

Hyperbolic Heterogeneous Graph Attention Networks

Jongmin Park
Chungnam National University
Daejeon, South Korea
pa5398@g.cnu.ac.kr

SooHwan Jeong
Chungnam National University
Daejeon, South Korea
integerhwan@g.cnu.ac.kr

Seunghoon Han
Chungnam National University
Daejeon, South Korea
tmdgns129@o.cnu.ac.kr

Sungsu Lim*
Chungnam National University
Daejeon, South Korea
sungsu@cnu.ac.kr

ABSTRACT

Most previous heterogeneous graph embedding models represent elements in a heterogeneous graph as vector representations in a low-dimensional Euclidean space. However, because heterogeneous graphs inherently possess complex structures, such as hierarchical or power-law structures, distortions can occur when representing them in Euclidean space. To overcome this limitation, we propose Hyperbolic Heterogeneous Graph Attention Networks (HHGAT) that learn vector representations in hyperbolic spaces with metapath instances. We conducted experiments on three real-world heterogeneous graph datasets, demonstrating that HHGAT outperforms state-of-the-art heterogeneous graph embedding models in node classification and clustering tasks.

1 INTRODUCTION

Heterogeneous graphs consist of multiple types of nodes and links, enabling effective modeling of real-world scenarios. To address machine learning problems involving heterogeneous graphs, recent studies [2, 4, 7, 9, 12, 14] aiming to represent elements in a heterogeneous graph as vector representations in a low-dimensional Euclidean space have adopted graph neural networks. HAN [12] leverages information from metapath-based neighbors. In HAN, the intermediate nodes in the metapath instance are ignored, whereas MAGNN [2] extends HAN by considering these intermediate nodes. GTN [14] learns a soft selection by stacking graph transformer layers to learn metapaths.

While these studies achieve notable performance, is Euclidean space truly appropriate for heterogeneous graphs? Recent studies [6, 11, 13] on heterogeneous graph embedding show that real-world heterogeneous graphs have complex structures, including hierarchical and power-law structures. Therefore, they argue that hyperbolic space, which naturally inherits properties of complex structures, is more appropriate for heterogeneous graph embedding than Euclidean space. HHNE [13] proposed a metapath-based random walk strategy for sampling metapath instances and embedding them into hyperbolic space, demonstrating the effectiveness of learning metapath instances in hyperbolic spaces. SHAN [6] proposed heterogeneous graph neural networks with hyperbolic space to learn representations of heterogeneous graphs, leveraging simplicial complexes and hyperbolic graph attention mechanisms for multi-order relations. However, the limitations of these studies are




Figure 1: Examples of metapath instances and metapath instance distribution in ACM dataset.

that HHNE is a shallow embedding model that cannot fully leverage node features. On the other hand, SHAN extracts a simplicial complex consisting of nodes of the same type to learn multi-order relations, it does not effectively capture the heterogeneity inherent in relations between different types of nodes explicitly represented in heterogeneous graphs.

In a heterogeneous graph, a metapath is defined as an ordered sequence of node or link types, and it reflects the semantic information of a heterogeneous graph. In addition, a metapath instance is defined as a node sequence in a heterogeneous graph following the schema defined by the metapath. From metapath instances, we can capture not only rich semantic structural information within a heterogeneous graph but also heterogeneity from various types of nodes within metapath instances. Figure 1 illustrates examples of metapath instances starting from node v and demonstrates that these metapath instances follow a power-law distribution in real-world heterogeneous graphs. For example, P-A-P metapath instances reveal when two papers share an author, while P-A-P-A instances additionally indicate co-authorship. Hence, we can observe heterogeneity between different types of nodes within each metapath instance.

*Corresponding author.

To overcome the limitations of previous studies, we propose the Hyperbolic Heterogeneous Graph Attention Network (HHGAT), designed to learn rich semantic structural information from metapath instances following power-law distributions. Specifically, HHGAT automatically samples metapath instances within the maximum metapath length based on given link types to address the challenge of defining metapaths relying on domain-specific knowledge and leverages them in hyperbolic spaces to learn heterogeneous graph representations.

Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to propose hyperbolic heterogeneous graph neural networks for learning metapath instances. HHGAT can effectively learn the hierarchical structure of metapath instances explicitly present in heterogeneous graphs.
- We propose attention mechanisms in hyperbolic spaces to enhance the learning of node representations in heterogeneous graphs.
- We empirically show that HHGAT outperforms state-of-the-art algorithms in node classification and clustering tasks. In addition, we analyzed the effectiveness of the curvature parameter in hyperbolic spaces.

2 PRELIMINARIES

Definition 1 (Poincaré ball model). The Poincaré ball model with curvature $-c$ ($c > 0$) is defined by the Riemannian manifold $(\mathbb{D}^{n,c}, g_x^c)$, where

$$\mathbb{D}^{n,c} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : c\|x\|^2 < 1\}, \quad g_x^c = (\lambda_x^c)I_d.$$

Here, $\mathbb{D}^{n,c}$ is the open n -dimensional ball with radius $\frac{1}{\sqrt{c}}$, g_x^c is the Riemannian metric tensor where $\lambda_x^c = \frac{2}{1-c\|x\|^2}$, I_d is the identity matrix. We denote $\mathcal{T}_x\mathbb{D}^{n,c}$ as the tangent space of $\mathbb{D}^{n,c}$ at x .

Definition 2 (Möbius addition). Given $x, y \in \mathbb{D}^{n,c}$, the Möbius addition, representing the addition operation in the Poincaré ball $\mathbb{D}^{n,c}$, is defined as follows:

$$x \oplus_c y = \frac{(1 + 2c\langle x, y \rangle + c\|y\|^2)x + (1 - c\|x\|^2)y}{1 + 2c\langle x, y \rangle + c^2\|x\|^2\|y\|^2},$$

where $\langle \cdot \rangle$ and $\|\cdot\|$ represent the Euclidean inner product and norm, respectively.

Definition 3 (Exponential and logarithmic maps). The exponential map $\exp_x^c : \mathcal{T}_x\mathbb{D}^{n,c} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}^{n,c}$ and the logarithmic map $\log_x^c : \mathbb{D}^{n,c} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_x\mathbb{D}^{n,c}$ are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \exp_x^c(v) &= x \oplus_c \left(\tanh\left(\sqrt{c}\frac{\lambda_x^c\|v\|}{2}\right) \frac{v}{\sqrt{c}\|v\|} \right), \\ \log_x^c(y) &= \frac{2}{\sqrt{c}\lambda_x^c} \tanh^{-1}\left(\sqrt{c}\| -x \oplus_c v \|\right) \frac{-x \oplus_c y}{\| -x \oplus_c y \|}, \end{aligned}$$

where x and y are points in the hyperbolic space $\mathbb{D}^{n,c}$ and $x \neq y$. v is a nonzero tangent vector in the tangent space $\mathcal{T}_x\mathbb{D}^{n,c}$.

Definition 4 (Hyperbolic matrix-vector multiplication). Given $x \in \mathbb{D}^{n,c}$ and a weight matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, the matrix multiplication operation in hyperbolic spaces is defined as follows: if $Mx \neq 0$,

$$M \otimes_c x = \exp_0^c(M \log_0^c(x)).$$

Definition 5 (Hyperbolic non-linear activation function). Given the point $x \in \mathbb{D}^{n,c}$, the hyperbolic non-linear activation function is defined as follows:

$$\sigma^{\otimes c}(x) = \exp_0^c(\sigma(\log_0^c(x))),$$

where σ is a Euclidean non-linear activation function.

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Metapath Instance Sampling

Given a set of embedding target nodes \mathcal{V}_t , HHGAT samples the set of metapath instances consisting of metapath instances that start from node $v \in \mathcal{V}_t$ and have lengths within the maximum metapath length l . Each metapath instance $p \in \mathcal{M}_v$ follows metapath $\phi \in \Phi$, a set of metapaths. In this sampling process, we employ breadth-first search, which effectively captures the hierarchical structure around node v . Note that this procedure doesn't require predefined metapaths.

3.2 Metapath-specific Embedding

3.2.1 Euclidean Metapath Instance Feature. Equation 1 denotes the concatenation operation of the features of nodes $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ within a metapath instance, where j represents the length of metapath instance p . HHGAT concatenates all x_i within p to preserve information of intermediate nodes and their order. We then consider this concatenated feature as the feature of the metapath instance.

$$x_p^{\mathbb{E}} = \parallel_{i=1}^j x_i \quad (j \leq l). \quad (1)$$

3.2.2 Hyperbolic metapath instance embedding. For hyperbolic metapath instance embedding, HHGAT first maps Euclidean feature of metapath instance $x_p^{\mathbb{E}}$ to hyperbolic space $\mathbb{D}^{jd,c}$. We can assume that $x_p^{\mathbb{E}}$ is included in the tangent space $\mathcal{T}_x\mathbb{D}^{jd,c}$ at $x = 0$, then we can map $x_p^{\mathbb{E}}$ to hyperbolic space via exponential map \exp_o^c , where $o := \mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{R}^{jd}$ that denotes origin manifold $\mathbb{D}^{jd,c}$. A hyperbolic feature of metapath instance p , denoted as $x_p^{\mathbb{H}} \in \mathbb{D}^{jd,c}$, is represented as follows:

$$x_p^{\mathbb{H}} = \exp_o^c(x_p^{\mathbb{E}}), \quad (2)$$

where $-c$ is a learnable parameter that denotes the negative curvature of hyperbolic space.

After mapping from Euclidean to hyperbolic space, we use hyperbolic linear transformation to map $x_p^{\mathbb{H}}$ into the embedding space. The formulation of a hyperbolic linear transformation is as follows:

$$h_p^{\mathbb{H}} = (W \otimes_c x_p^{\mathbb{H}}) \oplus \exp_o^c(b). \quad (3)$$

In Equation 3, $W \in \mathbb{R}^{d' \times jd}$ is the weight matrix corresponds to the metapath instances following the metapath ϕ , d' is the dimension of metapath-specific embedding vector and $h_p^{\mathbb{H}} \in \mathbb{D}^{d',c}$ is the hyperbolic metapath instance embedding vector.

3.2.3 Metapath Instance Aggregation. The attention mechanism in hyperbolic spaces is used to learn the attention score of each metapath instance and aggregate them accordingly. In this process, we calculate the attention score of each metapath instance α_p as follows:

$$i_p = \sigma^{\otimes c}(a^T \cdot (\log_o^c(h_p^{\mathbb{H}}))), \quad (4)$$

$$\alpha_p = \frac{\exp(i_p)}{\sum_{q \in \mathcal{M}_v^{\phi}} \exp(i_q)}, \quad (5)$$

Table 1: Statistics of datasets

Dataset	# Nodes	# Links	# Class	Splitting	# Features
IMDB	Movie (M) : 4,661	M-D : 4,661	3	# Train : 1,410	1,256
	Director (D) : 2,270	M-A : 13,983		# Valid : 353	
	Actor (A) : 5,841			# Test : 1,175	
DBLP	Author (A) : 4,057	A-P : 19,645	4	# Train : 1,947	334
	Paper (P) : 14,328	P-C : 14,328		# Valid : 487	
	Conference (C) : 20			# Test : 1,622	
ACM	Paper (P) : 3,020	P-A : 9,936	3	# Train : 1,452	1,902
	Author (A) : 5,912	P-S : 3,025		# Valid : 363	
	Subject (S) : 57			# Test : 1,209	

where $a \in \mathbb{R}^{d'}$ is the attention vector.

Once the attention scores for each metapath instance following a specific metapath ϕ are obtained, HHGAT performs metapath instance aggregation to obtain the metapath-specific embedding vector $z_v^\phi \in \mathbb{D}^{d',c}$ as follows:

$$z_v^\phi = \sigma \otimes^c \left(\exp_o^c \left(\sum_{p \in \mathcal{M}_o^\phi} (\alpha_p \cdot \log_o^c(h_p^{\mathbb{H}})) \right) \right). \quad (6)$$

In Equations 4 and 6, $\sigma \otimes^c (\cdot)$ denotes the hyperbolic non-linear activation function with ReLU.

3.3 Inter-metapath Attention

For given metapath-specific embedding vectors, HHGAT aggregates them using an attention mechanism. The attention score for each metapath-specific embedding vector β_ϕ can be calculated as follows:

$$w_\phi = q^T \cdot \tanh(M \cdot \log_o^c(z_v^\phi) + b), \quad (7)$$

$$\beta_\phi = \frac{\exp(w_\phi)}{\sum_{\pi \in \Phi} \exp(w_\pi)}. \quad (8)$$

In Equation 7, $M \in \mathbb{R}^{d_e \times d'}$ is the weight matrix corresponds to z_v^ϕ , and $q \in \mathbb{R}^{d_e}$ is the attention vector and d_e is the dimension of final node embedding vector. With the learned attention score for metapath-specific embedding vectors, HHGAT can assign higher weights to semantically important metapath-specific embedding vectors. The final node embedding for node v , denoted as $Z_v \in \mathbb{R}^{d_e}$, is represented in Equation 9. Here, σ represents the ReLU activation function.

$$z_v = \sigma \left(\sum_{\phi \in \Phi} (\beta_\phi \cdot \log_o^c(z_v^\phi)) \right). \quad (9)$$

3.4 Model Training

We utilize the linear transformation $f(\cdot)$ to project node embedding vectors into a space with the specified output dimension. This transformation is formulated as follows:

$$f(z_v) = \sigma(W_c \cdot z_v), \quad (10)$$

where $W_c \in \mathbb{R}^{d_o \times d_e}$ is the weight matrix with d_o representing the dimension of the output vector and σ is the activation function. Then, HHGAT is trained by minimizing the cross-entropy function \mathcal{L} , which is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{L} = - \sum_{v \in V_t} \sum_{c=1}^C (y_v[c] \cdot \log(f(z_v)[c])), \quad (11)$$

where v_t is the embedding target node set from labeled node set, C is the number of classes, y_v is the one-hot encoded label vector of node v , and $f(z_v)$ is a vector representing the label probabilities of node v .

4 EXPERIMENTS

4.1 Datasets

We conducted experiments using three widely-used real-world heterogeneous graph datasets provided by GTN [14]. Table 1 shows the statistics of the datasets. IMDB is an online database related to movies and television programs. Movie type of nodes were labeled according to the movie’s genre. In DBLP and ACM, both of which are citation networks, the Author and Paper types of nodes are labeled according to the author’s research area and the paper’s subject area, respectively.

4.2 Baselines

We compare HHGAT with several state-of-the-art GNN models. These baselines are divided into four categories: Euclidean homogeneous GNNs including GCN [5] and GAT [10]; hyperbolic homogeneous GNNs including HGCN [1]; Euclidean heterogeneous GNNs including HAN [12], MAGNN [2], GTN [14], HetSANN [3], HGT [4], GraphMSE [7] and Simple-HGN [8]; hyperbolic heterogeneous GNNs including SHAN [6]. Note that, for a fair comparison between homogeneous GNNs and heterogeneous GNNs, we preprocess the node features to be homogeneous.

4.3 Implementation Details

For the baselines, we randomly initialize parameters and use the Adam optimizer with a learning rate of 0.0001 and a weight decay of 0.001. We set the dropout rate to 0.5, the embedding dimension to 64, and the number of attention heads to 8 for multi-head attention-based models. The baseline models are trained for 100 epochs, and we adopt early stopping with patience of 20 epochs. The metapath settings for metapath-based heterogeneous GNNs follow the specifications outlined in their papers. For HHGAT, the maximum length of metapath l is set to 4, 5, and 3 for IMDB, DBLP, and ACM, respectively.

4.4 Node Classification & Clustering

Node classification and clustering were performed ten times, and we report the average values and standard deviations of Macro-F1 and Micro-F1 for classification, as well as NMI and ARI for clustering. The classification and clustering were performed using SVM and k -means clustering on the embedding vectors of the labeled nodes.

As shown in Tables 2 and 3, HHGAT performs better than the baseline models in most cases. The results from HHGAT and SHAN indicate the effectiveness of hyperbolic space embedding in heterogeneous graphs. Compared to SHAN, HHGAT effectively captures the continuous hierarchical structure of nodes contained within metapath instances that follow the metapath schema representing the semantic structure within heterogeneous graphs. Also, through effective aggregation of metapath-specific embeddings (Sec. 3.3), HHGAT captures important semantic information well.


On the other hand, HGCN achieves better performance than GCN and GAT. The reason lies in that hyperbolic space has a constant negative curvature, and it expands exponentially. This property makes hyperbolic space more appropriate for modeling tree-like or hierarchically structured graphs where the number of nodes grows exponentially, as opposed to Euclidean space. At last, the results from heterogeneous GNNs show that these baselines

Table 2: Experimental results (%) for the node classification task.

Dataset	Metric	Baselines											
		GCN	GAT	HGCN	HAN	MAGNN	GTN	HetSANN	HGT	GraphMSE	Simple-HGN	SHAN	HHGAT
IMDB	Macro-F1	54.37±0.43	56.91±0.28	57.89±0.59	58.92±0.51	60.72±0.46	61.79±0.61	60.21±0.58	60.63±0.20	63.57±0.43	64.72±0.75	66.63±0.73	67.01±0.55
	Micro-F1	54.53±0.41	56.18±0.35	57.91±0.48	58.44±0.86	60.62±0.63	63.63±0.71	57.14±0.56	62.74±0.49	66.81±0.52	67.12±0.76	69.59±0.80	70.23±0.54
DBLP	Macro-F1	89.42±0.23	91.50±0.48	92.58±1.06	92.83±0.51	93.62±0.64	93.75±0.42	92.15±0.54	92.27±0.49	94.35±0.31	94.02±0.43	94.53±0.25	95.72±0.27
	Micro-F1	89.16±0.51	92.17±0.43	93.36±0.87	93.33±0.63	94.13±0.51	94.25±0.38	92.78±0.56	92.61±0.18	94.50±0.56	94.70±0.51	94.67±0.26	96.06±0.30
ACM	Macro-F1	88.51±0.49	88.39±0.37	89.95±0.42	91.23±0.31	90.69±0.29	91.27±0.19	89.20±0.27	90.88±0.17	93.34±0.30	93.32±0.19	93.90±0.31	94.40±0.23
	Micro-F1	88.22±0.45	87.86±0.43	90.24±0.37	92.44±0.32	92.15±0.25	92.05±0.23	90.02±0.35	91.23±0.39	93.31±0.27	93.36±0.51	94.42±0.30	94.45±0.21

Table 3: Experimental results (%) for the node clustering task.

Dataset	Metric	Baselines											
		GCN	GAT	HGCN	HAN	MAGNN	GTN	HetSANN	HGT	GraphMSE	Simple-HGN	SHAN	HHGAT
IMDB	NMI	12.62±0.18	13.12±0.34	14.88±0.81	15.54±0.84	20.67±1.10	19.98±0.38	20.01±0.45	19.66±0.34	20.69±0.91	22.38±0.74	22.64±0.83	22.87±0.54
	ARI	12.80±0.29	13.84±0.24	15.71±0.78	16.42±0.93	21.60±0.48	20.85±0.46	21.75±0.51	21.06±0.54	21.47±0.80	23.61±0.75	26.49±0.46	26.83±0.63
DBLP	NMI	76.20±0.12	77.34±0.51	78.18±0.96	79.01±0.21	80.39±0.37	80.24±0.84	80.87±0.35	79.15±0.40	36.32±0.46	81.26±0.18	82.15±0.25	81.34±0.31
	ARI	77.18±0.16	78.36±0.63	80.44±1.09	82.51±0.33	85.66±0.35	83.39±0.76	81.84±0.48	82.41±0.52	33.81±0.58	85.73±0.21	86.07±0.36	86.12±0.42
ACM	NMI	55.52±0.37	63.19±0.24	64.93±0.50	66.17±0.36	70.86±0.44	69.94±0.17	69.10±0.20	72.01±0.26	72.82±0.39	74.63±0.36	75.19±0.27	75.38±0.19
	ARI	58.48±0.36	65.63±0.32	67.89±0.79	68.92±0.33	72.05±0.29	71.46±0.24	72.78±0.33	77.09±0.36	77.56±0.24	78.68±0.48	79.93±0.34	80.16±0.64

**Figure 2: Node classification accuracy for varying the curvature parameter c . The red line indicates the optimal c .**

outperform homogeneous GNNs by leveraging the semantic information derived from the heterogeneity of heterogeneous graphs.

4.5 Analysis of Curvature

To analyze the effect of a curvature parameter c , that is the curvature is $-c$, we kept the curvature fixed during model training. As a result, Figure 2 illustrates the node classification accuracy for different curvatures. The red line highlights the optimal curvatures for each dataset, which are -0.8189 , -0.5278 , and -0.8052 for IMDB, DBLP, and ACM, respectively.

Figure 2 shows that HHGAT achieved the highest performance with the optimal curvature. As c approaches zero, we observed that the performance of HHGAT generally decreases. This is due to the hyperbolic space becoming similar to the flat curvature of the Euclidean space, which weakens its property to represent hierarchical structures. On the other hand, when the curvature parameter c becomes larger than the optimal value and continues to increase, the hyperbolic space with that curvature does not appropriate well with the power-law distribution inherent in each dataset. This mismatch leads to lower performance compared to the optimal case. From this empirical observation, we conclude that setting the curvature

as a learnable parameter and training it to align with the power-law distribution inherent in each dataset is an effective approach.

5 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we proposed the hyperbolic heterogeneous graph attention networks. Without domain knowledge, HHGAT samples metapath instances and leverages them in hyperbolic spaces for effective heterogeneous graph representation learning. We conduct extensive experiments using three real-world heterogeneous graph datasets. The results demonstrate that HHGAT performs better than other state-of-the-art baselines. For the future work, we plan to explore optimizing curvature with regularization to enhance the representation of heterogeneous graphs, aiming to better capture the inherent power-law distribution.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ines Chami, Zhitao Ying, Christopher Ré, and Jure Leskovec. 2019. Hyperbolic graph convolutional neural networks. In *NeurIPS*, Vol. 32.
- [2] Xinyu Fu, Jian Zhang, Ziqiao Meng, and Irwin King. 2020. MAGNN: Metapath Aggregated Graph Neural Network for Heterogeneous Graph Embedding. In *WWW*. 2331–2341.
- [3] Huiting Hong, Hantao Guo, Yucheng Lin, Xiaoqing Yang, Zang Li, and Jieping Ye. 2020. An attention-based graph neural network for heterogeneous structural learning. In *AAAI*, Vol. 34. 4132–4139.
- [4] Ziniu Hu, Yuxiao Dong, Kuansan Wang, and Yizhou Sun. 2020. Heterogeneous graph transformer. In *WWW*. 2704–2710.
- [5] Thomas N. Kipf and Max Welling. 2017. Semi-Supervised Classification with Graph Convolutional Networks. In *ICLR*.
- [6] Junlin Li, Yueheng Sun, and Minglai Shao. 2023. Multi-Order Relations Hyperbolic Fusion for Heterogeneous Graphs. In *CIKM*. 1358–1367.
- [7] Yi Li, Yilun Jin, Guojie Song, Zihao Zhu, Chuan Shi, and Yiming Wang. 2021. GraphMSE: Efficient Meta-path Selection in Semantically Aligned Feature Space for Graph Neural Networks. In *AAAI*. 4206–4214.
- [8] Qingsong Lv, Ming Ding, Qiang Liu, Yuxiang Chen, Wenzheng Feng, Siming He, Chang Zhou, Jianguo Jiang, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. 2021. Are we really making much progress? revisiting, benchmarking and refining heterogeneous graph neural networks. In *KDD*. 1150–1160.
- [9] Jongmin Park, Soohwan Jeong, Byung Suk Lee, and Sungsu Lim. 2023. MIGTNet: Metapath Instance-based Graph Transformation Network for heterogeneous graph embedding. *Future Generation Computer Systems* 149 (2023), 390–401.
- [10] Petar Veličković, Guillem Cucurull, Arantxa Casanova, Adriana Romero, Pietro Liò, and Yoshua Bengio. 2018. Graph Attention Networks. In *ICLR*.
- [11] Lili Wang, Chongyang Gao, Chenghan Huang, Ruiho Liu, Weicheng Ma, and Soroush Vosoughi. 2021. Embedding heterogeneous networks into hyperbolic space without meta-path. In *AAAI*, Vol. 35. 10147–10155.
- [12] Xiao Wang, Houye Ji, Chuan Shi, Bai Wang, Yanfang Ye, Peng Cui, and Philip S Yu. 2019. Heterogeneous Graph Attention Network. In *WWW*. 2022–2032.
- [13] Xiao Wang, Yiding Zhang, and Chuan Shi. 2019. Hyperbolic heterogeneous information network embedding. In *AAAI*, Vol. 33. 5337–5344.
- [14] Seongjun Yun, Minbyul Jeong, Raehyun Kim, Jaewoo Kang, and Hyunwoo J. Kim. 2019. Graph Transformer Networks. In *NeurIPS*, Vol. 32.