

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Topics in AI (CPSC 532S): **Multimodal Learning with Vision, Language and Sound**

Lecture 18: Graph Neural Networks



Traditional Neural Networks

IM **G**ENET



Speech data

Natural language processing (NLP)

. . .

Deep neural nets that exploit:

- translation equivariance (weight sharing)
- hierarchical compositionality



Grid games









A lot of real-world data does not "live" on grids



A lot of real-world data does not "live" on grids





A lot of real-world data does not "live" on grids











Graph Neural Networks (GNNs)



Main Idea: Pass massages between pairs of nodes and agglomerate

Alternative Interpretation: Pass massages between nodes to refine node (and possibly edge) representations

Graph Neural Networks (GNNs)



Main Idea: Pass massages between pairs of nodes and agglomerate

Alternative Interpretation: Pass massages between nodes to refine node (and possibly edge) representations



Notation: $\mathcal{G} = (\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{X})$

Single CNN layer with 3x3 filter:





 \mathbf{b}

Single CNN layer with 3x3 filter:





- \mathbf{h}_i
- $\mathbf{h}_i \in \mathbb{R}^F$ are (hidden layer) activations of a pixel/node

Single CNN layer with 3x3 filter:





 $\mathbf{h}_i \in \mathbb{R}^F$ are (hidden layer) activations of a pixel/node

Single CNN layer with 3x3 filter:





Full update:

 $\mathbf{h}_{A}^{(l+1)}$

 $\mathbf{h}_i \in \mathbb{R}^F$ are (hidden layer) activations of a pixel/node

$$\sigma \left(\mathbf{W}_{0}^{(l)} \mathbf{h}_{0}^{(l)} + \mathbf{W}_{1}^{(l)} \mathbf{h}_{1}^{(l)} + \dots + \mathbf{W}_{8}^{(l)} \mathbf{h}_{8}^{(l)} \right)$$

Consider this undirected graph:



Consider this undirected graph:

Calculate update for node in red:







Calculate update for node in red:



Update rule: $\mathbf{h}_{i}^{(l+1)} = \sigma \left(\mathbf{h}_{i}^{(l)} \mathbf{W}_{0}^{(l)} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{i}} \frac{1}{c_{ij}} \mathbf{h}_{j}^{(l)} \mathbf{W}_{1}^{(l)} \right)$

Scalability: subsample messages [Hamilton et al., NIPS 2017]

 \mathcal{N}_i : neighbor indices

 c_{ij} : norm. constant (fixed/trainable)



Calculate update for node in red:



Update rule: $\mathbf{h}_{i}^{(l+1)} = \sigma \left(\mathbf{h}_{i}^{(l)} \mathbf{W}_{0}^{(l)} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{i}} \frac{1}{c_{ij}} \mathbf{h}_{j}^{(l)} \mathbf{W}_{1}^{(l)} \right)$

Scalability: subsample messages [Hamilton et al., NIPS 2017]



Desirable properties:

- Weight sharing over all locations
- Invariance to permutations
- Linear complexity O(E)
- Applicable both in transductive and inductive settings

 \mathcal{N}_i : neighbor indices

 c_{ij} : norm. constant (fixed/trainable)

GNNs with Edge Embeddings Battaglia et al. (NIPS 2016), Gilmer et al. (ICML 2017), Kipf et al. (ICML 2018)



$$\mathbf{x}_{(i,j)}^{l}])$$

GNNs with Edge Embeddings Battaglia et al. (NIPS 2016), Gilmer et al. (ICML 2017), Kipf et al. (ICML 2018)



:	MLP	
)		
	- 1	
L	f_v^{ι}	

Pros:

- Supports edge features
- More expressive than GCN
- As general as it gets (?)
- Supports sparse matrix ops

$$(i,j)]) \ \mathbf{x}_{(i,j)}^{l}, \mathbf{x}_{j}])$$

GNNs with **Edge** Embeddings Battaglia et al. (NIPS 2016), Gilmer et al. (ICML 2017), Kipf et al. (ICML 2018)



:	MLP	
_		-

 f_v^l

Pros:

- Supports edge features
- More expressive than GCN
- As general as it gets (?)
- Supports sparse matrix ops

Cons:

- Need to store intermediate edge-based activations
- Difficult to implement • with subsampling
- In practice limited to small graphs





[Figure from Veličković et al. (ICLR 2018)]

$$\vec{h}'_i = \sigma \left(\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \alpha^k_{ij} \mathbf{W}^k \vec{h}_j \right)$$



[Figure from Veličković et al. (ICLR 2018)]

$$\vec{h}_{i}' = \sigma \left(\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{i}} \alpha_{ij}^{k} \mathbf{W}^{k} \vec{h}_{j} \right) \qquad \alpha_{ij} = \frac{\exp \left(\text{LeakyReLU} \left(\vec{\mathbf{a}}^{T} [\mathbf{W} \vec{h}_{i} \| \mathbf{W} \vec{h}_{j}] \right) \right)}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_{i}} \exp \left(\text{LeakyReLU} \left(\vec{\mathbf{a}}^{T} [\mathbf{W} \vec{h}_{i} \| \mathbf{W} \vec{h}_{k}] \right) \right)}$$



[Figure from Veličković et al. (ICLR 2018)]

$$\vec{h}_{i}' = \sigma \left(\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{i}} \alpha_{ij}^{k} \mathbf{W}^{k} \vec{h}_{j} \right) \qquad \alpha_{ij} = \frac{\exp \left(\text{LeakyReLU} \left(\vec{\mathbf{a}}^{T} [\mathbf{W} \vec{h}_{i} \| \mathbf{W} \vec{h}_{j}] \right) \right)}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_{i}} \exp \left(\text{LeakyReLU} \left(\vec{\mathbf{a}}^{T} [\mathbf{W} \vec{h}_{i} \| \mathbf{W} \vec{h}_{k}] \right) \right)}$$

Pros:

- No need to store intermediate edge-based activation vectors (when using dot-product attn.)
- Slower than GCNs but faster than GNNs with edge embeddings





[Figure from Veličković et al. (ICLR 2018)]

$$\vec{h}_{i}' = \sigma \left(\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_{i}} \alpha_{ij}^{k} \mathbf{W}^{k} \vec{h}_{j} \right) \qquad \alpha_{ij} = \frac{\exp \left(\text{LeakyReLU} \left(\vec{\mathbf{a}}^{T} [\mathbf{W} \vec{h}_{i} \| \mathbf{W} \vec{h}_{j}] \right) \right)}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_{i}} \exp \left(\text{LeakyReLU} \left(\vec{\mathbf{a}}^{T} [\mathbf{W} \vec{h}_{i} \| \mathbf{W} \vec{h}_{k}] \right) \right)}$$

Pros:

- No need to store intermediate edge-based activation vectors (when using dot-product attn.)
- Slower than GCNs but faster than GNNs with edge embeddings

Cons:

- (Most likely) less expressive than GNNs with edge embeddings
- Can be more difficult to optimize