vol. 104, no. 18, pp. 7332–7336, 2007.
- [20] M. S. Granovetter, "The strength of weak ties," *American journal of sociology*, vol. 78, no. 6, pp. 1360–1380, 1973.
- [21] A. Kavanagh, D. D. Reese, J. M. Carroll, and M. B. Rosson, "Weak ties in networked communities," in *Communities and Technologies: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Communities and Technologies; C&T 2003*. Springer, 2003, pp. 265–286.
- [22] J. Sanz-Cruzado and P. Castells, "Enhancing structural diversity in social networks by recommending weak ties," in *Proceedings of the 12th ACM conference on recommender systems*, 2018, pp. 233–241.
- [23] F. Masrour, T. Wilson, H. Yan, P.-N. Tan, and A. Esfahanian, "Bursting the filter bubble: Fairness-aware network link prediction," in *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, vol. 34, no. 01, 2020, pp. 841–848.
- [24] P. Li, Y. Wang, H. Zhao, P. Hong, and H. Liu, "On dyadic fairness: Exploring and mitigating bias in graph connections," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [25] N. Wang, L. Lin, J. Li, and H. Wang, "Unbiased graph embedding with biased graph observations," in *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*, 2022, pp. 1423–1433.
- [26] S. Boccaletti, G. Bianconi, R. Criado, C. I. Del Genio, J. Gómez-Gardenes, M. Romance, I. Sendina-Nadal, Z. Wang, and M. Zanin, "The structure and dynamics of multilayer networks," *Physics reports*, vol. 544, no. 1, pp. 1–122, 2014.
- [27] M. De Domenico, A. Solé-Ribalta, E. Cozzo, M. Kivelä, Y. Moreno, M. A. Porter, S. Gómez, and A. Arenas, "Mathematical formulation of multilayer networks," *Physical Review X*, vol. 3, no. 4, p. 041022, 2013.
- [28] S. Najari, M. Salehi, V. Ranjbar, and M. Jalili, "Link prediction in multiplex networks based on interlayer similarity," *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, vol. 536, p. 120978, 2019.
- [29] Y. Yao, R. Zhang, F. Yang, Y. Yuan, Q. Sun, Y. Qiu, and R. Hu, "Link prediction via layer relevance of multiplex networks," *International Journal of Modern Physics C*, vol. 28, no. 08, p. 1750101, 2017.
- [30] Y. Wu, D. Lian, S. Jin, and E. Chen, "Graph convolutional networks on user mobility heterogeneous graphs for social relationship inference," in *IJCAI*, 2019, pp. 3898–3904.
- [31] H. Zhang, L. Qiu, L. Yi, and Y. Song, "Scalable multiplex network embedding," in *IJCAI*, vol. 18, 2018, pp. 3082–3088.
- [32] S. Xu, C. Yang, C. Shi, Y. Fang, Y. Guo, T. Yang, L. Zhang, and M. Hu, "Topic-aware heterogeneous graph neural network for link prediction," in *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*, 2021, pp. 2261–2270.
- [33] J. Melton, M. Ridenhour, and S. Krishnan, "Pay attention to relations: Multi-embeddings for attributed multiplex networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.01903*, 2022.
- [34] M. Schlichtkrull, T. N. Kipf, P. Bloem, R. Van Den Berg, I. Titov, and M. 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*. Springer, 2018, pp. 593–607.
- [35] C. Park, D. Kim, J. Han, and H. Yu, "Unsupervised attributed multiplex network embedding," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 34, no. 04, 2020, pp. 5371–5378.
- [36] X. Wang, H. Ji, C. Shi, B. Wang, Y. Ye, P. Cui, and P. S. Yu, "Heterogeneous graph attention network," in *The world wide web conference*, 2019, pp. 2022–2032.
- [37] M. Qu, J. Tang, J. Shang, X. Ren, M. Zhang, and J. Han, "An attention-based collaboration framework for multi-view network representation learning," in *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, 2017, pp. 1767–1776.
- [38] S. Negi and S. Chaudhury, "Link prediction in heterogeneous social networks," in *Proceedings of the 25th ACM International on Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, 2016, pp. 609–617.
- [39] R. Matsuno and T. Murata, "Mell: effective embedding method for multiplex networks," in *Companion Proceedings of the The Web Conference 2018*, 2018, pp. 1261–1268.
- [40] Y. Lu, Y. Guo, and A. Korhonen, "Link prediction in drug-target interactions network using similarity indices," *BMC bioinformatics*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 1–9, 2017.
- [41] Ö. Şimşek and D. Jensen, "Navigating networks by using homophily and degree," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 105, no. 35, pp. 12758–12762, 2008.
- [42] F. Papadopoulos, M. Kitsak, M. Á. Serrano, M. Boguná, and D. Krackhardt, "Popularity versus similarity in growing networks," *Nature*, vol. 489, no. 7417, pp. 537–540, 2012.
- [43] W. Hamilton, Z. Ying, and J. Leskovec, "Inductive representation learning on large graphs," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [44] R. Li, S. Gao, A. Luo, Q. Yao, B. Chen, F. Shang, R. Jiang, and H. E. Stanley, "Gravity model in dockless bike-sharing systems within cities," *Physical Review E*, vol. 103, no. 1, p. 012312, 2021.
- [45] W. Gu, A. Tandon, Y.-Y. Ahn, and F. Radicchi, "Principled approach to the selection of the embedding dimension of networks," *Nature Communications*, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 3772, 2021.
- [46] B. Perozzi, R. Al-Rfou, and S. Skiena, "Deepwalk: Online learning of social representations," in *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, 2014, pp. 701–710.
- [47] W. Liu, P.-Y. Chen, S. Yeung, T. Suzumura, and L. Chen, "Principled multilayer network embedding," in *2017 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining Workshops (ICDMW)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 134–141.
- [48] Y. Cen, X. Zou, J. Zhang, H. Yang, J. Zhou, and J. Tang, "Representation learning for attributed multiplex heterogeneous network," in *Proceedings*

- of the 25th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining, 2019, pp. 1358–1368.
- [49] T. Mikolov, K. Chen, G. Corrado, and J. Dean, “Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space,” in 1st International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2013, Scottsdale, Arizona, USA, May 2-4, 2013, 2013.
- [50] —, “Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space,” arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781, 2013.