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## Networks

- Ubiquitous in real world

- A flexible and general data structure
- Many types of data can be formulated as networks

Network Minina: Link Prediction


## Network Mining: Ranking



## Network Mining: Community Detection



Who tend to work together?

- Q.Mei, D.Cai, D.Zhang, and C.Zhai, Topic Modeling with Hitting Time, WWW 2008


## Network Mining: Classification



- d1 is democratic
- d2 is republican
- What can we say about d3 and d4?
- Graph from Jerry Zhu's tutorial in ICML 07


## Network Mining: Resilience

How robust are networks to random/targeted attacks?


## Network Mining: Information Cascades



60 seconds after


Two minutes before the official denial


Three hours after

Cascade of the "white house bombing rumor" - Zhao et al., WWW 2015

## Network Mining: Many Other Tasks

- Sampling
- Recommendation
- Structure analysis (e.g., structural holes)
- Evolution
- Matching
- Visualization


## Traditional Representations of Networks



$$
\left(\begin{array}{cccccccccc}
0 & 0 & 1 & . & . & . & . & 2 & 1 & 1 \\
1 & 0 & 1 & . & . & . & . & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
3 & 2 & 0 & . & . & . & . & 0 & 0 & . \\
1 & . & . & . & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & 1 \\
0 & . & . & . & . & . & . & . & 1 & . \\
0 & . & 0 & . & . & . & 0 & . & . & . \\
0 & . & . & 1 & . & . & . & 0 & . & . \\
0 & 0 & . & . & . & . & . & . & 0 & . \\
1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0
\end{array}\right)
$$

- Suffer from data sparsity
- Suffer from high dimensionality
- Does not facilitate computation
- Does not represent "semantics"


## Research Question and Challenges

- How to effectively and efficiently represent networks?
- Challenges:
- Large-scale: millions of nodes and billions of edges
- Heterogeneous: directed/undirected, and binary/weighted


## Learning Node Representations for Networks



Network


Node representations

- Node Classification
- Node Clustering
- Link Prediction
- Recommendation
- ...
- E.g., Facebook social network -> user representations (features)-> friend recommendation

Text representation, e.g., word and document representation,
Deep learning has been attracting increasing attention.
A future direction of deep learning is to integrate unlabeled data

The Skip-gram model is quite effective and efficient


Word co-occurrence network

## Extremely Low-dimensional Representations: 2D/3D for Visualizing Networks
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High-dimensional Data


Networks


2D/3D Layout


## Visualizing Scientific Papers



## From Node Representation to Graph Representation

- Node representations are good for
- Node classification
- Recommendation
- Link prediction
- How about ...
- Information cascades
- Community detection
- Protein function prediction
- We want to learn graph representations


## Outline

- Part I: Learning Node Representations of Networks
- Related Work: Laplacian Eigenmap, Word2Vec
- LINE, DeepWalk, and Node2Vec
- Extensions
- Part II: Visualizing Networks and High-Dimensional Data
- t-SNE
- LargeVis
- Pat III: Learning Representations of Entire Networks
- Graph kernels
- End-to-end methods
- Part IV: Summary, Challenges \& Future Work
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## Problem Definition: Node Embedding

- Given a network/graph $G=(V, E, W)$, where $V$ is the set of nodes, $E$ is the set of edges between the nodes, and $W$ is the set of weights of the edges, the goal of node embedding is to represent each node $i$ with a vector $\vec{u}_{i} \in R^{d}$, which preserves the structure of networks.


Networks


Node representations

## Related Work

- Classical graph embedding algorithms
- MDS, IsoMap, LLE, Laplacian Eigenmap, ...
- Hard to scale up
- Graph factorization (Ahmed et al. 2013)
- Not specifically designed for network representation
- Undirected graphs only
- Neural word embeddings (Bengio et al. 2003)
- Neural language model
- word2vec (skipgram), paragraph vectors, etc.


## Laplacian Eigenmap (Belkin and Niyogi, 2003)

- Intuition: the embeddings of similar nodes should be close to each other
- Objective:

$$
O=\frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i, j) \in E} w_{i j}\left(\vec{u}_{i}-\vec{u}_{j}\right)^{2}=\operatorname{tr}\left(U^{T} L U\right)
$$

-Where $U=\left[\vec{u}_{1}, \vec{u}_{2}, \cdots, \vec{u}_{N}\right]$, $L$ is the Laplacian matrix $L=D-W$, and $D_{i i}=\sum_{j} w_{i j}$

- Optimization by finding the eigenvectors of smallest eigenvalues of the Laplacian matrix L:

$$
L u=\lambda D u
$$

- Computationally expensive for finding eigenvectors when networks are very big


## Word2VEC (Mikolov et al. 2014)

- Goal: represent each word $i$ with a vector $\vec{v}_{i} \in R^{d}$ by training from a sequence ( $w_{1}, w_{2}, \cdots, w_{T}$ )
- Distributional hypothesis (John Rupert Firth): You know a word by the company it keeps
- Skip-gram: learning word representations by predicting the nearby words


$$
p\left(w_{O} \mid w_{I}\right)=\frac{\exp \left(v_{w_{O}}^{\prime}{ }^{\top} v_{w_{I}}\right)}{\sum_{w=1}^{W} \exp \left(v_{w}^{\prime \top} v_{w_{I}}\right)}
$$

Tomas Mikolov, Ilya Sutskever, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, Jeffrey Dean. Distributed Representations of Words and Phrases and their Compositionality. NIPS 2014

## Skipgram

- Objective:

$$
\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{-c \leq j \leq c, j \neq 0} \log p\left(w_{t+j} \mid w_{t}\right)
$$

- Where $c$ is the window size
- Direct optimization is computationally expensive due to the softmax function
- Negative sampling:

$$
\log \sigma\left(v_{w_{O}}^{\prime}{ }^{\top} v_{w_{I}}\right)+\sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathbb{E}_{w_{i} \sim P_{n}(w)}\left[\log \sigma\left(-v_{w_{i}}^{\prime}{ }^{\top} v_{w_{I}}\right)\right]
$$

- Where $P_{n}(w)$ is a noisy distribution


## LINE: Large-scale Information Network Embedding (Tang et al., Most Cited Paper of WWW 2015)

- Arbitrary types of networks
- Directed, undirected, and/or weighted
- Clear objective function
- Preserve the first-order and second-order proximity
- Scalable
- Asynchronous stochastic gradient descent
- Millions of nodes and billions of edges: a coupe of hours on a single machine


## First-order Proximity



- The local pairwise proximity between the nodes
- However, many links between the nodes are not observed
- Not sufficient for preserving the entire network structure


## Second-order Proximity

"The degree of overlap of two people's friendship networks correlates with the strength of ties between them" --Mark Granovetter

"You shall know a word by the company it keeps" --John Rupert Firth

- Proximity between the neighborhood structures of the nodes


## Preserving the First-order Proximity (LINE 1st)

- Distributions: : (defined on the undirected edge $\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{j}$ )

Empirical distribution of first-order proximity:

$$
\hat{p}_{1}\left(v_{i}, v_{j}\right)=\frac{w_{i j}}{\sum_{(m, n) \in E} w_{m n}}
$$

Model distribution of first-order proximity:

$$
p_{1}\left(v_{i}, v_{j}\right)=\frac{\exp \left(\vec{u}_{i}^{T} \vec{u}_{j}\right)}{\sum_{(m, n) \in V \times V} \exp \left(\vec{u}_{m}^{T} \vec{u}_{n}\right)}
$$

- Objective:

$$
O_{1}=K L\left(\hat{p}_{1}, p_{1}\right)=-\sum_{(i, j) \in E} w_{i j} \log p_{1}\left(v_{i}, v_{j}\right)
$$

## Preserving the Second-order Proximity (LINE 2nd)

- Distributions: (defined on the directed edge i-> j)

Empirical distribution of neighborhood structure:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \hat{p}_{2}\left(v_{j} \mid v_{i}\right)=\frac{w_{i j}}{\sum_{k \in V} w_{i k}} \\
& p_{2}\left(v_{j} \mid v_{i}\right)=\frac{\exp \left(\vec{u}_{i}^{T} \vec{u}_{j}\right)}{\sum_{k \in V} \exp \left(\vec{u}_{k}^{T} \vec{u}_{i}\right)}
\end{aligned}
$$

Model distribution of neighborhood structure:

- Objective:

$$
O_{2}=\sum_{i} K L\left(\hat{p}_{2}\left(\cdot \mid v_{i}\right), p_{2}\left(\cdot \mid v_{i}\right)\right)=-\sum_{(i, j) \in E} w_{i j} \log p_{2}\left(v_{j} \mid v_{i}\right)
$$

## Optimization Tricks

- Stochastic gradient descent + Negative Sampling
- Randomly sample an edge and multiple negative edges
- The gradient w.r.t the embedding with edge ( $i, j$ )

$$
\frac{\partial O_{2}}{\partial \vec{u}_{i}}=w_{i j} \frac{\partial \log \hat{p}_{2}\left(v_{j} \mid v_{i}\right)}{\partial \vec{u}_{i}}
$$

- Problematic when the variances of weights of the edges are large
- The variance of the gradients are large
- Solution: edge sampling
- Sample the edges according to their weights and treat the edges as binary
- Complexity: $O\left(d^{\star} K^{\star}|E|\right)$
- Linear to the dimensionality $d$, the number of negative samples $K$, and the number of edges


## Discussion

- Embed nodes with few neighbors
- Expand the neighbors by adding higher-order neighbors
- Breadth-first search (BFS)
- Adding only second-order neighbors works well in most cases
- Embed new nodes
- Fix the embeddings of existing nodes
- Optimize the objective w.r.t. the embeddings of new nodes


## DeepWalk (Perozzi et al. 2014)

- Learning node representations with the technique for learning word representations, i.e., Skipgram
- Treat random walks on networks as sentences


Random walk generation (generate node contexts through random search)


$$
p\left(v_{j} \mid v_{i}\right)=\frac{\exp \left(\vec{u}_{i}^{T T} \vec{u}_{j}\right)}{\sum_{k \in V} \exp \left(\vec{u}_{k}^{T} \vec{u}_{i}\right)}
$$

Predict the nearby nodes in the random walks

## DeepWalk (Perozzi et al. 2014)

- Optimization: hierarchical softmax (Morin, Bengio, 2005)
- Assign the nodes to the leaves of a binary tree
- Predict the node => predict a path in the tree
- Make binary decisions along the path
- Complexity from |V| to $\log (|\mathrm{V}|)$
3
$1] v_{j}$
5
1
$\vdots$

Predict the nearby nodes in the random walks (v1->v3, v1->v5)


Hierarchical softmax

## Node2Vec (Grover and Leskovec, 2016)



Figure 1: BFS and DFS search strategies from node $u(k=3)$.

- Find the node context by a hybrid strategy of
- Breadth-first Sampling (BFS): homophily
- Depth-first Sampling (DFS): structural equivalence


## Expand Node Contexts with Biased Random Walk



- Biased random walk with two parameters $p$ and $q$
- p: controls the probability of revisiting a node in the walk
- q: controls the probability of exploring "outward" nodes
- Find optimal $p$ and $q$ through cross-validation on labeled data
- Optimized through similar objective as LINE with first-order proximity


## Comparison between LINE, DeepWalk, and Node2Vec

| Algorithm | Neighbor <br> Expansion | Proximity | Optimization | Labeled Data |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LINE | BFS | $1^{\text {st }}$ or $2^{\text {nd }}$ | Negative Sampling | No |
| DeepWalk | Random | $2^{\text {nd }}$ | Hierarchical Softmax | No |
| Node2Vec | BFS + DFS | $1^{\text {st }}$ | Negative Sampling | Yes |

## Applications

- Node classification (Perozzi et al. 2014, Tang et al. 2015a, Grover et al. 2015 )
- Node visualization (Tang et al. 2015a)
- Link prediction (Grover et al. 2015)
- Recommendation (Zhao et al. 2016)
- Text representation (Tang et al. 2015a, Tang et al. 2015b)


## Node Classification

- social network => user representations (features) => classifier
- Community identities as classification labels

|  | \% Labeled Nodes | $1 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | DEEPWALK |  | $\mathbf{3 2 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 7 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 7 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 . 5}$ |
| $\mathbf{3 8 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 . 7}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Micro-F1(\%) | SpectralClustering | 27.43 | 30.11 | 31.63 | 32.69 | 33.31 | 33.95 | 34.46 | 34.81 | 35.14 | 35.41 |
|  | EdgeCluster $=$ | 25.75 | 28.53 | 29.14 | 30.31 | 30.85 | 31.53 | 31.75 | 31.76 | 32.19 | 32.84 |
|  | Modularity | 22.75 | 25.29 | 27.3 | 27.6 | 28.05 | 29.33 | 29.43 | 28.89 | 29.17 | 29.2 |
|  | wvRN | 17.7 | 14.43 | 15.72 | 20.97 | 19.83 | 19.42 | 19.22 | 21.25 | 22.51 | 22.73 |
|  | Majority | 16.34 | 16.31 | 16.34 | 16.46 | 16.65 | 16.44 | 16.38 | 16.62 | 16.67 | 16.71 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table: Results on Flickr Network (Perozzi et al. 2014)

## DeepWalk > Laplacian Eigenmap

## Node Classification

- social network => user representations (features) => classifier
- Community identities as classification labels

| Metric | Algorithm | 1\% | 2\% | 3\% | 4\% | 5\% | 6\% | 7\% | 8\% | 9\% | 10\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Micro-F1 | GF | $\begin{gathered} \hline 25.43 \\ (24.97) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 26.16 \\ (26.48) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 26.60 \\ (27.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 26.91 \\ (27.87) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 27.32 \\ (28.31) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 27.61 \\ (28.68) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 27.88 \\ (29.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 28.13 \\ (29.21) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 28.30 \\ (29.36) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 28.51 \\ (29.63) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | DeepWalk | 39.68 | 41.78 | 42.78 | 43.55 | 43.96 | 44.31 | 44.61 | 44.89 | 45.06 | 45.23 |
|  | DeepWalk(256dim) | 39.94 | 42.17 | 43.19 | 44.05 | 44.47 | 44.84 | 45.17 | 45.43 | 45.65 | 45.81 |
|  | LINE(1st) | $\begin{gathered} \hline 35.43 \\ (36.47) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 38.08 \\ (38.87) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 39.33 \\ (40.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40.21 \\ (40.85) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40.77 \\ (41.33) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 41.24 \\ (41.73) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 41.53 \\ (42.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 41.89 \\ (42.34) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 42.07 \\ (42.57) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 42.21 \\ (42.73) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | LINE(2nd) | $\begin{gathered} \hline 32.98 \\ (36.78) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 36.70 \\ (40.37) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38.93 \\ (42.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40.26 \\ (43.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 41.08 \\ (43.90) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 41.79 \\ (44.44) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 42.28 \\ (44.83) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 42.70 \\ (45.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 43.04 \\ (45.50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 43.34 \\ (45.67) \end{gathered}$ |
|  | LINE(1st+2nd) | $\begin{gathered} 39.01^{*} \\ (\mathbf{4 0 . 2 0}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 41.89 \\ (\mathbf{4 2 . 7 0}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 43.14 \\ (\mathbf{4 3 . 9 4 * *}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 44.04 \\ (\mathbf{4 4 . 7 1 * *}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 44.62 \\ (\mathbf{4 5 . 1 9 * *}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 45.06 \\ (\mathbf{4 5 . 5 5} *) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 45.34 \\ \left(45.87^{* *}\right) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 45.69^{* *} \\ \left(46.15^{* *}\right) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 45.91^{* *} \\ \left(46.33^{* *}\right) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 46.08^{* *} \\ \left(46.43^{* *}\right) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

Table: Results on Youtube Network(Tang et al. 2015a)
$\operatorname{LINE}\left(1^{\text {st }}+2^{\text {nd }}\right)>\operatorname{LINE}\left(2^{\text {nd }}\right)>$ DeepWalk $>\operatorname{LINE}\left(1^{\text {st }}\right)$

## Node Visualization (Tang et al. 2015a)

- Coauthor network: authors from three different research fields


- "Machine learning"

- "Computer vision"
(a) Graph factorization
(b) DeepWalk
(c) $\operatorname{LINE}\left(2^{\text {nd }}\right)$


## Link Prediction (Grover and Leskovec, 2016)

| Op | Algorithm |  | Dataset |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  |  | Facebook | PPI | arXiv |  |
|  | Common Neighbors | 0.8100 | 0.7142 | 0.8153 |  |
|  | Jaccard's Coefficient | 0.8880 | 0.7018 | 0.8067 |  |
|  | Adamic-Adar | 0.8289 | 0.7126 | 0.8315 |  |
|  | Pref. Attachment | 0.7137 | 0.6670 | 0.6996 |  |
|  | Spectral Clustering | 0.5960 | 0.6588 | 0.5812 |  |
|  | DeepWalk | 0.7238 | 0.6923 | 0.7066 |  |
|  | LINE | 0.7029 | 0.6330 | 0.6516 |  |
|  | node2vec | 0.7266 | 0.7543 | 0.7221 |  |
| (b) | Spectral Clustering | 0.6192 | 0.4920 | 0.5740 |  |
|  | DeepWalk | $\mathbf{0 . 9 6 8 0}$ | 0.7441 | 0.9340 |  |
|  | LINE | 0.9490 | 0.7249 | 0.8902 |  |
|  | node2vec | $\mathbf{0 . 9 6 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 7 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 3 6 6}$ |  |

## Table: Results of Link Prediction

Node Embeddings (LINE, DeepWalk, node2vec)
> Jaccard's Coefficient > Adamic-Adar

## Unsupervised Text Representation (Tang et al. 2015a)

- Construct text networks from unstructured text

Text representation, e.g., word and document representation,
Deep learning has been attracting increasing attention

A future direction of deep learning is to integrate unlabeled data.

The Skip-gram model is quite effective and efficient
Information networks encode the relationships between the data objects

Unstructured text


## Word Analogy

- Entire Wikipedia articles => word co-occurrence network ( 2 M words, 1 B edges)
- Size of word co-occurrence networks does not grow linearly with data size
- Only the weights of edges change

| Algorithm | Semantic(\%) | Syntactic(\%) | Overall |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GF | 61.38 | 44.08 | 51.93 |
| SkipGram | 69.14 | 57.94 | 63.02 |
| LINE(1 st $\left.^{\text {st }}\right)$ | 58.08 | 49.42 | 53.35 |
| LINE $\left.2^{\text {nd }}\right)$ | 73.79 | 59.72 | 66.10 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{LINE}\left(2^{\text {nd }}\right)>\operatorname{LINE}\left(1^{\text {st }}\right) \\
& \operatorname{LINE}\left(2^{\text {nd }}\right)>\operatorname{SkipGram}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Text Classification (on Long Documents)

- Word co-occurrence network ( $\omega-\omega$ ), word-document network ( $\omega-\mathrm{d}$ ) to learn the word embedding
- Document embedding as average of word embeddings in the document



## Text Classification (on Short Documents)

- Word co-occurrence network ( $\omega-\omega$ ), word-document network ( $\omega-\mathrm{d}$ ) to learn the word embedding
- Document embedding as average of word embeddings in the document



## Extensions

- Other variants
- Multi-view networks
- Networks with node attributes
- Heterogeneous networks
- Task-specific network embedding


## Extensions

- Other variants
- Multi-view networks
- Networks with node attributes
- Heterogeneous networks
- Task-specific network embedding


## Other Variants

- Leverage global structural information (Cao et al. 2015)
- Non-linear methods based on autoencoders (Wang et al. 2016)
- Directed network embedding (Ou et al. 2016)
- Signed network embedding (Wang et al. 2017)
- Shaosheng Cao, Wei Lu, and Qiongkai Xu. GraRep: Learning graph representations with global structural information. CIKM' 2015.
- Mingdong Ou, Peng Cui, Jian Pei, Wenwu Zhu. Asymmetric transitivity preserving graph embedding. KDD, 2016.
- Daixing Wang, Peng Cui, Wenwu Zhu. Structural deep network embedding. KDD, 2016.
- Suhang Wang, Jiliang Tang, Charu Aggarwal, Yi Chang, Huan Liu. Signed network embedding in social media. SDM 2017.


## Extensions

- Other variants
- Multi-view networks
- Networks with node attributes
- Heterogeneous networks
- Task-specific network embedding


## Multi-view Network Embedding (Qu and Tang et al. 2017)

- Multiple types of relationships between nodes exist in real-world networks
- E.g., following, retweeting relationships between users in Twitter
- Each type of relationship => a view of the network
- Multiple types of relationships => multi-view networks
- Infer robust node representations with multiple views
- Complementary information in different views


Figure: Networks with multiple views

## A Co-Regularization Approach

- Each node has a robust representation and multiple view-specific representations
- Preserve the structure of different views through view-specific representations
- Promote the collaboration of different views to vote for robust representations
- Regularize the view-specific representations



## A Co-Regularization Approach

## - Objective

$$
O_{\text {collab }}=\sum_{k=1}^{K} O_{k}+\eta R
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& O_{k}=-\sum_{(i, j) \in E_{k}}^{k=1} w_{i j}^{(k)} \log p_{k}\left(v_{j} \mid v_{i}\right) . \\
& R=\sum_{i=1}^{|V|} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \lambda_{i}^{k}\left\|\mathrm{x}_{i}^{k}-\mathrm{x}_{i}\right\|_{2}^{2},
\end{aligned}
$$

Multi-view
Network


Voting Weights

$\mathrm{X}_{i}^{k}$ :view-specific node embedding
of node $i$
$\lambda_{i}^{k}$ :weights of views of node $i$

## Learning the Weights of the Views via Neural Attention

- According to the regularization term:

$$
R=\sum_{i=1}^{|V|} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \lambda_{i}^{k}\left\|\mathrm{x}_{i}^{k}-\mathrm{x}_{i}\right\|_{2}^{2}, \quad \square \quad \mathrm{x}_{i}=\sum_{k=1}^{K} \lambda_{i}^{k} \mathrm{x}_{i}^{k}
$$

- Learning the weights with supervised data, e.g., node classification

$$
O_{a t t n}=\sum_{v_{i} \in S} L\left(\mathbf{x}_{i}, y_{i}\right),
$$

- Define the attention weight of views for each node:

$$
\lambda_{i}^{k}=\frac{\exp \left(\mathrm{z}_{k}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{i}^{C}\right)}{\sum_{k^{\prime}=1}^{K} \exp \left(\mathbf{z}_{k^{\prime}}^{T} \mathbf{x}_{i}^{C}\right)}, \quad \mathbf{x}_{i}^{C}: \begin{aligned}
& \text { concatenation of view-specific } \\
& \text { embeddings of node } \mathrm{i}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Results of Multi-label Node Classification

| Category | Algorithm | DBLP |  | Flickr |  | PPI |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Macro-F1 | Micro-F1 | Macro-F1 | Micro-F1 | Macro-F1 | Micro-F1 |
| Single View | LINE | 70.29 | 70.77 | 34.49 | 54.99 | 20.69 | 24.70 |
|  | node2vec | 71.52 | 72.22 | 34.43 | 54.82 | 21.20 | 25.04 |
| Multi View | node2vec-merge | 72.05 | 72.62 | 29.15 | 52.08 | 21.00 | 24.60 |
|  | node2vec-concat | 70.98 | 71.34 | 32.21 | 53.67 | 21.12 | 25.28 |
|  | CMSC | - | - | - | - | 8.97 | 13.10 |
|  | MultiNMF | 51.26 | 59.97 | 18.16 | 51.18 | 5.19 | 9.84 |
|  | MultiSPPMI | 54.34 | 55.65 | 32.56 | 53.80 | 20.21 | 23.34 |
|  | MVE-NoCollab | 71.85 | 72.40 | 28.03 | $54.62$ | $18.23$ | $22.40$ |
|  |  | 73.36 | $\overline{7} \overline{3} \cdot \overline{7} \overline{7}$ | $\overline{3} \overline{2} \cdot \overline{4} 1$ | $54.18$ | $22.24$ | $\overline{2} \overline{5} \cdot 41$ |
|  | MVE | 74.51 | 74.85 | 34.74 | 58.95 | 23.39 | 26.96 |

MVE > MVE-NoAttn > LINE/node2vec

Single best view

## Extensions

- Other variants
- Multi-view networks
- Networks with node attributes
- Heterogeneous networks
- Task-specific network embedding


## Networks with Node Attributes (Yang et al. 2015, N.Kipf et al. 2016, Liao et al. 2017)

- Networks with text information (Yang et al. 2015)
- Networks with attributes (Liao et al. 2017)
- Gender, location, text, …
- Variational graph autoencoders (N.Kipf et al. 2016)
- Encode the node with neighborhood structures and attributes
- Decode the neighborhood structures
- Cheng Yang, Zhiyuan Liu, Deli Zhao, Maosong Sun, Edward Y. Chang. Network representation learning with rich text information. IJCAI 2015.
- Thomas N.Kipf and Max Welling. Variational Graph Auto-encoders. NIPS Workshop 2016.
- Lizi Liao, Xiangnan He, Hanwang Zhang, and Tat-Seng Chua. Attributed Social Network Embedding. arXiv, 2017.


## Extensions

- Other variants
- Multi-view networks
- Networks with node attributes
- Heterogeneous networks
- Task-specific network embedding


## Heterogeneous Network Embedding via Deep Architectures (Chang et al. 2015)

- Heterogeneous networks of images and text
- Make the embeddings of linked objects close to each other
- image-image, image-text, text-text


Siyu Chang, Wei Han, Jiliang Tang, Guo-Jun Qi, Charu C. Aggarwal, Thomas S. Huang. Heterogeneous network embedding via Deep Architectures. KDD'15

## Heterogeneous Star Network Embedding (Chen et al. 2017)

- Heterogeneous Star Networks
- Paper, keywords, authors, venues
- Aims to embed the center objects
- paper


Ting Chen and Yizhou Sun, "Task-Guided and Path-Augmented Heterogeneous Network Embedding for Author Identification. WSDM'17.

## Extensions

- Other variants
- Multi-view networks
- Networks with node attributes
- Heterogeneous networks
- Task-specific network embedding


## Semi-supervised Text Representation (Tang et al. 2015b)

- Heterogeneous text network
- Word-word, word-document, and word-label networks
- Different levels of word co-occurrences: local context-level, documentlevel, label-level
- Learning word embeddings through jointly training the heterogeneous networks
- Document embeddings as the average of word embeddings



## Word co-occurrence network



> Word-document network


Word-label network

[^0]
## Results on Text Classification of Long Documents

|  |  | 2Onewsgroup |  | Wikipedia |  | IMDB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type | Algorithm | Micro-F1 | Macro-F1 | Micro-F1 | Macro-F1 | Micro-F1 | Macro-F1 |
| Unsupervised | LINE(G_wd) | 79.73 | 78.40 | 80.14 | 80.13 | 89.14 | 89.14 |
|  | CNN | 80.15 | 79.43 | 79.25 | 79.32 | 89.00 | 89.00 |
| Predictive <br> embedding | PTE(G_ww+G_wl) | 83.90 | 83.11 | 81.65 | 81.62 | 89.14 | 89.14 |
|  | PTE(G_wd+G_wl) | 84.39 | 83.64 | 82.29 | 82.27 | 89.76 | 89.76 |
|  | PTE(joint) | 84.20 | 83.39 | 82.51 | 82.49 | 89.80 | 89.80 |

## PTE > CNN

## Results on Text Classification of Short Documents

|  |  | 2Onewsgroup |  | Wikipedia |  | IMDB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type | Algorithm | Micro-F1 | Macro-F1 | Micro-F1 | Macro-F1 | Micro-F1 | Macro-F1 |
| Unsupervised | LINE(G_ww) | 74.22 | 70.12 | 71.13 | 71.12 | 73.84 | 73.84 |
|  | CNN | 76.16 | 73.08 | 72.71 | 72.69 | 75.97 | 75.96 |
|  | PTE(G_wl) | 76.45 | 72.74 | 73.44 | 73.42 | 73.92 | 73.91 |
| Predictive <br> embedding | PTE(G_ww+G_wl) | 76.80 | 73.28 | 72.93 | 72.92 | 74.93 | 74.92 |
|  | PTE(G_wd+G_wl) | 77.46 | 74.03 | 73.13 | 73.11 | 75.61 | 75.61 |
|  | PTE(joint) | 77.15 | 73.61 | 73.58 | 73.57 | 75.21 | 75.21 |

## PTE $\approx C N N$

## Semi-supervised Classification with Graph Convolutional Networks (Kipf et al. 2017)

- Task: Given a graph $G=(V, E)$, and the features of nodes $X \in R^{N \times D}$, and the labels of a subset of nodes are given.
- Learning the node representations through graph convolutional networks
- Combining node representations (self-link) and representations of neighbors



## Multi-layer Graph Convolution Neural Networks

$$
\mathbf{H}^{(l+1)}=\sigma\left(\hat{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{H}^{(l)} \mathbf{W}^{(l)}\right)
$$

- Final objective:
$\mathcal{L}=-\sum_{l \in \mathcal{Y}_{L}} \sum_{f=1}^{F} Y_{l f} \ln Z_{l f}$
- $\quad$ Starting from the node features $H^{(0)}=X$
- Define the propagation rule

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{A} & =A+I_{N} & & \text { Add the self-links } \\
\hat{\mathbf{A}} & =\tilde{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{A} \tilde{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}} . & & \text { Normalize the matrix } \\
\mathbf{H}^{(l+1)} & =\sigma\left(\hat{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{H}^{(l)} \mathbf{W}^{(l)}\right) & & \text { Nonlinear propagation }
\end{aligned}
$$

## Experimental Results (Kipf \& ICLR 2017)

Table 2: Summary of results in terms of classification accuracy (in percent).

| Method | Citeseer | Cora | Pubmed | NELL |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ManiReg [3] | 60.1 | 59.5 | 70.7 | 21.8 |
| SemiEmb [28] | 59.6 | 59.0 | 71.1 | 26.7 |
| LP [32] | 45.3 | 68.0 | 63.0 | 26.5 |
| DeepWalk [22] | 43.2 | 67.2 | 65.3 | 58.1 |
| TCA [18] | 69.1 | 75.1 | 73.9 | 23.1 |
| Planetoid* [29] | $64.7(26 \mathrm{~s})$ | $75.7(13 \mathrm{~s})$ | $77.2(25 \mathrm{~s})$ | $61.9(185 \mathrm{~s})$ |
| GCN (this paper) | $\mathbf{7 0 . 3 ( 7 \mathrm { s } )}$ | $\mathbf{8 1 . 5 ( 4 \mathrm { s } )}$ | $\mathbf{7 9 . 0}(38 \mathrm{~s})$ | $\mathbf{6 6 . 0 ( 4 8 \mathrm { s } )}$ |
| GCN (rand. splits) | $67.9 \pm 0.5$ | $80.1 \pm 0.5$ | $78.9 \pm 0.7$ | $58.4 \pm 1.7$ |

> GCN > Label Propagation
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## Extremely Low-dimensional Representations: 2D/3D for Visualizing Networks

## K-Nearest Neighbor Graph (KNN-G) Construction







High-dimensional Data

Graph Layout


2D/3D Layout


Scatter Plots
Network Diagrams


## t-SNE (Maarten and Hinton, 2008, 2014 )

- State-of-the-art algorithms for high-dimensional data visualization
- Deployed in Tensorbord for visualizing the representations learned by deep neural networks.


Visualizations of MNIST Data


TensorBoard Visualizations by t-SNE
L.J.P. van der Maaten and G.E. Hinton. Visualizing High-Dimensional Data Using t-SNE. JMLR, 2008.
L.J.P. van der Maaten. Accelerating t-SNE using Tree-Based Algorithms. JMLR, 2014.

## Constructing the K-nearest Neighbor Graph

- Finding the nearest neighbors for all the data points
- Vantage-point tree
- Calculating the weights of the edges between the data points

$$
\begin{gathered}
p_{j \mid i}=\left\{\begin{array}{rl}
\frac{\exp \left(-d\left(\mathbf{x}_{i}, \mathbf{x}_{j}\right)^{2} / 2 \sigma_{i}^{2}\right)}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_{i}} \exp \left(-d\left(\mathbf{x}_{i}, \mathbf{x}_{k}\right)^{2} / 2 \sigma_{i}^{2}\right)}, & \text { if } j \in \mathcal{N}_{i} \\
0, & \mathcal{N}_{i}: \begin{array}{c}
\text { nearest neighbors } \\
\text { of node } \mathrm{i}
\end{array} \\
p_{i j}=\frac{p_{j \mid i}+p_{i \mid j}}{2 N} . &
\end{array} .\right.
\end{gathered}
$$

- Complexity: $O(N \log N)$ w.r.t. the number of data points $N$


## K-nearest Neighbor Graph Visualization

- Similarity between two data points $i$ and $j$ in low-dimensional space is defined as:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
q_{i j}=\frac{\left(1+\left\|\mathbf{y}_{i}-\mathbf{y}_{j}\right\|^{2}\right)^{-1}}{\sum_{k \neq l}\left(1+\left\|\mathbf{y}_{k}-\mathbf{y}_{l}\right\|^{2}\right)^{-1}}, & \mathbf{y}_{i}: \begin{array}{l}
\text { low-dimensional representations } \\
\text { (coordinates) of node } i
\end{array} \\
q_{i i}=0
\end{array}
$$

- Objective: minimize the similarities defined in the high-dimensional spaces and low-dimensional spaces

$$
C(\mathcal{E})=K L(P \| Q)=\sum_{i \neq j} p_{i j} \log \frac{p_{i j}}{q_{i j}}
$$

- The complexity: O(NLogN) (Maarten, 2014).


## Limitations of $t-S N E$

- K-NNG construction: complexity grows $O(N \log N)$ to the number of data poitns N
- Graph layout: complexity is $\mathrm{O}(\mathrm{NlogN})$
- Very sensitive parameters


## LargeVis (Tang et al., Best Paper Nomination at WWW 2016)

- Efficient approximation of K-NNG construction
- 30 times faster than t-SNE (3 million data points)
- Better time-accuracy tradeoff
- Efficient probabilistic model for graph layout
- O(NlogN) -> O(N)
- 7 times faster than $t-$ SNE (3 million data points)
- Better visualization layouts
- Stable parameters across different data sets


## Random Projection Trees

- Partition the whole space into different regions with multiple hyperplanes



## Random Projection Trees



## Random Projection Trees



## Random Projection Trees



## Random Projection Trees



## K-NNG Construction

- Search nearest neighbors through traversing trees
- Only data points in the leaf are considered as nearest neighbors
- Multiple trees are usually used to improve the accuracy
- e.g., hundreds



## Reduce the Number of Trees

- Construct a less accurate K-NNG with a few trees
- Iteratively refine the K-NNG through "neighbor exploring"
. "A neighbor of my neighbor is also likely to be my neighbor"
- Second-order neighbors are also treated as candidates of first-order neighbors


## It Works!

- X axis: accuracy of K-NNG
- Y axis: running time (minutes)
- tSNE: 16 hours ( $95 \%$ accuracy)
- LargeVis: 25 minutes
- >30 times faster than t-SNE



## Learning the Layout of KNN Graph

- Preserve the similarities of the nodes in 2D/3D space
- Represent each node with a 2D/3D vector
- Keep similar data close while dissimilar data far apart
- Probability of observing a binary edge between nodes $(i, j)$ :

$$
p\left(e_{i j}=1\right)=\frac{1}{1+\left\|\vec{y}_{i}-\vec{y}_{j}\right\|^{2}}
$$

- Likelihood of observing a weighted edge between nodes $(i, j)$ :

$$
p\left(e_{i j}=w_{i j}\right)=p\left(e_{i j}=1\right)^{w_{i j}}
$$

## A Probabilistic Model for Graph Layout

- Objective:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& O=\prod_{(i, j) \in E} p\left(e_{i j}=w_{i j}\right) \prod_{(i, j) \in \bar{E}}\left(1-p\left(e_{i j}=w_{i j}\right)\right)^{\gamma} \\
& \quad \gamma: \text { an unified weight assigned to negative edge }
\end{aligned}
$$

- Randomly sample some negative edges
- Optimized through asynchronous stochastic gradient descent
- Time complexity: linear to the number of data points


## It Works Too!

- Time complexity
- t-SNE: O(NlogN)
- LargeVis: O(N)
- On 3 million data points
- t-SNE: 45 hours
- LargeVis: 5.6 hours
- Seven times faster



## Visualization Quality

- Metric: classification accuracy with KNN on 2D space
- Configuration:
- LargeVis with default parameters
- t-SNE with default and optimal parameters (tuned per data set)
- LargeVis $\approx t-S N E$ with optimal parameters
- LargeVis >> t-SNE with default parameters
- Parameters of LargeVis are very stable


10M Scientific Papers on One Slide


Computer Science


Mathematics


Physics


Biology


## Computer Science vs. Mathematics



## Computer Science vs. Physics






## Summary

- LargeVis: a new technique for visualizing networks and high-dimensional data
- A better tool than t-SNE.
- >7 times faster than t-SNE on three million data points


## Impact

Our release:
LINE:
(C++)
LargeVis:
https://github.com/tangjianpku/LINE
(271 stars, released since 2015.3)
https://github.com/Iferry007/LargeVis (C++\&Python) (289 stars, released since 2016.7)

Other tools based on our implementation:
$R$ version in CRAN: $\quad$ https://github.com/elbamos/largeVis
LargeVis Tutorial: https://jlorince.github.io/viz-tutorial/
Interactive Visualization: https://github.com/NLeSC/DiVE
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## Beyond node representations

- Node representations are good for
- Node classification
- Recommendation
- Link prediction
. How about ...
- Information cascades
- Community detection

- Protein function prediction
- We want to learn graph representations


## Road map

- Non end-to-end method
- Graph kernels
- Manually designed kernel matrix
- Kernel matrix is later used for down-stream tasks
- End-to-end methods
- Matrix-based
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## Road map

- Non end-to-end method
- Graph kernels
- Manually designed kernel matrix
- Kernel matrix is later used for down-stream tasks
- End-to-end methods
- Matrix-based
- Sequence-based
- Graphical model based


## Kernels

- Quantify similarity of two objects
- $K\left(X, X^{\prime}\right)=\left(\Phi(X), \Phi\left(X^{\prime}\right)\right)$
- $\Phi(\cdot)$ maps objects to embedding space


## Graph kernels

- Intuition
- Design graph substructures
- Compare them to find similarity $K\left(G, G^{\prime}\right)$
- Embedding of a graph is its similarity to all other graphs

$G$

$G^{\prime}$
- Many graph kernels
- Shortest Path Kernel [Borgwardt+ '05]
- Graphlet Kernel [Shervashidze+ '09]
- Weisfeiler-Lehman Kernel [Shervashidze+ '11]


## Graphlet kernel

- Count \#graphlets


Graphlets of size 4

- $v_{G}=\left(\# F_{1}, \# F_{2}, \cdots, \# F_{11}\right)$ defines feature vector
- $\# F_{i}$ is the number of graphlet $F_{i}$ in $G$
- Isomorphic graphs have identical graphlet distribution.
- Graphlet kernel $K\left(G, G^{\prime}\right)=v_{G}{ }^{\top} v_{G^{\prime}}$


## Example of graphlet kernel



## Road map

- Non end-to-end method
- Graph kernels
- Manually designed kernel matrix
- Kernel matrix is later used for down-stream tasks
- End-to-end methods
- Matrix-based
- Sequence-based
- Graphical model based


## Matrix-based methods

- Represent graphs as matrices
- Similar to images
- Convolutional neural networks (CNNs) can be applied
- A simple way -- affinity matrix
- Sensitive to node order permutations
- Isomorphic graphs can be mapped to different matrices
- Problem: how to find a good intermediate matrix?


## PATCHY-SAN [Niepert+ '16]



Neighborhood normalization (exactly $k=4$ nodes)

## PATCHY-SAN [Niepert+ '16]

Normalized neighborhood


## DeepGraph [Li+'17a]

- Heat Kernel Signature (HKS)
- Proposed in computer vision [Sun+, '09]
- Represent the surface of 3D objects
- Model the amount of heat flow on nodes overtime
- Simulated on the snapshot of a graph



## Heat kernel

- There is a unit amount of heat on each node
- Heat starts to flow at time $t=0$
- $h_{t}(i, j)$ is the amount of heat flow
- Among node $i$ and $j$ after time $t$
- Through all edges between $i$ and $j$
- Calculate $h_{t}(i, j)$
- $f(t, i, j$, eigenvalue, eigenvector of $g($ adjacency matrix $))$


## HKS Graph Descriptor

- Heat kernel signature (HKS) H
- $H_{i, t}=h_{t}(i, i)$
- i-th node, t-th sampled time point
- HKS Graph descriptor S
- Independent of \#nodes
- Compute histograms for each column $H_{\text {,t }}$
- $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{k}, \mathrm{t}}$-- \#nodes in k -th bin at time t
- Row -- heat density dynamics over diffusion steps
- Column -- static heat density patterns at $t$


## Visualizing the graph descriptor

Convolutional architecture
" can be applied


Friendship network from Facebook

Author's Collaboration network from ACL


## Road map

- Non end-to-end method
- Graph kernels
- Manually designed kernel matrix
- Kernel matrix is later used for down-stream tasks
- End-to-end methods
- Matrix-based
- Sequence-based
- Graphical model based


## Current node embedding methods

- DeepWalk [Perozzi+ '14] and node2vec [Grover+ '16]
- Sample random walk sequences
- Sequence $\Leftrightarrow$ sentence
- Node $\Leftrightarrow$ word
- Word2vec can be used [Mikolov+ '13]
- DeepWalk, LINE [Tang+ '15] and node2vec
- Obtain graph embedding
- Average node embeddings
- Lead to significant loss of information


## DeepCas [Li+'17b]

- Inspired by DeepWalk [Perozzi+ '14]

We can adapt deep

- Make an analogy
- Node $\Leftrightarrow$ word
learning methods
developed for text
- Sampled random path $\Leftrightarrow$ sentence

How to assemble by
end-to-end learning?

- Graph $\Leftrightarrow$ document
- A set of graphs $\Leftrightarrow$ document collection


## Pipeline of DeepCas



## From sequence to graph representation

- Random walk has a terminating probability
- Decides the expected \#sequences
- Learn it by examining
- Represent the graph well $\rightarrow$ good prediction
- Intuition
- We sample enough sequences
- Partition the sequences into "mini-batches"
- Read in more until enough $\rightarrow$ stop random walk
- Implement the intuition
- A geometric distribution of attentions over mini-batches


## Assemble sequences to a document (graph)



## Road map

- Non end-to-end method
- Graph kernels
- Manually designed kernel matrix
- Kernel matrix is later used for down-stream tasks
- End-to-end methods
- Matrix-based
- Sequence-based
- Graphical model based


## Structure2vec [Dai+ '16]

- Construct graphical models for graphs

- A Markou random field $p\left(\left\{H_{i}\right\},\left\{X_{i}\right\}\right) \propto \prod_{i \in V} \Phi\left(H_{i}, X_{i}\right) \prod_{(i, j) \in E} \Psi\left(H_{i}, H_{j}\right)$
- $\Phi$ : node potentials
- $\Psi$ : edge potentials


## Embedding latent variable models

- Standard maximum likelihood estimation is difficult
- Embed the posterior marginal $p\left(H_{i} \mid\left\{x_{i}\right\}\right)$ to $u_{i}$
- $u_{i}=\int_{H} \phi\left(h_{i}\right) p\left(h_{i} \mid\left\{x_{i}\right\}\right) d h_{i}$
- $\phi\left(h_{i}\right)$ is a feature map to be learned
- $u_{i}$ is an embedding vector for node $i$


## Embedding latent variable models

- Standard maximum likelihood estimation is difficult
- Embed the posterior marginal $p\left(H_{i} \mid\left\{x_{i}\right\}\right)$ to $u_{i}$
- $u_{i}$ can be computed by approximate inference
- Parameterize it as a neural network
- $\tilde{u}_{i}=\sigma\left(W_{1} x_{i}+W_{2} \Sigma_{j \in N(i)} \tilde{u}_{j}+W_{3} \Sigma_{j \in N(i)} x_{j}\right)$
- $\left\{W_{1}, W_{2}, W_{3}\right\}$ are parameters
- $N(i)$ are neighbors of $i$
- $\sigma$ is an activation function


## Discriminative training

- We have embedding vectors $\left\{u_{i}\right\}$
- $\tilde{u}_{i}=\sigma\left(W_{1} x_{i}+W_{2} \Sigma_{j \in N(i)} \tilde{u}_{j}+W_{3} \Sigma_{j \in N(i)} x_{j}\right)$
- Represent a graph by $\Sigma_{i} \tilde{u}_{i}$
- Minimize the empirical square loss
- $\left(y-\theta^{\top} \sigma\left(\Sigma_{i} \tilde{u}_{i}\right)\right)^{2}$
- $y$ is the graph label
- $\theta$ is a parameter


## Conclusion

- Learning Representations of Entire Networks
- End-to-end methods usually work better
- When there are particular tasks at hand
- No general consensus on which methods consistently work better
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## Summary

- Network representation is a new methodology for analyzing and mining networks
- State-of-the-art approaches for node representation learning
- LINE, DeepWalk, and Node2Vec
- Moving towards to task-specific node representations (e.g., PTE and GraphConv)
- Visualizing large-scale networks and high-dimensional data
- LargeVis
- Sales up to tens of millions of nodes or data points
- Learning representations of network substructures
- DeepCas, Stru2Vec


## Challenges \& Future Work

- Scalability
- How to scale up to networks with billions of nodes
- Hierarchical representations
- How to learn hierarchical representations of networks
- Dynamic
- Heterogeneous networks
- Multiple types of nodes, multiple types of edges
- Learning isomorphism-invariance representations of entire networks
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## Optimization

- The gradient w.r.t. the embedding $\mathbf{y}_{i}$

$$
\frac{\partial C}{\partial \mathbf{y}_{i}}=4 \sum_{j \neq i}\left(p_{i j}-q_{i j}\right) q_{i j} Z\left(\mathbf{y}_{i}-\mathbf{y}_{j}\right)
$$

- Z is the partition function:

$$
Z=\sum_{k \neq l}\left(1+\left\|\mathbf{y}_{k}-\mathbf{y}_{l}\right\|^{2}\right)^{-1}
$$

- The complexity w.r.t. the number of data points $N$ is $O\left(N^{\wedge} 2\right)$
- Too expensive!


## Barnes-Hut Approximation

- Rewriting the gradient as:

$$
\frac{\partial C}{\partial \mathbf{y}_{i}}=4\left(\sum_{j \neq i}^{\substack{i j}} \sum_{\substack{\text { Attractive forces }}} p_{i j} q_{i j} Z\left(\mathbf{y}_{i}-\mathbf{y}_{j}\right)-\sum_{j \neq i} q_{i j}^{2} Z\left(\mathbf{y}_{i}-\mathbf{y}_{j}\right)\right),
$$

- Constructing a quadtree of the nodes according to the current low-dimensional representations


From $O\left(N^{\wedge} 2\right)$ to $O(N \log N)$ !


Sum of node $i$ and nodes in a cell: $-q_{i j}^{2} Z\left(\mathbf{y}_{i}-\mathbf{y}_{j}\right)$
$-N_{\text {cell }} q_{i, \text { cell }}^{2} Z\left(\mathbf{y}_{i}-\mathbf{y}_{\text {cell }}\right)$


[^0]:    Jian Tang, Meng Qu, and Qiaozhu Mei. PTE: Predictive Text Embedding through Large-scale Heterogeneous Text Networks. KDD'15.

