

Hierarchical Graph Topic Modeling with Topic Tree-based Transformer

Delvin Ce Zhang¹, Menglin Yang², Xiaobao Wu³, Jiasheng Zhang⁴, Hady W. Lauw⁵,

¹The Pennsylvania State University, ²Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (Guangzhou),

³Nanyang Technological University, ⁴University of Electronic Science and Technology of China,

⁵Singapore Management University

¹delvincezhang@gmail.com, ²menglinyang@hkust-gz.edu.cn,


³xiaobao002@e.ntu.edu.sg, ⁴zjss12358@std.uestc.edu.cn, ⁵hadywlauw@smu.edu.sg,

Abstract

Textual documents are commonly connected in a hierarchical graph structure where a central document links to others with an exponentially growing connectivity. Though Hyperbolic Graph Neural Networks (HGNNs) excel at capturing such *graph hierarchy*, they cannot model the rich textual semantics within documents. Moreover, text contents in documents usually discuss topics of different specificity. Hierarchical Topic Models (HTMs) discover such latent *topic hierarchy* within text corpora. However, most of them focus on the textual content within documents, and ignore the graph adjacency across interlinked documents. We thus propose a Hierarchical Graph Topic Modeling Transformer to integrate both topic hierarchy within documents and graph hierarchy across documents into a unified Transformer. Specifically, to incorporate topic hierarchy within documents, we design a topic tree and infer a *hierarchical tree embedding* for hierarchical topic modeling. To preserve both topic and graph hierarchies, we design our model in hyperbolic space and propose *Hyperbolic Doubly Recurrent Neural Network*, which models ancestral and fraternal tree structure. Both hierarchies are inserted into each Transformer layer to learn unified representations. Both supervised and unsupervised experiments verify the effectiveness of our model.

1 Introduction

Documents are usually linked as a graph, e.g., papers cited in a citation graph; news articles linked in a hyperlink graph. Such graph usually exhibits a hierarchical structure: a central document links to others with an exponentially growing connectivity (Fig. 1(a)). For example, an academic paper is extended by follow-up works, which are further cited by others; a news article reporting an event is traced by others with subsequent events. Hyperbolic Graph Neural Networks (HGNNs) (Chami



(a) Graph hierarchy (b) Topic hierarchy of a machine learning paper corpus

Figure 1: (a) Graph hierarchy, (b) topic hierarchy.

et al., 2019) capture such *graph hierarchy*. However, when modeling documents, we usually assume latent topics (Blei et al., 2003) and model contextualized semantics (Vaswani et al., 2017). HGNNs are not designed to capture latent topics or contextualized semantics, leading to inferior document embeddings. Text indicates how documents relate to each other in the latent topic space, and modeling it could capture semantic similarities.

Moreover, documents usually discuss topics of different specificity. For instance, some news report the overall Olympic Games, while others focus on specific sports; survey papers summarize a broad area, while regular papers deal with specific problems (Fig. 1(b)). Though topic models (Wu et al., 2023b, 2024c,b) capture text semantics, most treat all documents equally and infer flat document representations. They fail to explore *topic hierarchy* to differentiate semantic specificity of documents, resulting in semantic distortion. Hierarchical Topic Models (HTMs) (Griffiths et al., 2003) are the first attempt for topic hierarchy, but ignore graph hierarchy, e.g., citations and hyperlinks.

Graph hierarchy is denoted by edge connectivity across documents, and topic hierarchy appears within text content of documents. Though some works, e.g., HGTM (Zhang et al., 2023), consider both hierarchies, they model both of them *separately*, i.e., *first* encoding graph hierarchy, *then* learning topic hierarchy. Such “cascaded” method can not well integrate both hierarchies into uni-

fied representations, because topic hierarchy is neglected when encoding graph hierarchy. Topic hierarchy could reveal semantic similarity of documents and benefit graph hierarchical learning. Consequently, two hierarchies can not mutually enhance each other, and the representations are biased towards one hierarchy and neglect the other.

Approach. We propose GTFormer, a Hierarchical Graph Topic Modeling Transformer, integrating both topic hierarchy and graph hierarchy into a unified Transformer (Fig. 2(a)). *First*, to encode topic hierarchy, we design a *topic tree* in latent semantic space and infer a *hierarchical tree embedding* (Fig. 2(b)). Documents with general content have high probability on root topic, while specific documents focus on leaf topics. *Second*, to derive effective tree embedding, we design topic tree in hyperbolic space, which is more suitable than Euclidean space for hierarchical structure (Chami et al., 2019). We design *Hyperbolic Doubly Recurrent Neural Network*, modeling ancestral (parent-to-children) and fraternal (sibling-to-sibling) tree structure to recurrently derive hyperbolic tree embedding. (Fig. 2(b-c)). In contrast, previous HTMs mainly operate in Euclidean space, leading to topic distortion. *Third*, to deeply unify both topic and graph hierarchies, we insert both tree and graph representations into each Transformer layer. The contextualized modeling allows one to propagate information to the other, and the output representation integrates both hierarchies.

Contributions. *First*, we propose GTFormer to jointly model topic and graph hierarchies into a unified Transformer. To explore topic hierarchy, we design a topic tree and infer hierarchical tree representation. *Second*, to better preserve both topic and graph hierarchies, we design in hyperbolic space and we propose Hyperbolic Doubly Recurrent Network. *Third*, both hierarchies are unified into each Transformer layer for contextualized modeling.

2 Related Work

Topic models are first designed with flat topics (Blei et al., 2003; Miao et al., 2016; Srivastava and Sutton, 2017; Grootendorst, 2022; Pham et al., 2023; Nguyen et al., 2024; Wu and Li, 2019; Wu et al., 2020a,b, 2021, 2022, 2023a, 2024a; Wu, 2024). HTMs explore topic hierarchy, e.g., graphical (Griffiths et al., 2003; Wang et al., 2020; Zhao et al., 2018b,a; Li and McCallum, 2006; Gan et al., 2015; Zhou et al., 2016; Paisley et al., 2014) and

neural ones (Isonuma et al., 2020; Pham and Le, 2021; Chen et al., 2021; Duan et al., 2021; Wu et al., 2024e; Shahid et al., 2023), but no one captures graph structure. Though Doubly RNN appears in (Alvarez-Melis and Jaakkola, 2022; Isonuma et al., 2020; Pham and Le, 2021), it is in Euclidean, not in hyperbolic space. Hyperbolic space has been shown to be more effective to capture hierarchy.

Relational topic models deal with graph-structured documents (Chang and Blei, 2009; Bai et al., 2018; Zhang and Lauw, 2020; Xie et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2021). The recent HGTM (Zhang et al., 2023) is the only one with both hierarchies, but is a cascaded method and is not effective to integrate both hierarchies.

Graph neural networks (GNNs) are first proposed in Euclidean space (Kipf and Welling, 2016; Veličković et al., 2018; Hamilton et al., 2017). To model graph hierarchy, hyperbolic GNNs are proposed, e.g., HGNN (Liu et al., 2019), HGCN (Chami et al., 2019), HAT (Zhang et al., 2021), HTGN (Yang et al., 2021b), κ GCN (Bachmann et al., 2020). However, they mainly focus on graph structure, and do not deal with textual semantics.

Text-attributed graph combines GNNs and language models for both graph and text, e.g., GraphFormer (Yang et al., 2021a), Patton (Jin et al., 2023a), Heterformer (Jin et al., 2023b), Edgeformers (Jin et al., 2022), TAPE (He et al., 2023), Specter (Cohan et al., 2020), LinkBERT (Yasunaga et al., 2022), etc. They consider both modalities, but no one models topic or graph *hierarchy*.

3 Problem Formulation and Preliminaries

$\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E}\}$ is a document graph. $\mathcal{D} = \{d_i\}_{i=1}^N$ is a set of N documents. Each document $d_i = \{w_{i,v}\}_{v=1}^{|d_i|} \subset \mathcal{V}$ is a sequence of words in vocabulary \mathcal{V} . $\mathcal{E} = \{e_{ij}\}$ is a set of edges. If there is an edge between documents i and j , $e_{ij} \in \mathcal{E}$. We follow (Zhang et al., 2023) and model an undirected graph, $e_{ij} = e_{ji}$, though our model is also applicable to directed graph. For document i , its neighbor set $\mathcal{N}(i)$ contains documents directly linked to i .

Given \mathcal{G} as input, we propose a topic model that outputs unified document representations preserving topic hierarchy \mathcal{D} and graph hierarchy \mathcal{E} . Appendix A summarizes math notations.

Hyperbolic geometry is a non-Euclidean differential geometry with a constant negative curvature $-1/K$ ($K > 0$). Curvature measures how a geometric object deviates from a flat plane. We

work with Hyperboloid model (Nickel and Kiela, 2018), though our work is applicable to others, e.g., Poincaré ball (Nickel and Kiela, 2017).

Hyperboloid model is an n -dimensional hyperbolic space $\mathbb{H}^{n,K}$ where Minkowski self-inner product $(\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{L}})$ of its vectors is $-K$,

$$\mathbb{H}^{n,K} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} | \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}} = -K, x_0 > 0\} \quad (1)$$

where $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}} = -x_0 y_0 + x_1 y_1 + \dots + x_n y_n$.

For hyperbolic vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{H}^{n,K}$, the tangent space $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbb{H}^{n,K}$ around \mathbf{x} is first-order approximation of $\mathbb{H}^{n,K}$ and is $(n+1)$ -dimensional Euclidean space.

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbb{H}^{n,K} = \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} | \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}} = 0\}. \quad (2)$$

Exponential and logarithmic maps. The projection between hyperbolic and tangent space is achieved by exponential and logarithmic maps. For a hyperbolic vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{H}^{n,K}$ and one of its tangent vectors $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbb{H}^{n,K}$ ($\mathbf{v} \neq \mathbf{0}$), exponential map projects \mathbf{v} to the hyperbolic space by

$$\exp_{\mathbf{x}}^K(\mathbf{v}) = \cosh\left(\frac{\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathcal{L}}}{\sqrt{K}}\right)\mathbf{x} + \sqrt{K} \sinh\left(\frac{\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathcal{L}}}{\sqrt{K}}\right) \frac{\mathbf{v}}{\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathcal{L}}}. \quad (3)$$

$\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathcal{L}} = \sqrt{\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}}}$ is the norm of $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbb{H}^{n,K}$. Reversely, for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{H}^{n,K}$ and hyperbolic vector $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{H}^{n,K}$ ($\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}$), logarithmic map projects \mathbf{y} to \mathbf{x} 's tangent space. $d_{\mathcal{L}}^K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is the distance between two hyperbolic vectors in Hyperboloid.

$$\log_{\mathbf{x}}^K(\mathbf{y}) = d_{\mathcal{L}}^K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \frac{\mathbf{y} + \frac{1}{K}\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}} \mathbf{x}}{\|\mathbf{y} + \frac{1}{K}\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}} \mathbf{x}\|_{\mathcal{L}}} \quad (4)$$

where $d_{\mathcal{L}}^K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sqrt{K} \operatorname{arccosh}(-\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}}/K)$.

Parallel transport. For two hyperbolic vectors $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{H}^{n,K}$ ($\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}$), parallel transport can transport $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbb{H}^{n,K}$ on \mathbf{x} 's tangent space to \mathbf{y} 's.

$$\text{PT}_{\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \mathbf{y}}^K(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{v} - \frac{\langle \log_{\mathbf{x}}^K(\mathbf{y}), \mathbf{v} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}}}{d_{\mathcal{L}}^K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})^2} (\log_{\mathbf{x}}^K(\mathbf{y}) + \log_{\mathbf{y}}^K(\mathbf{x})). \quad (5)$$

4 Model Architecture

Fig. 2 shows the overall model with Hyperbolic Doubly Recurrent Network for hierarchical tree representation and a nested Transformer.

4.1 Tree-structured Topic Hierarchy

To preserve topic hierarchy, we construct a topic tree in latent semantic space, illustrated by Fig. 1(b) and Fig. 2(b). Documents with general concept present high probability on the root topic, while

documents focusing on specific content sample topics near leaves. Thus, we calculate topic probability distribution of each document over topic tree, so as to differentiate semantic specificity of different documents and preserve topic hierarchy. Specifically, for each document i , we calculate its path distribution π_i and level distribution δ_i , which are then combined to derive its topic distribution over topic tree $\theta_i \in \Delta^T$. Δ^T is $(T-1)$ -dimensional simplex. T is the number of topics on topic tree.

Path distribution. A path contains a sequence of topics, with increasing topic specificity from root to leaf. Different paths express different semantics. A document with certain themes present high probability on one path and low probabilities on others. In Fig. 1(b), the left path shows reinforcement learning, while the right one is knowledge base. For path p with topics $\{t_h\}_{h=1}^H$ where H is the path length, document i 's path probability is

$$\Pr(p = \{t_h\}_{h=1}^H) = \Pr(t_H | t_{H-1}) \dots \Pr(t_2 | t_1) \Pr(t_1), \quad (6)$$

where $\Pr(t_1) = \Pr(t_{\text{root}}) = 1$. Topic t_h is one of the child topics of t_{h-1} . Since a parent topic usually has more than one child, conditional probability $\Pr(t_h | t_{h-1})$ is the probability of selecting one of the child topics t_h given parent t_{h-1} . We define it by tree-based stick-breaking construction:

$$\Pr(t_h | t_{h-1}) = \sigma(t_h, i) \prod_{t'_h \in \text{LeftSibling}(t_h)} (1 - \sigma(t'_h, i)), \quad (7)$$

where $h = 1, 2, \dots, H$. $\sigma(t_h, i) \in [0, 1]$ is the similarity between document i and topic t_h , to be explained shortly. $\text{LeftSibling}(t_h)$ contains left siblings of topic t_h . Suppose a parent topic has three children (t_A , t_B , and t_C), the probability of selecting each child topic is respectively $\sigma(t_A, i)$, $\sigma(t_B, i)(1 - \sigma(t_A, i))$, and $(1 - \sigma(t_A, i))(1 - \sigma(t_B, i))$, which are summed to one (Isonuma et al., 2020). A document i with higher similarity to one child topic t_h than its siblings tends to have higher probability of selecting t_h on the path. Starting from the root topic, we repeat this selection process until we reach leaf topic, forming a path with Eq. 6 as path probability. Finally, we calculate Eq. 6 for every path and obtain path distribution $\pi_i = [\Pr(p_1), \Pr(p_2), \dots]$, which is unique to document i , since $\sigma(t_h, i)$ is document-specific.

Hyperbolic doubly recurrent neural network. We now explain similarity $\sigma(t_h, i)$, which is calculated by topic t_h 's and document i 's embeddings, using Hyperbolic Doubly Recurrent Neu-




Figure 2: Illustration of (a) our proposed GTFormer, (b) topic tree embedding, and (c) Hyperbolic Doubly Recurrent Neural Network. Hyperbolic operations are omitted for clarity. Best seen in color.

ral Network (HypDRNN). HypDRNN consists of two Hyperbolic Recurrent Neural Networks (HypRNNs) that respectively model the ancestral (parent-to-children) and fraternal (sibling-to-sibling) tree structure to preserve topic hierarchy. Specifically, a topic t has parent and siblings, thus we first use two HypRNNs to respectively calculate its ancestral hidden state $\mathbf{z}_{t,p}$ and fraternal hidden state $\mathbf{z}_{t,s}$, which are then combined to obtain t 's hyperbolic hidden state \mathbf{z}_t . See Fig. 2(b-c).

We first present topic t 's ancestral (parent-to-children) hidden state. We have feature projection,

$$\mathbf{z}'_{t,p} = \exp_{\mathbf{0}}^K(\mathbf{W}_p \log_{\mathbf{0}}^K(\mathbf{z}_{\text{Parent}(t)})) \in \mathbb{H}^{n,K}. \quad (8)$$

$\mathbf{z}_{\text{Parent}(t)} \in \mathbb{H}^{n,K}$ is hyperbolic hidden state of t 's parent. $\mathbf{W}_p \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+1) \times (n+1)}$ is Euclidean parameter. We project $\mathbf{z}_{\text{Parent}(t)}$ to tangent space for linear projection, whose result is mapped back to hyperbolic space. We use the origin $\mathbf{0} = [\sqrt{K}, 0, \dots, 0] \in \mathbb{H}^{n,K}$ as projection reference point.

For bias addition, we use parallel transport. We initialize a Euclidean bias $\mathbf{b}_p \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and concatenate it with 0, i.e., $\mathbf{b}'_p = [0 || \mathbf{b}_p] \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{0}}\mathbb{H}^{n,K}$. \mathbf{b}'_p is on origin's tangent space, due to $\langle \mathbf{b}'_p, \mathbf{0} \rangle_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$. We then transport \mathbf{b}'_p to the tangent space of $\mathbf{z}'_{t,p}$, whose result is mapped back to hyperbolic space.

$$\mathbf{z}_{t,p} = f_{\tanh}^K \left(\exp_{\mathbf{z}'_{t,p}}^K \left(\text{PT}_{\mathbf{0} \rightarrow \mathbf{z}'_{t,p}}^K(\mathbf{b}'_p) \right) \right) \in \mathbb{H}^{n,K}. \quad (9)$$

Here we use hyperbolic tanh activation $f_{\tanh}^K(\mathbf{x}) = \exp_{\mathbf{0}}^K(\tanh(\log_{\mathbf{0}}^K(\mathbf{x})))$ and $\tanh(x) = \frac{e^x - e^{-x}}{e^x + e^{-x}}$. Summarizing Eqs. 8–9, we have ancestral hidden state $\mathbf{z}_{t,p} = f_{\text{HypRNN}}(\mathbf{z}_{\text{Parent}(t)}; \mathbf{W}_p, \mathbf{b}_p)$. Similarly, fraternal hidden state is $\mathbf{z}_{t,s} = f_{\text{HypRNN}}(\mathbf{z}_{\text{LeftSibling}(t)}; \mathbf{W}_s, \mathbf{b}_s)$. Finally, we obtain topic t 's hyperbolic hidden state \mathbf{z}_t where $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+1) \times (n+1)}$ is Euclidean parameter.

$$\mathbf{z}_t = f_{\tanh}^K \left(\exp_{\mathbf{0}}^K \left(\mathbf{W} (\log_{\mathbf{0}}^K(\mathbf{z}_{t,p}) + \log_{\mathbf{0}}^K(\mathbf{z}_{t,s})) \right) \right) \in \mathbb{H}^{n,K}. \quad (10)$$

Integrating Eqs. 8–10, we have Hyperbolic Doubly Recurrent RNN, $\mathbf{z}_t = f_{\text{HypDRNN}}(\mathbf{z}_{t,p}, \mathbf{z}_{t,s})$, which uses two

Hyperbolic RNNs to model the information flow of ancestral and fraternal tree structure, hence the name of this module. See Fig. 2(c). Hidden state \mathbf{z}_t is also topic t 's hyperbolic topic embedding.

Finally, the similarity $\sigma(t, i)$ is calculated by topic t 's and document i 's hyperbolic embeddings, using Fermi-Dirac function $\sigma(t, i) = [1 + e^{d_{\mathcal{L}}^K(\mathbf{z}_t, \mathbf{d}_i^{(l)})}]^{-1}$. $\mathbf{d}_i^{(l)}$ is document i 's hyperbolic embedding, to be explained shortly.

Level distribution. Having calculated path distribution, we discuss level distribution. A path contains a sequence of topics, each representing a level. Different levels represent different topic specificity. Root topic denotes the most general concept, while leaf topic focuses on specific sub-concept. Specifically, for a document i , its probability at level h is another tree-based stick-breaking process,

$$\delta_h = \sigma(h, i) \prod_{h'=1}^{h-1} (1 - \sigma(h', i)), \quad (11)$$

where $h = 1, 2, \dots, H$. $\sigma(h, i) \in [0, 1]$ is the similarity between level h and document i . A general document presents high probability at root $h = 1$, while a document with specific content falls on bottom $h = H$. We calculate level similarity $\sigma(h, i)$ by a separate Hyperbolic RNN,

$$\mathbf{z}_h = f_{\text{HypRNN}}(\mathbf{z}_{h-1}; \mathbf{W}_H, \mathbf{b}_H) \in \mathbb{H}^{n,K}, \quad (12)$$

$$\sigma(h, i) = [1 + e^{d_{\mathcal{L}}^K(\mathbf{z}_h, \mathbf{d}_i)}]^{-1}.$$

$\mathbf{z}_h \in \mathbb{H}^{n,K}$ is hyperbolic hidden state of level h . $f_{\text{HypRNN}}(\cdot)$ is a separate hyperbolic RNN with hyperbolic tanh activation (Eqs. 8–9). Level similarity $\sigma(h, i)$ is Fermi-Dirac function. For document i , we evaluate its probability of each level and obtain level distribution $\delta_i = [\delta_1, \delta_2, \dots, \delta_H]$.

Having obtained both path and level distributions, we now combine them to derive document i 's topic distribution over topic tree. Specifically, given one path $p = \{t_h\}_{h=1}^H$ and one level h , we already narrow down to one topic t_h with probability $\pi_i(p) \times \delta_i(h)$. Since there are multiple paths

going through topic t_h , the overall topic probability is $\theta_{t_h} = \delta_i(h) \sum_{t_h \in p'} \pi_i(p')$, i.e., the summation of all paths having topic t_h at level h . We repeat this process for every topic and obtain document i 's topic distribution $\theta_i = [\theta_{i,t_1}, \theta_{i,t_2}, \dots, \theta_{i,T}]$ where T is the total number of topics on the tree. Documents with general content present high probability on the root topic θ_{t_1} , while documents focusing on specific content concentrate on leaf topics. Thus, this topic distribution θ_i preserves topic hierarchy.

Hyperbolic tree representation. We use document i 's hierarchical topic distribution θ_i and topic embeddings $\{\mathbf{z}_t\}_{t=1}^T$ to obtain *hierarchical tree embedding* $\mathbf{e}_i \in \mathbb{H}^{n,K}$.

$$\mathbf{e}_i = \exp_{\mathbf{0}}^K \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \theta_{i,t} \log_{\mathbf{0}}^K(\mathbf{z}_t) \right) \in \mathbb{H}^{n,K}. \quad (13)$$

$\mathbf{z}_t \in \mathbb{H}^{n,K}$ is t 's topic embedding. Tree embedding \mathbf{e}_i preserves topic hierarchy and will later be inserted into Transformer.

4.2 Topic and Graph Joint Modeling

We show hierarchical graph embedding and integrate both hierarchies into Transformer (Fig. 2(a)).

Hyperbolic graph representation. We use Hyperbolic Graph Neural Network (Chami et al., 2019) to capture graph hierarchy. For document $\mathbf{d}_i^{(l)}$, we first linearly transform it by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i^{(l)'} = \exp_{\mathbf{0}}^K(\mathbf{W}_g \log_{\mathbf{0}}^K(\mathbf{d}_i^{(l)})) \in \mathbb{H}^{n,K}. \quad (14)$$

We then evaluate its attention w.r.t. its neighbors and aggregate neighbor embeddings by Eq. 15. $\text{softmax}(x) = \frac{e^x}{\sum_{x'} e^{x'}}$. Here $\mathbf{b}_{\text{att}} \in \mathbb{R}^{2(n+1)}$ is Euclidean parameter.

$$\alpha_{ij} = \text{softmax}(\mathbf{b}_{\text{att}}^\top [\log_{\mathbf{0}}^K(\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i^{(l)}) \parallel \log_{\mathbf{0}}^K(\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_j^{(l)})]),$$

$$\mathbf{g}_i^{(l)} = \exp_{\mathbf{0}}^K \left(\frac{1}{2} (\log_{\mathbf{0}}^K(\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i^{(l)}) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \alpha_{ij} \log_{\mathbf{0}}^K(\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_j^{(l)})) \right). \quad (15)$$

After HGNN, we obtain i 's aggregated embedding $\mathbf{g}_i^{(l)}$, preserving its hierarchical graph structure.

Topic- and graph-nested Transformer encoding. We have obtained both hierarchical tree embedding $\mathbf{e}_i^{(l)}$ at Eq. 13 and hierarchical graph embedding $\mathbf{g}_i^{(l)}$ at Eq. 15. Both are calculated by document i 's embedding $\mathbf{d}_i^{(l)}$ from the l -th Transformer layer. Now we aim to insert them into the $(l+1)$ -th Transformer layer for hierarchical encoding. Specifically, we let $\mathbf{H}_i^{(l)} =$

$[\mathbf{H}_{i,\text{CLS}}^{(l)}, \mathbf{H}_{i,w_1}^{(l)}, \mathbf{H}_{i,w_2}^{(l)}, \dots]$ denote the output from the l -th Transformer layer. We concatenate $\mathbf{e}_i^{(l)}$ and $\mathbf{g}_i^{(l)}$ with $\mathbf{H}_i^{(l)}$, i.e., $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_i^{(l)} = [\mathbf{e}_i^{(l)} \parallel \mathbf{g}_i^{(l)} \parallel \mathbf{H}_i^{(l)}]$. After concatenation, $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_i^{(l)}$ contains information of both hierarchical topic tree and hierarchical graph structure. To allow all the tokens in $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_i^{(l)}$ to fully capture both hierarchies, we input it to the next Transformer layer for contextualized modeling.

$$\mathbf{H}_i^{(l+1)} = f_{\text{HypTRM}}(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_i^{(l)}). \quad (16)$$

Here $f_{\text{HypTRM}}(\cdot)$ is a Transformer layer in hyperbolic space. The building blocks of $f_{\text{HypTRM}}(\cdot)$ are mostly the same as existing Transformer (Vaswani et al., 2017), except that the embeddings are hyperbolic and need to be projected between hyperbolic and tangent spaces. To make this paper self-contained, below we briefly present $f_{\text{HypTRM}}(\cdot)$. We input $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_i^{(l)}$ to the $(l+1)$ -th Transformer layer, where $f_{\text{LN}}(\cdot)$ is layer normalization, and $f_{\text{MLP}}(\cdot)$ is multi-layer perceptron (Vaswani et al., 2017).

$$\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_i^{(l)'} = f_{\text{LN}} \left(\log_{\mathbf{0}}^K(\mathbf{H}_i^{(l)}) + \log_{\mathbf{0}}^K(f_{\text{AsymMHA}}(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_i^{(l)})) \right),$$

$$\mathbf{H}_i^{(l+1)} = \exp_{\mathbf{0}}^K \left(f_{\text{LN}}(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_i^{(l)'} + f_{\text{MLP}}(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_i^{(l)'})) \right). \quad (17)$$

We follow (Yang et al., 2021a) and implement an *asymmetric* multi-head attention $f_{\text{AsymMHA}}(\cdot)$, where \mathbf{K} and \mathbf{V} are augmented with hierarchical topic and graph embeddings, while \mathbf{Q} is not.

$$f_{\text{AsymMHA}}(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_i^{(l)}) = \text{softmax} \left(\frac{\log_{\mathbf{0}}^K(\mathbf{Q}) \log_{\mathbf{0}}^K(\mathbf{K}^\top)}{\sqrt{n+1}} \right) \log_{\mathbf{0}}^K(\mathbf{V}),$$

$$\mathbf{Q} = \exp_{\mathbf{0}}^K(\log_{\mathbf{0}}^K(\mathbf{H}_i^{(l)}) \mathbf{W}_Q^{(l)}), \quad \mathbf{K} = \exp_{\mathbf{0}}^K(\log_{\mathbf{0}}^K(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_i^{(l)}) \mathbf{W}_K^{(l)}),$$

$$\mathbf{V} = \exp_{\mathbf{0}}^K(\log_{\mathbf{0}}^K(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_i^{(l)}) \mathbf{W}_V^{(l)}). \quad (18)$$

The output from the $(l+1)$ -th layer $\mathbf{H}_i^{(l+1)}$ preserves both hierarchies. We use [CLS] token to calculate hierarchical tree and graph embeddings for the current layer, which are concatenated and passed to the next layer. We repeat this *layer-wise encoding* for L layers and obtain $\mathbf{d}_i = \mathbf{H}_{i,\text{CLS}}^{(L)} \in \mathbb{H}^{n,K}$, document i 's hierarchical embedding.

4.3 Training Objective

Decoding. Since we preserve both topic and graph hierarchies, we present two decodings. For hierarchical topic decoding, we first use document i 's final-layer embedding \mathbf{d}_i to calculate its topic distribution θ_i by its path and level distributions. As in LDA, we then construct topic-word distribution for each topic t by $\beta_t = \text{softmax}(\mathbf{U} \log_{\mathbf{0}}^K(\mathbf{z}_t)) \in \Delta^{|\mathcal{V}|}$.

Table 1: Dataset statistics.

Name	#Documents	#Links	#Labels
DS	1,703	3,234	9
ML	3,087	8,573	7
PL	2,597	7,754	9
DBLP	239,026	1,071,208	N.A.
COVID	1,500	5,706	5
Web	445,657	565,502	N.A.

Here $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}| \times (n+1)}$ is a matrix of word embeddings, \mathcal{V} is vocabulary. The overall topic-word distribution is $\beta = [\beta_1, \dots, \beta_T] \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}| \times T}$. The reconstructed document is $\hat{\mathbf{d}}_i = \beta \theta_i \in \Delta^{|\mathcal{V}|}$. The topic modeling objective is $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Topic}}$ where $d_{i,w}$ is the word count of word w in document i . For graph decoding, we use contrastive loss in Eq. 19.

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Topic}} = - \sum_{w \in \mathcal{V}} d_{i,w} \log \hat{d}_{i,w},$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Graph}} = - \log \frac{e^{-d_{\mathcal{L}}^K(\mathbf{d}_i, \mathbf{d}_j)^2}}{e^{-d_{\mathcal{L}}^K(\mathbf{d}_i, \mathbf{d}_j)^2} + \sum_{j' \in B} e^{-d_{\mathcal{L}}^K(\mathbf{d}_i, \mathbf{d}_{j'})^2}}. \quad (19)$$

The overall loss is $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{Graph}} + \lambda_{\text{Topic}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{Topic}}$. Hyperparameter λ_{Topic} controls the weight of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Topic}}$.

Supervised version. The above model is *unsupervised*. If we also observe document labels, we design the *supervised* version by adding a classifier $\hat{y}_i = \text{softmax}(f_{\text{MLP}}(\log_0^K(\mathbf{d}_i)))$. The supervised loss is $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Sup}} = - \sum_{y'} y'_i \log \hat{y}'_i$. The overall loss of the supervised version becomes $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{Graph}} + \lambda_{\text{Topic}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{Topic}} + \lambda_{\text{Sup}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{Sup}}$.

Continuously updating topic tree. Different corpora contain documents of different topic hierarchy. To match the unique topic hierarchy of the given corpus, we update topic tree during training. For each topic t , we calculate the proportion of words belonging to it by $s_t = \frac{\sum_{d_i \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}} |d_i| \theta_{i,t}}{\sum_{d_i \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}} |d_i|}$ where $|d_i|$ is the number of words in document i . For a non-leaf topic whose s_t is greater than the adding threshold s_{add} , we add a child topic, since it contains overly much semantics, and we split it into sub-concepts. Reversely, if the summation of topic t and its descendants $\sum_{t' \in \text{Des}(t)} s_{t'}$ is smaller than the pruning threshold s_{prune} , we remove topic t and its descendants, since they contain overly small proportion of semantics, and it is not necessary to keep them. Empirically, we set $s_{\text{add}} = s_{\text{prune}} = 0.05$. We summarize our model with Algorithm 1.

5 Experiments

Datasets. We use six datasets in Table 1. Cora (McCallum et al., 2000) is a citation network with

abstracts as texts and citations as links. We follow (Zhu et al., 2007) and create three independent datasets, **DS**, **ML**, and **PL**. **DBLP** (Tang et al., 2008) is another citation graph. **COVID** (Zhang et al., 2023) is a Coronavirus news corpus with hyperlinks among articles. **Web** (Leskovec et al., 2009) is a Webpage hyperlink network. Appendix C contains dataset preprocessing (Wu et al., 2024d).

Baselines. Since GTFormer is topic model, we mainly compare to topic models. *i) Flat topic models* do not learn any hierarchy, ProLDA (Srivastava and Sutton, 2017), ETM (Dieng et al., 2020), GATON (Yang et al., 2020), GNTM (Shen et al., 2021). *ii) Hierarchical topic models*, nCRP (Griffiths et al., 2003), TSNTM (Isonuma et al., 2020), HTV (Pham and Le, 2021), HyperMiner (Xu et al., 2022), TraCo (Wu et al., 2024e). *iii) Topic models for document graph* capture text and graph, AdjEnc (Zhang and Lauw, 2020), LANTM (Wang et al., 2021), GTNN (Xie et al., 2021), HGTM (Zhang et al., 2023). HGTM has topic and graph hierarchies in a *cascaded* method. *iv) Text-attributed graph models.* Strictly speaking, they are not topic models, nor baselines. For completeness, we still compare to BERT+HGCM, LLaMA2+HGCM (Touvron et al., 2023), Specter (Cohan et al., 2020), LinkBERT (Yasunaga et al., 2022), Patton (Jin et al., 2023a). For BERT+HGCM, we first use BERT to encode each document, then apply HGCM, in a *cascaded* method. *v) Hyperbolic graph transformer* is designed in hyperbolic space. It is not a topic model, either. We still compare to FPS-T (Cho et al., 2023). *vi) Text classification* has label supervision, TextGCN (Yao et al., 2019), HyperGAT (Ding et al., 2020), HINT (Yan et al., 2022), G2P2 (Wen and Fang, 2023). HINT has a topic tree. Besides, we also convert the best unsupervised baselines to their supervised version (TSNTM, HGTM, Patton).

We set $\tau = 10$, $\lambda_{\text{Topic}} = 1$. For the supervised model, $\lambda_{\text{Sup}} = 1$. We initialize topic tree with three levels, each non-leaf topic has three children. We initialize model with scientific parameters (Beltagy et al., 2019) for DS, ML, PL, DBLP, and general ones (Devlin et al., 2019) for others. Experiments are done on an NVIDIA A40 GPU. Each result is obtained by 5 runs. Appendix D has more details.

5.1 Quantitative Evaluation

Document classification. We use document classification for evaluation, as in LDA. We use 80%

Table 2: Unsupervised document classification with Micro F1 and Macro F1 scores (in percentage).

Category	Model	Micro F1				Macro F1			
		DS	ML	PL	COVID	DS	ML	PL	COVID
Flat topic models	ProdLDA	51.4±1.1	65.3±1.0	49.8±2.5	72.7±1.7	40.1±4.3	67.4±1.4	48.4±1.8	73.3±1.7
	ETM	42.2±2.4	46.2±1.2	39.8±0.8	67.2±1.8	31.1±3.4	42.8±1.6	32.1±1.2	67.4±1.7
	GATON	39.7±1.3	61.1±0.7	51.2±1.0	70.5±1.2	29.9±1.8	58.2±0.8	44.6±1.5	70.7±1.1
	GNTM	37.0±1.3	60.2±3.1	50.0±1.9	73.2±2.2	26.4±2.1	56.4±3.4	43.0±1.6	73.2±2.1
Hierarchical topic models	nCRP	27.5±3.3	28.6±1.7	25.2±2.5	41.7±4.4	16.7±2.2	21.6±1.8	16.7±2.5	41.5±4.5
	TSNTM	39.5±3.7	62.0±1.0	47.8±1.3	74.1±3.2	28.9±4.1	58.8±1.0	38.9±1.6	73.9±3.2
	HTV	29.7±2.1	37.3±4.2	29.2±5.4	61.6±4.3	13.7±2.2	32.0±4.1	21.3±4.7	61.9±4.7
	HyperMiner	41.3±1.3	53.4±0.1	45.3±0.4	50.2±4.5	30.1±1.9	43.9±2.5	38.6±1.4	48.6±2.9
Topic models for document graph	TraCo	46.7±2.1	64.4±4.2	47.5±2.0	60.4±3.8	36.7±1.9	61.2±5.3	38.6±2.1	61.3±3.4
	AdjEnc	58.8±1.2	72.5±1.1	61.2±1.0	74.8±2.4	54.6±1.5	68.3±1.0	49.3±0.6	69.8±2.3
	LANTM	56.8±2.4	72.2±0.7	61.7±1.1	80.3±1.7	54.7±0.8	68.6±1.0	54.6±1.2	80.2±1.7
	GTNN	52.9±1.4	68.1±0.7	58.8±1.2	70.9±1.0	42.8±3.3	64.7±1.3	52.4±1.3	70.8±0.9
Text-attributed graph models	HGTM	65.6±1.5	82.1±0.9	68.3±0.5	81.6±0.5	62.3±1.6	80.1±0.9	62.6±1.7	81.2±0.6
	BERT+HGCM	62.5±1.4	78.9±0.9	62.7±1.5	75.5±1.3	58.6±1.3	77.0±1.1	57.0±1.3	75.1±1.6
	LLaMA2+HGCM	67.3±1.6	83.0±0.5	65.8±1.1	81.3±0.3	64.4±1.2	80.9±0.6	59.4±1.9	81.0±0.6
	Specter	63.1±0.1	77.2±0.8	63.7±1.6	80.3±1.5	59.5±1.2	75.2±0.8	59.3±1.9	80.0±1.7
Hyperbolic graph transformer	LinkBERT	47.5±2.2	61.5±3.2	47.9±0.4	72.0±1.2	40.0±2.7	59.9±3.8	39.6±0.1	76.1±0.6
	Patton	65.1±1.8	82.4±1.0	70.0±1.6	78.6±1.5	60.0±2.4	80.4±1.1	65.5±1.9	77.9±1.7
	FPS-T	60.9±2.7	74.7±2.6	67.2±3.9	76.0±2.4	53.4±4.7	73.4±3.0	63.0±3.2	75.7±2.4
Our proposed model (<i>unsupervised</i>)	GTFormer	69.1±0.6	84.5±0.9	70.9±2.4	82.3±1.1	65.8±0.8	82.8±1.0	65.8±2.1	82.2±1.1

Table 3: Supervised document classification with Micro F1 and Macro F1 scores (in percentage).

Category	Model	Micro F1				Macro F1			
		DS	ML	PL	COVID	DS	ML	PL	COVID
Supervised version	TSNTM	54.9±2.1	72.8±1.5	63.3±0.5	84.1±1.3	50.8±2.4	68.6±1.3	56.1±0.8	84.0±1.2
	HGTM	68.2±0.8	83.8±0.5	72.2±1.4	86.3±1.7	63.9±1.5	82.6±0.7	67.4±2.0	86.2±1.9
	Patton	67.8±3.5	84.1±2.4	73.5±0.5	81.5±1.2	62.9±3.0	83.2±2.3	69.5±1.7	80.8±1.6
Text classification models	TextGCN	66.8±1.0	78.3±0.7	67.5±0.7	83.7±0.5	61.6±0.4	76.0±0.8	61.4±1.1	79.6±0.5
	HyperGAT	70.2±0.4	80.0±0.4	65.8±2.5	84.3±1.2	65.4±0.9	78.9±0.5	60.2±2.5	81.3±0.8
	HINT	45.7±3.5	69.5±1.1	55.4±2.3	85.7±1.5	42.1±2.6	64.8±3.9	44.3±3.2	85.8±1.5
	G2P2	58.0±2.2	71.7±3.2	65.3±0.4	77.5±1.2	51.1±2.7	68.7±3.8	61.1±0.1	75.6±0.6
Our proposed model (<i>supervised</i>)	GTFormer	72.2±1.1	86.5±0.5	74.5±1.1	85.3±1.0	69.3±2.0	85.1±0.7	71.4±1.0	86.2±1.1

Table 4: Topic coherence NPMI (left, in percentage) and perplexity (right).

Model	Topic Coherence NPMI (higher is better)						Perplexity (lower is better)					
	DS	ML	PL	COVID	DBLP	Web	DS	ML	PL	COVID	DBLP	Web
ProdLDA	10.5±0.3	10.9±0.7	12.1±0.7	12.0±0.7	9.9±0.6	21.2±0.2	7.97±0.00	7.99±0.00	7.92±0.00	7.82±0.00	8.18±0.00	8.34±0.00
ETM	7.3±0.2	7.1±0.2	8.7±0.1	8.2±0.7	9.5±0.5	16.4±0.6	7.92±0.00	7.96±0.00	7.94±0.00	7.80±0.00	8.66±0.00	8.52±0.00
GATON	12.2±0.2	17.4±1.0	5.4±1.1	13.8±1.2	7.2±0.8	4.8±1.1	8.83±0.07	8.37±0.02	8.38±0.03	8.42±0.00	8.35±0.00	8.33±0.00
GNTM	11.6±0.5	12.1±0.3	15.4±0.7	13.8±0.8	15.2±0.2	23.8±0.3	7.18±0.01	6.91±0.01	6.83±0.01	7.69±0.01	7.52±0.00	7.79±0.00
nCRP	2.6±0.4	2.2±0.1	2.2±0.1	3.0±0.1	2.8±0.3	2.8±0.0	6.91±0.05	6.94±0.02	6.87±0.02	7.69±0.05	8.00±0.02	7.71±0.04
TSNTM	11.5±0.9	12.1±0.6	15.1±0.8	14.1±0.8	15.1±1.0	26.6±2.3	7.75±0.02	6.92±0.01	6.83±0.01	7.64±0.04	7.68±0.01	7.35±0.03
HTV	11.2±1.2	10.8±1.0	13.3±1.8	16.6±2.5	12.1±0.6	26.5±0.9	7.78±0.03	6.95±0.02	6.83±0.03	7.62±0.04	7.53±0.01	7.44±0.01
HyperMiner	12.9±0.2	15.9±0.2	20.0±1.5	9.9±0.8	17.3±0.3	15.3±0.5	7.86±0.23	7.73±0.19	7.69±0.20	8.04±0.22	9.65±0.02	8.54±0.01
TraCo	11.0±0.3	11.5±0.2	11.2±0.3	12.7±0.5	15.4±0.4	18.6±0.2	7.83±0.08	7.69±0.01	7.65±0.01	8.04±0.02	8.64±0.00	7.67±0.01
AdjEnc	12.0±0.2	9.9±0.9	11.3±0.9	13.8±0.4	9.2±0.2	15.2±0.1	8.06±0.02	7.65±0.05	7.62±0.04	6.96±0.00	8.71±0.02	8.26±0.01
LANTM	6.4±0.5	5.4±0.3	7.2±0.8	8.6±0.3	N.A.	N.A.	7.58±0.03	8.63±0.00	8.48±0.00	8.48±0.00	N.A.	N.A.
GTNN	9.9±1.5	7.2±0.6	5.8±0.6	13.5±2.7	8.3±0.5	7.9±1.6	7.77±0.04	7.75±0.02	7.73±0.01	7.96±0.00	9.39±0.01	8.26±0.01
HGTM	17.1±1.4	19.0±2.6	21.9±2.8	23.3±3.1	18.5±1.2	25.0±1.7	7.46±0.03	6.89±0.02	6.81±0.00	7.60±0.01	7.77±0.02	7.71±0.01
HINT	9.3±1.3	6.6±2.2	8.6±2.4	11.6±3.0	N.A.	N.A.	8.04±0.07	8.45±0.08	8.51±0.28	8.84±0.12	N.A.	N.A.
GTFormer	19.1±1.2	20.6±0.4	23.2±1.5	24.0±1.3	20.2±1.0	26.2±0.8	7.40±0.03	6.82±0.04	6.68±0.04	6.79±0.03	7.49±0.00	7.58±0.00

documents and links within them for training (of which 10% are for validation). We infer test document embeddings and classify them.

Unsupervised training does not involve labels and $\lambda_{\text{Sup}} = 0$. We use κNN ($\kappa = 5$) as classifier. We report Micro and Macro F1 scores at Table 2.

Supervised training uses labels for training. We convert the best baselines to the supervised version by adding classifier $f_{\text{MLP}}(\cdot)$. Table 3 shows results.

HGTM achieves better accuracy than other topic models, due to its modeling of both hierarchies. Our model is better than HGTM, since we capture both hierarchies in a nested manner and better integrate them into representations.

Topic coherence. To evaluate if keywords of each topic coherently reflect the same meaning, we follow ProdLDA and use Google Web 1T 5-gram Version 1 (Evert, 2010) as external corpus to evaluate their NPMI score. Only topic models produce topic interpretability and can be evaluated, thus others are excluded. Table 4(left) shows that HGTM has higher results than other baselines, due to its topic and graph hierarchies. We unify both hierarchies in a nested way and improve NPMI.

Perplexity. As in LDA, we report perplexity of test documents. Since perplexity, $e^{-\frac{\log \Pr(D_{\text{test}})}{\sum_{d \in D_{\text{test}}} |d|}}$, varies much w.r.t. its power, we report its power

Table 5: Link prediction with AUC score (in percentage).

Category	Model	Link prediction AUC					
		DS	ML	PL	COVID	DBLP	Web
Flat topic models	ProdLDA	76.8±0.5	82.5±0.2	78.9±0.4	80.1±0.8	92.6±0.1	82.4±0.0
	ETM	71.0±1.3	70.3±1.6	72.5±1.1	87.2±0.9	70.3±1.2	79.4±0.0
	GATON	76.0±0.6	75.9±1.5	64.5±0.5	70.2±1.2	82.6±0.8	87.6±0.1
	GNTM	77.0±0.9	79.3±0.8	73.2±0.3	76.8±0.4	93.7±0.0	86.3±0.0
Hierarchical topic models	nCRP	62.2±3.3	58.0±0.9	60.1±3.1	70.8±0.8	56.3±1.1	57.2±0.0
	TSNTM	72.7±1.9	77.8±1.5	75.5±0.9	70.8±0.8	84.6±0.8	87.4±0.8
	HTV	66.2±2.5	69.9±1.9	68.3±4.6	86.0±2.0	84.9±1.0	86.1±0.8
	HyperMiner	64.0±1.0	63.7±1.3	62.5±2.6	71.5±2.0	75.1±2.8	78.2±1.3
	TraCo	72.5±0.5	75.0±3.1	70.0±1.6	76.4±0.9	87.3±1.2	87.5±1.1
Topic models for document graph (LANTM cannot run on large data DBLP and Web)	AdjEnc	81.7±0.4	81.0±1.1	80.8±1.7	79.8±0.6	95.5±0.0	73.2±0.0
	LANTM	78.4±0.6	78.7±0.7	82.2±0.3	93.6±0.3	N.A.	N.A.
	GTNN	71.5±1.1	76.6±0.9	73.7±1.2	84.3±1.0	95.3±0.4	74.3±0.2
	HGTM	94.5±0.3	89.9±0.8	91.3±0.3	95.7±0.2	96.6±0.3	91.3±0.1
Text-attributed graph models	BERT+HGCN	93.6±0.4	91.9±0.7	91.0±0.8	91.5±0.2	97.5±0.1	90.2±0.0
	LLaMA2+HGCN	94.2±0.2	92.5±0.5	92.2±0.8	92.2±0.3	97.1±0.0	91.5±0.0
	Specter	90.0±1.3	88.1±0.8	87.6±0.8	87.2±1.0	97.1±0.2	86.3±0.2
	LinkBERT	66.9±2.1	71.2±1.5	66.3±0.7	74.9±1.2	75.3±0.8	70.4±0.5
	Patton	93.7±1.6	92.1±0.7	92.2±0.5	91.9±1.3	97.6±0.1	87.5±0.2
Hyperbolic transformer (cannot run on large data)	FPS-T	92.4±2.1	90.1±1.8	91.6±0.7	89.1±1.6	N.A.	N.A.
Text classification models (cannot run on DBLP and Web with no labels)	TextGCN	83.2±0.4	76.5±0.5	68.2±0.4	87.1±0.4	N.A.	N.A.
	HyperGAT	84.5±0.2	82.0±0.8	77.5±1.0	87.1±0.4	N.A.	N.A.
	HINT	72.6±2.1	71.7±1.4	69.7±1.4	86.6±0.2	N.A.	N.A.
	G2P2	84.5±0.7	82.9±1.0	83.3±0.1	85.0±1.3	N.A.	N.A.
Our proposed model	GTFormer	95.6±0.4	93.4±0.5	93.4±0.6	93.2±0.7	98.1±0.2	91.4±0.1




Figure 3: Ablation analysis of our model. Best seen in color.

at Table 4. Lower is better. We model both hierarchies to differentiate documents, thus outperform baselines, except on Web where TSNTM is slightly better, because the text is more informative than its graph. But we are still better than it on other tasks.

Link prediction. We predict links within 20% test documents. We evaluate the probability of a link for Euclidean models by $\Pr(e_{ij}) \propto e^{-\|\mathbf{d}_i - \mathbf{d}_j\|^2}$, and for hyperbolic models by $\Pr(e_{ij}) \propto e^{-d_{\mathcal{L}}^K(\mathbf{d}_i, \mathbf{d}_j)^2}$. We report AUC at Table 5. Among baselines, HGTM predicts links more accurately than others, since it models both topic and graph hierarchies. We achieve better results than it, due to nested modeling.

See Appendix E for topic visualization.

5.2 Model Analysis

Topic tree structure. We design two settings: *i*) replacing hierarchical tree with flat topics; *ii*) fixing the tree structure during learning. Fig. 3(a) shows that a flat structure decreases the result, since a hierarchical tree captures topic hierarchy to improve the result. A fixed tree decreases the result, since

the pre-defined tree is not suitable for the corpus.

Topic and graph hierarchies. We respectively remove each hierarchy from the model in Fig. 3(b). The model with both hierarchies performs the best. The ablated models drop the result. This observation verifies that both hierarchies are useful.

Hyperbolic modeling. We replace all hyperbolic operations with their Euclidean ones in Fig. 3(c). Hyperbolic space is helpful to better preserve hierarchy and improve result than Euclidean space.

Different λ_{Topic} . We vary λ_{Topic} in Fig. 3(d). For classification, an appropriate value maintains result, while a high value hurts result, since a high value influences graph loss. For topic coherence, gradually increasing λ_{Topic} improves NPMI, while a high value hurts the result. Taking the balance, we set $\lambda_{\text{Topic}} = 1$.

6 Conclusion

We design GTFormer, a topic model with topic and graph hierarchies. We design Hyperbolic Doubly RNN for tree embedding. Topic and graph hierarchies are inserted in Transformer.

Limitations

Here we identify two limitations in terms of training corpus and language.

Training corpus. We assume the corpus is truthful. If it has fake news, they may appear in the topics, causing potential negative impact. To mitigate it, we could use fake news detection model to remove fake documents, then apply our model on the remaining truthful documents.

Language. Corpora used in this paper mainly consist of English vocabulary. The language models are also mostly trained on English-based corpora. Since our model is corpus-agnostic, extracting multilingual information may be feasible with an appropriate corpus.

Ethics Statement

We do not foresee any undesired implications stemming from our work. Conversely, we hope that our work can advance AI Ethics research.

References

- David Alvarez-Melis and Tommi S Jaakkola. 2022. Tree-structured decoding with doubly-recurrent neural networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Gregor Bachmann, Gary Bécigneul, and Octavian Ganea. 2020. Constant curvature graph convolutional networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 486–496. PMLR.
- Haoli Bai, Zhuangbin Chen, Michael R Lyu, Irwin King, and Zenglin Xu. 2018. Neural relational topic models for scientific article analysis. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pages 27–36.
- Iz Beltagy, Kyle Lo, and Arman Cohan. 2019. Scibert: A pretrained language model for scientific text. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3615–3620.
- David M Blei, Andrew Y Ng, and Michael I Jordan. 2003. Latent dirichlet allocation. *the Journal of machine Learning research*, 3:993–1022.
- Ines Chami, Zhitao Ying, Christopher Ré, and Jure Leskovec. 2019. Hyperbolic graph convolutional neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32.
- Jonathan Chang and David Blei. 2009. Relational topic models for document networks. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 81–88. PMLR.
- Ziye Chen, Cheng Ding, Yanghui Rao, Haoran Xie, Xiaohui Tao, Gary Cheng, and Fu Lee Wang. 2021. Hierarchical neural topic modeling with manifold regularization. *World Wide Web*, 24:2139–2160.
- Sungjun Cho, Seunghyuk Cho, Sungwoo Park, Han-kook Lee, Honglak Lee, and Moontae Lee. 2023. Curve your attention: Mixed-curvature transformers for graph representation learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.04082*.
- Arman Cohan, Sergey Feldman, Iz Beltagy, Doug Downey, and Daniel S Weld. 2020. Specter: Document-level representation learning using citation-informed transformers. In *58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2020*, pages 2270–2282. Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL).
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Adji B Dieng, Francisco JR Ruiz, and David M Blei. 2020. Topic modeling in embedding spaces. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:439–453.
- Kaize Ding, Jianling Wang, Jundong Li, Dingcheng Li, and Huan Liu. 2020. Be more with less: Hypergraph attention networks for inductive text classification. In *Proceedings of the 2020 EMNLP*, pages 4927–4936.
- Zhibin Duan, Dongsheng Wang, Bo Chen, Chaojie Wang, Wenchao Chen, Yewen Li, Jie Ren, and Mingyuan Zhou. 2021. Sawtooth factorial topic embeddings guided gamma belief network. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2903–2913. PMLR.
- Stefan Evert. 2010. Google web 1t 5-grams made easy (but not for the computer). In *Proceedings of the NAACL HLT 2010 Sixth Web as Corpus Workshop*, pages 32–40.
- Zhe Gan, Changyou Chen, Ricardo Henao, David Carlson, and Lawrence Carin. 2015. Scalable deep poisson factor analysis for topic modeling. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1823–1832. PMLR.
- Thomas Griffiths, Michael Jordan, Joshua Tenenbaum, and David Blei. 2003. Hierarchical topic models and the nested chinese restaurant process. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 16.
- Maarten Grootendorst. 2022. Bertopic: Neural topic modeling with a class-based tf-idf procedure. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.05794*.
- Will Hamilton, Zhitao Ying, and Jure Leskovec. 2017. Inductive representation learning on large graphs. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.

- Xiaoxin He, Xavier Bresson, Thomas Laurent, Adam Perold, Yann LeCun, and Bryan Hooi. 2023. Harnessing explanations: Llm-to-llm interpreter for enhanced text-attributed graph representation learning. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Masaru Isonuma, Junichiro Mori, Danushka Bollegala, and Ichiro Sakata. 2020. Tree-structured neural topic model. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 800–806.
- Bowen Jin, Wentao Zhang, Yu Zhang, Yu Meng, Xinyang Zhang, Qi Zhu, and Jiawei Han. 2023a. Patton: Language model pretraining on text-rich networks. In *61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2023*, pages 7005–7020. Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL).
- Bowen Jin, Yu Zhang, Yu Meng, and Jiawei Han. 2022. Edgeformers: Graph-empowered transformers for representation learning on textual-edge networks. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Bowen Jin, Yu Zhang, Qi Zhu, and Jiawei Han. 2023b. Heterformer: Transformer-based deep node representation learning on heterogeneous text-rich networks. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 1020–1031.
- Thomas N Kipf and Max Welling. 2016. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.02907*.
- Jure Leskovec, Lars Backstrom, and Jon Kleinberg. 2009. Meme-tracking and the dynamics of the news cycle. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 497–506.
- Wei Li and Andrew McCallum. 2006. Pachinko allocation: Dag-structured mixture models of topic correlations. In *Proceedings of the 23rd international conference on Machine learning*, pages 577–584.
- Qi Liu, Maximilian Nickel, and Douwe Kiela. 2019. Hyperbolic graph neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32.
- Andrew Kachites McCallum, Kamal Nigam, Jason Rennie, and Kristie Seymore. 2000. Automating the construction of internet portals with machine learning. *Information Retrieval*, 3(2):127–163.
- Yishu Miao, Lei Yu, and Phil Blunsom. 2016. Neural variational inference for text processing. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1727–1736. PMLR.
- Thong Thanh Nguyen, Xiaobao Wu, Xinshuai Dong, Cong-Duy T Nguyen, See-Kiong Ng, and Anh Tuan Luu. 2024. Topic modeling as multi-objective contrastive optimization. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Maximilian Nickel and Douwe Kiela. 2017. Poincaré embeddings for learning hierarchical representations. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Maximilian Nickel and Douwe Kiela. 2018. Learning continuous hierarchies in the lorentz model of hyperbolic geometry. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 3779–3788. PMLR.
- John Paisley, Chong Wang, David M Blei, and Michael I Jordan. 2014. Nested hierarchical dirichlet processes. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 37(2):256–270.
- Chau Minh Pham, Alexander Hoyle, Simeng Sun, and Mohit Iyyer. 2023. Topicgpt: A prompt-based topic modeling framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.01449*.
- Dang Pham and Tuan Le. 2021. Neural topic models for hierarchical topic detection and visualization. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, pages 35–51. Springer.
- Simra Shahid, Tanay Anand, Nikitha Srikanth, Sumit Bhatia, Balaji Krishnamurthy, and Nikaash Puri. 2023. Hyhtm: Hyperbolic geometry-based hierarchical topic model. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 11672–11688.
- Dazhong Shen, Chuan Qin, Chao Wang, Zheng Dong, Hengshu Zhu, and Hui Xiong. 2021. Topic modeling revisited: A document graph-based neural network perspective. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:14681–14693.
- Akash Srivastava and Charles Sutton. 2017. Autoencoding variational inference for topic models. In *5th International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Jie Tang, Jing Zhang, Limin Yao, Juanzi Li, Li Zhang, and Zhong Su. 2008. Arnetminer: extraction and mining of academic social networks. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 990–998.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.
- Laurens Van der Maaten and Geoffrey Hinton. 2008. Visualizing data using t-sne. *Journal of machine learning research*, 9(11).

- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Petar Veličković, Guillem Cucurull, Arantxa Casanova, Adriana Romero, Pietro Liò, and Yoshua Bengio. 2018. Graph attention networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Yiming Wang, Ximing Li, and Jihong Ouyang. 2021. Layer-assisted neural topic modeling over document networks. In *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 3148–3154.
- Zhengjue Wang, Chaojie Wang, Hao Zhang, Zhibin Duan, Mingyuan Zhou, and Bo Chen. 2020. Learning dynamic hierarchical topic graph with graph convolutional network for document classification. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 3959–3969. PMLR.
- Zhihao Wen and Yuan Fang. 2023. Augmenting low-resource text classification with graph-grounded pre-training and prompting. In *Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 506–516.
- Xiaobao Wu. 2024. *Towards effective neural topic modeling*. Ph.D. thesis, Nanyang Technological University.
- Xiaobao Wu, Xinshuai Dong, Thong Nguyen, Chaoqun Liu, Liang-Ming Pan, and Anh Tuan Luu. 2023a. Infocm: A mutual information maximization perspective of cross-lingual topic modeling. In *Proceedings of the AAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pages 13763–13771.
- Xiaobao Wu, Xinshuai Dong, Thong Nguyen, and Anh Tuan Luu. 2023b. Effective neural topic modeling with embedding clustering regularization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR.
- Xiaobao Wu, Xinshuai Dong, Liangming Pan, Thong Nguyen, and Anh Tuan Luu. 2024a. Modeling dynamic topics in chain-free fashion by evolution-tracking contrastive learning and unassociated word exclusion. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xiaobao Wu and Chunping Li. 2019. Short Text Topic Modeling with Flexible Word Patterns. In *International Joint Conference on Neural Networks*.
- Xiaobao Wu, Chunping Li, and Yishu Miao. 2021. Discovering topics in long-tailed corpora with causal intervention. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 175–185, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xiaobao Wu, Chunping Li, Yan Zhu, and Yishu Miao. 2020a. Learning Multilingual Topics with Neural Variational Inference. In *International Conference on Natural Language Processing and Chinese Computing*.
- Xiaobao Wu, Chunping Li, Yan Zhu, and Yishu Miao. 2020b. Short text topic modeling with topic distribution quantization and negative sampling decoder. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1772–1782, Online.
- Xiaobao Wu, Anh Tuan Luu, and Xinshuai Dong. 2022. Mitigating data sparsity for short text topic modeling by topic-semantic contrastive learning. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2748–2760, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xiaobao Wu, Thong Nguyen, and Anh Tuan Luu. 2024b. A survey on neural topic models: Methods, applications, and challenges. *Artificial Intelligence Review*.
- Xiaobao Wu, Thong Thanh Nguyen, Delvin Ce Zhang, William Yang Wang, and Anh Tuan Luu. 2024c. Fastopic: Pretrained transformer is a fast, adaptive, stable, and transferable topic model. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Xiaobao Wu, Fengjun Pan, and Anh Tuan Luu. 2024d. Towards the TopMost: A topic modeling system toolkit. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 3: System Demonstrations)*, pages 31–41, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xiaobao Wu, Fengjun Pan, Thong Nguyen, Yichao Feng, Chaoqun Liu, Cong-Duy Nguyen, and Anh Tuan Luu. 2024e. On the affinity, rationality, and diversity of hierarchical topic modeling. In *Proceedings of the AAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 19261–19269.
- Qianqian Xie, Jimin Huang, Pan Du, Min Peng, and Jian-Yun Nie. 2021. Graph topic neural network for document representation. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021*, pages 3055–3065.
- Yi Xu, Dongsheng Wang, Bo Chen, Ruiying Lu, Zhibin Duan, Mingyuan Zhou, et al. 2022. Hyperminer: Topic taxonomy mining with hyperbolic embedding. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:31557–31570.
- Hanqi Yan, Lin Gui, and Yulan He. 2022. Hierarchical interpretation of neural text classification. *Computational Linguistics*, 48(4):987–1020.
- Junhan Yang, Zheng Liu, Shitao Xiao, Chaozhuo Li, Defu Lian, Sanjay Agrawal, Amit Singh,

- Guangzhong Sun, and Xing Xie. 2021a. Graphformers: Gnn-nested transformers for representation learning on textual graph. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:28798–28810.
- Liang Yang, Fan Wu, Junhua Gu, Chuan Wang, Xiaochun Cao, Di Jin, and Yuanfang Guo. 2020. Graph attention topic modeling network. In *Proceedings of The Web Conference 2020*, pages 144–154.
- Menglin Yang, Min Zhou, Marcus Kalander, Zengfeng Huang, and Irwin King. 2021b. Discrete-time temporal network embedding via implicit hierarchical learning in hyperbolic space. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pages 1975–1985.
- Liang Yao, Chengsheng Mao, and Yuan Luo. 2019. Graph convolutional networks for text classification. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 33, pages 7370–7377.
- Michihiro Yasunaga, Jure Leskovec, and Percy Liang. 2022. Linkbert: Pretraining language models with document links. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8003–8016.
- Ce Zhang and Hady W Lauw. 2020. Topic modeling on document networks with adjacent-encoder. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pages 6737–6745.
- Delvin Ce Zhang, Rex Ying, and Hady W Lauw. 2023. Hyperbolic graph topic modeling network with continuously updated topic tree. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 3206–3216.
- Yiding Zhang, Xiao Wang, Chuan Shi, Xunqiang Jiang, and Yanfang Ye. 2021. Hyperbolic graph attention network. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data*, 8(6):1690–1701.
- He Zhao, Lan Du, Wray Buntine, and Mingyuan Zhou. 2018a. Dirichlet belief networks for topic structure learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31.
- He Zhao, Lan Du, Wray Buntine, and Mingyuan Zhou. 2018b. Inter and intra topic structure learning with word embeddings. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5892–5901. PMLR.
- Mingyuan Zhou, Yulai Cong, and Bo Chen. 2016. Augmentable gamma belief networks. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(1):5656–5699.
- Shenghuo Zhu, Kai Yu, Yun Chi, and Yihong Gong. 2007. Combining content and link for classification using matrix factorization. In *Proceedings of the 30th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*, pages 487–494.

A Summary of Mathematical Notations

We summarize the main mathematical notations used in the main paper in Table 6.

B Learning Algorithm

We summarize the learning process of our model and formulate it in Algorithm 1. Code and datasets are submitted as supplementary materials. We will release them upon publication.

C Dataset Preprocessing

Here we introduce dataset preprocessing. We will release code and datasets upon publication.

Cora (McCallum et al., 2000) is a paper citation graph where each document is an academic paper with abstract, and each graph edge is a citation between two documents. We follow (Zhu et al., 2007) and created three independent datasets, Data Structure (DS), Machine Learning (ML), and Programming Language (PL).

DBLP (Tang et al., 2008) is another academic paper citation graph. We used *DBLP-Citation-network V4* version¹. We removed documents with no words and documents with no citations. After removal, we obtain 239,026 documents and 1,071,208 citation links.

COVID is a Coronavirus news corpus available online², collected from multiple publishers. Each document is a news article and has a category for the content of the article. We selected five categories, *economy, business, and finance, education, health, labour, and sports*. For each category, we randomly selected 300 news articles, resulting in a corpus of 1,500 articles in total. Since we did not observe graph edges connecting these articles, we compared documents’ *tf-idf* similarity and induced edges by κ NN ($\kappa = 5$), resulting in 5,706 links in total.

Web is a Webpage hyperlink graph publicly available online³. Each Webpage is a news article containing the most frequent phrases and quotes. Each page has hyperlinks to other related pages. The Webpages in this dataset were published between August 2008 through April 2009. We collected Webpages published between August 2008 through December 2008. For each Webpage, we used Breadth First Search algorithm to collect its

¹<https://www.aminer.org/citation>

²<https://aylien.com/coronavirus-news-dataset/>

³<https://snap.stanford.edu/data/memetracker9.html>

Table 6: Summary of main mathematical notations.

Notation	Description
\mathcal{G}	a document graph
\mathcal{D}	a corpus of documents, $\mathcal{D} = \{d_i\}_{i=1}^N$
N	number of documents in the corpus, $N = \mathcal{D} $
d_i	document i containing a sequence of words, $d_i = \{w_{i,v}\}_{v=1}^{ d_i } \subset \mathcal{V}$
\mathcal{V}	vocabulary
$ d_i $	number of words in document i
\mathcal{E}	a set of graph edges connecting documents, $\mathcal{E} = \{e_{ij}\}$
$\mathcal{N}(i)$	the neighbor set of document i
$\mathbb{H}^{n,K}$	Hyperboloid model with dimension n and curvature $-1/K$
$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbb{H}^{n,K}$	tangent (Euclidean) space around hyperbolic vector $x \in \mathbb{H}^{n,K}$
$\exp_{\mathbf{x}}^K(\mathbf{v})$	exponential map, projecting tangent vector \mathbf{v} to hyperbolic space
$\log_{\mathbf{x}}^K(\mathbf{y})$	logarithmic map, projecting hyperbolic vector \mathbf{y} to \mathbf{x} 's tangent space
$d_C^K(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$	hyperbolic distance between hyperbolic vectors \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y}
$\text{PT}_{\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \mathbf{y}}^K(\mathbf{v})$	parallel transport, transporting \mathbf{v} from \mathbf{x} 's tangent space to \mathbf{y} 's
H	length of a path on topic tree
$\sigma(t, i)$	similarity between topic t and document i
$\boldsymbol{\pi}_i$	path distribution of document i over topic tree
$\mathbf{z}_{t,p}$	hyperbolic ancestral hidden state of topic t
$\mathbf{z}_{t,s}$	hyperbolic fraternal hidden state of topic t
\mathbf{z}_t	hyperbolic hidden state of topic t
$\sigma(h, i)$	similarity between topic t and document i
\mathbf{z}_h	hyperbolic hidden state of level h
$\boldsymbol{\delta}_i$	level distribution of document i over topic tree
$\boldsymbol{\theta}_i$	topic distribution of document i over topic tree
\mathbf{e}_i	hierarchical tree embedding of document i
T	number of topics on topic tree
\mathbf{g}_i	hierarchical graph embedding of document i
\mathbf{U}	a matrix of word embeddings, $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{ \mathcal{V} \times (n+1)}$
$\boldsymbol{\beta}$	topic-word distribution $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times \mathcal{V} }$

neighbors. We remove pages with less than 30 words, resulting in 445,657 documents and 565,505 hyperlinks in total. We did not observe any ground-truth categories of these documents.

D Implementation Environment

Here we introduce the detailed implementation details and environment for reproducibility purpose. For our model, we choose hyperparameters based on the performance on validation set (Document classification task in the main paper explains how we split validation set). The results in the main paper are obtain by 5 independent runs. The standard deviations reported in the main paper are 1-sigma error bars and are obtained by calling its corresponding function in Excel library. All the experiments were done on Linux server with an

NVIDIA A40 GPU with 46,068 MiB. Its operating system is CentOS Linux 7 (Core). We implemented our proposed model GTFormer using Python 3.10 as programming language and PyTorch 2.0.0 as deep learning library. Other frameworks include NumPy 1.23.1, sklearn 0.23.2, and scipy 1.5.2. We emphasize that the main focus of our model is effectiveness, instead of running efficiency. But for completeness, we still make a short comment on execution time. Our model is efficient, on the largest dataset Web, the training takes less than 40 hours to converge. We will release code and datasets upon publication.

E Qualitative Topic Analysis

In the main paper, we mainly present quantitative topic analysis, including topic coherence and per-

Algorithm 1 Training Process of GTFormer

Input: A document graph \mathcal{G} with documents \mathcal{D} and graph edges \mathcal{E} , a predefined topic tree structure, hyperparameters λ_{HTM} , τ , and λ_{sup} .

Output: Document embeddings $\{\mathbf{h}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ and topic-word distribution β .

- 1: Initialize model parameters.
 - 2: **while** not converged **do**
 - 3: **for** document $i \in \mathcal{D}$ **do**
 - 4: Feature initialization and obtain hyperbolic embedding $\mathbf{H}_i^{(l=0)}$.
 // Get the initial hyperbolic token embeddings
 - 5: Pass to one hyperbolic Transformer layer and obtain $\mathbf{H}_i^{(l=1)} = f_{\text{HypTRM}}(\mathbf{H}_i^{(l=0)})$.
 // (L - 1) topic- and graph-Transformer layers
 - 6: **for** $l = 2, \dots, L$ **do**
 - 7: Obtain document embedding $\mathbf{d}_i^{(l)} = \mathbf{H}_{i, \text{CLS}}^{(l)}$.
 - 8: Use Hyperbolic Doubly RNN to obtain hyperbolic topic embeddings $\{\mathbf{z}_t\}_{t=1}^T$.
 - 9: Evaluate path distribution $\pi_i^{(l)}$ and level distribution $\delta_i^{(l)}$ using document embedding $\mathbf{d}_i^{(l)}$ and topic embeddings $\{\mathbf{z}_t\}_{t=1}^T$.
 // Hierarchical tree embedding
 - 10: Obtain hierarchical tree embedding $\mathbf{e}_i^{(l)}$.
 // Capture graph hierarchy by HGNNs
 - 11: Obtain hierarchical graph embedding $\mathbf{g}_i^{(l)}$.
 // Insert both hierarchies into Transformer
 - 12: Obtain the output from the l -th hyperbolic Transformer layer $\mathbf{H}_i^{(l+1)} = f_{\text{HypTRM}}([\mathbf{e}_i^{(l)} || \mathbf{g}_i^{(l)} || \mathbf{H}_i^{(l)}])$.
 - 13: **end for**
 - 14: **end for**
 // Optimization
 - 15: Minimize objective function \mathcal{L} with Adam optimizer.
 // Update topic tree structure
 - 16: Update topic tree based on adding threshold λ_{add} and pruning threshold λ_{prune} .
 - 17: **end while**
-

plexity results. Here we further provide qualitative topic analysis as a case study.

Topic interpretability. To intuitively understand what topic tree structure our model learns and what keywords each topic contains, here we plot topic tree and keywords of each topic on PL dataset at Fig. 4. Here we show top-4 keywords of each topic for clarity purpose. For each topic, we manually summarize its keywords into one word or phrase. For topic hierarchy of other datasets, our submitted code can produce topic hierarchy after convergence for every dataset.

Overall, the learned topic tree has three levels. The root topic *Programming Language* is split into three concepts at the second level, *Software Analysis*, *Object Oriented Programming (OOP)*, and *Design Pattern*. For Software Analysis topic, the corpus seems to contain documents about *Semantics* of programming language and *Efficiency* of the program. Similarly, for Object Oriented Programming topic, papers in this corpus mainly talk about three sub-concepts, *Programming*, *Parallelism*, and *Compiler*, all of which are related to OOP. Similar topic hierarchy can also be observed on the Design Pattern topic, which is split into *Implementation* and *Inheritance* topics.

Topic visualization. We use t-SNE (Van der Maaten and Hinton, 2008) to project document embeddings into 2D space and color embeddings using documents' labels in Fig. 5. Since our model is a topic model, we mainly select representative topic models for visualization. GATON does not incorporate topic hierarchy or graph hierarchy, thereby its document embeddings of different categories tend to mix together. By modeling topic hierarchy, TSNTM produces clearer separation among different categories. HGTM and our model capture both topic hierarchy and graph hierarchy, and produce similar separation based on visual observation.




Figure 4: Topic tree structure learned on PL dataset.




Figure 5: Visualization on ML dataset.