

---

# TOP K ENHANCED REINFORCEMENT LEARNING ATTACKS ON HETEROGENEOUS GRAPH NODE CLASSIFICATION

---

A PREPRINT

**Honglin Gao**

School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering  
Nanyang Technological University  
Singapore  
HONGLIN001@e.ntu.edu.sg

**Gaoxi Xiao**

School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering  
Nanyang Technological University  
Singapore  
egxxiao@ntu.edu.sg

## ABSTRACT

Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) have attracted substantial interest due to their exceptional performance on graph-based data. However, their robustness, especially on heterogeneous graphs, remains underexplored, particularly against adversarial attacks. This paper proposes HeteroKRLAttack, a targeted evasion black-box attack method for heterogeneous graphs. By integrating reinforcement learning with a Top-K algorithm to reduce the action space, our method efficiently identifies effective attack strategies to disrupt node classification tasks. We validate the effectiveness of HeteroKRLAttack through experiments on multiple heterogeneous graph datasets, showing significant reductions in classification accuracy compared to baseline methods. An ablation study underscores the critical role of the Top-K algorithm in enhancing attack performance. Our findings highlight potential vulnerabilities in current models and provide guidance for future defense strategies against adversarial attacks on heterogeneous graphs.

**Keywords** Reinforcement learning · Heterogeneous graph attack · Node classification · Top-K algorithm

## 1 Introduction

In modern data science and network analysis, Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) have garnered significant attention for their superior performance on graph data. Graph data is prevalent in various practical applications, such as social networks [Fan et al., 2019], biological networks [Muzio et al., 2021a], and knowledge graphs [Ye et al., 2022], where nodes and edges represent different entities and their relationships. GNNs update node representations by aggregating information from neighboring nodes, thereby capturing the complex relationships within the graph structure.

Heterogeneous Graphs are complex networks that contain multiple types of nodes and edges. Unlike homogeneous graphs, which have a single type of node and edge, heterogeneous graphs can have diverse node and edge types. For example, in an academic knowledge graph, nodes can represent researchers, papers, and institutions, while edges can represent author relationships, citation relationships, and collaboration relationships. Due to their ability to more accurately reflect real-world complex relationships, heterogeneous graphs are widely used in financial networks [Xu et al., 2022], citation networks [Geng et al., 2022], etc.

Node Classification is a core task in graph analysis, aiming to predict the category of nodes based on their features and the graph structure. In social networks, this task is used to predict user interests or community affiliations [Bhagat et al., 2011]; in biological networks, to predict gene functions or disease associations [Muzio et al., 2021b]. By uncovering patterns and relationships within the graph structure, node classification provides valuable insights and supports various applications.

Although Heterogeneous Graph Neural Networks (HGNNs) have shown great potential in node classification on heterogeneous graphs, research on the robustness of graph neural networks on heterogeneous graphs remains very limited, particularly in the face of adversarial attacks. While some studies have begun to focus on improving the




Figure 1: This figure illustrates a target attack on an academic network, showing the relationships between authors (A), papers (P), and fields (F) before and after the addition of a new connection. On the left, the initial network structure is depicted, with authors (green icons) connected to papers (document icons), which are linked to fields (telescope icons). The overall structure is labeled "Database". On the right, after a target attack, a new connection (in red) is added between an author and a paper, and the node initially labeled "Database" is now labeled "Data Mining".

robustness of models, these studies mainly concentrate on homogeneous graphs [Zügner et al., 2020]. There is relatively little research on the robustness of heterogeneous graphs [Zhao et al., 2024a]. Heterogeneous graphs consist of multiple types of nodes and edges, with more complex structures and higher data heterogeneity, making the design and implementation of robust graph neural networks on heterogeneous graphs more challenging. In particular, research on black-box attacks based on heterogeneous graphs has received almost no attention. Black-box attacks assume that the attacker has no knowledge of the model’s internal structure and parameters, and only uses the input and output to attack the model. This is more relevant in practical applications, as attackers in the real world often cannot access detailed information about the model. Therefore, studying how to design effective black-box attack methods on heterogeneous graphs can not only reveal potential vulnerabilities in current models but also provide important guidance for the development of future defense strategies.

To address the aforementioned research problems, we propose a *Targeted Evasion Black Box Attack* method for heterogeneous graphs, named Heterogeneity based Top-K-Enhanced Reinforcement Learning Attack (HeteroKRLAttack), aiming to effectively attack node classification tasks on heterogeneous graphs. Figure 1 illustrates an example of this method applied to an academic network. Our research method includes the following key steps:

First, we design a black-box attack method, assuming that the attacker has no knowledge of the internal structure and parameters of the model and attacks the model only by observing the inputs and outputs. The goal of the attack is to minimize the accuracy of node classification. To achieve this, we construct a reinforcement learning framework in which the attacker is treated as an agent that learns the optimal attack strategy through exploratory attacks.

In the reinforcement learning framework, we train the agent using a policy gradient algorithm [Williams, 1992] based on a discrete Markov decision process (MDP). At each step of the attack, the agent selects an action to modify the nodes or edges in the graph, aiming to maximize the cumulative reward. The reward function is defined based on the decrease in classification accuracy of the model after the attack. Through continuous interaction with the environment, the agent gradually optimizes its attack strategy.

However, due to the complexity of heterogeneous graphs and the vast action space, directly searching for the optimal strategy in the entire action space is infeasible. To address this issue, we introduce the Top-K algorithm to effectively reduce the action space. At each step of the attack, the agent considers only the candidate actions closest to the current state, greatly improving search efficiency. Specifically, we use the K-D tree algorithm to select the K nearest nodes in the feature space as potential attack targets and choose actions on these targets.

By combining reinforcement learning and the Top-K algorithm, our method can efficiently find effective attack strategies in the vast action space and successfully disrupt node classification tasks on heterogeneous graphs. To validate the effectiveness of our method, we conducted experiments on multiple publicly available heterogeneous graph datasets.

The results demonstrate that our black-box attack method significantly reduces the accuracy of node classification, showcasing its potential threat to practical applications.

In Section 2, we review related work on heterogeneous neural networks and adversarial attacks on graph neural networks. Section 3 provides the necessary preliminaries and formal definitions used throughout this paper. In Section 4, we present our proposed HeteroKRLAttack method in detail, including the reinforcement learning framework and the Top-K algorithm to reduce the action space. Section 5 describes the experimental setup and results, including the performance comparison with baseline methods and the ablation study. Finally, in Section 6, we conclude the paper and discuss future research directions.

In summary, our main contributions are as follows:

- **Reinforcement learning black-box attack method:** We propose a reinforcement learning-based black-box attack method on heterogeneous graphs, attacking the model by observing inputs and outputs.
- **Top-K algorithm for action space reduction:** We utilize the Top-K algorithm to effectively reduce the action space, improving search efficiency and attack effectiveness.
- **Experimental validation:** We conducted experiments on multiple publicly available heterogeneous graph datasets; the results demonstrate that the proposed method significantly lowers the accuracy of node classification.

## 2 Related Work

### 2.1 Heterogeneous Graph Neural Network

Early work on heterogeneous graph embedding focused mainly on using Random Walk [He et al., 2019] and Matrix Factorization methods [Newman, 2006] to generate node embeddings. For instance, metapath2vec [Dong et al., 2017] captures the structure and semantic information of graphs through meta-path guided random walks, while PME [Chen et al., 2018] uses relation-specific matrices to project nodes, thereby maintaining the heterogeneity of different types of links.

With the rise of deep learning, deep models based on message passing have been applied to heterogeneous graphs. The Heterogeneous Graph Attention Network (HAN) [Wang et al., 2019] effectively aggregates information from different types of nodes and meta-paths through a hierarchical attention mechanism, significantly improving the performance in handling tasks such as node classification and link prediction. Other methods, such as MAGNN [Fu et al., 2020] and HetGNN [Zhang et al., 2019], further extend attention mechanisms and message passing techniques to capture richer structural and attribute information.

In particular, many heterogeneous graph neural networks (HGNNs) are built on existing HGNN frameworks. These methods enhance model expressiveness and generalization by introducing new aggregation strategies, attention mechanisms, or meta-path selection techniques into existing models. For example, GATNE [Cen et al., 2019] utilizes the relational information of different types of edges in multiplex graphs, further improving the accuracy of node embeddings.

### 2.2 Adversarial Attacks on Graph Data

In the field of adversarial attacks on graph data, recent research has highlighted the vulnerability of deep neural networks, especially in applications involving graph structures. While these networks excel in tasks like image recognition and natural language processing, their robustness on graph data remains problematic [Sun et al., 2022]. Attack methods often involve subtle perturbations to graph structures or node features, misleading models into incorrect classifications [Goodfellow et al., 2014, Szegedy et al., 2013]. Furthermore, researchers have employed reinforcement learning to develop black-box attack strategies that do not require knowledge of the target model’s internals. For instance, a study by Dai et al. [Dai et al., 2018] demonstrated a reinforcement learning-based attack that only needs prediction labels from the target classifier. Another research by Ma et al. [Ma et al., 2021] in 2020 explored less detectable methods like graph rewiring, using deep reinforcement learning to devise effective attack strategies. These insights not only highlight the fragility of graph neural networks but also prompt further development of defensive measures for graph data.

Although research on the robustness of heterogeneous graphs is still in its early stages, there are several noteworthy contributions. Zhang et al. [Zhang et al., 2022] developed a robust HGNN framework called RoHe, which enhances the robustness of HGNNs against adversarial attacks by pruning malicious neighbors through an attention purifier. On the other hand, Zhao et al. [Zhao et al., 2024b] introduced HGAttack, the first grey-box evasion attack method specifically designed for heterogeneous graphs, which generates perturbations by designing a new surrogate model

and incorporating a semantic-aware mechanism. However, both of these methods are categorized as grey-box attacks, which have limitations as they require certain gradient information to be executed. Moreover, since these methods are gradient-based, they may exhibit deficiencies in complex adversarial environments. In contrast, reinforcement learning approaches can optimize without the need for gradient information, making them more suitable for addressing attacks in unknown environments.

### 3 Preliminaries

**Definition 3.1 (Heterogeneous graph)** A heterogeneous graph is defined as  $G = \{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, X, \phi, \psi\}$ , where  $\mathcal{V}$  is a set of nodes,  $\mathcal{E}$  is a set of edges, and  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}| \times f}$  is a node feature matrix with  $f$  representing the dimension of each node feature. The functions  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  map node types and edge types, respectively:  $\phi : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  and  $\psi : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ , where  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  are predefined sets of node types and edge types. A heterogeneous graph satisfies the condition  $|\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{R}| > 2$ . Each edge type  $r \in \mathcal{R}$  is associated with a binary adjacency matrix  $A_r$ . We define a function  $h : G \rightarrow \tilde{G}$  that converts a heterogeneous graph into its corresponding homogeneous graph. The resulting graph  $\tilde{G} = \{\mathcal{V}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}, X\}$  has the same set of nodes  $\mathcal{V}$ , and each pair of nodes is connected if there exists any edge between them in the original heterogeneous graph, regardless of the edge type. The adjacency matrix  $\tilde{A}$  of the homogeneous graph is defined as  $\tilde{A}_{ij} = 1$  if there is at least one edge between node  $v_i$  and node  $v_j$  in the original graph; otherwise  $\tilde{A}_{ij} = 0$ .

**Definition 3.2 (Meta-path)** A metapath in a heterogeneous graph is a sequence of node types connected by edge types. Formally, a metapath  $M$  is defined as  $M = A_1 \xrightarrow{R_1} A_2 \xrightarrow{R_2} \dots \xrightarrow{R_{l-1}} A_l$ , where  $A_i$  are node types and  $R_i$  are edge types, with  $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $R_i \in \mathcal{R}$ . The length of the metapath  $M$  is  $l$ , which denotes the number of edges in the path. For instance, in a bibliographic network, a metapath can be represented as Author  $\xrightarrow{\text{writes}}$  Paper  $\xrightarrow{\text{cites}}$  Paper  $\xrightarrow{\text{written by}}$  Author, indicating a connection between two authors through papers they have written and cited.

**Definition 3.3 (Targeted evasion attack)** A targeted evasion attack is a specific type of adversarial attack aiming at decreasing the performance of a target instance in a machine learning model. This attack is characterized by its focus on altering the input data after the training phase, thereby causing the model to misclassify or incorrectly process the altered data during testing. The goal of a targeted attack is to decrease the performance of the model specifically for a targeted instance. This means that the attacker selects one or more specific instances and modifies them in a way that leads to a significant drop in the model’s accuracy or effectiveness for those instances. An evasion attack involves making modifications to the data after the model has been trained, with the intent to deceive the model during the testing phase. The attacker changes the test data in a subtle way that is often imperceptible to humans but causes the model to fail in correctly classifying or processing the data.

**Example 1** Consider a heterogeneous graph with node types such as ‘Author’, ‘Paper’, and ‘Field’. Assume we have a trained model  $M$  that classifies papers into different categories. An original test instance  $x$  could be a specific paper node with its features and relationships to authors and field. An evasion attack would then modify this paper’s features or its links to authors and fields to create a perturbed instance  $x'$  such that  $M(x') \neq M(x)$ , i.e., the model misclassifies the perturbed paper. The goal is to maximize the discrepancy between the model’s outputs on  $x$  and  $x'$ . In summary, a targeted evasion attack is a type of adversarial attack where the attacker aims to reduce the performance of the model on specific target instances by altering the test data after the model has been trained. The modifications are designed to evade the model’s learned patterns, causing it to misclassify or mishandle the targeted instances.

**Definition 3.4 (Primary type and auxiliary type)** In a heterogeneous graph, node types can be classified into primary types and auxiliary types [Luo et al., 2021] based on their roles in a targeted attack scenario. The primary type refers to the targeted attack node type. This is the specific type of node that is the focus of the attack in node classification tasks. Formally, if  $\mathcal{T}$  represents the set of all node types in the graph, the primary type  $\mathcal{P}$  is a subset of  $\mathcal{T}$  that includes the node types specifically targeted for the attack ( $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ ). We define the set of nodes belonging to the primary type as  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{P}}$ .

The auxiliary type refers to all other node types that are not the primary target of the attack but may still interact with the primary type nodes. These node types provide additional context and information which can be used to facilitate the attack on the primary type nodes. Formally, if  $\mathcal{T}$  represents the set of all node types in the graph, the auxiliary type  $\mathcal{A}$  is defined as the set difference between all node types and the primary type nodes ( $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{P}$ ). The set of nodes belonging to the auxiliary type is denoted as  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

**Example 2** In a bibliographic network with node types such as ‘Author’, ‘Paper’, and ‘Field’, if the attack targets the ‘Paper’ nodes, then ‘Paper’ is the primary type. The ‘Author’ and ‘Field’ nodes would be considered as auxiliary types, as they are not the primary focus of the attack but can provide relevant information and context.




Figure 2: Overall HeteroKRLAttack framework

## 4 HeteroKRLAttack Approach

In this work, our goal is to build an attacker  $\mathcal{B}$  that takes a heterogeneous graph as input and modifies its structure to fool a HAN (Heterogeneous Graph Attention Network) classifier by altering the adjacency matrix of a meta-path  $M$ . The attacker’s function can be represented as  $\hat{G} = \mathcal{B}(G) = \{\mathcal{B}(M), X\} = \{\hat{M}, X\}$ . Given a classifier  $f(\cdot)$ , the objective of the attacker is to maximize the difference between the classifier’s output and its original prediction by modifying the graph structure. Here, we ignore the parameters  $\theta$  in  $f(\cdot)$  as the classifier is already trained and fixed. As mentioned earlier, the attacker  $\mathcal{B}$  is specifically designed for a given classifier  $f(\cdot)$ . In summary, we can formulate the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{argmax}_{\hat{G}} \mathcal{L}(f(G), f(\hat{G})) \\ & \text{subject to } \hat{G} = \mathcal{B}(G), \\ & \|\hat{G} - G\|_0 \leq C, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}(f(G), f(\hat{G}))$  is the function that measures the difference between the classifier’s outputs on the original graph  $G$  and the modified graph  $\hat{G}$ .  $C$  is a budget that limits the number of modifications to the adjacency matrix of  $G$ . The optimization problem aims to maximize the discrepancy between the original and modified predictions, thus enhancing the effectiveness of the attack.

### 4.1 Reinforcement Learning-based Attack Strategy

We formulate the graph modification problem as a reinforcement learning task, where the RL attack agent iteratively modifies the graph structure to fool the classifier  $f(\cdot)$ . The key components of our RL framework are defined as follows:

- **State ( $s$ ):** The state  $s_t$  at time  $t$  is represented by the tuple  $(\hat{G}, v)$ , where  $v$  is the victim node with its primary type, and  $\hat{G}$  includes the chosen auxiliary type and modified graph information.
- **Action ( $a$ ):** The action  $a_t$  involves selecting an auxiliary type or a node within that auxiliary type, denoted as  $a_t = (\mathcal{A}, v_{\mathcal{A}})$ . After choosing this action, the victim node will add or delete an edge between itself and the

selected auxiliary node. The action space includes all possible nodes in the graph, while the number of edges added or deleted must be within the budget  $C$ .

- **Reward ( $r$ ):** The reward  $r_t$  is designed to measure the effectiveness of the graph modification in fooling the classifier. A higher reward is given when the classifier’s output on the modified graph  $\hat{G}$  significantly differs from its output on the original graph  $G$ . The reward function can be defined as:

$$r_t = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if selecting an auxiliary type} \\ L(f(\hat{G})) & \text{if } f(\hat{G}) = y \\ 10 & \text{if } f(\hat{G}) \neq y \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where  $L(\cdot)$  is the Negative Log Likelihood Loss (NLLoss) [Goodfellow et al., 2016], which measures the distance between the prediction and the true label  $y$  of the victim node.

- **Policy ( $\pi$ ):** The policy  $\pi(a_t|s_t)$  defines the strategy used by the RL attack agent to choose actions based on the current state. The policy aims to maximize the expected cumulative reward over time.
- **Terminal:** The process has two termination criteria. First, it terminates if the attack is successful, regardless of the number of modifications made. Second, it terminates when the number of modifications reaches the budget  $C$ , irrespective of the attack’s success.

To effectively implement this attack strategy, we chose the classic reinforcement learning algorithm REINFORCE [Sutton et al., 1999]. The REINFORCE algorithm directly optimizes the policy function through policy gradient methods, enabling it to effectively learn how to modify the graph structure to maximize the success rate of deceiving the classifier.

REINFORCE is a classic policy gradient algorithm used for policy optimization in reinforcement learning. It directly parameterizes the policy and uses the Monte Carlo method to update the policy parameters, aiming to find the optimal policy. The core idea is to compute the returns using the Monte Carlo method and use these returns to update the policy parameters. The key steps include: sampling trajectories from the current policy  $\pi_\theta$ , where a trajectory consists of states, actions, and rewards  $(s_0, a_0, r_1, s_1, a_1, \dots, s_T, a_T, r_{T+1})$ ; computing the return  $G_t$  for each time step  $t$  as the cumulative discounted reward from that step onwards:

$$G_t = \sum_{k=t}^T \gamma^{k-t} r_{k+1} \quad (3)$$

where  $\gamma$  is the discount factor; and updating the policy parameters using gradient ascent based on the return:

$$\theta \leftarrow \theta + \alpha \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(a_t | s_t) G_t \quad (4)$$

where  $\alpha$  is the learning rate. The algorithm proceeds by initializing the policy parameters and iteratively sampling trajectories, computing returns, and updating the policy until convergence.

In the context of a heterogeneous graph attack, we employ a step-by-step approach to modify the graph structure. First, we select an auxiliary type  $\mathcal{A}$  based on the victim node. Specifically, we start by choosing an appropriate auxiliary type based on the characteristics of the victim node and the structure of the graph. This choice can be based on the features of the node, its degree, and its importance in the graph. The probability of selecting an auxiliary type  $\mathcal{A}$  given the state  $s_t$  is denoted as  $p(\mathcal{A} | s_t)$ .

Once the auxiliary type is determined, we select nodes in the graph that match this type. These nodes will serve as candidates for modification. The probability of selecting a node  $v_{\mathcal{A}}$  given the state  $s_t$  and the auxiliary type  $\mathcal{A}$  is denoted as  $p(v_{\mathcal{A}} | s_t, \mathcal{A})$ .

Finally, we add or delete one edge between the chosen auxiliary nodes and the victim node, thus changing the structure of the graph. This systematic step-by-step approach allows us to modify the graph structure in an organized manner, achieving the objective of attacking the classifier. So we decompose  $p(a_t|s_t)$  as follows:

$$p(a_t|s_t) = p(\mathcal{A} | s_t) \cdot p(v_{\mathcal{A}} | s_t, \mathcal{A}) \quad (5)$$

The main purpose of adopting the step-by-step approach is to reduce the complexity of the action space. For larger networks, the action space becomes extensive, leading to significant computational overhead and making the problem difficult to handle. By breaking down the process into steps, we can effectively reduce the action space, simplifying the problem and breaking it into more manageable steps, making it easier to process and analyze. Additionally, reducing the action space at each step significantly improves computational efficiency, reducing computation time and resource consumption. More importantly, by selectively choosing and modifying the graph structure, we can enhance the effectiveness of the attack in altering the classifier’s output. Figure 2 shows the whole process of the method.

## 4.2 Policy Network

We design two policy networks based on HAN to estimate the distributions in Equation 5. First, we develop a type network (TypeNet) that extracts information from node features and classification features to select an auxiliary type. The type network’s primary structure includes a Heterogeneous Graph Attention Network (HAN), which processes node features and passes them to an attention mechanism. HAN can capture complex relationships between nodes, enhancing node feature representation. The attention mechanism in this context is its ability to dynamically weigh the importance of different nodes in the graph, allowing the model to prioritize more relevant nodes and relationships. Specifically, this process is represented by:

$$p(\mathcal{A} | s_t) = \text{softmax} \left( \mathbf{W}_{\text{out}} \left( \sum_i \frac{\exp(\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{k}_i / \sqrt{d_k})}{\sum_j \exp(\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{k}_j / \sqrt{d_k})} \mathbf{v}_i \right) + \mathbf{b}_{\text{out}} \right) \quad (6)$$

The probability of selecting an auxiliary type given state  $s_t$  is calculated using the softmax function. The core of the attention mechanism is the computation of the query, key, and value vectors. The query vector combines the target node and graph embeddings, the key and value vectors are the embeddings of all nodes. In the equation, the query vector  $q$  represents the combined embedding, the key vector  $\mathbf{k}_i$  is the  $i$ -th node’s embedding, and the value vector  $\mathbf{v}_i$  is also the  $i$ -th node’s embedding. By calculating the dot product of the query and key vectors, followed by normalization, attention scores are obtained. These scores are used to compute attention weights via the softmax function, and a weighted sum of the value vectors generates the context vector. This process ensures that the model focuses on key nodes, enhancing node feature representation.

Another important network is the action network (ActionNet), which is designed similarly to the type network but aims to select actions based on the chosen node type. The action network also first extracts node features through a Heterogeneous Graph Attention Network (HAN), followed by linear transformation and ReLU activation to generate node embeddings. To determine actions, the action network further calculates the embeddings of the target node and the graph, combining them with the embeddings of all possible action nodes. Unlike the type network, it does not use an attention mechanism but instead processes these combined features through a multi-layer perceptron (MLP) to generate the probability distribution for each action. Specifically, this process can be represented as:

$$p(\mathcal{V}_A | s_t, \mathcal{A}) = \text{softmax}(\mathbf{W}_2 (\text{ReLU}(\mathbf{W}_1 [\mathbf{h}_{\text{target}}; \mathbf{h}_{\text{graph}}; \mathbf{h}_{\text{action}}] + \mathbf{b}_1)) + \mathbf{b}_2) \quad (7)$$

where the probability of selecting an action given state  $s_t$  and auxiliary type  $\mathcal{A}$  is calculated using the softmax function. In this formula,  $\mathbf{h}_{\text{target}}$  represents the embedding of the target node,  $\mathbf{h}_{\text{graph}}$  represents the embedding of the entire graph, and  $\mathbf{h}_{\text{action}}$  represents the combined embeddings of all possible action nodes.  $\mathbf{W}_1$  and  $\mathbf{W}_2$  are the weight matrices for the two linear transformations, and  $\mathbf{b}_1$  and  $\mathbf{b}_2$  are the corresponding bias vectors. These combined features are processed through linear transformations and ReLU activation, and the action selection probability distribution is ultimately generated by the softmax function.

## 4.3 Top-K Algorithm for Reducing Action Space

We observed that for large-scale networks, even when actions are divided into several parts according to auxiliary types, the action space remains vast, leading to inefficient search processes. To address this challenge, inspired by Google DeepMind’s [Dulac-Arnold et al., 2015] success in handling large action spaces, we introduced a Top-K algorithm during the testing phase. This algorithm aims to identify the K most promising candidate actions, thereby significantly reducing the number of actions to consider and enhancing decision-making efficiency and accuracy. To further improve spatial and temporal search efficiency, we selected the k-d tree (KD-Tree) [Friedman et al., 1976] as the underlying structure for implementing the Top-K algorithm.

KD-Tree (k-dimensional tree) is an efficient data structure used for organizing k-dimensional spatial data, commonly applied in multidimensional searches such as nearest neighbor search and range queries. The construction of a KD-Tree involves the following steps: First, the root node is selected by choosing the median point along a particular dimension (e.g., the 0th dimension) from the dataset, and the data points are divided based on this dimension. Next, the same procedure is recursively applied to the left and right subtrees, each time selecting the median point along the next dimension for partitioning, until all points are included in the tree. The nearest neighbor search starts from the root node, recursively selecting the left or right subtree by comparing the query point with the current node in the splitting dimension. During the backtracking process, it checks whether the other subtree needs to be searched to ensure the closest neighbor is found. This method significantly optimizes data queries in high-dimensional spaces through efficient partitioning and search strategies.

In the testing phase, we employed the KD-Tree algorithm to identify the optimal attack strategy. Initially, we converted the heterogeneous graph into a homogeneous graph and utilized the Node2Vec algorithm [Grover and Leskovec, 2016]

to obtain embeddings for each node. Subsequently, leveraging the results from the reinforcement learning framework, we used the KD-Tree algorithm to find the  $N$  nearest nodes. From these  $N$  nodes, we select the most suitable node based on the following criteria:

1. If a node can directly mislead the attack model, it is selected as the final result. In the case of multiple nodes capable of misleading the attack model, a node is randomly selected.
2. Otherwise, we select the node that maximizes the difference between the attacked graph and the original graph, based on Equation 1.

## 5 Experiments

Datasets	Nodes	Edges	Primary Type	Primary Nodes	Auxiliary Type	Metapath	Classes
ACM	21,529	17,432	Paper (p)	4,025	Author (a), Field (f)	pap, pfp	3
IMDB	19,103	37,440	Movie (m)	4,275	Keyword (k), Actor (a), Director (d)	mam, mdm, mkm	3
DBLP	7,727	19,969	Paper (p)	2,835	Author (a), Term (t)	pap, ptp	3

Datasets	Author	Field	Paper	Term	Actor	Director	Keyword	Movie
ACM	17,351	72	4,025	-	-	-	-	-
IMDB	-	-	-	-	5,432	2,083	7,313	4,275
DBLP	1,633	-	2,835	3,259	-	-	-	-

Table 1: This table presents comprehensive statistics for the ACM, IMDB, and DBLP datasets, covering structural elements such as nodes and edges, types of nodes (both primary and auxiliary), utilized metapaths, and classification groups. Additionally, it details the distributions of individual node types such as authors, fields, papers, actors, directors, keywords, and movies, providing a clear breakdown of the composition of each dataset.

In this section, we conduct experiments to evaluate the performance of the proposed HeteroKRLAttack framework. Additionally, we perform ablation experiments and provide analysis to validate the effectiveness of our method. We use three real-world datasets, namely the ACM, IMDB and DBLP [Wang et al., 2019].

The ACM dataset contains papers published in KDD, SIGMOD, SIGCOMM, MobiCOMM, and VLDB, and these papers are divided into three categories: Database, Wireless Communication, and Data Mining. The IMDB dataset includes three types of entities: movies, actors, and directors. Movies are categorized into three genres: Action, Comedy, and Drama. DBLP is a comprehensive computer science bibliography database that not only collects literature but also serves as a detailed catalog of publications and conferences in the field of computer science and information technology, including journal articles, conference papers, and academic dissertations, with three conferences randomly selected as labels for data extraction. Table 1 shows the information about these datasets. We used the Heterogeneous Graph Attention Network (HAN) as the target model for our attack experiments, employing enhanced reinforcement learning methods to perform attacks on the node classification task.

### 5.1 Attack Performance

In this experiment, we evaluated the performance of the proposed HeteroKRLAttack method and compared it with four baseline methods: RandomEdgeAddGlobalAttack, RandomEdgeDeleteGlobalAttack, BetweennessEdgeAddGlobalAttack, and BetweennessEdgeDeleteGlobalAttack. These baseline methods disrupt the graph structure by randomly adding or deleting edges or by adding or deleting edges based on betweenness centrality [Iyer et al., 2013]. The specific setup is as follows: for the HeteroKRLAttack method, we set  $K$  to 0.5%, which is 5 per thousand of the number of nodes for each auxiliary type. The evaluation metrics included node classification accuracy, Micro F1 score and Macro F1 score. The experiments were conducted on a computer with a 12th Gen Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-12650H CPU, 16GB RAM, and an NVIDIA GTX 3060 GPU with 6GB VRAM.

As shown in Table 2, the HeteroKRLAttack method significantly outperforms baseline methods, drastically decreasing node classification performance across the ACM, IMDB, and DBLP datasets. In the ACM dataset, accuracy drops to 0.17 at budget 5, primarily due to the concentration of node types in Papers, Authors, and Fields, which limits the effectiveness of the TypeNet and results in less successful attacks. In contrast, the IMDB and DBLP datasets, which feature more evenly distributed node types, see more dramatic drops in performance, illustrating the method’s efficiency in exploiting these balanced structures. Specifically, the accuracy on the IMDB dataset plummets to 0.01, while in the DBLP dataset, which mainly includes Papers, Authors, and Terms, the accuracy decreases to 0.06 at budget 5. The extensive interconnections between Papers and Terms in DBLP, similar to the node distribution in IMDB, provide a fertile ground for the propagation of attacks. Despite the variances in node type concentrations, the HeteroKRLAttack



Budget	Attack Method	ACM			IMDB			DBLP		
		Micro-F1	Macro-F1	Accuracy	Micro-F1	Macro-F1	Accuracy	Micro-F1	Macro-F1	Accuracy
0	Clear	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.73	0.73	0.73	0.85	0.62	0.85
1	RandomEdgeAddGlobalAttack	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.83	0.59	0.83
	RandomEdgeDeleteGlobalAttack	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.69	0.69	0.69	0.83	0.60	0.83
	BetweennessEdgeAddGlobalAttack	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.71	0.70	0.71	0.85	0.62	0.85
	BetweennessEdgeDeleteGlobalAttack	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.85	0.61	0.85
	HeteroRLAttack	0.56	0.48	0.56	0.43	0.34	0.43	0.51	0.36	0.51
	HeteroKRLAttack	<b>0.33</b>	<b>0.27</b>	<b>0.33</b>	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.15</b>	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.49</b>	<b>0.34</b>	<b>0.49</b>
3	RandomEdgeAddGlobalAttack	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.69	0.68	0.69	0.79	0.55	0.79
	RandomEdgeDeleteGlobalAttack	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.61	0.60	0.61	0.79	0.55	0.79
	BetweennessEdgeAddGlobalAttack	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.85	0.62	0.85
	BetweennessEdgeDeleteGlobalAttack	0.70	0.70	0.70	0.68	0.68	0.68	0.82	0.58	0.82
	HeteroRLAttack	0.31	0.25	0.31	0.32	0.18	0.32	0.19	0.14	0.19
	HeteroKRLAttack	<b>0.20</b>	<b>0.16</b>	<b>0.20</b>	<b>0.04</b>	<b>0.03</b>	<b>0.04</b>	<b>0.16</b>	<b>0.11</b>	<b>0.16</b>
5	RandomEdgeAddGlobalAttack	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.69	0.68	0.69	0.75	0.50	0.75
	RandomEdgeDeleteGlobalAttack	0.39	0.33	0.39	0.53	0.50	0.53	0.74	0.48	0.74
	BetweennessEdgeAddGlobalAttack	0.55	0.54	0.55	0.72	0.71	0.72	0.85	0.62	0.85
	BetweennessEdgeDeleteGlobalAttack	0.40	0.35	0.40	0.61	0.60	0.61	0.77	0.52	0.77
	HeteroRLAttack	0.32	0.24	0.32	0.14	0.09	0.14	0.12	0.08	0.12
	HeteroKRLAttack	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.13</b>	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>0.06</b>	<b>0.04</b>	<b>0.06</b>

Table 2: Attack Performance on ACM, IMDB and DBLP Datasets

method demonstrates robust performance across all examined datasets, significantly degrading classification accuracy and highlighting its effectiveness in exploiting the heterogeneous nature of these graphs.

## 5.2 Ablation study

To evaluate the impact of the Top-K algorithm on the HeteroKRLAttack method, we designed an ablation study in which we removed the Top-K algorithm and directly searched for the optimal strategy within the entire action space. By comparing the performance differences between the original method and the method without the Top-K algorithm (HeteroRLAttack), from Table 2, we can assess the contribution of the Top-K algorithm in dramatically increasing the attack effectiveness.




Figure 3: Comparison of models with different K values for IMDB, ACM, and DBLP datasets

To explore the impact of the K value on attack effectiveness, we conducted an experiment with K values ranging from 0.0002 to 0.01, using attack success rate as the evaluation metric. The results for different budget levels are visualized in the provided graph. From Fig. 3, it can be observed that as the K value increases, the success rate of the attack also rises. In all cases, the initial increase in the K value has the most significant impact on the results, but this effect plateaus at a certain point. This is because HeteroRLAttack cannot guarantee finding the optimal result. Instead, the agent gains some information about nodes that are likely to affect the victim node. However, as the K value further increases and the search range expands, the impact on the results diminishes. Therefore, using the Top-K algorithm to search within a proper range helps effectively identify the nodes that most effectively influence the victim node.

## 6 Conclusion

In this study, we introduced the HeteroKRLAttack method, a reinforcement learning-based black-box attack strategy enhanced with the Top-K algorithm, aiming at node classification tasks on heterogeneous graphs. Our approach leverages the Top-K algorithm to notably reduce the action space and enhance the efficiency of the search process. Extensive experiments on multiple heterogeneous graph datasets showed that HeteroKRLAttack significantly decreases the accuracy of node classification, outperforming several baseline methods. Moreover, the results confirm that the

Top-K algorithm is pivotal in increasing the attack success rate by identifying the most influential nodes within a specific range, as evidenced by an ablation study where removal of the Top-K algorithm leads to a noticeable decline in attack performance.

Looking forward to future research, two promising directions are identified. First, exploring attacks based on community structures within graphs could offer a novel and potent strategy for disrupting node classification by exploiting the natural divisions within heterogeneous graphs. Second, designing robust defense mechanisms tailored to counteract adversarial attacks like HeteroKRLAttack could improve resilience against such strategies, thus safeguarding the integrity and reliability of graph-based systems.

## 7 Acknowledgements

This research was partially supported by the Ministry of Education, Singapore, under Grant RG10/23.

## References

- Wenqi Fan, Yao Ma, Qing Li, Yuan He, Eric Zhao, Jiliang Tang, and Dawei Yin. Graph neural networks for social recommendation. In *The world wide web conference*, pages 417–426, 2019.
- Giulia Muzio, Leslie O’Bray, and Karsten Borgwardt. Biological network analysis with deep learning. *Briefings in bioinformatics*, 22(2):1515–1530, 2021a.
- Zi Ye, Yogan Jaya Kumar, Goh Ong Sing, Fengyan Song, and Junsong Wang. A comprehensive survey of graph neural networks for knowledge graphs. *IEEE Access*, 10:75729–75741, 2022.
- Cong Xu, Huiling Huang, Xiaoting Ying, Jianliang Gao, Zhao Li, Peng Zhang, Jie Xiao, Jiarun Zhang, and Jiangjian Luo. Hgmn: Hierarchical graph neural network for predicting the classification of price-limit-hitting stocks. *Information Sciences*, 607:783–798, 2022.
- Hao Geng, Deqing Wang, Fuzhen Zhuang, Xuehua Ming, Chenguang Du, Ting Jiang, Haolong Guo, and Rui Liu. Modeling dynamic heterogeneous graph and node importance for future citation prediction. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*, pages 572–581, 2022.
- Smriti Bhagat, Graham Cormode, and S Muthukrishnan. Node classification in social networks. *Social network data analytics*, pages 115–148, 2011.
- Giulia Muzio, Leslie O’Bray, and Karsten Borgwardt. Biological network analysis with deep learning. *Briefings in bioinformatics*, 22(2):1515–1530, 2021b.
- Daniel Zügner, Oliver Borchert, Amir Akbarnejad, and Stephan Günnemann. Adversarial attacks on graph neural networks: Perturbations and their patterns. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)*, 14(5): 1–31, 2020.
- He Zhao, Zhiwei Zeng, Yongwei Wang, Deheng Ye, and Chunyan Miao. Hgattack: Transferable heterogeneous graph adversarial attack. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.09945*, 2024a.
- Ronald J Williams. Simple statistical gradient-following algorithms for connectionist reinforcement learning. *Machine learning*, 8:229–256, 1992.
- Yu He, Yangqiu Song, Jianxin Li, Cheng Ji, Jian Peng, and Hao Peng. Hetspaceywalk: A heterogeneous spacey random walk for heterogeneous information network embedding. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM international conference on information and knowledge management*, pages 639–648, 2019.
- Mark EJ Newman. Modularity and community structure in networks. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 103(23):8577–8582, 2006.
- Yuxiao Dong, Nitesh V Chawla, and Ananthram Swami. metapath2vec: Scalable representation learning for heterogeneous networks. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 135–144, 2017.
- Hongxu Chen, Hongzhi Yin, Weiqing Wang, Hao Wang, Quoc Viet Hung Nguyen, and Xue Li. Pme: projected metric embedding on heterogeneous networks for link prediction. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*, pages 1177–1186, 2018.
- Xiao Wang, Houye Ji, Chuan Shi, Bai Wang, Yanfang Ye, Peng Cui, and Philip S Yu. Heterogeneous graph attention network. In *The world wide web conference*, pages 2022–2032, 2019.
- Xinyu Fu, Jiani Zhang, Ziqiao Meng, and Irwin King. Maggn: Metapath aggregated graph neural network for heterogeneous graph embedding. In *Proceedings of the web conference 2020*, pages 2331–2341, 2020.

- Chuxu Zhang, Dongjin Song, Chao Huang, Ananthram Swami, and Nitesh V Chawla. Heterogeneous graph neural network. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*, pages 793–803, 2019.
- Yukuo Cen, Xu Zou, Jianwei Zhang, Hongxia Yang, Jingren Zhou, and Jie Tang. Representation learning for attributed multiplex heterogeneous network. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*, pages 1358–1368, 2019.
- Lichao Sun, Yingtong Dou, Carl Yang, Kai Zhang, Ji Wang, Philip S. Yu, Lifang He, and Bo Li. Adversarial attack and defense on graph data: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 2022.
- Ian J. Goodfellow, Jonathon Shlens, and Christian Szegedy. Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2014.
- Christian Szegedy, Wojciech Zaremba, Ilya Sutskever, Joan Bruna, Dumitru Erhan, Ian Goodfellow, and Rob Fergus. Intriguing properties of neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6199*, 2013.
- Hanjun Dai, Hui Li, Tian Tian, Xin Huang, Lin Wang, Jun Zhu, and Le Song. Adversarial attack on graph structured data. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1115–1124. PMLR, 2018.
- Yao Ma, Suhang Wang, Tyler Derr, Lingfei Wu, and Jiliang Tang. Graph adversarial attack via rewiring. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pages 1161–1169, 2021.
- Mengmei Zhang, Xiao Wang, Meiqi Zhu, Chuan Shi, Zhiqiang Zhang, and Jun Zhou. Robust heterogeneous graph neural networks against adversarial attacks. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 36, pages 4363–4370, 2022.
- He Zhao, Zhiwei Zeng, Yongwei Wang, Deheng Ye, and Chunyan Miao. Hgattack: Transferable heterogeneous graph adversarial attack. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.09945*, 2024b.
- Linhao Luo, Yixiang Fang, Xin Cao, Xiaofeng Zhang, and Wenjie Zhang. Detecting communities from heterogeneous graphs: A context path-based graph neural network model. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM international conference on information & knowledge management*, pages 1170–1180, 2021.
- Ian Goodfellow, Yoshua Bengio, and Aaron Courville. *Deep Learning*. MIT Press, 2016. ISBN 9780262035613. URL <http://www.deeplearningbook.org>.
- Richard S Sutton, David McAllester, Satinder Singh, and Yishay Mansour. Policy gradient methods for reinforcement learning with function approximation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 12, 1999.
- Gabriel Dulac-Arnold, Richard Evans, Hado van Hasselt, Peter Sunehag, Timothy Lillicrap, Jonathan Hunt, Timothy Mann, Theophane Weber, Thomas Degris, and Ben Coppin. Deep reinforcement learning in large discrete action spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.07679*, 2015.
- Jerome H Friedman, Jon Louis Bentley, and Raphael Ari Finkel. An algorithm for finding best matches in logarithmic time. *ACM Trans. Math. Software*, 3(SLAC-PUB-1549-REV. 2):209–226, 1976.
- Aditya Grover and Jure Leskovec. node2vec: Scalable feature learning for networks. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 855–864, 2016.
- Swami Iyer, Timothy Killingback, Bala Sundaram, and Zhen Wang. Attack robustness and centrality of complex networks. *PloS one*, 8(4):e59613, 2013.