

Multi-Relational Graph Neural Network for Out-of-Domain Link Prediction

Asma Sattar*, Georgios Deligiorgis †, Marco Trincavelli‡, Davide Bacciu§

*§ *Dipartimento di Informatica, Università di Pisa, Pisa, Italy*

†‡ *Business Tech, AI, Analytics, and Data, H&M Group, Stockholm, Sweden*

*asma.sattar@phd.unipi.it, †georgios.deligiorgis@hm.com, ‡marco.trincavelli@hm.com, §bacciu@di.unipi.it

Abstract—Dynamic multi-relational graphs are an expressive relational representation for data enclosing entities and relations of different types, and where relationships are allowed to vary in time. Addressing predictive tasks over such data requires the ability to find structure embeddings that capture the diversity of the relationships involved, as well as their dynamic evolution. In this work, we establish a novel class of challenging tasks for dynamic multi-relational graphs involving out-of-domain link prediction, where the relationship being predicted is not available in the input graph. We then introduce a novel Graph Neural Network model, named GOOD, designed specifically to tackle the out-of-domain generalization problem. GOOD introduces a novel design concept for multi-relation embedding aggregation, based on the idea that *good* representations are such when it is possible to disentangle the mixing proportions of the different relational embeddings that have produced it. We also propose five benchmarks based on two retail domains, where we show that GOOD can effectively generalize predictions out of known relationship types and achieve state-of-the-art results. Most importantly, we provide insights into problems where out-of-domain prediction might be preferred to an in-domain formulation, that is, where the relationship to be predicted has very few positive examples.

Index Terms—Discrete Dynamic Graphs, Multi-Relational Graphs, Graph Neural Networks, Out-of-domain link prediction

I. INTRODUCTION

Graphs are popular abstractions that represent complex compound data made up of several entities, and nodes, connected by relationships, and represented by graph edges. Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) [1]–[3] provide an effective means of mapping such discrete combinatorial objects and their composing substructures into a numerical representation that facilitates their use in predictive machine learning tasks, with a variety of applications spanning computer vision [4], natural language processing [5], recommendation systems [6]. The key intuition underlying most of such GNN models is the computation of a node vectorial representation (embedding) by an iterative process of aggregation of messages from nearby nodes and propagation of messages to the same neighbors.

Node relationships, and hence graph edges, are central to such a message-passing mechanism. In their simplest and most popular form, graphs are typically restricted to edges that represent a single static relationship (i.e., not evolving in time). Real-world processes, however, often call for richer representation capabilities that can accommodate nodes of different types and edges representing different kinds of relationship

(e.g., friendships vs. co-working vs. family). The resulting networks are often referred to as multi-dimensional or multi-relational graphs. Previous work has dealt with these structures mostly by transforming, more or less explicitly, a single multi-relational graph into several graphs, one for each node/edge type, producing embeddings independently for each relation [7], [8]. This approach treats the different relationships in isolation, ignoring their cross-dependencies and limiting the quality of the representation learned by the GNN and its predictive power. To exemplify this aspect, let us consider a scenario comprising products sold in four countries (A, B, C, D), where the former are nodes, and each country defines a different relationship type. Here, the edges represent “bought-together” and “style-together” relationships. Now assume that A is a neighboring country to B, while C is a neighbor to D. Knowing that two products have been purchased/styled in country A but not in countries C and D can affect the prediction of future purchases in country B, allowing us to take into consideration the different behaviors with different contributing factors.

The above limitation of multi-relational graph models in the literature pairs with an additional and most crucial one: lack of consideration for out-of-domain relationship prediction. Work in the literature determines the existence of a relationship between two nodes (i.e., the presence of an edge) under the assumption that the input multi-relational graph already contains examples of links of the same type (in-domain scenario) [9]. Recalling our example above, we would like to be able to learn to predict the edges of an out-of-domain country E by leveraging a multi-relational graph encoding only relationships of type A-D.

The work described in this paper is, to the extent of our knowledge, the first to address the problem of link prediction in multi-relational graph data in such an out-of-domain scenario. To make the problem more challenging and general, we also release the constraint on static graphs, allowing (a subset of) relationships to have edges that vary dynamically with respect to context/relation. In the remainder of this paper, we introduce GOOD, a multi-relational GNN for **Out-Of-Domain** prediction problems. The key methodological contribution of GOOD, which allows the transfer of knowledge to out-of-domain relationships, lies in the use of a novel relationship aggregation component paired with a disentanglement loss. The key intuition is that a single multi-relational graph rep-




Fig. 1. A multi-relational graph with nodes of different types connected with known relations (left), that are used to predict an unknown relationship (right) in a link prediction task.

representation can be straightforwardly obtained by a weighted aggregation of the contributions from each relationship type; however, in order for this representation to be “good”, the model should be able to reconstruct the mixing proportions of every single relationship from the aggregated embedding.

Fig. 1 provides a pictorial intuition of our out-of-domain task: given information about known relations ($C' = \{c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4\}$) between entities (on the left), the task is to predict an unseen relation (c_5 or $C' + 1$). For the sake of compactness, we will refer to the setting in Fig. 1 as Multi-Input Single-Output (MISO), in contrast to single-Input Single-Output (SISO) in-domain learning. We also assume that we work with a finite number of relationships, which we also refer to as contexts in the rest of the paper.

The key contributions of this work are as follows.

- We formalize the novel problem of out-of-domain link prediction in multi-relational graphs and we introduce associated benchmarks from two retail domains.
- We propose a novel GNN model named GOOD, capable of addressing the MISO learning problem in multi-relational graphs. To the best of our knowledge, this work is the first to extend multi-relational GNNs to learn from known domain relations and predict out-of-domain contexts.
- We introduce the idea of regularizing a learning model to be proficient in separating aggregated embeddings into their mixing coefficients, as a driver for obtaining more effective representations for out-of-domain generalization.
- We provide an empirical validation of the effectiveness of our approach in five benchmark tasks, showing that GOOD can outperform models from the related literature in both the MISO and SISO settings.

II. RELATED WORK

Several models exist that tackle the problem of learning representations from homogeneous graphs [10]–[12], which have rarely found application to multi-typed edges by straightforward extensions of the model that leverage type-dependent parameterizations. A discussion of these models is beyond

the scope of this work, as they do not deepen the aspect of aggregation of multiple relationships into a single embedding, and they have little generality and portability to the MISO setting: the interested reader can refer to popular surveys for further details [13], [14].

Recently, work has started to deal specifically with representation learning on multi-relational graphs [15]–[17]. Earlier work has been developed in the context of knowledge graphs (KG), where different relations are mapped to different aggregation operators working on the KG concept embedding. For example, neural tensor network (NTN) [18] defines each relationship as a bilinear tensor operator, TransE [19] represents each relation as a single vector and random walk-based approaches, e.g., MAGNN [20], HIN2Vec [21] and HAN [22] leveraging meta-paths for multi-relational data. In addition, in this case, applications are limited to the SISO setting alone, and their high computational requirements affect their scalability to realistic settings.

Schlichtkrull et al. [8] were among the first to extend the popular graph convolution approach [11] to multi-relational graphs. M2GRL [23] learns a representation of the nodes of each subrelation graph separately and then aggregates the final representation for a downstream node classification task. The recent MB-GMN model [24] exploits multi-relationships/behaviors in heterogeneous graphs and learns the type-dependent representation of behavior using GNN to capture personalized high-order collaborative effects. This model is not capable of out-of-domain link prediction. Recently, research has introduced models for discrete dynamic graphs [7], [9], [25]. DSRS [25] learns the dynamic social influence of users on their preferences for items by employing structural and temporal attention. The models proposed in [7], [26] provide the setting to learn the representation of new nodes entering the discrete dynamic network. In MSGCN [7], the representation of the new node is generated using vector representations of neighboring nodes from multiple discrete relational graphs (known contexts).

In general, work in the literature is limited to an in-domain setting, and little effort has been put into investigating general forms of aggregation across multiple contexts. As a result of this, the aggregation functions are typically chosen to optimize an in-domain performance metric (e.g., node classification accuracy), and the models are not flexible enough to account for out-of-domain predictive tasks. We believe that the latter is a challenging problem which nevertheless has high potential in settings characterized by the richness in terms of the number of types of relationship available, but where the number of positive examples for each relationship type is relatively low. In this particular setting, we expect to gain the most from a truly integrative approach, such as GOOD, operating across different relationships to obtain high-quality and general embeddings of the structures.

III. PROBLEM DEFINITION

A multi-relational graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ consists of M types of nodes and C types of edges (Fig. 1). Let $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2, \dots, \mathcal{V}_M\}$




Fig. 2. High-level architecture diagram. From top to bottom: each row represents node embeddings generated with respect to different contexts. From left to right: each row represents the effect of a sub-context inside a main context. Dashed lines represent the residual connections. MixAGG denotes the aggregation block.

represent a set of M types of nodes, where $|\mathcal{V}|$ represents the total number of nodes of all types and $|\mathcal{V}_i|$ is the total number of nodes in the set i .

The nodes in the graph are connected with C types of edges. When considering dynamic graphs in which edges can change over time, edges can be represented as $\mathcal{E} = \{\mathcal{E}_{c,t} | c : \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_C\}, t : \{1, 2, \dots, T-1, T\} \vee \emptyset\}$ where $\mathcal{E}_{c,t}$ is a set of links of type c at time t . The number of contextual relations available is denoted by C , while T is the total number of time steps. The number of edges in a given context and time is denoted by $|\mathcal{E}_{c,t}|$.

The out-of-domain task for discrete context-based dynamic graphs refers to the problem of learning from a set of known context relational graph snapshots $\mathcal{G} : \{\mathcal{G}_{c_1}, \mathcal{G}_{c_2}, \dots, \mathcal{G}_{c'}\}$ while predicting unseen relationships for context in $\mathcal{G}_{c'+1}$. Where context explicitly is any information that can be utilized to characterize and interpret the situation in which nodes interact with each other. As shown in Fig. 2, inside the GNNRel block, we can have different nodes and edges under different contexts, which can refer to different time stamps, locations, etc. More formally, this can be drafted as

$$\mathcal{G}_c(V_c, E_c), \dots, \mathcal{G}_{c', T-1}(V_{c'}, \mathcal{E}_{c', T-1}) \xrightarrow[\text{domain}]{\text{out of}} \mathcal{G}_{c'+1, T}(V_{c'+1}, E_{c'+1, T}), \dots, \mathcal{G}_C(V_C, E_C)$$

where $c_{i=1, \dots, c'}$ represent the C' known contexts, $c_{j=c'+1, \dots, C}$ are the $C - C'$ unknown target contexts and $E_{c', t}, E_C$ are the time dependent and independent contexts, respectively. The arrow denotes the structured transduction between the multi-relation graph in input, defined over C' relationships, and the multi-relation graph in output, defined on a disjoint set of target contexts.

Given this problem setting, we focus mainly on generating strong representations of the nodes conditioned on different

contexts/relations¹. To achieve this, we build a multi-objective model that learns to generate strong embedding representations for known contexts, but at the same time promotes an efficient combination of representations coming from several contexts in a self-supervised manner. In other words, our recommendation problem is cast as the task of predicting the existence of an unknown contextual relation among nodes, given the relations among the nodes present in different contexts.

IV. MODELING MULTI-RELATIONAL EMBEDDINGS FOR MULTI-RELATIONAL GRAPH

This section introduces our graph neural network for Out-Of-Domain (GOOD) link prediction in discrete dynamic multi-relational graphs. The high-level architecture diagram of the proposed model is shown in Fig. 2. The model consists of two key components, the GNN multi-relation embedded (GNNRel) and the Mixing-AGGregator (MixAGG).

GNNRel: This component constructs an independent representation of the nodes for each relation. As illustrated in Fig. 2, some relations have a time dependency, while other relations are connected with respect to the time-independent context. For time-dependent contexts, we constructed a different graph for each time step. Therefore, each graph considered by the GNNRel module is a homogeneous one considering only one context at a given time step. The GNNRel is implemented using a Graph Convolutional Network (GCN) [11] and is responsible for generating structure embeddings specialized for single contexts.

¹ In the paper we use the terms context, relation, and contextual relation interchangeably when denoting the type of the graph edges.

MixAGG: The MixAGG component builds an aggregated representation based on the embeddings produced by the GNNRel module. On a high level, we aggregate the contexts using mixing coefficients $Q = \{q_1, q_2, \dots, q_{C'}\}$, where C' is equal to the number of known contexts such as $1 \leq C' \leq C, C' \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and q_i has the properties of a probability mass function, that is, $0 \leq q_i, \sum q_i = 1, q_i \in \mathbb{R}$. The mixing coefficients are set in different ways depending on the variation of the model, and the aggregation can be performed using several alternative methods, as discussed in detail in Section IV-A.

The final embedding vectors are then fed to two Multi-Layer Perceptrons (MLP). The first is responsible for the link prediction task in the unknown domain, and the second is responsible for predicting the mixing coefficients used during the aggregation step. The disentanglement of mixing coefficients through the Coefficient Disentangler (CD) mimics the classic problem of Blind Source Separation [27], when one wants to discriminate between different sources, compensating for the perceived compound signal. We argue that our architecture helps generalization leveraging the information contained in out-of-domain contextual relations, since it pushes the model to learn how to combine and generate strong embedding vectors by conditioning on different contextual relations mixed in the final embedding with coefficients that can even be learned from the data.

In our work, we propose a novel way in which two or more contexts can be combined with any normalized coefficient in a continuous space and still perform adequately in the given target context. The goal is to use a different set of coefficients (different contributions) to generate embedding representations, which could be useful for other use cases, which share some common base information with the ones used for training.

Next, we explain in more detail the variants of our proposed model, which are GOOD, GOOD_{LC} and GOOD_{LC}⁺ (Section IV-A). Subsequently, we will define several possible aggregation methods for the MixAGG block (same section). The loss function of a GOOD model is discussed in Section IV-B.

A. Model Architecture

For the generation of nodes' embeddings, GOOD is using the GNNRel block by treating each context as independent of the other contexts, meaning that each context at a specific time step is a homogeneous graph. On each homogeneous graph, we apply the following sequential layers:

$$f_{c,t}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}_{c,t}) = \text{BN} \left(\text{DP} \left(\text{ReLU} \left(\text{GCN}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}_{c,t}) \right) \right) \right) \quad (1)$$

where ReLU [28] is the Rectified Linear Unit activation function, DP and BN are the Dropout [29] and Batch Normalization [30] layers, respectively. The \mathbf{X} are the input embeddings and $\mathbf{A}_{c,t}$ is the adjacency matrix for context c at time t that encodes the edges $\mathcal{E}_{c,t}$. Sequential layers in (1)

compose the subblocks, and all of these subblocks form the GNNRel model. At each time step, we can apply more than one $f_{c,t}$ based on the number of k -hop neighbors that we are interested in visiting. The GNN-Rel model is then formulated as follows:

$$\mathbf{H}_{c,t_T-1} = f_{c,t_T-1}(\mathbf{H}_{c,t_T-2} \mathbf{A}_{c,t_T-1}) + M_{c,t_T-1}(\mathbf{H}_{c,t_T-3}) \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{H}_{c,t_0} = \mathbf{X}$, $M_{c,t}$ is a matrix that projects the input embedding vectors of the previous layer onto the current if and only if the dimensions of the embeddings of two consecutive time steps are different; otherwise $M_{c,t}$ is equal to the identity matrix. Using the input embeddings of the previous layer as input to the current layer is known as residual connections (skip connections), which are illustrated with dashed lines in Fig. 2. For a time-independent context, f_c has to be applied once in (2). Moreover, the residual connections computations in (2) are skipped, since there are no historical time steps.

Finally, the nodes' embeddings for all relations are aggregated as follows:

$$\mathbf{H} = \text{MixAGG} \left((\mathbf{H}_{c_1}, q_{c_1}), (\mathbf{H}_{c_2}, q_{c_2}), \dots, (\mathbf{H}_{c_{C'}}, q_{c_{C'}}) \right) \quad (3)$$

where q_{c_i} is the coefficient that controls how much each context contributes. The coefficients q_{c_i} are set in different ways in the three different model variations that we propose:

- 1) **GOOD:** During training, it uses random mixing coefficients sampled at the beginning of each epoch and a CD that identifies which random coefficients are used per context. We sample the coefficients from a Dirichlet distribution of order C' with concentration parameters sampled from a uniform distribution $[0, 1)$, ensuring that they are all greater than or equal to zero. During inference, the mixing coefficients are set to $q_i = 1/C'$, which is the expected value of the concentration parameters of the Dirichlet distribution.
- 2) **GOOD_{LC}:** This model learns the mixing coefficients during training. Since the learned coefficients are not guaranteed to sum up to one, they are normalized once the training is completed. Moreover, since the mixing coefficients are learned, the CD module is not used in this model. At inference time, the model uses the normalized mixing coefficients obtained in training.
- 3) **GOOD_{LC}⁺:** This configuration uses the normalized mixing coefficients learned by the GOOD_{LC} in the inference phase for a GOOD model trained with random mixing coefficients. The rationale behind this choice is to decouple the learning of the mixing coefficients from the learning of the other components of the model.

We have evaluated several aggregator functions (Agg_{sum} , Agg_{stack} , Agg_{Dsum} , Agg_{Dtack}) for the MixAGG block, where Agg_{sum} and Agg_{stack} are sum and stack operations on all node embeddings weighted by their respective q_i (contribution w.r.t. i^{th} relation). Whereas Agg_{Dsum} and Agg_{Dtack} also multiply the weighted/unweighted node's degree with respect to relation along with their respective q_i . The choice of the

best aggregation function is treated as a hyperparameter and is optimized through model selection.

B. Loss Function

GOOD features a multi-objective loss function:

$$L = L_{link} + L_Q \quad (4)$$

where the first component L_{link} aims to maximize link prediction performance for the target context, while the second component L_Q learns mixing coefficients so that the model generalizes well across several contexts. The two components of the loss can be seen as two downstream tasks that will be solved using the embedding vectors obtained by the models that aggregate several contexts. In the following subsections, we describe in detail the two components of the loss function.

1) *Link Prediction Objective*: The link prediction objective ensures that the embedding obtained by merging the various contexts has a strong ability to predict what would happen in the next time step for the target context. Therefore, we have a link predictor for each target context. In case the target context is time-dependent, we predict the links at time $t = T$. The link prediction tasks are formulated as binary classification problems with BCE loss.

$$L_{link} = \frac{\sum_c \left(\mathbf{Y}_c \log_e(\sigma(\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_c)) + (1 - \mathbf{Y}_c) \log_e(1 - (\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_c)) \right)}{C - C'} \quad (5)$$

where $\sigma(\cdot)$ is a sigmoid activation, \mathbf{Y}_c are the targets, and $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_c$ are the predictions of the model:

$$\hat{\mathbf{Y}} = \{\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_c = g_L(\mathbf{H}_{src} \odot \mathbf{H}_{dst}) \quad c : c_1, \dots, c_{C'}\}. \quad (6)$$

The term $g_L(\cdot)$ is the output of the MLP used for link prediction:

$$g_L(\mathbf{H}_{src} \odot \mathbf{H}_{dst}) = \sigma \left(\mathbf{W}_L \text{DP} \left(\text{ReLU}(\text{BN}(\mathbf{W}_l(\mathbf{H}_{src} \odot \mathbf{H}_{dst}) + \mathbf{b}_l)) \right) + \mathbf{b}_L \right)$$

where \odot is the element-wise notation, $\mathbf{H}_{src}, \mathbf{H}_{dst}$ are the embeddings of the source and destination nodes, respectively. Terms l and L denote the l -th and the last layer of the MLP, respectively, and $\mathbf{W}_l, \mathbf{W}_L, \mathbf{b}_l, \mathbf{b}_L$ are the learnable weights and biases. A common practice to train GNNs for link prediction is to provide a balanced number of positive and negative links as targets. We experimented with different techniques to sample negative links as described in Appendix VII.

2) *Coefficient Disentanglement Objective*: The Coefficient Disentanglement objective enforces the model to learn (reconstruct) the mixing coefficients that are used to calculate the merged embedding representations by aggregating the context-specific ones. This can be seen as a regularization term, which enables the model to generalize better by aggregating information from different contexts. This amounts to a regression task learned by Mean Squared Log Error (MSLE):

$$L_Q = \frac{1}{C'} \sum_c \left(\log_e(1 + \mathbf{q}_c) - \log_e(1 + \hat{\mathbf{q}}_c) \right)^2 \quad (7)$$

TABLE I
STATISTICAL INFORMATION ABOUT EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL DATASETS.

Dataset	Type of Nodes	Type of Edges	#Nodes	#Edges
ST ₁	4	24	72549	6726113
ST ₂				
ST ₃				
CS ₁	1	18	3729	3355544
CS ₂				

where \mathbf{q}_c is the vector of the target coefficients and $\hat{\mathbf{q}}_c$ is the vector of the predicted coefficients for context c computed as

$$\hat{\mathbf{q}} = \text{SoftMax}(g_Q(\mathbf{H})) \quad (8)$$

where \mathbf{H} are the final embedding vectors and $g_Q(\cdot)$ is the output of the MLP used for disentangling coefficients, that is:

$$g_Q(\mathbf{H}) = \mathbf{W}_Q \text{DP} \left(\text{ReLU}(\text{BN}(\mathbf{W}_q \mathbf{H} + \mathbf{b}_q)) \right) + \mathbf{b}_Q. \quad (9)$$

The terms $\mathbf{W}_q, \mathbf{W}_Q, \mathbf{b}_q, \mathbf{b}_Q$ are the learnable weights and biases. It should be noted that for the GOOD_{LC} variant, where the mixing coefficients embedded in the model are learned during training, the objective of the coefficient disentangler L_Q is deactivated. The impact of CD is studied in Appendix VIII.

V. BENCHMARKS AND EXPERIMENTAL ANALYSIS

A. Datasets

One of the motivating tasks behind our problem formulation is the need to build a predictor of future co-purchases (products bought in the same basket) of $C - C'$ relations, knowing what has been purchased from C' relations. Coherently with such an objective, we have assembled five benchmark datasets to assess our model, generated in the context of retail data. Three datasets, that is, ST₁, ST₂, and ST₃, are obtained from an internally available Seasonal Transaction (ST) dataset provided by a global fashion retailer H&M. The other two datasets, CS₁ and CS₂, are obtained from publicly available data known as Customer Segmentation². All datasets can be represented through a bidirectional graph, where the nodes represent the products and the links connect the products bought in the same basket. Two products can be connected multiple times with respect to different contexts. More statistical information on the data sets can be found in Table I.

The ST₁, ST₂ and ST₃ datasets consist of online transactions from multiple markets and different seasons. The nodes' representations are visual features extracted from a ResNet-50 [31] pre-trained on ImageNet [32]. Each dataset is a multi-relational graph that consists of four types of products and twenty-four types of edges (comprising four contexts and six seasons). Three contexts are used as input, and the fourth as the target of the model. For training, we used seasons 1, 2, 3 \rightarrow 4, for validation, we used seasons 2, 3, 4 \rightarrow 5 and for testing, we used seasons 3, 4, 5 \rightarrow 6.

² <https://www.kaggle.com/fabiendaniel/customer-segmentation/data>

TABLE II

TEST-SET PERFORMANCE COMPARISON OF THE PROPOSED APPROACH AGAINST RELATED MODELS FROM THE LITERATURE. THE PARAMETERS USED TO ACHIEVE THESE RESULTS ARE LISTED IN APPENDIX VII.

ALGORITHM	ST ₁		ST ₂		ST ₃		CS ₁		CS ₂	
	Accuracy (%)	ROC AUC	Accuracy (%)	ROC AUC	Accuracy (%)	ROC AUC	Accuracy (%)	ROC AUC	Accuracy (%)	ROC AUC
GOOD	71.28	0.6340	65.09	0.5963	62.54	0.6484	64.42	0.6085	66.12	0.6990
GOOD _{LC}	71.18	0.6338	59.45	0.5924	62.58	0.6341	57.21	0.5973	63.75	0.6884
GOOD _{LC} ⁺	71.32	0.6307	66.64	0.5935	62.61	0.6430	64.42	0.6085	66.14	0.6991
GCN [11]	71.12	0.6078	71.21	0.5733	61.89	0.6422	50.48	0.4066	53.64	0.6161
MSGCN [7]	71.07	0.5000	61.07	0.5590	60.39	0.5998	54.33	0.5861	44.39	0.4464
MSGCN-mean [7]	71.07	0.5352	70.86	0.5954	61.22	0.6372	39.42	0.3859	52.69	0.6293
RGCN [8]	65.84	0.6242	64.73	0.5955	62.58	0.6431	59.62	0.5856	61.25	0.6592
MMGCN [33]	35.08	0.5009	32.48	0.5025	43.19	0.5068	50.01	0.6074	49.80	0.5699

The public data sets CS₁ and CS₂ consist of online transactions of customers belonging to 37 different countries from a physical store in the UK. Due to the excessive sparsity in the data, we decided to split the contexts in a different way compared to the ST dataset, by grouping countries together under the same context based on their geographical location. Here, the task requires predicting the co-purchases in one group from the purchases that occurred in the other groups. These multi-relational graphs connect one type of product with 16 different types of edges. The initial node embeddings used in the CS datasets are learnable embeddings (for more information, see Section VII).

B. Evaluation Methodology

1) *Related Approaches*: We have compared our proposed algorithms GOOD, GOOD_{LC} and GOOD_{LC}⁺ to two families of related works. The first category includes a method that is designed for homogeneous networks. The second category includes models that are designed for multi-relational graphs. The baseline algorithms used in the empirical evaluation are summarized below.

- GCN [11]: A classical semi-supervised GNN (from first category) for aggregating neighborhood information. It is the most referenced method in the GNN literature and the most widely used design in real-world applications.

- MSGCN [7]: MSGCN belongs to the second category; it aggregates the embedding of all relational subgraphs and uses the aggregated embedding (each node has a different weight w_i based on its contribution to the respective relational subgraph) for the node classification task. In our setting, we have used this approach to aggregate the known subgraph relations and predict links for an unknown relational subgraph.
- MSGCN-mean [7]: This is an MSGCN variant that averages all C' relations without taking into account the effect (w_i) of the relational graph on each node.
- MMGCN [33]: builds an independent graph for each context and uses a modified GNN to propagate the information for each graph separately. In its aggregation layer, it learns several preference functions that eventually combine into a single overall node's representation. In the original work, each graph was separated with respect to node features, but here we have a separation on a relation basis (belonging to the second category).
- RGCN [8]: it uses a relational message passing over the nodes on multi-relational graphs (belongs to the second category). This model performs relation-specific aggregation at the node level without considering the significance of various relations and neighborhoods.

C. Performance Comparison

For comparing our models, we mainly used two metrics: Accuracy and Receiver Operating Characteristic Area Under Curve (ROC-AUC) [34]. Table II shows the performance of GOOD and related models in five data sets. GOOD outperforms all models considered from the literature in terms of the ROC-AUC metric. The inability of MMGCN to generalize on out-of-domain predictions makes it perform the worst compared to our GOOD. Our model uses both MixAGG with random coefficients and a CD, and generalizes better to out-of-domain tasks, compared to models without MixAGG (i.e., RGCN) and CD (i.e., MSGCN and MSGCN mean).

The purpose of solving an out-of-domain task is two-fold. First, we want to predict an unknown context and, second, to benefit from the knowledge of the other contexts. To evaluate the latest, we compare our model with the same target c_k




Fig. 3. Multi-relational out-of-domain Vs. Single-relation in-domain ROC-AUC results.

once using inputs c_1 to c_{k-1} (out-of-domain) and once only using c_k (in-domain). Intuitively, the best performance should be achieved when we learn and predict in the same domain.

To this end, we also analyze how the performance of our MISO model in the out-of-domain task compares with the SISO in-domain task. For this purpose, we have used a single GNNRel block per time t in our model (Fig. 2) to learn and predict in the same domain; we call this model Single Input Single Output in-domain (SISO-GNN-ID).

In Fig. 3, we can see that our model GOOD and GOOD_{LC} (for the MISO task) is more confident compared to SISO-GNN-ID. The better ROC-AUC result of GOOD and GOOD_{LC} is a very positive sign for believing in our model for out-of-domain link prediction. The results show that multiple relevant relations that are out-of-domain are helpful in generating strong embeddings, which are capable of achieving a performance that is at least as good as the performance of in-domain link prediction.

VI. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

We formalized and studied the problem of out-of-domain link prediction on dynamic multi-relational graphs. We argued that existing literature works leveraging graph neural networks for multi-relational graphs are only designed for in-domain tasks, and they are not capable to effectively generalize to out-of-domain problems. To address such a limitation, we introduced a novel GNN approach, GOOD, specifically designed for out-of-domain link prediction tasks with dynamically evolving multi-relationship networks. We have discussed and empirically analyzed the performance of different variants of our model, with the help of newly introduced benchmarks in the field of retail product recommendation. Among the GOOD variants, it is highlighted through the experimental analysis that we performed that the GOOD_{LC} model is the one that generalizes the least. However, we have also witnessed the advantage of GOOD_{LC}⁺, which uses a hybrid strategy utilizing the best-normalized coefficients learned by GOOD_{LC}, with the static mixing coefficients of vanilla GOOD.

Our experiments reveal that GOOD provides strong and general embeddings for multi-relational graphs by leveraging the disentanglement mechanism that makes the model proficient in guessing the mixing coefficients used in the multi-relation embedding aggregation step. Such embeddings also seem promising for downstream out-of-domain link prediction tasks for dynamic graphs. The applications of the proposed model are not limited to recommendation systems, but could also include the discovery/repurposing of therapies from protein-drug interaction networks and, in general, any problem that can be formalized using heterogeneous graphs.

In the future, we plan to investigate a scalable meta-path-based approach for our multi-relational graph setting, aiming to produce stronger and more generalized embeddings, which can improve performance on the out-of-domain link prediction task. Moreover, we also plan to investigate an attention-based integration mechanism for multiple relations and nodes and to evaluate our model on new industrially relevant problems.

TABLE III
IMPACT OF USING RANDOM COEFFICIENTS WITH COEFFICIENT
DISENTANGLER AS COMPARED TO EQUAL CONTRIBUTION.

ALGORITHM	ST ₁		CS ₂	
	Accuracy (%)	ROC-AUC	Accuracy (%)	ROC-AUC
GOOD	71.33	0.6307	66.12	0.6990
GOOD _{LC}	69.28	0.6335	63.75	0.6884
GOOD-coefficient-ablated	69.80	0.5944	62.41	0.6613

VII. IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

Our implementation³ is based on PyTorch [35] and PyTorch Lightning⁴. We also used the Deep Graph Library (DGL) [36] to manipulate the graphs and for the standard implementation of GCN layers [11]. Most graphs used in GNNs do not provide ground truth negative edges, but the ST₁, ST₂ and ST₃ datasets contain ground truth negative edges, which are based on returned products. During the training part, the negative edges were sampled in different ways based on their frequency (edge weight) using a multinomial distribution, a uniform random distribution (samples from the ground-truth negative edges), a uniform random distribution (samples from all non-positive edges) or a ratio of all the aforementioned.

For all experiments, we chose the following hyperparameter settings: dropout for the input node features inside the GNN layer under the GNNRel block $\in \{0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.6, 0.7, 0.8\}$. We have used Adam optimizer [37] with a learning rate set to 0.0001 and the weight decay set to 0.00001. For CS_{*i*} datasets, the features are generated using learnable embeddings. For the ST_{*i*} datasets, we used the 2048 dimensions produced from ResNet-50 [31]. For all datasets, we have concluded with an architecture 2-1-1, which means that we use two GNN subblocks for the first GNNRel block and a single GNN subblock for the second and third blocks, respectively. The GNN in the first block has [2048, 520] layer size for the ST_{*i*} datasets and [200, 150] for the CS_{*i*} datasets. The layer size for the second block is set to [250] for the ST_{*i*} and [100] for the CS_{*i*} datasets. The last block is set to a layer size equal to [150] for the ST_{*i*} and [75] for the CS_{*i*} datasets.

To find the best set of parameters for our model in different experiments, we use the Ray⁵ framework which performed hyperparameter searching using Hyperopt [38] as backend. The parameters we performed the hyperparameter search are the dropout value, the choice of the aggregation function, the existence of the BN [30] layer, and the residual connections.

VIII. ABLATION STUDIES AND MODEL ANALYSIS

Revisiting the architecture Fig. 2, we can see that our model consists of two key components, namely, GNNRel, which constructs the context-specific node embeddings, and MixAGG, which aggregates all context-specific embeddings.

Impact of coefficients aggregation (MixAGG) : Table III reports the relative performance, in terms of accuracy and ROC-AUC, for ST₁ and CS₂ data sets of different variants. All variations have been trained with BCE as their objective

³ <https://github.com/asmaAdil/GOOD>

⁴ <http://pytorchlightning.ai>

⁵ <https://docs.ray.io/en/latest/tune/examples/tune-pytorch-lightning.html>

function, except GOOD, which used BCE in combination with MSLE. The MixAGG of the GOOD model used random coefficients, whereas the MixAGG of the GOOD_{LC} model used learnable mixing coefficients. The MixAGG of the GOOD-coefficient-ablated model used fixed normalized coefficients during training and inference. As we can observe in Table III, GOOD, which disentangles the coefficients of the multiple relations in the final node embedding, performed better compared to the GOOD-coefficient-ablated model, which instead aggregates all embeddings with equal contribution without generalizing on the different values of the coefficients. Furthermore, the GOOD_{LC} model seems to generalize better than a MixAGG with fixed coefficients. Therefore, our method for decomposing these different contributions is effective.

REFERENCES

- [1] F. Scarselli, M. Gori, A. C. Tsoi, M. Hagenbuchner, and G. Monfardini, "The graph neural network model," *IEEE transactions on neural networks*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 61–80, 2008.
- [2] M. Zhang and Y. Chen, "Link prediction based on graph neural networks," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 31, pp. 5165–5175, 2018.
- [3] J. Zhou, G. Cui, S. Hu, Z. Zhang, C. Yang, Z. Liu, L. Wang, C. Li, and M. Sun, "Graph neural networks: A review of methods and applications," *AI Open*, vol. 1, pp. 57–81, 2020.
- [4] X. Wang, Y. Ye, and A. Gupta, "Zero-shot recognition via semantic embeddings and knowledge graphs," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp. 6857–6866.
- [5] L. Yao, C. Mao, and Y. Luo, "Graph convolutional networks for text classification," in *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, vol. 33, no. 01, 2019, pp. 7370–7377.
- [6] A. Sattar and D. Bacciu, "Context-aware graph convolutional autoencoder," in *International Work-Conference on Artificial Neural Networks*. Springer, 2021, pp. 279–290.
- [7] J. Chen, F. Huang, and J. Peng, "Msgcn: Multi-subgraph based heterogeneous graph convolution network embedding," *Applied Sciences*, vol. 11, no. 21, p. 9832, 2021.
- [8] M. Schlichtkrull, T. N. Kipf, P. Bloem, R. Van Den Berg, I. Titov, and M. Welling, "Modeling relational data with graph convolutional networks," in *European semantic web conference*. Springer, 2018, pp. 593–607.
- [9] A. Sankar, Y. Wu, L. Gou, W. Zhang, and H. Yang, "Dysat: Deep neural representation learning on dynamic graphs via self-attention networks," in *Proceedings of the 13th international conference on web search and data mining*, 2020, pp. 519–527.
- [10] W. L. Hamilton, R. Ying, and J. Leskovec, "Inductive representation learning on large graphs," in *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017, pp. 1025–1035.
- [11] T. Kipf and M. Welling, "Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. in proceedings of the 5th international conference on learning representations, iclr'17, toulon, france, april 24-26," 2017.
- [12] P. Veličković, G. Cucurull, A. Casanova, A. Romero, P. Lio, and Y. Bengio, "Graph attention networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.10903*, 2017.
- [13] D. Bacciu, F. Errica, A. Micheli, and M. Podda, "A gentle introduction to deep learning for graphs," *Neural Networks*, vol. 129, pp. 203–221, 2020.
- [14] H. Cai, V. W. Zheng, and K. C.-C. Chang, "A comprehensive survey of graph embedding: Problems, techniques, and applications," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 30, no. 9, pp. 1616–1637, 2018.
- [15] M. Qu, J. Tang, J. Shang, X. Ren, M. Zhang, and J. Han, "An attention-based collaboration framework for multi-view network representation learning," in *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, 2017, pp. 1767–1776.
- [16] V. K. Potluru, R. E. Tillman, P. Reddy, and M. Veloso, "Deeplex: A gnn for link prediction in multiplex networks," in *SIAM Workshop on Network Science*, 2020.
- [17] Y. Fang, X. Zhao, Y. Chen, W. Xiao, and M. de Rijke, "Pf-hin: Pre-training for heterogeneous information networks," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 2022.
- [18] R. Socher, D. Chen, C. D. Manning, and A. Ng, "Reasoning with neural tensor networks for knowledge base completion," in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2013, pp. 926–934.
- [19] A. Bordes, N. Usunier, A. Garcia-Duran, J. Weston, and O. Yakhnenko, "Translating embeddings for modeling multi-relational data," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 26, 2013.
- [20] X. Fu, J. Zhang, Z. Meng, and I. King, "Magnn: Metapath aggregated graph neural network for heterogeneous graph embedding," in *Proceedings of The Web Conference 2020*, 2020, pp. 2331–2341.
- [21] T.-y. Fu, W.-C. Lee, and Z. Lei, "Hin2vec: Explore meta-paths in heterogeneous information networks for representation learning," in *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, 2017, pp. 1797–1806.
- [22] X. Wang, H. Ji, C. Shi, B. Wang, Y. Ye, P. Cui, and P. S. Yu, "Heterogeneous graph attention network," in *The World Wide Web Conference*, 2019, pp. 2022–2032.
- [23] M. Wang, Y. Lin, G. Lin, K. Yang, and X.-M. Wu, "M2grl: A multi-task multi-view graph representation learning framework for web-scale recommender systems," in *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, 2020, pp. 2349–2358.
- [24] L. Xia, Y. Xu, C. Huang, P. Dai, and L. Bo, "Graph meta network for multi-behavior recommendation," in *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, 2021, pp. 757–766.
- [25] Y. Liu, Z. Li, W. Huang, T. Xu, and E.-H. Chen, "Exploiting structural and temporal influence for dynamic social-aware recommendation," *Journal of Computer Science and Technology*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 281–294, 2020.
- [26] M. Hang, T. Schnabel, L. Yang, and J. Neville, "Lightweight compositional embeddings for incremental streaming recommendation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.02427*, 2022.
- [27] A. Hyvärinen and E. Oja, "Independent component analysis: algorithms and applications," *Neural networks*, vol. 13, no. 4-5, pp. 411–430, 2000.
- [28] A. F. Agarap, "Deep learning using rectified linear units (relu)," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.08375*, 2018.
- [29] N. Srivastava, G. Hinton, A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and R. Salakhutdinov, "Dropout: a simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting," *The journal of machine learning research*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1929–1958, 2014.
- [30] S. Ioffe and C. Szegedy, "Batch normalization: Accelerating deep network training by reducing internal covariate shift," in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2015, pp. 448–456.
- [31] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [32] J. Deng, W. Dong, R. Socher, L.-J. Li, K. Li, and L. Fei-Fei, "Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database," in *2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. IEEE, 2009, pp. 248–255.
- [33] Y. Wei, X. Wang, L. Nie, X. He, R. Hong, and T.-S. Chua, "Mmgcn: Multi-modal graph convolution network for personalized recommendation of micro-video," in *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 2019, pp. 1437–1445.
- [34] T. Fawcett, "An introduction to roc analysis," *Pattern recognition letters*, vol. 27, no. 8, pp. 861–874, 2006.
- [35] A. Paszke, S. Gross, F. Massa, A. Lerer, J. Bradbury, G. Chanan, T. Killeen, Z. Lin, N. Gimelshein, L. Antiga et al., "Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 32, pp. 8026–8037, 2019.
- [36] M. Wang, D. Zheng, Z. Ye, Q. Gan, M. Li, X. Song, J. Zhou, C. Ma, L. Yu, Y. Gai et al., "Deep graph library: A graph-centric, highly-performant package for graph neural networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.01315*, 2019.
- [37] D. P. Kingma and J. Ba, "Adam: A method for stochastic optimization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.
- [38] J. Bergstra, D. Yamins, and D. Cox, "Making a science of model search: Hyperparameter optimization in hundreds of dimensions for vision architectures," in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2013, pp. 115–123.