

Graph machine learning for flight delay prediction due to holding manouever

Jorge L. Franco^{1,2}, Manoel V. Machado Neto², Filipe A. N. Verri² and Diego R. Amancio¹

¹*Institute of Mathematics and Computer Science,
University of São Paulo, São Carlos, Brazil*

²*Aeronautical Technology Institute – ITA,
São José dos Campos, SP, Brazil*

Abstract

Flight delays due to holding maneuvers are a critical and costly phenomenon in aviation, driven by the need to manage air traffic congestion and ensure safety. Holding maneuvers occur when aircraft are instructed to circle in designated airspace, often due to factors such as airport congestion, adverse weather, or air traffic control restrictions. This study models the prediction of flight delays due to holding maneuvers as a graph problem, leveraging advanced Graph Machine Learning (Graph ML) techniques to capture complex interdependencies in air traffic networks. Holding maneuvers, while crucial for safety, cause increased fuel usage, emissions, and passenger dissatisfaction, making accurate prediction essential for operational efficiency. Traditional machine learning models, typically using tabular data, often overlook spatial-temporal relations within air traffic data. To address this, we model the problem of predicting holding as edge feature prediction in a directed (multi)graph where we apply both CatBoost, enriched with graph features capturing network centrality and connectivity, and Graph Attention Networks (GATs), which excel in relational data contexts. Our results indicate that CatBoost outperforms GAT in this imbalanced dataset, effectively predicting holding events and offering interpretability through graph-based feature importance. Additionally, we discuss the model’s potential operational impact through a web-based tool that allows users to simulate real-time delay predictions. This research underscores the viability of graph-based approaches for predictive analysis in aviation, with implications for enhancing fuel efficiency, reducing delays, and improving passenger experience.

I. INTRODUCTION

The aviation industry increasingly relies on data-driven approaches to improve operational efficiency and reduce delays. Among the pressing challenges in air traffic management is the prediction of ‘holding’ maneuvers, where aircraft are instructed to delay landing due to factors such as airport congestion, adverse weather, or airspace limitations. While holding patterns are necessary for safety, they contribute to increased fuel consumption, emissions, and passenger dissatisfaction. This study aims to enhance the accuracy of holding predictions using machine learning (ML) models based on graph-structured data, specifically employing advanced methodologies in Graph Machine Learning (Graph ML) and Graph Neural Networks (GNNs).

Traditional machine learning applications in aviation have primarily focused on flight delay prediction and air traffic flow management. For instance, delay predictions based on weather conditions, airport congestion, and flight schedules have been widely studied [21, 25]. However, these models often rely on tabular data representations, which limit their ability to capture complex relational patterns among airports and other influencing factors. Additionally, research specifically focused on holding maneuvers is limited and generally lacks machine learning and network-based approaches that can model the spatial and temporal dependencies intrinsic to air traffic data [26, 35].

The use of graph-based machine learning methods is rapidly advancing in the field of intelligent transportation, where graph structures effectively capture complex spatial and temporal relationships across networks. A recent survey on GNNs in intelligent transportation systems, [33], highlights their application across a variety of domains, including traffic forecasting, demand prediction, and urban planning. This survey underscores the power of GNNs in applications where data is inherently interconnected, such as autonomous vehicle routing and intersection management. By organizing studies within these domains, they identify distinct opportunities and challenges, particularly in multi-modal models and reinforcement learning applications. Similarly, [43] demonstrates the value of GNNs in the specific context of real-time traffic forecasting with their T-GCN (Temporal Graph Convo-

lutional Network) model. By combining Graph Convolutional Networks (GCN) and Gated Recurrent Units (GRU), the T-GCN model captures both spatial and temporal dependencies, achieving state-of-the-art accuracy in urban traffic prediction tasks. These studies exemplify the increasing role of GNNs in transportation-related decision-making, showing potential for improved accuracy and efficiency in complex, dynamic systems.

The study employs two main approaches:

1. *Tabular-based approach:* We use the CatBoost model, leveraging graph features—such as centrality and connectivity metrics—that capture the significance of directed edges (flights) within the network [32].
2. *Graph Attention Network (GAT) approach:* We compare with GATs that have proven effective in applications where relational data is essential, making them a promising choice for capturing the interconnected nature of air traffic [38].

The contributions of this study are twofold. First, we demonstrate the application of graph-based ML models for predicting holding events, offering a detailed perspective on airport interdependencies. Second, by comparing the CatBoost model with the GAT, we assess which method better captures the graph topology of air traffic and achieves superior predictive performance. This research has potential implications for improved fuel efficiency, reduced delays, and enhanced passenger experiences by refining model selection and feature engineering strategies tailored to aviation applications. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first application of graph-based ML approaches to address the problem of flight delays caused by holding maneuvers.

The structure of this work is as follows. In Section II, we review relevant literature and build the theoretical background needed. Section III details the dataset and the modelling. Section V discusses the experimental setup, with results and comparison analysis presented and model deployment.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RELATED WORKS

Graph machine learning can be tracked backwards to the problem of ‘learning’ on data that is inherently a graph [11] or can be modeled as a graph [40, 42]. This field encompasses a variety of tasks, including node/edge classification, network construction, link prediction, graph classification, graph cut/partitioning, network embeddings, graph coarsening/reduction, which rely on learning representations from graph-structured data [1, 13, 14, 20, 28, 34, 36]. Over the last decades, researchers have developed numerous approaches to tackle these challenges, initially these techniques were most developed by complex networks researchers. However, in the last decade with the advancements in deep learning, the field has seen a significant shift towards the merging of three main communities: graph signal processing, deep learning and complex nets.

As described, defining the field of graph machine learning is not straightforward, as it encompasses a broad range of methods and applications. The tasks mentioned above are just a few examples of the many challenges that can be addressed through graph-based learning techniques. For clarity, these tasks can be categorized into three main learning paradigms: supervised, unsupervised, and semi-supervised learning. In this study, we are interested on the (semi-)supervised learning paradigm, which encompasses a variety of techniques designed to leverage learning to (partially) labeled data [2, 39]. But we can refine even more, in fact, this work will focus in the subset of graph elements prediction(classification/regression) methods.

In this section, we provide an overview of the theoretical framework of graph machine learning for node/edge prediction. Here we consider the division of the field into **traditional** graph learning and **deep** graph learning, where here ‘traditional’ refers to the machine learning techniques applied to graphs before the advent of graph neural networks, where standard ML algorithms were applied to graph data and the topological information measures were encoded as features together with the tabular data [15]. This bipartition is what will pave the way of our explanation, since the last decade has seen a complex interplay between these two approaches. The field’s evolution can be traced back to when [9] introduced one of

the first GNN architectures leaned on the theory of graph signal processing. Concurrently, researchers were developing node embedding techniques like DeepWalk [31] and node2vec [19], which bridged traditional and deep approaches while remaining using complex networks concepts. The subsequent years saw a surge in GNN architectures, including Graph Convolutional Networks (GCNs) [24] and GraphSAGE [22], marking a shift towards more sophisticated deep learning approaches for graphs and the unification of the field.

In the following sections, we explain each subset, their theory and applications, and how they have evolved over time. We also discuss the challenges and limitations of these methods.

A. Traditional Graph Learning

These early efforts focused on shallow learning techniques, such as feature engineering, graph traversal algorithms, and spectral methods, which laid the foundation for understanding graph structure and dynamics. Methods like community detection, centrality measures, and link prediction became key tools for analyzing large-scale networks in areas such as social science, biology, and infrastructure systems [4, 29]. A significant focus of these techniques was to develop graph-based features that could be integrated into traditional machine learning models, effectively transforming graph data into a format compatible with standard algorithms like logistic regression, decision trees, and support vector machines. By encoding graph topology through hand-crafted features, such as connectivity and centrality, researchers could leverage these features for tasks like classification, regression, and clustering in tabular machine learning frameworks.

Among these features, centrality measures became particularly important due to their ability to capture the relative importance or influence of nodes in a graph, not just nodes [6], but other graph elements such as edges [8, 27] and hyperedges [37]. Centrality measures, such as degree, betweenness, and closeness, served as input features in machine learning pipelines, helping to predict outcomes based on the structural role of nodes within the network.

Spectral centrality, particularly eigenvector centrality [6], has proven valuable in machine

learning applications due to its ability to identify globally influential nodes. Eigenvector centrality assigns a score to each node by considering not only its direct connections but also the centrality of its neighbors, which results in a recursive definition. Mathematically, the eigenvector centrality x of a node in a graph can be defined as the solution to the equation $Ax = \lambda x$, where A is the adjacency matrix of the graph, and λ is the largest eigenvalue, thus x is the eigenvector associated with the largest eigenvalue. This relationship arises from the fact that the centrality of a node is proportional to the sum of the centralities of its neighbors, if we normalize the adjacency we get a stochastic matrix and then $\lambda = 1$ is the largest eigenvalue, named the **Perron vector**. The eigenvector centrality captures both local and global structure in a network, making it a powerful feature for tasks such as node classification, ranking, and recommendation systems. A related and widely used spectral measure is PageRank [7], which extends the idea of eigenvector centrality by introducing a damping factor to model random surfing behavior,

$$PR(v) = \frac{1-d}{N} + d \sum_{u \in \mathcal{N}(v)} \frac{PR(u)}{\deg(u)},$$

where $PR(v)$ is the PageRank score of node v , d is the damping factor, and $\mathcal{N}(v)$ represents the neighbors of node v . This iterative computation converges to a stationary distribution of scores, which can be interpreted as the probability of landing on a given node after a long random walk, in this sense the **Perron vector** signifies the convergence of the process in the infinite. PageRank has been widely used in ranking tasks, such as identifying important websites in search engines or recommending influential users in social networks.

However, these spectral-based centralities come with limitations. Eigenvector centrality requires the computation of the principal eigenvector of the adjacency matrix, which involves finding the largest eigenpair problem. This has a time complexity of $\mathcal{O}(n^2d)$ for exact methods, where n is the number of nodes in the graph and d is the ratio of convergence for the power method. Furthermore, spectral methods can suffer from limitations rooted in the Perron-Frobenius theorem, which guarantees the existence of a unique largest eigenvalue only for irreducible, non-negative matrices. For graphs that are disconnected or have negative

weights, these conditions are violated, and the eigenvector centrality may not be well-defined or interpretable. That is, the adjacency matrix should be non-negative and irreducible, where we could use the Perron test $\sum A^k > 0$ to see if the graph is strongly connected. These centralities also tend to be node-centric, lacking a direct extension to edge importance. For edge centrality, betweenness remains crucial, particularly in directed graphs, where the structural role of links (edges) must be considered to capture flow dynamics. Additionally, spectral centralities can be sensitive to noise and small perturbations in the graph structure, leading to instability in the centrality scores. Despite these challenges, spectral centrality remains a powerful tool for machine learning tasks that benefit from capturing global graph structure, provided that the computational and stability issues can be managed.

B. Deep graph learning

The rise of deep learning has revolutionized the field of graph machine learning, enabling the development of more powerful and scalable models for graph data. Graph neural networks can be divide in two main categories: spectral-based and spatial-based. Here is a trick thing, the GCN architecture [24] is commonly divulgated as a spatial-based method, since it is more intuitive talking about the convolution operation in the spatial domain, where we simply aggregate information from the immediate neighbors. However, the GCN is a spectral-based method, in fact, it can be thought as a simplification of the first spectral GNN [9] proposed and that builds the math behind GCNs. That said, first we introduce the spectral-based GNNs and then the spatial-based ones.

1. Spectral-based GNNs

Spectral methods are rooted in graph signal processing. The core idea is that a signal on a graph can be represented as node features, where each feature vector at a node corresponds to a ‘signal’ defined over the graph. In this context, the graph Laplacian $\mathcal{L} = D - A$, where D is the degree matrix and A is the adjacency matrix, plays a crucial role. It captures

the structure of the graph and can be used to perform operations analogous to Fourier transforms in classical signal processing. Spectral methods can be categorized into two types: eigenvalue-based, where the focus is on creating a graph filter in the Fourier domain, and eigenvector-based, where the goal is to use a spectral basis to decompose the signal [3].

[9] introduced the first spectral Graph Neural Network (GNN), termed the Spectral CNN (SCNN), which aimed to translate ideas from standard Convolutional Neural Networks for images to graphs. The SCNN leverages the spectral decomposition of the graph Laplacian $\mathcal{L} = U\Lambda U^T$ to define a filter convolution operation in the Fourier domain. In this framework, the graph Fourier transform of a signal f is represented as $\hat{f} = U^T f$, and the convolution operation (\star) is defined as $g_\theta \star f = U g_\theta U^T f$, where g_θ is a learnable filter parameterized by θ . While powerful, the SCNN faces significant challenges: it requires $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ computational complexity to calculate the entire graph spectrum, which is prohibitively expensive for large graphs. Moreover, the non-localized nature of eigenvectors means global information can overshadow local structural details, leading suboptimal balance between local and global information aligned with a huge parameter complexity [12].

To address these limitations, ChebNet [16] introduced Chebyshev polynomials to approximate spectral filters, effectively reducing computational complexity while preserving the ability to capture localized patterns in the graph structure. The main idea is to redefine our previous filtering operation to $g_\theta(\mathcal{L})f = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \theta_k T_k(\tilde{\mathcal{L}})f$, where $T_k(\tilde{\mathcal{L}})$ is the Chebyshev polynomial of order k evaluated at the scaled Laplacian $\tilde{\mathcal{L}} = 2\frac{\mathcal{L}}{\lambda_{\max}} - I_n$. This innovation not only makes spectral GNNs more scalable to larger graphs, since we just need to calculate the first eigenpair ($\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ through the power method) for the approximations, but also enhances their ability to balance local and global information processing. In fact, the filters are K -localized for polynomials of order K , that is intuitive by remembering that \mathcal{L}^K represents the paths with length less or equal to K . The ChebNet laid the foundation for GCNs [24]. Although GCNs are commonly referred to as spatial methods, their underlying principle is rooted in the truncation of the Chebyshev expansion to $K = 1$, which limits the filter to first-order neighbors. This simplification reduces computational complexity significantly while preserving effectiveness. Instead of requiring the full spectral decomposition

of the Laplacian matrix, GCNs use a localized approximation of the graph convolution, expressed as: $g_\theta \star f \approx \theta(I_n + \tilde{A})f$, where $\tilde{A} = D^{-\frac{1}{2}}AD^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ is the normalized adjacency matrix, where A is the adjacency matrix, and D is the degree matrix. This approximation results in an efficient propagation rule that aggregates information from a node’s immediate neighbors while updating the node’s features. This propagation mechanism is often confused as a spatial method because it effectively propagates information from adjacent nodes—akin to a spatial neighborhood aggregation. Although its already a simple model, results have shown that GCNs can achieve state-of-the-art performance on a variety of tasks with even more simplifications [41]. However, as we can note, all these spectral methods works just in undirected graphs, since it needs the spectral decomposition. Furthermore, these methods are ‘node centric’, that is, they focus just on node features and the topology of the nodes, most of this is because the adjacency matrix maps the dimension of nodes to nodes, thus leaving *edge features* out of the scene.

2. Spatial-based GNNs

Spatial-based GNNs differ from spectral-based approaches by directly leveraging the graph structure to perform convolutions in the spatial domain, rather than relying on the spectral decomposition of graph operators like the Laplacian. In spatial-based methods, the convolution operation is interpreted as an aggregation of node features from a node’s local neighborhood, akin to how standard convolutional neural networks aggregate pixel information from nearby regions in image data. These methods operate by iteratively updating node representations by propagating information between neighboring nodes, making them intuitive and highly scalable for large-scale graphs.

The general framework for message passing in spatial-based GNNs can be described as follows. For each node i , at layer t , we aggregate the features of its neighbors $\mathcal{N}(i)$ to produce an updated node embedding: $\mathbf{m}_i^{(t+1)} = \text{AGGREGATE}^{(t)} \left(\left\{ \mathbf{h}_j^{(t)} : j \in \mathcal{N}(i) \right\} \right)$, where $\mathbf{h}_j^{(t)}$ is the feature of neighboring node j at layer t . Then, we update the node i ’s representation: $\mathbf{h}_i^{(t+1)} = \text{UPDATE}^{(t)} \left(\mathbf{h}_i^{(t)}, \mathbf{m}_i^{(t+1)} \right)$, where $\text{AGGREGATE}^{(t)}$ is a neighborhood aggregation

function, and $\text{UPDATE}^{(t)}$ is the node update function.

The general idea behind spatial-based GNNs is that, for each node, we aggregate the features of its neighbors to produce an updated node embedding. A key example of this is the GraphSAGE architecture [22], which computes node representations by sampling and aggregating features from the node’s neighbors. The GraphSAGE model employs several types of aggregation functions, including mean, LSTM-based, and pooling aggregators, which allow for flexible and inductive learning on large graphs. In particular, GraphSAGE enables the generation of embeddings for unseen nodes, making it suitable for inductive learning tasks, where the model needs to generalize to new nodes that were not present during training. Unlike spectral-based methods, which are constrained to a fixed graph size and structure due to their reliance on the graph Laplacian, spatial-based GNNs are inherently more flexible and can be applied to dynamic and evolving graphs. These models perform neighborhood aggregation locally, and therefore do not require the global knowledge of the graph structure that spectral methods need. This flexibility makes them particularly useful for large-scale graphs and for graphs where the structure may change over time, such as social networks or knowledge graphs.

Another prominent spatial-based GNN is the Graph Attention Network (GAT) [38], which introduced attention mechanisms into graph learning. GAT models learn to assign different weights to the neighbors of a node, allowing the model to focus more on the most relevant neighbors during the feature aggregation process. This is achieved using a self-attention mechanism, where the importance of neighboring nodes is learned through a shared attention coefficient, $e_{ij} = \text{LeakyReLU}(\mathbf{a}^T[\mathbf{W}\mathbf{h}_i||\mathbf{W}\mathbf{h}_j])$, where e_{ij} represents the attention coefficient between nodes i and j , \mathbf{W} is a learnable weight matrix, \mathbf{h}_i and \mathbf{h}_j are the feature vectors of nodes i and j , and $||$ denotes concatenation. The attention coefficients are then normalized across all of a node’s neighbors using the softmax function, $\alpha_{ij} = \frac{\exp(e_{ij})}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \exp(e_{ik})}$, this normalization ensures that the attention coefficients sum to 1, allowing the model to perform a weighted aggregation of the neighbors’ features, $\mathbf{h}'_i = \sigma\left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \alpha_{ij} \mathbf{W}\mathbf{h}_j\right)$, here \mathbf{h}'_i is the updated representation of node i , and σ is a non-linear activation function. By learning attention coefficients, GATs can capture both the importance and the structure

of the graph, making them particularly effective in tasks where the relationships between nodes are not equally important, such as in citation networks or social media graphs.

III. MATERIALS AND METHODS

This section details the materials and methods used in our study, providing a fluid overview of the datasets and aviation features employed in our predictive modeling. Our objective is to predict whether a given aircraft will experience a delay due to a holding maneuver by leveraging both a CatBoost model enhanced with graph-derived features and a Graph Attention Network (GAT) approach.

The study utilizes two distinct datasets, each comprising 42,336 observations that encompass a comprehensive range of meteorological, geographical, and flight-specific features. These datasets were constructed from weather reports and airport/flight specifications provided by ICEA, and they are tailored for different predictive tasks. In the binary classification dataset, the model is tasked with predicting the occurrence of a holding maneuver. Here, the vast majority of samples (41,616) represent flights without holding delays, while a small subset (720) corresponds to flights with holding delays. This significant imbalance challenges the model to accurately predict a rare event without succumbing to overfitting. In contrast, the regression dataset is designed to predict the precise duration of holding delays, with each observation labeled by a continuous value representing the delay in seconds. This approach offers a more detailed analysis of delay durations, enhancing the potential for operational insights.

Aviation features in our datasets can be understood through three intertwined dimensions. First, meteorological features—sourced from both METAR and METAF reports—provide real-time weather observations and complementary forecast elements. METAR (Meteorological Terminal Aviation Routine Weather Report) delivers data on wind direction and speed, visibility, temperature, and cloud coverage, while METAF reports offer additional context that deepens the understanding of atmospheric conditions that might influence holding maneuvers. Second, geographical features offer spatial context by capturing the geodesic

flight distance between departure and arrival airports, along with details such as airport altitudes and precise latitude and longitude coordinates. This spatial information is critical for analyzing how physical location and distance affect delay events. Finally, flight-specific features capture operational nuances such as the flight hour and indicators of runway activity, including previous runway head changes and recent alterations in runway configuration. Together, these features provide a holistic view of the operational environment, allowing for a more nuanced prediction of holding maneuvers.

In our modeling approaches, we first apply CatBoost—a gradient boosting decision tree model enhanced with graph-derived features from the airport network—which is well-suited to handle class imbalances and offers transparency through explainable AI techniques. In parallel, we explore Graph Attention Networks (GATs), which use attention mechanisms to model the intricate relationships within graph-structured data. Although GATs are promising in capturing relational patterns, our experiments reveal that they struggle with class imbalance, often leading to overfitting in deeper architectures.

The following sections provide further details on the specific implementations and experimental configurations for both the CatBoost and GAT models.

A. CatBoost with Graph Features

This study employs the CatBoost model, a high-performance gradient boosting library, chosen specifically for its ability to handle categorical features and class imbalance effectively, as well as for its robust handling of noisy data [32]. CatBoost has been widely recognized for its superior performance in structured data problems, particularly when compared to other boosting algorithms like XGBoost and LightGBM, thanks to its unique techniques such as ordered boosting and categorical feature encoding. These innovations help prevent overfitting and enhance generalization in class unbalanced problems.

Here, we describe how CatBoost is combined the graph-based features that are extracted of our modeled airports network. These features are derived from the weighted directed graph and encoded as tabular features that are used as input to the model as we describe

in the following sections.

1. Graph Representation of the Flight Network

To model the interactions in flight data, we represented the problem as a directed graph, depicted in Figure 1, where each node represents an airport, here we represent the airports as states of Brazil: SP (São Paulo), MG (Minas Gerais), RJ (Rio de Janeiro). In this network, nodes represent airports. Directed edges represent flights, with each edge directed from the departure airport to the destination airport. Given the frequent occurrence of multiple flights between the same pairs of airports (i.e., multiedges), we have in fact a multigraph, however we abstract it into a weighted directed graph as shown in 2. Here, each edge’s weight corresponds to the total number of flights between a specific pair of airports, transforming multiple directed edges into a single weighted edge. This abstraction allows us to calculate key network metrics more easily, which we then used as features in the CatBoost model.




FIG. 1. Example of airports and directed flights.

2. Graph-based Features

The graph-based features encode essential structural information about the flight network, capturing connectivity, centrality, and robustness. These features are crucial for understanding the influence of each airport within the network and its potential impact on flight holding patterns.




FIG. 2. Transformation of a multigraph of flights into a weighted directed graph. The multigraph (left) represents multiple flights between airports. In the weighted graph (right), edges are aggregated to show total flights as weights.

Although we have already made this simplification of the multigraph, transforming it into a weighted directed graph, we still need to extract the features from the graph and encode them as tabular data. However, this is not straightforward, as the graph measures are not directly compatible with the model.

The modelling will impact dramatically in the resulting graph-based features. For instance, we need to calculate edge measures, but this is not so explored as node measures, so the lack of possibilities is a challenge to be overcome. Another challenge is the direction, that is, we have to create edge measures in a directed weighted graph, which is hard, as we detailed in section II A, because most of the complex networks measures proposed are ‘node centric’ and for undirected graphs.

With this in mind, we can observe why the weighted graph transformation was so important, since the measures available for our setting are strongly dependent to the weight (as we will detail later), and our graph is almost totally connected, so in undirected unweighted setting they would be approximately equal, leaving no information. The following graph metrics were calculated from the weighted directed graph:

1. *Betweenness Centrality*: Captures the relative importance of each airport in terms of

the routes it controls within the network. Higher values indicate airports that serve as critical transit points.

2. *Flow Betweenness*: Highlights the flow dynamics of connections, showing how flights tend to route through certain airports, which may correlate with congestion.
3. *Edge Connectivity*: Indicates the robustness of airport connections, with higher values signifying more resilient routes between airports that could better handle rerouting needs.
4. *Degree Difference*: Measures the disparity between in-degrees and out-degrees at each node, helping to identify key hubs or spokes in the network.
5. *Google Matrix*: Based on PageRank centrality, the Google matrix provides a probabilistic transition representation for each airport, which reflects both local and global connectivity.

As we can see, these features are not commonly used in the literature. Here is where the weighted network plays a crucial role, edge betweenness centrality [30] is constructed using shortest paths in the network, thus the weight will be crucial part of it, since without it the graph is almost fully connected, the shortest path will be almost the same for all pairs of nodes. The same happens with flow betweenness centrality [18], that is a measure based on electrical circuits Kirchoff law, more specifically, instead of working with shortest paths, it use the maximum flow that pass through each edge and the weight visualized as capacity will be crucial to calculate it.

The edge connectivity is a measure of the minimum number of edges that must be removed to disconnect the graph, and the weight will be crucial to calculate it. The degree difference we stated here as a measure of the difference between the in-degree and out-degree of a node. The Google matrix is a way we derived to keep using PageRank for edges. In fact, as we detailed in section II A, although the PageRank centrality could be applied in our graph, since it satisfies the Perron theorem as it is always positive and strongly connected, it is a node measure, so we have to adapt it to edges, and the Google matrix is a way to do it.

These features enhance the CatBoost model by embedding graph-theoretic insights into its predictive capabilities, ultimately enabling a more nuanced understanding of how network dynamics relate to flight holding patterns.

IV. GRAPH ATTENTION NETWORK

As we previously described, the GAT model in section II B 2 has a large range of applications, from drug discovery to fake news detection [10]. The GAT model leverages the underlying graph structure but does not rely on explicitly computed graph-derived features like the CatBoost model does. Instead, it learns node representations in an end-to-end manner, enabling the model to capture the relationships between airports and flights directly from the data.

The modelling of a GNN for our problem is a challenging task, as we have to adapt the model to predict edge features, since ‘holding’ is an edge feature in our setting. In section II B 1 we detailed why the spectral-based GNNs are not suitable for our setting, as they are not able to handle edge features and direction, due to their ‘node-centric’ approach based on the adjacency matrix. Although spatial-based GNNs can handle direction in their majority, they are not able to handle edge features in general, since they need to create a way to aggregate the edge features with the neighbors’ features.

The GAT model is so used because it is highly adaptable in practically any graph setting. As we will show, the attention mechanism detailed in section II B 2 can be generalized to handle edge features, and the model can be adapted to predict edge features. In fact, a simple concatenation (\parallel) in the attention formula already gives us this power,

$$\alpha_{ij} = \sigma(\phi_1(\mathbf{a}^T [Wh_i \parallel Wh_j \parallel W_2 e_{ij}])), \quad (1)$$

where e_{ij} are the edge features, h_i and h_j are the node features, and W and W_2 are the weight matrices. This formula allows the model to focus on the relevant neighboring nodes, making it ideal for relational data. In our case, the edge features are the tabular data features with




FIG. 3. Airport multigraph GAT Layer with multi-head attention for three different flights between nodes (SP,RJ), with alternating colors opacity for each flight.

holding being part of them, which is the target we want to predict.

Furthermore, the directed multigraph setting we described in section III A is not a problem for the GAT model, since it can handle multiple edges between the same pair of nodes, as we will show in the following sections. We show how we model the GAT to be a directed multigraph representing the flights and their features in Figure 3.

Finally, the last layer of our predictor would be to pass the learned node embeddings h_i and h_j with the edge feature $e_{ij}^{(k)}$ of the flight k to a fully connected layer (MLP) to predict the holding of the flight k . That is, we simply concatenate them, and after the MLP layer, we have a sigmoid σ activation function that outputs the prediction \hat{y}_k of holding,

$$\hat{y}_k = \sigma(\text{MLP}(h_i || h_j || e_{ij}^{(k)})) \quad .$$

V. RESULTS

This section presents a comprehensive evaluation of the models applied in this study, with a focus on comparing the CatBoost and Graph Attention Network (GAT) models, as well as examining the regression capabilities and interpretability of the CatBoost approach. The discussion that follows preserves detailed narrative paragraphs while reducing the number of sections and removing the step-by-step definitions of performance metrics.

A. Model Performance and Interpretability

The performance of each model in predicting flight delays due to holding maneuvers was evaluated using a range of metrics, including accuracy, precision, recall, and F1-score. Table I summarizes the results for various GAT layer configurations alongside the CatBoost model. While the single-layer GAT model achieved the highest accuracy, its precision and F1-score were markedly low. In contrast, the CatBoost model provided a balanced performance across all metrics, which is particularly beneficial for the imbalanced dataset at hand. This balanced performance indicates that CatBoost is more effective at capturing both delayed and non-delayed flights, even if it sometimes errs on the side of caution in predicting delays.

TABLE I. Performance metrics for various GAT layer configurations and CatBoost with graph features.

Model	Test Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1-Score
CatBoost	0.90	0.09	0.58	0.16
1 GAT Layer	0.95	0.03	0.06	0.04
3 GAT Layers	0.52	0.01	0.40	0.03
5 GAT Layers	0.57	0.01	0.30	0.02
10 GAT Layers	0.91	0.02	0.08	0.03
30 GAT Layers	0.02	0.02	0.99	0.03

Beyond classification, the CatBoost model was also applied to a regression task aimed at predicting continuous delay values. Figures 5 and 6 illustrate the distributions of the predicted and actual delay values, respectively. The overall alignment between these distributions suggests that CatBoost is effective at capturing the underlying trends in flight delay data, though deviations at extreme values highlight potential areas for further refinement.

Interpretability is another key strength of the CatBoost approach. By leveraging graph-based features, the model not only achieves robust performance but also offers transparency regarding feature importance. As shown in Figure 4, Explainable AI (XAI) techniques help elucidate how specific graph-based metrics contribute to the model’s predictions, thereby providing valuable insights into the decision-making process.




FIG. 4. Feature importance for the CatBoost model on the airport network dataset, highlighting the relevance of graph-based features.

B. Deployment, Implementation, and Discussion

The practical applicability of our approach is further demonstrated through the development of a web-based simulation tool. The source code for this project is available on GitHub at <https://github.com/graph-learning-ita/airnet-holding-ml/>. The simulation tool, named *Airdelay*, is implemented using Folium and Streamlit and is accessible at <https://airdelay.manoel.dev>. This tool visualizes flight delays as predicted by the CatBoost model in real time, enabling users to simulate various operational scenarios and




FIG. 5. Distribution of predicted delay values (y_{pred}) for the regression task using CatBoost.




FIG. 6. Distribution of actual delay values (y_{test}) for the test set in the regression task.

assess the potential impact of holding maneuvers.

Figure 7 shows a screenshot of the *Airdelay* interface, which allows users to interact with the map, explore different scenarios, and gain a deeper understanding of the model’s performance through dynamic visualizations.

In summary, our results underscore the advantages of the CatBoost model for this application. Despite the high accuracy observed with some GAT configurations, issues such as overfitting and unstable performance—particularly in terms of precision and F1-score—limit their effectiveness in an imbalanced setting. The CatBoost model, enhanced by graph-based features, not only achieves superior performance in both classification and regression tasks but also offers interpretability through XAI techniques.

Nevertheless, our study is not without limitations. The scope of hyperparameter tuning was restricted, and the challenges posed by class imbalance remain significant. Future




FIG. 7. *Airdelay* web-based simulation tool, showing predicted flight delays due to holding maneuvers.

research should focus on refining the GAT architecture, exploring additional graph-based features, and potentially incorporating alternative models such as Support Vector Machines (SVM) to further improve predictive performance. Moreover, emerging GNN architectures, such as the provably powerful graph neural network for directed multigraphs introduced in [17], hold promise for addressing class imbalance issues and enhancing minority-class performance.

VI. CONCLUSION

This study examined the prediction of flight delays caused by holding maneuvers using graph machine learning techniques. By modeling air traffic as a directed network, we applied both CatBoost, which integrates graph-based features, and Graph Attention Networks (GATs), which capture relational dependencies. Our results demonstrate that while GATs provide a flexible framework for learning from structured data, CatBoost achieved better

performance on this imbalanced dataset, highlighting the effectiveness of graph-based feature engineering in structured tabular models. Additionally, our web-based simulation tool illustrates the practical implications of these predictive models for real-time decision-making in air traffic management.

Despite these advances, several areas remain open for improvement. One limitation of our approach is the lack of explicit data imputation techniques for handling missing information. Future work could explore oversampling methods such as GraphSMOTE [44] to enhance the representation of underrepresented holding events in the dataset. Furthermore, since this is an edge-based classification problem, incorporating topological deep learning techniques could offer new insights by leveraging higher-order structures in the flight network. Methods from topological graph learning, such as persistent homology-based representations [23] or topological message passing [5] techniques tailored for edge features, may provide a richer understanding of the underlying flight delay dynamics.

Additionally, future research could explore hybrid models that combine GNNs and gradient boosting to leverage both graph-based feature learning and tabular-based decision trees. The integration of real-time air traffic and weather data could further enhance predictive accuracy, making these models more robust for operational deployment. As airspace management continues to evolve, these approaches hold promise for optimizing flight scheduling, reducing delays, and improving overall passenger experience.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was financed in part by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - Brasil (CAPES) - Finance Code 001. Diego R. Amancio acknowledges financial support from CNPq (Grant no. 311074/2021-9) and FAPESP (Grant no. 2020/06271-0).

-
- [1] D. R. Amancio. Network analysis of named entity co-occurrences in written texts. *Europhysics Letters*, 114(5):58005, 2016.
- [2] D. R. Amancio, C. H. Comin, D. Casanova, G. Travieso, O. M. Bruno, F. A. Rodrigues, and L. da Fontoura Costa. A systematic comparison of supervised classifiers. *PLOS ONE*, 9(4):1–14, 04 2014.
- [3] D. Bo, X. Wang, Y. Liu, Y. Fang, Y. Li, and C. Shi. A survey on spectral graph neural networks, 2023.
- [4] S. Boccaletti, V. Latora, Y. Moreno, M. Chavez, and D.-U. Hwang. Complex networks: Structure and dynamics. *Physics Reports*, 4(424):175–308, 2006.
- [5] C. Bodnar, F. Frasca, Y. Wang, N. Otter, G. F. Montufar, P. Lio, and M. Bronstein. Weisfeiler and lehman go topological: Message passing simplicial networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1026–1037. PMLR, 2021.
- [6] P. Bonacich. Power and centrality: A family of measures. *American journal of sociology*, 92(5):1170–1182, 1987.
- [7] S. Brin. The pagerank citation ranking: bringing order to the web. *Proceedings of ASIS, 1998*, 98:161–172, 1998.
- [8] T. Bröhl and K. Lehnertz. Centrality-based identification of important edges in complex networks. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 29(3), 2019.
- [9] J. Bruna, W. Zaremba, A. Szlam, and Y. LeCun. Spectral networks and locally connected networks on graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6203*, 2013.
- [10] M. Caravanti de Souza, M. P. Silva Gôlo, A. Mário Guedes Jorge, E. Carvalho Freire de Amorim, R. Nuno Taborda Campos, R. Marcondes Marcacini, and S. Oliveira Rezende. Keywords attention for fake news detection using few positive labels. *Inf. Sci.*, 663(C), June 2024.
- [11] I. Chami, S. Abu-El-Haija, B. Perozzi, C. Ré[©], and K. Murphy. Machine learning on graphs: A model and comprehensive taxonomy. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(89):1–64,

- 2022.
- [12] X. Chen. Understanding spectral graph neural network. *Arxiv*, 12 2020.
 - [13] E. A. Corrêa Jr and D. R. Amancio. Word sense induction using word embeddings and community detection in complex networks. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 523:180–190, 2019.
 - [14] E. A. Corrêa Jr, F. N. Silva, L. d. F. Costa, and D. R. Amancio. Patterns of authors contribution in scientific manuscripts. *Journal of Informetrics*, 11(2):498–510, 2017.
 - [15] L. d. F. Costa. Characterization of complex networks: A survey of measurements. *Advances in physics*, 56(1):167–242, 2007.
 - [16] M. Defferrard, X. Bresson, and P. Vandergheynst. Convolutional neural networks on graphs with fast localized spectral filtering. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29, 2016.
 - [17] B. Egressy, L. Von Niederhäusern, J. Blanuša, E. Altman, R. Wattenhofer, and K. Atasu. Provably powerful graph neural networks for directed multigraphs. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 11838–11846, 2024.
 - [18] L. C. Freeman, S. P. Borgatti, and D. R. White. Centrality in valued graphs: A measure of betweenness based on network flow. *Social networks*, 13(2):141–154, 1991.
 - [19] A. Grover and J. Leskovec. node2vec: Scalable feature learning for networks. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 855–864, 2016.
 - [20] C. Gui. Link prediction based on spectral analysis. *Plos one*, 19(1):e0287385, 2024.
 - [21] G. Gui, F. Liu, J. Sun, J. Yang, Z. Zhou, and D. Zhao. Flight delay prediction based on aviation big data and machine learning. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, 69(1):140–150, 2019.
 - [22] W. Hamilton, Z. Ying, and J. Leskovec. Inductive representation learning on large graphs. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
 - [23] J. Immonen, A. Souza, and V. Garg. Going beyond persistent homology using persistent homology. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.

- [24] T. N. Kipf and M. Welling. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.02907*, 2016.
- [25] M. Lambelho, M. Mitici, S. Pickup, and A. Marsden. Assessing strategic flight schedules at an airport using machine learning-based flight delay and cancellation predictions. *Journal of air transport management*, 82:101737, 2020.
- [26] D. h. Lee, C.-J. Kim, M. J. Heo, J. W. Hwang, H. G. Lyu, and J. Y. Lee. Development of real-time maneuver library generation technique for implementing tactical maneuvers of fixed-wing aircraft. *International Journal of Aerospace Engineering*, 2020(1):7025374, 2020.
- [27] L. Lu and M. Zhang. *Edge Betweenness Centrality*, pages 647–648. Springer New York, New York, NY, 2013.
- [28] C. Morris, N. Dym, H. Maron, İ. İ. Ceylan, F. Frasca, R. Levie, D. Lim, M. Bronstein, M. Grohe, and S. Jegelka. Future directions in foundations of graph machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.02287*, 2024.
- [29] M. Newman. *Networks*. Oxford university press, 2018.
- [30] M. Newman and M. Girvan. Finding and evaluating community structure in networks. *Physical review E*, 69(2):026113, 2004.
- [31] B. Perozzi, R. Al-Rfou, and S. Skiena. Deepwalk: Online learning of social representations. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 701–710, 2014.
- [32] L. Prokhorenkova, G. Gusev, A. Vorobev, A. V. Dorogush, and A. Gulin. Catboost: unbiased boosting with categorical features. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- [33] S. Rahmani, A. Baghbani, N. Bouguila, and Z. Patterson. Graph neural networks for intelligent transportation systems: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 24(8):8846–8885, 2023.
- [34] A. Semeraro, S. Vilella, R. Improta, E. S. De Duro, S. M. Mohammad, G. Ruffo, and M. Stella. Emoatlas: An emotional network analyzer of texts that merges psychological lexicons, artificial intelligence, and network science. *Behavior Research Methods*, 57(2):77, 2025.

- [35] A. P. Smith and H. Bateman. Management of holding patterns: A potential ads-b application. In *2008 IEEE/AIAA 27th Digital Avionics Systems Conference*, pages 3–D. IEEE, 2008.
- [36] S. Talaga, M. Stella, T. J. Swanson, and A. S. Teixeira. Polarization and multiscale structural balance in signed networks. *Communications Physics*, 6(1):349, 2023.
- [37] F. Tudisco and D. J. Higham. Node and edge nonlinear eigenvector centrality for hypergraphs. *Communications Physics*, 4(1):201, 2021.
- [38] P. Veličković, G. Cucurull, A. Casanova, A. Romero, P. Liò, and Y. Bengio. Graph Attention Networks. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [39] F. A. N. Verri, P. R. Urio, and L. Zhao. Advantages of edge-centric collective dynamics in machine learning tasks. *Journal of Applied Nonlinear Dynamics*, 7(3):269–285, 2018.
- [40] F. A. N. Verri and L. Zhao. High level data classification based on network entropy. In *The 2013 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, pages 1–5, 2013.
- [41] F. Wu, A. Souza, T. Zhang, C. Fifty, T. Yu, and K. Weinberger. Simplifying graph convolutional networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 6861–6871. PMLR, 2019.
- [42] J. You, X. Ma, Y. Ding, M. J. Kochenderfer, and J. Leskovec. Handling missing data with graph representation learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:19075–19087, 2020.
- [43] L. Zhao, Y. Song, C. Zhang, Y. Liu, P. Wang, T. Lin, M. Deng, and H. Li. T-gcn: A temporal graph convolutional network for traffic prediction. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 21(9):3848–3858, 2020.
- [44] T. Zhao, X. Zhang, and S. Wang. Graphsmote: Imbalanced node classification on graphs with graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM international conference on web search and data mining*, pages 833–841, 2021.