

Revisiting Graph Neural Networks on Graph-level Tasks: Comprehensive Experiments, Analysis, and Improvements

Haoyang LI
Computing, PolyU
haoyang-comp.li@polyu.edu.hk

Yuming XU
Computing, PolyU & SCUT
fm.martinx@gmail.com

Chen Jason ZHANG
Computing & SHTM, PolyU
jason-c.zhang@polyu.edu.hk

Alexander ZHOU
Computing, PolyU
alexander.zhou@polyu.edu.hk

Lei CHEN
DSA, HKUST(GZ) & HKUST
leichen@cse.ust.hk

Qing LI
Computing, PolyU
csqli@comp.polyu.edu.hk

ABSTRACT

Graphs are essential data structures for modeling complex interactions in domains such as social networks, molecular structures, and biological systems. Graph-level tasks, which predict properties or classes for the entire graph, are critical for applications, such as molecular property prediction and subgraph counting. Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) have shown promise in these tasks, but their evaluations are often limited to narrow datasets, tasks, and inconsistent experimental setups, restricting their generalizability. To address these limitations, we propose a unified evaluation framework for graph-level GNNs. This framework provides a standardized setting to evaluate GNNs across diverse datasets, various graph tasks (e.g., graph classification and regression), and challenging scenarios, including noisy, imbalanced, and few-shot graphs. Additionally, we propose a novel GNN model with enhanced expressivity and generalization capabilities. Specifically, we enhance the expressivity of GNNs through a k -path rooted subgraph approach, enabling the model to effectively count subgraphs (e.g., paths and cycles). Moreover, we introduce a unified graph contrastive learning algorithm for graphs across diverse domains, which adaptively removes unimportant edges to augment graphs, thereby significantly improving generalization performance. Extensive experiments demonstrate that our model achieves superior performance against fourteen effective baselines across twenty-seven graph datasets, establishing it as a robust and generalizable model for graph-level tasks.

PVLDB Reference Format:

Haoyang LI, Yuming XU, Chen Jason ZHANG, Alexander ZHOU, Lei CHEN, and Qing LI. Revisiting Graph Neural Networks on Graph-level Tasks: Comprehensive Experiments, Analysis, and Improvements. PVLDB, 14(1): XXX-XXX, 2020.
doi:XX.XX/XXX.XX

PVLDB Artifact Availability:

The source code, data, and/or other artifacts have been made available at URL_TO_YOUR_ARTIFACTS.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0 International License. Visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/> to view a copy of this license. For any use beyond those covered by this license, obtain permission by emailing info@vldb.org. Copyright is held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to the VLDB Endowment.

Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment, Vol. 14, No. 1 ISSN 2150-8097.
doi:XX.XX/XXX.XX

1 INTRODUCTION

Graphs represent objects as nodes and their relationships as edges, which are key data structures across various domains to model complex interactions [8, 20, 22], such as social networks, molecular structures, biological systems, etc. Graph-level tasks involve predicting properties or labels of entire graphs, rather than individual nodes or edges. These tasks are crucial in various domains, such as subgraph counting in database management systems [25, 51], molecular property prediction in chemistry [35, 105], and protein classification in biology [48, 61]. Recently, graph neural networks [13, 31, 55, 57, 78] have emerged as powerful tools for modeling and analyzing graph-structured data. They learn node representations by iteratively aggregating information from their neighbors and obtain graph representations based on node representations for graph-level tasks.

Depending on the technique, current GNNs designed for graph-level tasks can be categorized into five types: *node-based*, *hierarchical pooling (HP)*-based, *subgraph-based*, *graph learning (GL)*-based, and *self-supervised learning (SSL)*-based GNNs. Firstly, node-based GNNs [31, 43, 78, 87] learn representations for individual nodes, which are then used to form a graph-level representation by a Readout function, such as averaging the representations of all nodes. Secondly, HP-based GNNs [7, 15, 54, 60] employ hierarchical pooling techniques to progressively reduce the graph size while preserving its essential structural information. HP-based GNNs aim to capture multi-level graph structures to learn a graph representation.

Thirdly, subgraph-based GNNs [5, 17, 65, 88] separate a graph into several subgraphs. They learn the representations for each subgraph and then obtain the final graph representation based on these subgraph representations. Fourthly, GL-based GNNs [23, 49, 56, 104] assume that graphs are noisy and incomplete. These methods aim to reconstruct the graph structure and node features to enhance graph quality, enabling the learning of more accurate and reliable graph representations. Finally, SSL-based GNNs [39, 48, 73, 76, 85] aim to pretrain GNNs on unlabeled graphs to learn generalizable node representations, which can then be fine-tuned with labeled data. Specifically, they pretrain GNNs by either predicting existing graph properties (e.g., node degrees and attributes) [34, 39, 85, 95, 99] or maximizing the similarity between graph representations obtained from different augmentations (e.g., edge dropping) of the same graph [32, 45, 48, 73].

Although various GNNs being designed for graph-level tasks, their evaluations are often restricted to a narrow range of domain-specific datasets and insufficient baseline comparisons [19, 84, 104].

This limited scope fails to accurately reflect the advancements and capabilities of existing GNNs in handling graph-level tasks. To address the need for fair and comprehensive empirical evaluations, we first identify three key issues in existing evaluation frameworks, thereby enhancing our evaluation capabilities.

- **Issue 1. Insufficient Coverage of Data Domains.** The evaluations of existing approaches often concentrate on a limited range of datasets, typically in specific domains such as chemistry or biology. This narrow focus can cause models to overfit to the unique characteristics of these datasets, limiting the generalizability and applicability of GNNs to other domain datasets, such as social networks or geometric graphs.
- **Issue 2. Insufficient Graph-level Tasks and Scenarios.** Current evaluation frameworks only focus on one type of graph-level task, such as graph classification for molecular graphs. The insufficient coverage of graph tasks neglects the diversity of potential graph-level applications, such as cycle counting and path counting in graphs. Additionally, current methods only assess GNNs under the assumption of enough labeled graphs. However, there are many other realistic scenarios. For example, the graphs labels are few and imbalanced, and the graph datasets are noisy.
- **Issue 3. Lacking One Unified Evaluation Pipeline.** The absence of a standardized evaluation pipeline leads to inconsistent reporting and comparison of results across studies. Different works may use varying metrics, datasets, and experimental setups, complicating the assessment of progress and the identification of truly effective models. A unified evaluation framework would facilitate more transparent and reliable comparisons

To address the above three issues, we propose a comprehensive framework to ensure a more comprehensive and fair assessment of GNNs for graph-level tasks. Firstly, we categorize existing GNNs for graph-level tasks into five types and analyze each type in depth. Secondly, we propose a unified and fair evaluation pipeline with standardized data splitting and experimental settings. We use graph datasets from diverse domains, including biology, chemistry, social networks, and geometric graphs. Thirdly, we evaluate existing graph-level GNNs on both graph classification and graph regression (e.g., cycle counting). We also consider diverse scenarios beyond those with ample labeled graphs, including noisy graphs, imbalanced graphs, and the few-shot setting.

Additionally, alongside the comprehensive evaluation framework, we propose an improved GNN model for graph-level tasks, which achieves both high expressivity and strong generalization capabilities. Firstly, to enhance the expressivity of GNNs, we introduce a general k -path rooted subgraph GNN, which samples subgraphs for each k -length path starting from every node. Our model learns representations for each subgraph and aggregates these into a comprehensive graph representation. We theoretically prove that k -path rooted subgraph GNNs can, at a minimum, count the number of $k + 2$ -Path and $k + 3$ -Cycle. Secondly, to improve generalization across diverse domains and scenarios, we propose an adaptive graph contrastive learning approach to augment graphs. By analyzing edge importance across different domains, we propose a unified metric based on node degree to remove unimportant edges, ensuring the augmented graphs retain their original structural patterns. Our model is then optimized by maximizing the similarity

between augmented graphs and predicting labels consistently with the original graph. This approach makes our model resistant to noise, thereby improving its generalization ability.

We summarize the contributions of this paper as follows.

- We systematically revisit GNNs for graph-level tasks and categorize them into five types, i.e., node-based, hierarchical pooling-based, subgraph-based, graph learning-based, and self-supervised learning-based. We provide an in-depth analysis of their distinct techniques for learning graph representations, offering a clear understanding of their strengths and limitations.
- We propose a unified evaluation framework to address limited domain diversity, insufficient task coverage, and the lack of standardization. It includes diverse datasets, supports multiple tasks, and ensures fair comparisons across challenging scenarios like noise, imbalance, and few-shot learning.
- We propose an expressive and generalizable GNN model, which enhances expressivity with a k -path rooted subgraph approach for counting paths and cycles, and improves generalization by adaptive graph contrastive learning that removes unimportant edges to handle noise and diverse domains.
- Extensive experiments on 13 graph classification datasets, 14 graph regression datasets, and various scenarios (e.g., few-shot and noisy graphs) demonstrate the superior performance of the proposed method over state-of-the-art GNNs.

2 PRELIMINARY AND RELATED WORK

In this section, we first introduce the graph-level tasks and then summarize existing GNNs used for these tasks. Important notations are summarized in Table 1.

2.1 Graph-level Tasks

Graphs are a fundamental data structure to model relations between nodes in real-world datasets, such as social networks [11, 58], chemistry graphs [10, 11], etc. Formally, we denote a graph as $G_i(V_i, A_i, X_i)$, where $V_i, A_i \in \{0, 1\}^{|V_i| \times |V_i|}$, $X_i \in \{0, 1\}^{|V_i| \times d_x}$, denote nodes, adjacency matrix, and node features, respectively. For each node $v \in V_i$, $N_i(v) = \{u : A_i[u][v] = 1\}$ is the 1-hop neighbors of v and $N_i^l(v)$ is the neighbors of v within l hops. In general, there are two types of graph-level tasks, graph classification and graph regression.

These two type of tasks involve predicting either categorical labels (classification) or a continuous value (regression) for an entire graph. Formally, given a labeled graph dataset $\mathcal{LG} = \{(G_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, each graph G_i is labeled with discrete label vector $y_i \in \{0, 1\}^{|\mathcal{Y}|}$ on labels \mathcal{Y} for classification, or a continuous value $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$ for regression. The goal is to learn a mapping function f_θ that generalizes to unseen graphs as follows:

$$f_\theta : G_j \rightarrow y_j, \text{ where } y_j \in \{0, 1\}^{|\mathcal{Y}|} \text{ or } y_j \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (1)$$

Graph classification and graph regression are critical and popular across various domains, such as databases, chemistry, and biology. Specifically, in database and data management fields, graph classification tasks include query plan strategy classification [103, 106] and community classification [21, 72], which help optimize database queries and understand data relationships. Graph regression tasks involve subgraph counting [51, 100] and cardinality estimation of

graph queries [70, 75, 81]. Also, biology benefits from graph classification for protein structure analysis and motif identification [95], and graph regression helps predict gene expression levels [63].

2.2 Graph Neural Networks

Recently, GNNs [14, 29, 30, 37, 47, 71, 83, 97, 110] have emerged as powerful tools to learn node representations, due to their ability to capture complex relationships within graph structures. Existing GNNs for graph-level tasks can generally be categorized into five types: node-based, pooling-based, subgraph-based, graph learning-based, and self-supervised learning-based GNNs.

2.2.1 Node-based Graph Neural Networks. As shown in Figure 1 (a), node-based GNNs first learn representations for individual nodes, which then are used to form a graph-level representation. Generally, each GNN f_θ consists of two basic operations, i.e., AGG(\cdot) and COM(\cdot) [31, 46], which can be formulated as two trainable parameter matrices \mathbf{W}_{agg} and \mathbf{W}_{com} . Formally, given a graph $G_i(V_i, \mathbf{A}_i, \mathbf{X}_i)$ and a node $v \in V_i$, in the l -th layer, AGG($^{(l)}$) in Equation (2) first aggregates the hidden representation $\mathbf{h}_i^{(l-1)}(u)$ and edge representation \mathbf{e}_{uv} of each neighbor u of node v and obtain the aggregated result $\mathbf{m}_i^{(l)}(v)$. Then, as shown in Equation (3), COM($^{(l)}$) combines the aggregated neighbor information $\mathbf{m}_i^{(l)}(v)$ and the latest information $\mathbf{h}_i^{(l-1)}(v)$ of node v to obtain the l -th layer representation $\mathbf{h}_i^{(l)}(v)$.

$$\mathbf{m}_i^{(l)}(v) = \text{AGG}^{(l)}\left(\{(\mathbf{h}_i^{(l-1)}(u), \mathbf{e}_{uv}) : u \in \mathcal{N}_i(v)\}\right) \quad (2)$$

$$\mathbf{h}_i^{(l)}(v) = \sigma\left(\text{COM}^{(l)}\left(\mathbf{h}_i^{(l-1)}(v), \mathbf{m}_i^{(l)}(v)\right)\right), \quad (3)$$

where σ denotes a non-linear function (e.g., ReLU [52]). $\mathbf{h}_i^{(0)}(v)$ is initialized as $\mathbf{X}_i[v]$. After L layers aggregation, we can obtain node representations $\mathbf{H}_i(V_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{|V_i| \times d_H}$. Then, the graph representation \mathbf{h}_i of G_i can be summarized from the node representation $\mathbf{H}_i(V_i)$ by a READOUT function [48] as follows:

$$\mathbf{h}_i = \text{READOUT}(\mathbf{H}_i(V_i)), \quad (4)$$

where READOUT is a permutation-invariant function, such as AVERAGE, SUM, or MAX functions [48]. The SUM function as an example is $\mathbf{h}_i = \sum_{v \in V_i} \mathbf{H}_i(V_i)[v]$.

Model Optimization. Then, we can use a decoder (e.g., 2-layer MLPs [108]) to predict discrete class or continuous property value for each graph G_i based \mathbf{h}_i . In summary, given the labeled training dataset $\mathcal{LG} = \{(G_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ and the prediction y_i^* for each graph G_i by the GNN f_θ , the GNN f_θ can be optimized by minimizing the task loss as follows:

$$\theta^* = \arg \min_{\theta} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{LG}|} \sum_{G_i \in \mathcal{LG}} \mathcal{L}_{task}(f_\theta, G_i, y_i). \quad (5)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \mathcal{L}_{task}(y_i^*, y_i) = \begin{cases} -\sum_{y \in y_i} y \log y_i^*[y], & y_i \in \{0, 1\}^{|\mathcal{Y}|} \\ \|y_i^* - y_i\|_2, & y_i \in \mathbb{R} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

2.2.2 Hierarchical Pooling-based Graph Neural Networks. As shown in Figure 1 (b), hierarchical pooling (HP)-based GNNs are designed to capture hierarchical structures in the graph, which can reduce the graph size progressively while preserving its essential structural information. This is achieved by clustering nodes into groups

Table 1: Summary on important notations.

Symbols	Meanings
$G_i(V_i, \mathbf{A}_i, \mathbf{X}_i)$	The graph G_i
y_i	Discrete label or continuous property value of G_i
$\mathcal{N}_i^l(v), \mathcal{N}_i(v)$	The l -hop and 1-hop neighbors of node v in G_i
$D_i(v), \bar{D}_i$	Degree of node v and average degree in G_i
f_θ	GNN model
l, L	GNN layer index and the total layer number
$\mathbf{h}_i^{(l)}(v)$	The l -th layer node representation of v in G_i
$\mathbf{h}_i(v)$	Final node representation of v in G_i
$\mathbf{H}_i^{(l)}(V_j)$	The l -th layer representation of nodes V_j in G_i
$\mathbf{H}_i(V_j)$	Final representation of nodes V_j in G_i
\mathbf{h}_i	Graph representation of G_i
y_i^*	Prediction of GNN f_θ for G_i
$\mathbf{S}_i^{(l)}$	Cluster assignment matrix at l -th layer
$\hat{G}_i^*(V_i, \hat{\mathbf{A}}_i^*, \hat{\mathbf{X}}_i^*)$	The reconstructed graph for G_i
\hat{G}_i, \hat{G}_i	Augmented positive views for G_i
$s(\mathbf{h}_i, \mathbf{h}_j)$	Similarity score between G_i and G_j
$imp_{v,u}$	Edge importance score between v and u
$\bar{\mathcal{T}}_{v_i}^k \in \mathcal{T}_{v_i}^k$	k -tuple set of each node $v_i \in V$
$G_{v_i}^s$	k -path rooted subgraph based on $\bar{\mathcal{T}}_{v_i}^k$
$G_{v_i}^{s,a}$	Feature augmented subgraph for $G_{v_i}^s$
$\mathcal{L}_{task}(\cdot)$	Task loss (Equation (5))
$\mathcal{L}_{cy}(\cdot)$	Consistency-aware loss (Equation (23))

and summarizing their features, allowing the model to focus on condensed graph structures and finally obtain the representation of each graph.

As mentioned in Equations (2) and (3), at the l -th layer, node-based GNNs learn node representations using the adjacency matrix \mathbf{A}_i and the node hidden representations $\mathbf{H}_i^{(l-1)}(V_i)$. In contrast, at the l -th layer, HP-based GNNs first generate a new cluster assignment matrix $\mathbf{S}_i^{(l)} \in \{0, 1\}^{n_{l-1} \times n_l}$, where $n_l < n_{l-1}$. This matrix maps the nodes $V_i^{(l-1)}$ from the $(l-1)$ -th layer to a cluster index in $\{1, \dots, n_l\}$. The new adjacency matrix $\mathbf{A}_i^{(l)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_l \times n_l}$ is then reconstructed based on the cluster assignment matrix $\mathbf{S}_i^{(l)}$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{A}_i^{(l)} = \mathbf{S}_i^{(l)\top} \mathbf{A}_i^{(l-1)} \mathbf{S}_i^{(l)}. \quad (7)$$

Subsequently, n_l new nodes $V_i^{(l)}$ are created to represent the n_l clusters. Then, the node hidden representations $\mathbf{H}_i^{(l-1)}(V_i^{(l)})$ can be obtained by a READOUT operation on nodes each cluster $k \in \{1, \dots, n_l\}$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{H}_i^{(l-1)}(V_i^{(l)})[k] = \text{READOUT}(\mathbf{H}_i^{(l-1)}(V_i^{(l-1)})[V_k]), \quad (8)$$

where $V_k = \{u \mid \mathbf{S}_i^{(l)}[u][k] = 1\}$ are nodes in the cluster k .

Depending on the technique of generating the cluster matrix $\mathbf{S}_i^{(l)}$, existing pooling-based GNNs can be classified into three types.

- **Similarity-based.** Similarity-based approaches [15, 54, 60] cluster nodes based on the similarity of nodes features or structures. These methods rely on predefined similarity metrics or graph partitioning algorithms to generate the cluster assignment matrix. Graclus [15, 60] and CC-GNN [54] assign nodes to different clusters based on feature similarity and graph structure.




Figure 1: The five types of current GNNs for graph-level tasks.

- **Node Dropping-based.** Node dropping-based methods [9, 28, 44] focus on reducing the number of nodes in the graph by learning an importance score for each node. Nodes with the highest scores are retained, while others are dropped, effectively shrinking the graph size in a controlled manner. TopKPool [9, 28] and SAGPool [44] aim to learn an importance score for each node and retain only the top- n_l nodes with the highest scores at layer l . In other words, they only assign one node for each cluster and directly drop the other nodes.
- **Learning-based.** Learning-based approaches [4, 7, 16, 77, 92] use neural network architectures to learn the cluster assignment matrix $S_i^{(l)}$ based on the graph’s node features and structure, which adaptively learn how to cluster nodes in a way that preserves the graph’s essential information. Specifically, DiffPool [92] and MinCutPool [7] use non-linear neural networks and and GMT [4] use the multi-head attention mechanism [77], to learn a cluster matrix $S_i^{(l)}$ based on the learned node features $H_i^{(l-1)}$ and adjacent matrix $A_i^{(l-1)}$. EdgePool [16] proposes to learn the edge score between each pair of connected nodes and then generate the cluster matrix accordingly.

2.2.3 Subgraph-based Graph Neural Networks. Recent studies propose subgraph-based GNNs with enhanced expressive power, enabling them to more effectively capture substructure information. As shown in Figure 1 (c), the core idea is to decompose the input graph into a set of overlapping or non-overlapping subgraphs and then learn representations for each subgraph to improve the final graph representation. Formally, given a graph $G_i(V_i, A_i, X_i)$, existing models first generate n_s subgraphs $G_{i,j}(V_{i,j}, A_{i,j}, X_{i,j})_{j=1}^{n_s}$. Then, for each subgraph $G_{i,j}$, the node representation of $v \in V_{i,j}$ is learned by Equations (2) and (3). In this approach, each node $v \in V_i$ can have multiple representations because it may appear in multiple sampled subgraphs. To derive the final node representation $\mathbf{h}_i(v)$, these representations are merged. A common approach is to use a READOUT function to combine them, as follows:

$$\mathbf{h}_i(v) = \text{READOUT}(\mathbf{h}_{i,j}(v) | v \in V_{i,j}). \quad (9)$$

Depending on the techniques of generating the subgraphs, current subgraph-based approaches can be classified into three types.

- **Graph Element Deletion-based.** These approaches [6, 12, 17, 64] propose deleting specific nodes or edges to create subgraphs,

enabling GNNs to focus on the most informative parts of the graph by removing noise or less relevant elements. For example, DropGNN [64] and ESAN [6] generate subgraphs through random edge deletion to enhance model expressiveness. Conversely, SGOOD [17] abstracts a superstructure from the original graphs and applies sampling and edge deletion on this superstructure, thereby creating a more diverse graphs.

- **Rooted Subgraph-based.** These approaches [5, 27, 38, 65, 68, 88, 89, 93, 96, 101] focus on generating subgraphs centered around specific nodes, referred to as *root nodes*, with the aim of capturing the structural role and local topology of the root node within the subgraph. The primary motivation is to enhance the representational power of GNNs by encoding the root node’s position within the subgraph, as well as its relationships to other nodes within the same subgraph. Specifically, I2GNN [38], ECS [88], and ID-GNN [93] propose to append side information to the root nodes or edges to capture the position information, such as an ID identifier for root nodes (e.g., the root v is 1 and other nodes are 0) [38, 93], and node degree and shortest distance information [88]. Also, NestGNN [96] and GNN-AK [101] use rooted subgraphs with different hops to capture the hierarchical relationships within graphs for root nodes.
- **k -hop Subgraph-based.** Similar to rooted subgraph-based approaches [3, 24, 62, 69, 79, 90], k -hop subgraph-based approaches construct subgraphs based on the k -hop neighborhood of each node v , focusing on capturing the local structure around each node. Unlike rooted subgraph-based approaches, which aggregate information from 1-hop neighbors, k -hop subgraph-based approaches aggregate information not only from 1-hop neighbors but also directly from nodes up to k hops away. Specifically, MixHop [3] utilizes a graph diffusion kernel to gather multi-hop neighbors and computes the final representation. SEK-GNN [90], KP-GNN [24], EGO-GNN [69], and k -hop GNN [62] progressively updates node representations by aggregating information from neighbors within k -hops. MAGNA [79] proposes to learn more accurate weights between each pair of nodes based on all the paths between them within k -hops.

2.2.4 Graph Learning-based Graph Neural Networks. Due to uncertainty and complexity in data collection, graph structures may be redundant, biased, or noisy. Consequently, GNNs cannot learn reliable and accurate graph representations, leading to incorrect predictions.

Therefore, as shown in Figure 1 (d), current researchers [23, 56, 104] propose reconstructing the graph structure and node features to improve the quality of the learned graph representations. Given a labeled graph set $\mathcal{LG} = \{(G_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, the graph learning-based approaches can be formulated as bi-level optimization problem.

$$\theta^* = \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{LG}|} \sum_{G_i \in \mathcal{LG}} \mathcal{L}_{task}(f_\theta, \hat{G}_i^*(V_i, \hat{A}_i^*, \hat{X}_i^*), y_i). \quad (10)$$

$$s.t. \quad \hat{A}_i^*, \hat{X}_i^* = \arg \min_{\hat{A}_i, \hat{X}_i} \mathcal{L}_{gl}(f_{\theta^*}, \hat{G}_i(V_i, \hat{A}_i, \hat{X}_i), y_i), \forall G_i \in \mathcal{G} \quad (11)$$

At the low level in Equation (11), current approaches propose different graph learning objectives $\mathcal{L}_{gl}(\cdot)$ to reconstruct graph structure A_i and node features X_i . Then, in Equation (10), $\hat{G}_i^*(V_i, \hat{A}_i^*, \hat{X}_i^*)$ will be used to optimize the GNNs by the loss function in Equation (5).

Depending on the techniques of reconstructing graphs, current GL-based GNNs can be categorized into three types.

- **Preprocessing-based.** Preprocessing-based approaches [18, 50, 86] reconstruct graphs and then use them to optimize GNNs directly. The basic idea is to first reveal the common graph patterns and modify the graph structure and node features to recover these patterns. For example, GNN-Jaccard [86] and GNAT [50] observe that similar nodes tend to be connected by edges. Therefore, they remove edges between dissimilar nodes and add edges between similar ones. Also, GNN-SVD [18] observes that noisy edges and node features tend to increase the rank of the adjacency matrix. Therefore, GNN-SVD reconstructs graphs by decreasing the rank of the adjacency matrix.
- **Jointly Training-based.** In contrast to static preprocessing-based methods, jointly training-based approaches aim to optimize the GNN while iteratively reconstructing the graph structure and node features alongside the GNN model parameters. This iterative bi-level optimization enables the GNN to dynamically adapt the graph structure and features based on task-specific objectives. For instance, several approaches [26, 41, 42, 49, 59, 74], such as ADGNN [49], ProGNN [42], and SimPGCN [41], propose reconstructing the edges between each pair of nodes by minimizing the GNN loss on the reconstructed structure while also reducing the rank of the adjacency matrix. Alternatively, several approaches [80, 98, 107], such as MOSGSL [107] and HGP-SL [98], focus on first partitioning each graph into subgraphs based on node similarities and predefined motifs, and then reconstructing the edges between these subgraphs rather than at the individual node level.

2.2.5 Self Supervised Learning-based Graph Neural Networks. Self-supervised learning (SSL) has become a powerful paradigm to pre-train GNNs without the need for labeled data, which can capture the node patterns and graph patterns. As shown in Figure 1 (e), the key idea of SSL approaches is to create supervised signals directly from the structure and node features of the unlabeled graph itself, leveraging the graph’s inherent properties to guide the learning process. Formally, given a set of unlabeled graphs $\mathcal{UG} = \{G_i(V_i, A_i, X_i)\}_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{UG}|}$, the GNN f_θ is pretrained as follows:

$$\theta' = \arg \min_{\theta} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{UG}|} \sum_{G_i \in \mathcal{UG}} \mathcal{L}_{ssl}(f_\theta, G_i, Signal_i), \quad (12)$$

where $Signal_i$ is the supervised signals from the unlabeled graph G_i and θ' is the optimized GNN parameters. Then, the pretrained $f_{\theta'}$ can be used to predict graph labels or properties. Formally, given the set of labeled graphs $\mathcal{LG} = \{G_j(V_j A_j, X_j), y_j\}_{j=1}^{|\mathcal{LG}|}$, the GNN $f_{\theta'}$ is optimized as follows:

$$\theta^* = \arg \min_{\theta'} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{LG}|} \sum_{G_j \in \mathcal{LG}} \mathcal{L}_{task}(f_{\theta'}, G_j, y_j), \quad (13)$$

where the task loss $\mathcal{L}_{task}(\cdot)$ is defined in Equation (5).

Depending on the technique of generating supervised signals from unlabeled graphs, SSL-based GNN approaches can be broadly categorized into two main types.

- **Pretext Task-based.** Pretext task-based approaches [34, 36, 39, 40, 85, 95, 99] design auxiliary tasks to help the model learn useful representations from the graph structure and features without requiring external labels. Current approaches design diverse node-level and graph-level tasks to capture intrinsic graph patterns [85], such as predicting node attribute, node degree, and the node number. For example, HMGNN [95] pretrains GNNs by predicting the links between nodes and the number of nodes in each graph. MGSSL [99] first masks the edges among motifs and then predicts the missing edges. MoAMa [39] first masks node features and then uses GNNs to reconstruct the node features based on the masked graphs. GraphMAE [34] and GPTGNN [36] predict both node attributes and edges.
- **Graph Contrastive Learning-based.** Graph contrastive learning (GCL)-based GNNs [32, 45, 67, 73, 82, 94] aim to learn representations by contrasting positive and negative examples. The basic idea is to maximize the similarity between different views or augmentations of the same node or graph (positive pairs) while minimizing the similarity between different nodes or graphs (negative pairs). In such a way, GCL-based approaches can distinguish the similarity between nodes and graphs. In general, the SSL loss $\mathcal{L}_{ssl}(\cdot)$ in Equation (12) can be formulated as follows.

$$\theta' = \arg \min_{\theta} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{UG}|} \sum_{G_i \in \mathcal{UG}} \mathcal{L}_{cl}(f_\theta, \hat{G}_i, \tilde{G}_i, Neg_i). \quad (14)$$

$$s.t. \quad \tilde{G}_i, \hat{G}_i = \arg \min_{\tilde{G}_i, \hat{G}_i} \mathcal{L}_{positive}(G_i, \mathcal{T}), \forall G_i \in \mathcal{UG}, \quad (15)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{cl}(\cdot)$ is the contrastive loss. Additionally, $\mathcal{L}_{positive}(\cdot)$ is the view generation loss used to generate two positive views (i.e., \tilde{G}_i and \hat{G}_i for each graph G_i) where \mathcal{T} is a set of augmentation operations for generating the views. Negative views (Neg_i) are a set of graphs, which are typically randomly sampled from all graphs or from graphs with labels different from G_i . One typical $\mathcal{L}_{cl}(f_\theta, \hat{G}_i, \tilde{G}_i, Neg_i)$ in Equation (14) can be defined based on InfoNCE loss [91, 108] as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{cl}(\cdot) = -\log \frac{s(\hat{\mathbf{h}}_i, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i)}{\sum_{G'_i \in \{\hat{G}_i, \tilde{G}_i\}} \sum_{G_j \in A(G_i)} s(\hat{\mathbf{h}}'_i, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_j)}, \quad (16)$$

where $A(G_i) = \hat{G}_i \cup \tilde{G}_i \cup Neg_i$ includes positive views and negative samples of G_i , and $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_i$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i$ are the representations of graph \hat{G}_i and \tilde{G}_i , respectively. Also, $s(\mathbf{h}_i, \mathbf{h}_j) = \exp(\cosine(\mathbf{h}_i, \mathbf{h}_j)/\tau)$ is the similarity score between \mathbf{h}_i and \mathbf{h}_j based the parameter τ .

The techniques in Equation (15) are employed to generate positive views for each node. Specifically, similarity-based methods [45, 67, 82] utilize both node features and graph structures to identify nodes in the original graph, which are similar to a given target node, as the positive nodes. Also, diffusion-based approaches [32, 73, 94] modify the graph’s structure (e.g., by deleting or adding edges) based on global topological information, such as personalized PageRank (PPR) [33] and motif-preserving [73]. Perturbation-based methods [48, 76, 108, 109], on the other hand, introduce changes to both the graph’s structure and node features.

3 A GENERALIZABLE AND EXPRESSIVE GNN

We propose a simple yet effective contrastive learning-based GNN with high generalization and expressivity capabilities on graph-level tasks. As shown in Figure 1, our proposed GNN model consists of three components, i.e., adaptive graph augmentation, k -Path rooted subgraph encoder, and consistency-aware model training.

3.1 Adaptive Graph Augmentation

To enhance the generalization ability of the GNN model, we propose using contrastive learning to optimize GNNs for graph-level tasks. As described in Section 2, the key step is to generate positive graph pairs for each graph. Here, we propose a unified contrastive learning approach for graphs in diverse domains, such as geometric graphs and biology. The basic idea is to first measure the importance of each edge concerning the whole graph and then drop the unimportant edges based on weighted sampling to generate positive pairs for G .

Specifically, given a graph $G_i(V_i, A_i, X_i)$ with edges E , the edge importance of each edge $e_{v,u} \in E_i$ is calculated based on node degree of v and u [48, 109], i.e., $imp_{v,u} = \log\left(\frac{D_i(v)+D_i(u)}{2} + 1\right)$, where edge connected with higher-degree nodes tends to be important because nodes with higher degrees in a graph are bridges and core nodes in a functional motif as follows:

- **Geometric Graphs.** High-degree nodes act as crucial bridges, and removing their edges significantly impacts the number of paths and cycles within this graph.
- **Social Networks.** Higher-degree nodes are crucial as they often represent key influencers or hubs in the network. These nodes connect different parts of the network, facilitating communication and information flow. Their removal can fragment the network and disrupt connectivity significantly.
- **Chemistry Graphs.** High-degree atoms mainly determine the properties of a motif. For example, phosphorus (P) in phosphate groups (PO_4) is bonded to four oxygen atoms (O). While oxygen atoms contribute to properties like electronegativity and polarity, phosphorus is often more critical in determining the overall functionality and behavior of the phosphate group.

Then, the dropping probability $p_{v,u}$ of each edge $e_{v,u}$ can be normalized using min-max normalization [48, 66, 109] as follows:

$$p_{v,u} = \mu \cdot \frac{imp_{max} - imp_{v,u}}{imp_{max} - imp_{min}}, \quad (17)$$

where $\mu \in [0, 1]$ is a hyperparameter, and $imp_{max} = \max_{e_{i,j} \in E_i} imp_{i,j}$ and $imp_{min} = \min_{e_{i,j} \in E_i} imp_{i,j}$ are the largest and smallest edge score, respectively. Then, for each graph G_i , we can generate two

positive graphs \hat{G}_i and \tilde{G}_i by randomly dropping unimportant edges based on Equation (17).

3.2 k -Path Rooted Subgraph Encoder

A more expressive GNN [38, 87]. can better encode substructures like paths, cycles, and other motifs, which are essential for solving downstream tasks. To enhance the expressivity ability, we propose a k -Path rooted subgraph encoder following [38, 93].

3.2.1 k -Path Rooted Subgraph and Feature Augmentation. Given a graph $G(V, A, X)$, we define a k -tuple set of each node $v_i \in V$ as $\mathcal{T}_{v_i}^k = \{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k = (v_i, v_{i+1}, v_{i+2}, \dots, v_{i+k-1})\}$, where there is an edge between each consecutive pair (v_i, v_{i+1}) and v_{i+j} is actually a j -hop neighbor of node v_i . Particularly, for each node $v_i \in V$, the number of k -tuples starting from v_i is $O(\bar{n}_{nei}^k)$, where \bar{n}_{nei} is the average neighbor number of nodes in G . Then, for each tuple in $\vec{t}_{v_i}^k \in \mathcal{T}_{v_i}^k$, we can extract a subgraph based on nodes in $\vec{t}_{v_i}^k$. Formally, given a k -tuple nodes $\vec{t}_{v_i}^k = (v_i, v_{i+1}, v_{i+2}, \dots, v_{i+k-1})$ and the graph G , we denote the rooted subgraph of $\vec{t}_{v_i}^k$ as $G_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^s (V_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^s, A_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^s, X_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^s)$, which extracts L -hop neighbors of each node in $\vec{t}_{v_i}^k$, i.e., $V_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^s = \cup_{v_j \in \vec{t}_{v_i}^k} \cup_{l=0}^L \mathcal{N}^l(v_j)$ and keep the edges among nodes $V_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^s$ in G .

Then, given each rooted subgraph $G_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^s (V_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^s, A_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^s, X_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^s)$ of nodes $\vec{t}_{v_i}^k$, we add identifiers for each node in $\vec{t}_{v_i}^k$ based on the consecutive order. Specifically, for each node $v_{i+j} \in \vec{t}_{v_i}^k$, its node feature $\mathbf{x}(v_{i+j}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ is augmented as $\mathbf{x}(v_{i+j}) = \mathbf{x}(v_{i+j}) \oplus \mathbf{e}_{j,k} \in \mathbb{R}^{(d_x+k)}$, where $\mathbf{e}_{j,k} \in \{0, 1\}^k$ is a one hot vector, where the j -th element is 1 and others are 0. For nodes $v_m \in V_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^s \setminus \vec{t}_{v_i}^k$, its node feature $\mathbf{x}(v_m) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ of is augmented as $\mathbf{x}(v_m) = \mathbf{x}(v_m) \oplus \mathbf{0}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{(d_x+k)}$, where $\mathbf{0}_k$ is a vector of length k and all its components are 0. Then, we denote the feature augmented subgraph $G_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^{s,a}$ as $G_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^{s,a} (V_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^s, A_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^s, X_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^{s,a})$.

3.2.2 Graph Representation Learning. Given each augmented rooted subgraph $G_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^{s,a}$, the node representations of nodes $V_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^s$ can be learned by a GNN encoder as $\mathbf{H}(V_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^s)$, such as GraphSAGE [31] or GatedGNN [53]. Then, the representations of each node v_i can be learned based on all subgraphs of each $\vec{t}_{v_i}^k \in \mathcal{T}_{v_i}^k$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{h}(v_i) = \text{READOUT}_1(\{\mathbf{H}(V_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^s)[v_i] | \vec{t}_{v_i}^k \in \mathcal{T}_{v_i}^k\}), \quad (18)$$

Where $\text{READOUT}_1(\cdot)$ is a readout function, such as MaxPooling. Therefore, the final graph representation of $G(V, A, X)$ can be learned as follows:

$$\mathbf{h} = \text{READOUT}_2(\{\mathbf{h}(v_i) | v_i \in V\}), \quad (19)$$

The graph representation \mathbf{h} can be used to predict graph labels or graph properties, as mentioned in Equation (1).

3.2.3 Theoretical Analysis.

THEOREM 3.1. *Given the graph $G(V, A, X)$, the k -Path rooted subgraph of the k -tuple node set $\mathcal{T}_{v_i}^k$ can count the number of $k+2$ -Path, starting from the node v_i .*

PROOF. We firstly give Lemma 3.2 and then prove Theorem 3.1.




Figure 2: Framework overview.

LEMMA 3.2. Given a graph denoted as $G(V, A, X)$ and a k -tuple $\vec{t}_{v_i}^k = (v_i, v_{i+1}, v_{i+2}, \dots, v_{i+k-1})$ starting from node v_i , our model can count the number of $(k+2)$ -Path between v_i and any node $v_j \notin \vec{t}_{v_i}^k$ that pass through the path $(v_i, v_{i+1}, v_{i+2}, \dots, v_{i+k-1})$.

PROOF. Note that since we extract the subgraphs based on the k tuple $\vec{t}_{v_i}^k$, we can know whether a node belong to this $\vec{t}_{v_i}^k$. Given a node $v_j \in V$ and $v \notin \vec{t}_{v_i}^k$, we can count the $k+2$ -Path between v_i and v_j by aggregating information from neighbor. Firstly, we can identify whether a node v_j is the one-hop neighbor of the last element of $\vec{t}_{v_i}^k$ (i.e., v_{i+k-1}) as follows:

$$\mathbf{h}_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^{(1)}(v_j) = \mathbb{I}(v_j \notin \vec{t}_{v_i}^k [1 : k-1]) \sum_{v_m \in N(v_j)} \mathbb{I}(v_m = v_{i+k-1}) \quad (20)$$

where $\vec{t}_{v_i}^k [1 : k-1] = (v_i, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_{i+k-2})$ is the first $k-1$ elements of $\vec{t}_{v_i}^k$, the indicator function $\mathbb{I}(\text{condition}) = 1$ if the *condition* is true. Specifically, in Equation (20), if v_j is the one-hop neighbor v_{i+k-1} , the hidden representation $\mathbf{h}_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^{(1)}(v_j) = 1$ otherwise $\mathbf{h}_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^{(1)}(v_j) = 0$.

Then, in Equation (21), for each node $v_j \notin \vec{t}_{v_i}^k$, $\mathbf{h}_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^{(2)}(v_j)$ indicate the number of 2-Path from node v_{i+k-1} to the node v_j .

$$\mathbf{h}_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^{(2)}(v_j) = \mathbb{I}(v_j \notin \vec{t}_{v_i}^k) \sum_{v_m \in N(v_j)} \mathbf{h}_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^{(1)}(v_m) \quad (21)$$

Finally, in Equation (22), for each node $v_j \notin \vec{t}_{v_i}^k$, $\mathbf{h}_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^{(3)}(v_j)$ indicate the number of 3-Path from node v_{i+k-1} to the node v_j .

$$\mathbf{h}_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^{(3)}(v_j) = \mathbb{I}(v_j \notin \vec{t}_{v_i}^k) \sum_{v_m \in N(v_j)} (\mathbf{h}_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^{(2)}(v_m) - \mathbf{h}_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^{(1)}(v_j)), \quad (22)$$

If v_j is a one-hop neighbor of v_{i+k-1} , there exists a recursive 3-Path of the form $(v_{i+k-1}, v_j, v_m, v_j)$. To eliminate these recursive 3-Path for v_j , we use $\mathbf{h}_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^{(2)}(v_m) - \mathbf{h}_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^{(1)}(v_j)$.

Since $\vec{t}_{v_i}^k$ is a $k-1$ path from node v_i to node v_{i+k-1} and $\mathbf{h}_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^{(3)}(v_j)$ is the number of 3-Path from v_{i+k-1} to v_j , $\mathbf{h}_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^{(3)}(v_j)$ is the number of $k+2$ -Path from v_i to v_j that pass through the path $\vec{t}_{v_i}^k$. \square

Based on Lemma 3.2, given the graph $G(V, A, X)$, we can compute the total number of $k+2$ path in the graph G that starts from node v_i as follows: $n_{v_i}^{k+2} = \sum_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k \in \mathcal{T}_{v_i}^k} \sum_{v_j \in V} \mathbf{h}_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^{(3)}(v_j)$. \square

THEOREM 3.3. Given the graph $G(V, A, X)$, the k -Path rooted subgraph of the k -tuple node set $\mathcal{T}_{v_i}^k$ can count the number of $k+3$ -Cycle of the node v_i .

PROOF. Based on the Theorem 3.1, we can counting the number of $k+2$ -Path from each node v_i that passes through the path $\vec{t}_{v_i}^k \in \mathcal{T}_{v_i}^k$, then we can cunt the number of $k+3$ -Cycle of node v_i based on its neighbor $N(v_i)$ as $\sum_{v_j \in N(v_i)} \sum_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k \in \mathcal{T}_{v_i}^k} \mathbf{h}_{\vec{t}_{v_i}^k}^{(3)}$. \square

3.3 Consistency-aware Model Training

We propose a contrastive loss and a task-aware consistency loss to optimize GNNs, enhancing the generalizability of learned representations and effectively capturing graph patterns. Given a batch of graphs $\mathcal{G}_B = \{(G_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^B$ with size B , we generate two positive views \hat{G}_i and \tilde{G}_i for each $G_i \in \mathcal{G}_B$ by dropping edges from G_i based on Equation (17). The contrastive loss $\mathcal{L}_{cl}(f_\theta, G_i)$ for each graph G_i is defined as follows:

$$-\log \frac{\sum_{\{G_j | y_j = y_i\}} \sum_{\mathbf{h}'_i \in \{\hat{\mathbf{h}}_i, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i\}} \sum_{\mathbf{h}'_j \in \{\hat{\mathbf{h}}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_j\}} s(\mathbf{h}'_i, \mathbf{h}'_j) + s(\hat{\mathbf{h}}_i, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i)}{\sum_{G_i, G_j \in \mathcal{G}_B} \sum_{\mathbf{h}'_i \in \{\hat{\mathbf{h}}_i, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i\}} \sum_{\mathbf{h}'_j \in \{\hat{\mathbf{h}}_j, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_j\}} s(\hat{\mathbf{h}}_i, \hat{\mathbf{h}}_j)},$$

where $\{G_j | y_j = y_i\}$ denotes the graphs in \mathcal{G}_B that has the same label of G_i , and $s(\mathbf{h}_i, \mathbf{h}_j) = \exp(\text{cosine}(\mathbf{h}_i, \mathbf{h}_j)/\tau)$ is the similarity score between \mathbf{h}_i and \mathbf{h}_j based the temperature parameter τ .

Also, we define a task-aware consistency loss. Note that two positive pairs \hat{G}_i and \tilde{G}_i are created by dropping unimportant edges from G_i . For graph classification tasks, the graph label of \hat{G}_i and \tilde{G}_i should remain similar to the original graph G_i . For graph regression tasks, such as counting tasks, the cycle (resp. path) number in \hat{G}_i and \tilde{G}_i should be less than that in G_i , since dropping edges decreases the cycle and path numbers in G_i . Based on this analysis, we define the task-aware consistency loss $\mathcal{L}_{cy}(f_\theta, \hat{G}_i, \tilde{G}_i, y_i)$ for each graph G_i as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{cy}(\cdot) = \begin{cases} -\sum_{y \in y_i} (\log \hat{y}_i^*[y] + \log \tilde{y}_i^*[y]), & y_i \in \{0, 1\}^{|Y|} \\ \text{ReLU}(\hat{y}_i^* - y_i) + \text{ReLU}(\tilde{y}_i^* - y_i), & y_i \in \mathbb{R} \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

In summary, we pretrain the GNNs by the combination of contrastive learning loss and task-aware consistency loss.

$$\theta' = \arg \min_{\theta} \frac{1}{B} \sum_{G_i \in \mathcal{G}_B} \mathcal{L}_{cl}(f_\theta, \hat{G}_i, \tilde{G}_i, \text{Neg}_i) + \mathcal{L}_{cy}(f_\theta, \hat{G}_i, \tilde{G}_i, y_i) \quad (24)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{cl}(\cdot)$ is the contrastive loss in Equation (16), and $\mathcal{L}_{cy}(\cdot)$ is the task-aware consistency loss in Equation (23). Then, we can fine-tune the GNNs with labeled data $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{G}$ based on the task-specific loss in Equation (5).

4 EXPERIMENTS

We conduct experiments to analyze baselines and our model on both graph classification and regression tasks. Specifically, we introduce datasets and baselines in Section 4.1 and Section 4.2. We present the hyperparameter setting and the evaluation metric in Section 4.3 and Section 4.4, respectively. Effectiveness and efficiency are discussed in Section 4.5 and Section 4.6. Additionally, we evaluate baselines on more scenarios in Section 4.7.

4.1 Datasets

We use graphs from four domains, including social networks (SN), biology (BIO), chemistry (CHE), and geometric (GE) graphs. In particular, for dataset splitting, if a standard split is publicly available and commonly used in existing works, we adopt the standard split. If there is no standard split, we use a 10-fold cross-validation approach. The detailed data statistics and split ratio are in Table 2.

4.1.1 Social Networks.

- **IMDB-B [61]** and **IMDB-M [61]**. Two movie datasets from the IMDB [1], where nodes are actors, edges denote co-appearances, and labels indicate movie genres. IMDB-B and IMDB-M are binary and multiple-class classification datasets, respectively.
- **REDDIT-B [61]**. A binary social network dataset from Reddit [2], where nodes represent users, edges indicate interactions, and graphs are labeled as QA-based or discussion-based.
- **COLLAB-M [61]**. A multi-class scientific collaboration network, where nodes are researchers and edges indicate co-authorship. Each graph is labeled with different research fields.

4.1.2 Biology.

- **PROTEIN-B [61]**. A binary protein dataset where nodes represent secondary structure elements, edges denote proximity, and graphs indicate if the molecule is an enzyme.
- **DD-B [61]**. Derived from a molecular protein dataset, where nodes represent amino acids, and edges indicate adjacency. Each graph is labeled to classify different types of proteins.
- **ENZYMES [61]**. Derived from the BRENDA enzyme database, it represents nodes as secondary structural elements, edges as adjacency, and labels each graph with one of six EC classes.
- **MolHIV [35]** and **MolTox21 [35]**. They are molecular datasets, where nodes represent atoms, and edges are chemical bonds. Labels in MolHIV indicate whether the molecule has HIV inhibition, and labels in MolTox21 indicate the toxicity type.

4.1.3 Chemistry. MUTAG, NCI1, MolBACE, and MolPCBA are molecular graph datasets, with nodes represent atoms, node labels indicating the atomic species (e.g., N, C, O), and edges represent chemical bonds between atoms.

- **MUTAG [61]**. The labels are whether a molecule has mutagenic activity, referring to its potential to cause genetic mutations.
- **NCI1 [61]**. The labels specify whether a molecule shows a positive response in assays for specific anticancer activity.

Table 2: Data statistics. CV denotes Cross-Validation.

Type	Data	Graphs	Nodes	Edges	Feat	Classes	Split Ratio
SN	IMDB-B	1,000	19.77	96.53	N/A	2	10-fold CV
	IMDB-M	1,500	13.00	65.94	N/A	3	10-fold CV
	REDDIT-B	2,000	429.63	497.75	N/A	2	10-fold CV
	COLLAB	5,000	74.49	2,457.78	N/A	3	10-fold CV
BIO	PROTEINS	1,113	39.06	72.82	3	2	10-fold CV
	DD	1,178	284.32	715.66	89	2	10-fold CV
	ENZYMES	600	32.63	62.14	3	6	10-fold CV
	MolHIV	41,127	25.50	54.93	9	2	8/1/1
	MolTox21	7,831	18.90	39.22	9	12	8/1/1
CHE	MUTAG	188	17.93	19.79	7	2	10-fold CV
	NCI1	4,110	29.87	32.30	37	2	10-fold CV
	MolBACE	1,513	34.13	36.91	204	2	8/1/1
	MolPCBA	437,929	26.00	28.10	128	128	8/1/1
GE	{3, 4, 5}-Cycle	5,000	18.80	31.34	1	1	3/2/5
	{6, 7, 8}-Cycle	5,000	18.80	31.34	1	1	3/2/5
	{4, 5, 6}-Path	5,000	18.80	31.34	1	1	3/2/5
	4-Clique	5,000	18.80	31.34	1	1	3/2/5
	Tailed Tri.	5,000	18.80	31.34	1	1	3/2/5
	Chordal Cyc.	5,000	18.80	31.34	1	1	3/2/5
	Triangle Rect.	5,000	18.80	31.34	1	1	3/2/5

- **MolBACE [35]**. The labels indicate whether a molecule inhibits the BACE enzyme (Beta-secretase 1).
- **MolPCBA [35]**. The labels represent the activity of a molecule across 128 different bioassays, indicating whether the compound is active in a given experimental condition.

4.1.4 Geometric Graphs. The counting task aims to predict the number of specific substructures in each graph. We collect 14 datasets [101]. Labels include the counts of various substructures, including 3-Cycle, 4-Cycle, 5-Cycle, 6-Cycle, 7-Cycle, 8-Cycle, 4-Path, 5-Path, 6-Path, 4-Clique, Tailed-Triangle (Tailed Tri.), Chordal-Cycle, and Triangle-Rectangle.

4.2 Baselines

We compare and comprehensively investigate our proposed model with 14 representative and effective baselines in five types.

4.2.1 Node-based GNNs.

- **GCN [43]**. It utilizes graph convolutional layers to aggregate information from neighbors, serving as a fundamental GNN.
- **GIN [87]**. The GIN baseline employs sum pooling and utilizes Graph Isomorphism Network as the message passing layer.
- **GraphSAGE (SAGE) [31]**. It aggregates information from sampled neighbors using different functions, such as mean, LSTM, or pooling, to update node embeddings in a scalable manner.

4.2.2 Pooling-based GNNs.

- **TopK [9, 28]**. It performs node drop by selecting the top-ranked nodes based on a learnable scoring function.
- **GMT [4]**. It condenses nodes into important ones based on grouping-matrix and create edges via attention mechanism.
- **EPool [16]**. It progressively merges nodes by contracting high-scoring edges between adjacent nodes through edge clustering.

4.2.3 Subgraph-based GNNs.

- **ECS [88]**. It integrates a base GNN with precomputed structural embeddings to efficiently count substructures using distance information and message passing.

- **AK+** [102]. It extends base GNNs by replacing the local aggregation mechanism with a GNN that encodes general subgraphs instead of star-shaped patterns.
- **I2GNN** [38]. It enhances Subgraph MPNNs by employing multiple node identifiers, assigning distinct identifiers to the root node and its neighbors within each subgraph.

4.2.4 GL-based GNNs.

- **VIBGSL (VIB)** [74]. It uses the Information Bottleneck principle to mask irrelevant features and learn a task-relevant graph structure for improved GNN performance.
- **HGPSL (HGP)** [98]. It selects key nodes to form an induced subgraph and refines the graph structure using sparse attention-based structure learning.
- **MOSGSL (MO)** [107]. It reconstructs key subgraphs using a motif-driven guidance module that captures and aligns discriminative structural patterns

4.2.5 SSL-based GNNs.

- **RGC** [73]. It employs a diverse-curvature GCN and motif-aware contrastive learning on a stable kernel layer to model motif regularity and learn node representations.
- **MVGRL(MVG)** [32]. It uses diffusion algorithms, such as Personalized PageRank, to generate two positive views of the graph and maximize their similarity.
- **Ours**. It enhances expressivity with a k -path rooted subgraph approach and improves generalization through adaptive graph contrastive learning, ensuring robust performance across diverse tasks and scenarios.

4.3 Hyperparameter and Hardware Setting

For classification datasets, we set the batch size as 32 for four larger datasets (REDDIT-B, COLLAB, DD, and MolPCBA) and 128 for the other datasets. For regression datasets, we set the batch size as 256. The baselines and our model use different hyperparameters, which are fine-tuned by grid search based on validation data. For example, the hidden dimension is selected from $\{64, 128, 256, 512\}$, the learning rate from $\{1e-2, 1e-3, 1e-4, 1e-5\}$, and the dropout rate from $\{0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5\}$. Our model sets $k = 1$ for graph classification, and sets $k = 3$ for regression with 3-path sampling uniformly. All models are trained for a maximum of 2000 epochs, with early stopping applied if no improvement is observed on the validation set within 50 epochs.

All codes are executed on a CentOS 7 machine equipped with a 20-core Intel® Xeon® Silver 4210 CPU @ 2.20GHz, 8 NVIDIA GeForce RTX 2080 Ti GPUs, and 256GB of RAM.

4.4 Evaluation Metric

We define the effectiveness and efficiency metrics as follows.

4.4.1 Effectiveness Metric. Given a graph set $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{G} = \{(G_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{L}\mathcal{G}|}$, we denote the prediction label of each graph G_i as \hat{y}_i . For graph classification tasks, we use the **Strict Accuracy (Acc)**, **Micro-F1 (Mi-F1)**, and **Macro-F1 (Ma-F1)**. Particularly, if each graph only has one label, the **Micro-F1** is same as **Accuracy**.

- **Strict Accuracy (Acc).** Strict accuracy is defined as $Acc = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}\mathcal{G}|} \sum_{G_i \in \mathcal{L}\mathcal{G}} \mathbb{I}(y_i = \hat{y}_i)$, where $\mathbb{I}(y_i = \hat{y}_i) = 1$ if only $y_i = \hat{y}_i$.

- **Micro-F1 (Mi-F1).** The Micro-precision is defined as $Mi-P = \frac{\sum_{G_i \in \mathcal{L}\mathcal{G}} |y_i \cap \hat{y}_i|}{\sum_{G_j \in \mathcal{L}\mathcal{G}} |\hat{y}_j|}$ and Micro-recall is $Mi-R = \frac{\sum_{G_i \in \mathcal{L}\mathcal{G}} |y_i \cap \hat{y}_i|}{\sum_{G_j \in \mathcal{L}\mathcal{G}} |y_j|}$. Then, the Micro-F1 is defined as $Mi-F1 = \frac{2 \times Mi-P \times Mi-R}{Mi-P + Mi-R}$.
- **Macro-F1 (Ma-F1).** The Macro-precision is defined as $Ma-P = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}\mathcal{G}|} \sum_{G_i \in \mathcal{L}\mathcal{G}} \frac{|y_i \cap \hat{y}_i|}{|\hat{y}_i|}$ and Macro-recall is defined as $Ma-R = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}\mathcal{G}|} \sum_{G_i \in \mathcal{L}\mathcal{G}} \frac{|y_i \cap \hat{y}_i|}{|y_i|}$, Macro-F1 $Ma-F1 = \frac{2 \times Ma-P \times Ma-R}{Ma-P + Ma-R}$.

For graph regression tasks, we use the **Mean Absolute Error (MAE)** and **R2** as follows.

- **Mean Absolute Error (MAE).** Mean Absolute Error is defined as $MAE = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}\mathcal{G}|} \sum_{G_i \in \mathcal{L}\mathcal{G}} |y_i - \hat{y}_i|$.
- **R2.** The R2 is defined as $R2 = 1 - \frac{\sum_{G_i \in \mathcal{L}\mathcal{G}} (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2}{\sum_{G_i \in \mathcal{L}\mathcal{G}} (y_i - \bar{y})^2} \in [0, 1]$, where $\bar{y} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}\mathcal{G}|} \sum_{G_i \in \mathcal{L}\mathcal{G}} y_i$ is the mean of the true values. Higher R2 indicates better prediction performance.

4.4.2 Efficiency Metric. We evaluate the efficiency of models on both graph classification and regression tasks based on the **training time (s)**, **inference time (s)**, **memory usage (MB)** in training and inference phases.

4.5 Effectiveness Evaluation

In this subsection, we evaluate the effectiveness of GNNs on graph tasks from two aspects. Firstly, in Section 4.5.1, we assess whether existing GNNs can capture the core semantic patterns of graphs, where the core semantic patterns mainly determine graph labels. Secondly, in Section 4.5.2, we evaluate the expressivity ability of GNNs based, i.e., whether GNNs can distinguish graph geometric patterns, such as the number of cycles and paths.

4.5.1 Graph Classification Tasks. We evaluate baselines and our model on the graph classification tasks in Table 3. Firstly, node-based GNNs, such as GCN and GIN, cannot achieve satisfactory performance. These models learn node representations and use global pooling, which overlooks local graph structures, resulting in suboptimal outcomes compared to other GNN types. Secondly, pooling-based approaches propose to progressively reduce the graph size hierarchically and progressively learn the graph representations, which cannot achieve the best performance. This is because they simply keep the top-k most important nodes and concentrate similar nodes into a community to learn graph representation, ignoring local graph structure information. Thirdly, subgraph-based approaches effectively capture intricate local structures within the graphs, making them well-suited for bioinformatics applications where understanding detailed interactions is essential. However, their computational intensity and potential overfitting to subgraph patterns present notable challenges. Fourthly, graph learning-based approaches reconstruct graph structure and node features to remove noisy information, thereby enhancing performance on noisy datasets, such as social networks. Lastly, SSL-based approaches propose to learn generalizable representations based on pretraining on unlabeled graphs and fine-tuning on labeled graphs. Particularly, our proposed model achieves the best or comparable performance on all datasets. This is because we propose adaptive

Table 5: Efficiency evaluation. We report the total training time (Train (s)), and total inference time (Infer (s)), and GPU memory during training (T-Mem) and inference (I-Mem).

Type	Dataset	Metric	Node-based			Pooling-based			Subgraph-based			GL-based			SSL-based		
			GCN	GIN	SAGE	TopK	GMT	EPool	ECS	AK+	I2GNN	VIB	HGP	MO	RGC	MVG	Ours
SN	REDDIT-B	Train(s)	192.44	182.98	179.55	218.03	758.22	8365.60	OOM	OOM	OOM	OOM	OOM	371.86	OOM	OOM	411.93
		Infer(s)	28.42	26.21	26.04	32.95	30.45	1953.91	OOM	OOM	OOM	OOM	OOM	79.35	OOM	OOM	34.50
		T-Mem(MB)	287	288	310	287	2120	360	OOM	OOM	OOM	OOM	OOM	604	OOM	OOM	4287
		I-Mem(MB)	190	122	135	190	244	194	OOM	OOM	OOM	OOM	OOM	289	OOM	OOM	190
BIO	ENZYMES	Train(s)	<u>26.05</u>	26.34	25.23	31.95	38.85	375.25	312.46	350.25	470.05	120.48	67.5	75.29	495.23	57.53	55.45
		Infer(s)	<u>5.19</u>	5.33	5.04	6.84	7.17	76.30	68.74	68.93	94.92	36.12	19.20	28.27	85.11	7.76	5.80
		T-Mem(MB)	83	<u>78</u>	77	83	228	103	582	2369	1656	323	186	506	282	324	246
		I-Mem(MB)	<u>42</u>	36	36	<u>42</u>	46	45	270	879	790	152	95	194	54	58	<u>42</u>
CHE	MUTAG	Train(s)	<u>10.78</u>	11.03	10.05	13.50	15.96	60.13	52.05	88.70	67.33	44.37	35.32	39.99	80.49	25.15	18.72
		Infer(s)	<u>3.86</u>	3.89	3.51	5.27	4.01	17.74	18.91	21.18	25.10	15.80	11.63	15.18	29.78	7.64	4.22
		T-Mem(MB)	42	<u>44</u>	<u>44</u>	42	82	46	422	775	1306	56	48	431	134	140	102
		I-Mem(MB)	19	<u>20</u>	21	19	24	19	245	210	722	26	27	74	24	25	19
GE	4-Cycle	Train(s)	166.50	<u>160.95</u>	140.88	180.57	1224.39	482.95	1180.51	645.97	1487.66	395.71	284.34	394.60	1770.94	300.21	1503.16
		Infer(s)	256.17	<u>241.02</u>	235.40	279.43	2058.62	1033.68	1776.91	920.13	2219.63	549.60	441.95	583.55	2675.22	461.87	2255.94
		T-Mem(MB)	<u>88</u>	85	85	<u>88</u>	380	104	1214	1734	3080	262	269	470	238	237	4327
		I-Mem(MB)	<u>64</u>	62	62	<u>64</u>	260	68	342	608	726	104	152	270	103	96	737

contrastive learning and sample subgraphs to learn local structure information, thereby learning a generalizable and informative graph representation.

4.5.2 Graph Regression Tasks. For graph regression, we mainly evaluate the ability of GNNs to capture the semantics and core patterns of graphs, based on cycle counting and path counting for each graph. Lower MAE and higher R2 values indicate better performance. As shown in Table 4, node-based (except GIN), pooling-based, GL-based, and SSL-based approaches (except our model) do not achieve satisfactory performance. This is because these approaches are not designed to enhance the expressivity of GNNs, i.e., they cannot distinguish whether two graphs are isomorphic or have the same cycles. In contrast, GIN, subgraph-based GNNs, and our model aim to theoretically increase the expressivity of GNNs, thereby achieving satisfying performance. Particularly, our model performs the best on all datasets. This is because our model is guaranteed to have better expressivity, such as counting 8-Cycle, while other approaches have low expressivity. Additionally, we propose a unified contrastive learning approach to augment graphs and achieve more generalizable graph representations.

4.6 Efficiency Evaluation

We evaluate the efficiency of GNNs in terms of time and GPU peak memory consumption during both the training and inference phases. As shown in Table 5, node-based GNNs are the most efficient because they directly learn node representations from the original graphs without any additional processing. Secondly, the pooling-based approach, TopK also achieves good efficiency and low memory usage by retaining only the most important nodes. However, GMT and EPool are slightly less efficient as it computes use nodes features to compute the cluster representation and pairwise similarities between connected nodes to form clusters, respectively. Thirdly, subgraph-based and GL-based approaches are less efficient due to their reliance on additional graph processing. Subgraph-based GNNs sample subgraphs for each root node or generate multiple subgraphs and learn representations for each one, which increases time and memory costs. Similarly, GL-based approaches iteratively optimize the graph structure and node features while

training the GNNs, further adding to resource consumption. Lastly, SSL-based approaches are computationally intensive in training because they augment graphs into positive pairs and optimize GNNs by maximizing the similarity between these pairs, which increases time and memory usage. However, during inference, they do not require graph augmentation and operate directly on the original graphs, resulting in efficiency comparable to node-based GNNs.

4.7 More Scenarios

We evaluate GNNs in more realistic scenarios, including noisy graphs, imbalanced graphs, and few-shot graphs. To ensure clarity, we select one representative graph dataset from each domain for evaluation, i.e., IMDB-M, ENZYMES, NCI1, and 4-Cycle. Additionally, we compare the most effective GNN model from each GNN category, including GCN, GMT, with AK+ and MO for classification tasks, I2GNN and HGPSL for regression tasks, with our model.

4.7.1 Robustness Evaluation. We evaluate the robustness of existing GNNs on noisy and incomplete graphs. Specifically, for each graph $G(V, A, X)$, we randomly delete $\alpha|A|_0$ existing edges by varying a ratio $\alpha \in \{0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5\}$. As shown in Figure 3, as α increases, the performance of GNNs decreases and our proposed model outperform other baselines under the same ratio α . Specifically, node-based GCN shows the sharply decline due to their reliance on the original graph structure and global pooling, which fail to capture local patterns effectively. Also, Pooling-based approach GMT also performs unsatisfying as it separates nodes into different clusters based on node similarity and connectivity, while edge deletions significantly affect the cluster results. Subgraph-based approach AK+ performs better by capturing intricate local patterns, but their reliance on subgraph sampling makes them sensitive to edge deletions. GL-based method MO shows resilience by dynamically learning graph structures. Particularly, our proposed model outperforms all baselines, maintaining strong performance on all α values. By leveraging adaptive contrastive learning and subgraph sampling, it effectively captures local structures and mitigates the impact of noise, resulting in superior robustness.

4.7.2 Imbalance Data Evaluation. In the graph classification task, given a dataset $\mathcal{G} = (G_i, y_i)$, we simulate class imbalance by setting




Figure 3: Robustness evaluation.




Figure 4: Imbalance data evaluation.




Figure 5: Few-shot evaluation.

the proportions of training samples per class as $\{1, \frac{1}{2\beta}, \frac{1}{3\beta}, \dots, \frac{1}{\lfloor y \rfloor \beta}\}$, where $\beta \in \{0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2\}$ controls the imbalance ratio. The number of samples in the first class is fixed under all β values. For graph regression tasks, where $y_i \in [y_{\min}, y_{\max}]$, we partition the label range into three equal buckets and vary the proportions of the groups as $\{1, \frac{1}{2\beta}, \frac{1}{3\beta}\}$ to simulate imbalance. A higher β indicates a greater level of imbalance. As shown in Figure 4, GCN and GMT struggle with both classification and regression tasks due to their reliance on global graph aggregation, which dilutes the features of minority class nodes and edges in imbalanced datasets. Similarly, AK+ (and I2GNN) and MO (and HGP), despite incorporating subgraph-level information or reconstructing graph structures, fail to explicitly address class imbalance, limiting their ability to preserve minority class features under skewed distributions. In contrast, our model demonstrates superior robustness across all tasks. By effectively capturing task-relevant subgraphs and leveraging adaptive contrastive learning, it mitigates the dominance of majority class features and balances feature representations, preserving the features of minority classes even under severe imbalance.

4.7.3 Few-shot Evaluation. Specifically, For graph classification tasks, given a training graph dataset $\mathcal{G} = \{(G_i, y_i)\}$, we set the number of training graphs per class as $\gamma \in \{5, 10, 15, 20, 25\}$. For graph regression tasks, we partition the range $[y_{\min}, y_{\max}]$ into five equal buckets to create discrete groups and sample γ training instances for each bucket. As shown in Figure 5, GCN and

GMT struggle in few-shot settings due to their reliance on global graph aggregation, which oversmooths features and fails to preserve task-relevant substructures. Similarly, AK+, I2GNN, MO, and HGP, while incorporating subgraph-level information, lack mechanisms to prioritize task-relevant features or adapt to low-data conditions, leading to suboptimal performance. In contrast, our model demonstrates superior performance across all tasks by explicitly capturing task-relevant subgraphs and leveraging adaptive contrastive learning, achieving robust generalization even with very limited training data.

5 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we systematically revisit existing GNNs for graph-level tasks, categorizing them into five types: node-based, hierarchical pooling-based, subgraph-based, graph learning-based, and self-supervised learning-based approaches. To address limitations in current evaluation practices, we proposed a unified evaluation framework that ensures comprehensive and fair comparisons by incorporating diverse datasets, multiple tasks, and challenging scenarios such as noisy, imbalanced, and few-shot graphs. Furthermore, we propose a novel GNN model that enhances expressivity through a k -path rooted subgraph approach and improves generalization via adaptive graph contrastive learning. Extensive experiments demonstrated the superior performance of our model across a wide range of graph-level tasks and twenty-seven datasets.

REFERENCES

- [1] 2024. IMDb: Ratings, Reviews, and Where to Watch the Best Movies & TV Shows – imdb.com. <https://www.imdb.com/>.
- [2] 2024. Reddit. <https://www.reddit.com/?rdt=55615>.
- [3] Sami Abu-El-Haija, Bryan Perozzi, Amol Kapoor, Nazanin Alipourfard, Kristina Lerman, Hrayr Harutyunyan, Greg Ver Steeg, and Aram Galstyan. 2019. Mixhop: Higher-order graph convolutional architectures via sparsified neighborhood mixing. In *international conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 21–29.
- [4] Jinheon Baek, Minki Kang, and Sung Ju Hwang. 2021. Accurate Learning of Graph Representations with Graph Multiset Pooling. In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3–7, 2021*. OpenReview.net.
- [5] Beatrice Bevilacqua, Moshe Eliasof, Eli Meir, Bruno Ribeiro, and Haggai Maron. 2024. Efficient Subgraph GNNs by Learning Effective Selection Policies. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [6] Beatrice Bevilacqua, Fabrizio Frasca, Derek Lim, Balasubramanian Srinivasan, Chen Cai, Gopinath Balamurugan, Michael M. Bronstein, and Haggai Maron. 2022. Equivariant Subgraph Aggregation Networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [7] Filippo Maria Bianchi, Daniele Grattarola, and Cesare Alippi. 2020. Spectral clustering with graph neural networks for graph pooling. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 874–883.
- [8] Angela Bonifati, M Tamer Özsu, Yuanyuan Tian, Hannes Voigt, Wenyuan Yu, and Wenjie Zhang. 2024. The future of graph analytics. In *Companion of the 2024 International Conference on Management of Data*. 544–545.
- [9] Cătălina Cangea, Petar Veličković, Nikola Jovanović, Thomas Kipf, and Pietro Liò. 2018. Towards sparse hierarchical graph classifiers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.01287* (2018).
- [10] Tingyang Chen, Dazhuo Qiu, Yinghui Wu, Arijit Khan, Xiangyu Ke, and Yunjun Gao. 2024. View-based explanations for graph neural networks. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data* 2, 1 (2024), 1–27.
- [11] Sara Cohen. 2016. Data management for social networking. In *Proceedings of the 35th ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGAI symposium on principles of database systems*. 165–177.
- [12] Leonardo Cotta, Christopher Morris, and Bruno Ribeiro. 2021. Reconstruction for powerful graph representations. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), 1713–1726.
- [13] Yue Cui, Kai Zheng, Dingshan Cui, Jiandong Xie, Liwei Deng, Feiteng Huang, and Xiaofang Zhou. 2021. METRO: a generic graph neural network framework for multivariate time series forecasting. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 15, 2 (2021), 224–236.
- [14] Gunduz Vehbi Demirci, Aparajita Haldar, and Hakan Ferhatosmanoglu. 2022. Scalable Graph Convolutional Network Training on Distributed-Memory Systems. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 16, 4 (2022), 711–724. <https://www.vldb.org/pvldb/vol16/p711-demirci.pdf>
- [15] Inderjit S Dhillon, Yuqiang Guan, and Brian Kulis. 2007. Weighted graph cuts without eigenvectors a multilevel approach. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 29, 11 (2007), 1944–1957.
- [16] Frederik Diehl. 2019. Edge contraction pooling for graph neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.10990* (2019).
- [17] Zhihao Ding, Jieming Shi, Shiqi Shen, Xuequn Shang, Jiannong Cao, Zhipeng Wang, and Zhi Gong. 2024. Sgcod: Substructure-enhanced graph-level out-of-distribution detection. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*. 467–476.
- [18] Negine Entezari, Saba A Al-Sayouri, Amirali Darvishzadeh, and Evangelos E Papalexakis. 2020. All you need is low (rank) defending against adversarial attacks on graphs. In *Proceedings of the 13th international conference on web search and data mining*. 169–177.
- [19] Federico Errica, Marco Podda, Davide Bacciu, and Alessio Micheli. 2019. A fair comparison of graph neural networks for graph classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.09893* (2019).
- [20] Wenfei Fan. 2022. Big graphs: challenges and opportunities. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 15, 12 (2022), 3782–3797.
- [21] Yixiang Fang, Xin Huang, Lu Qin, Ying Zhang, Wenjie Zhang, Reynold Cheng, and Xuemin Lin. 2020. A survey of community search over big graphs. *The VLDB Journal* 29 (2020), 353–392.
- [22] Yixiang Fang, Wensheng Luo, and Chenhao Ma. 2022. Densest subgraph discovery on large graphs: Applications, challenges, and techniques. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 15, 12 (2022), 3766–3769.
- [23] Bahare Fatemi, Sami Abu-El-Haija, Anton Tsitsulin, Mehran Kazemi, Dustin Zelle, Neslihan Bulut, Jonathan Halcrow, and Bryan Perozzi. 2023. UGSL: A unified framework for benchmarking graph structure learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10737* (2023).
- [24] Jiarui Feng, Yixin Chen, Fuhai Li, Anindya Sarkar, and Muhan Zhang. 2022. How powerful are k-hop message passing graph neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 4776–4790.
- [25] Hendrik Fichtenberger and Pan Peng. 2022. Approximately Counting Subgraphs in Data Streams. In *Proceedings of the 41st ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGAI Symposium on Principles of Database Systems*. 413–425.
- [26] Luca Franceschi, Mathias Niepert, Massimiliano Pontil, and Xiao He. 2019. Learning discrete structures for graph neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 1972–1982.
- [27] Fabrizio Frasca, Beatrice Bevilacqua, Michael Bronstein, and Haggai Maron. 2022. Understanding and extending subgraph gnn by rethinking their symmetries. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 31376–31390.
- [28] Hongyang Gao and Shuiwang Ji. 2019. Graph u-nets. In *international conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2083–2092.
- [29] Shihong Gao, Yiming Li, Xin Zhang, Yanyan Shen, Yingxia Shao, and Lei Chen. 2024. SIMPLE: Efficient Temporal Graph Neural Network Training at Scale with Dynamic Data Placement. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data* 2, 3 (2024), 1–25.
- [30] Rustam Guliyev, Aparajita Haldar, and Hakan Ferhatosmanoglu. 2024. D3-GNN: Dynamic Distributed Dataflow for Streaming Graph Neural Networks. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 17, 11 (2024), 2764–2777.
- [31] Will Hamilton, Zitao Ying, and Jure Leskovec. 2017. Inductive representation learning on large graphs. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [32] Kaveh Hassani and Amir Hosein Khasahmadi. 2020. Contrastive multi-view representation learning on graphs. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 4116–4126.
- [33] Taher Haveliwala. 1999. *Efficient computation of PageRank*. Technical Report. Stanford.
- [34] Zhenyu Hou, Xiao Liu, Yukuo Cen, Yuxiao Dong, Hongxia Yang, Chunjie Wang, and Jie Tang. 2022. Graphmae: Self-supervised masked graph autoencoders. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 594–604.
- [35] Weihua Hu, Matthias Fey, Marinka Zitnik, Yuxiao Dong, Hongyu Ren, Bowen Liu, Michele Catasta, and Jure Leskovec. 2020. Open graph benchmark: Datasets for machine learning on graphs. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 22118–22133.
- [36] Ziniu Hu, Yuxiao Dong, Kuansan Wang, Kai-Wei Chang, and Yizhou Sun. 2020. GPT-GNN: Generative pre-training of graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*. 1857–1867.
- [37] Kezhao Huang, Haitian Jiang, Minjie Wang, Guangxuan Xiao, David Wipf, Xiang Song, Quan Gan, Zengfeng Huang, Jidong Zhai, and Zheng Zhang. 2024. FreshGNN: Reducing Memory Access via Stable Historical Embeddings for Graph Neural Network Training. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 17, 6 (2024), 1473–1486.
- [38] Yanan Huang, Xingang Peng, Jianzhu Ma, and Muhan Zhang. 2022. Boosting the Cycle Counting Power of Graph Neural Networks with I2GNNs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.13978* (2022).
- [39] Eric Inae, Gang Liu, and Meng Jiang. 2023. Motif-aware attribute masking for molecular graph pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.04589* (2023).
- [40] Wei Jin, Tyler Derr, Haochen Liu, Yiqi Wang, Suhang Wang, Zitao Liu, and Jiliang Tang. 2020. Self-supervised learning on graphs: Deep insights and new direction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.10141* (2020).
- [41] Wei Jin, Tyler Derr, Yiqi Wang, Yao Ma, Zitao Liu, and Jiliang Tang. 2021. Node similarity preserving graph convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM international conference on web search and data mining*. 148–156.
- [42] Wei Jin, Yao Ma, Xiaorui Liu, Xianfeng Tang, Suhang Wang, and Jiliang Tang. 2020. Graph structure learning for robust graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*. 66–74.
- [43] Thomas N Kipf and Max Welling. 2016. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.02907* (2016).
- [44] Junhyun Lee, Inyeop Lee, and Jaewoo Kang. 2019. Self-attention graph pooling. In *International conference on machine learning*. pmlr, 3734–3743.
- [45] Namkyeong Lee, Junseok Lee, and Chanyoung Park. 2022. Augmentation-free self-supervised learning on graphs. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 36. 7372–7380.
- [46] Haoyang Li and Lei Chen. 2021. Cache-based gnn system for dynamic graphs. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*. 937–946.
- [47] Haoyang Li and Lei Chen. 2023. Early: Efficient and reliable graph neural network for dynamic graphs. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data* 1, 2 (2023), 1–28.
- [48] Haoyang Li, Shimin Di, Lei Chen, and Xiaofang Zhou. 2024. E2GCL: Efficient and Expressive Contrastive Learning on Graph Neural Networks. In *2024 IEEE 40th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE, 859–873.
- [49] Haoyang Li, Shimin Di, Calvin Hong Yi Li, Lei Chen, and Xiaofang Zhou. 2024. Fight Fire with Fire: Towards Robust Graph Neural Networks on Dynamic Graphs via Actively Defense. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 17, 8 (2024),

- 2050–2063.
- [50] Haoyang Li, Shimin Di, Zijian Li, Lei Chen, and Jiannong Cao. 2022. Black-box adversarial attack and defense on graph neural networks. In *2022 IEEE 38th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE, 1017–1030.
- [51] Qiyang Li and Jeffrey Xu Yu. 2024. Fast Local Subgraph Counting. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 17, 8 (2024), 1967–1980.
- [52] Yuanzhi Li and Yang Yuan. 2017. Convergence analysis of two-layer neural networks with relu activation. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [53] Yujia Li, Richard Zemel, Marc Brockschmidt, and Daniel Tarlow. 2016. Gated Graph Sequence Neural Networks. In *Proceedings of ICLR’16*.
- [54] Zhiyuan Li, Xun Jian, Yue Wang, and Lei Chen. 2022. CC-GNN: A community and contraction-based graph neural network. In *2022 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*. IEEE, 231–240.
- [55] Zhiyuan Li, Xun Jian, Yue Wang, Yingxia Shao, and Lei Chen. 2024. DAHA: Accelerating GNN Training with Data and Hardware Aware Execution Planning. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 17, 6 (2024), 1364–1376.
- [56] Zhixun Li, Xin Sun, Yifan Luo, Yanqiao Zhu, Dingshuo Chen, Yingtao Luo, Xiangxin Zhou, Qiang Liu, Shu Wu, Liang Wang, et al. 2024. GSLB: the graph structure learning benchmark. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [57] Ningyi Liao, Dingheng Mo, Siqiang Luo, Xiang Li, and Pengcheng Yin. 2022. SCARA: scalable graph neural networks with feature-oriented optimization. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 15, 11 (2022), 3240–3248.
- [58] Qingyuan Linghu, Fan Zhang, Xuemin Lin, Wenjie Zhang, and Ying Zhang. 2020. Global reinforcement of social networks: The anchored coreness problem. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data*. 2211–2226.
- [59] Dongsheng Luo, Wei Cheng, Wenchao Yu, Bo Zong, Jingchao Ni, Haifeng Chen, and Xiang Zhang. 2021. Learning to drop: Robust graph neural network via topological denoising. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM international conference on web search and data mining*. 779–787.
- [60] Diego Mesquita, Amauri Souza, and Samuel Kaski. 2020. Rethinking pooling in graph neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 2220–2231.
- [61] Christopher Morris, Nils M Kriege, Franka Bause, Kristian Kersting, Petra Mutzel, and Marion Neumann. 2020. TUDataset: A collection of benchmark datasets for learning with graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.08663* (2020).
- [62] Giannis Nikolentzos, George Dasoulas, and Michalis Vazirgiannis. 2020. K-hop graph neural networks. *Neural Networks* 130 (2020), 195–205.
- [63] Hakan T Otal, Abdulhamit Subasi, Furkan Kurt, M Abdullah Canbaz, and Yasin Uzun. 2024. Analysis of Gene Regulatory Networks from Gene Expression Using Graph Neural Networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.13664* (2024).
- [64] Pál András Papp, Karolis Martinkus, Lukas Faber, and Roger Wattenhofer. 2021. DropGNN: Random dropouts increase the expressiveness of graph neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), 21997–22009.
- [65] Pál András Papp and Roger Wattenhofer. 2022. A theoretical comparison of graph neural network extensions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 17323–17345.
- [66] S Patro. 2015. Normalization: A preprocessing stage. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.06462* (2015).
- [67] Bryan Perozzi et al. 2014. Deepwalk: Online learning of social representations. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*. 701–710.
- [68] Chendi Qian, Gaurav Rattan, Floris Geerts, Mathias Niepert, and Christopher Morris. 2022. Ordered subgraph aggregation networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 21030–21045.
- [69] Dylan Sandfelter, Priyesh Vijayan, and William L Hamilton. 2021. Ego-gnns: Exploiting ego structures in graph neural networks. In *ICASSP 2021-2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 8523–8527.
- [70] Tim Schwabe and Maribel Aco. 2024. Cardinality Estimation over Knowledge Graphs with Embeddings and Graph Neural Networks. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data* 2, 1 (2024), 1–26.
- [71] Zezhi Shao, Zhao Zhang, Wei Wei, Fei Wang, Yongjun Xu, Xin Cao, and Christian S Jensen. 2022. Decoupled dynamic spatial-temporal graph neural network for traffic forecasting. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 15, 11 (2022), 2733–2746.
- [72] Xing Su, Shan Xue, Fanzhen Liu, Jia Wu, Jian Yang, Chuan Zhou, Wenbin Hu, Cecile Paris, Surya Nepal, Di Jin, et al. 2022. A comprehensive survey on community detection with deep learning. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* (2022).
- [73] Li Sun, Zhenhao Huang, Zixi Wang, Feiyang Wang, Hao Peng, and S Yu Philip. 2024. Motif-aware riemannian graph neural network with generative-contrastive learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 38. 9044–9052.
- [74] Qingyun Sun, Jianxin Li, Hao Peng, Jia Wu, Xingcheng Fu, Cheng Ji, and S Yu Philip. 2022. Graph structure learning with variational information bottleneck. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 36. 4165–4174.
- [75] Fei Teng, Haoyang Li, Shimin Di, and Lei Chen. 2024. Cardinality Estimation on Hyper-relational Knowledge Graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.15231* (2024).
- [76] Shantanu Thakoor, Corentin Tallec, Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, Rémi Munos, Petar Veličković, and Michal Valko. 2021. Bootstrapped representation learning on graphs. In *ICLR 2021 Workshop on Geometrical and Topological Representation Learning*.
- [77] A Vaswani. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (2017).
- [78] Petar Veličković, Guillem Cucurull, Arantxa Casanova, Adriana Romero, Pietro Lio, and Yoshua Bengio. 2017. Graph attention networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.10903* (2017).
- [79] Guangtao Wang, Zhitao Ying, Jing Huang, and Jure Leskovec. 2021. Multi-hop Attention Graph Neural Network. In *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [80] Huizhao Wang, Yao Fu, Tao Yu, Linghui Hu, Weihao Jiang, and Shiliang Pu. 2023. Prose: Graph structure learning via progressive strategy. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 2337–2348.
- [81] Hanchen Wang, Rong Hu, Ying Zhang, Lu Qin, Wei Wang, and Wenjie Zhang. 2022. Neural subgraph counting with Wasserstein estimator. In *Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference on Management of Data*. 160–175.
- [82] Haonan Wang, Jieyu Zhang, Qi Zhu, and Wei Huang. 2022. Augmentation-Free Graph Contrastive Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.04874* (2022).
- [83] Kai Wang, Yuwei Xu, and Siqiang Luo. 2024. TIGER: Training Inductive Graph Neural Network for Large-scale Knowledge Graph Reasoning. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 17, 10 (2024), 2459–2472.
- [84] Pengyun Wang, Junyu Luo, Yanxin Shen, Ming Zhang, Siyu Heng, and Xiao Luo. 2024. A comprehensive graph pooling benchmark: Effectiveness, robustness and generalizability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.09031* (2024).
- [85] Yu Wang, Wei Jin, and Tyler Derr. 2022. Graph neural networks: Self-supervised learning. *Graph Neural Networks: Foundations, Frontiers, and Applications* (2022), 391–420.
- [86] Huijun Wu, Chen Wang, Yuriy Tyshetskiy, Andrew Docherty, Kai Lu, and Liming Zhu. 2019. Adversarial examples for graph data: deep insights into attack and defense. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. 4816–4823.
- [87] Keyulu Xu, Weihua Hu, Jure Leskovec, and Stefanie Jegelka. 2019. How Powerful are Graph Neural Networks?. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=ryGs6iA5Km>
- [88] Zuoyu Yan, Junru Zhou, Liangcai Gao, Zhi Tang, and Muhan Zhang. 2024. An Efficient Subgraph GNN with Provable Substructure Counting Power. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 3702–3713.
- [89] Kuo Yang, Zhengyang Zhou, Wei Sun, Pengkun Wang, Xu Wang, and Yang Wang. 2023. Extract and refine: Finding a support subgraph set for graph representation. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 2953–2964.
- [90] Tianjun Yao, Yingxu Wang, Kun Zhang, and Shangsong Liang. 2023. Improving the expressiveness of k-hop message-passing gnns by injecting contextualized substructure information. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 3070–3081.
- [91] Chun-Hsiao Yeh, Cheng-Yao Hong, Yen-Chi Hsu, Tyng-Luh Liu, Yubei Chen, and Yann LeCun. 2022. Decoupled contrastive learning. In *European conference on computer vision*. Springer, 668–684.
- [92] Zhitao Ying, Jiaxuan You, Christopher Morris, Xiang Ren, Will Hamilton, and Jure Leskovec. 2018. Hierarchical graph representation learning with differentiable pooling. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 31 (2018).
- [93] Jiaxuan You, Jonathan M Gomes-Selman, Rex Ying, and Jure Leskovec. 2021. Identity-aware graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 35. 10737–10745.
- [94] Jinliang Yuan, Hualei Yu, Meng Cao, Ming Xu, Junyuan Xie, and Chongjun Wang. 2021. Semi-Supervised and Self-Supervised Classification with Multi-View Graph Neural Networks. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*. 2466–2476.
- [95] Xuan Zang, Xianbing Zhao, and Buzhou Tang. 2023. Hierarchical molecular graph self-supervised learning for property prediction. *Communications Chemistry* 6, 1 (2023), 34.
- [96] Muhan Zhang and Pan Li. 2021. Nested graph neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), 15734–15747.
- [97] Xin Zhang, Yanyan Shen, Yingxia Shao, and Lei Chen. 2023. DUCATI: A dual-cache training system for graph neural networks on giant graphs with the GPU. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data* 1, 2 (2023), 1–24.
- [98] Zhen Zhang, Jiajun Bu, Martin Ester, Jianfeng Zhang, Chengwei Yao, Zhi Yu, and Can Wang. 2019. Hierarchical graph pooling with structure learning. *arXiv*

- [preprint arXiv:1911.05954](#) (2019).
- [99] Zaixi Zhang, Qi Liu, Hao Wang, Chengqiang Lu, and Chee-Kong Lee. 2021. Motif-based graph self-supervised learning for molecular property prediction. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), 15870–15882.
- [100] Kangfei Zhao, Jeffrey Xu Yu, Hao Zhang, Qiyang Li, and Yu Rong. 2021. A learned sketch for subgraph counting. In *Proceedings of the 2021 International Conference on Management of Data*. 2142–2155.
- [101] Lingxiao Zhao, Wei Jin, Leman Akoglu, and Neil Shah. 2022. From Stars to Subgraphs: Uplifting Any GNN with Local Structure Awareness. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [102] Lingxiao Zhao, Wei Jin, Leman Akoglu, and Neil Shah. 2022. From Stars to Subgraphs: Uplifting Any GNN with Local Structure Awareness. In *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2022, Virtual Event, April 25-29, 2022*. OpenReview.net.
- [103] Yue Zhao, Gao Cong, Jiachen Shi, and Chunyan Miao. 2022. Queryformer: A tree transformer model for query plan representation. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 15, 8 (2022), 1658–1670.
- [104] Zhou Zhiyao, Sheng Zhou, Bochao Mao, Xuanyi Zhou, Jiawei Chen, Qiaoyu Tan, Daochen Zha, Yan Feng, Chun Chen, and Can Wang. 2024. OpenGSL: A comprehensive benchmark for graph structure learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [105] Zhiqiang Zhong and Davide Mottin. 2023. Knowledge-augmented Graph Machine Learning for Drug Discovery: From Precision to Interpretability. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 5841–5842.
- [106] Xuanhe Zhou, Ji Sun, Guoliang Li, and Jianhua Feng. 2020. Query performance prediction for concurrent queries using graph embedding. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 13, 9 (2020), 1416–1428.
- [107] Zhiyao Zhou, Sheng Zhou, Bochao Mao, Jiawei Chen, Qingyun Sun, Yan Feng, Chun Chen, and Can Wang. 2024. Motif-driven Subgraph Structure Learning for Graph Classification. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.08897](#) (2024).
- [108] Yanqiao Zhu et al. 2021. Graph contrastive learning with adaptive augmentation. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021*. 2069–2080.
- [109] Yanqiao Zhu, Yichen Xu, Feng Yu, Qiang Liu, Shu Wu, and Liang Wang. 2020. Deep graph contrastive representation learning. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.04131](#) (2020).
- [110] Yuanhang Zou, Zhihao Ding, Jieming Shi, Shuting Guo, Chunchen Su, and Yafei Zhang. 2023. EmbedX: A Versatile, Efficient and Scalable Platform to Embed Both Graphs and High-Dimensional Sparse Data. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 16, 12 (2023), 3543–3556.