

ERGNN: Spectral Graph Neural Network with Explicitly-optimized Rational Graph Filters

Guoming Li
Dept. of machine learning
MBZUAI
Abu Dhabi, UAE
Paskardli@outlook.com

Jian Yang
Institute of automation
Chinese Academy of Sciences
Beijing, China
jianyang0227@gmail.com

Shangsong Liang[†]
MBZUAI, Abu Dhabi, UAE
Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, China
Guangzhou, China
liangshangsong@gmail.com

Abstract—Approximation-based spectral graph neural networks, which construct graph filters with function approximation, have shown substantial performance in graph learning tasks. Despite their great success, existing works primarily employ polynomial approximation to construct the filters, whereas another superior option, namely ratiom approximation, remains under-explored. Although a handful of prior works have attempted to deploy the rational approximation, their implementations often involve intensive computational demands or still resort to polynomial approximations, hindering full potential of the rational graph filters. To address the issues, this paper introduces ERGNN, a novel spectral GNN with explicitly-optimized rational filter. ERGNN adopts a unique two-step framework that sequentially applies the numerator filter and the denominator filter to the input signals, thus streamlining the model paradigm while enabling explicit optimization of both numerator and denominator of the rational filter. Extensive experiments validate the superiority of ERGNN over state-of-the-art methods, establishing it as a practical solution for deploying rational-based GNNs.

Index Terms—Spectral graph neural networks, Graph filters, Rational approximation.

I. INTRODUCTION

Spectral graph neural networks (GNNs) is a distinct branch of GNNs that treat graph data as signals on graph and manipulate these signals in the spectral domain using crucial graph filters [1]. Approximation-based ones, which construct graph filters with function approximation, are routinely adopted in practice for their substantial performances in graph learning tasks [2]–[5]. Prior studies have revealed that GNNs benefit from more accurate filter approximations, prompting the introduction of diverse approximation techniques to build more potent approximation-based GNNs [3]–[10].

However, prior research primarily employs *polynomial approximation* to construct the graph filters [3]–[8], [10]. In contrast, *rational approximation*, which has provable superiority over polynomials in approximating complex functions [11], [12], has not yet received sufficient attention. While a few prior works have attempted to deploy rational approximation, their implementations either involve intensive computation costs [13] or still resort to polynomials [2], hindering practical application and full potential of the rational graph filters.

To address these concerns, we propose ERGNN (Explicitly-optimized Rational Graph Neural Network). ERGNN employs a unique two-step framework that sequentially applies the numerator filter and the denominator filter to the input signals. Such framework ensures an efficient and effective implementation of the rational graph filter, while also enabling explicit optimization of the filter’s numerator and denominator, offering notable flexibility in filter construction. In summary, our contributions can be listed below:

- We propose ERGNN with a streamlined framework that avoids intricate computations required by prior methods and enables explicit optimization of the rational graph filter, offering a practical solution for deploying the rational-based GNNs.
- We provide an in-depth analysis of ERGNN, guaranteeing the efficacy of the rational graph filter implemented through the novel two-step framework.
- We conduct extensive experiments to validate the superiority of our ERGNN over state-of-the-art methods. The compelling results confirm the accuracy of our analysis and lay the groundwork for future research.

II. BACKGROUND AND PRELIMINARIES

Let \mathcal{G} be an undirected unweighted graph with adjacency matrix \mathbf{A} and normalized graph Laplacian \mathbf{L} . We denote $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{U} \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \mathbf{U}^T$ be eigendecomposition of \mathbf{L} , with \mathbf{U} , $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ being the eigenvectors and eigenvalues of \mathbf{L} , respectively.

A. Spectral GNNs

The core of spectral GNNs is to perform filtering on graph signals by leveraging pivotal graph filters. To be specific, given a graph signal $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ on \mathcal{G} , the filtering operation is given by $f \star \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{U} \text{diag}(f(\boldsymbol{\lambda})) \mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{x}$, where $f(\cdot)$ is the graph filter and \star acts as filtering. In practical scenarios, the graph signals operated by spectral GNNs are mostly of the matrix-type. Thus, we let $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d}$ be the graph signals, the spectral GNNs are formulated as follows:

$$\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{U} \text{diag}(f(\boldsymbol{\lambda})) \mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{X}, \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{Z} denotes the output of spectral GNNs. In this paper, \mathbf{Z} is considered as label prediction of nodes.

[†] Corresponding author.




Fig. 1. Overall framework of ERGNN.

Approximation-based approaches. In practice, spectral GNNs are predominantly built upon function approximation techniques. These approximation-based approaches typically formulate $f(\cdot)$ with polynomial approximations [15]–[17] or rational approximation [11], [12], [18]–[20], resulting in Eq. 1 being derived into the following forms:

$$\text{Polynomial-based : } \mathbf{Z} = \sum_{k=0}^K \gamma_k \mathbf{L}^k \mathbf{X}, \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Rational-based : } \mathbf{Z} = \frac{\sum_{k_1=0}^{K_1} \alpha_{k_1} \mathbf{L}^{k_1}}{\sum_{k_2=0}^{K_2} \beta_{k_2} \mathbf{L}^{k_2}} \mathbf{X}. \quad (3)$$

Here, α , β and γ are designated as learnable parameters, and K_1 is generally equal to K_2 . As shown with the equations, in contrast to polynomial-based methods that involve only matrix addition and multiplication, rational-based methods require further computation-intensive matrix inversion. This makes existing proposals either involve intensive computations [13] or resort to polynomial approximations [2], impeding the substantial potential of rational graph filters.

B. Augmented MLPs as Substitutions of GNNs

Recent attempts to integrate graph information into Multi-layer Perceptrons (MLPs) have led to the creation of *graph-augmented MLPs*. These methods use only augmented node features as input and employ a pure MLP model to generate output embeddings, yet they achieve performance comparable to sophisticated GNNs. Existing proposals are categorized into regularization-based and distillation-based methods. **Regularization-based methods** train an MLP encoder via combining supervised loss with a regularization that accounts for the graph structure [21], [22]; **Distillation-based methods** leverage KL-divergence loss to distill the predictions of a GNN teacher into an MLP student, with the objective of aligning the MLP’s predictions with those of the GNN teacher [23], [24].

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Model Architecture of ERGNN

Initially, let \mathbf{X} be the raw node feature of \mathcal{G} , drawing from prior proposals on linear spectral GNNs [4], [5], we first

employ a linear transformation on \mathbf{X} :

$$\mathbf{Z}^{(0)} = \mathbf{X} \mathbf{W} + \mathbf{b}. \quad (4)$$

This $\mathbf{Z}^{(0)}$ will serve as the input signals of the unique two-step framework. Next, as indicated in Eq. 3, the filtering operation of the rational graph filter is equivalent to the sequential application of numerator filter and denominator filter. This motivates our design of ERGNN as a two-step filtering:

Step①: Numerator filtering. Evidently, the numerator filtering can be achieved with a polynomial-based graph filter. We further generalize the $\sum_{k_1=0}^{K_1} \alpha_{k_1} \mathbf{L}^{k_1}$ to a unified polynomial approximation paradigm, leading to the following formulation for numerator filtering:

$$\mathbf{Z}^{(1)} = \sum_{k_1=0}^{K_1} \alpha_{k_1} \mathbf{T}_{k_1}(\mathbf{L}) \mathbf{Z}^{(0)}, \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{T}_{k_1}(\cdot)$ denotes the k_1 -order polynomial basis.

Step②: MLP-based denominator filtering. To circumvent the matrix inversion operation inherent in denominator filtering, inspired by graph-augmented MLPs, we opt for an MLP to substitute the denominator graph filter, as shown below:

$$\mathbf{Z}^{(2)} = \text{MLP}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{Z}^{(1)}). \quad (6)$$

The $\mathbf{Z}^{(2)}$ will serve as the final output of the ERGNN. While $\text{MLP}_{\mathcal{G}}(\cdot)$ does not reflect the form of the denominator filter, a unique *regularization* will be introduced into the model optimization to shape this MLP into the structure of a polynomial filter. More discussions are detailed in Section III-B.

B. Optimization Target

Suppose \mathbf{Y} be the true node label. To ensure the proper construction of the rational graph filter in ERGNN and its performance on downstream tasks, we propose to optimize an innovative loss function \mathcal{L} defined as below:

$$\mathcal{L} = \eta \mathcal{L}_{\text{nume}} + \xi \mathcal{L}_{\text{deno}} + \mathcal{L}_r \quad (7)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \mathcal{L}_{\text{nume}} = \text{CE}(\mathbf{Z}^{(1)}, \mathbf{Y}) \quad (8)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{deno}} = \text{CE}(\mathbf{Z}^{(2)}, \mathbf{Y}) \quad (9)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_r = \text{CE}\left(\mathbf{Z}^{(1)}, \sum_{k_2=0}^{K_2} \beta_{k_2} \mathbf{T}_{k_2}(\mathbf{L}) \mathbf{Z}^{(2)}\right), \quad (10)$$

TABLE I
EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS ON HOMOPHILIC AND HETEROPHILIC DATASETS: MEAN (%) \pm STANDARD DEVIATION. Δ_{\uparrow} DENOTES THE IMPROVEMENT OF ERGNN RELATIVE TO THE RUNNER-UP.

Method	Cora	Cite.	Pubm.	Comp.	Photo	Actor	-empire	Tolo.	-ratings	Ques.
GCN [25]	87.11 \pm 0.75	77.56 \pm 0.69	87.05 \pm 0.62	86.25 \pm 0.77	88.54 \pm 0.55	35.12 \pm 1.61	55.78 \pm 0.43	76.65 \pm 0.87	47.38 \pm 0.47	71.55 \pm 0.71
GCNII [26]	88.55 \pm 0.62	76.83 \pm 0.71	87.86 \pm 0.77	89.13 \pm 0.53	90.68 \pm 0.47	37.81 \pm 0.82	66.25 \pm 0.56	75.41 \pm 0.44	43.62 \pm 0.52	70.71 \pm 0.83
H2GCN [27]	88.24 \pm 0.42	75.93 \pm 0.89	88.06 \pm 0.48	89.55 \pm 0.57	90.13 \pm 0.52	38.54 \pm 0.75	70.73 \pm 0.81	77.62 \pm 0.59	46.52 \pm 0.70	71.19 \pm 0.57
APPNP [28]	87.79 \pm 1.32	77.62 \pm 1.63	88.46 \pm 0.82	87.11 \pm 0.93	89.43 \pm 0.63	37.66 \pm 1.04	72.74 \pm 0.63	73.92 \pm 0.60	48.41 \pm 0.34	72.08 \pm 0.91
Nodeformer [29]	88.21 \pm 0.88	76.72 \pm 0.85	88.10 \pm 0.67	89.28 \pm 0.63	90.71 \pm 0.48	38.81 \pm 0.73	73.42 \pm 0.63	79.47 \pm 0.48	45.48 \pm 0.50	68.51 \pm 0.96
GLOGNN [30]	88.76 \pm 0.62	78.18 \pm 0.52	88.68 \pm 0.44	90.63 \pm 0.28	94.19 \pm 0.71	39.29 \pm 1.26	67.39 \pm 0.34	79.08 \pm 0.72	49.88 \pm 0.44	74.12 \pm 0.87
ChebNet [31]	86.79 \pm 1.55	76.78 \pm 1.92	85.43 \pm 0.63	89.77 \pm 1.22	91.55 \pm 1.23	33.88 \pm 1.21	63.69 \pm 0.33	71.22 \pm 0.53	38.19 \pm 0.41	65.13 \pm 1.25
GPRGNN [6]	88.75 \pm 1.07	78.15 \pm 1.78	88.76 \pm 0.82	90.05 \pm 0.68	93.49 \pm 0.59	40.16 \pm 0.87	73.44 \pm 0.35	75.12 \pm 0.64	49.56 \pm 0.47	73.82 \pm 1.08
BernNet [3]	88.49 \pm 1.22	78.03 \pm 1.32	89.47 \pm 0.47	90.12 \pm 0.72	92.51 \pm 0.71	40.57 \pm 0.93	72.66 \pm 0.81	74.71 \pm 0.63	48.73 \pm 0.43	73.65 \pm 1.14
CayleyNet [13]	88.13 \pm 1.21	77.25 \pm 1.78	87.81 \pm 0.91	88.58 \pm 0.60	91.69 \pm 0.68	34.38 \pm 1.25	63.18 \pm 0.45	72.53 \pm 1.02	41.25 \pm 0.88	63.12 \pm 0.53
ARMA [2]	88.69 \pm 1.03	78.07 \pm 1.53	88.30 \pm 0.81	87.81 \pm 0.54	93.13 \pm 0.47	38.11 \pm 1.31	68.28 \pm 0.73	73.82 \pm 0.73	42.09 \pm 0.62	69.24 \pm 0.48
JacobiConv [4]	89.19 \pm 1.08	78.33 \pm 1.15	89.19 \pm 0.58	90.19 \pm 0.59	94.88 \pm 0.32	40.64 \pm 1.17	74.35 \pm 0.65	78.41 \pm 0.38	48.56 \pm 0.22	73.78 \pm 0.75
ChebNetII [7]	88.72 \pm 0.76	78.47 \pm 1.12	88.75 \pm 0.89	90.15 \pm 0.73	94.30 \pm 0.54	41.03 \pm 1.28	74.58 \pm 0.35	79.02 \pm 0.60	49.43 \pm 0.41	73.93 \pm 0.69
OptBasis [10]	88.76 \pm 1.03	78.38 \pm 1.18	89.35 \pm 0.63	90.27 \pm 1.03	94.71 \pm 0.33	41.11 \pm 0.75	74.29 \pm 0.33	79.25 \pm 0.53	49.48 \pm 0.36	74.16 \pm 0.75
PCNet [5]	89.23 \pm 0.82	78.22 \pm 0.91	87.72 \pm 0.55	90.02 \pm 0.67	94.54 \pm 0.82	40.39 \pm 0.73	73.17 \pm 0.51	77.63 \pm 0.41	48.77 \pm 0.57	73.97 \pm 0.70
ERGNN(ours)	90.41\pm1.16	79.25\pm0.73	91.11\pm0.65	93.12\pm0.55	96.87\pm0.48	43.05\pm0.62	77.67\pm0.81	82.88\pm0.58	53.69\pm0.54	78.39\pm0.70
Δ_{\uparrow}	1.18%	0.78%	1.64%	2.49%	1.99%	1.94%	3.09%	3.22%	3.81%	4.23%

where η and ξ are trade-off parameters, and $\text{CE}(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes cross-entropy loss. Both $\mathcal{L}_{\text{nume}}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{deno}}$ measure the prediction error of the outputs from the two filtering operations. The regularization term \mathcal{L}_r ensures the equivalence of $\text{MLP}_G(\mathcal{Z}^{(1)})$ with a polynomial denominator filtering. The overall framework of ERGNN is depicted in Figure 1. In the following section, we will provide in-depth theoretical explanation on the rationale and validity of these loss terms.

IV. THEORETICAL INSIGHTS

We now provide in-depth theoretical analysis to substantiate the soundness and effectiveness of our ERGNN. To begin with, as noted in previous studies [3]–[7], [10], the objective of approximation-based spectral GNNs is to use the approximate construction $f(\lambda)$ to approximate the target (optimal) filter $f^*(\lambda)$, with better approximations leading to superior model performance of spectral GNNs. Building on this insight, we examine the approximation capability of the rational graph filter in ERGNN compared to polynomial graph filters. Specially, we introduce Appel’s method on best-fit rational approximation [32], [33], as follows:

Lemma 1. (Restatement of Appel’s method [32]) *Let decay-type function $F(x)$ be the approximation target. Given a fixed function $P(x)$, we can derive a polynomial function $Q(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i x^i$ with coefficients w_i computed via Appel’s algorithm, resulting in $\frac{P(x)}{Q(x)}$ as a rational approximation of $F(x)$ that satisfies the Chebyshev best-fit [15].*

Lemma 1 indicates that even with a fixed numerator function, we can obtain the Chebyshev best-fit rational approximation by adjusting only the denominator polynomial. This insight leads us to propose the following theorem:

Theorem 1. *Let $f^*(\lambda)$ be the target (optimal) filter we aim to approximate, and let $\sum_{k_1=0}^{K_1} \alpha_{k_1}^* T_{k_1}(\lambda)$ be the optimal approximation to $f^*(\lambda)$ using polynomial T. By considering*

a rational graph filter of the form $\frac{\sum_{k_1=0}^{K_1} \alpha_{k_1}^ T_{k_1}(\lambda)}{\sum_{k_2=0}^{K_2} \beta_{k_2} T_{k_2}(\lambda)}$, we can achieve a rational graph filter that satisfies the Chebyshev best-fit by adjusting (learning) the parameters β .*

The theorem is evidently valid. To be specific, since λ lies within $[0, 2]$, the approximation $f(\lambda)$ is equivalent to a decay-type function that approaches 0 at infinity, thus making Lemma 1 applicable to the graph filters.

The theorem above offers a theoretical guarantee for the two-step framework and optimization strategy of ERGNN. In detail, ERGNN learns the optimal numerator filter via the loss $\mathcal{L}_{\text{nume}}$ and also optimizes the denominator filter with the fixed numerator using $\mathcal{L}_{\text{deno}}$ and \mathcal{L}_r , resulting in the rational graph filter that satisfies the Chebyshev best-fit. Furthermore, since the obtained numerator filter is the optimal polynomial approximation to the target $f^*(\lambda)$, the rational filter provably offers a better approximation to $f^*(\lambda)$ than polynomial ones.

V. EMPIRICAL STUDIES

We now perform extensive experiments to showcase the superior efficacy of ERGNN against state-of-the-art baselines.

A. Node Classification on Real-world Graphs

Experimental settings. We perform routine node classification experiments on 10 benchmark datasets, including 5 *homophilic* datasets: Cora, CiteSeer and PubMed [35], Computers and Photo [36]; and 5 *heterophilic* datasets: Actor [37], Roman-empire, Tolokers, Amazon-ratings and Questions [38]. The selected datasets deviate from the routine choices that have been flagged for data-leakage issues, as proven by [38]. We adopt the routine 60%/20%/20% split ratio for Actor and homophilic datasets following [3]–[5], [7], [10], and use 50%/25%/25% ratio for the remaining datasets following [38]. We evaluate each model on 10 pre-generated splits of each dataset and use Adam optimizer [39] for model training, with early stopping 250 and maximum epochs 2000.

TABLE II

EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS ON LARGE GRAPHS: MEAN (%) \pm STANDARD DEVIATION. OOM DENOTES ‘‘OUT OF MEMORY’’. COMPLEXITY ON PAPERS100M CONSISTS OF: AVERAGE TRAINING TIME PER EPOCH (SECOND) / TOTAL TRAINING TIME (HOURS) / NUMBER OF PARAMETERS (KILO).

Method	arxiv	products	papers100M	Penn94	Genius	Gamers	Complexity on papers100M
GCN [25]	71.74 \pm 0.33	75.64 \pm 0.27	OOM	82.47 \pm 0.36	87.42 \pm 0.34	62.18 \pm 0.32	-
Nodeformer [29]	65.08 \pm 0.61	73.66 \pm 0.52	OOM	83.71 \pm 0.34	89.38 \pm 0.48	63.18 \pm 0.58	-
LINKX [34]	67.23 \pm 0.34	77.52 \pm 0.70	OOM	85.15 \pm 0.17	90.69 \pm 0.44	66.48 \pm 0.32	-
GloGNN [30]	72.11 \pm 0.54	81.51 \pm 0.43	66.73 \pm 0.41	85.54 \pm 0.31	90.72 \pm 0.26	66.52 \pm 0.42	17.8 / 2.73 / 4, 495K
GPRGNN [6]	71.96 \pm 0.47	80.75 \pm 0.35	65.66 \pm 0.38	83.87 \pm 0.65	90.07 \pm 0.43	63.18 \pm 0.61	15.1 / 2.70 / 4, 495K
BernNet [3]	71.73 \pm 0.24	79.67 \pm 0.36	65.12 \pm 0.32	84.18 \pm 0.52	89.69 \pm 0.52	62.93 \pm 0.38	15.3 / 2.54 / 4, 495K
JacobiConv [4]	72.18 \pm 0.21	81.75 \pm 0.42	64.28 \pm 0.24	84.56 \pm 0.42	90.63 \pm 0.35	65.23 \pm 0.37	9.3 / 1.78 / 4, 700
ChebNetII [7]	72.33 \pm 0.34	81.07 \pm 0.36	67.21 \pm 0.33	85.22 \pm 0.36	90.47 \pm 0.28	65.71 \pm 0.24	15.5 / 2.38 / 4, 495K
OptBasis [10]	72.26 \pm 0.42	81.15 \pm 0.33	66.82 \pm 0.36	84.82 \pm 0.60	90.91 \pm 0.24	65.86 \pm 0.44	16.1 / 2.62 / 4, 495K
PCNet [5]	72.08 \pm 0.21	82.15 \pm 0.32	65.63 \pm 0.27	83.75 \pm 0.40	90.33 \pm 0.45	65.28 \pm 0.58	15.8 / 2.64 / 4, 495K
ERGNN(ours)	73.29\pm0.38	83.37\pm0.42	69.08\pm0.47	86.91\pm0.50	92.25\pm0.32	67.98\pm0.39	11.8 / 2.35 / 4, 495K
Δ_{\uparrow}	0.96%	1.22%	1.87%	1.37%	1.34%	1.46%	-

Baseline models include 9 spectral GNNs and 6 non-spectral methods, ensuring extensive coverage of baselines. For our ERGNN, we use Chebyshev interpolation [40] and set both K_1 and K_2 to 10 following ChebNetII [7]. We set MLP $_G$ to be a 2-layer MLP with 64 hidden units. Learning rate, weight decay and dropout are set within same search range as other baselines [3]–[5], [7], [10].

Results and analysis. We report the results in Table I, with the best performance highlighted in **bold**, and the runner-up underlined. We observe that our ERGNN consistently outperforms all baselines across both homophilic and heterophilic datasets, with performance gains over the runner-up methods reaching up to 4.23%. This not only underscores the superiority of our proposed approach but also serves as empirical validation of the correctness of our analysis.

B. Evaluating Scalability on Large Graphs

Experimental settings. We assess the scalability of our ERGNN through experiments on large graphs, including 3 homophilic graphs: papers100M, products and arxiv [41]; and 3 heterophilic graphs: Penn94, Genius and Gamers [34]. We generate 5 random splits for each dataset using the partitions suggested in [34], [41] and apply batch training.

For ERGNN, we search K_1 ($= K_2$) over $\{4, 6, 8, 10, 12\}$, and optimize MLP $_G$ with number of layers on $\{2, 3\}$ and hidden units among $\{128, 256, 512, 1024, 2048\}$.

Results and analysis. As outlined in Table II, our ERGNN outperforms all baselines across various large datasets, showcasing notable enhancements compared to the runner-up results (up to a remarkable 1.87% increase). Moreover, as evidenced by the model complexity evaluation on papers100M, ERGNN surpasses most baselines in both computational and parameter complexity. These results underscore the exceptional prowess of ERGNN in effectively handling large-scale datasets characterized by intricate patterns, validating the outstanding scalability of our proposal.

C. Learning Graph Filters from Signals

Experimental settings. Following previous studies [3], [4], [10], we assess the filter approximation ability of ERGNN through experiments of learning 5 graph filters (low: $e^{-10\lambda^2}$,

TABLE III

AVERAGE SQUARED ERROR ACROSS 5 GRAPH FILTERS: LOWER INDICATES BETTER PERFORMANCE.

	Low	High	Band	Reject	Comb
ARMA	1.8478	1.8632	7.6922	8.2732	15.1214
GPRGNN	0.4169	0.0943	3.5121	3.7917	4.6549
BernNet	0.0314	0.0113	0.0411	0.9313	0.9982
PCNet	0.0076	0.0054	0.0291	0.0371	0.4426
ChebNetII	0.0008	0.0015	0.0255	0.0173	0.3761
JacobiConv	0.0003	0.0011	0.0213	0.0156	0.2933
OptBasis	0.0002	0.0009	0.0227	0.0148	0.2976
ERGNN	0.0000	0.0004	0.0027	0.0009	0.0096

high: $1 - e^{-10\lambda^2}$, band: $e^{-10(\lambda-1)^2}$, reject: $1 - e^{-10(\lambda-1)^2}$ and comb: $|\sin(\pi\lambda)|$) from processed signals on a grid graph. We adopt the same settings for ERGNN as those employed in prior works, with the average squared error of both ERGNN and baselines reported as the evaluation metric.

Results and analysis. As reported in Table III, ERGNN achieves far lower error compared to the counterparts across all 5 filters (even reducing the error by 94% compared to the runner-up on the reject filter). These results not only highlight ERGNN’s prowess in filter approximation but also affirm the superiority of rational over polynomial (note that ARMA is actually implemented using polynomial approximations [2]).

VI. CONCLUSIONS

This paper proposes ERGNN, an innovative spectral GNN with an explicitly-optimized rational graph filters. ERGNN applies a unique two-step framework, sequentially building the numerator filter and the MLP-based denominator filter, thus avoiding intricate computations required by prior methods and enabling an explicitly-optimized rational filter. Backed by in-depth theoretical insight, the superiority of our ERGNN are justified. Extensive experiments further validate that ERGNN outperforms state-of-the-art methods, highlighting the exceptional efficacy and scalability of ERGNN.

Our ERGNN with two-step framework offers a viable solution for deploying rational-based GNNs in practical applications. Future research can build upon this by proposing more concrete frameworks that allow for direct control & optimization over the filter constructions.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Bo, X. Wang, Y. Liu, Y. Fang, Y. Li, and C. Shi, “A survey on spectral graph neural networks,” 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.05631>
- [2] F. M. Bianchi, D. Grattarola, L. Livi, and C. Alippi, “Graph neural networks with convolutional arma filters,” *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 44, no. 7, pp. 3496–3507, 2022.
- [3] M. He, Z. Wei, Z. Huang, and H. Xu, “Bernnet: Learning arbitrary graph spectral filters via bernstein approximation,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P. Liang, and J. W. Vaughan, Eds., 2021.
- [4] X. Wang and M. Zhang, “How powerful are spectral graph neural networks,” in *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v162/wang22am.html>
- [5] B. Li, E. Pan, and Z. Kang, “Pc-conv: Unifying homophily and heterophily with two-fold filtering,” *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 38, no. 12, pp. 13437–13445, Mar. 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/view/29246>
- [6] E. Chien, J. Peng, P. Li, and O. Milenkovic, “Adaptive universal generalized pagerank graph neural network,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [7] M. He, Z. Wei, and J.-R. Wen, “Convolutional neural networks on graphs with chebyshev approximation, revisited,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, A. H. Oh, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, and K. Cho, Eds., 2022.
- [8] G. Li, J. Yang, S. Liang, and D. Luo, “Spectral gnn via two-dimensional (2-d) graph convolution,” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.04559>
- [9] —, “Elevating spectral gnns through enhanced band-pass filter approximation,” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.15354>
- [10] Y. Guo and Z. Wei, “Graph neural networks with learnable and optimal polynomial bases,” in *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v202/guo23i.html>
- [11] D. J. Newman, *Approximation with rational functions*. American Mathematical Soc., 1979.
- [12] P. P. Petrushev and V. A. Popov, *Rational approximation of real functions*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [13] R. Levie, F. Monti, X. Bresson, and M. M. Bronstein, “Cayleynets: Graph convolutional neural networks with complex rational spectral filters,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 67, no. 1, pp. 97–109, 2019.
- [14] J. Fang, Q. Zhang, Z. Meng, and S. Liang, “Structure-aware random fourier kernel for graphs,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 34, pp. 17 681–17 694, 2021.
- [15] G. K. Smyth, “Polynomial approximation,” *Encyclopedia of Biostatistics*, vol. 13, 1998.
- [16] G. M. Phillips, *Interpolation and approximation by polynomials*. Springer New York, 2003, vol. 14.
- [17] D. Funaro, *Polynomial approximation of differential equations*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008, vol. 8.
- [18] E. B. Saff and R. S. Varga, *Padé and rational approximation*. Elsevier, 1977.
- [19] G. Litvinov, “Approximate construction of rational approximations and the effect of error autocorrection. applications,” 2001. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0101042>
- [20] J. Mason, “Some properties and applications of chebyshev polynomial and rational approximation,” in *Rational Approximation and Interpolation: Proceedings of the United Kingdom-United States Conference held at Tampa, Florida, December 12–16, 1983*. Springer, 2006, pp. 27–48.
- [21] Y. Hu, H. You, Z. Wang, Z. Wang, E. Zhou, and Y. Gao, “Graph-mlp: Node classification without message passing in graph,” 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.04051>
- [22] H. Yang, K. Ma, and J. Cheng, “Rethinking graph regularization for graph neural networks,” *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 35, no. 5, pp. 4573–4581, May 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/view/16586>
- [23] S. Zhang, Y. Liu, Y. Sun, and N. Shah, “Graph-less neural networks: Teaching old MLPs new tricks via distillation,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [24] Y. Tian, C. Zhang, Z. Guo, X. Zhang, and N. V. Chawla, “Nosmog: Learning noise-robust and structure-aware mlps on graphs,” 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.10010>
- [25] T. N. Kipf and M. Welling, “Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks,” 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=SJU4ayYgI>
- [26] M. Chen, Z. Wei, Z. Huang, B. Ding, and Y. Li, “Simple and deep graph convolutional networks,” in *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v119/chen20v.html>
- [27] J. Zhu, Y. Yan, L. Zhao, M. Heimann, L. Akoglu, and D. Koutra, “Beyond homophily in graph neural networks: Current limitations and effective designs,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M. Balcan, and H. Lin, Eds., vol. 33. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020, pp. 7793–7804.
- [28] J. Gasteiger, A. Bojchevski, and S. Günnemann, “Combining neural networks with personalized pagerank for classification on graphs,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- [29] Q. Wu, W. Zhao, Z. Li, D. Wipf, and J. Yan, “Nodeformer: A scalable graph structure learning transformer for node classification,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, A. H. Oh, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, and K. Cho, Eds., 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=sMezXGG5So>
- [30] X. Li, R. Zhu, Y. Cheng, C. Shan, S. Luo, D. Li, and W. Qian, “Finding global homophily in graph neural networks when meeting heterophily,” in *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v162/li22ad.html>
- [31] M. Defferrard, X. Bresson, and P. Vandergheynst, “Convolutional neural networks on graphs with fast localized spectral filtering,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, D. Lee, M. Sugiyama, U. Luxburg, I. Guyon, and R. Garnett, Eds., vol. 29. Curran Associates, Inc., 2016.
- [32] K. Appel, “Rational approximation of decay-type functions,” *BIT Numerical Mathematics*, 1962.
- [33] I. Barrodale and J. Mason, “Two simple algorithms for discrete rational approximation,” *MATHEMATICS of computation*, 1970.
- [34] D. Lim, F. M. Hohne, X. Li, S. L. Huang, V. Gupta, O. P. Bhalerao, and S.-N. Lim, “Large scale learning on non-homophilous graphs: New benchmarks and strong simple methods,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P. Liang, and J. W. Vaughan, Eds., 2021.
- [35] Z. Yang, W. W. Cohen, and R. Salakhutdinov, “Revisiting semi-supervised learning with graph embeddings,” 2016. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1603.08861>
- [36] O. Shchur, M. Mumme, A. Bojchevski, and S. Günnemann, “Pitfalls of graph neural network evaluation,” 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.05868>
- [37] J. Tang, J. Sun, C. Wang, and Z. Yang, “Social influence analysis in large-scale networks,” in *Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, ser. KDD ’09. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2009, p. 807–816. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1557019.1557108>
- [38] O. Platonov, D. Kuznedelev, M. Diskin, A. Babenko, and L. Prokhorenkova, “A critical look at the evaluation of GNNs under heterophily: Are we really making progress?” in *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [39] D. P. Kingma and J. Ba, “Adam: A method for stochastic optimization,” 2014. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6980>
- [40] A. Gil, J. Segura, and N. M. Temme, *Numerical Methods for Special Functions*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2007. [Online]. Available: <https://epubs.siam.org/doi/abs/10.1137/1.9780898717822>
- [41] W. Hu, M. Fey, M. Zitnik, Y. Dong, H. Ren, B. Liu, M. Catasta, and J. Leskovec, “Open graph benchmark: Datasets for machine learning on graphs,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M. Balcan, and H. Lin, Eds., vol. 33. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020, pp. 22 118–22 133.