

Non-Euclidean Hierarchical Representational Learning using Hyperbolic Graph Neural Networks for Environmental Claim Detection

Darpan Aswal

Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur
darpanaswal@kgpian.iitkgp.ac.in

Manjira Sinha

TCS Research
manjiras@gmail.com

Abstract

Transformer-based models dominate NLP tasks like sentiment analysis, machine translation, and claim verification. However, their massive computational demands and lack of interpretability pose challenges for real-world applications requiring efficiency and transparency. In this work, we explore Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) and Hyperbolic Graph Neural Networks (HGNNs) as lightweight yet effective alternatives for Environmental Claim Detection, reframing it as a graph classification problem. We construct dependency parsing graphs to explicitly model syntactic structures, using simple word embeddings (word2vec) for node features with dependency relations encoded as edge features. Our results demonstrate that these graph-based models achieve comparable or superior performance to state-of-the-art transformers while using 30x fewer parameters. This efficiency highlights the potential of structured, interpretable, and computationally efficient graph-based approaches.

1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) are getting increasingly accepted as the standard in many industry applications (Chkirbene et al., 2024), achieving state-of-the-art performance in tasks such as sentiment analysis, machine translation, and claim verification (Miah et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2023; Xu et al., 2024). However, their dominance has also raised concerns—LLMs require large-scale computational resources, leaving behind a large carbon footprint (Faiz et al., 2023) which makes them overkill for many real-world applications. Their black-box nature is yet another issue which limits interpretability (Lin et al., 2023). Specifically, in claim verification, where corporate statements must be rigorously analyzed, over-reliance on black-box models can result in misleading or unverifiable conclusions. The increasing scrutiny on sustainability claims further necessitates interpretability and com-

putationally efficiency in models.

Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) and their hyperbolic counterpart (HGNNs) (Wu et al., 2020; Zhou et al., 2023) present a compelling alternative. These architectures offer a structured and interpretable approach to syntactic and semantic learning while significantly reducing computational overhead. Unlike the implicit encoding of relationships in LLMs, GNNs and HGNNs explicitly model hierarchical and relational dependencies through graph structures such as constituency parsing or dependency parsing graphs (Li et al., 2020b; Nivre, 2010). Furthermore, these models can integrate rich semantic information from word embeddings, knowledge graphs, and named entity recognition (Mikolov et al., 2013; Opdahl et al., 2022; Li et al., 2020a), with structural representation.

Environmental claims (Stammach et al., 2022), a complex detection task in NLP, often exhibit hierarchical and nested information such as conditional statements, vague terminology as well as Greenwashing elements (de Freitas Netto et al., 2020). Prior work has predominantly relied on transformer-based architectures, but their interpretability limitations hinder the auditability of detected claims. This study reframes the problem as a graph classification task, leveraging the structured nature of environmental claims to analyze the effectiveness of GNNs and HGNNs in capturing syntactic and hierarchical dependencies. The research questions for the study are as follows.

RQ1. Can interpretable graph-based models (GNNs and HGNNs) match SOTA performance for environmental claim detection while using just a fraction of the compute as that of LLMs?

RQ2. How do euclidean (GNN) and hyperbolic (HGNN) representations compare in capturing hierarchical and relational structures, and how well can explicit syntactic learning with dependency parsing graphs complement them for enhanced claim verification?

2 Related Work

Graph-based models have gained significant attention in various NLP tasks due to their ability to explicitly capture relational structures within data. GNNs have been effectively used in applications like node classification, link prediction, and graph classification by leveraging message-passing mechanisms to aggregate information from neighbors, thus capturing both local and global dependencies within graphs (Scarselli et al., 2009); (Kipf and Welling, 2016). Recent advancements have extended these models to more complex domains, including sentiment analysis and fake news detection, where the relational context is essential.

HGNNs extend the principles of GNNs into hyperbolic space, capturing long-range dependencies and hierarchical relations more naturally than their Euclidean counterparts (Nickel and Kiela, 2017); (Chami et al., 2019). Hyperbolic spaces, characterized by their constant negative curvature, are particularly well-suited for capturing tree-like and hierarchical data, where relationships exhibit exponential growth in scale. This property has been shown to improve the representation of complex graph structures, such as those found in linguistic data, by preserving the hierarchical and relational intricacies often missed by Euclidean models.

The Poincaré Ball Model (Nickel and Kiela, 2017) and the Lorentz Hyperboloid Model (Nickel and Kiela, 2018) are among the most prominent hyperbolic models. These frameworks have demonstrated superior performance in embedding hierarchical data due to their ability to maintain structural integrity under hyperbolic constraints.

3 Dataset

For this study, we utilized the Environmental Claim Detection (ECD) dataset introduced by (Stammbach et al., 2022). This dataset comprises environmental claims extracted from various corporate communications of publicly listed companies, including sustainability reports, earnings calls, and annual reports. The original dataset consisted of 3,000 annotated sentences. After removing tied annotations, the final dataset used in our analysis contains 2,647 examples. These examples are categorized into two classes: claim statements and not claim statements. The dataset exhibits an imbalanced distribution, with 665 sentences (25.1%) labeled as claim statements and 1,982 sentences (74.9%) labeled as not claim statements.

4 Methodology and Models

4.1 Representation as Dependency Parsing Graphs

We utilized spaCy’s built-in DependencyParser for generating dependency parsing graphs. This tool enabled us to represent sentences as directed graphs, where nodes correspond to words, and edges represent syntactic dependencies between them.

Mathematically, a dependency parsing graph can be represented as:

$$G = (V, E)$$

where:

- V is the set of vertices (or nodes) such that each $v \in V$ represents a token (word) from the sentence.
- E is the set of edges such that each $e \in E$ represents a syntactic dependency between two tokens.

The following are the node and edge attributes we consider:

- Token text (token.text): Each node in the graph corresponds to a token (word) from the sentence, represented by its textual content.
- Dependency (Edge) relations (token.dep_): Specifies the type of syntactic dependency between a token and its head. It describes how the token relates to its syntactic governor.
- Token head text (token.head.text): This identifies the head or governor token that governs the current token in the dependency structure.

4.2 Vector Representations of Nodes and Edges

We utilized word2vec (Mikolov et al., 2013), a pre-trained word embedding to transform words (nodes) into embedding vectors within our dependency parsing graphs. These embeddings enhanced our ability to analyze syntactic structures and semantic similarities across our experimental data.

Other embedding approaches include GloVe (Pennington et al., 2014), fastText (Bojanowski et al., 2017), and BERT embeddings, each with their own set of advantages for extracting semantic

information from text input. However, a comparison among different embedding models lies outside the purpose of our study.

For the dependency types represented as the edges in the graphs, we utilize a total of 45 different types in the ECD-dataset by numerically encoding the edges relations.

4.3 Model Architectures

In this study, we compared the original results from (Stammach et al., 2022) against two model architectures: Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) and Hyperbolic Graph Neural Networks (HGNNs). For training the GNNs, we utilized the HGNN toolkit from (Liu et al., 2019).

4.3.1 Graph Neural Networks

GNNs operate by iteratively updating the representation of nodes in a graph by aggregating features from neighbouring nodes, effectively capturing the local and global structure of the graph.

We utilized word2vec embeddings to initialise the node features which represent the tokens from the Environmental Claims, with numerically encoded edges features to represent the syntactic dependencies between these tokens.

The core of GNN learning is the Message Passing algorithm, which can be broken down into the construction and aggregation of messages between nodes. The process proceeds as follows:

- **Message Construction:** At each iteration t , a message $\mathbf{m}_{uv}^{(t+1)}$ is created from node u to node v :

$$\mathbf{m}_{uv}^{(t+1)} = M^{(t)}(\mathbf{h}_u^{(t)}, \mathbf{h}_v^{(t)}, \mathbf{e}_{uv})$$

where $M^{(t)}$ (message function) can be a neural network or any differentiable function that combines the features of node u ($\mathbf{h}_u^{(t)}$), node v ($\mathbf{h}_v^{(t)}$), and the edge feature \mathbf{e}_{uv} .

- **Message Aggregation and Node Update:** Node v aggregates messages from its neighbors $\mathcal{N}(v)$:

$$\mathbf{h}_v^{(t+1)} = U^{(t)}(\mathbf{h}_v^{(t)}, \sum_{u \in \mathcal{N}(v)} \mathbf{m}_{uv}^{(t+1)})$$

where $U^{(t)}$ is the node update function, typically involving non-linear transformations such as those performed by neural network layers.

4.3.2 Hyperbolic Graph Neural Networks (HGNNs)

For our dataset, nodes are initially embedded into hyperbolic space using the Lorentz Hyperboloid Model. We utilize the Lorentz Hyperboloid model over the Poincaré Ball Model due to the former’s superior ability to capture the inherent curvature of hierarchical data structures. This is because it represents hyperbolic space through the hyperboloid equation, which can efficiently manage the curvature constraints and maintain numerical stability during training (Chami et al., 2019). The syntactic dependencies (edges) are also considered within the hyperbolic framework, taking advantage of hyperbolic distance metrics.

The message passing in HGNNs is analogous to Euclidean GNNs but adapted for hyperbolic geometry. Consider the n -dimensional Lorentz model \mathbb{L}^n . The process includes:

- **Message Construction in Hyperbolic Space:** At each step t , the message passing is defined as:

$$\mathbf{m}_{uv}^{(t+1)} = \text{Log}_{\mathbf{h}_v^{(t)}}^{\mathbb{H}} \left(\text{Add}_{\mathbb{H}} \left(\mathbf{h}_u^{(t)}, \mathbf{e}_{uv} \right) \right)$$

where $\mathbf{h}_u^{(t)}$ and $\mathbf{h}_v^{(t)}$ are hyperbolic embeddings, \mathbf{e}_{uv} is the edge feature, $\text{Log}_{\mathbf{h}_v^{(t)}}^{\mathbb{H}}$ is the logarithmic map at $\mathbf{h}_v^{(t)}$ on the hyperboloid, and $\text{Add}_{\mathbb{H}}$ represents the addition operation in the hyperbolic space.

- **Hyperbolic Message Aggregation and Node Update:** Aggregation and update operations are then performed:

$$\mathbf{h}_v^{(t+1)} = \text{Exp}_{\mathbf{h}_v^{(t)}}^{\mathbb{H}} \left(\sum_{u \in \mathcal{N}(v)} \mathbf{m}_{uv}^{(t+1)} \right)$$

Here, $\text{Exp}_{\mathbf{h}_v^{(t)}}^{\mathbb{H}}$ is the exponential map that projects the aggregated message back into hyperbolic space.

A sequence of Message Passing operations are performed to obtain the final Node Embeddings, which are then pooled to form a global graph representation. (Liu et al., 2019) use average pooling in their HGNN toolkit, we use the same. This pooled representation is then fed into a Multi Layer Perceptron for the task of Graph Classification.

Architecture	Patience	Epochs Ran (Early Stop- ping)	Dev Accu- racy	Test Accu- racy
<i>ClimateBERT</i>	-	-	<u>90.9%</u>	90.9%
<i>RoBERTa_{base}</i>	-	-	90.6%	89.8%
<i>RoBERTa_{large}</i>	-	-	92.8%	<u>91.7%</u>
<i>Graph Neural Network (GNNs)</i>	8	16	87.9%	92.1%
<i>Hyperbolic Graph Neural Network (HGNNs)</i>	8	23	89.0%	88.7%

Table 1: Results: We report the accuracy on the development set (dev), and the test set of the environmental claims dataset. The best performance per split is indicated in bold, the second best is underlined.

5 Results and Conclusion

Table 1 shows that both our models achieve results that are comparable to the state-of-the-art in Environmental Claim Detection, even surpassing the current best test accuracy score. We achieve these scores with relatively simpler and much lighter architectures that use word2vec node features and a primitive edge encoding method and are trained without any hardware acceleration, pointing to the representational power of GNNs compared to pre-trained models. Specifically, we use 4 layers in both our models with an embedding dimension of 256. With a total number of edge types (dependency types) equal to 45, we calculate the number of parameters in both our models to be approximately 12M, far less than the 355M parameters in *RoBERTa_{large}*, 125M in *RoBERTa_{base}* and 110M in *ClimateBERT*. We achieve a better test accuracy with GNNs than with HGNNs, indicating a high hyperbolicity in the ECD dataset (lower hierarchy).

Limitations

Our study highlights the potential of GNNs and HGNNs for environmental claim detection, but there are several limitations to our methodology and the broader application of graph structures in sequential modeling tasks.

- **Limitations in Methodology:** The task of environmental claim detection, like many areas in NLP, relies heavily on sequential information to capture the flow of context within sentences. However, our approach utilizes word2vec embeddings, which do not encode sequential dependencies between words, limiting the model’s understanding of contextual nuances. More advanced embedding tech-

niques, such as Transformer-based embeddings could offer richer semantic representations by preserving sequential information. Additionally, our method employs a basic edge encoding strategy to represent syntactic dependencies and also omits part-of-speech tag features that carry a significant part of the syntactic information present in dependency graphs. This simplification may result in a loss of important syntactic and semantic cues that could improve model performance.

- **Limitations of Graph Structures in Sequential Modeling:** While graph-based approaches offer a novel way to model hierarchical and relational structures, most textual data is inherently sequential and better suited to traditional models like transformers. Adapting sequential data for tasks like graph classification is complex and often unintuitive, requiring significant preprocessing and domain-specific adaptations that may not generalize. As a result, while graphs are a powerful tool to model certain NLP applications, they may struggle with the broader range of sequential tasks where traditional models excel.

References

- Piotr Bojanowski, Edouard Grave, Armand Joulin, and Tomas Mikolov. 2017. Enriching word vectors with subword information. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 5:135–146.
- Ines Chami, Zhitao Ying, Christopher Ré, and Jure Leskovec. 2019. Hyperbolic graph convolutional neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32.

- Zina Chkirbene, Ridha Hamila, Ala Gouisse, and Unal Devrim. 2024. Large language models (llm) in industry: A survey of applications, challenges, and trends. In *2024 IEEE 21st International Conference on Smart Communities: Improving Quality of Life using AI, Robotics and IoT (HONET)*, pages 229–234. IEEE.
- Sebastião Vieira de Freitas Netto, Marcos Felipe Falcão Sobral, Ana Regina Bezerra Ribeiro, and Gleibson Robert da Luz Soares. 2020. Concepts and forms of greenwashing: A systematic review. *Environmental Sciences Europe*, 32:1–12.
- Ahmad Faiz, Sotaro Kaneda, Ruhan Wang, Rita Osi, Prateek Sharma, Fan Chen, and Lei Jiang. 2023. Llmcarbon: Modeling the end-to-end carbon footprint of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.14393*.
- Thomas N Kipf and Max Welling. 2016. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.02907*.
- Jing Li, Aixin Sun, Jianglei Han, and Chenliang Li. 2020a. A survey on deep learning for named entity recognition. *IEEE transactions on knowledge and data engineering*, 34(1):50–70.
- Jun Li, Yifan Cao, Jiong Cai, Yong Jiang, and Kewei Tu. 2020b. An empirical comparison of unsupervised constituency parsing methods. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3278–3283.
- Zhen Lin, Shubhendu Trivedi, and Jimeng Sun. 2023. Generating with confidence: Uncertainty quantification for black-box large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.19187*.
- Qi Liu, Maximilian Nickel, and Douwe Kiela. 2019. Hyperbolic graph neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32.
- Md Saef Ullah Miah, Md Mohsin Kabir, Talha Bin Sarwar, Mejdil Safran, Sultan Alfarhood, and MF Mridha. 2024. A multimodal approach to cross-lingual sentiment analysis with ensemble of transformer and llm. *Scientific Reports*, 14(1):9603.
- Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. 2013. Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781*.
- Maximillian Nickel and Douwe Kiela. 2017. Poincaré embeddings for learning hierarchical representations. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Maximillian Nickel and Douwe Kiela. 2018. Learning continuous hierarchies in the lorentz model of hyperbolic geometry. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 3779–3788. PMLR.
- Joakim Nivre. 2010. Dependency parsing. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 4(3):138–152.
- Andreas L Opdahl, Tareq Al-Moslmi, Duc-Tien Dang-Nguyen, Marc Gallofré Ocaña, Bjørnar Tessem, and Csaba Veres. 2022. Semantic knowledge graphs for the news: A review. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(7):1–38.
- Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher D Manning. 2014. Glove: Global vectors for word representation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1532–1543.
- Franco Scarselli, Marco Gori, Ah Chung Tsoi, Markus Hagenbuchner, and Gabriele Monfardini. 2009. [The graph neural network model](#). *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 20(1):61–80.
- Dominik Stammbach, Nicolas Webersinke, Julia Binger, Mathias Kraus, and Markus Leippold. 2022. Environmental claim detection. *Available at SSRN 4207369*.
- Zonghan Wu, Shirui Pan, Fengwen Chen, Guodong Long, Chengqi Zhang, and S Yu Philip. 2020. A comprehensive survey on graph neural networks. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 32(1):4–24.
- Bangrui Xu, Fuhui Sun, Xiaoliang Liu, Peng Wu, Xiaoyan Wang, and Li Pan. 2024. Complex claim verification via human fact-checking imitation with large language models. In *2024 19th International Joint Symposium on Artificial Intelligence and Natural Language Processing (iSAI-NLP)*, pages 1–6. IEEE.
- Biao Zhang, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. 2023. Prompting large language model for machine translation: A case study. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 41092–41110. PMLR.
- Min Zhou, Menglin Yang, Bo Xiong, Hui Xiong, and Irwin King. 2023. Hyperbolic graph neural networks: A tutorial on methods and applications. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 5843–5844.