

Improving Graph Neural Networks via Adversarial Robustness Evaluation

Yongyu Wang

JD Logistics, Beijing 101111, China
wangyongyu1@jd.com

Abstract. Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) are currently one of the most powerful types of neural network architectures. Their advantage lies in the ability to leverage both the graph topology, which represents the relationships between samples, and the features of the samples themselves. However, the given graph topology often contains noisy edges, and GNNs are vulnerable to noise in the graph structure. This issue remains unresolved. In this paper, we propose using adversarial robustness evaluation to select a small subset of robust nodes that are less affected by noise. We then only feed the features of these robust nodes, along with the KNN graph constructed from these nodes, into the GNN for classification. Additionally, we compute the centroids for each class. For the remaining non-robust nodes, we assign them to the class whose centroid is closest to them. Experimental results show that this method significantly improves the accuracy of GNNs.

1 Introduction

Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) have become one of the most powerful and widely adopted methods in the field of machine learning, especially for tasks involving graph-structured data. These networks have demonstrated remarkable capabilities in learning from both the structural information of the graph and the feature representations of the nodes. However, despite their success, GNNs are often vulnerable to the noise present in the graph topology. These noisy edges can significantly impair the performance of GNNs, leading to reduced classification accuracy and less meaningful learned representations.

In this paper, we propose a novel approach that focuses on identifying a small subset of robust nodes—nodes that exhibit strong resilience to noise. We apply an adversarial robustness evaluation method to assess and select these robust nodes. Only the features of these selected nodes, along with a KNN graph constructed from them, are used for training the GNN. Additionally, we compute the centroids of each class based on the robust nodes. For the remaining non-robust nodes, we classify them based on the closest class centroid. This approach not only improves the classification accuracy of GNNs but also reduces computational costs, as it minimizes the number of nodes that need to be processed. Experimental results demonstrate that our method significantly enhances GNN performance, providing a promising direction for building more noise-resilient GNN models.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Adversarial attack and defense

Adversarial attacks involve crafting inputs designed to deceive machine learning models, often by introducing subtle perturbations to the data, known as adversarial examples [7, 8]. These attacks exploit the vulnerability of models to small, strategically added noise, leading to incorrect predictions. Research has shown that many machine learning models, including deep networks, are highly susceptible to such attacks [9–11].

To counteract adversarial attacks, various defense strategies have been proposed. These defenses can generally be grouped into two categories: reactive and proactive defenses. Reactive defenses aim to identify adversarial examples during the model’s input phase, detecting and mitigating their influence before they affect the model’s output [12–14]. On the other hand, proactive defenses focus on improving the inherent robustness of the model, making it more resistant to adversarial perturbations. These techniques work by either modifying the model’s architecture or training process to better handle adversarial inputs, as seen in approaches such as [15, 16].

2.2 Graph Neural Networks (GNNs)

Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) are deep learning models designed to process graph-structured data. A graph $G = (V, E)$ consists of nodes V and edges E , where edges represent relationships between nodes. GNNs update node features by aggregating information from their neighbors in each layer, enabling the model to capture complex dependencies in the graph.

Mathematically, a GNN layer can be expressed as:

$$h_i^{(l+1)} = \sigma \left(W^{(l)} h_i^{(l)} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} W^{(l)} h_j^{(l)} \right)$$

where $h_i^{(l)}$ is the feature vector of node i at layer l , $\mathcal{N}(i)$ denotes the neighbors of node i , and $W^{(l)}$ is a learnable weight matrix. GNNs have been applied to tasks such as node classification, graph classification, link prediction, and graph generation.

3 Method

3.1 Adversarial Attacks in Graph-Based Machine Learning Models

Machine learning models aim to map inputs to outputs by transforming feature representations. For example, deep neural networks apply transformations through multiple layers of processing. Similarly, algorithms such as Support Vector Machines (SVM) and Support Vector Clustering (SVC) utilize kernel functions to project data into higher-dimensional spaces [22]. Adversarial attacks

aim to deceive these models by manipulating the input space to mislead the transformation process.

In graph-based machine learning models, the graph structure itself plays a critical role, as it encodes the relationships between data points. These relationships influence how the model learns and maps input data to predictions. Thus, adversarial attacks on graph-based models can target the graph structure, disrupting the information flow and adversely affecting the model’s performance.

For instance, consider the scenario where a "perfect" graph exists as the ground truth. Any deviations between the actual graph constructed by a learning algorithm and this ideal graph could be seen as adversarial perturbations. This motivates the need to adopt adversarial defense strategies to address noisy edges, which can be viewed as perturbations in the graph structure.

3.2 Proactive Defense Strategy: Enhancing Node Resilience to Noisy Edges

In graph-based learning, managing noisy edges has been the traditional focus of adversarial defenses [2, 4]. However, the ideal graph structure is often unknown, and directly addressing noisy edges has proven challenging. In this work, we propose an alternative approach by focusing on node-level resilience to noisy edges.

Graph-based algorithms, including Graph Neural Networks (GNNs), perform tasks such as classification or prediction by leveraging both node features and edge relationships. These relationships are crucial, as they allow the model to learn complex dependencies between nodes. However, erroneous or redundant edges can severely degrade performance by introducing noise into the graph.

By enhancing the resilience of nodes to noisy edges, we aim to isolate and capitalize on the beneficial structural information in the graph while minimizing the impact of harmful edges. In particular, we propose a strategy that focuses on improving the robustness of nodes, enabling the model to ignore detrimental edges and use the most informative parts of the graph for more accurate predictions. This approach allows GNNs to maintain their performance despite the presence of noisy edges, leading to more reliable and efficient graph-based learning outcomes.

3.3 Adversarial Robustness Evaluation for GNNs

To identify nodes with strong resilience to noisy edges in the context of Graph Neural Networks (GNNs), we first evaluate the robustness of data points by examining the distortion between the input graph and the output graph after the GNN transformation.

Inspired by [17], and building on the work of [18], we propose a method to assess the adversarial robustness of nodes in a GNN framework using the generalized Courant-Fischer theorem [19]. In the following steps, we evaluate each node’s robustness:

- Given a dataset D with N samples $x_1, \dots, x_N \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and the number of clusters k , we are provided with an input graph G_{input} that directly represents the relationships between the data points. The feature matrix of the dataset, denoted as $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d}$, and the graph G_{input} are fed into a Graph Neural Network (GNN). The GNN then processes both the features and the graph structure to generate new feature representations for each data point.
- Construct a KNN graph based on the new representations generated by the GNN, denoted as G_{output} .
- Using the generalized Courant-Fischer theorem [19], we compute the eigenpairs of the matrix $L_{\text{output}}^+ L_{\text{input}}$ to estimate the robustness of each node. Here, L_{output}^+ represents the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse of the graph Laplacian of G_{output} , and L_{input} corresponds to the graph Laplacian of the original graph G_{input} . To proceed, we construct the eigensubspace matrix $\mathbf{V}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times k}$:

$$\mathbf{V}_k = [\mathbf{v}_1 \sqrt{\lambda_1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k \sqrt{\lambda_k}], \quad (1)$$

where $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_k$ are the top k eigenvalues of the matrix $L_{\text{output}}^+ L_{\text{input}}$, and $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k$ are the corresponding eigenvectors.

- Next, we calculate the spade score for each node i to evaluate its vulnerability to adversarial perturbations. The spade score is computed using the following formula [18]:

$$\text{spade}(i) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}(i)|} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \|\mathbf{V}_k^\top \mathbf{e}_{i,j}\|_2^2, \quad (2)$$

where $j \in \mathcal{N}(i)$ indicates the j -th neighbor of node i in G_{input} , and $\mathcal{N}(i)$ denotes the set of neighbors of node i . The vector $\mathbf{e}_{i,j} = \mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_j$ is the difference between the standard basis vectors for nodes i and j , and $\mathbf{e}_o \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is the standard basis vector where the i -th element is 1, and all other elements are 0. A larger spade score suggests a higher susceptibility of node i to adversarial attacks.

The above procedure is computationally efficient: constructing the k -NN graph can be performed in $O(|n| \log |n|)$ time [26], and the spade score can be computed in nearly-linear time with the aid of fast Laplacian solvers [28].

3.4 Multi-Level Algorithm Framework Using Robust Node Sets in GNNs

After computing the spade scores for all nodes, we sort the nodes in ascending order of their scores. We then select a small subset of nodes with the lowest spade scores, corresponding to the most robust nodes, to form a robust node set.

Once we have identified the robust node set, we apply the GNN model to perform learning tasks, focusing exclusively on these robust nodes. This approach aims to improve performance by leveraging only the most resilient structural relationships. For example, for the node classification task, the procedure is as follows:

- We use the robust node set to construct a new graph representation and apply the GNN on this subgraph to perform node classification, with the goal of grouping the robust nodes into k classes.
- For each of the k classes, we calculate its centroid.
- For each non-robust node, we calculate its distance to the centroid of each class and assign it to the class whose centroid is closest to it.

4 Experiment

We use the Cora dataset and GCN to validate the effectiveness. The table below lists the results of directly applying GCN for classification on Cora, as well as the results of selecting the top 40% most robust nodes.

| Robust Node Selection Percentage | Accuracy |
|---|-----------------|
| Orig | 0.8040 |
| 40% | 0.9106 |

Table 1: Performance comparison between directly applying GCN and selecting the top 40% most robust nodes on the Cora dataset.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we examine the impact of noisy edges in graph-based models from the perspective of adversarial robustness. Building upon this framework, we propose a method that focuses on identifying and leveraging robust nodes to mitigate the negative effects of noisy edges. By evaluating adversarial robustness, we are able to enhance the resilience of graph neural networks (GNNs) against these disturbances. Our experimental results on real-world datasets demonstrate that the proposed approach significantly improves the performance of GNNs, outperforming state-of-the-art methods in handling noisy edges and enhancing overall model robustness and accuracy.

References

1. U. Von Luxburg, “A tutorial on spectral clustering,” *Statistics and computing*, vol. 17, pp. 395–416, 2007.
2. V. Premachandran and R. Kakarala, “Consensus of k-nns for robust neighborhood selection on graph-based manifolds,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2013, pp. 1594–1601.
3. S. T. Roweis and L. K. Saul, “Nonlinear dimensionality reduction by locally linear embedding,” *science*, vol. 290, no. 5500, pp. 2323–2326, 2000.
4. Y. Wang and Z. Feng, “Towards scalable spectral clustering via spectrum-preserving sparsification,” in *33rd British Machine Vision Conference 2022, BMVC 2022, London, UK, November 21-24, 2022*. BMVA Press, 2022.
5. X. Yang, L. Prasad, and L. J. Latecki, “Affinity learning with diffusion on tensor product graph,” *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 28–38, 2012.
6. B. Sarwar, G. Karypis, J. Konstan, and J. Riedl, “Item-based collaborative filtering recommendation algorithms,” in *Proceedings of the 10th international conference on World Wide Web*, 2001, pp. 285–295.
7. I. Goodfellow, P. McDaniel, and N. Papernot, “Making machine learning robust against adversarial inputs,” *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 61, no. 7, pp. 56–66, 2018.
8. A. Fawzi, O. Fawzi, and P. Frossard, “Analysis of classifiers’ robustness to adversarial perturbations,” *Machine learning*, vol. 107, no. 3, pp. 481–508, 2018.
9. C. Szegedy, W. Zaremba, I. Sutskever, J. Bruna, D. Erhan, I. Goodfellow, and R. Fergus, “Intriguing properties of neural networks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6199*, 2013.
10. A. Nguyen, J. Yosinski, and J. Clune, “Deep neural networks are easily fooled: High confidence predictions for unrecognizable images,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2015, pp. 427–436.
11. S.-M. Moosavi-Dezfooli, A. Fawzi, and P. Frossard, “Deepfool: a simple and accurate method to fool deep neural networks,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2016, pp. 2574–2582.
12. R. Feinman, R. R. Curtin, S. Shintre, and A. B. Gardner, “Detecting adversarial samples from artifacts,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.00410*, 2017.
13. J. H. Metzen, T. Genewein, V. Fischer, and B. Bischoff, “On detecting adversarial perturbations,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.04267*, 2017.
14. P. Yang, J. Chen, C.-J. Hsieh, J.-L. Wang, and M. Jordan, “MI-loo: Detecting adversarial examples with feature attribution,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 34, no. 04, 2020, pp. 6639–6647.
15. C. Agarwal, A. Nguyen, and D. Schonfeld, “Improving robustness to adversarial examples by encouraging discriminative features,” in *2019 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 3801–3505.
16. X. Liu, Y. Li, C. Wu, and C.-J. Hsieh, “Adv-bnn: Improved adversarial defense through robust bayesian neural network,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.01279*, 2018.
17. T.-W. Weng, H. Zhang, P.-Y. Chen, J. Yi, D. Su, Y. Gao, C.-J. Hsieh, and L. Daniel, “Evaluating the robustness of neural networks: An extreme value theory approach,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.10578*, 2018.
18. W. Cheng, C. Deng, Z. Zhao, Y. Cai, Z. Zhang, and Z. Feng, “Spade: A spectral method for black-box adversarial robustness evaluation,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 1814–1824.

19. D. Spielman, "Spectral graph theory," *Combinatorial scientific computing*, vol. 18, p. 18, 2012.
20. J. Shi and J. Malik, "Normalized cuts and image segmentation," *IEEE Transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 22, no. 8, pp. 888–905, 2000.
21. A. Ng, M. Jordan, and Y. Weiss, "On spectral clustering: Analysis and an algorithm," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 14, 2001.
22. A. Ben-Hur, D. Horn, H. T. Siegelmann, and V. Vapnik, "Support vector clustering," *Journal of machine learning research*, vol. 2, no. Dec, pp. 125–137, 2001.
23. C. H. Papadimitriou and K. Steiglitz, *Combinatorial optimization: algorithms and complexity*. Courier Corporation, 1998.
24. A. Strehl and J. Ghosh, "Cluster ensembles—a knowledge reuse framework for combining multiple partitions," *Journal of machine learning research*, vol. 3, no. Dec, pp. 583–617, 2002.
25. A. Szlam and X. Bresson, "A total variation-based graph clustering algorithm for cheeger ratio cuts," *UCLA Cam Report*, pp. 09–68, 2009.
26. Y. A. Malkov and D. A. Yashunin, "Efficient and robust approximate nearest neighbor search using hierarchical navigable small world graphs," *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 824–836, 2018.
27. M. K. Pakhira, "A linear time-complexity k-means algorithm using cluster shifting," in *2014 international conference on computational intelligence and communication networks*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 1047–1051.
28. R. Kyng and S. Sachdeva, "Approximate gaussian elimination for laplacians-fast, sparse, and simple," in *2016 IEEE 57th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 573–582.