

GIN-Graph: A Generative Interpretation Network for Model-Level Explanation of Graph Neural Networks

Xiao Yue¹, Guangzhi Qu¹, Lige Gan¹

¹Oakland University

{xiaoyue, gqu, lgan}@oakland.edu

Abstract

One significant challenge of exploiting Graph neural networks (GNNs) in real-life scenarios is that they are always treated as black boxes, therefore leading to the requirement of interpretability. Model-level interpretations explain what patterns maximize probability of predicting to a certain class. However, existing model-level interpretation methods pose several limitations such as generating invalid explanation graphs and requiring extreme fine-tuning on hyperparameters manually. In this paper, we propose a new Generative Interpretation Network for Model-Level Explanation of Graph Neural Networks (GIN-Graph), to generate reliable model-level explanation graphs. The implicit and likelihood-free generative adversarial networks are exploited to construct explanation graphs similar to original graphs, meanwhile maximizing the prediction probability for a certain class by adopting a novel objective function. Experimental results indicate that GIN-Graph can be easily applied to GNN models trained on a variety of graph datasets to create meaningful explanation graphs without requiring extensive fine-tuning on hyperparameters.

1 Introduction

The development of deep neural networks significantly improved the fields of machine learning and artificial intelligence. They have achieved remarkable performance in various research areas, such as computer vision, natural language processing, and data analysis. Meanwhile, the increasing availability of graph data has led to the deployment of graph neural networks (GNNs) on various graph-related domains, including social analysis [Backstrom and Leskovec, 2011], biology, transportation, and financial systems [Wu *et al.*, 2020]. Inspired by neural networks which efficiently extract patterns from large and high-dimensional datasets, variants of GNNs [Micheli, 2009; Scarselli *et al.*, 2008] have been developed such as graph auto-encoders [Kipf and Welling, 2016b], graph recurrent neural networks [Li *et al.*, 2015; Tai *et al.*, 2015], graph attention networks [Veličković *et al.*, 2017], graph isomorphism networks [Xu *et al.*, 2018], and

graph convolutional networks. GNNs enable the applications of machine learning techniques to graph-structured data by combining graph networks and neural networks. However, one significant challenge of exploiting GNNs in real-life scenarios is that they are always treated as black boxes, which leads to the requirement for interpretability. In certain critical fields, the models can only be trusted if their predictions can be explained in human-understandable ways.

In order to interpret and explain the underlying behaviors of neural networks when making predictions, several interpretation techniques have been proposed to explain deep learning models applied to image and text data [Simonyan *et al.*, 2013; Zhou *et al.*, 2016], which can be broadly categorized into two types: instance-level interpretation and model-level interpretation. Instance-level interpretations provide explanations for a specific input instance by indicating the important features or the decision procedure for this input through the model. Model-level interpretations aim to interpret general behaviors of models by analyzing which patterns maximize the probability of predicting a certain class. The main approach of interpreting GNNs at the instance level is to exploit the gradients or values in hidden feature maps as the approximations of input importance [Yuan *et al.*, 2022; Li *et al.*, 2022], leading to methods such as SA [Baldassarre and Azizpour, 2019] and CAM [Pope *et al.*, 2019]. Model-level interpretations on GNNs are less explored, as the input optimization method [Erhan *et al.*, 2009] cannot be directly applied due to the discrete topological information of graphs like the adjacency matrix. Yuan *et al.* first proposed the XGNN [Yuan *et al.*, 2020] interpreter to interpret GNNs at model-level. They trained a graph generator to create explanation graphs which maximize the prediction probability for a certain class. The graph generation is formulated as a reinforcement learning task with predefined policies. However, manual creation of these policies demands significant human effort. To address this limitation, GNNInterpreter (GNNI) [Wang and Shen, 2022] was developed to build explanation graphs by learning a probabilistic generative graph distribution that produces the most discriminative graph pattern. However, their model performs poorly for models trained on datasets with complicated topological features, as it is likely to fail or generate invalid explanation graphs. Additionally, two objectives of generated explanation graphs that GNNI aims to maximize, prediction probability and embed-

ding similarity, do not necessarily lead to a valid explanation graph. Furthermore, finding an appropriate set of hyperparameters is critical to GNNI which requires a large amount of manual experiments as automatic hyperparameter searching is unavailable due to lack of a metric of evaluating the generated explanation graphs. To address limitations of the GNNI, we proposed a new Generative Interpretation Network for Model-Level Explanation of Graph Neural Networks (GIN-Graph), to generate more reliable model-level explanation graphs. The implicit and likelihood-free generative adversarial networks (GANs) are exploited to construct explanation graphs which are topologically similar to input graphs, meanwhile maximizing the prediction probability for a certain class by adopting a novel objective function. The categorical reparameterization with the Gumbel-Softmax [Jang *et al.*, 2016] method is exploited to overcome the obstacle that topological information of a graph is represented by a discrete adjacency matrix, which cannot be directly optimized via back-propagation. Besides, a graph pruning method is proposed to mitigate the challenge on generating explanation graphs for models where the important patterns they learn are much smaller than regular graphs, therefore enhancing the ability of GIN-Graph on capturing local topological features. Experimental results indicate that GIN-Graph can be easily applied on GNN models trained on various graph datasets to create meaningful explanation graphs without requiring extensive fine-tuning on hyperparameters. The contributions of this paper are as follows:

- We investigate the properties of model-level explanation graphs and define rules and a score metric for selecting valid explanation graphs.
- We propose the graph pruning preprocessing method that mitigates the challenge in generating explanation graphs for models where the important patterns they learn are much smaller than regular graphs.
- We develop the GIN-Graph, as well as a novel objective function, to create valid explanation graphs for GNNs without extensive human efforts.

2 Related Works

2.1 GNNs Interpretations

There is a rising interest in enhancing the interpretations of GNNs [Longa *et al.*, 2024] due to the growing popularity of real-world graph data. One significant challenge of developing interpretations of graph-related models is the discrete nature of adjacency matrix that represents topology information of a graph, leading to difficulties in employing existing interpretation methods such as input optimization [Simonyan *et al.*, 2013]. Based on the type of interpretations that are being delivered, interpretations of GNNs are categorized as instance-level and model-level. Furthermore, instance-level interpretation methods can be classified into two categories: gradient-based and feature-based. Gradient-based methods compute the gradients of target prediction relative to input features using back-propagation. Meanwhile, feature-based methods map the hidden features to the input space via interpolation to measure importance scores [Zhou *et al.*, 2016].

As a gradient-based method, SA [Baldassarre and Azizpour, 2019] directly exploits the squared values of gradients as the importance scores of different input features while importance scores can be directly computed via back-propagation. On the other hand, as a feature-based model, CAM [Pope *et al.*, 2019] measures important nodes by mapping the node features in the final layer back to the input space. However, it is limited to GNNs that employ a global average pooling layer and a fully-connected layer as the final classifier. In contrast, model-level interpretations aim at explaining the overall model behavior. As the first model-level interpretation method on GNNs, XGNN [Yuan *et al.*, 2020] exploits a graph generator to construct explanation graphs designed to maximize prediction probability for a certain class. This process involves iteratively adding an edge to a constructed graph, and utilizing feedback from the GNNs being explained to train the generator through policy gradient, which can be formulated as a reinforcement learning task with predefined policies. However, manual creation these policies manually is labor-intensive. To address this limitation, GNNI learns a probabilistic generative graph distribution to generate the most discriminative graph pattern by optimizing a novel objective function, which is more flexible and computationally efficient compared to XGNN.

2.2 Graph Generative Models

Deep graph generative models have drawn significant attention due to the successful applications of generative models in other domains. Graph generative models share a common challenge in GNNs that machine learning techniques which are developed primarily for continuous data cannot be directly applied to a discrete adjacency matrix. To address this challenge, graph generative models are developed and can be categorized into two main branches [Guo and Zhao, 2022], based on the generation process: sequential generating and one-shot generating. Sequential generating [You *et al.*, 2018; Zhang *et al.*, 2019] aims to generate the nodes and edges in a sequential manner. In each step, one node and a few edges are generated, while the generations of edges involve predicting connections across all pairs of nodes or progressively selecting the nodes to be connected with the generated node from the existing nodes. In contrast, one-shot generating [Flam-Shepherd *et al.*, 2020; Bresson and Laurent, 2019] exploits a probabilistic graph model based on the matrix representation which allows the simultaneous generation of all nodes and edges. These models learn to encode graphs into latent representations based on a probabilistic distribution, therefore a graph can be obtained by sampling directly from this probabilistic distribution in a single step. Graph generative models are extensively utilized in graph-centric fields such as molecule design [De Cao and Kipf, 2018; Popova *et al.*, 2019] and protein structure modeling [Anand and Huang, 2018].

3 Model-level explanation graphs

3.1 valid or invalid explanations

Model-level interpretations of GNNs aim to provide explanation graphs that maximize the probability of predicting a spe-

cific class. Intuitively, one might consider explanation graphs that the GNN model predicts with high probability as valid explanation graphs. However, it is insufficient to only rely on the probability to evaluate explanation graphs, as some of them with high probability may not provide any meaningful information to the user. The GNNI addresses this issue by considering maximizing the similarity between the embedding of an explanation graph and the average embedding of all graphs as well. Nonetheless, these two objectives are heavily dataset-dependent and do not necessarily lead to a valid explanation graph. Figure 1 illustrates this issue using a GNN and an example graph from the *Non-Mutagen* class in the *MUTAG* dataset. Two invalid explanation graphs both have nearly 100% probabilities and cosine similarities larger than 0.9. Obviously they fail to provide any meaningful information for interpretation at the model level, indicating that selecting explanation graphs only based on probability and similarity is not sufficient. Invalid explanation graphs with high probabilities tend to be either near-complete (*Invalid explanation 1*), where the number of edges is significantly larger than number of nodes, or near-sequential (*Invalid explanation 2*) where all nodes are connected sequentially like a path, highlighting the potential pitfalls of GNNs. To eliminate near-complete explanation graphs, the GNNI restricts the maximum number of edges in a graph, which is a hyperparameter requiring manual fine-tuning due to the variability in the number of nodes. However, this method cannot filter out near-sequential graphs.

To overcome this limitation, we utilize the average degree x of a graph ($x = e/n$, where e is the number of edges and n is the number of nodes) to further filter out invalid explanation graphs. We compute the mean (μ) and standard deviation (σ) of the average degrees of all graphs in a certain class. Any graphs whose average degrees fall outside the range $[\mu - 3 * \sigma, \mu + 3 * \sigma]$ are considered invalid explanation graphs. As shown in Figure 1, the mean and standard deviations for the *Non-Mutagen* class are 1.12 and 0.044. Therefore two invalid explanation graphs should be filtered out due to their average degrees. Additionally, to evaluate the explanation graphs more effectively, we define a validation score v as $v = \sqrt[3]{s * p * d}$, where s , p and d represent similarity, probability and degree score, respectively. The degree score d is calculated as $d = e^{-\frac{(x-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}}$ where x is the average degree of an explanation graph. The validation score is utilized to evaluate the quality of explanation graph, ranging from 0 to 1, where 1 represents the highest quality. It is sensitive to low values, ensuring that an explanation graph cannot perform poorly in any single aspect. In Figure 1, scores of two invalid explanation graphs are close to 0, while the score of the valid explanation graph is 0.63. The validation score can be utilized to further filter out invalid explanation graphs efficiently.

3.2 local or global explanation

Even though some explanation graphs may satisfy the requirements for being valid, they can still vary significantly in another important property: size. A small-size explanation graph tends to highlight the fine details of a model-level





Real graph	Invalid Explanation 1	Invalid Explanation 2	Valid Explanation
			
$\mu: 1.12$ $\sigma: 0.044$	$p: 1.00$ $s: 0.95$ $x: 6.97$ $d: 0$ $v: 0$	$p: 1.00$ $s: 0.92$ $x: 0.83$ $d: 3.75 * 10^{-10}$ $v: 0$	$p: 1.00$ $s: 0.89$ $x: 1.05$ $d: 0.29$ $v: 0.63$

Figure 1: Illustration of valid and invalid explanation graphs

explanation with high granularity. A large-size explanation graph, on the other hand, tends to present the overall topological features of graphs learned by the model. Therefore, explanation graphs can be further categorized into two types based on their granularity: *local* and *global*. Figure 2 shows local and global explanation graphs of two models learned from two datasets. A local explanation graph has high granularity, such as NO_2 or NH_2 in the *MUTAG* dataset, or a motif in the *motif* dataset. In contrast, a global explanation graph with low granularity tends to be similar to original graphs. In this work, we define granularity related explanation metric (k) using the formula $k = 1 - \min(1, b/a)$, where a is the average number of nodes of all graphs and b denotes the number of nodes in an explanation graph. This formula scales the granularity into the range of 0 to 1, where 0 indicates the lowest granularity and 1 represents highest granularity which is generally impossible. The k can be utilized to guide the generation process by triggering the *graph pruning* described in section 4.3. It is important to note that the local and global explanations discussed in this paper are model-level explanations, instead of explanations of a graph dataset. A model-level explanation focuses on interpretation on the patterns learned by the model, therefore the generation must be guided by models’ feedback. In contrast, explanations on a graph dataset aim to discover the pattern within the dataset itself. If a model has perfectly learned the dataset’s patterns, two types of explanations may appear similar, but they are naturally different.







Real graph 1	Local Explanation 1	Global Explanation 1	Real graph 2	Local Explanation 2	Global Explanation 2
					
	$k = 0.70$	$k = 0$		$k = 0.92$	$k = 0.53$

Figure 2: Illustration of local and global explanation graphs

4 Approaches

We present details of the GIN-Graph in this section. The overview of GIN-Graph is shown in Figure 3. It exploits a generative adversarial network to construct explanation graphs, using the feedback from the GNN being explained.




Figure 3: Overview of the Architecture of GIN-Graph

4.1 Objective function

Let $f(\cdot)$ denote a GNN model that we aim to interpret, which is trained on a graph dataset \mathcal{G} with known classes of $\{c_1, \dots, c_l\}$. Hence, for a target class c_i , the model-level interpretation of $f(\cdot)$ can be formulated as deriving an explanation graph g^* such that $g^* = \arg \max_g P(f(g) = c_i)$, where g could be an existing graph in \mathcal{G} or a generated one by GIN-Graph. Since the prediction probability should not be the only metric for assessing the quality of an explanation graph, we introduce a score filter denoted as $W(\cdot)$, which takes a graph as input and determines if the graph satisfies the preset rules, such as the validation score (v) is larger than a threshold. Considering the validation metric, the objective of generating an explanation graph is $g^* = \arg \max_g P(f(g) = c_i | W(g) = True)$. We denote the set of all graphs with labels in class c_i as \mathcal{G}_i . A generative adversarial network consisting of a generator $G(\cdot)$ and a discriminator $D(\cdot)$ is exploited to generate graphs, the parameters of $G(\cdot)$ and $D(\cdot)$ are denoted as θ_G and θ_D , respectively. A graph generated by the generator $G(\cdot)$ is represented as $G(z) = \hat{g}$ where z is sampled from a distribution p_z . The parameters of the generator θ_G are optimized using Equation 1, where L_G is the original GAN loss function and L_c is the cross-entropy loss.

$$\theta_G = \arg \min_{\theta} (L_G + \lambda L_c(f(\hat{g}), c_i)) \quad (1)$$

4.2 Generative Adversarial Network

Generator and Discriminator

The generator $G(\cdot)$ is implemented as a multi-layer perceptron, which takes a sampled vector z from a distribution p_z as input and generates two matrices with continuous values, an adjacency matrix and a node feature matrix, representing the topology of a graph for downstream tasks. As both generated and real graphs are represented by these two matrices, we exploit the graph convolutional networks (GCNs)

[Kipf and Welling, 2016a] as the discriminator. The parameters of the generator θ_G are optimized by Equation 1, where $L_G = -\mathbf{E}_{z \sim p_z} [D(G(z))]$. The discriminator $D(\cdot)$ is utilized for maximally differentiating an existing graph from a generated one. We denote the distribution of existing graphs as p_x , the parameters of the discriminator are optimized by WGAN (Wasserstein GAN) loss with gradient penalty shown in the Equation 2, where $\hat{x} = \epsilon x + (1 - \epsilon)G(z)$, $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{U}(0, 1)$ and α is a hyperparameter of gradient penalty.

$$\theta_D = \arg \min_{\theta} \mathbf{E}_{z \sim p_z} [D(G(z))] - \mathbf{E}_{x \sim p_x} [D(x)] + \alpha (\|\nabla_{\hat{x}} D(\hat{x})\| - 1)^2 \quad (2)$$

Adjacency matrix and node feature matrix

The generator $G(\cdot)$ outputs two matrices with continuous values: a continuous adjacency matrix A and a continuous node feature matrix X , that will be utilized for the graph generation task. If there is no attribute associated with edges in a graph, each element should be either 0 or 1 in a discrete adjacency matrix \tilde{A} . The discrete adjacency matrix can be derived through binary categorical sampling from A . If edges have categorical features with k different classes, we utilize one-hot encoding to encode edge features into a $(k+1)$ -dimensional vector, where the extra dimension indicates the absence of an edge. In this case, we can treat each element in the adjacency matrix as a $(k+1)$ -dimensional vector, instead of a single value. For the node feature matrix X , we can directly feed the matrix X to the discriminator for prediction if node features are numerical. If the node features are categorical, we exploit the same categorical sampling method used for adjacency matrix to derive a discrete feature matrix \tilde{X} . Note that the categorical sampling operation is not differentiable, therefore cannot be directly optimized by back-propagation. We address this obstacle by exploiting the categorical reparameterization with the Gumbel-Softmax [Jang *et al.*, 2016].

GNN being explained

Similar to the discriminator $D(\cdot)$, the GNN model that is being explained here also takes the discrete adjacency matrix \tilde{A} and the node feature matrix \tilde{X} as inputs. The GNN generates embedding and prediction probability of a generated explanation graph to evaluate its quality. Note that the GNN being explained doesn't have to be the same model structure as the discriminator, as long as it is capable of accepting an adjacency matrix and a feature matrix as inputs, or any other data formats that can be derived through differentiable transformations from these matrices.

4.3 Graph pruning

Most of message-passing based GNNs appreciate the important patterns (e.g., subgraphs) in predictions, indicating that there may exist some redundant nodes and edges that play less or no role. In order to improve the explanation graphs for GNNs that are trained on datasets where important patterns are much smaller than the entire graphs, GIN-Graph employs a graph pruning method that preprocesses the input graphs by removing irrelevant nodes and edges. This method enhances capability of GIN-Graph in generating local explanation graphs of GNNs.

Three parameters are defined for the pruning process: N_r , N_p and N_f . The pruning size N_r indicates the ratio of the number of nodes to be pruned to the number of nodes in the entire graph at each iteration. N_p denotes the maximum number of pruning operations on a graph, and N_f indicates maximum number of failed attempts to prune a graph. At each iteration of the pruning process, certain number of nodes from the current graph are removed satisfying the criteria of N_r . Note that any isolated nodes resulted by removing their neighboring nodes in the pruned graphs will be removed as well. Then the pruned graph is fed into the GNN model. If the resulting prediction probability of pruned graph is lower than that of the current graph, this pruning attempt is considered successful, and the pruned graph becomes the new current graph for the next iteration. Otherwise this attempt fails and the pruned graph is discarded. This process repeats iteratively until successful pruning operations reach N_p or failed attempts reach N_f . When the granularity related explanation metric k is utilized, GIN-Graph prunes the graph iteratively with N_r until the graph size is smaller than $h * (1 - k)$ where h denotes the size of original graph, or number of failed attempts exceeds N_f .

5 Experiments

5.1 Dataset and experiment setting

GIN-Graph was evaluated on GNNs trained on four datasets: one real-world dataset *MUTAG* and three synthetic datasets *Cyclicity*, *Shape* and *Motif*. The *MUTAG* [Debnath *et al.*, 1991] dataset is a widely recognized benchmark dataset in the field of graph learning. Each compound sample in it is labeled according to its mutagenic effect on a bacterium. The datasets *Cyclicity*, *Shape* and *Motif* are introduced in the paper [Wang and Shen, 2022], and they are randomly generated by their respective algorithms. GIN-Graph is implemented using PyTorch with python version 3.9. When training GIN-Graph for interpreting models for different datasets, we only modified four hyperparameters: *maximum number of nodes*, λ , *learning rate* and *batch size*, where *maximum number of nodes* defines the size of feature matrix and adjacency matrix and λ is a hyperparameter in the loss function. All other hyperparameters are fixed through all experiments to demonstrate the generality and robustness of the GIN-Graph model. We applied the graph pruning method to *Cyclicity* and *Motif* datasets to derive smaller graphs as training datasets. In order to compare GIN-Graph to GNNI, we evaluated both interpreters on the same GNNs. Due to the large number of hyperparameters in GNNI that may affect the quality of explanation graphs, we evaluated its performance by 1,000 different sets of hyperparameters and selected the best explanation graphs from all generated graphs based on observation and prior knowledge of the datasets. In addition, we granted GNNI double training time as GIN-Graph if it does not trigger its early stop strategy that estimates thresholds for prediction probability and number of edges to generate an explanation graph. The large number of critical hyperparameters in GNNI makes determining a good set of values require a large number of experiments. This presents a weakness of GNNI, as it requires extensive human efforts on fine-tuning the hyperparameters and auto-

matic hyperparameters searching is not applicable. We also conducted experiments on GIN-Graph 10 times to generate 100 explanation graphs each time and selected best explanation graphs of each class as results using the same criterion applied to GNNI.

5.2 Experimental results

The experimental results for GNNs trained on datasets *MUTAG*, *Motif*, *Shape* and *Cyclicity* are shown in Figure 4. The best explanation graphs of each class generated by GNNI are presented in the column **GNNI (validation)**. However, due to the loss of original datasets and the lack of detailed guidance on hyperparameter settings, we were unable to reproduce all results in the GNNI paper. It failed to generate valid explanation graphs for several classes, despite extensive experiments on hyperparameters with ample training time. Therefore we also present the explanation graphs from their paper [Wang and Shen, 2022] in column **GNNI (paper)** for reference.

Experimental results indicate that GIN-Graph demonstrates superior performance to the GNNI, without requiring extensive effort on hyperparameters fine-tuning. By exploiting graph pruning preprocessing on *Motif* and *Cyclicity* datasets, GIN-Graph produced better explanation graphs for all classes compared to GNNI. For the GNN trained on *Motif* dataset, GIN-Graph accurately generated all motifs that GNN learned while GNNI failed for classes *house*, *house-X* and *comp4*. For the GNN trained on *Cyclicity* dataset, both models generated explanation graphs for *Red cyclic* class. GIN-Graph generated acceptable valid explanation graphs for classes *Acyclic* and *Green cyclic*, while GNNI failed to generate any valid explanation graph. For the GNN trained on *MUTAG* dataset, neither interpreter could present the fact that both NO_2 and NH_2 substructures are strong evidences for the molecule mutagenicity [Debnath *et al.*, 1991]. However, GIN-Graph was able to capture the carbon-based chemical compound structures of the molecules, and the number of carbon atoms is much larger than that of other atoms in all explanation graphs. For the GNN trained on *Shape* dataset, both interpreters produced valid explanation graphs for all classes, but GIN-Graph required less effort to obtain an appropriate set of hyperparameters. In addition, we present the average validation scores of top 10 and top 100 scored explanation graphs at Table 1 for evaluation where *t10* and *t100* indicate *top 10* and *top 100*. To ensure a fair comparison on two models, we modified the score filter in GIN-Graph to only exclude explanation graphs whose average degree falls outside range $[\mu - 5 * \sigma, \mu + 5 * \sigma]$ when we conducted the experiments. This filter removed a large amount of invalid explanation graphs with near-complete structures, similar to the restriction on the maximum number of edges in GNNI. Consequently, GIN-Graph didn't filter out low-score graphs automatically to get advantages. The experimental results on validation scores align well with the observations from Figure 4. First, GIN-Graph consistently outperformed GNNI on all GNNs being explained. For the GNN trained on the *MUTAG* dataset, GIN-Graph performed slightly better than GNNI. For the GNN trained on the *Shape* dataset, both models achieved comparable performance in the top 10 explanations, supporting the observation from Figure 4 that explanation graphs




Figure 4: Experimental results on GNNs trained on four datasets

Table 1: Experimental results on validation scores of models trained on four datasets

Dataset	Class	GIN-Graph		GNNI	
		t10	t100	t10	t100
MUTAG	Mutagen	0.984	0.876	0.912	0.417
	Non-Mutagen	0.971	0.751	0.957	0.675
Shape	Lollipop	0.989	0.924	0.935	0.782
	Wheel	0.949	0.765	0.960	0.486
	Grid	0.998	0.969	0.981	0.671
	Star	0.997	0.986	0.918	0.323
Motif	House	0.970	0.748	0.119	0.012
	House-X	0.934	0.675	0.090	0.009
	Comp4	0.914	0.704	0.150	0.141
	Comp5	0.813	0.698	0.477	0.049
Cyclicity	Red Cyclic	0.986	0.606	0.973	0.260
	Green Cyclic	0.007	≈ 0	≈ 0	≈ 0
	Acyclic	0.004	≈ 0	≈ 0	≈ 0

generated by two models are of good quality. However, for the GNN trained on the *motif* dataset, GIN-Graph significantly outperformed GNNI, supporting the result that GNNI failed on the classes *house*, *house-X* and *comp4*. For the GNN trained on the *Cyclicity* dataset, both models achieved acceptable performance on the *Red cyclic* class, while performance on other two classes was extremely poor, supporting the results in Figure 4 that GNNI failed to generate any valid explanation graphs on these two classes. In conclusion, GIN-Graph demonstrated superior performance on both *top 10* and *top 100* explanations, indicating its ability to generate high-quality explanation graphs.

5.3 Experiments on graph pruning

In the section *Graph pruning*, we proposed the graph pruning preprocessing method designed to remove nodes and edges that are irrelevant to predictions by a GNN model. Firstly, we used *Motif* dataset and the GNN trained on it to evaluate the effectiveness of this method. Each graph in the *Motif* dataset is constructed by connecting a random Rome graph to a specific motif. There are four different motifs: *house*, *house-X*, *comp4*, and *comp5*, as shown in Figure 4. In this dataset, the type of motif is the only distinguishing factor between different classes. Initially, we evaluated the prediction accuracies of the GNN model on original graphs. Next, we evaluated the prediction accuracies of the same GNN model on graphs where all motifs are removed. For graphs with motifs, the prediction accuracies of *house*, *house-X*, *comp4*, and *comp5* were 99.21%, 99.80%, 99.13%, and 100.00%, respectively. For graphs without motifs, the prediction accuracies of them were 0.17%, 0.00%, 0.00%, and 0.00%, respectively. We can conclude that motifs are the only critical patterns for the GNN model to make accurate predictions. However, as the number of nodes in a motif (4 or 5 nodes) is extremely smaller than the number of nodes in a graph (more than 50 nodes), we applied the graph pruning method to remove redundant nodes and edges. We conducted experiments with different parameters values of $[N_r, N_p, N_f]$. The resulting pruned graphs on the same graphs are shown in Figure 5. We draw the following conclusions by observing all pruned graphs created using four groups of parameters: 1) The parameters set $[0.1, 20, 20]$ is sufficient for acquiring pruned graphs in which the motifs are not dominated by random Rome graphs. 2) Even using the most aggressive parameter set $[0.1, 50, 50]$, it is impossible to obtain a pure motif without any extra nodes. 3) Motifs remain intact regardless of the parameter set used. Further-




Figure 5: Pruned graphs from Motif and MUTAG datasets

more, we can infer that while motifs are the most important patterns, they are not the subgraphs which maximize the prediction probabilities. To investigate the relationships between the motifs and graphs, we projected the embeddings of the graphs obtained from the GNN model into 2D space, alongside the embeddings of the motifs. We observed that none of the motifs are close to the original graph clusters, indicating that they are outliers, as shown in Figure 6 (a). This observation suggests that it is challenging to generate explanation graphs that are exactly the same as motifs from original graphs by exploiting embeddings, which corresponds to the experimental results that GNNI cannot construct the motifs for classes *house*, *house-X* and *comp4*. We also generate dis-




Figure 6: Embedding distributions of graphs before (a) and after (b) graph pruning

tributions of the embeddings of the pruned graphs, as shown in Figure 6 (b). Comparing Figure 6 (a), we observed that the embeddings of pruned graphs are more tightly clustered and the embeddings of *House* and *House-X* graphs are well-

separated. Additionally, the embeddings of the motifs are closer to their respective clusters, indicating that the pruned graphs are more similar to the real motifs.

We also present explanation graphs generated by utilizing original graphs in Figure 7. We can observe that explanation graphs based on original graphs primarily capture the global topological features that the model learned. They consist of a dense, fully connected subgraph which corresponds to the motif, and a sparse graph which corresponds to the Rome graph.




Figure 7: Explanation graphs generated from original graphs

However, as the graph pruning was originally designed to simplify graphs whose important patterns are much smaller than the graphs themselves, it’s risky to apply graph pruning on graphs whose important patterns are less clear to be learned by GNNs. In the experiments, we found the pruned graphs of the dataset *MUTAG* are more likely to retain the NO_2 structure. Considering the fact that both NO_2 and NH_2 substructures are strong evidence for the molecule mutagenicity, we could draw the conclusion that the GNN model learned the important patterns partially. Figure 5 compares the original and pruned graphs of dataset *MUTAG*, it shows that graph pruning may break the carbon-based structure, such as carbon rings, leading to explanation graphs generated by the interpreter that lack a realistic chemical compound structure.

In conclusion, graph pruning is effective in deriving smaller-sized graphs while retaining the important patterns learned by the GNN model. Graph pruning enhances capability of GIN-Graph in generating local explanation graphs of GNNs, allowing it to interpret GNNs at varying levels of granularity.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we investigate the properties of model-level explanation graphs, and define validation score and granularity related explanation metric to evaluate explanation graphs. We also proposed GIN-Graph to generate more reliable model-level explanation graphs. GANs are exploited in GIN-Graph, aiming to produce the explanation graphs that are similar to original graphs, meanwhile maximizing the prediction probability for a certain class. Experimental results demonstrate that GIN-Graph presents superior performance to GNNI, without requiring extensive efforts in hyperparameter finetuning, highlighting its generality in generating model-level explanation graphs for GNNs trained on a variety of graph datasets.

In the future, given the considerable diversity within datasets, we aim to tackle the challenge of creating a universal metric for accurately evaluating explanation graphs across all

datasets. Additionally, we plan to focus on reducing the reliance on human expertise and prior knowledge in identifying meaningful explanation graphs.

References

- [Anand and Huang, 2018] Namrata Anand and Possu Huang. Generative modeling for protein structures. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- [Backstrom and Leskovec, 2011] Lars Backstrom and Jure Leskovec. Supervised random walks: predicting and recommending links in social networks. In *Proceedings of the fourth ACM international conference on Web search and data mining*, pages 635–644, 2011.
- [Baldassarre and Azizpour, 2019] Federico Baldassarre and Hossein Azizpour. Explainability techniques for graph convolutional networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.13686*, 2019.
- [Bresson and Laurent, 2019] Xavier Bresson and Thomas Laurent. A two-step graph convolutional decoder for molecule generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.03412*, 2019.
- [De Cao and Kipf, 2018] Nicola De Cao and Thomas Kipf. Molgan: An implicit generative model for small molecular graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.11973*, 2018.
- [Debnath *et al.*, 1991] Asim Kumar Debnath, Rosa L Lopez de Compadre, Gargi Debnath, Alan J Shusterman, and Corwin Hansch. Structure-activity relationship of mutagenic aromatic and heteroaromatic nitro compounds. correlation with molecular orbital energies and hydrophobicity. *Journal of medicinal chemistry*, 34(2):786–797, 1991.
- [Erhan *et al.*, 2009] Dumitru Erhan, Yoshua Bengio, Aaron Courville, and Pascal Vincent. Visualizing higher-layer features of a deep network. *University of Montreal*, 1341(3):1, 2009.
- [Flam-Shepherd *et al.*, 2020] Daniel Flam-Shepherd, Tony Wu, and Alan Aspuru-Guzik. Graph deconvolutional generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.07087*, 2020.
- [Guo and Zhao, 2022] Xiaojie Guo and Liang Zhao. A systematic survey on deep generative models for graph generation. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 45(5):5370–5390, 2022.
- [Jang *et al.*, 2016] Eric Jang, Shixiang Gu, and Ben Poole. Categorical reparameterization with gumbel-softmax. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.01144*, 2016.
- [Kipf and Welling, 2016a] Thomas N Kipf and Max Welling. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.02907*, 2016.
- [Kipf and Welling, 2016b] Thomas N Kipf and Max Welling. Variational graph auto-encoders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.07308*, 2016.
- [Li *et al.*, 2015] Yujia Li, Daniel Tarlow, Marc Brockschmidt, and Richard Zemel. Gated graph sequence neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.05493*, 2015.
- [Li *et al.*, 2022] Peibo Li, Yixing Yang, Maurice Pagnucco, and Yang Song. Explainability in graph neural networks: An experimental survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.09258*, 2022.
- [Longa *et al.*, 2024] Antonio Longa, Steve Azzolin, Gabriele Santin, Giulia Cencetti, Pietro Lio, Bruno Lepri, and Andrea Passerini. Explaining the explainers in graph neural networks: a comparative study. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, September 2024. Just Accepted.
- [Micheli, 2009] Alessio Micheli. Neural network for graphs: A contextual constructive approach. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 20(3):498–511, 2009.
- [Pope *et al.*, 2019] Phillip E Pope, Soheil Kolouri, Mohammad Rostami, Charles E Martin, and Heiko Hoffmann. Explainability methods for graph convolutional neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 10772–10781, 2019.
- [Popova *et al.*, 2019] Mariya Popova, Mykhailo Shvets, Junier Oliva, and Olexandr Isayev. Molecularrnn: Generating realistic molecular graphs with optimized properties. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.13372*, 2019.
- [Scarselli *et al.*, 2008] Franco Scarselli, Marco Gori, Ah Chung Tsoi, Markus Hagenbuchner, and Gabriele Monfardini. The graph neural network model. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 20(1):61–80, 2008.
- [Simonyan *et al.*, 2013] Karen Simonyan, Andrea Vedaldi, and Andrew Zisserman. Deep inside convolutional networks: Visualising image classification models and saliency maps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6034*, 2013.
- [Tai *et al.*, 2015] Kai Sheng Tai, Richard Socher, and Christopher D Manning. Improved semantic representations from tree-structured long short-term memory networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.00075*, 2015.
- [Veličković *et al.*, 2017] Petar Veličković, Guillem Cucurull, Arantxa Casanova, Adriana Romero, Pietro Lio, and Yoshua Bengio. Graph attention networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.10903*, 2017.
- [Wang and Shen, 2022] Xiaoqi Wang and Han-Wei Shen. Gnninterpreter: A probabilistic generative model-level explanation for graph neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.07924*, 2022.
- [Wu *et al.*, 2020] Zonghan Wu, Shirui Pan, Fengwen Chen, Guodong Long, Chengqi Zhang, and S Yu Philip. A comprehensive survey on graph neural networks. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 32(1):4–24, 2020.
- [Xu *et al.*, 2018] Keyulu Xu, Weihua Hu, Jure Leskovec, and Stefanie Jegelka. How powerful are graph neural networks? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.00826*, 2018.

- [You *et al.*, 2018] Jiaxuan You, Rex Ying, Xiang Ren, William Hamilton, and Jure Leskovec. Graphrnn: Generating realistic graphs with deep auto-regressive models. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 5708–5717. PMLR, 2018.
- [Yuan *et al.*, 2020] Hao Yuan, Jiliang Tang, Xia Hu, and Shuiwang Ji. Xggn: Towards model-level explanations of graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pages 430–438, 2020.
- [Yuan *et al.*, 2022] Hao Yuan, Haiyang Yu, Shurui Gui, and Shuiwang Ji. Explainability in graph neural networks: A taxonomic survey. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 45(5):5782–5799, 2022.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2019] Muhan Zhang, Shali Jiang, Zhicheng Cui, Roman Garnett, and Yixin Chen. D-vae: A variational autoencoder for directed acyclic graphs. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [Zhou *et al.*, 2016] Bolei Zhou, Aditya Khosla, Agata Lapedriza, Aude Oliva, and Antonio Torralba. Learning deep features for discriminative localization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 2921–2929, 2016.