

# Robust Offline Active Learning on Graphs

Yuanchen Wu <sup>\*1</sup> and Yubai Yuan <sup>†2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Statistics, The Pennsylvania State University

<sup>2</sup>Department of Statistics, The Pennsylvania State University

## Abstract

We consider the problem of active learning on graphs, which has crucial applications in many real-world networks where labeling node responses is expensive. In this paper, we propose an offline active learning method that selects nodes to query by explicitly incorporating information from both the network structure and node covariates. Building on graph signal recovery theories and the random spectral sparsification technique, the proposed method adopts a two-stage biased sampling strategy that takes both *informativeness* and *representativeness* into consideration for node querying. *Informativeness* refers to the complexity of graph signals that are learnable from the responses of queried nodes, while *representativeness* refers to the capacity of queried nodes to control generalization errors given noisy node-level information. We establish a theoretical relationship between generalization error and the number of nodes selected by the proposed method. Our theoretical results demonstrate the trade-off between *informativeness* and *representativeness* in active learning. Extensive numerical experiments show that the proposed method is competitive with existing graph-based active learning methods, especially when node covariates and responses contain noises. Additionally, the proposed method is applicable to both regression and classification tasks on graphs.

**Key words:** graph semi-supervised learning, network sampling, optimal design, signal recovery

---

\*E-mail: yqw5734@psu.edu

†Corresponding author: yvy5509@psu.edu

# 1 Introduction

In many graph semi-supervised learning tasks, labeled nodes are scarce, and the labeling process often incurs high costs in real-world applications. Training machine learning model via labels on nodes randomly sampled from network can be inefficient due to the ignorance of label dependence over network. Instead of passively collected training data, active learning [27] addresses this label efficiency problem by selecting informative samples to be labeled by external oracle, thus improving performance on downstream machine learning algorithm.

The active learning paradigm is closely related to the optimal experimental design principle [1] in statistics. The traditional optimal experimental design methods select samples such that a specific statistical criteria [22, 17] among the selected samples is maximized. However, the classical design criteria typically ignore the network structure within data, therefore are still inefficient for graph-based learning tasks. On the other hand, selecting informative nodes on network is studied by graph sampling literature [9, 16, 23, 26]. The selection strategies are typically based on the *network homophily* assumption such that connected nodes tend to have similar labels. However, it is common in real-world networks that the a node’s label also depends on the individual covariates on the node. Therefore, the graph-sampling-based strategies may not be effective given the existence of label heterogeneity over network.

Recently, inspired by great success of graph neural network (GNN) on graph-based machine learning task, many GNN-based active learning strategies have been proposed. Existing methods select nodes to query by maximizing information gain under different criterion including information entropy [6], number of influenced nodes [39, 40], prediction uncertainty [20], expected error reduction [24], and expected model change [30]. Most of the information gain measurement is defined on the graph domain, i.e, a summary of query gain that aggregates over network that depends on both the network topologies and node covariates. Although the graph-based information gain measurements are popular, the effectiveness of maximizing these measurements is typically

not guaranteed and difficult to analysis. This is mainly due to that the complexity of node labeling function is generally difficult to quantify on the graph domain because of the intractable network topologies. Although some complexity measurements are derived for binary classification task over network [7], their extendibility remains unclear to general graph signals with node covariates. Besides making performance analysis infeasible, the lack of complexity measurement on node labelling function can result a misalignment between graph-based information measurements and the gradient in searching labeling function space, therefore leads to sub-optimal node selection.

From the perspective of applications, most of the above active learning methods work in an online style that need promptly labeling feedback from external annotator. However, the online active learning framework is not always practical when computational resources are limited [25] or when recurrent interaction between the algorithm and annotator is infeasible, such as in remote sensing or online marketing tasks [33, 36]. Additionally, network data and label feedback from annotator are not always accurate in the applications. While the above methods fail to account for the potential noise in collecting training samples [21], which can deteriorate the prediction performance of models trained on the noise data [8, 18].

However, most of these methods rely on heuristic measures of node importance in either the network or latent space domains, lacking a principled query methodology applicable to general network structures and node covariates. Additionally, these methods often fail to account for scenarios where node-level information contains noise [21]. Ignoring noise in active learning can lead to unbounded generalization error on unlabeled nodes [8, 18].

To solve the above challenges, we propose an offline active learning framework for graph-based semi-supervised learning tasks. Motivated by the theory of graph signal recovery [9, 16, 26] and GNN, we first introduce a graph function space integrating both node covariate information and network topology. The complexity of node labeling function on the function space is well-defined on graph spectral domain. Accordingly, a query information gain measurement is proposed and aligned with the spectral-based complexity measurement, which enables our strategy to achieve the

theoretically guaranteed optimal sample complexity. Then we propose a greedy offline query strategy to sequentially select nodes. The labels on the queried nodes can be used to identify orthogonal components of target labelling function with different levels of smoothness over network. To overcome data noise issue, the query procedure takes into account both *informativeness*: information of queried nodes in recovering non-smoothing components of a signal, and *representativeness*: prediction robustness to noise in training data. Compared to existing methods, the proposed method offers a strategy that is provably effective under general network structures, and achieves higher query efficiency by incorporating both network and node covariate information. The proposed method identifies labelling function via a bottom-up strategy, i.e., first identifying smoother components of the labelling function, and continuing on more oscillated components. Therefore, the proposed method is also naturally immune to high-frequency noise in node covariate. We provide a theoretical guarantee for the effectiveness of the proposed method in semi-supervised learning task. The generalization error bound is guaranteed even when the nodes' labels are noisy. The theoretical results also demonstrate an interesting trade-off between informativeness and representativeness in graph-based active learning.

This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces the background of active learning on graph and notations. Section 3 introduces the proposed offline node query strategy and the graph signal estimation. Section 4 establishes the theoretical properties of the proposed node query method. Simulation studies and real-world benchmark network examples are illustrated in Section 5 and Section 6, respectively. The last section provides conclusion and discussion.

## 2 Preliminaries

We consider an undirected network  $\mathbf{G}$  on a set of nodes  $\mathbf{V} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . Let  $\{a_{ij}\}_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n}$  denote the edge among nodes, where edge  $a_{ij} \geq 0$  between node  $i$  and node  $j$  can be either binary connection status or continuous connection weights. The network can be represented as an

$n \times n$  symmetric adjacency matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ , where  $\mathbf{A}_{ij} = a_{ij}$ . Let  $\mathbf{D} = \text{diag}\{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n\}$ , where  $d_i = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} a_{ij}$  denotes the degree of node  $i$ . Besides network, each node has a  $p$ -dimensional covariate, and let  $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_p)$  denote the  $n \times p$  node-wise covariate matrix, where the  $i$ th column  $X_{\cdot i}$  represents the node-wise observations for the  $i$ th covariates. Through the paper,  $\text{Span}\{X_1, \dots, X_p\}$  represents the linear space containing all the linear combinations of vectors  $X_1, \dots, X_p$ . We use  $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)^T$  to denote the  $n \times 1$  node response vector. The normalized graph Laplacian matrix of network  $A$  is defined as  $\mathcal{L} = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{D}^{-1/2}$ , where  $\mathbf{I}$  is the  $n \times n$  identity matrix.  $\mathcal{L}$  is symmetric and positive semi-definite with  $n$  real eigenvalues  $0 = \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n \leq 2$  and a corresponding set of eigenvectors  $\mathbf{U} = \{U_1, U_2, \dots, U_n\}$ . We use  $b = \mathcal{O}(a)$  to indicate  $|b| \leq M|a|$  for some  $M > 0$ . For a set of nodes  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $|\mathcal{S}|$  indicates the set cardinality and  $\mathcal{S}^c$  is the complement of  $\mathcal{S}$ .

## 2.1 Graph signal representation

Consider the graph signal  $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , where  $\mathbf{f}(i)$  denotes the value of the signal on node  $i$ . For a subset of nodes  $\mathcal{S}$ , we introduce the subspace  $\mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{S}} := \{\mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \mathbf{f}(\mathcal{S}^c) = 0\}$  where  $\mathbf{f}(\mathcal{S})$  denotes the values of  $\mathbf{f}$  on nodes in  $\mathcal{S}$ . In this paper, we consider both regression task where  $\mathbf{f}(i)$  is a continuous response, and classification task where  $\mathbf{f}(i)$  is a multi-categorical label. Since  $\mathbf{U}$  serve as a set of bases for space  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , we can decompose  $\mathbf{f}$  on the graph spectral domain as  $\mathbf{f} = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_{\mathbf{f}}(\lambda_j) U_j$ , where  $\alpha_{\mathbf{f}}(\lambda_j) = \langle \mathbf{f}, U_j \rangle$  is defined as the Graph Fourier Transform (GFT) coefficient corresponding to frequency  $\lambda_j$ . From the perspective of graph signal processing, the eigenvalues of  $\mathcal{L}$  represent the smoothness of network spectrum [28] with a large eigenvalue  $\lambda_k$  indicating high variation of the corresponding eigenvector  $U_k$ . Therefore, the smoothness of  $\mathbf{f}$  over the network can be characterized by the magnitude of  $\alpha_{\mathbf{f}}(\lambda_j)$  over each frequency  $\lambda_j$ . More formally, we measure the signal complexity of  $\mathbf{f}$  via bandwidth frequency  $\omega_{\mathbf{f}} = \sup\{\lambda_j \mid \alpha_{\mathbf{f}}(\lambda_j) > 0\}$ .

## 2.2 Active semi-supervised learning on graphs

The key idea of graph-based semi-supervised learning is to reconstruct graph signal  $\mathbf{f}$  with a function space  $\mathbf{H}_\omega(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$ . The function space  $\mathbf{H}_\omega(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$  is constructed by both the network and node-wise covariates. The frequency  $\omega$  controls the size of space to prevent overfitting issue. Assuming  $\mathbf{Y}_i$  being the observations of  $\mathbf{f}(i)$  on node  $i$ , the active learning works on the scenario that we have limited access to  $\mathbf{Y}_i$  only on a subset of nodes  $\mathcal{S}$  with  $|\mathcal{S}| \ll n$ , and aim to estimate  $\mathbf{f}$  on  $\mathbf{H}_\omega(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$  by using  $\{\mathbf{Y}_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{S}}$ . Specifically, we consider the empirical estimator of  $\mathbf{f}$  as

$$\mathbf{f}_\mathcal{S} = \underset{\mathbf{g} \in \mathbf{H}_\omega(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} l(Y_i, \mathbf{g}(i)), \quad (1)$$

where  $l(\cdot)$  is a task-specific loss function. We denote  $\mathbf{f}^*$  as the minimizer of (1) when responses on all nodes are available, i.e.,  $\mathbf{f}^* = \mathbf{f}_\mathbf{V}$ . The goal of active semi-supervised learning on  $\mathbf{A}$  is to define an appropriate  $\mathbf{H}_\omega(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$  and select an informative subset of nodes  $\mathcal{S}$  for querying the responses such that the estimation error is bounded as follows:

$$\|\mathbf{f}_\mathcal{S} - \mathbf{f}^*\|_2^2 \leq \epsilon \|\mathbf{f}^* - \mathbf{Y}\|_2^2,$$

under the query budget  $|\mathcal{S}| \leq \mathcal{B}$ . The  $\epsilon > 0$  represents the error due to limited labelled nodes, and converges to 0 as the query budget  $\mathcal{B}$  goes to  $n$ . In general, the converge rate of  $\epsilon$  is determined by both the selection of  $\mathbf{H}_\omega(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$  and informativeness of responses on  $\mathcal{S}$ .

## 3 Biased Sequential Sampling

In this section, we introduce the function space for recovering the graph signal based on the observed network information and node label information from external oracle. Based on the function space, we propose an offline node query strategy combining both node informativeness and

representative for inferring unlabelled nodes on network.

### 3.1 Graph signal function space

In the supervised or semi-supervised learning task over network, both the network topology structure and node-wise covariates are important for inferring the graph signal. To incorporate both network and covariate information, the function class for reconstructing the graph signal should lie at the intersection between the space of network spectral and node covariates. Motivated by the graph Fourier representation, we consider the following function class:

$$\mathbf{H}_\omega(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}) = \text{Proj}_{\mathbf{L}_\omega} \text{Span}(\mathbf{X}) := \text{Span}\{\text{Proj}_{\mathbf{L}_\omega} X_1, \dots, \text{Proj}_{\mathbf{L}_\omega} X_p\},$$

$$\text{where } \text{Proj}_{\mathbf{L}_\omega} X_i = \sum_{j:\lambda_j \leq \omega} \langle X_i, U_j \rangle U_j.$$

The  $\{U_j \mid \lambda_j \leq \omega\}$  are the all network spectrum with variation smaller than  $\omega$ , then  $\text{Proj}_{\mathbf{L}_\omega} X_i$  is the smoothed version of the  $i$ th original node-wise covariate, therefore  $\mathbf{H}_\omega(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$  consists of the column space of  $\mathbf{X}$  with smoothness level truncated at  $\omega$ . On the other hand, the network topology information is also incorporated into  $\mathbf{H}_\omega(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$  via the smoothing operation. Specifically, two nodes have similar values of  $\text{Proj}_{\mathbf{L}_\omega} X_i$  if they are strongly connected on the network. Notice that the capacity of  $\mathbf{H}_\omega(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$  increases as  $\omega$  become larger, and  $\mathbf{H}_\omega(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}) = \text{Span}\{X_1, \dots, X_p\}$  when  $\omega = 2$  such that the full column space of covariates can be utilized to estimate graph signal at the price of overfitting and requiring more labeled nodes.

There are mainly two advantages of considering the above function space for estimating graph signal. From the perspective of model estimation,  $\mathbf{H}_\omega(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$  imposes network regularization over covariates to improves the generalizability when the dimension of covariates  $p$  is larger than the query budget or even the network size, which is common in real applications. In addition, the covariate smoothing can filter out the signals in covariates irrelevant to network-based prediction,

which enhance the estimation robustness to potential covariates noise. From the perspective of active learning, considering  $\mathbf{H}_\omega(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$  allows us to adopt a bottom-up query strategy such that querying labels to first learn the smooth global trends over graph signal with setting small  $\omega$  in  $\mathbf{H}_\omega(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$ , and then adaptively increases  $\omega$  to learn more complicate graph signal in a larger space  $\mathbf{H}_\omega(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$  when more labeling budget is available.

The graph signal  $\mathbf{f}$  can be approximated by its projection in the space  $\mathbf{H}_\omega(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$ . Specifically, we stack the  $d$  leading network spectrum  $\mathbf{U}_d \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d} = (U_1, U_2, \dots, U_d)$  where  $d = \operatorname{argmax}_{1 \leq j \leq n} (\lambda_j - \omega) \leq 0$ , and graph signal estimation can be represented as linear combination of columns of  $\mathbf{U}_d \mathbf{U}_d^T \mathbf{X}$ , i.e.,

$$\mathbf{U}_d \mathbf{U}_d^T \mathbf{X} \beta, \quad (2)$$

where  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is a trainable weight vector. However, the parameters  $\beta$  might be unidentifiable when dimension of node covariates  $p$  is larger than  $d$ . To solve this issue, we reparametrize the linear regression (2) to

$$\mathbf{U}_d \mathbf{U}_d^T \mathbf{X} \beta = \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{\beta}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\tilde{\beta} = \Sigma V_2^T \beta$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbf{U}_d V_1$ . The  $(V_1)_{d \times r}$ ,  $(V_2)_{p \times r}$ , and  $\Sigma_{r \times r}$  are left and right singular vectors, and the diagonal matrix containing  $r$  singular values, respectively.

In the parametrization form (3), the columns of  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$  serve as bases of  $\mathbf{H}_\omega(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$ , therefore  $\dim(\mathbf{H}_\omega(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})) = \operatorname{rank}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) = r \leq \min\{d, p\}$ . The transformed predictors  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$  represent the components of node covariates constrained within the subspace of smooth network spectrum. A graph signal  $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbf{H}_\omega(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$  can be parametrized as linear combination of  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ , and the corresponding



weights  $\tilde{\beta}$  can be identified via

$$\hat{\beta} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\tilde{\beta}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} (\mathbf{f}(i) - (\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{S}})_i \tilde{\beta}^T)^2 \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathcal{S}$  is the set of query nodes,  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{S}} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}| \times r}$  is the submatrix of  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$  with row indexes in  $\mathcal{S}$ , and  $\{\mathbf{f}(i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{S}}$  are the true labels queried from oracle. To achieve the identification of  $\mathbf{f}$ , it is necessary that the query budget size  $|\mathcal{S}| \geq r$ . Otherwise, there will be more parameters than equations in (4). More importantly, due to the fact that  $\operatorname{rank}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{S}}) \leq \operatorname{rank}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) = r$ ,  $\mathbf{f}$  can be identified only when  $\mathcal{S}$  is well-chosen such that  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{S}}$  has full column rank. Notice that  $r$  is monotone increasing in terms of frequency  $\omega$ , when  $\mathcal{S}$  is not carefully chosen, we can only identify graph signal in  $\mathbf{H}_{\omega'}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$  with  $\omega' < \omega$ , which is a subspace of  $\mathbf{H}_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$ .

## 3.2 Informative node selection

The set of query node  $\mathcal{S}$  determines the rank of  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{S}}$ , therefore the size of space  $\mathbf{H}_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$  which can be identified via labels on  $\mathcal{S}$ . Specifically, we define the identification of graph signal space as following:

**Definition 1.** *A subset of nodes  $\mathcal{S}$  can identify graph signal space  $\mathbf{H}_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$  up to frequency  $\omega$  if for any two  $\mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2 \in \mathbf{H}_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$  such that  $\mathbf{f}_1(i) = \mathbf{f}_2(i)$ ,  $i \in \mathcal{S}$ , then  $\mathbf{f}_1(j) = \mathbf{f}_2(j)$ ,  $j \in \mathbf{V}$  on all nodes.*

Intuitively, the informativeness of set  $\mathcal{S}$  can be measured by the frequency  $\omega$  corresponding to  $\mathbf{H}_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$  that can be identified. To select informative nodes, we need to bridge the query set  $\mathcal{S}$  on graph domain to the  $\omega$  on frequency domain. To achieve this goal, we consider the counterpart of function space  $\mathbf{H}_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$  in graph domain. Specifically, we introduce the projection space in

terms of a subset of nodes  $\mathcal{S}$  as  $\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}) := \text{Span}\{(X_1)_{\mathcal{S}}, \dots, (X_p)_{\mathcal{S}}\}$  where

$$(X_i)_{\mathcal{S}} := \begin{cases} (X_i)_j, & \text{if } j \in \mathcal{S}; \\ \mathbf{0}, & \text{if } j \in \mathcal{S}^c \end{cases},$$

where  $(X_i)_j$  is value of node covariate  $X_i$  on the  $j$ th node. The following Theorem 3.1 establishes a connection between two graph signal spaces  $\mathbf{H}_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$  and  $\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$ , and provides a metric for the informativeness of querying a subset of nodes on graphs.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Any graph signal  $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbf{H}_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$  can be identified by labels on a subset of nodes  $\mathcal{S}$  if and only if:*

$$\omega < \omega(\mathcal{S}) := \inf_{\mathbf{g} \in \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{S}^c}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})} \omega_{\mathbf{g}}, \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathcal{S}^c$  is the complement set of  $\mathcal{S}$  in  $\mathbf{V}$ .

We denote the quantity  $\omega(\mathcal{S})$  in 5 as *bandwidth frequency* in terms of node set  $\mathcal{S}$ . The quantity  $\omega(\mathcal{S})$  can be explicitly calculated, and measures the size of space  $\mathbf{H}_{\omega}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$  recoverable from the subset of nodes  $\mathcal{S}$ . The goal of active learning strategy is to select  $\mathcal{S}$  within the budget to maximize the bandwidth frequency  $\omega(\mathcal{S})$ , allowing us to identify graph signals with the highest possible complexity.

To calculate the bandwidth frequency  $\omega(\mathcal{S})$ , consider any graph signal  $\mathbf{g}$  and its components with non-zero frequency  $\Lambda_{\mathbf{g}} := \{\lambda_i \mid \alpha_{\mathbf{g}}(\lambda_i) > 0\}$ , we use the fact that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left( \sum_{j: \lambda_j \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{g}}} c_j \lambda_j^k \right)^{1/k} = \max_{\lambda_j \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{g}}} (\lambda_j)$$

where  $\sum_{j: \lambda_j \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{g}}} c_j = 1$  and  $0 \leq c_j \leq 1$ . Combined with Rayleigh quotient representation of

eigenvalues, the bandwidth frequency  $\omega_{\mathbf{g}}$  can be calculated as

$$\omega_{\mathbf{g}} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \omega_{\mathbf{g}}(k), \text{ where } \omega_{\mathbf{g}}(k) = \left( \frac{\mathbf{g}^T \mathcal{L}^k \mathbf{g}}{\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{g}} \right)^{1/k}.$$

As a result, we can approximate the bandwidth of  $\omega_{\mathbf{g}}$  using  $\omega_{\mathbf{g}}(k)$  with a large  $k$ , and maximizing  $\omega(\mathcal{S})$  over  $\mathcal{S}$  transforms to the optimization problem:

$$\mathcal{S} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathcal{S}: |\mathcal{S}| \leq \mathbb{B}} \hat{\omega}(\mathcal{S}) \text{ where } \hat{\omega}(\mathcal{S}) := \inf_{\mathbf{g} \in \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{S}^c}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})} \omega_{\mathbf{g}}^k(k), \quad (6)$$

where  $\mathbb{B}$  indicates the budget number of querying labels. Due to the combinatorial complexity of directly solving the optimization (6) via selecting  $\mathcal{S}$  simultaneously, we propose a greedy selection strategy as a continuous relaxation of (6).

The greedy selection starts with  $\mathcal{S} = \emptyset$  and sequentially adds one node to  $\mathcal{S}$  that maximizes the increase in  $\omega(\mathcal{S})$  until the budget is reached. We introduce a  $n$ -dimensional vector  $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n)^T$  with  $0 \leq t_i \leq 1$  and the corresponding diagonal matrix  $D(\mathbf{t})$  with diagonal being  $\mathbf{t}$ . Therefore, we can encode the set of query nodes by  $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{S}}$  where  $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{S}}(i) = 1$  if  $i \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{S}}(i) = 0$  if  $i \in \mathcal{S}^c$ . We consider the space spanned by the columns of  $D(\mathbf{t})\mathbf{X}$  as  $\operatorname{Span}\{D(\mathbf{t})\mathbf{X}\}$ , and the relation holds:

$$\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{S}^c}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}) = \operatorname{Span}\{D(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{S}^c})\mathbf{X}\}.$$

Intuitively,  $\operatorname{Span}\{D(\mathbf{t})\mathbf{X}\}$  serves as a differentiable relaxation of the subspace  $\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$  and facilitates the perturbation analysis of the bandwidth frequency when adding a new node into  $\mathcal{S}$ . The projection operator associated with  $\operatorname{Span}\{D(\mathbf{t})\mathbf{X}\}$  can be explicitly represented as  $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{t}) = D(\mathbf{t})\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{X}^T D(\mathbf{t})\mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T D(\mathbf{t})$ .

To quantify the increases in  $\hat{\omega}(\mathcal{S})$  when adding a new node into  $\mathcal{S}$ , we consider the following

regularized optimization:

$$\lambda_\alpha(\mathbf{t}) = \min_{\phi} \frac{\phi^T \mathcal{L}^k \phi}{\phi^T \phi} + \alpha \frac{\phi^T (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{t})) \phi}{\phi^T \phi}. \quad (7)$$

The penalty on the right side of (7) encourages graph signal  $\phi$  to stay in  $\mathbf{H}_{S^c}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$ . When the parameter  $\alpha$  goes to infinity and  $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{1}_{S^c}$ , the minimization  $\lambda_\alpha(\mathbf{1}_{S^c})$  of (7) converges to  $\hat{\omega}(S)$  in (6). Then the information gain of labeling node  $i \in S^c$  can be measured by the gradient of bandwidth frequency when decreases  $t_i$  from 1 to 0:

$$\Delta_i := - \left. \frac{\partial \lambda_\alpha(\mathbf{t})}{\partial t_i} \right|_{\mathbf{t}=\mathbf{1}_{S^c}} = 2\alpha \times \phi^T \left. \frac{\partial \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{t})}{\partial t_i} \phi \right|_{\mathbf{t}=\mathbf{1}_{S^c}}, \quad (8)$$

where  $\phi$  is the minimizer of (7) at  $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{1}_{S^c}$ , which is the eigenvector corresponding to the smallest non-zeros eigenvalue of matrix  $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{1}_{S^c})\mathcal{L}^k\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{1}_{S^c})$ . Then we select node  $i = \operatorname{argmax}_{j \in S^c} \Delta_j$  and update query set  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S} \cup \{i\}$ .

*Remark:* we can improve the computational efficiency of calculating node-wise informativeness (8) by avoiding  $D(\mathbf{t})$  in matrix inversion. When  $\mathbf{t}$  is in the neighborhood of  $\mathbf{1}_{S^c}$ , we have the approximation:

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{t}) \approx D(\mathbf{t})\mathbf{X}_{S^c}(\mathbf{X}_{S^c}^T\mathbf{X}_{S^c})^{-1}\mathbf{X}_{S^c}^T D(\mathbf{t}) = D(\mathbf{t})\mathbf{Z}_{S^c}\mathbf{Z}_{S^c}^T D(\mathbf{t}),$$

where  $\mathbf{X}_{S^c} = ((X_1)_{S^c}, \dots, (X_p)_{S^c})$ , and  $\mathbf{Z}_{S^c} = \mathbf{X}_{S^c}(\mathbf{X}_{S^c}^T\mathbf{X}_{S^c})^{-1/2}$ . Then the node-wise informativeness can be explicitly represented as:

$$\Delta_i \propto t_i \phi_i^2(\mathbf{Z}_{S^c})_i (\mathbf{Z}_{S^c}^T)_i + \sum_{j \neq i, 1 \leq j \leq n} t_j t_i \phi_i \phi_j (\mathbf{Z}_{S^c})_i (\mathbf{Z}_{S^c}^T)_j. \quad (9)$$

We find the approximation achieves similar empirical performance comparing with the accurate formulation (8). Therefore, we adopt the formulation (9) in the following numerical experiments.

### 3.3 Representative node selection

In real-world applications, we often only access to the perturbed version of true graph signals as  $Y = \mathbf{f} + \epsilon$ , where  $\epsilon$  collects node-wise noises independent from network data. When replacing true label  $\mathbf{f}(i)$  by  $Y(i)$  in (4), the label noise lead to both finite-sample bias and variance in estimation of graph signal  $\mathbf{f}$ . The key for achieving a robust graph signal recovery is to ensure that the query nodes  $\mathcal{S}$  are representative for the distribution of smoothed covariates  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$  on the entire node set. An effective way to achieve the representativeness is through sampling such that each node has opportunity to be selected in  $\mathcal{S}$ . Therefore, we blender principled randomness into the deterministic selection procedure in the previous section such that  $\mathcal{S}$  consists of nodes that are both informative and representative. And the graph signal estimation is modified as

$$\hat{\beta} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\tilde{\beta}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} s_i (Y(i) - (\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{S}})_i \tilde{\beta}^T)^2, \quad (10)$$

where  $s_i$  is the weight for the  $i$ th labeled node, associated with the probability of node  $i$  being selected into  $\mathcal{S}$ .

Specifically, the generalization error of estimator in (10) is determined by the smallest eigenvalue  $\lambda_{\min}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{S}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{S}})$ . Notice that  $\lambda_{\min}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}}) = 1$  corresponding to the entire dataset. To control the generalization error, we target to select  $\mathcal{S}$  such that the smallest eigenvalue of the corresponding covariance matrix can be lower bounded as:

$$\lambda_{\min}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{S}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{S}}) \geq (1 - o_{|\mathcal{S}|}(1)) \lambda_{\min}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}}). \quad (11)$$

On the other hand, the informative selection method in section 3.2 are not designed to guarantee (11). To address this issue, we propose a selection method based on sequential biased sampling method that simultaneously achieves informative node query and generalization error control.

The key idea to achieve lower bound of  $\lambda_{\min}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{S}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{S}})$  is to use spectral sparsification techniques

[4] for positive semi-definite matrices. Denote the  $i^{\text{th}}$  row of the constrained bases  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$  as  $v_i \in \mathcal{R}^{1 \times r}$ , then  $\mathbf{I}_{r \times r} = \sum_{i=1}^n v_i^T v_i$  by definition of  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ . Motivated by the randomization sampling introduced in [15], we propose a biased sampling strategy to construct  $\mathcal{S}$  with  $|\mathcal{S}| \ll n$  and weights  $\{s_i > 0, i \in \mathcal{S}\}$  such that  $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} s_i v_i^T v_i \approx \mathbf{I}$ . In other words, the weighed covariance matrix of the query set  $\mathcal{S}$  satisfies  $\lambda_{\min}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{S}}^T W_{\mathcal{S}} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{S}}) \approx 1$ , where  $W_{\mathcal{S}}$  is a diagonal matrix with  $s_i$  on its diagonal. At a high level, each step in the biased sampling query strategy consists of two stages. First, we use randomized spectral sparsification to sample  $m \ll n$  nodes, and collect them as a candidate set  $B_m$ . Intuitively, the covariance matrix on the updated  $\mathcal{S}$  remains a lower bounded eigenvalues if a node in  $B_m$  is added into  $\mathcal{S}$ . In the second stage, we select one node from  $B_m$  based on the informativeness criterion in Section 3.2 to achieve a large frequency increase in (8).

We illustrate the detailed sampling procedure as follows. After the  $(t-1)^{\text{th}}$  selection, we denote the set of query nodes as  $\mathcal{S}_{t-1}$  with corresponding node-wise weights  $\mathcal{W}_{t-1} = \{s_j > 0 \mid j \in \mathcal{S}_{t-1}\}$ . Let the covariance matrix of  $\mathcal{S}_{t-1}$  be  $C_{t-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r} = \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{S}_{t-1}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathcal{S}_{t-1}} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_{t-1}} s_j v_j^T v_j$ . To analyze the behavior of eigenvalues when updating the set of query nodes, we follow [15] to introduce the potential function:

$$\Phi_{t-1} = \text{Tr}[(u_{t-1}I - C_{t-1})^{-1}] + \text{Tr}[(C_{t-1} - l_{t-1}I)^{-1}], \quad (12)$$

where  $u_{t-1}$  and  $l_{t-1}$  are two constants satisfying  $l_{t-1} < \lambda_{\min}(C_{t-1}) \leq \lambda_{\max}(C_{t-1}) < u_{t-1}$ , and  $\text{Tr}(\cdot)$  is the trace of matrix. The potential function  $\Phi_{t-1}$  measures the coherence among all eigenvalues of  $C_{t-1}$ . The value of  $\Phi_{t-1}$  becomes large if some eigenvalues are close to either of boundary  $u_{t-1}$  and  $l_{t-1}$ , while a small value of  $\Phi_{t-1}$  indicates that all eigenvalues are concentrated around  $(l_{t-1} + u_{t-1})/2$ . To construct the candidate set  $B_m$ , we appropriately sample node  $i$  and update  $C_t$ ,  $u_t$  and  $l_t$  such that all eigenvalues of  $C_t$  remains within interval  $(l_t, u_t)$ . To achieve this, we first

calculate the node-wise probabilities  $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^n$  as

$$p_i = [v_i(u_{t-1}I - C_{t-1})^{-1}v_i^T + v_i(C_{t-1} - l_{t-1}I)^{-1}v_i^T]/\Phi_{t-1}, \quad (13)$$

where  $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1$ . Then we sample  $m$  nodes into  $B_m$  according to  $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^n$ . For each node  $i \in B_m$ , the corresponding weight is  $s_i = \frac{\epsilon}{p_i\Phi_{t-1}}$ ,  $0 < \epsilon < 1$ . After obtaining the candidate set  $B_m$ , we perform informative node selection criterion  $\Delta_i$  introduced in section 3.2, i.e., selecting node  $i = \operatorname{argmax}_{i \in B_m} \Delta_i$ , and update query set and weights as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } i \in \mathcal{S}_{t-1}^c : \mathcal{S}_t &= \mathcal{S}_{t-1} \cup \{i\}, \mathcal{W}_t = \mathcal{W}_{t-1} \cup \{s_i\}, \\ \text{if } i \in \mathcal{S}_{t-1} : s_i &= s_i + \frac{\epsilon}{p_i\Phi_{t-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we update the lower and upper bounds of eigenvalues as

$$u_t = u_{t-1} + \frac{\epsilon}{\Phi_{t-1}(1 - \epsilon)}, \quad l_t = l_{t-1} + \frac{\epsilon}{\Phi_{t-1}(1 + \epsilon)}. \quad (14)$$

The update rule ensures that  $u_t - l_t$  increase at a lower rate than  $u_t$ , resulting the convergence of gap between largest and smallest eigenvalue of  $\tilde{X}_S^T W_S \tilde{X}_S$ , therefore controlling the condition number. Accordingly, the covariance matrix is updated with the selected node  $i$  as

$$C_t = C_{t-1} + \frac{\epsilon}{p_i\Phi_{t-1}}v_i^T v_i. \quad (15)$$

With the covariance matrix update rule (15), the average increment is  $\mathbf{E}(C_t) - C_{t-1} = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i s_i v_i^T v_i = \frac{\epsilon}{\Phi_{t-1}}I$ . Intuitively, the selected node enables the all eigenvalues of  $C_{t-1}$  increases at the same order on average. This guarantees the  $\lambda_{\min}(\tilde{X}_S^T \tilde{X}_S)$  keep increasing to  $\lambda_{\min}(\tilde{X}^T \tilde{X}) = 1$  during the selection process, therefore drive the smallest eigenvalue bounded away from 0. On the other hand, the selected node remains locally informative within candidate set  $B_m$ . Compared with the entire node

set, selecting from a subset of nodes serves as a regularization on informativeness maximization, providing a balance between informativeness and representativeness for node query.

### 3.4 Node query implementation and graph signal recovery

We summarize the biased sampling selection strategy in Algorithm 1. For initialization, the dimension of network spectrum  $d$ , size of candidate set  $m$ , and the constant  $0 < \epsilon < 1$  in spectral sparsification need to be specified. Based on the discussion at the end of section 3.1., the dimension of function space  $\mathbf{H}_\omega(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$  is at most  $\mathcal{B}$  where  $\mathcal{B}$  is the budget of label query. Therefore, we can set  $d = \min\{p, \mathcal{B}\}$ . The parameters  $m$  and  $\epsilon$  jointly control the condition number  $\frac{\lambda_{max}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_S^T W_S \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_S)}{\lambda_{min}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_S^T W_S \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_S)}$ . A smaller  $m$  and  $\epsilon$  lead to a condition number closer to  $\frac{\lambda_{max}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}})}{\lambda_{min}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}})}$ , while the dimension of identifiable space  $\mathbf{H}_\omega(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$  will also be lower due to the trade-off between informativeness and representativeness in the selection. In practice, we can tune  $m$  by making covariance matrix well-behaved. Specifically, we can run the biased sampling procedure multiple times with different values of  $m$ , and use the largest  $m$  such that the condition number of covariance matrix on the query set  $\mathcal{S}$  is less than 10 [14]. This number is a rule of thumb for a covariance matrix being considered as well-conditioned [14]. In addition,  $\epsilon$  is typically fix at a smaller number, and one can follow protocol in [15] to set up  $\epsilon$ .

Based on the output from Algorithm 1, we solve the weighted least square problem:

$$\hat{\beta} = \underset{\tilde{\beta}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} s_i (Y(i) - (\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_S)_i \tilde{\beta})^2 \quad (16)$$

and recover the graph signal on the entire network as  $\hat{\mathbf{f}} = \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \hat{\beta}$ .

*Remark:* the proposed node query and graph signal estimation procedure are also applied to classification task. Consider the  $K$ -class classification task where the response on each node  $i$  is  $\mathbf{f}(i) \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$ . We introduce the dummy membership vector  $(Y_1(i), \dots, Y_K(i))$  where  $Y_c(i) = 1$  if  $\mathbf{f}(i) = c$  and  $Y_k(i) = 0$  otherwise. For each class  $c \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$ , we obtain the



---

**Algorithm 1** Biased Sampling Selection Algorithm

---

**Require:** set  $t = 0$ ,  $C_0 = 0$ , set of query node  $\mathcal{S}_0 = \{\emptyset\}$ , set of node weight  $\mathcal{W}_0 = \{\emptyset\}$ , dimension  $d$ , size of candidate set  $m$ , constant  $0 < \epsilon < 1/m$ ,  $u_0 = 2r/\epsilon$ ,  $l_0 = -2r/\epsilon$ ,  $\kappa = 2r(1 - m^2\epsilon^2)/(m\epsilon^2)$ ,  $r = \text{rank}(\tilde{X})$ , and number of remaining query budget  $\mathcal{B}$  with  $\mathcal{B} \ll n$

**Initialization:**  $\mathbf{U}_d = (U_1, \dots, U_d)$ , perform SVD decomposition  $\mathbf{U}_d^T \mathbf{X} = V_1 \Sigma V_2^T$ , and set  $\tilde{X} = \mathbf{U}_d V_1$  with the  $i$ th row denoted as  $v_i, i = 1, \dots, n$

**while**  $\mathcal{B} > 0$  **do** selection starting from  $t = 0$

step 1: calculate  $\Phi_t$  in (12) and  $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^n$  in (13)

step 2: sample with replacement  $m$  nodes as node set  $B_m$  with probability  $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^n$

step 3: select node  $i: i = \text{argmax}_{i \in B_m} \Delta_i$ , calculate weight  $w_i = \frac{\epsilon}{p_i \Phi_t}$

if  $i \notin \mathcal{S}_t$ , then  $\mathcal{S}_{t+1} = \mathcal{S}_t \cup \{i\}$ ,  $\mathcal{W}_{t+1} = \mathcal{W}_t \cup \{s_i\}$ ,  $s_i = \frac{w_i}{\kappa}$ ,

if  $i \in \mathcal{S}_t$ , then  $s_i = s_i + \frac{w_i}{\kappa}$

step 4: set  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B} - 1$ , and update  $C_t, u_t$ , and  $l_t$

$$C_{t+1} = C_t + w_i v_i^T v_i, u_{t+1} = u_t + \frac{\epsilon}{\Phi_t(1 - m\epsilon)}, l_{t+1} = l_t + \frac{\epsilon}{\Phi_t(1 + m\epsilon)}, t = t + 1.$$

**end while**

**Query:** query responses (labels) of nodes in  $\mathcal{S}$  from the external oracle

**Output:** set of query nodes  $\mathcal{S}$ , corresponding response  $Y_i, i \in \mathcal{S}$ , smoothed covariates  $\tilde{X}_{\mathcal{S}}$ , and weights of query nodes  $\mathcal{W}$

---

corresponding parameter  $\hat{\beta}_c$  from the weighed least square estimation in (16) using training data  $\{\tilde{X}_i, Y_c(i), s_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{S}}$ , and estimate the score of class  $c$  as  $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_c = \tilde{X} \hat{\beta}_c$ . Then the label of an unqueried node  $j$  is assigned as  $\hat{\mathbf{f}}(j) = \text{argmax}_{1 \leq c \leq K} \{\hat{\mathbf{f}}_1(j), \hat{\mathbf{f}}_2(j), \dots, \hat{\mathbf{f}}_K(j)\}$ . Notice that above score-based classifier is equivalent to the softmax classifier:

$$\hat{\mathbf{f}} = \text{argmax}_{1 \leq c \leq K} \left\{ \frac{\exp(\hat{\mathbf{f}}_1)}{\sum_c \exp(\hat{\mathbf{f}}_c)}, \dots, \frac{\exp(\hat{\mathbf{f}}_K)}{\sum_c \exp(\hat{\mathbf{f}}_c)} \right\}$$

due to that the softmax function is monotone increasing in terms of each score function  $\{\hat{\mathbf{f}}_c\}_{c=1}^K$ .

### 3.5 Computational complexity

The computational complexity of calculating sampling probability in representative sampling stage is  $\mathcal{O}(n)$ . Then we sample  $m$  nodes to formulate a candidate set  $B_m$ , and the complexity of sampling  $m$  variables from a discrete probability distribution is  $\mathcal{O}(m)$  [32]. Therefore, the complexity of

representative learning stage is  $\mathcal{O}(n + m)$ . To calculate the information gain  $\Delta_i$  for each node in informative selection stage, we need to first obtain the eigenvector of the smallest non-zero eigenvalue of projected graph Laplacian matrix, where the complexity of SVD is  $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ . Then we calculate  $\Delta_i$  for each node in candidate set  $B_m$  based on their loadings on eigenvector with computational cost  $\mathcal{O}(mn)$ . The complexity of our biased sampling method is  $\mathcal{O}(n+m+nm+n^3)$ . When the budget of node label query is  $\mathcal{B}$ , the total computational cost is then  $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{B}(n + m + nm + n^3))$ .

When the dimension of node covariates  $p \ll n$ , we can replace SVD operation by Lanczos algorithm to speed up the informative selection. The Lanczos algorithm is designed to obtain the  $k$ th largest or smallest eigenvalues and the corresponding eigenvectors via generalized power iteration method, which has the time complexity  $\mathcal{O}(kn^2)$  [12]. Therefore, the complexity of the proposed biased sampling method is  $\mathcal{O}(pn^2)$ . This complexity is comparable to GNN-based active learning methods since GNN and its variations in general have complexity  $\mathcal{O}(pn^2)$  in one training update [5, 35].

## 4 Theoretical Analysis

In this section, we provide theory analysis for the proposed node query strategy. The theoretical results consist of two parts focusing on the properties of proposed method on both local selection information gain and global graph signal recovery performance. Specifically, we first analyze the biased sampling selection algorithm during one-step selection, and compare the information gain with random selection strategy. Then we provide the generalization error bound of recovering graph signal using the labelled nodes queried by Algorithm 1 and weighted least square regression (16). Our result takes into consideration the noise within node labels, therefore also quantify the robustness of the proposed method.

Given a set of query nodes  $\mathcal{S}$ , the information gain of querying the label on a new node  $i$  can be

measured as the increase in bandwidth frequency  $\Delta_i := \omega(\mathcal{S} \cup \{i\}) - \omega(\mathcal{S})$ . We provide a step-wise analysis for the proposed method in terms of bandwidth frequency increase via the comparison with random selection. The analysis is through performing first-order matrix perturbation theory [2] on the Laplacian matrix  $\mathcal{L}$ . In the Theorem 4.1, we assume the column space of node covariate  $\mathbf{X}$  is identical to space spanned by the first  $d$  eigenvalues of  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}^c}$ . This assumption simplifies the analysis and result such that it is sufficient to analyze the perturbation of  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}^c}$ , where  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}^c}$  is the reduced matrix of Laplacian  $\mathcal{L}$  where the rows and columns in  $\mathcal{S}$  are zeros. On the other hand, the analysis can be straightforwardly extended to the general setting via replacing  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}^c}$  by  $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{S}^c})\mathcal{L}\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{S}^c})$  where  $\mathbf{P}(t)$  is the projection operator defined in section 3.2. In addition, under the assumption of node covariates, the information gain  $\Delta_i$  has an explicit dependence on the network statistics, which provides a better interpretation on how network structure affects the benefits of seeking informative nodes.

**Theorem 4.1.** *For the remaining adjacency matrix after the  $s$ th selection as  $\mathbf{A}_{(n-|\mathcal{S}|) \times (n-|\mathcal{S}|)}$ , denote  $d_{\min} = \min_i \{d_i\}$  and  $d_i$  degree of the  $i$ th node. Assume that the set of query nodes before the  $s$ th selection is  $\mathcal{S}$ . Let  $\Delta_s^R$  and  $\Delta_s^B$  be the bandwidth frequency increase of the  $s$ th label querying on a node selected by random sampling and the proposed sampling method, respectively. Denote node  $j^*$  as the node who has largest magnitude on the eigenvector corresponding to the smallest non-zero eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}^c}$ . Then we have:*

$$\mathbf{E}(\Delta_s^R) = \Omega\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \quad (1), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{E}(\Delta_s^B) - \mathbf{E}(\Delta_s^R) > \Omega\left(\frac{1}{\eta_0 \eta_1^3 d_{\min}^2}\right) - \Omega\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \quad (2),$$

where  $f = \Omega(g)$  if  $c_1 \leq \left|\frac{f}{g}\right| \leq c_2$  for constants  $c_1, c_2$  when  $n$  is sufficient large. Inequality (2) holds given  $m$  satisfying

$$\left(\frac{n-m-d_{\min}}{n-m}\right)^m \left(\frac{n-m-d_{\min}}{n-d_{\min}}\right)^{d_{\min}} \sqrt{d_{\min}} = \mathcal{O}(1).$$

The expectation  $\mathbf{E}(\cdot)$  is over the randomness of node selection. Both  $\eta_0, \eta_1$  are network-related quantities as  $\eta_0 := \#\{i : |\frac{d_i - d_{j^*}}{d_{\min}}| \leq 1\}$  and  $\eta_1 := \max_i(\frac{d_i}{d_{\min}})$ .

Theorem 4.1 provides several insights into the information gain via querying labels on nodes. If we randomly select node to query the label, the information gain is constant for each selection on average. While the proposed biased sampling method achieves larger information gain than random selection. The improvement of biased sampling is larger with larger  $d_{\min}$  and smaller  $\eta_0, \eta_1$ . Specifically,  $d_{\min}$  reflects the connectedness of network. A better connected network facilitates the propagation of label information and enhances the informativeness of a node's label on other nodes. A smaller  $\eta_1$  prevents the existence of dominating nodes such that the connectedness does not significantly decreases when some nodes are removed from network. Notice that node  $j^*$  in the most informative node for the next selection, and  $\eta_0$  measures the number of nodes similar to  $j^*$  on network. Recall that the proposed biased sampling take in both informativeness and representativeness of selected nodes. Therefore, the information gain will be less penalized by representativeness requirement if  $\eta_0$  is small. In addition, the size of candidate set  $m$  should be large enough to ensure that informative nodes are included into  $B_m$ .

Besides the informative gain guarantee of the proposed sampling for each selection iteration, we also provide the generalization error bound of the proposed sampling and weighted OLS estimator. We introduce the following quantities: denote  $\alpha_i := \langle \mathbf{f}, U_i \rangle$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ,  $\text{supp}(\mathbf{f}) := \{i : 1 \leq i \leq n, |\alpha_i| > 0\}$ , and  $r_d = \text{rank}(\mathbf{U}_d^T \mathbf{X})$ . We make following assumptions for Theorem 4.2:

**Assumption 1:** for the underlying graph signal  $\mathbf{f}$ , there exists a bandwidth frequency  $\omega_0$  such that  $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbf{H}_{\omega_0}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$ .

**Assumption 2:** node-wise response follows  $Y_i = \mathbf{f}(i) + \epsilon_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$  where  $\{\epsilon_i\}_{i=1}^n$  are independent random variables with  $\mathbf{E}(\epsilon_i) = 0$  and  $\mathbf{Var}(\epsilon_i) \leq \sigma^2$ .

**Theorem 4.2.** Under Assumption 1 and 2, for the graph signal estimation  $\hat{\mathbf{f}}$  obtained by training

(16) on  $\mathcal{B}$  labelled nodes selected by Algorithm 1, with probability larger than  $1 - \frac{2m}{t}$ , we have

$$\mathbf{E}_Y \|\hat{\mathbf{f}} - \mathbf{f}\|_2^2 \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{r_d t}{\mathcal{B}} + 2\left(\frac{r_d t}{\mathcal{B}}\right)^{3/2} + \left(\frac{r_d t}{\mathcal{B}}\right)^2\right) \times (n\sigma^2 + \sum_{i>d, i \in \text{supp}(\mathbf{f})} \alpha_i^2) + \sum_{i>d, i \in \text{supp}(\mathbf{f})} \alpha_i^2, \quad (17)$$

where  $t > 2m$ , and  $\mathbf{E}_Y(\cdot)$  is expected value in terms of randomness in response observations.

Intuitively, the RHS of (17) indicates both variance and bias of estimating  $\mathbf{f}$  via noise labels on sampled nodes. The first four terms correspond to the error of estimating the best approximation of  $\mathbf{f}$  in a space  $\mathbf{H}_\omega(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$  where  $\omega < \omega_0$  is the bandwidth frequency corresponding to network spectral dimension  $d$ . Specifically, the first two terms are estimation variance originates from controlling condition number of design matrix on the queried nodes, which decay at the rate  $(mr_d/\mathcal{B})^{3/2}$  as  $\mathcal{B}$  increases. The third and fourth term reflects the noise and unidentifiable components in the responses of queried nodes. The fifth term  $\sum_{i>d, i \in \text{supp}(\mathbf{f})} \alpha_i^2$  represents the bias from approximation error of space using  $\mathbf{H}_\omega(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$ . Note that the bias term can be further controlled if the true signal  $\mathbf{f}$  has decaying or zero weights on high-frequency network components.

Theorem 4.2 reveals the trade-off between informativeness and representativeness for active learning on network, which is controlled by the spectral dimension  $d$ . Given that  $r_d$  is a monotone function of  $d$ , a large  $d$  leads to a low representativeness among queried nodes, therefore increases variance in controlling of the condition number, i.e., the first and second term. On the other hand, a large  $d$  reduces the approximation bias to the true graph signal, i.e, the fourth and fifth term, via including nodes more informative for identifying less smoothed signals. Similarly, lowering  $d$  results in smaller variance and larger bias. Additionally, the size of candidate set  $m$  affects the probability of controlling the generalization error. A small  $m$  places a large weight on the representativeness criterion in the sampling, and leads to a higher probability of controlling the condition number, while this could miss informative nodes and increases approximation bias.

*Remark:* with prediction MSE fixed, the query complexity of our method is  $\mathcal{O}(d)$ , while that of random sampling is  $\mathcal{O}(\tilde{d} \log \tilde{d})$  with  $\tilde{d} > d$ . Our method improves random sampling in two

aspects: (1) the information selection identifies  $\mathbf{f}$  via less queries than random sampling based on Theorem 4.1 (2) our method further improves by a log factor compared to random sampling by actively controlling the condition number of the covariate matrix.

## 5 Experiments on Synthetic Networks

In this section, we consider regression tasks on networks with continuous node responses. Given that many real-world networks exhibit either community structures[11] or scale-free properties[3], we investigate the performance of the proposed method on synthetic networks satisfying the corresponding topology. The number of nodes in both networks is set at  $n = 100$ . After generating the networks, we consider them fixed and then simulate  $\mathbf{Y}$  and  $\mathbf{X}$  repeatedly using 10 different random seeds. The detailed simulation process for the two networks is described below.

**Case 1: network with community structure** For network with community structure, the synthetic networks are generated by the stochastic block model (SBM), in which the nodes are divided into communities and the probability of an edge between two nodes only depends on which communities they belong to. We fix the number of communities  $K = 4$ , with predetermined community sizes of  $(40, 20, 20, 20)$ . We set the within-community probability  $P_{\text{in}} = 0.35$  and across-community probability  $P_{\text{out}} = 0.01$  such that nodes within the same community are more densely connected. We set node response  $\mathbf{Y} = \beta^T U_{1:10} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon$ , where  $U_{1:10} = \{U_1, U_2, \dots, U_{10}\}$  represents the leading ten eigenvectors of the normalized Laplacian  $\mathcal{L}$  of the simulated network,  $\beta = \underbrace{(5, 5, \dots, 5)}_{\text{length } 10}^T$  and  $\epsilon \sim N(0, I_n)$ . Finally, we define the observed node covariates  $\mathbf{X}$  as a perturbed version of  $U_{1:10}$  by adding high-frequency noise. Specifically  $\mathbf{X} = U_{1:10} + M^{\text{SBM}}U_{45:54}$ , where  $M^{\text{SBM}}$  is the transformation matrix with each entry  $M_{ij}^{\text{SBM}} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0.3, 0.1)$ .

**Case 2: scale-free network** Networks with a scale-free property have a degree distribution that follows a power law. In other words, a few nodes have a very high degree, while most nodes have a low degree. The Barabási-Albert (BA) model generates random scale-free networks using a

preferential attachment process, where new nodes are more likely to connect to existing nodes with higher degrees. We set the attachment parameter  $\alpha = 3$  such that the generated network exhibits a heavy-tailed degree distribution. Then, we set  $\mathbf{Y} = \beta^T U_{1:15} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon$  and  $\mathbf{X} = U_{1:15} + M^{\text{BA}} U_{45:59}$ , where  $\beta = (\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{\text{length 5}}, \underbrace{5, \dots, 5}_{\text{length 10}})^T$  and  $M_{ij}^{\text{BA}} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0.5, 0.2)$ .




Figure 1: (a) Prediction MSE for graph signal from different node query strategies under different network topologies: community structure (**SBM**) and scale-free property (**BA**). (b) Estimation MSE for regression coefficients. The red dotted line indicates the MSE using responses from all nodes.

In the algorithm, we set  $m = 50$ ,  $d = 10$ ,  $\epsilon = 0.01$  for **SBM** and  $m = 50$ ,  $d = 15$ ,  $\epsilon = 0.01$  for **BA**. We compare the proposed query method with several competing node query methods: (1) random selection (**Random**); (2) selecting subset of nodes  $\mathcal{S}$  to maximize determinant of covariance matrix  $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}}^T \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}}$ , where  $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}}$  is the submatrix of the observed  $\mathbf{X}$  (**D-optimal** [22]). Moreover, we compare with heuristic strategy that utilizes specific network topology information. For **SBM**, we randomly select nodes from each community (**Community**) (**clear**; for **BA**, we select nodes to query in the decreasing order of node degree (**Degree**)).

After selecting nodes to label using different methods, we fit the weighted linear regression in (16) on the labeled nodes with smoothed covariates  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$  to estimate the linear coefficient  $\hat{\beta}$  and predict the response  $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}$  for the unlabeled nodes. The prediction and coefficient estimation Mean Squared Error (MSE) for varying numbers of labeled nodes from different strategies are shown in Figure 1. Figure 1a illustrates that, by explicitly integrating both network and node covariate information, the proposed method consistently outperforms the baseline methods, which either consider

only network information (**Community** and **Degree**) or only covariate information (**D-optimal**). Figure 1b shows that the estimation of  $\hat{\beta}$  is significantly more accurate with the proposed strategy compared to random selection. In both figure 1a and 1b, the greatest margin of improvement is observed when the query budget is most limited. Moreover, as visualized in figure 2, the nodes queried by the proposed algorithm are adaptable to the *informativeness* criteria of different network topologies, effectively adjusting to the community structure of SBM and the scale-free structure of BA.

## 6 Experiments on Real-world Networks

In this section, we evaluate the proposed methods against state-of-the-art baselines in regression and classification tasks on four real-world networks, using Mean Squared Error (MSE) for regression and Macro-F1 score for classification.


**Case 1: Regression** We use the New Jersey public school social network dataset **School**, originally collected to study the impact of educational workshops on reducing conflicts in schools. Each node represents an individual student, and edges represent friendships among students. We treat the students’ grade point averages (GPA) as node responses and select five student features (grade level, race, and three binary survey responses) as node covariates using a standard forward selection approach[14]. We set the parameters to be  $m = 200$ ,  $d = 5$ ,  $\epsilon = 0.01$ .

In addition to the heuristic strategies in section 5 (**Random**, **Degree D-optimal**), we also compare with **GraphPart (GPT [19])**. This method first uses the latent representation, determined by both network and node-wise covariates, to divide the network into disjoint clusters. Then, **GPT** selects representative nodes from each cluster to query labels. We implement **GPT** using the open source code <sup>1</sup>. Given that the dimension of node covariates in School dataset is 5, the number of queried nodes starts at 6 to mitigate the identifiability problem in graph signal estimation. As


---

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/Mars-tin/GraphPart>





(a)



(b)

Figure 2: For (a) SBM, nodes are grouped by the assigned community; for (b) BA, nodes are grouped by degree. The integer  $i$  on each node represents the  $i^{th}$  node queried by the proposed algorithm in one of the ten replications.

in Section 5, after obtaining nodes to label, we use the weighted linear regression in (16) with smoothed covariates  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$  to predict labels for the remaining nodes.

**Case 2: Classification** Unlike regression, node classification with Graph Neural Networks(GNNs) is a widely studied research area. We utilize three benchmark citation networks commonly used

in current literature: **Cora**, **Citeseer**, and **PubMed**. In these networks, papers are represented as nodes and edges correspond to citations among the papers. The node-wise covariates consist of binary word vectors indicating the presence or absence of certain words from a predefined vocabulary, and the node labels indicate the topics to which the paper belong. We set  $m = 1000$ ,  $d = 100$ ,  $\epsilon = 0.01$  for Cora and Citeseer and  $m = 3000$ ,  $d = 60$ ,  $\epsilon = 0.01$  for Pubmed.

In addition to the query strategies mentioned in previous section, we include two more methods for comparison: **Pagerank** and **IGP**[38]. Unlike **Degree** centrality which is based on direction connection between nodes, **Pagerank** selects nodes by considering that connections to higher-ranking nodes significantly enhance a node’s own ranking. **IGP** is a GNN-based active learning method that selects nodes to greedily maximize the expected entropy reduction in each iteration of model training. To implement **IGP**, we use the open source code <sup>2</sup>. Notice that we do not include **IGP** for the regression task because it is specifically designed for node classification task. We follow prior works [38] to set the query budget from  $2C$  to  $20C$ , where  $C$  represents the number of classes. Since extensive empirical results have shown that the performance of node query strategies is consistent across different variants of GNN-based node classifiers [19, 29, 37, 38], we use Simplified Graph Convolution (SGC) [34] as the node classifier due to its low computational cost. Note that SGC is equivalent to multi-class logistic regression on smoothed node covariates [34], making it a variant of the regression model in (16) (See Appendix B). For all the three citation networks, we train a 2-layer SGC model with fixed 300 epochs. We set the initial learning rate as  $10^{-2}$  and weight decay as  $10^{-4}$ .

The prediction MSE on School network and Macro-F1 on citation networks are illustrated in Figure 3 and Table 2. The results show that the proposed algorithm outperforms other methods on the Cora, Citeseer, and School datasets, particularly when the query budget is more limited. On the other hand, the prediction accuracy on PubMed is overall similar to that of GPT and IGP, with some underperformance in the budget range between 20 and 30. This is because the node responses

---

<sup>2</sup><https://github.com/zwt233/IGP>

in PubMed consist of both low-frequency (homophily) and high-frequency (heterophily) components, while we only include the first, while we only include the first  $d = 60$  eigenvectors in the algorithm for 3d. To handle such scenarios where network homophily is violated, we can set the graph signal subspace  $\mathbf{U}_d$  in Algorithm 1 as  $\mathbf{U}_d = (U_1, \dots, U_d, U_{n-d+1}, \dots, U_n)$ , which includes both the first  $d$  low-frequency and the last  $d$  high-frequency network components. In Figure 5b, we illustrate the node classification performance on PubMed using different graph signal subspaces: 1. low-frequency subspace  $(U_1, \dots, U_{60})$  (Low), 2. a combination of low- and high-frequency subspace  $(U_1, \dots, U_{30}, U_{60}, U_{n-29}, \dots, U_n)$  (Low+High), and 3. the subspace with  $U_i$  selected by top-ranking 60 Graph Fourier Transform coefficients. Compared to the initial low-frequency subspace, using the expanded subspace improves classification performance and achieves similar performance to the optimal selection using oracle node response information as the number of queries increases. Note that GPT is an offline, cluster-based method, while IGP is a GNN-based method requiring model retraining with each new node query. Both are fundamentally different from our method.

Table 1: Overview of the four real-world networks

Dataset	#Nodes	#Features	#Edges	Node Response	Task type	Description
Cora	2,708	1,433	5,429	Categorical(7)	Classification	citation network
Citeseer	3,327	3,703	4,732	Categorical(6)	Classification	citation network
Pubmed	19,717	500	44,338	Categorical(3)	Classification	citation network
School	615	5	7,413	Continuous(GPA)	Regression	friendship network

Table 2: Marco-F1(%) predictive accuracy on citation networks

#labeled nodes	Cora $h = 0.81$			Citeseer $h = 0.23$			Pubmed $h = 0.11$		
	20	40	80	20	40	80	20	40	60
Random	46.4	64.2	74.4	42.2	52.6	58.6	54.6	59.1	65.2
Degree	59.1	63.9	73.8	29.7	51.1	53.9	44.1	46.7	49.2
Pagerank	59.1	72.3	75.1	49.7	52.8	62.0	48.2	50.5	51.2
GPT	64.4	72.2	78.2	41.1	56.5	63.9	<b>63.8</b>	67.3	74.8
IGP	61.7	73.0	78.8	54.9	57.1	64.0	55.7	68.4	76.5
Proposed	<b>67.3</b>	<b>74.2</b>	<b>79.4</b>	<b>60.3</b>	<b>61.0</b>	<b>66.3</b>	54.9	<b>70.0</b>	<b>76.5</b>




Figure 3: Prediction accuracy of node responses on four real-world networks. Regression: (a); Classification: (b), (c), (d).




Figure 4: Ablation study: (a) The condition number (log scale) of the design matrix of query nodes selected by proposed method and random sampling. The effectiveness of (b) representative sampling and (c) incorporating covariate information in Algorithm 1.

**Ablation Study** The proposed method relies on both representative sampling and informative selection achieved by Step 2 and Step 3 in Algorithm 1. The representative sampling is essential to control the condition number of the design matrix on queried nodes’ covariates, therefore is crucial in controlling prediction error when network data are noisy. In this subsection, we investigate the effectiveness of both representative sampling and informative selection via numerical experiments.

We first illustrate in Figure 4a the condition number  $\frac{\lambda_{max}(\tilde{X}_S^T W_S \tilde{X}_S)}{\lambda_{min}(\tilde{X}_S^T W_S \tilde{X}_S)}$  using the proposed method, and compare with the one using random selection where  $W_S$  is identity matrix. The proposed algorithm achieve a significantly lower condition number than random selection, especially when the number of query is small.

In addition, we investigate the prediction performance of the proposed method on the Citeseer




Figure 5: (a) Graph Fourier Transformation coefficients of one of the node class membership functions. (b) Node classification accuracy of the proposed method using different graph signal subspaces.

network when removing representative sampling, i.e., setting the candidate set  $B_m$  as entire set of node in steps 1 and 2 of Algorithm 1. Figure 4b shows that, with representative sampling, the Macro-F1 score is consistently higher, with a performance gap of up to 15%. Given that node classification on Citeseer is found to be highly sensitive to labeling noise [37], this result validates the effectiveness of representative sampling in improving the robustness of our query strategy. The results validate the effectiveness of representative sampling in our proposed method to increase the prediction robustness to label noise. Furthermore, we examine the effectiveness of informative selection in the proposed method in integrating node covariates for improving prediction performance. In the School dataset, we compare our method to one that removes node covariates during the query stage by setting  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{I}$ . Figure 4c illustrates that the prediction MSE for GPA is significantly lower when incorporating node covariates, thus distinguishing our node query strategy from existing graph signal recovery methods [10] that do not account for node covariates. As a result, the ablation study on real-world networks empirically validates the importance of incorporating both representative sampling and informative selection within the algorithm.

## 7 Conclusion

We propose an offline active learning framework for graph semi-supervised learning including both node query strategy and estimation method. The proposed method utilizes both network and node covariate information, which is effective under different network topologies and the existence of node-level noises. We provide theoretical guarantee for the proposed method in controlling generalization error. The theoretical results uncover a novel trade-off between informativeness and representativeness in active learning. We also demonstrate the effectiveness of our method on simulating network and competitiveness to state-of-art methods on benchmark datasets. A promising future direction is to extend our method to the online active learning setting, leveraging the accumulated node response information to further enhance query efficiency. Moreover, we can utilize the Lanczos method [31] or Chebyshev polynomial approximation [13] during the informative node selection step to further improve the scalability of the proposed method on large-scale graphs.

## References

- [1] Z. Allen-Zhu, Y. Li, A. Singh, and Y. Wang. Near optimal discrete optimization for experimental design: A regret minimization approach. *Mathematical Programming*, 2020.
- [2] B. Bamieh. A tutorial on matrix perturbation theory (using compact matrix notation). arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.05001, 2020.
- [3] A.-L. Barabasi and R. Albert. Emergence of scaling in random networks. *Science*, 1999.
- [4] J. Batson, D. A. Spielman, N. Srivastava, and S.-H. Teng. Spectral sparsification of graphs: theory and algorithms. *Communications of the ACM*, 2013.

- [5] Derrick Blakely, Jack Lanchantin, and Yanjun Qi. Time and space complexity of graph convolutional networks. *Accessed on: Dec, 31:2021*, 2021.
- [6] Hongyun Cai, Vincent W Zheng, and Kevin Chen-Chuan Chang. Active learning for graph embedding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.05085*, 2017.
- [7] Gautam Dasarathy, Robert Nowak, and Xiaojin Zhu. S2: An efficient graph based active learning algorithm with application to nonparametric classification. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 503–522. PMLR, 2015.
- [8] J. Du and C. X. Ling. Active learning with human-like noisy oracle. In *Proceedings of the 2010 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining(ICDM)*, 2010.
- [9] A. Gadde, A. Anis, and A. Ortega. Active semi-supervised learning using sampling theory for graph signals. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining (KDD)*, 2014.
- [10] Akshay Gadde, Aamir Anis, and Antonio Ortega. Active semi-supervised learning using sampling theory for graph signals. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 492–501, 2014.
- [11] M. Girvan and M. E. J. Newman. Community structure in social and biological networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 2002.
- [12] Gene H Golub and Charles F Van Loan. *Matrix computations*. JHU press, 2013.
- [13] T. N. Kipf and M. Welling. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2017.
- [14] M. Kutner, C. Nachtsheim, J. Neter, and W. Li. *Applied Linear Statistical Models*. McGraw-Hill/Irwin, 2004.

- [15] YT. Lee and H. Sun. Constructing linear-sized spectral sparsification in almost-linear time. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 47(6):2315–2336, 2018.
- [16] P. Di Lorenzo, S. Barbarossa, and P. Banelli. *Cooperative and Graph Signal Processing*. Academic Press, 2018.
- [17] DJ. Hsu M. Derezhinski, MKK. Warmuth. Leveraged volume sampling for linear regression. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2018.
- [18] K. Santosh M.-R. Bouguelia, S. Nowaczyk and A. Verikas. Agreeing to disagree: active learning with noisy labels without crowdsourcing. 2018.
- [19] J. Ma, Z. Ma, J. Chai, and Q. Mei. Partition-based active learning for graph neural networks. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023.
- [20] Jiaqi Ma, Ziqiao Ma, Joyce Chai, and Qiaozhu Mei. Partition-based active learning for graph neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.09391*, 2022.
- [21] T. Maehara NT. Hoang and T. Murata. Revisiting graph neural networks: Graph filtering perspective. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR)*, 2021.
- [22] F. Pukelsheim. *Optimal Design of Experiments (Classics in Applied Mathematics) (Classics in Applied Mathematics, 50)*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2018.
- [23] G. Puy, N. Tremblay, R. Gribonval, and P. Vandergheynst. Random sampling of bandlimited signals on graphs. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 2016.
- [24] Florence Regol, Soumyasundar Pal, Yingxue Zhang, and Mark Coates. Active learning on attributed graphs via graph cognizant logistic regression and preemptive query generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8041–8050. PMLR, 2020.



- [25] P. Ren, Y. Xiao, X. Chang, P.-Y. Huang, Z. Li, X. Chen, and X. Wang. A survey of deep active learning. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 2020.
- [26] J. M. F. Moura S. Chen, A. Sandryhaila and J. Kovačević. Signal recovery on graphs: Variation minimization. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 2016.
- [27] B. Settles. Active learning literature survey. Technical report, University of Wisconsin Madison, 2010.
- [28] D. I. Shuman, S. K. Narang, P. Frossard, A. Ortega, and P. Vandergheynst. The emerging field of signal processing on graphs: Extending highdimensional data analysis to networks and other irregular domains. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 2012.
- [29] Z. Song, Y. Zhang, and I. King. No change, no gain: Empowering graph neural networks with expected model change maximization for active learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2023.
- [30] Zixing Song, Yifei Zhang, and Irwin King. No change, no gain: empowering graph neural networks with expected model change maximization for active learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [31] A. Susnjara, N. Perraudin, D. Kressner, and P. Vandergheynst. Accelerated filtering on graphs using lanczos method. arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.04537, 2015.
- [32] Michael D Vose. A linear algorithm for generating random numbers with a given distribution. *IEEE Transactions on software engineering*, 17(9):972–975, 1991.
- [33] W. Wang and WN. Street. Modeling and maximizing influence diffusion in social networks for viral marketing. *Applied network science*, 2018.

- [34] F. Wu, A. H. S. Jr., T. Zhang, C. Fifty, T. Yu, and K. Q. Weinberger. Simplifying graph convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2019.
- [35] Zonghan Wu, Shirui Pan, Fengwen Chen, Guodong Long, Chengqi Zhang, and S Yu Philip. A comprehensive survey on graph neural networks. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 32(1):4–24, 2020.
- [36] A. Liu Y. Xu, X. Chen and C. Hu. A latency and coverage optimized data collection scheme for smart cities. In *New Advances in Identification, Information and Knowledge in the Internet of Things*, 2017.
- [37] W. Zhang, Y. Wang, Z. You, M. Cao, P. Huang, J. Shan, Z. Yang, and B. Cui. Rim: Reliable influence-based active learning on graphs. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2021.
- [38] W. Zhang, Y. Wang, Z. You, M. Cao, P. Huang, J. Shan, Z. Yang, and B. Cui. Information gain propagation: a new way to graph active learning with soft labels. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2022.
- [39] Wentao Zhang, Yexin Wang, Zhenbang You, Meng Cao, Ping Huang, Jiulong Shan, Zhi Yang, and Bin Cui. Rim: Reliable influence-based active learning on graphs. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:27978–27990, 2021.
- [40] Wentao Zhang, Yexin Wang, Zhenbang You, Meng Cao, Ping Huang, Jiulong Shan, Zhi Yang, and Bin Cui. Information gain propagation: a new way to graph active learning with soft labels. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.01093*, 2022.