

Rewiring Techniques to Mitigate Oversquashing and Oversmoothing in GNNs: A Survey

Hugo Attali, Davide Buscaldi, and Nathalie Pernelle

LIPN, CNRS UMR 7030, Université Paris Sorbonne Nord, France

Abstract. Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) are powerful tools for learning from graph-structured data, but their effectiveness is often constrained by two critical challenges: oversquashing, where the excessive compression of information from distant nodes results in significant information loss, and oversmoothing, where repeated message-passing iterations homogenize node representations, obscuring meaningful distinctions. These issues, intrinsically linked to the underlying graph structure, hinder information flow and constrain the expressiveness of GNNs. In this survey, we examine graph rewiring techniques, a class of methods designed to address these structural bottlenecks by modifying graph topology to enhance information diffusion. We provide a comprehensive review of state-of-the-art rewiring approaches, delving into their theoretical underpinnings, practical implementations, and performance trade-offs.

Keywords: Graph Rewiring · Oversquashing · Oversmoothing · Graph Neural Networks.

1 Introduction

Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) [27,29,50,15] have emerged as a popular and efficient method for analyzing structured data represented as graphs across various fields [59]. However, they face significant challenges, especially in heterophilic contexts where nodes belonging to different classes are highly interconnected. In such scenarios, the ability to propagate long-range information becomes crucial, yet it is often hindered by phenomena such as over-squashing [3][54] and oversmoothing [18,16,48]. Over-squashing occurs when information from distant nodes is excessively compressed through the network’s layers, leading to a loss of critical information. On the other hand, oversmoothing homogenizes node representations across the graph, making it increasingly difficult to distinguish nodes, especially in deeper architectures.

Recent advances have introduced graph rewiring as a promising approach to mitigate these challenges by modifying the underlying graph structure to better facilitate information diffusion. Additionally, other approaches, such as those in [12,56,37,14], leverage edge reweighting to capture more complex node relationships. While these techniques offer localized improvements, their effectiveness in heterophilic graphs remains limited due to their restricted diffusion capabilities.

Complementary research has explored multi-hop aggregation strategies, in particular the works by [1,40,57,35,30,51]. Such strategies enhance the propagation of long-range information by extending the *receptive field* of nodes. These techniques are particularly effective in heterophilic datasets, where capturing relationships between distant nodes is critical for accurate representation and classification. For a more detailed discussion, refer to [58].

These multi-hop methods can also be seen as forms of graph rewiring, as they modify the effective graph structure (e.g., the adjacency matrix) to better control the long range flow of information. Both theoretical and empirical studies highlight their advantages, especially in settings with small graph sizes [36] or localized interactions [22].

However, the benefits of multi-hop strategies come with trade-offs. While they improve communication between distant nodes, they can exacerbate oversquashing, as the aggregation of information from multiple distant nodes increases complexity and risks compressing essential information [3,54]. Furthermore, the denser effective graph structure resulting from these methods can struggle with scalability in larger graphs and may amplify oversmoothing, leading to overly homogenized node representations and reduced model expressivity [39].

Since the identification of oversquashing as a key limitation of Message Passing Neural Networks (MPNNs) [3], several graph rewiring methods have been proposed to mitigate these phenomena. This survey focuses on **preprocessing-based graph rewiring techniques**, which modify the graph structure before training **to enhance information diffusion and mitigate both oversquashing and oversmoothing**.

This survey aims to provide a comprehensive overview of state-of-the-art graph rewiring techniques designed to alleviate these phenomena. By exploring these methods, we aim to shed light on their theoretical foundations, practical implementations, and the trade-offs they entail, thereby offering valuable insights for optimizing GNNs in challenging settings, particularly in heterophilic graphs.

2 Preliminary Concepts

2.1 Notations

We begin by introducing the notations used throughout this paper. A graph is represented as a tuple $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, where \mathcal{V} denotes the set of nodes and \mathcal{E} the set of edges. The number of nodes is denoted by $N = |\mathcal{V}|$, and an edge connecting node i to node j is represented by $e_{ij} \in \mathcal{E}$. In this work, we focus on undirected graphs, meaning that if $e_{ij} \in \mathcal{E}$, then $e_{ji} \in \mathcal{E}$. We define the $N \times N$ adjacency matrix \mathbf{A} such that $\mathbf{A}_{i,j} = 1$ if $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$, and 0 otherwise. Additionally, \mathbf{D} denotes the diagonal matrix where $\mathbf{D}_{ii} = d_i$, the degree of node i . The maximum and minimum degrees are denoted by d_{\max} and d_{\min} , respectively. We note by $h_i^{(\ell)}$ the embedding of the node i at the ℓ layer.

We also introduce the notion of homophily, which measures the tendency of connected nodes to share the same label. It is defined as:

$$H(G) = \frac{|\{(u, v) \in \mathcal{E} : y_u = y_v\}|}{|\mathcal{E}|}$$

where y_u is the label of node u . This value represents the proportion of edges in the graph that connect nodes with the same label.

2.2 Graph Neural Networks

Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) are a class of models designed to leverage the structure of graph data by iteratively propagating and updating node features through their neighborhoods. This process is typically framed within the Message Passing Neural Networks (MPNNs) paradigm, where node representations are refined by exchanging information with neighboring nodes. Each iteration of the GNN involves two operations, *aggregation* and *update* to compute embeddings h_i^ℓ at the layer ℓ based on message $m_i^{(\ell)}$ containing information on neighbors :

$$\begin{aligned} m_i^{(\ell)} &= \text{AGGREGATE}^{(\ell)} \left(h_i^{(\ell-1)}, \{h_j^{(\ell-1)} \mid j \in \mathcal{N}(i)\} \right), \\ h_i^{(\ell)} &= \text{UPDATE}^{(\ell)} \left(h_i^{(\ell-1)}, m_i^{(\ell)} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

2.3 Heterophily

Heterophily in graphs refers to the phenomenon where connected nodes tend to exhibit dissimilar characteristics or labels *i.e.* ($\approx H(G) \leq 0.5$). Since MPNNs is a highly local operation, working on heterophilic graphs requires accessing information from further distances. A straightforward way to extend information spread over longer distances in the graph is to increase the number of layers. However, this strategy introduces two major issues in GNNs: oversquashing and oversmoothing.

2.4 Oversquashing

Recent studies have highlighted that message-passing neural networks frequently encounter challenges when dealing with tasks that require long-range dependencies [22]. This difficulty is particularly pronounced in scenarios where the graph structure results in an exponential number of long-range neighboring nodes. In such cases, the final embedding of an MPNN heavily depends on the representations of distant nodes that interact with each other. Consequently, messages originating from non-adjacent nodes must navigate through the network while minimizing distortion, ensuring effective communication and accurate representation of information across long distances.

In practice, the local framework of MPNNs is highly sensitive to long-range dependencies, leading to the compression of representations from an increasingly large number of neighboring nodes into fixed-size vectors.

Building on their findings, different papers identify the structural properties of the graph that contribute to oversquashing as bottlenecks [54]. In fact, bottleneck edges compel the compression of multiple node representations into a single (or fewer) pathway, which limits the ability to retain all the information from these representations.

Impact of the graph structure To address the challenges posed by oversquashing, a common strategy involves rewiring the input graph to enhance connectivity and alleviate structural bottlenecks. Such adjustments promote a more efficient and balanced flow of information within the network, ultimately improving its ability to manage long-range dependencies and ensuring effective knowledge dissemination throughout the graph.

2.5 Oversmoothing

Oversmoothing [48] is another well-known issue in Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) that has been studied prior to the problem of oversquashing [42] and [16]. Oversmoothing occurs when the representations of nodes within a graph become indistinguishable, meaning that after a certain number of propagation layers, all representations begin to resemble one another. The more layers there are, the more information spreads across the graph, leading to a gradual loss of original local diversity in node features.

Impact of Graph Structure This problem is exacerbated in highly connected subgraphs, where repeated diffusion further dilutes the node-specific information.

2.6 Rewiring

Definition Consider a GNN based on the MPPNs paradigm. Rewiring the graph $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ involves modifying the edges \mathcal{E} to obtain a new graph $G^+ = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}')$, with the objective to obtain a graph that is topologically more favorable for information diffusion than the original graph.

A good strategy to obtain this enhanced graph G^+ consists in addressing substructures that disrupt MPNNs, such as those responsible for oversmoothing and oversquashing.

Unlike traditional graph learning methods that typically adjust the UPDATE and/or AGGREGATE operations while maintaining fixed neighborhoods $\mathcal{N}(i)$, rewiring methods approach the problem differently. They treat graph modification as a preprocessing step, allowing for alterations in the neighborhood structure while keeping the message-passing operations intact.




Fig. 1. The red edges indicate an "overload" of information within each clique, enhancing feature homogeneity and promoting oversmoothing. In contrast, the blue edges represent the compression of information between the two dense subgraphs.




Fig. 2. By reducing the density of cliques (red edges) and adding green edges around the bottleneck structure, information can flow more effectively between the two subgraphs. This setup mitigates oversquashing and oversmoothing by promoting a more balanced information flow throughout the graph

Building G^+ effectively necessitates a thorough understanding of how the graph structure impacts message-passing dynamics constructing This involves identifying critical structural descriptors that can reveal substructures contributing to issues like oversmoothing and oversquashing. By leveraging these descriptors, approaches can strategically redesign the graph to promote a more effective information flow.

Figures 1 and 2 present an example of heuristic graph rewiring.

3 Topological and Connectivity Measures

Various topological measures have been utilized and proposed as a basis for constructing G^+ .

3.1 Discrete Curvature on Graphs

A prominent concept in graph rewiring is discrete curvature. Discrete curvature draws the analogy between dispersion geodesics on a manifold and edge

on a graph. Intuitively, edge curvature reflects the local structure around the neighborhoods of two connected nodes.

The work of [54] first connected edge curvature to bottleneck structures, demonstrating that highly negatively curved edges characterise bottleneck structures. Various discrete curvature measures have been studied for their potential to improve graph rewiring techniques:

Ollivier Curvature [41] Ollivier curvature is based on the concept of optimal transport, measuring how well probability distributions over the neighbors of nodes align. It provides a localized perspective on bottleneck structures within the graph.. Let μ_i be a probability distribution over the neighbors of node i , defined using a lazy random walk with parameter α :

$$\mu_i : j \mapsto \begin{cases} \alpha & \text{if } j = i, \\ \frac{1-\alpha}{d_i} & \text{if } j \in \mathcal{N}(i), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where d_i is the degree of node i and $\mathcal{N}(i)$ is the set of its neighbors. Next, the Wasserstein distance of order 1, $W_1(i, j)$, is calculated to represent the cost of transporting the probability mass from μ_i to μ_j :

$$W_1(\mu_i, \mu_j) = \inf_{M \in \Pi(\mu_i, \mu_j)} \sum_{k, l \in V} \text{dist}(k, l) M(k, l), \quad (3)$$

where $\Pi(\mu_i, \mu_j)$ is the set of joint distributions with marginals μ_i and μ_j , and $M(k, l)$ is the mass transported along the shortest path between nodes k and l .

The Ollivier curvature c_{ij} of edge e_{ij} is then defined as:

$$c_{ij} = 1 - \frac{W_1(\mu_i, \mu_j)}{\text{dist}(i, j)}, \quad (4)$$

where $\text{dist}(i, j)$ is the shortest path distance between nodes i and j .

Unlike other curvature measures, Ollivier curvature is more bounded, with values in the range $c_{ij} \in [-2, 1]$ [39], which can make it more interpretable.

Augmented Forman Curvature proposed by [49], extends the original definition of Forman Curvature [25] to incorporate the presence of triangles in a graph. For an undirected graph, the curvature of edge e_{ij} is given by:

$$c_{ij} = 4 - D_{ii} - D_{jj} + 3m, \quad (5)$$

where m is the number of triangles containing e_{ij} , and D_{ii} and D_{jj} are the degrees of nodes i and j , respectively.

Balanced Forman Curvature [54] introduced a more expressive combinatorial curvature measure, known as balanced Forman curvature, which considers not only triangles but also cycles of different lengths:

$$c_{ij} = \frac{2}{D_{ii}} + \frac{2}{D_{jj}} - 2 + 2 \frac{m}{\max\{D_{ii}, D_{jj}\}} + \frac{m}{\min\{D_{ii}, D_{jj}\}} + \frac{(\Gamma_{\max})^{-1}}{\max\{D_{ii}, D_{jj}\}} (\gamma_i + \gamma_j), \quad (6)$$

where $\Gamma_{\max}(i, j)$ is the maximum number of 4-cycles based at edge e_{ij} , and γ_i counts the number of 4-cycles at e_{ij} without diagonals.

Jost-Liu Curvature The Jost-Liu curvature [31] further refines edge-based curvature measures by considering the relative contribution of cycles. For an edge $i \sim j$, the curvature is defined as:

$$JLc(i, j) = - \left(1 - \frac{1}{D_{ii}} - \frac{1}{D_{jj}} - \frac{b}{D_{ii} \wedge D_{jj}} \right)_+ - \left(1 - \frac{1}{D_{ii}} - \frac{1}{D_{jj}} - \frac{b}{D_{ii} \vee D_{jj}} \right)_+ + \frac{b}{D_{ii} \vee D_{jj}}, \quad (7)$$

where D_{ii} and D_{jj} are the degrees of the nodes, and b is the number of cycles containing edge e_{ij} .

A more detailed discussion on the role of different curvature edge measures are provided in [55].

Trade-offs and Complexity There is an inherent trade-off between the expressivity of these curvature measures and their computational cost. We discuss the complexity of curvature-based methods in detail in Section 4.3.

3.2 Effective Resistance

Effective resistance offers a more global perspective measure of how well two nodes communicate by considering all possible paths between them, rather than focusing solely on their local neighborhoods. It is defined as the inverse of the sum of the inverses of the lengths of all disjoint paths connecting two nodes, placing more weight on shorter paths. The higher the effective resistance of an edge, the more it acts as a bottleneck in the graph. Compared to curvature-based measures, effective resistance provides a global view of graph connectivity.

For vertices u and v connected by several disjoint paths, the effective resistance $R_{u,v}$ is given by:

$$R_{u,v} = \left(\sum_{uv\text{-paths } p} \text{length}(p)^{-1} \right)^{-1} \quad (8)$$

A lower $R_{u,v}$ indicates easier communication and information flow between nodes u and v , making it a valuable metric for identifying key structural bottlenecks in the graph.

3.3 Random Walk-based Measure

Random walks provide a probabilistic method for exploring graph structures by examining how information traverses between nodes. In the context of MPNNs, the number of random walks of a given length between two nodes plays a crucial role in determining the ease with which information can flow between them, especially across long distances. Theorem 4.1 from [21] highlights the impact of this phenomenon on over-squashing, where distant nodes struggle to effectively share information due to a diminishing number of random walks.

For nodes v and u at distance r in a graph G , let $\gamma_r(i, j)$ denote the number of random walks of length r between i and j . According to Theorem 4.1, the Jacobian sensitivity between nodes decreases with distance. The rate of decay is influenced by both the model parameters, such as the Lipschitz constant c_σ , the weight matrices w , and the hidden dimension p , as well as the graph properties, particularly the minimum degree d_{\min} and the number of walks $\gamma_r(i, j)$.

Specifically, the sensitivity bound is given by:

$$\frac{\partial h_i}{\partial h_j} \leq C_k \gamma_{r+k}(i, j) \left(\frac{2c_\sigma w p}{d_{\min}} \right)^r \quad (9)$$

This bound indicates that, for large distances r , if the number of walks $\gamma_{r+k}(i, j)$ is small, then the Jacobian decays exponentially, leading to an increased risk of oversquashing.

Building on this theorem, [9] proposes the use of a local connectivity measure μ , defined as follows:

$$\mu_k(i, j) = \left(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}^k \right)_{ij}, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{I} \quad (10)$$

The measure $\mu_k(i, j)$ aims to evaluate the connectivity between two nodes i and j efficiently by counting the number of paths from i to j of maximum length k . Thus, fixing k , a high value of $\mu_k(i, j)$ indicates strong connectivity with numerous pathways for information exchange. Conversely, if $\mu_k(i, j)$ is low, this suggests a higher risk of oversquashing for nodes i and j , as there are few paths available for information diffusion, making interactions between these nodes less sensitive to message updates.

3.4 Spectral Gap

Another widely used measure is the spectral gap, which is derived from the cheeger constant [19].

$$Ch(G) = \min_{1 \leq |S| \leq \frac{|V|}{2}} \frac{|\partial S|}{|S|}, \quad (11)$$

with $S \subset V$ and where $\partial S = \{(i, j) : i \in S, j \in \bar{S}, (i, j) \in E\}$

If Cheeger’s constant is small, there is a bottleneck structure in the sense that there are two large groups of vertices with few edges connecting them. Cheeger’s constant is large if a feasible vertex split into two subsets has "many" edges between these two subsets.

Calculating the precise value of $Ch(G)$ is too costly. The discrete Cheeger inequality [2] [17] shows the link between the spectral gap and the Cheeger constant. The spectral gap of G is the difference between the first two eigenvalues $\lambda_2 - \lambda_1$ of L with $\lambda_1 = 0$.

$$\frac{\lambda_2}{2} \leq Ch(G) \leq \sqrt{2\lambda_2} \quad (12)$$

An intuitive way to understand the link between spectral gap and bottleneck is to relate it to the spectral property of the Laplacian, which states that the number of eigenvalues equal to 0 of the Laplacian corresponds to the number of connected components in the graph. Thus, a spectral gap very close to 0 would indicate that only a few edges need to be removed to create a new connected component. This result suggests the presence of a bottleneck in the graph.

4 Objectives of Rewiring Methods

The primary aim of most graph rewiring techniques is to tackle specific challenges faced by Graph Neural Networks (GNNs), particularly the issues of oversquashing and oversmoothing. The groundbreaking research by [3] paved the way for an array of methods designed to alleviate these problems, frequently through structural modifications to the underlying graph. Subsequent studies have investigated a variety of strategies, including the addition, removal, or alteration of edge directions, all with the objective of enhancing information flow and improving GNN performance in tasks where the graph structure is pivotal.

These methods vary significantly in their granularity: some concentrate on local rewiring, targeting specific bottlenecks or high-curvature edges, while others adopt a global perspective, implementing extensive changes to the overall graph topology. We propose to categorize rewiring methods into three categories:

- **Types of Graph Transformations:** Does the method concentrate on removing edges, adding new edges, or utilizing a combination of both?
- **Approach Used and Information Level Utilized:** Is the rewiring process grounded in a local or global perspective? What types of data are employed for the rewiring? Is the transformation based solely on the graph’s topology, node features ?
- **Computational Efficiency and Sensitivity to Hyperparameters:** What is the computational cost of the method, and how sensitive is it to variations in hyperparameters?

4.1 Types of Graph Transformations

The issue of over-squashing and bottlenecks in graph neural networks (GNNs) was first formally studied by [3]. In their pioneering work, the authors proposed modifying the adjacency matrix in the final layer of the GNN, effectively creating a fully connected graph where every pair of nodes is linked by an edge. This modification aimed to alleviate over-squashing by enhancing the ability of distant nodes to exchange information.

Another pioneering approach is DropEdge [46], a technique that randomly removes edges during training to mitigate oversmoothing—a common issue where node representations become indistinguishable after multiple layers of message passing. By dropping a proportion of edges, DropEdge introduces diversity into the input data, which helps prevent overfitting and reduces the intensity of message passing, thus combating oversmoothing.

This dual strategy adding edges to mitigate over-squashing and removing edges to alleviate oversmoothing—has since become a fundamental approach in graph rewiring research.

Edge Additive Approaches The challenge of working with fully connected graphs, where the number of edges grows quadratically, has led subsequent research to adopt more methods that preserve the original graph. Instead of globally rewiring the entire graph, studies such as [54,32,39,11,5,24,9] have focused on selectively modifying specific regions of the graph. For instance, these works propose adding edges around identified bottleneck structures to prevent over-squashing.

Without explicitly addressing over-squashing or oversmoothing, [33] aims to enhance connectivity between nodes with short diffusion paths by adding edges based on the PageRank algorithm [43].

Edge Reduction Methods Some methods, like [54,39], go further by not only adding edges to sparse regions but also removing edges from dense parts of the graph to address oversmoothing [46]. By observing that in homophilic graphs, edges with positive curvature more frequently connect nodes of the same label, while in heterophilic graphs, edges with negative curvature are more likely to link nodes sharing the same label [5], the authors propose a method to sparsify the graph by removing edges based on their curvature. This approach aims to facilitate information diffusion exclusively through edges with positive curvature in homophilic graphs and through edges with negative curvature in heterophilic graphs.

Another innovative technique, proposed by [8], involves flipping edges locally without explicitly adding or removing them. This approach helps alleviate the bottleneck structure while preserving both the local and global graph structure, as well as maintaining the node degrees.

In a novel approach, [9] introduced progressive rewiring, where new edges are incrementally added at each step, first connecting nearby nodes and then gradually including more distant ones. This method enhances the global connectivity of the graph while preserving the local structure, ensuring that important local neighborhoods remain intact.

Graph Rebuilding Lastly, in contrast to other methods, [6] adopted an approach by entirely reconstructing the graph based solely on the node features, ignoring the original graph structure. By applying Delaunay triangulation to the nodes two-dimensional feature space, a graph is created that inherently limits the formation of large cliques to a maximum of three nodes. This approach allows for edge curvature in the graph to be centered around zero. Consequently, it effectively balances the mitigation of both over-squashing and oversmoothing.

Master Node Another category of methods, closely related to Graph Rewiring techniques, aims to modify not only the graph's edges but also its nodes. In this specific approach, we define an augmented graph $G^+ = (\mathcal{V} \cup \{M\}, \mathcal{E}')$, where M is a new node added to the graph. This node M is connected to all existing nodes in G , meaning that \mathcal{E}' includes edges linking M to each node in \mathcal{V} , in addition to the edges already present in \mathcal{E} . Adding M to the graph reduces its diameter to 2, which in turn decreases the effective resistance, helping to mitigate the oversquashing phenomenon [52].

4.2 Approaches and Metrics Used for Rewiring

Rewiring methods can be broadly classified based on the types of information they leverage: local metrics like curvature measure or global metrics like spectral gap information.

Curvature-Based Methods Early work, such as [54,39], highlighted the importance of edge curvature in determining both over-squashing and oversmoothing. Curvature-based methods aim to address structural bottlenecks by analyzing edges with high negative curvature, which are often indicative of regions where information flow is constrained. To mitigate these bottlenecks, the graph is locally modified by adding edges around these negatively curved areas, helping to bypass the bottlenecked regions. By adding new edges around these negatively curved areas, these methods can create additional pathways for information, effectively "bypassing" bottlenecked regions and alleviating over-squashing effects. Most approaches justify the use of specific curvature measures either for their computational feasibility, as seen with Augmented Forman curvature, or for their effectiveness in capturing the underlying graph structure, providing advantages over curvature concepts derived from manifold spaces.

Typical curvature-based rewiring strategies [39,54,24] involve modifying graphs by adding edges in areas of high negative curvature to establish intermediary pathways, while simultaneously removing edges in regions of high positive curvature. These techniques effectively reduce the impact of bottleneck structures,

facilitating smoother message passing and enhancing the overall flow of information within the network. By strategically eliminating edges in densely connected areas, these methods also slow down message propagation, thereby mitigating the negative effects associated with oversmoothing.

Resistance-based method However, curvature provides only a local view of the graph’s connectivity. To address this limitation, [11] proposed the use of effective resistance, a metric that considers all paths between two nodes, offering a more global perspective on connectivity. Effective resistance provides a broader measure of how well two nodes can communicate, factoring in all possible routes between them, rather than focusing solely on local neighborhoods. [11] propose an iterative algorithm to add edges to the graph to minimize total resistance.

Random Walk Based method Despite their advantages, both curvature and effective resistance are computationally expensive to calculate. To reduce this complexity, alternative metrics have been explored, such as the number of walks between nodes. As shown by [21], a high number of walks between two nodes indicates multiple alternative paths for communication, making them less sensitive to over-squashing. This metric can serve as a proxy for effective resistance while being computationally cheaper. Thus, [9] proposes a connectivity method based on the k -power of the adjacency matrix, thereby modeling the maximum number of walks between two nodes in the graph.

Spectral Gap method In contrast to curvature rewiring-based methods, spectral gap rewiring methods use global information to construct G^+ . The spectral gap is closely related to the effective resistance and helps improve long-distance node connectivity. In practice, a high spectral gap implies low effective resistance, which facilitates better information transmission across the graph, even between distant nodes.

In their study, [32] introduce an iterative approach to adding edges specifically aimed at improving the spectral gap. They demonstrate that by systematically incorporating a relatively small number of edges, it is possible to achieve a significant increase in the spectral gap, thereby enhancing overall connectivity and facilitating information propagation throughout the graph.

Another approach explores the use of expander graphs, which are characterized by strong connectivity despite their low density. As [20] point out, these graphs are sparsely connected but have a small diameter, meaning that any two nodes in the graph can be reached quickly with a small number of hops. This property eliminates bottlenecks that might otherwise hinder the diffusion of information. The lack of such limitations makes expander graphs particularly effective in mitigating oversquashing issues.

Furthermore, expander graphs have high Cheeger constants, which means that the graph strikes a good balance between edge density and the ability to separate

distinct parts of the graph. This feature reduces issues associated with bottleneck edges, which can pose major obstacles to smooth information propagation. By increasing the Cheeger constant, the graph promotes robust connectivity and efficient propagation, thereby minimizing problems related to poor graph structure.

Feature Rewiring In contrast to the above approaches, [6] introduced a novel method that completely ignores the original graph structure, relying solely on node features to reconstruct the graph. This approach utilizes Delaunay triangulation on the two-dimensional node features to maximize the formation of 2-simplexes (triangles). By doing so, it effectively avoids highly negatively curved edges while limiting the largest clique size to three. Moreover, this approach provides a valuable solution for applying graph learning methods when structural information is unavailable [7]. It could be serves as an alternative to K-NN graphs [23], offering significantly more robust structural properties, including enhanced local and global connectivity and a more balanced curvature distribution, which together promote more efficient information flow.

4.3 Computational Efficiency and Sensitivity to Hyperparameters

Two major challenges faced by rewiring graph methods are their computational complexity and their sensitivity to hyperparameters.

Hyperparameters Most rewiring methods rely on several hyperparameters in addition to those required by the GNN. Typically, these may include the number of edges to add or remove [54,32,39,11], or thresholds related to the density of the graph [9]. Furthermore, these methods are highly sensitive to such hyperparameters, depending on the specific graph being analyzed [55]. In addition for spatial methods, finding the right balance between adding edges and preserving the local structure of the graph is a particularly delicate task. Only [24] and [6] do not use hyperparameters to construct their graphs. [24] employs a Gaussian mixture model to classify edges based on their curvature, allowing for the definition of upper and lower curvature thresholds to identify edges with low or high curvature for removal. In contrast, [6] uses only Delaunay triangulation on the node features to construct the graph, eliminating the need for hyperparameters.

Complexity A significant challenge for graph rewiring methods lies in their computational complexity, which often restricts their practical applicability, particularly for large-scale graphs. The computation of curvature and effective resistance, for instance, is notably resource-intensive. Curvature-based methods, such as those proposed in [54] and [39], exhibit quadratic and cubic complexities, respectively, relative to the number of edges. Similarly, effective resistance-based approaches, like [11], involve a cubic complexity with respect to the number of nodes. Spectral methods, which rely on the spectral gap, are also computationally expensive due to the high cost of Laplacian decomposition, at least quadratic relative to the number of nodes. In contrast, alternative measures proposed in

Table 1. Comparison of various reviewing methods

Models	Venues	OSQ	OSM	Measure
KNN		NO	NO	Distance
Master Node	[ICML 2017]	YES	NO	Connectivity
Drop Edge ¹	[ICLR 2020] [46]	NO	Yes	Random
DIGL ²	[NEURIPS 2019] [33]	NO	NO	Page Rank
PPRGo ³	[KDD 2020] [13]	NO	NO	Page Rank
FA	[ICLR 2021] [3]	YES	NO	Connectivity
SDRF ⁴	[ICLR 2022] [54]	YES	NO	Balanced Forman Curvature
RLEF ⁵	[IEEE AACC 2022] [8]	Yes	NO	Spectral GAP
DiffWire ⁶	[LOG 2022] [4]	Yes	NO	Learning Rewiring
EGP ⁷	[LOG 2022] [20]	NO	YES	Cayley graph
FOSR ⁸	[ICLR 2023] [32]	NO	YES	Spectral GAP
BORF ⁹	[ICML 2023] [39]	YES	YES	Ollivier Curvature
GTR ¹⁰	[ICML 2023] [11]	NO	YES	Effective Resistance
SLJR ¹¹	[CIKM 2023] [26]	YES	YES	Jost and Liu Curvature
AFR-3 ¹²	[LOG 2023] [24]	YES	YES	Augmented Forman Curvature
PR-MPNNs ¹³	[ICLR 2024] [45]	Yes	NO	Probabilistic learning rewiring
LASER ¹⁴	[ICLR 2024] [9]	NO	YES	Random Walk
DR ¹⁵	[ICML 2024] [6]	YES	YES	Delaunay Triangulation

[3,33,9,6] achieve significantly lower complexities. These approaches facilitate the application of rewiring methods to large graphs, making them more efficient and practical for real-world scenarios.

Table 1 provides a summary of the primary rewiring methods that have been published to date. For each method, the table indicates whether it mitigates over-squashing (OSQ) and/or oversmoothing (OSM) and specifies the underlying measures upon which the rewiring technique is based. Additionally, we include links to the GitHub repositories to facilitate reproducibility.

4.4 Evaluation

¹ <https://github.com/DropEdge/DropEdge>

² <https://github.com/gasteigerjo/gdc>

³ <https://github.com/gasteigerjo/gdc>

⁴ <https://github.com/jctops/understanding-oversquashing/tree/main>

⁵ <https://github.com/kedar2/Oversquashing>

⁶ <https://github.com/AdrianArnaiz/DiffWire>

⁷ https://github.com/josephjwilson/cayley_graph_propagation

⁸ <https://github.com/kedar2/FoSR/tree/main>

⁹ <https://github.com/hieubkvn123/revisiting-gnn-curvature>

¹⁰ https://github.com/blackmit/gtr_rewiring

¹¹ <https://github.com/jhonygiraldo/SJLR>

¹² https://github.com/Weber-GeoML/AFRC_Rewiring

¹³ <https://github.com/chendiqian/PR-MPNN/>

¹⁴ <https://github.com/Fedzbar/laser-release>

¹⁵ <https://github.com/Hugo-Attali/Delaunay-Rewiring>

The different rewiring methods are evaluated on classic graph learning tasks for GNNs, such as node classification or graph classification.

To assess their impact, the approach involves applying a simple GNN on the original graph and then evaluating the same GNN on the rewired graph, G^+ . Various benchmarks are used to quantify the performance of rewiring methods. For node classification, evaluation is often conducted on heterophilic datasets, as these datasets tend to be more negatively impacted by bottleneck structures. Key benchmarks include those in [53,47,36,44].

Graph classification is also commonly used to evaluate rewiring methods, relying on the TUDatasets benchmark [38].

More recently, a series of datasets focusing on long-range interactions have become part of the empirical validation for rewiring methods [22].

5 Discussion and Conclusion

In this article, we have explored various graph rewiring methods as a preprocessing step to mitigate the issues of oversquashing and oversmoothing in Graph Neural Networks (GNNs). While this approach of rewiring the graph before training shows promise, there are also methods that dynamically modify the graph structure during training [4,26,45] adjusting the graph according to the specific task at hand.

Modifying the input graph structure, rather than focusing solely on adjusting the model architecture, is an appealing idea for several reasons. On one hand, it helps avoid overly complex architectures, reducing the number of parameters and improving model efficiency. On the other hand, it opens up exciting possibilities for better understanding the impact of the graph structure on GNN performance by offering a more explicit and controllable way to manage the interaction between the graph structure and input data.

Other approaches focus not on altering the graph structure itself, but on modifying the original features of nodes [34]. Techniques that adjust features for nodes sharing the same class have shown intriguing and promising results [34]. Combining original feature rewiring with structural rewiring could be a particularly interesting avenue for future research.

An especially compelling research direction involves delving into the intricate relationship between graph structure and node features, a domain that remains largely unexplored. As highlighted in [28,10], this interaction plays a crucial role and warrants further exploration to improve GNN performance and mitigate undesired phenomena such as oversquashing and oversmoothing.

References

1. Sami Abu-El-Haija, Bryan Perozzi, Amol Kapoor, Nazanin Alipourfard, Kristina Lerman, Hrayr Harutyunyan, Greg Ver Steeg, and Aram Galstyan. Mixhop: Higher-order graph convolutional architectures via sparsified neighborhood mixing. In *ICML*, pages 21–29, 2019.

2. Noga Alon and Vitali D Milman. Eigenvalues, expanders and superconcentrators. In *25th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science.*, pages 320–322. IEEE, 1984.
3. Uri Alon and Eran Yahav. On the bottleneck of graph neural networks and its practical implications. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
4. Adrián Arnaiz-Rodríguez, Ahmed Begga, Francisco Escolano, and Nuria Oliver. Diffwire: Inductive graph rewiring via the Lovász bound. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.07369*, 2022.
5. Hugo Attali, Davide Buscaldi, and Nathalie Pernelle. Curvature constrained mpnns: Improving message passing with local structural properties. 2024.
6. Hugo Attali, Davide Buscaldi, and Nathalie Pernelle. Delaunay graph: Addressing over-squashing and over-smoothing using delaunay triangulation. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.
7. Hugo Attali and Nadi Tomeh. Transductive legal judgment prediction combining BERT embeddings with delaunay-based GNNs. In Nikolaos Aletras, Ilias Chalkidis, Leslie Barrett, Cătălina Goanță, Daniel Preoțiuc-Pietro, and Gerasimos Spanakis, editors, *Proceedings of the Natural Language Processing Workshop 2024*, pages 187–193, Miami, FL, USA, November 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics.
8. Pradeep Kr Banerjee, Kedar Karhadkar, Yu Guang Wang, Uri Alon, and Guido Montúfar. Oversquashing in gnn through the lens of information contraction and graph expansion. In *2022 58th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*, pages 1–8. IEEE, 2022.
9. Federico Barbero, Ameya Velingker, Amin Saberi, Michael M. Bronstein, and Francesco Di Giovanni. Locality-aware graph rewiring in GNNs. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
10. Maya Bechler-Speicher, Ido Amos, Ran Gilad-Bachrach, and Amir Globerson. Graph neural networks use graphs when they shouldn't. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.04332*, 2023.
11. Mitchell Black, Zhengchao Wan, Amir Nayyeri, and Yusu Wang. Understanding oversquashing in gnn through the lens of effective resistance. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2528–2547. PMLR, 2023.
12. Deyu Bo, Xiao Wang, Chuan Shi, and Huawei Shen. Beyond low-frequency information in graph convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 35, pages 3950–3957, 2021.
13. Aleksandar Bojchevski, Johannes Gastegger, Bryan Perozzi, Amol Kapoor, Martin Blais, Benedek Rózemerczki, Michal Lukasik, and Stephan Günnemann. Scaling graph neural networks with approximate pagerank. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pages 2464–2473, 2020.
14. Shaked Brody, Uri Alon, and Eran Yahav. How attentive are graph attention networks? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.14491*, 2021.
15. Joan Bruna, Wojciech Zaremba, Arthur Szlam, and Yann LeCun. Spectral networks and locally connected networks on graphs. In *ICLR*, 2014.
16. Chen Cai and Yusu Wang. A note on over-smoothing for graph neural networks. *Graph Representation Learning*, 2020.
17. Jeff Cheeger. A lower bound for the smallest eigenvalue of the laplacian. In *Problems in Analysis: A Symposium in Honor of Salomon Bochner (PMS-31)*. Princeton University Press, 1970.

18. Deli Chen, Yankai Lin, Wei Li, Peng Li, Jie Zhou, and Xu Sun. Measuring and relieving the over-smoothing problem for graph neural networks from the topological view. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference*, pages 3438–3445, 2020.
19. Fan RK Chung and Fan Chung Graham. *Spectral graph theory*. American Mathematical Soc., 1997.
20. Andreea Deac, Marc Lackenby, and Petar Veličković. Expander graph propagation. In *Learning on Graphs Conference*, pages 38–1. PMLR, 2022.
21. Francesco Di Giovanni, Lorenzo Giusti, Federico Barbero, Giulia Luise, Pietro Lio, and Michael M Bronstein. On over-squashing in message passing neural networks: The impact of width, depth, and topology. In *ICML*, pages 7865–7885. PMLR, 2023.
22. Vijay Prakash Dwivedi, Ladislav Rampášek, Michael Galkin, Ali Parviz, Guy Wolf, Anh Tuan Luu, and Dominique Beaini. Long range graph benchmark. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:22326–22340, 2022.
23. Federico Errica. On class distributions induced by nearest neighbor graphs for node classification of tabular data. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
24. Lukas Fesser and Melanie Weber. Mitigating over-smoothing and over-squashing using augmentations of forman-ricci curvature. In *The Second Learning on Graphs Conference*, 2023.
25. Robin Forman. Bochner’s method for cell complexes and combinatorial ricci curvature. 2003.
26. Jhony H Giraldo, Konstantinos Skianis, Thierry Bouwmans, and Fragkiskos D Malliaros. On the trade-off between over-smoothing and over-squashing in deep graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM international CIKM*, pages 566–576, 2023.
27. Christoph Goller and Andreas Kuchler. Learning task-dependent distributed representations by backpropagation through structure. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Neural Networks (ICNN’96)*, volume 1, pages 347–352. IEEE, 1996.
28. Diana Gomes, Frederik Ruelens, Kyriakos Efthymiadis, Ann Nowe, and Peter Vrancx. When are graph neural networks better than structure-agnostic methods? In *I Can’t Believe It’s Not Better Workshop: Understanding Deep Learning Through Empirical Falsification*, 2022.
29. Marco Gori, Gabriele Monfardini, and Franco Scarselli. A new model for learning in graph domains. In *Proceedings. 2005 IEEE International Joint Conference on Neural Networks, 2005.*, volume 2, pages 729–734. IEEE, 2005.
30. Benjamin Gutteridge, Xiaowen Dong, Michael M Bronstein, and Francesco Di Giovanni. Drew: Dynamically rewired message passing with delay. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12252–12267. PMLR, 2023.
31. Jürgen Jost and Shiping Liu. Ollivier’s ricci curvature, local clustering and curvature-dimension inequalities on graphs. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 51(2):300–322, 2014.
32. Kedar Karhadkar, Pradeep Kr Banerjee, and Guido Montúfar. Fosr: First-order spectral rewiring for addressing oversquashing in gnns. In *International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR*, 2023.
33. Johannes Klicpera, Stefan Weissenberger, and Stephan Günnemann. Diffusion improves graph learning. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, NeurIPS, 2019.
34. Soo Yong Lee, Sunwoo Kim, Fanchen Bu, Jaemin Yoo, Jiliang Tang, and Kijung Shin. Feature distribution on graph topology mediates the effect of graph convolution: Homophily perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04621*, 2024.

35. Runlin Lei, Zhen Wang, Yaliang Li, Bolin Ding, and Zhewei Wei. Evennet: Ignoring odd-hop neighbors improves robustness of graph neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:4694–4706, 2022.
36. Derek Lim, Felix Hohne, Xiuyu Li, Sijia Linda Huang, Vaishnavi Gupta, Omkar Bhalerao, and Ser Nam Lim. Large scale learning on non-homophilous graphs: New benchmarks and strong simple methods. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2021.
37. Sitao Luan, Chenqing Hua, Qincheng Lu, Jiaqi Zhu, Mingde Zhao, Shuyuan Zhang, Xiao-Wen Chang, and Doina Precup. Is heterophily a real nightmare for graph neural networks to do node classification? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.05641*, 2021.
38. Christopher Morris, Nils M Kriege, Franka Bause, Kristian Kersting, Petra Mutzel, and Marion Neumann. Tudataset: A collection of benchmark datasets for learning with graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.08663*, 2020.
39. Khang Nguyen, Nong Minh Hieu, Vinh Duc Nguyen, Nhat Ho, Stanley Osher, and Tan Minh Nguyen. Revisiting over-smoothing and over-squashing using ollivier-ricci curvature. In *ICML*, pages 25956–25979. PMLR, 2023.
40. Giannis Nikolentzos, George Dasoulas, and Michalis Vazirgiannis. K-hop graph neural networks. *Neural Networks*, 130:195–205, 2020.
41. Yann Ollivier. Ricci curvature of metric spaces. *Comptes Rendus Mathematique*, 345(11):643–646, 2007.
42. Kenta Oono and Taiji Suzuki. Graph neural networks exponentially lose expressive power for node classification. *Proceedings of the ICLR*, 2020.
43. Lawrence Page, Sergey Brin, Rajeev Motwani, and Terry Winograd. The pagerank citation ranking: Bring order to the web. Technical report, Technical report, stanford University, 1998.
44. Oleg Platonov, Denis Kuznedelev, Michael Diskin, Artem Babenko, and Liudmila Prokhorenkova. A critical look at the evaluation of gnns under heterophily: are we really making progress? In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
45. Chendi Qian, Andrei Manolache, Kareem Ahmed, Zhe Zeng, Guy Van den Broeck, Mathias Niepert, and Christopher Morris. Probabilistically rewired message-passing neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02156*, 2023.
46. Yu Rong, Wenbing Huang, Tingyang Xu, and Junzhou Huang. Dropedge: Towards deep graph convolutional networks on node classification. In *International conference on learning representations*, ICLR, 2019.
47. Benedek Rozemberczki, Carl Allen, and Rik Sarkar. Multi-scale attributed node embedding. *Journal of Complex Networks*, 9(2):cnab014, 2021.
48. T Konstantin Rusch, Michael M Bronstein, and Siddhartha Mishra. A survey on oversmoothing in graph neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.10993*, 2023.
49. Areejit Samal, RP Sreejith, Jiao Gu, Shiping Liu, Emil Saucan, and Jürgen Jost. Comparative analysis of two discretizations of ricci curvature for complex networks. *Scientific reports*, 8(1):8650, 2018.
50. Franco Scarselli, Marco Gori, Ah Chung Tsoi, Markus Hagenbuchner, and Gabriele Monfardini. The graph neural network model. In *transactions on neural networks*. IEEE, 2008.
51. Yunchong Song, Chenghu Zhou, Xinbing Wang, and Zhouhan Lin. Ordered gnn: Ordering message passing to deal with heterophily and over-smoothing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.01524*, 2023.
52. Joshua Southern, Francesco Di Giovanni, Michael Bronstein, and Johannes F Lutzeyer. Understanding virtual nodes: Oversmoothing, oversquashing, and node heterogeneity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.13526*, 2024.

53. Jie Tang, Jimeng Sun, Chi Wang, and Zi Yang. Social influence analysis in large-scale networks. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 807–816, 2009.
54. Jake Topping, Francesco Di Giovanni, Benjamin Paul Chamberlain, Xiaowen Dong, and Michael M Bronstein. Understanding over-squashing and bottlenecks on graphs via curvature. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
55. Floriano Tori, Vincent Holst, and Vincent Ginis. The effectiveness of curvature-based rewiring and the role of hyperparameters in gnns revisited. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.09381*, 2024.
56. Petar Veličković, Guillem Cucurull, Arantxa Casanova, Adriana Romero, Pietro Liò, and Yoshua Bengio. Graph Attention Networks. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR*, 2018.
57. Yu Wang and Tyler Derr. Tree decomposed graph neural network. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM international conference on information & knowledge management*, pages 2040–2049, 2021.
58. Xin Zheng, Yi Wang, Yixin Liu, Ming Li, Miao Zhang, Di Jin, Philip S Yu, and Shirui Pan. Graph neural networks for graphs with heterophily: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.07082*, 2022.
59. Jie Zhou, Ganqu Cui, Shengding Hu, Zhengyan Zhang, Cheng Yang, Zhiyuan Liu, Lifeng Wang, Changcheng Li, and Maosong Sun. Graph neural networks: A review of methods and applications. *AI open*, 2020.