

Kolmogorov–Arnold Graph Neural Networks

Gianluca De Carlo, Andrea Mastropietro, Aris Anagnostopoulos

Department of Computer, Control, and Management Engineering

Sapienza University of Rome

Rome, Italy

decarlo@diag.uniroma1.it, mastropietro@diag.uniroma1.it, aris@diag.uniroma1.it

Abstract—Graph neural networks (GNNs) excel in learning from network-like data but often lack interpretability, making their application challenging in domains requiring transparent decision-making. We propose the Graph Kolmogorov–Arnold Network (GKAN), a novel GNN model leveraging spline-based activation functions on edges to enhance both accuracy and interpretability. Our experiments on five benchmark datasets demonstrate that GKAN outperforms state-of-the-art GNN models in node classification, link prediction, and graph classification tasks. In addition to the improved accuracy, GKAN’s design inherently provides clear insights into the model’s decision-making process, eliminating the need for post-hoc explainability techniques. This paper discusses the methodology, performance, and interpretability of GKAN, highlighting its potential for applications in domains where interpretability is crucial.

Index Terms—deep learning, graph neural networks, interpretability

I. INTRODUCTION

Neural networks and deep learning have clearly revolutionized countless fields, encompassing the domains of image, text, audio, and medical data. The basic building block of neural network models is the multilayer perceptron (MLP) [1]. Very recently, a promising alternative to MLPs was proposed, namely the Kolmogorov–Arnold Network (KAN) [2]. MLPs are proved to be universal function approximators [3], whereas KANs are inspired by the Kolmogorov–Arnold representation theorem [4], [5], which states that a smooth multivariate function can be written as the finite sum of the composition of univariate functions; this has a similar structure to a two-layer neural network.

The idea of Liu et al. [2] is to generalize this two-level structure to more levels. This extension allows the definition of a novel framework that proved increased accuracy and interpretability with respect to standard MLPs. Indeed, lack of interpretability in neural networks is a major issue, which limits its usage in domains in which interpretable results are crucial (e.g., medical and financial scenarios). To cope with this flaw, research focuses on the development of explainability techniques that try to unveil what was learned by those models in terms of salient features [6], [7]. In the domain of neural networks, models specialized in learning from graph-structure data have emerged. Graph neural networks (GNNs) [8] are able to leverage the connectivity structure of network-like data, learning representative topology-aware embeddings. In literature, we find different architectures addressing different

aspects and characteristics of graph data. Graph convolutional networks (GCNs) [9] extend the concept of convolution to graph structures, aggregating information from each node’s neighbors using spectral graph convolutions. GraphSAGE [10] is another GNN model that generates node embeddings by sampling and aggregating information from neighbor nodes. It is based on an inductive learning procedure that allows embedding generation also for previously unseen nodes. Graph attention networks (GATs) [11] incorporate attention mechanisms into GNNs, allowing the model to focus on the most salient parts of a node’s neighborhood. An additional GNN model is offered by GINs (graph isomorphism networks) [12]. Such models are designed to have an effective discriminative ability, theoretically proven to be as powerful as the Weisfeiler–Lehman graph isomorphism test [13]. GNNs have also been extended to relational structures, with the introduction of relational graph convolutional networks (RGCNs). They are designed to handle graphs with multiple types of edges and nodes by incorporating relations explicitly into the model. Furthermore, variational graph autoencoders (VGAE) [14] aim to encode graph data into a latent space and then reconstruct the graph from the generated embeddings.

Similarly to classic multilayer perceptron models, GNNs are not immune to the interpretability curse; to shed light on their predictions, several explainability methodologies have been developed. Such methods explain GNN predictions in terms of importance subgraphs built of salient nodes, edges, node features, connected subgraphs, or a combination of those elements. The pioneering work in eXplainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) for GNNs is GNNExplainer [15], which determined explanations by generating important subgraphs using a mask on the adjacency matrix able to maximize the mutual information between the prediction and the distribution of the possible explanation subgraphs. GraphSVX [16] in another method, which determines explanation in terms of important nodes and node features relying on the theoretical background behind Shapley values [17]. It uses a decomposition technique relying on a surrogate linear model for approximating Shapley values. A methodology targeting edges as a means for determining explanation subgraphs is EdgeSHAPer [18]. It employs Monte Carlo sampling to approximate Shapley values determining salient edges forming relevant subgraphs driving predictions. One additional XAI tool is SubgraphX. Also exploiting Shapley value approximation, it looks for explanations only in terms of connected subgraphs by using

a Monte Carlo Tree Search approach. Given the underlying mechanisms and the different ideas on which each explainer is based, rationalizing a model’s predictions may lead to different explanations, given the intrinsic methodological biases different explainers have, which may lead to counterintuitive outcomes [19].

Motivated by the need for inherently interpretable GNN models, we extend the Kolmogorov–Arnold representation theorem to GNNs, introducing the Graph Kolmogorov–Arnold Network (GKAN). Our main contributions are as follows:

- **Novel GNN Architecture:** We propose GKAN, a novel GNN model that employs spline-based activation functions on graph edges. This design enhances the model’s flexibility and interpretability while retaining the efficiency of message-passing mechanisms in GNNs.
- **Enhanced Interpretability:** GKAN provides inherent interpretability by design, eliminating the need for external explainability techniques. This feature is crucial for applications in domains requiring transparent decision-making processes.
- **Performance Improvement:** We demonstrate that GKAN outperforms state-of-the-art GNN models in node classification, link prediction, and graph classification tasks on benchmark datasets (Cora, PubMed, CiteSeer, MUTAG, and PROTEINS).

In the following sections, we detail the GKAN architecture and its components, present experimental results to validate our approach, and discuss the interpretability of GKAN compared to existing methods. Our findings suggest that GKAN represents a significant advancement in the development of accurate and interpretable GNNs, with potential applications in various fields where interpretability is fundamental.¹

II. METHODOLOGY

This section details the construction and operation of our proposed GKAN model. We begin by revisiting the key elements of Kolmogorov–Arnold Networks (KANs), upon which GKAN is built.

A. Kolmogorov–Arnold Networks

The core idea of GKAN lies behind KANs. Kolmogorov–Arnold theorem states that a multivariate continuous function in a bounded domain can be rewritten using a finite composition of continuous functions on one single variable and the addition operation. Given \mathbf{x} a vector of dimension n , f a function such that $f : [0, 1]^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, it is thus possible to write:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{q=1}^{2n+1} \Phi_q \left(\sum_{p=1}^n \phi_{q,p}(x_p) \right), \quad (1)$$

where $\phi_{q,p} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\Phi_q : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Liu et al. [2] extended Equation (1), representing a two-layer KAN with $2n + 1$ terms in the hidden layer, to larger depths and widths, parametrizing each one-dimensional function as a B-spline

curve. This kind of neural network has an activation function on the edges instead of nodes; the latter simply perform a summation. From the implementation side, KANs activation functions $\phi(x)$ are built as a sum of a basis function $b(x)$ and the spline function such that:

$$\phi(x) = w_b b(x) + w_s \text{spline}(x). \quad (2)$$

The original KAN model uses

$$b(x) = \text{silu}(x) = \frac{x}{(1 + e)}, \quad \text{spline}(x) = \sum_i c_i B_i(x). \quad (3)$$

At initialization, all activation functions are such that $w_s = 1$ and $\text{spline}(x) \approx 0$ and w_b are initialized using Xavier initialization. The simplified interpretable KAN is the one at the basis of our GKAN.

To maximize KANs’ interpretability, some simplifications are needed. The interpretable KAN is trained with sparsity regularization techniques and pruning. They use the L1 norm of the activation functions with entropy regularization to favor sparsity. Once the network has been trained with a sparsification penalty to reduce the number of activation functions, pruning occurs at the node level. Reducing the number of active neurons renders interpretation of the network more straightforward. To prune nodes, two scores are defined, namely the incoming and the outgoing scores. If both scores are above a certain threshold (10^{-2} in the default implementation), a node is considered important and, thus, preserved; otherwise, it is pruned. An additional adaptation made by Liu et al. consists of symbolification. In the simplified KAN, if an activation function is suspected to be a symbolic function, such activation is set to be that symbolic function with shift and scaling of input and output learned with grid search; for more details we refer the reader to the original KAN paper [2].

B. Kolmogorov–Arnold Graph Neural Networks (GKAN)

Building upon the strengths of KANs, we introduce GKAN (Graph Kolmogorov–Arnold Network), a novel GNN architecture (Figure 1) designed for processing graph-structured data. GKAN leverages the flexibility, accuracy, and interpretability of KANs while retaining the efficient message passing mechanisms of GNNs.

1) *GKAN Architecture:* GKAN employs learnable spline-based activation functions on the edges of the graph, allowing for flexible nonlinear transformations of node features based on their connections. The architecture is composed of multiple layers:

- **KAN-based convolutional layers:** Each layer efficiently handles the propagation and aggregation of messages between nodes by applying a KAN-based transformation to the features of each node, taking into account information from its neighbors.
- **KAN-based linear layers:** A final linear layer performs a linear transformation on the aggregated node features, producing the final output of the network (e.g., node labels for classification).

¹We will make the code available upon publication.




Fig. 1: A simplified graphical representation of the GKAN model. The hidden layers are GKAN convolutional layers, in which messages are propagated and then aggregated, the output layer instead is a KAN linear layer. Each neuron in the hidden and output layers has its own set of learnable splines.

The Xavier uniform initialization, also known as Glorot initialization, is a widely used method for initializing the weights of neural networks. This technique aims to maintain the variance of the gradients approximately the same across all layers, thereby mitigating the vanishing and exploding gradient problems. The weights are initialized by sampling from a uniform distribution in the range $[-r, r]$, with $r = \sqrt{\frac{6}{n_{in} + n_{out}}}$, where n_{in} and n_{out} denote the number of input and output units in the weight tensor, respectively [20]. As suggested in the KAN paper, also in GKAN the basis function weights are initialized using the Xavier initialization, facilitating effective training and optimization.

2) *Mathematical Formulation of GKAN:* In the next part of this section we will go through the basic mathematical formulation of the constituent steps of GKAN.

Message Passing and Aggregation: Each node i in the graph has an initial feature vector \mathbf{x}_i . For each layer l in the GKAN, the node representations are updated through message passing and aggregation. The message from node j to node i at layer l is denoted as $\mathbf{m}_{j \rightarrow i}^{(l)}$.

1) **Message Passing:**

$$\mathbf{m}_{j \rightarrow i}^{(l)} = \text{spline}(\mathbf{x}_j^{(l-1)})$$

where $\text{spline}(\cdot)$ denotes the spline-based activation function applied to the features of node j .

2) **Aggregation:** The aggregated message for node i is obtained by summing or averaging the messages from

its neighbors $\mathcal{N}(i)$:

$$\mathbf{a}_i^{(l)} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \mathbf{m}_{j \rightarrow i}^{(l)}$$

or

$$\mathbf{a}_i^{(l)} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}(i)|} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \mathbf{m}_{j \rightarrow i}^{(l)}$$

Node Update: The node representation is then updated using the aggregated message and a spline-based transformation:

$$\mathbf{x}_i^{(l)} = \text{spline}(\mathbf{a}_i^{(l)})$$

Spline-Based Activation Function: The spline-based activation function φ used in GKAN is defined as:

$$\varphi(x) = w_b b(x) + w_s \text{spline}(x)$$

where $b(x)$ is a basis function (e.g., SiLU), and $\text{spline}(x)$ is a B-spline function:

$$\text{spline}(x) = \sum_i c_i B_i(x)$$

with $B_i(x)$ being the basis splines.

GKAN Layer: Each GKAN layer combines these steps, resulting in the following layer-wise update rule for node i :

$$\mathbf{x}_i^{(l)} = \varphi \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \varphi(\mathbf{x}_j^{(l-1)}) \right)$$

Output Layer: After passing through multiple GKAN layers, the final node representations are transformed using a KAN-based linear layer for tasks like classification or regression:

$$\mathbf{z}_i = \text{KANLinear}(\mathbf{x}_i^{(L)})$$

where L is the number of layers and KANLinear applies a final spline-based transformation.

3) *Overall Model:* The overall model can be summarized as:

- 1) Initialize node features \mathbf{x}_i .
- 2) For each GKAN layer $l = 1, \dots, L$:
 - a) Compute messages $\mathbf{m}_{j \rightarrow i}^{(l)}$ for each edge.
 - b) Aggregate messages $\mathbf{a}_i^{(l)}$ for each node.
 - c) Update node features $\mathbf{x}_i^{(l)}$ using spline-based activation functions.
- 3) Apply a KAN-based linear layer to obtain final node representations.

This section provided a comprehensive overview of the GKAN architecture and its core components. The next sections will delve into the experimental results and demonstrate the effectiveness and interpretability of this new approach to GNNs.

III. EXPERIMENTS

A. Datasets

We evaluated GKAN on node classification, graph classification, and link prediction tasks using the benchmark datasets summarized in Table I. In the following section, we will discuss the experimental setup and the results obtained by GKAN in comparison to state-of-the-art methodologies. Dataset are available from the Planetoid² and TUDadates³ libraries of Pytorch Geometric [21].

Node Classification and Link Prediction Datasets					
name	#nodes	#edges	#features	#classes	
Cora	2,708	10,556	1,433	7	
PubMed	3,327	9,104	3,703	6	
CiteSeer	19,717	88,648	500	3	
Graph Classification Datasets					
	#graphs	#nodes	#edges	#features	#classes
MUTAG	188	~17.9	~39.6	7	2
PROTEINS	1,113	~39.1	~145.6	3	2

TABLE I: Summary of benchmark datasets. Datasets were split in train, validation, and test sets with proportions of 80%, 10%, and 10%, respectively.

B. GKAN Performances

We compare the performances of our proposed model against established GNN architectures, namely GCN, GAT, and GraphSAGE. GKAN was able to outperform all the mentioned GNN models in all tasks with all datasets, with the single exception of the link prediction with PubMed, in which GCN performed better.

Each method is unique, and the hyperparameters chosen for training are as crucial as the implementation itself. To ensure a fair comparison, each model has been trained following the guidelines and hyperparameters provided by their authors. For training GKAN, we conducted hyperparameter fine-tuning on the Cora dataset; we then use these hyperparameters to train GKAN also on the other two citation datasets, PubMed and CiteSeer. This hyperparameter tuning strategy was also reported in previous work [9]. Similarly, in the compared methods, we use their optimal hyperparameters suggested for the Cora dataset to train, evaluate, and compare on PubMed and CiteSeer.

Hyperparameter fine-tuning was conducted using a grid search over a broad range of potential values: learning rate [0.01, 0.001, 0.005], hidden channels [8, 16, 32, 64], dropout rate [0, 0.3, 0.6, 0.7], number of layers [1, 2, 3, 4], spline grid size [2, 3, 4, 8, 10, 20, 30], splines degree [1, 2, 4, 8, 10, 15], aggregation function [*add*, *mean*], and L2-regularization [0.0001, 0.00001]. The optimal hyperparameters that we found for GKAN in the node classification task are as follows: a dropout rate of 0.7, a learning rate of 0.001, 2 layers, 32 hidden channels, a weight decay of 1e-4, the *mean* function for aggregating the messages, a spline grid size of 3, and a spline

²https://pytorch-geometric.readthedocs.io/en/stable/generated/torch_geometric.datasets.Planetoid.html

³https://pytorch-geometric.readthedocs.io/en/2.5.1/generated/torch_geometric.datasets.TUDataset.html?highlight=tudataset

TABLE II: Results in terms of accuracy (node and graph classification) and AUC-ROC (link prediction) obtained by GKAN and the compared architectures. Our framework delivers higher accuracy and ROC, being the top-performing architecture.

Dataset	GCN	GAT	GraphSAGE	GKAN (Ours)
Node Classification				
Cora	76.3	78.9	73.4	81.2
PubMed	77.4	78.2	73.9	81.0
CiteSeer	66.7	68.2	62.3	69.4
Link Prediction				
Cora	79.3	81.6	80.6	83.5
PubMed	90.6	86.3	82.4	82.3
CiteSeer	78.7	78.1	78.3	80.3
Graph Classification				
MUTAG	71.3	75.1	71.1	85.0
PROTEINS	73.8	72.5	70.7	77.7

TABLE III: Average time to complete one training epoch on the Cora dataset for each model. These times were measured while training the models on an Apple Silicon M1 processor.

Method	Avg time (s)
GCN	0.0016
GAT	0.020
GraphSAGE	0.065
GKAN (ours)	2.052

degree of 2. For link prediction, the dropout rate is set to 0.2 and the weight decay to 1e-5. For the graph classification task, the best hyperparameters found (on the MUTAG dataset) are: dropout rate of 0, learning rate of 0.001, 3 layers, 32 hidden channels, a weight decay of 1e-4, and the *add* aggregation function. The results summarized in Table II are obtained by averaging over 100 runs the test accuracy (or AUC-ROC for link prediction) of the models that achieved the highest validation accuracy during training over each run.

The models were all trained for up to 300 epochs, utilizing early stopping with a window size of 10. Training a single epoch of GKAN takes significantly longer compared to other GNN models (Table III) due to its design and operational complexity. GKAN employs learnable spline-based activation functions, which require additional computational resources. This results in more precise and interpretable transformations but increases computational complexity. The sophisticated message passing and aggregation process, involving spline transformations, adds further computational cost. Thus, even though GKAN offers improved interpretability and accuracy, these benefits come with the trade-off of increased training time.

C. Interpretability

The added value of GKAN lies not only in its higher accuracy and effectiveness but also in its inherent interpretability Figure 2. Built upon the simplified and interpretable KAN, GKAN allows for understanding its predictions without relying on external explainers, which can sometimes provide biased or approximated explanations [19]. As a representative example, we present an interpretation of a node’s prediction by GKAN




Fig. 2: Interpretability of GKAN at 2 hops from a target node (node with ID 4). The model was trained on the Cora dataset, and in this figure, we are visualizing the weights learned by the splines on the edges to achieve the prediction. It is possible to visualize the direct values that lead to a particular prediction for a number of hops up to the number of layers of the network, as this is the extent to which the messages are aggregated. For visualization purposes, the weights have been normalized.

in a node classification problem, and compare it with an explanation generated by GNNExplainer on a GCN prediction for the same node (Figure 3). It could be said that in GKAN, the values (which have been normalized for comparison purposes) truly represent the message of the network, meaning the values used to arrive at the prediction. In contrast, in GNNExplainer, they are importance scores calculated post hoc on a subgraph that maximizes mutual information and do not necessarily reflect what the network has learned.

Spline-based activation functions, which are central to KAN and consequently GKAN, are inherently more interpretable compared to traditional neural network activation functions. Traditional GNNs use fixed, nonlinear activation functions like ReLU or Sigmoid, which can make it challenging to understand the decision boundaries or the transformations applied to the input features. These activations are often considered as “black boxes” because they do not provide a straightforward way to interpret how input features are transformed and combined to make predictions.

In contrast, spline functions are defined as piecewise polynomials which can be easily visualized and understood. The smooth and continuous nature of splines allows for a clear representation of how inputs are mapped to outputs. By examining the spline functions, one can see exactly how each input feature contributes to the final prediction. This transparency makes it possible to trace the influence of individual features and understand the model’s decision-making process.

In traditional GNNs, post-hoc explainability techniques like

GNNExplainer attempt to infer the importance of nodes and edges after the model has made its predictions. These solutions can have methodological bias resulting from the different strategies employed to determine the explanations (e.g., mutual information maximization, Shapley value estimation, etc.) and may not accurately represent the underlying decision process of the model. On the other hand, GKAN’s intrinsic interpretability provides a more reliable and accurate understanding of the model’s behavior, as it directly reflects the structure and parameters used during training.

In summary, its inherent interpretability makes GKAN particularly valuable in applications where understanding the decision-making process is crucial, such as in biomedical and financial domains.

IV. CONCLUSIONS


In this paper, we propose GKAN, a novel GNN architecture inspired by the Kolmogorov–Arnold theorem and based on the recently introduced KAN model. The added value of GKAN is two-fold. First, it is more accurate than established state-of-the-art GNNs in node and graph classification and link prediction tasks. Second, thanks to the usage of splines and the simple aggregation (addition or average) functions, GKAN models are inherently interpretable. As we showed in our experiments, the message carried by the graph edges represents, indeed, in a clear and direct way, what the neural network used to deliver its predictions. GKAN extends the opportunity offered by KAN to render neural network models interpretable also to GNNs, opening up the possibility of using GNNs in scenarios in which interpretability is a strong requirement, as in biomedical and life sciences applications.

A. Limitations and Interpretability


While GKAN exhibits promising results, it faces certain limitations that requires further investigation:

- **Memory Usage:** Scaling the number of splines or increasing their degree leads to a significant increase in memory consumption. This can pose a challenge when working with large graphs or when higher-degree splines are required to capture complex relationships.
- **Lack of Edge Features:** The current implementation of GKAN does not utilize edge features. Many real-world graph datasets contain valuable information about edges, and incorporating this information could potentially enhance model performance.
- **Interpretability:** : We want to make clear that we do not claim that GKAN is interpretable, but that it is more interpretable than other models. For instance, if the neural network is deep (large number of layers) then some of the information is lost. The added value is that the interpretation is given by the model itself and not by a surrogate explainability model.

We are actively exploring strategies to address these limitations and improve GKAN’s efficiency, adaptability, and interpretability.



(a) Direct interpretation of GKAN by plotting the values of the splines of the last convolutional layer.



(b) Output of GNNExplainer applied to GCN.

Fig. 3: Interpretability vs. explainability: Comparison of the interpretation of GKAN (Figure 3a) and GNNExplainer applied to GCN (Figure 3b). Both models are trained on the Cora dataset for the node classification task. The explanations focus on the node with ID 4. In Figure 3a, the output of the direct interpretation of the weights of the splines of the neurons in the last convolutional layer (just before the KAN-based linear layer used for classification) is plotted. In Figure 3b, the edge mask returned by GNNExplainer is shown.

B. Future Work

To further improve and expand the applicability of GKAN, we propose the following directions for future research:

- **Framework optimization:** Optimize the computational efficiency of GKAN. This includes reducing memory usage and improving the speed of training and inference. Techniques such as more efficient spline implementations, approximation methods, and parallelization

strategies could be explored.

- **Incorporating edge features:** Extend GKAN to handle edge features. This would involve developing new methods to integrate edge features into the spline-based message passing and aggregation process, thereby leveraging additional information that could enhance the model’s predictive power.
- **Real-world applications:** Apply GKAN to real-life problems where its increased performance and inherent interpretability can bring significant improvements. Potential application domains include biomedical research, where understanding the model’s decision-making process is crucial, and financial analytics, where interpretability can aid in regulatory compliance and trust.
- **Scalability studies:** Investigate the scalability of GKAN to very large graphs. This includes exploring distributed training approaches and evaluating the model’s performance on large-scale datasets.
- **Hybrid models:** Explore hybrid models that combine GKAN with other advanced GNN architectures, such as attention mechanisms or variational techniques, to further boost performance while maintaining interpretability.

By addressing these limitations and exploring these future research directions, GKAN can be further developed into a robust and versatile tool for a wide range of graph-based machine learning tasks, combining high accuracy with clear interpretability.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Haykin, *Neural networks: a comprehensive foundation*. Prentice Hall PTR, 1998.
- [2] Z. Liu, Y. Wang, S. Vaidya, F. Ruehle, J. Halverson, M. Soljačić, T. Y. Hou, and M. Tegmark, “KAN: Kolmogorov–arnold networks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.19756*, 2024.
- [3] K. Hornik, M. Stinchcombe, and H. White, “Multilayer feedforward networks are universal approximators,” *Neural networks*, vol. 2, no. 5, pp. 359–366, 1989.
- [4] A. Kolmogorov, “On the representation of functions of several variables as a superposition of functions of a smaller number of variables,” *Dokl. Akad. Nauk*, vol. 108, no. 2, 1956.
- [5] A. N. Kolmogorov, “On the representation of continuous functions of several variables in the form of superpositions of continuous functions of one variable and addition,” in *Reports of the Academy of Sciences*, vol. 114, no. 5. Russian Academy of Sciences, 1957, pp. 953–956.
- [6] N. Burkart and M. F. Huber, “A survey on the explainability of supervised machine learning,” *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, vol. 70, pp. 245–317, 2021.
- [7] R. Saleem, B. Yuan, F. Kurugollu, A. Anjum, and L. Liu, “Explaining deep neural networks: A survey on the global interpretation methods,” *Neurocomputing*, vol. 513, pp. 165–180, 2022.
- [8] 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.
- [9] T. N. Kipf and M. Welling, “Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks,” in *5th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2017, Conference Track Proceedings*, 2017.
- [10] W. Hamilton, Z. Ying, and J. Leskovec, “Inductive representation learning on large graphs,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [11] P. Velickovic, G. Cucurull, A. Casanova, A. Romero, P. Liò, and Y. Bengio, “Graph attention networks,” in *6th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2018, Conference Track Proceedings*, 2018.

- [12] K. Xu, W. Hu, J. Leskovec, and S. Jegelka, "How powerful are graph neural networks?" in *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019*, 2019.
- [13] B. Weisfeiler and A. Leman, "The reduction of a graph to canonical form and the algebra which appears therein," *nti, Series*, vol. 2, no. 9, pp. 12–16, 1968.
- [14] T. N. Kipf and M. Welling, "Variational graph auto-encoders," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1611.07308, 2016. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1611.07308>
- [15] Z. Ying, D. Bourgeois, J. You, M. Zitnik, and J. Leskovec, "GNNE-xplainer: generating explanations for graph neural networks," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 32, 2019.
- [16] A. Duval and F. D. Malliaros, "GraphSVX: Shapley value explanations for graph neural networks," in *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases. Research Track: European Conference, ECML PKDD 2021, Proceedings, Part II 21*. Springer, 2021, p. 302–318.
- [17] L. S. Shapley, "A value for n -person games," in *Contributions to the Theory of Games II*, H. W. Kuhn and A. W. Tucker, Eds. Princeton University Press, 1953, p. 307–317.
- [18] A. Mastropietro, G. Pasculli, C. Feldmann, R. Rodríguez-Pérez, and J. Bajorath, "EdgeSHAPer: bond-centric Shapley value-based explanation method for graph neural networks," *iScience*, vol. 25, no. 10, p. 105043, 2022.
- [19] C. Rudin, "Stop explaining black box machine learning models for high stakes decisions and use interpretable models instead," *Nature Machine Intelligence*, vol. 1, no. 5, p. 206–215, 2019.
- [20] X. Glorot and Y. Bengio, "Understanding the difficulty of training deep feedforward neural networks," in *Proceedings of the thirteenth international conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2010, pp. 249–256.
- [21] M. Fey and J. E. Lenssen, "Fast graph representation learning with PyTorch Geometric," in *ICLR Workshop on Representation Learning on Graphs and Manifolds*, 2019.