
Graph Pooling with Local Cluster Selection

Yizhu Chen
cyzhaa@gmail.com

Abstract

Graph poolings in GNNs are a family of operations which take graphs as inputs and produce coarsened graphs as output. Modern graph poolings are trainable and closely related to GNNs, which learn to pool graphs under different assumptions. Though there are various assumptions, the procedure of generating pooled graphs is relatively similar and limited. This work formalizes a novel procedure of pooling graphs, along with a graph pooling approach for average situations.

1 Introduction

Graph neural networks (GNNs) have shown their great power on processing graph-structure data across lots of domains including social network, recommender system, drug discovery and time series[1][2][3][4]. Graph pooling, as a way of hierarchically reducing graph representations, is crucial for capturing graph structures of different scales and coarsening large-scale graphs[5][6] with the purpose of applying GNNs on real-world problems[7][8]. The initial graph pooling approaches are non-trainable, which use deterministic algorithms to pool graphs[9][10][11]. The modern approaches are trainable and closely related to GNNs[12][13][7][14][15]. Though many approaches are proposed which learn to pool graphs under different assumptions, the procedure they generate pooled graphs is relatively similar and limited[6][16]. This work formalizes a new procedure of generating pooled graphs, which boosts the diversity of modern graph pooling approaches. Along with the new procedure, a node-centred graph pooling for average situations is proposed.

2 Background

A graph G is a data structure that could be described by a set of nodes V and a set of edges E that connect nodes. The node features is denoted by $X \in \mathbb{R}^{|V| \times d}$, where $|V|$ is the number of nodes and d is the dimension of features. The edges are represented by adjacency matrix $A \in \{0, 1\}^{|V| \times |V|}$, where entry $a_{i,j}$ is non-zero if there is an edge between vertex v_i and v_j .

$$G = (V, E) = (X, A)$$

Graph Convolution. Graph convolution is the generalization of convolution operator to graph structure data, which updates the node features by convolution on graph[1]. It could be derived from both spectral and spatial perspective. Spatial graph convolution is formalized by message-passing(MP) scheme[17]. Mathematically, an MP layer performs the following calculation.

$$x'_i = \gamma(h_i, x_i); \quad h_i = \oplus(\{\hat{m}_j | j \in \mathcal{N}(i)\}); \quad \hat{m}_i = \{\phi(x_i, x_j, e_{ij}) | j \in \mathcal{N}(i)\}$$

where γ and ϕ are differentiable functions, \oplus is a permutation-invariant and differentiable aggregation function, x'_i is the updated node feature, h_i and \hat{m}_i are hidden features and e_{ij} is the potential edge weight of edge connecting node i and j .

Graph Pooling. Graph pooling is an operation $Pool(\cdot)$ that generates coarsened graphs which have less nodes than input graphs.

$$G' = Pool(G) = (V', E') = (X', A')$$

where G' is the pooled graph. V' and E' are the set of new nodes and edges. X' and A' are the new node features and adjacency matrix. Mathematical, $Pool(\cdot)$ is a function that takes X and A as inputs and produces X' and A' with smaller $|V'|$:

$$X', A' = Pool(X, A)$$

If $|V'| = 1$, then the pooling is *global pooling*, otherwise it's called *hierarchical pooling*. In this paper, we only discuss about *hierarchical pooling*.

SRC Pooling. Grattarola et al. [6] propose a formal characterization of graph pooling based on three main operations, called *selection*, *reduction*, and *connection*. The selection function (SEL) calculates a series of sets $S = \{S_1, \dots, S_K\}$, with each set $S_j = \{s_i^j | i \in [1, N]\}$ representing the contributions of every original node to pooled node j . The reduction function (RED) calculates the new node features by $X' = RED(S, G)$ and the connection function (CON) calculates the new adjacency matrix by $A' = CON(S, G)$.

Graph poolings are distinct by the design of SEL, RED and CON functions. Though there are various SEL functions are designed, the ways existing graph poolings generate pooled graphs (RED and CON functions) are relative fixed. The most existing ways fall into two families, which are *node selection* and *dense assignment*.

Node Selection. Node selection is used by most sparse graph poolings[6][12][13], which generate the pooled graph by selecting some nodes and keeping edges between these nodes. The selection is usually performed by ranking nodes with customized score function $g(\cdot)$ and select nodes with top k scores. The follow equations give a mathematical description of this process.

$$\begin{aligned} h &= g(X, A) \\ \hat{i} &= topk(h) \\ X' &= (X \odot h)(\hat{i}, :) \\ A' &= A(\hat{i}, \hat{i}) \end{aligned}$$

Where $topk(\cdot)$ is the function that returns index \hat{i} of top k inputs, $(\hat{i}, :)$ selects the \hat{i} rows of matrix and (\hat{i}, \hat{i}) selects the \hat{i} rows and \hat{i} columns of matrix.

Dense Assignment. Dense assignment is used by most dense pooling approaches[6][7][14]. It learns a dense assignment matrix S for each nodes in G by an assignment function $f(\cdot)$ and generates pooled graph G' by matrix multiplication. The following equations show this process.

$$\begin{aligned} S &= f(X, A) \\ X' &= S^T X \\ A' &= S^T A S \end{aligned}$$

The main difference of existing graph pooling approaches is how they define the score function $g(\cdot)$ or the assignment function $f(\cdot)$.

3 Local Cluster Pooling

We formalize a new way of generating pooled graphs and present its distinctive properties. Then we show how it is simplified under some common conditions. After that, we propose a graph pooling learns to pool graph from both node feature and their differences among local neighbours.

3.1 Local Assignment Selection

The two fixed processes introduce some inherent properties for pooling approaches adopting them. The *node selection* only filter edges without constructing new edges, which produces pooled graph with bad connectivity in some situations. The *dense assignment* involves an assignment matrix S which is dense inherently, therefore related matrix multiplications are computationally costly. Besides, the dense adjacency matrix A' of pooled graph requires extra efforts to be made when cooperate the graph poolings with sparse graph convolution layers.

We formalize *local assignment selection* as follows. Given a graph $G = (X, A)$, S is the assignment matrix learnt by an assignment function $f(\cdot)$, $g(\cdot)$ is a score function. If S satisfies prerequisite **1** and the pooled graph $G' = (X', A')$ is generated in the following way, then we call this way *local assignment selection*.

Prerequisite 1. S has the size of $N \times N$, where N is the number of nodes. Let $A^* = I_N + A$, for any entry $s_{i,j}$ of S , $s_{i,j}$ is not zero only if the entry $a_{i,j}^*$ of A^* is not zero.

We call such S the *local assignment matrix*. The prerequisite **1** ensures that every node is only able to contribute to its neighbours and itself, thus the assignment matrix is not inherently dense and could utilize sparse matrix operations to reduce computational cost.

Local assignment selection generates pooled graphs as follows

$$\begin{aligned} S &= f(X, A) \\ X^* &= S^T X \\ h &= g(X^*, A) \\ \hat{i} &= \text{topk}(h) \\ X' &= (X^* \odot h)(\hat{i}, :) \\ S' &= S(:, \hat{i}) \\ A' &= S'^T A S' \end{aligned}$$

Where $(:, i)$ selects the columns \hat{i} of matrix and $(\hat{i}, :)$ selects the rows. The node features are updated by local assignment matrix first, then $g(\cdot)$ calculates the scores h of updated features. Nodes are selected by these scores and edges are constructed by sparse matrix multiplication. h is multiplied to node features to train $g(\cdot)$ jointly. The figure 1 shows a visualization of how new adjacency matrix A' is calculated.

In this way, the connectivity of pooled graphs are strengthened compared to ones produced by *node selection*. Precisely, we have the proposition **2**. The node features are also more representative since they are calculated by the aggregating contributors.

Proposition 2. *For coarsened graphs produced by local assignment selection, edges are constructed between pooled nodes if they have connected contributors, and the edges of original graph are kept if all the diagonal entries $s_{i,i}$ of S are not zero.*




Figure 1: This figure shows how the adjacency matrix of pooled graph is calculated.

The way ASAPool[15] generates pooled graph could be described by our generalized formula where $f(\cdot)$ is an attention mechanism and $g(\cdot)$ is a customized MP layer. Considering the common parts share by *local assignment selection* and *node selection*, the later could be viewed as a class of instances of the former.

Proposition 3. *Node selection could be viewed as local assignment selection with $f(\cdot)$ being a constant function: $f(\cdot) = I_N$.*

3.2 Local Cluster Selection

For a certain type of $f(\cdot)$, *local assignment selection* is able to produce coarsened graphs without calculating detailed assignment matrix S . We call it *local cluster selection*. The theorem **4** gives the description of *local cluster selection*, dismissing the assignment matrix S .

Theorem 4. *For a function $v(\cdot)$ updating node features, if the following conditions hold:*

1. $v(\cdot)$ updates feature of node i with exactly itself and its one-hop neighbours.
2. The original and coarsened graphs both have unweighted edges.

Then local assignment selection could be simplified by the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} X^* &= v(X, A) \\ h &= g(X^*, A) \\ \hat{i} &= \text{topk}(h) \\ X' &= (X \odot h)(\hat{i}, :) \\ A' &= \text{ones}(A + A^T A + A^2 + A^T A^2)(\hat{i}, \hat{i}) \end{aligned}$$

Where $\text{ones}(\cdot)$ is the function that replaces all non-zero entries of matrix with one.

Notably, if the graph is undirected, then A is symmetrical, obviously, we have the Proposition 5.

Proposition 5. For undirected graphs, the way of generating A' is simplified by $A' = \text{ones}(A + A^2 + A^3)(\hat{i}, \hat{i})$.

3.3 Local Cluster Pooling

We propose local cluster pooling (LCPool) that pools graphs by local cluster selection. Since $v(\cdot)$ updates node features by itself and its neighbours, which is in the same way that graph convolutions perform, we could use any convolution operation satisfying the condition of theorem 4 as $v(\cdot)$. Considering the convolution parts of a GNN model before pooling, we could just dismiss function $v(\cdot)$ in the pooling process.

Proposition 6. Function $v(\cdot)$ could be dismissed if the convolution layer before pooling satisfies the condition in theorem 4.

Its hard to give a rigorous mathematical proof of proposition 6. We will validate it by experiments. For LCPool, we design a function $g(\cdot)$ which learns the scores from both node features and differences among local neighbours to select the clusters.

3.3.1 From graph laplacian to LCSMP

Given a graph G with adjacency matrix A , Its graph laplacian matrix L is given by $L = D - A$, where D is the degree matrix of graph. Graph laplacian could be viewed as a discrete laplacian operator on a graph. If we multiply graph laplacian by node features matrix X , we get a feature matrix H^* , $H^* = LX$. Expanding the matrix multiplication, the value of an entry $h_{i,j}^*$ of matrix H^* is given by:

$$h_{i,j}^* = x_{i,j} * d_i - \sum_{k \in \mathbf{N}(i)} x_{k,j}$$

Where d_i is the degree of node i and $\mathbf{N}(i)$ is the set formed by neighbours of node i . Collecting all the columns, we have the feature vector \vec{h}_i^* of node i .

$$\vec{h}_i^* = \vec{x}_i * d_i - \sum_{k \in \mathbf{N}(i)} \vec{x}_k$$

Where \vec{x}_i is the feature vector of node i . Since the cardinality of $\mathbf{N}(i)$ is d_i , we could rewrite the equation in following formula.

$$\vec{h}_i^* = \sum_{k \in \mathbf{N}(i)} (\vec{x}_i - \vec{x}_k)$$

So actually the multiplication of L and X performs an aggregation of node differences between local neighbours and produces a feature matrix H^* which represents the differences. If we multiply feature vector \vec{h}_i^* of node i by a learnable vector \vec{w} , we get a function g^* that learns score from the node differences among local neighbours of node i .

$$g^*(\vec{x}_i) = (\sum_{k \in \mathbf{N}(i)} (\vec{x}_i - \vec{x}_k)) \vec{w}^T$$

The problem here is that the differences cancel each other out if we do not perform any operation before summation, which limits the distinction ability of function $g^*(\cdot)$, see figure 2.

So we introduce another learnable weight matrix to transform the difference $(\vec{x}_i - \vec{x}_k)$ before we sum them up. To simplify the notation, we use linear layer to denote the operation that transforms the features. The definition of linear layer is given as follows.




Figure 2: $g^*(\cdot)$ could not distinct x_0 and x'_0 in the two local clusters above, since $x_0 - x_3$ and $x_0 - x_2$ cancels each other out.

Linear layer. For an input feature matrix $X \in \mathcal{R}^{N \times F_1}$, a linear layer L transforms X in the way $L = XW^T + \vec{b}$, where $W \in \mathcal{R}^{F_2 \times F_1}$ is the learnable weight matrix and $\vec{b} \in \mathcal{R}^{1 \times F_2}$ is the learnable bias. N is the number of features, F_1 is the dimension of input features and F_2 is the dimension of output features.

Then our score function g produces the score h_i of node feature x_i in the following way.

$$h_i = L_s(L_{f_d}(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}(i)} L_d(\vec{x}_i - \vec{x}_k)) + L_x(\vec{x}_i))$$

The feature differences of node i and its neighbours are first transformed into hidden features by linear layer L_d , so that they do not just cancel each other out, then their aggregation are transform by L_{f_d} into hidden feature that represents the difference among the local neighbours of node i . This hidden feature is summed with the feature learnt from x_i by L_x to learn also from node feature itself. After that, a linear layer L_s learns the score h_i of node i from summed feature.

This function could be implemented as an MP layer which we call it local cluster score MP(LCSMP). The figure 3 shows the architecture of LCSMP layer.

3.3.2 Equation description of LCPool

We assumpt that the input and coarsened graphs are undirected and have unweighted edges. With score function $g(\cdot) = \text{LCSMP}(\cdot)$, LCPool could be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} h &= \text{LCSMP}(X, A) \\ \hat{i} &= \text{topk}(h) \\ X' &= (X^* \odot h)(\hat{i}, :) \\ A' &= \text{ones}(A + A^2 + A^3)(\hat{i}, \hat{i}) \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{LCSMP}(\cdot)$ is given by

$$\text{LCSMP}(\vec{x}_i) = L_s(L_{f_d}(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}(i)} L_d(\vec{x}_i - \vec{x}_k)) + L_x(\vec{x}_i))$$

4 Experiment

4.1 Goals of Experiment

The experiment is mainly designed for two goals.

1. Our proposed LCPool is a competitive and effective graph pooling approach in average situations.
2. Our proposition 6 of dismissing the cluster function $v(\cdot)$ of *local cluster section* is valid.

We build a GNN backbone that learns the graph representation in hierarchical style. For goal 1, we carry the following experiments. Our proposed pooling is compared with other exsiting works within this GNN backbone. The exsiting works we chose are SAGPool[13], TopKPool[12], DiffPool[7], MinCutPool[14] and ASAPool[15]. We evaluate the model's prediction accuracy on various graph classification tasks to see the effectiveness of pooling approaches. Besides, we change the type of




Figure 3: This figure shows the architecture of LCSMP. L denotes the linear transformation, the unfilled circle denotes mathematical operation and filled circle denote the sum aggregation through neighbours. The subfigure 1 shows the overall structure of LCSMP from a message passing perspective. The subfigure 2 shows the message part of LCSMP. We calculate the differences and transform them with a linear layer. The subfigure 3 shows the aggregation part. The subfigure 4 shows how the importance score is learned from hidden features.

graph convolutions in GNN backbone from GCN to GraphCONV for observing the compatibility of poolings with different convolutions. The training settings and hyperparameters of model are consistent for all graph poolings, which is tuned so that all models converge and there is no obvious overfitting (model loss stops decreasing at first epoch). See the detailed settings in appendix.

For goal 2, we add an extra GCN convolution in our pooling to get a variant **LCPool***, with $v(\cdot) = \text{GCNConv}(\cdot)$. We also evaluate model with this variant pooling when we carry the experiments mentioned above.

4.2 Results

The table 1 shows the evaluation results of hierarchical classification model with GCNConv. The table 2 shows the evaluation results of hierarchical classification model with GraphCONV. From the results we find that the dismissing of $v(\cdot)$ does not decrease model performance.

References

- [1] Wei Ju, Zheng Fang, Yiyang Gu, Zequn Liu, Qingqing Long, Ziyue Qiao, Yifan Qin, Jianhao Shen, Fang Sun, Zhiping Xiao, Junwei Yang, Jingyang Yuan, Yusheng Zhao, Yifan Wang, Xiao Luo, and Ming Zhang. A comprehensive survey on deep graph representation learning. *Neural Networks*, 173:106207, May 2024. ISSN 0893-6080. doi: 10.1016/j.neunet.2024.106207. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neunet.2024.106207>. 1

Table 1: Accuracy of hierarchical classification model with GCNConv.

GNN _h	PROTEINS	ENZYMES	Muatagenicity	DD	NCII	COX2
nopool	75.00±2.00	70.17±5.19	78.02±1.63	73.56±1.19	76.98±3.15	82.77±2.60
topkpool	74.73±2.00	65.00±4.08	77.95±1.21	75.51±1.58	77.64±2.32	82.77±4.89
sagpool	74.11±1.87	65.50±4.02	78.13±1.81	75.93±2.12	79.78±2.03	84.89±2.42
asapool	73.57±1.92	-	80.09±1.42	75.00±1.98	79.00±2.52	84.47±3.57
diffpool	73.84±1.74	71.00±3.18	79.22±0.67	72.37±1.38	74.62±1.84	84.47±4.47
mincutpool	74.82±2.45	71.17±4.48	79.12±1.01	73.14±2.89	76.16±2.22	83.19±2.93
lcpool	75.71±1.25	66.67±3.16	78.52±1.31	74.15±1.79	79.10±1.75	85.96±1.70
lcpool*	74.46±1.14	64.17±3.10	79.40±0.86	73.05±4.23	81.80±1.86	83.83±3.46

Table 2: Accuracy of hierarchical classification model with GraphConv.

GNN _h ^c	PROTEINS	ENZYMES	Muatagenicity	DD	NCII	COX2
nopool	74.02±1.67	73.50±3.37	80.21±0.90	77.46±1.94	81.63±1.79	85.32±2.01
topkpool	73.48±1.50	71.67±5.63	80.32±2.28	76.27±0.93	79.78±1.64	83.19±3.49
sagpool	75.27±0.90	71.67±3.80	79.12±1.60	75.00±2.30	80.68±1.73	85.10±4.76
asapool	73.48±2.77	77.00±3.93	79.86±1.45	76.10±2.30	78.73±1.37	81.91±3.33
diffpool	73.66±1.21	79.83±3.11	79.40±0.96	76.53±1.78	76.98±1.98	81.70±2.17
mincutpool	72.77±1.80	75.67±3.89	79.84±0.98	76.10±2.93	77.20±1.57	78.30±4.34
lcpool	74.91±1.89	74.50±2.36	80.51±1.20	76.10±3.10	78.61±1.98	84.04±2.38
lcpool*	74.55±2.23	74.83±2.92	81.61±1.32	72.88±2.14	81.00±1.76	83.19±3.35

- [2] Chen Ma, Liheng Ma, Yingxue Zhang, Jianing Sun, Xue Liu, and Mark Coates. Memory augmented graph neural networks for sequential recommendation. *CoRR*, abs/1912.11730, 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1912.11730>. 1
- [3] Zhenqin Wu, Bharath Ramsundar, Evan N. Feinberg, Joseph Gomes, Caleb Geniesse, Aneesh S. Pappu, Karl Leswing, and Vijay S. Pande. Moleculenet: A benchmark for molecular machine learning. *CoRR*, abs/1703.00564, 2017. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1703.00564>. 1
- [4] Andrea Cini, Ivan Marisca, and Cesare Alippi. Multivariate time series imputation by graph neural networks. *CoRR*, abs/2108.00298, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.00298>. 1
- [5] Chuang Liu, Yibing Zhan, Jia Wu, Chang Li, Bo Du, Wenbin Hu, Tongliang Liu, and Dacheng Tao. Graph pooling for graph neural networks: Progress, challenges, and opportunities, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.07321>. 1
- [6] Daniele Grattarola, Daniele Zambon, Filippo Maria Bianchi, and Cesare Alippi. Understanding pooling in graph neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 35(2):2708–2718, February 2024. ISSN 2162-2388. doi: 10.1109/tnnls.2022.3190922. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/TNNLS.2022.3190922>. 1, 2
- [7] Rex Ying, Jiaxuan You, Christopher Morris, Xiang Ren, William L. Hamilton, and Jure Leskovec. Hierarchical graph representation learning with differentiable pooling, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1806.08804>. 1, 2, 5
- [8] Diego P. P. Mesquita, Amauri H. Souza Jr., and Samuel Kaski. Rethinking pooling in graph neural networks. *CoRR*, abs/2010.11418, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.11418>. 1
- [9] Filippo Maria Bianchi, Daniele Grattarola, Lorenzo Livi, and Cesare Alippi. Hierarchical representation learning in graph neural networks with node decimation pooling. *CoRR*, abs/1910.11436, 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1910.11436>. 1
- [10] Davide Bacciu and Luigi Di Sotto. A non-negative factorization approach to node pooling in graph convolutional neural networks, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.03287>. 1
- [11] Inderjit S. Dhillon, Yuqiang Guan, and Brian Kulis. Weighted graph cuts without eigenvectors a multilevel approach. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 29(11):1944–1957, 2007. doi: 10.1109/TPAMI.2007.1115. 1
- [12] Hongyang Gao and Shuiwang Ji. Graph u-nets. *CoRR*, abs/1905.05178, 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1905.05178>. 1, 2, 5

- [13] Junhyun Lee, Inyeop Lee, and Jaewoo Kang. Self-attention graph pooling. In Kamalika Chaudhuri and Ruslan Salakhutdinov, editors, *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3734–3743. PMLR, 09–15 Jun 2019. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v97/lee19c.html>. 1, 2, 5
- [14] Filippo Maria Bianchi, Daniele Grattarola, and Cesare Alippi. Mincut pooling in graph neural networks. *CoRR*, abs/1907.00481, 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1907.00481>. 1, 2, 5
- [15] Ekagra Ranjan, Soumya Sanyal, and Partha Pratim Talukdar. Asap: Adaptive structure aware pooling for learning hierarchical graph representations, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.07979>. 1, 3, 5
- [16] Pengyun Wang, Junyu Luo, Yanxin Shen, Siyu Heng, and Xiao Luo. A comprehensive graph pooling benchmark: Effectiveness, robustness and generalizability, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.09031>. 1
- [17] Justin Gilmer, Samuel S. Schoenholz, Patrick F. Riley, Oriol Vinyals, and George E. Dahl. Neural message passing for quantum chemistry. *CoRR*, abs/1704.01212, 2017. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1704.01212>. 1

A Proofs

Lemma 1. *Let S denote the local assignment matrix and A the adjacency matrix. Operator $(\hat{i}, :)$ selects \hat{i} rows of matrix, $(:, \hat{i})$ selects \hat{i} columns of matrix and (\hat{i}, \hat{i}) selects the rows \hat{i} and columns \hat{i} of matrix, we have the following equation vaild.*

$$S(:, \hat{i})^T A(S(:, \hat{i})) = (S^T AS)(\hat{i}, \hat{i})$$

A.1 Proof of Proposition 2

According to lemma 1, we have $A' = (S^T AS)(\hat{i}, \hat{i})$. For node p and q , if they share connected contributors, then there exists node n and m such that (s.t.) node n contributes to node p , node m contributes to node q and node m and node n are connected. Then we have $s_{p,n}^t$, $a_{n,m}$ and $s_{m,q}$ are non-zero, where s^t denotes the entry of S^T . Let $H = S^T AS$, expanding the matrix multiplication, we have $h_{p,q}$ is non-zero. So there is an edge between node p and node q in pooled graph.

If the diagonal entries $s_{i,i}$ of S are all non-zero, then each node must contribute to itself. Considering two node p and q which are connected in original graph, they have the connected contributors p and q , so that there is an edge constructed between them in pooled graph. In the other word, the edge connecting node p and q are preserved if we don't consider the edge weights.

A.2 Proof of Proposition 3

Substitute $f(\cdot) = I_N$ into the equations of local assignment selection, we have

$$\begin{aligned} X^* &= X \\ h &= g(X^*, A) = g(X, A) \\ \hat{i} &= \text{topk}(h) \\ X' &= (X^* \odot h)(\hat{i}, :) = (X \odot h)(\hat{i}, :) \\ A' &= I_N(\hat{i}, :)^T A(I_N(:, \hat{i})) = (I_N^T A I_N)(\hat{i}, \hat{i}) = A(\hat{i}, \hat{i}) \end{aligned}$$

which exactly describes the node selection process.

A.3 Proof of Theorem 4

Since we don't care about the edge weights, we could just replaces S with $I_N + A$, which doesn't change the positions of non-zero entries. Since we don't acer about edge weights, we have $A' = \text{ones}(S'^T A S')$. According to the lemma 1, we have

$$A' = \text{ones}(S'^T A S') = \text{ones}(S(:, \hat{i})^T A(S(:, \hat{i}))) = \text{ones}((S^T AS)(\hat{i}, \hat{i}))$$

Replacing S with $I_N + A$, we have

$$A' = ones((I_N + A)^T A (I_N + A))(\hat{i}, \hat{i})$$

Expanding the equations, we have

$$A' = ones((I_N^T A I_N + A^T A I_N + I_N^T A A + A^T A A)(\hat{i}, \hat{i})) = ones((A + A^T A + A^2 + A^T A^2)(\hat{i}, \hat{i}))$$

We could take the rows and columns selection operator out, since it does not change the value of entries. Then we have

$$A' = ones(A + A^T A + A^2 + A^T A^2)(\hat{i}, \hat{i})$$

Then the value of entries of S is only used to calculate X^* , so we could integrate the equations

$$\begin{aligned} S &= f(X, A) \\ X^* &= S^T X \end{aligned}$$

into one function $v(\cdot)$ s.t. $X^* = v(X, A)$, where $v(\cdot)$ satisfies the conditions.

A.4 Proof of Proposition 5

If graphs are undirected, we have A which is symmetrical, then $A^T = A$. Substitute the equation, we have

$$A' = ones(A + A^T A + A^2 + A^T A^2)(\hat{i}, \hat{i}) = ones(A + 2 * A^2 + A^3)(\hat{i}, \hat{i})$$

since $ones(\cdot)$ replaces all non-zero entries with one,

$$A' = ones(A + 2 * A^2 + A^3)(\hat{i}, \hat{i}) = ones(A + A^2 + A^3)(\hat{i}, \hat{i})$$

B Model Architecture

The GNN backbone is composed by MLP, graph convolution block, pooling layer and readout layer. The figure shows the architecture of GNN backbone.

C Experiment settings

We training the models using early-stopping with patience. The patience is set to 50 and the maximum epoches is set to 500. The batch size is 32 and the learning rate is 0.0005. The dimension of hidden features is 128, while the pre-MLP has the linear layers of size [128] and the post-MLP has the linear layers of size [256, 128]. The readout function is defined as

$$readout(X) = \text{concat}(\text{global_mean}(X), \text{global_max}(X))$$

where $\text{global_mean}(\cdot)$ is the global mean pooling, $\text{global_max}(\cdot)$ is the global max pooling and $\text{concat}(\cdot)$ is the concatenation function.




Figure 4: This figure shows the architecture of GNN backbones. The left one is in hierarchical style while the right one in plain style