# <span id="page-0-0"></span>AGS-GNN: Attribute-guided Sampling for Graph Neural Networks

Siddhartha Shankar Das das90@purdue.edu Purdue University West Lafayette, IN, USA

S M Ferdous sm.ferdous@pnnl.gov Pacific Northwest National Lab. Richland, WA, USA

Mahantesh M Halappanavar hala@pnnl.gov Pacific Northwest National Lab. Richland, WA, USA

Edoardo Serra edoardoserra@boisestate.edu Boise State University Boise, ID, USA

Alex Pothen apothen@purdue.edu Purdue University West Lafayette, IN, USA

# Abstract

We propose AGS-GNN, a novel attribute-guided sampling algorithm for Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) that exploits node features and connectivity structure of a graph while simultaneously adapting for both homophily and heterophily in graphs. (In homophilic graphs vertices of the same class are more likely to be connected, and vertices of different classes tend to be linked in heterophilic graphs.) While GNNs have been successfully applied to homophilic graphs, their application to heterophilic graphs remains challenging. The best-performing GNNs for heterophilic graphs do not fit the sampling paradigm, suffer high computational costs, and are not inductive. We employ samplers based on feature-similarity and feature-diversity to select subsets of neighbors for a node, and adaptively capture information from homophilic and heterophilic neighborhoods using dual channels. Currently, AGS-GNN is the only algorithm that we know of that explicitly controls homophily in the sampled subgraph through similar and diverse neighborhood samples. For diverse neighborhood sampling, we employ submodularity, which was not used in this context prior to our work. The sampling distribution is pre-computed and highly parallel, achieving the desired scalability. Using an extensive dataset consisting of 35 small ( $\leq 100K$  nodes) and large ( $> 100K$  nodes) homophilic and heterophilic graphs, we demonstrate the superiority of AGS-GNN compare to the current approaches in the literature. AGS-GNN achieves comparable test accuracy to the best-performing heterophilic GNNs, even outperforming methods using the entire graph for node classification. AGS-GNN also converges faster compared to methods that sample neighborhoods randomly, and can be incorporated into existing GNN models that employ node or graph sampling.

### Keywords

Graph Neural Networks, Heterophily, Submodular Functions

### 1 Introduction

Traditional Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) rely on the homophilic property of the learning problem, which assumes that a significant portion of a node's neighbors share the class label of the node. However, this assumption has been challenged in recent years since graphs in several practical applications do not satisfy homophily [\[34,](#page-8-0) [54\]](#page-9-0). Consequently, GNNs designed with the assumption of homophily fail to classify heterophilic graphs accurately due to noisy or improper neighborhood aggregation [\[27\]](#page-8-1). A simple Multi-layer Perceptron (MLP) based model that ignores the

graph structure can outperform existing homophilic GNNs on heterophilic graphs [\[8,](#page-8-2) [25,](#page-8-3) [26,](#page-8-4) [28,](#page-8-5) [50,](#page-9-1) [57\]](#page-9-2). As a result, a number of special-purpose GNNs have been developed to classify heterophilic graphs [\[8,](#page-8-2) [23,](#page-8-6) [26](#page-8-4)[–28,](#page-8-5) [46,](#page-9-3) [47,](#page-9-4) [54,](#page-9-0) [56,](#page-9-5) [57\]](#page-9-2).

Although GNNs have been adapted for heterophilic graphs in earlier work, their applicability is limited since they do not scale to large graphs and are transductive. Unlike homophilic GNNs [\[3,](#page-8-7) [4,](#page-8-8) [6,](#page-8-9) [15,](#page-8-10) [18,](#page-8-11) [51\]](#page-9-6), where subgraph sampling strategies have been developed for scaling, currently there are no effective sampling approaches for heterophilic graphs [\[25\]](#page-8-3). Recent authors have enabled scaling by first transforming node features and adjacency matrix into lower dimensional representations, and then applying minibatching on the combined representations [\[24,](#page-8-12) [25\]](#page-8-3). Thus inference on heterophilic graphs via graph sampling remains challenging.

The dichotomy of classifying graphs into heterophilic or homophilic graphs, as used in current literature, is blurred in practice by the presence of locally homophilic and locally heterophilic nodes. As shown in Fig. [1](#page-1-0) ([§2\)](#page-1-1), both homophilic and heterophilic graphs could have nodes with high local homophily or heterophily. However, there is no systematic and scalable approach for neighborhood sampling that distinguishes each node w.r.t. its local homophily property. We propose a new sampling strategy that incorporates both the adjacency structure of the graph as well as the feature information of the nodes that is capable of making this distinction. For a homophilic node, we build our sampling strategy based on a widely used smoothing assumption [\[40\]](#page-8-13) that labels and features generally correlate positively. Heterophilic nodes of the same labels, however, are expected to have the same dissimilar neighborhood [\[27\]](#page-8-1), and our sampling strategy exploits this. Thus, we generate two sets of local neighborhood samples for each node: one based on feature similarity that potentially improves local homophily, while the other encourages diversity and increases heterophily. These two samples are adaptively learned using an MLP to select the appropriate one based on the downstream task. Our attribute-based sampling strategy can be seamlessly plugged into GNNs designed for classifying heterophilic graphs and performs well in practice. The strength of our approach, however, is that even when paired with GNNs designed for homophilic graphs, we obtain better accuracies for heterophilic graphs, thus rendering an overall scalable approach for the latter graphs. The key contributions and findings of this work are summarized as follows:

(1) We propose a novel scalable and inductive unsupervised and supervised feature-guided sampling framework, AGS-GNN, to learn node representations for both homophilic and heterophilic graphs.

(2) AGS-GNN incorporates sampling based on similarity and diversity (modeled by a submodular function). We are not aware of earlier work that uses submodularity in this context. AGS-GNN employs dual channels with MLPs to learn from both similar and diverse neighbors of a node.

(3) We experimented with 35 benchmark datasets for node classification and compared them against GNNs designed for heterophilic and homophilic graphs. For both types of graphs, AGS-GNN achieved improved accuracies relative to earlier methods (Fig. [5\)](#page-7-0) ([§5.3\)](#page-6-0). Further, AGS-GNN also requires fewer iterations (up to 50% less) ([§5.4\)](#page-7-1) to converge relative to random sampling.

#### <span id="page-1-1"></span>2 Preliminaries

Consider a weighted graph  $G(V, \mathcal{E})$  with set of vertices V, and set of edges E. We denote the number of vertices and edges by  $|\mathcal{V}| \equiv n$ and  $|\mathcal{E}| \equiv m$ . The adjacency matrix of the graph will be denoted by  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , and the f-dimensional feature matrix of nodes by  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times f}$ . We denote  $y_u \in \mathbb{Y} = \{1, 2, \dots, c\}$  to be the label of a node *u* that belongs to one of the *c* classes, and the vector  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Y}^n$ to denote the labels of all nodes. Additionally, the graph may have associated edge features of dimension  $f_e$ . The degree of node  $u$  is denoted by  $d_u$ , the average degree by d, and the set  $\mathcal{N}(u)$  denotes the set of neighboring vertices of a node  $u$ . For a GNN,  $\ell$  denotes the number of layers,  $H$  the number of neurons in the hidden layer, and  $W<sup>i</sup>$  the learnable weight of the *i*-th layer.

#### 2.1 Homophily Measures

The homophily of a graph characterizes how likely vertices with the same labels are neighbors of each other. Many measures of homophily fit this definition, and Appendix [10.2](#page-15-0) discusses seven of them, with the values computed on our benchmark dataset. However, for conciseness, we will focus here on *node homophily*  $(H_n)$ (intuitive), and *adjusted homophily* ( $H_a$ ) (handles class imbalance). The local node homophily of node u is  $\mathcal{H}_n(u) = \frac{|\{v \in \mathcal{N}(u): y_v = y_u\}|}{|\mathcal{N}(u)|},$ and its mean value node homophily [\[33\]](#page-8-14) is defined as follows:

$$
\mathcal{H}_n = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{V}|} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{V}} \mathcal{H}_n(u). \tag{1}
$$

The *edge homophily* [\[57\]](#page-9-2) of a graph is  $\mathcal{H}_e = \frac{|\{(u,v) \in \mathcal{E} : y_u = y_v\}|}{|\mathcal{E}|}$ . Let  $D_k = \sum_{v: y_v = k} d_v$  denote the sum of degrees of the nodes belonging to class  $k$ . Then the *adjusted homophily* [\[34\]](#page-8-0) is defined as

$$
\mathcal{H}_a = \frac{\mathcal{H}_e - \sum_{k=1}^c D_k^2 / (2|\mathcal{E}|^2)}{1 - \sum_{k=1}^c D_k^2 / 2|\mathcal{E}|^2}.
$$
 (2)

The values of the node homophilies and edge homophily range from 0 to 1, and the adjusted homophily ranges from  $-\frac{1}{3}$  to +1 (Proposition 1 in [\[34\]](#page-8-0)). In this paper, we will classify graphs with adjusted homophily less than 0.50 as heterophilic. Fig. [1](#page-1-0) shows the distribution of the local node homophily of a homophilic and a heterophilic graph. We see that both the graphs have a mix of locally heterophilic and locally homophilic nodes.

#### 2.2 Effect of Homophily on Classification

To highlight the effect of homophily, we conduct an experiment on node classification using synthetic graphs with different levels of node homophily. These synthetic graphs are generated from the

<span id="page-1-0"></span>

Figure 1: The distribution of local node homophily in a homophilic and a heterophilic graph. Figs. [13](#page-19-0) and [14](#page-20-0) in Appendix [10.5](#page-18-0) show this for all datasets.

existing graphs, ignoring the structure information of the graph but retaining the node features and class labels. Following [\[27\]](#page-8-1), to generate an undirected graph with an average degree of  $d$  and node homophily  $H_n$ , for each node u we randomly assign  $H_n \cdot d/2$ edges from the same class as  $u$  and  $(1 - H_n) \cdot d/2$  edges from other classes. We left the class distribution unbalanced, as it is in the original graph, making it more challenging for GNNs since the neighborhood of a heterophilic node could potentially have more nodes from the majority class.

Fig. [2](#page-2-0) shows the performance of GSAGE [\[15\]](#page-8-10) (a homophilic GNN) and ACM-GCN [\[27\]](#page-8-1) (a heterophilic GNN) on the synthetic graphs generated from Squirrel and Chameleon [\[36\]](#page-8-15) datasets. We use two versions of ACM-GCN, one with three channels (low-pass, high-pass, and identity) and the other with an additional channel with graph structure information (ACM-GCN-struc). The original Squirrel and Chameleon datasets are heterophilic, and the ACM-GCN-struc is the best-performing. For synthetic graphs, on both Squirrel and Chameleon, (Fig. [2\)](#page-2-0), we see that surprisingly the worst  $\overline{F_1}$  score is not achieved on the graphs whose homophily value is zero but for values near 0.25. When the homophily score is high, GNNs perform well since it aggregates relevant information, but as we observe ACM-GCN also does well at a very low homophily. This is because some locally heterophilic nodes become easier to classify after neighborhood aggregation on features (note that features are not considered in the definition of homophily based solely on labels). Another intuitive reason is that when two nodes are adjacent to the same dissimilar (wrt class labels) neighbors, the high pass filters (e.g., graph Laplacian) used in ACM-GCN treat these nodes as similar and can classify them correctly (Appendix [7.4\)](#page-10-0).

#### <span id="page-1-2"></span>2.3 Similarity, Diversity, and Homophily

Nodes with similar features tend to have similar labels [\[40\]](#page-8-13). We carried out an experiment to validate this statement and show in Appendix [10.4](#page-17-0) that the labels of nodes often correlate positively with their features. Therefore, if instead of sampling the neighbors of a node  $u$  uniformly at random, we sample neighbors that are similar to  $u$  in feature space, we are likely to increase the homophily of the sampled subgraph.

However, this strategy alone is not enough for heterophilic graphs as they include both locally homophilic and heterophilic nodes (Fig. [1\)](#page-1-0). Two heterophilic nodes with the same label are expected to have similar class label distributions in their neighbors.

<span id="page-2-0"></span>

Figure 2:  $F_1$  Score comparison of GSAGE and ACM-GCN on synthetic graphs generated from Squirrel (a) and Chameleon (b) datasets with varying node homophily.

In other words, the diversity in their class labels makes them similar. It has been shown [\[27,](#page-8-1) [46,](#page-9-3) [54\]](#page-9-0) that high-pass filters [\[9\]](#page-8-16) (e.g., variants of graph Laplacians:  $\vec{L} = \vec{D} - \vec{A}$ ,  $\vec{L_{sym}} = \vec{D}^{-1/2} \vec{L} \vec{D}^{-1/2}$ , or  $L_{rw} = D^{-1}L$ ) capture the difference between nodes, and low-pass filters (e.g., scaled adjacency matrices,  $A_{sym} = D^{-1/2}AD^{-1/2}$ , or  $A_{rw} = D^{-1}A$ ) retain the commonality of node features (Appendix [7.4\)](#page-10-0). Therefore, if we sample diverse neighbors (in feature space) and use a GNN with a high-pass filter, we expect a higher chance of mapping two heterophilic nodes of same class to the same space (after feature transformation) since they will have the same dissimilar neighborhood.

A mathematical approach to ensure diversity is through submodular function maximization [\[22,](#page-8-17) [37\]](#page-8-18). A submodular function is a set function that favors a new node that is most distant in feature space to add to a partially sampled neighborhood. It accomplishes this by defining a suitable marginal gain of the new element with respect to the current neighborhood, and maximizing this value. However, employing only diverse neighborhoods can also cause issues since two nodes with different labels may have similar neighborhoods after sampling. In this scenario, sampling based on similarity is more appropriate. For the spectral domain, AGS-GNN considers two channels: one with a sampled subgraph ensuring diversity (used with a high-pass filter) and the other with a subgraph sampled based on similarity (used with a low-pass filter). Similar to ACM-GCN, we can also use an identity channel. However, spectral GNNs are difficult to scale as they often do not support mini-batching, and are transductive. Hence we consider spatial GNNs for heterophilic graphs, which employ graph topology to develop aggregation strategies. However, for heterophilic graphs, both similar and dissimilar neighbors need to be considered, and in AGS-GNN, we achieve this through attribute-guided biased sampling of similar and diverse samples.

2.3.1 Node Homophily with Similar and Diverse neighborhood: Consider an ego node  $t = \{x_t, y_t\}$  with feature  $x_t$ , label  $y_t$ , and local node homophily  $H_n(t)$ . Let the feature and label tuples of the neighbors of t be  $\mathcal{N}(t) = \{ (x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), \cdots, (x_{d_t}, y_{d_t}) \}$ . From the definition of homophily, the probability of randomly selecting a neighbor  $i \in \mathcal{N}(t)$  with the same label as the ego node is  $P_{\mathcal{U}}(y_i = y_t) = \mathcal{H}_n(t)$ . Here,  $\mathcal U$  refers to the distribution of selecting a neighbor uniformly at random. Let  $s(x_i, x_t)$  be a positive similarity score in features between a neighbor,  $i$ , and the ego node,  $t$ .

Assumption 2.1. For a node t, the average similarity of neighbors with the same label as t is greater than or equal to the average similarity of all neighbors.

<span id="page-2-1"></span>Lemma 2.1. If the probability of selecting a neighboring node is proportional to its similarity to the ego node  $t$ , the local node homophily of sampled neighborhood  $\mathcal{H}'_n(t) \geq \mathcal{H}_n(t)$ . If the sampling probability distribution is *S*, then  $P_S(y_i = y_t) \geq P_U(y_i = y_t)$ .

To retrieve a diverse set of neighbors we can employ a submodular function. An example could be the facility location function based on maximizing pairwise similarities between the points in the data set and their nearest chosen point,  $f(S, A) = \sum_{y \in A} \max_{x \in S} \phi(x, y)$ , where A is the ground set,  $S \subseteq A$  is a subset, and  $\phi$  is the similarity measure. In our context  $S$  is the current set of selected nodes initialized with ego node t, and ground set  $A = N(t) \cup \{t\}$ . The *marginal* gain is  $f_i = f(S \cup \{i\}, A) - f(S, A)$  for each neighbor  $i \in \mathcal{N}(t) \setminus S$ . Successively, neighbors are added to the sampled neighborhood by choosing them to have maximum marginal gain with respect to the current sample of the neighborhood.

Assumption 2.2. The average marginal gain of the neighbors of a node t with the same label as t is less than or equal to the average marginal gain of all neighbors.

<span id="page-2-2"></span>Lemma 2.2. If the probability of selecting a neighboring node is proportional to its marginal gain wrt the ego node t, then the local node homophily of sampled neighborhood  $\mathcal{H}'_n(t) \leq \mathcal{H}_n(t)$ . If the sampling probability distribution is  $D$ , then  $P_{\mathcal{D}}(y_i = y_t) \leq P_{\mathcal{U}}(y_i = y_t)$ .

Proofs of Lemmas [2.1](#page-2-1) and [2.2](#page-2-2) are included in the Appendix [7.1](#page-9-7) and Appendix [7.2](#page-10-1) respectively. We also report experimental verification of these properties in Appendix [7.3.](#page-10-2) From the Lemma [2.1,](#page-2-1) sampling neighbors based on feature-similarity improves homophily, which potentially helps to map homophilic nodes of the same labels into the same space. We assume features and labels to be positively correlated; thus, if we ensure feature diversity among neighbors, we can also expect label diversity in the samples, reducing local homophily (as shown in Lemma [2.2\)](#page-2-2) and increasing the chances of mapping two heterophilic nodes into the same space. We devise feature-similarity and feature-diversity-based sampling based on these results in the next section.

### 3 Proposed Method: **AGS-GNN**

Fig. [3](#page-3-0) shows an overview of the AGS-GNN framework. AGS-GNN has a pre-computation step that ranks the neighbors of nodes and computes edge weights to form a distribution to sample from in the sampling phases during training.

#### <span id="page-2-3"></span>3.1 Pre-computing Probability Distribution

An ideal graph sampling process should have the following key requirements: (i) Nodes with strong mutual influences (in terms of structure and attributes) should be sampled together in a subgraph [\[51\]](#page-9-6). (ii) Should be able to distinguish between similar and dissimilar neighbors (especially for heterophilic graphs) [\[54\]](#page-9-0). (iii) Every edge should have a non-zero probability of being sampled in order to generalize and explore the full feature and label space.

In this section, we will devise sampling strategies satisfying these requirements. We assume that we have access to a similarity measure between any two nodes in the graph. This similarity function

<span id="page-3-0"></span>KDD '24, August, Barcelona Trovato and Tobin, et al.



Figure 3: **AGS-GNN** framework with Node Sampling. a) Pre-computation step to rank the neighbor of vertices. b) Demonstrates how weighted node sampling is performed based on the selection probabilities of ranked neighbors.

typically depends on the problem and the dataset. For an example, in text based datasets, we may use cosine similarity of the feature vectors (e.g., TF-IDF) generated from the texts of the corresponding items. We may also learn the similarities when an appropriate similarity measure is not apparent. Once we have the similarity function, for each vertex  $u$ , we construct a probability distribution over its neighbors as follows: (i) *rank* the neighboring nodes  $(N(u))$ using the similarity scores to  $u$ . (ii) assign weights to the adjacent edges of  $u$  based on this ranking. A few choices are shown in Fig. [10](#page-12-0) in Appendix. (iii) normalize the weights to construct the probability mass function (PMF)  $\mathcal{P}(u)$  of the distribution over  $\mathcal{N}(u)$ .

We construct the probability distribution using the rank rather than the actual similarity values, since the distribution using the similarity values could be skewed and extremely biased towards a few top items. Here we consider two choices of rankings of neighborhoods that are suited for homophilic and heterophilic graphs.

<span id="page-3-1"></span>3.1.1 Ranking based on similarity: For this case, our goal is to sample subgraphs favoring similar edges to be present more frequently in the subgraph. To achieve that we propose to construct a probability distribution over the edges based on the similarity scores. We sort the similarity values of all the neighboring vertices of a vertex from high to low and assign ranking based on the order to the adjacent edges. Thus, although the similarity function is symmetric, we may get two different ranks for each edge. Note that the computation required to generate the rankings are local to each vertex and thus highly parallel. For cosine similarity the time complexity to compute the ranking of the adjacent edges of a vertex u is  $O(f d_u \log d_u)$ .

<span id="page-3-2"></span>Once we have the rankings, we can use these to construct different probability distributions. Some choices of Probability Mass Functions (PMF) can be linear or exponential decay with non-zero selection probability to the later elements in the ranking order. Another options is the *step* function where the top  $k_1$ % neighbors of a vertex are given a uniform weight  $(\lambda_1)$ , the next  $k_2$ % as  $\lambda_2$ , and the rest  $\lambda_3$ , where  $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \lambda_3$ . The benefit of using such function is that we can partially sort the top  $(k_1 + k_2)$ % of neighbors avoiding the full ordering. Fig. [10](#page-12-0) in Appendix [8](#page-12-1) shows pictorial representations of some of the PMFs mentioned.

3.1.2 Ranking based on diversity: As discussed in section [2.3,](#page-1-2) for a heterophilic graph, in general it is desirable to construct subgraphs based on diversity in the class labels. To accomplish that, we propose a sampling strategy based on optimizing (a nonlinear) submodular function. A submodular function is a set function that has the diminishing returns property. Formally, given a ground set  $V$  and two subsets A and B with  $A \subseteq B \subseteq V$ , a function f is submodular if and only if, for every  $e \in V \setminus B$ ,  $f(A \cup e) - f(A) \ge f(B \cup e) - f(B)$ . The quantity on either side of the inequality is called the *marginal gain* of an element  $e$  with respect to the two sets  $A$  or  $B$ . For maximizing cardinality constrained submodular functions, where the solution set  $(S)$  is required to be at most  $k$  in size, a natural Greedy algorithm that starts with empty solution and augments it with the element with highest marginal gain is  $(1 - 1/e)$ -approximate [\[31\]](#page-8-19).

To see how a submodular function may behave differently than the (linear) similarity based function (section [3.1.1\)](#page-3-1), consider a paper citation graph [\[38\]](#page-8-20) where the nodes are the scientific documents and the feature on each node is the binary count vector of the associate text. For a vertex  $u$ , our goal is to find a set of  $k$ neighboring vertices of u,  $(S \subseteq N(u)$  where  $|S| = k$ , such that given the initial set  $\{u\}$ , we maximize the number of *unique* word counts. This objective can be modeled as a submodular function known as maximum  $k$ -coverage problem, and the Greedy approach would select successive nodes with maximum marginal gains wrt to  $S$ . Intuitively, the Greedy algorithm prioritizes neighbors that have more distinct words than what has been covered through the selected nodes. Therefore, if different word sets correspond to different class labels, the final set  $S$  will likely represent a diverse set. This contrasts sharply with the ranking based on similarity, where we would encourage neighbors with similar words. Facility Location, Feature-based functions, and Maximum Coverage are some submodular functions applicable in the graph context.

Given a submodular function, for a vertex  $u$ , we execute the Greedy algorithm on the neighbors of  $u$  to compute their marginal gains, assuming  $u$  is in the initial solution. We use these marginal gains to rank neighbors of  $u$  and then use the ranks to construct a probability distribution as described in section [3.1.1.](#page-3-1) To compute the solution faster, we employed a variant of the Greedy algorithm which is called Lazy Greedy [\[29\]](#page-8-21) that can reduce the number of marginal gain computations. Algorithm [3](#page-13-0) and [4](#page-13-1) in Appendix [8.3](#page-12-2) shows the pseudocode of the Lazy Greedy version of the ranking procedure using the Facility Location function. Since we need to compute pairwise similarity for this function, the complexity of computing the ranks of the neighbors of a vertex u is  $O(f d_u^2)$ .

3.1.3 Learnable Similarity Function: When we lack domain knowledge to compute an appropriate similarity metric, we can use the training subgraph to train a regression model to learn the edge weights of the graphs [\[8\]](#page-8-2). We form training batches using equal numbers of edges and randomly chosen non-edges of the graph. We set the target label as 1 for nodes with the same labels and 0 otherwise, and then train a model using the batches to get an approximation of edge weights. We use these weights as similarity values to compute ranks based on similarity or diversity (as detailed in section [3.1.1](#page-3-1) and section [3.1.2\)](#page-3-2), and to compute a probability distribution over the directed edges. Given the number of training edges and an equal number of non-edges, we can expect the computation complexity to be  $O(fm)$ . The neural network model is shallow, learnable parameters are relatively small, and computation is performed in batches, making it very fast. Appendix [8.4](#page-12-3) shows the architecture of a Siamese [\[7\]](#page-8-22) edge-weight computation model and the training and inference process (Algorithm [5\)](#page-13-2) in detail.

### <span id="page-4-2"></span>3.2 Sampling

Algorithm [1](#page-4-0) describes AGS-GNN, using the node sampling process for training denoted as AGS-NS. The method NodeSample is employed for sampling an  $\ell$ -hop neighborhood based on the probability distribution derived from learned or computed weights.

<span id="page-4-0"></span>

AGS can be plugged in with other GNNs that use sampling strategy. Here, we demonstrate this with GSAGE and call it AGS-GSAGE. The original formulation of GSAGE for  $i$ -th layer is,

$$
\mathbf{h}_v^{(i)} = \sigma(\mathbf{W}^{(i)}, \mathbf{h}_v^{(i-1)} | \text{AGG}(\{\mathbf{h}_u^{(i-1)} : u \in \mathcal{N}_{rn}(v)\}).
$$
 (3)

Here *h* denotes feature vectors,  $N_{rn}(v)$  ( $\subseteq N(v)$ ) is the subset of neighbors of  $v$  (of size  $k$ ) sampled uniformly at random. AGG is any permutation invariant function (mean, sum, max, LSTM, etc.).

In AGS-GSAGE, we use the probability distribution derived in section [3.1](#page-2-3) to sample with or without replacement from the neighborhood of a node. Depending on the nature of the graph, single or dual-channel GNNs might be necessary. Some homophilic graphs may have only a few locally heterophilic nodes, where samples

<span id="page-4-1"></span>

Figure 4: Computation graph with sample size  $k = 2$  and hopsize 2. a), b) samples from similarity and diversity ranking for a single channel, c) dual channel with combined representation at the target node, and d) similar and diverse weighted samples at each sampled node.

from a distribution generated by similarity only may be sufficient. However, we expect the dual-channel AGS to perform better for heterophilic graphs since they typically have both locally homophilic and heterophilic nodes (see Fig. [1,](#page-1-0) and Fig. [13,](#page-19-0) Fig. [14](#page-20-0) from Appendix [10.5\)](#page-18-0). Fig. [4](#page-4-1) shows some possible computation graphs. The dualchannel AGS mechanism can be incorporated easily into GSAGE. We generate two similar and diverse neighborhood samples for the target node, compute the transformed feature representations using both samples, and use MLPs to combine these representations.

$$
\mathbf{h}_{v_{sim}}^{(i)} = \sigma(W_{sim}^{(i)}, \mathbf{h}_v^{(i-1)} | \text{AGG}(\{\mathbf{h}_u^{(i-1)} : u \in N_{sim}(v)\}) \tag{4}
$$

$$
h_{v_{div}}^{(i)} = \sigma(W_{div}^{(i)}, h_v^{(i-1)} | \text{AGG}(\{h_u^{(i-1)} : u \in \mathcal{N}_{div}(v)\}). \tag{5}
$$

Here  $N_{sim}(v)$  and  $N_{div}(v)$  are the subset of neighbors of v sampled from the distribution based on similarity and diversity, respectively. We can combine these representations by concatenating,  $h_v^{(i)} = \text{MLP}(h_{v_{sim}}^{(i)} | h_{v_{div}}^{(i)})$  or using skip connections,

$$
\mathbf{h}_v^{(i)} = \text{MLP}(\sigma(\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{h}_{v_{sim}}^{(i)}|\mathbf{h}_{v_{div}}^{(i)}) + \mathbf{h}_{v_{sim}}^{(i)} + \mathbf{h}_{v_{div}}^{(i)})).
$$
 (6)

Combining representations at the root of the computation graph as shown in Fig. [4c](#page-4-1) can be better than combining two different samples at each node of the tree, as in Fig. [4d](#page-4-1). This is to avoid overfitting and make it computationally efficient. For transductive learning, as we have already precomputed the probability distributions, the inference process works similarly to the training phase. In inductive setting, we have to compute the probability distribution over the neighbors of a node as described in section [3.1.](#page-2-3)

3.2.1 Other sampling strategies and models: AGS can also be integrated into ACM-GCN [\[27\]](#page-8-1) and other filter-based spectral GNNs. At the start of the epoch, we sample  $k$  neighbors of each node from the similarity and diversity based distributions and construct two sparse subgraphs. We can then use the subgraph based on similarity with a low-pass filter and the subgraph based on diversity with a high-pass filter. We can employ graph sampling strategies (instead of node sampling), such as weighted random walks, and use them with existing GNNs. We can also incorporate heuristics by first computing edge-disjoint subgraphs and then sampling a sparse subgraph. We call our graph sampling GNN AGS-GS, and its details are provided in Appendix [9](#page-13-3) for conciseness. We call AGS-GS-RW (Appendix [9.1\)](#page-13-4) the weighted random walk version, and call AGS-GS-Disjoint (Appendix [9.2\)](#page-14-0) the edge-disjoint subgraph-based sampling version). For the downstream model, there is flexibility to adapt existing models like ChebNet [\[16\]](#page-8-23), GSAINT [\[51\]](#page-9-6), GIN [\[44\]](#page-9-8), GCN [\[21\]](#page-8-24), and GAT [\[41\]](#page-8-25). We can also use two separate GNNs in two separate channels.

#### 3.3 Computation Complexity

The pre-computation of the probability distribution requires  $O(fn \cdot$  $d \log d$ ) and  $O(rnd^2)$  operations for similarity and facility location based ranking, respectively. If the similarity metric is required to be learned the added time complexity is  $O(fm)$ . The training and memory complexity depend on the usage of underlying GNNs. Let the number of hidden dimensions (*H*) be fixed and equal to  $H = f$ for all  $\ell$  layers. For Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD)-based approaches, let  $b$  be the batch size, and  $k$  be the number of sampled neighbors per node. When a single channel is used, each node expands to  $k^{\ell}$  nodes in its computation graph, and requires  $f^2$  operations to compute the embedding (a matrix-vector multiplication) in every epoch. Therefore, for  $n$  nodes, the per epoch training time complexity is  $O(nk^{\ell} f^2)$ . The memory complexity is  $O(bk^{\ell} f + \ell f^2)$ , where The first term corresponds to the space for storing the embedding, and the second term corresponds to storage for all weights of neurons of size,  $W \in \mathbb{R}^{f \times f}$ .

For single channel node sampling (Fig. [4a](#page-4-1),b), the training and memory complexity of AGS-GNN is similar to GSAGE. The training and memory requirements are twice as much for dual channels using the same sampling size, leaving the asymptotic bounds unchanged. However, for the dual channel with computation graph scenario shown in Fig. [4d](#page-4-1), where each node generates two types of samples of size  $k$ , the per epoch computation complexity becomes  $O(n^2)^{\ell} k^{\ell} f^2$ ). One way to ameliorate this cost is to reduce the sample neighborhood size by half.

#### 4 Related Work

While Spatial GNNs focus on graph structure (topology) to develop aggregation strategies, spectral GNNs leverage graph signal processing to design graph filters. Spectral GNNs use low-pass and high-pass filters to extract low-frequency and high-frequency signals adaptively for heterophilic graphs. ACM-GCN [\[27\]](#page-8-1) is one of the best-performing heterophilic GNNs that uses adaptive channels with low-pass and high-pass filters. Recently, the authors of [\[46\]](#page-9-3) proposed an adaptive filter-based GNN, ALT, that combines signals from two filters with complementary filter characteristics to classify homophilic and heterophilic graphs. These methods perform well for small heterophilic graphs but do not scale to large graphs. In the spectral domain, AGS-GNN can be used in conjunction with these approaches by computing feature-similarity and feature-diversitybased sparse graphs at first before applying filters for large graphs.

For applying spatial GNNs to heterophilic graphs, rather than using average aggregation (as in homophilic GNNs), edge-aware weights of neighbors can be assigned according to the spatial graph topology and node labels. DMP [\[48\]](#page-9-9) considers node attributes as weak labels and aggregates element-wise weights from neighbors. GGCN [\[47\]](#page-9-4) uses cosine similarity to create signed neighbor features; the intuition is to send positive attributes to neighbors in the same class and negative ones to neighbors in different classes. GPNN [\[49\]](#page-9-10) considers ranking the neighbors based on similarity and uses a 1D convolution operator on the sequential nodes. Another related work is SimP-GCN [\[19\]](#page-8-26), which computes the node similarity and then chooses the top  $k$  similar node pairs in terms of feature-level cosine similarity for each ego node, and then constructs the neighbor set using the  $k$ -NN algorithm. AGS-GNN, in contrast, uses submodularity,

node-similarity, reweighting, and sampling of the subgraph instead of reconstructing neighbor sets.

When learned weight functions are considered, AGS-GNN can be placed into the category of supervised sampling. LAGCN [\[2\]](#page-8-27) trains an edge classifier from the existing graph topology, similar to our regression task of weight approximation. NeuralSparse [\[53\]](#page-9-11) learns a sparsification network to sample a  $k$ -neighbor subgraph (with a predefined  $k$ ), which is fed to GCN [\[21\]](#page-8-24), GraphSAGE [\[15\]](#page-8-10) or GAT [\[41\]](#page-8-25). Unlike our heuristic-based sampler, NeuralSparse has end-to-end training of the sampler network and GNN, and may require more iterations to find appropriate sampling probabilities.

There are only a few scalable GNNs for heterophilic graphs. The most notable one is LINKX [\[25\]](#page-8-3), which is transductive as the model architecture depends on node size. A recent scalable GNN, LD2 [\[24\]](#page-8-12), attempts to remedy this by transforming the adjacency and the feature matrix into embeddings as a pre-computation and then applying feature transformation in a mini-batch fashion.

#### <span id="page-5-0"></span>5 Experiments

### 5.1 Dataset, Setup, and Methods

5.1.1 Dataset: We experimented with 35 graphs of different sizes and varying homophily. We also generated synthetic graphs of different homophily and degrees while retaining the node features for ablation studies and scaling experiments. We considered the node classification task in our experiments. For heterophily studies, we used: Cornell, Texas, Wisconsin [\[33\]](#page-8-14); Chameleon, Squirrel [\[36\]](#page-8-15); Actor [\[33\]](#page-8-14); Wiki, ArXiv-year, Snap-Patents, Penn94, Pokec, Genius, Twitch-Gamers, reed98, amherst41, cornell5, and Yelp [\[25\]](#page-8-3). We also experiment on some recent benchmark datasets, Roman-empire, Amazon-ratings, Minesweeper, Tolokers, and Questions from [\[35\]](#page-8-28). We converted a few multi-label multiclass classification problems (Flickr, Amazon-Products) to single-label multiclass node classification, and their homophily values become relatively small, making them heterophilic. For homophily studies we used Cora [\[38\]](#page-8-20); Citeseer [\[13\]](#page-8-29); pubmed [\[30\]](#page-8-30); Coauthor-cs, Coauthor-physics [\[39\]](#page-8-31); Amazon-computers, Ama-zon-photo [\[39\]](#page-8-31); Reddit [\[15\]](#page-8-10); Reddit2 [\[51\]](#page-9-6); and, dblp [\[11\]](#page-8-32). Details of datasets, homophily measures (Table [8\)](#page-16-0), homophily distributions (Fig. [13,](#page-19-0) [14\)](#page-20-0), origins, splits, etc. (Table [9\)](#page-17-1) are in Appendix [10.](#page-15-1)

5.1.2 Experimental Setup: All evaluations are repeated 10 times using a split of 60%/20%/20% (train/validation/test), unless a specific split is specified. All experiments are executed on 24GB NVIDIA A10 Tensor Core GPU. For all benchmark models, we use the settings specified in their corresponding papers, and for AGS-GNN, we use two message-passing layers ( $\ell = 2$ ) and a hidden layer with dimension  $H = 256$ . We use the Adam [\[20\]](#page-8-33) optimizer with a learning rate of 10−<sup>3</sup> and train for 250 epochs or until convergence. A model converges if the standard deviation of the training loss in the most recent 5 epochs (after at least 5 epochs) is below 10−<sup>4</sup> . For node sampling, we use a batch size of 512 to 1024 with  $k = [25, 10]$ or [8, 4] in the two layers unless otherwise specified. For graph sampling, we use a batch size of 6000 and a random walk step size of 2. For reporting accuracy, we select the model that gives the best validation performance. Depending on the models, we use a dropout probability of 0.2 or 0.5 during training. All of the implementations

are in PyTorch [\[32\]](#page-8-34), PyTorch Geometric [\[10\]](#page-8-35), and Deep Graph Library (DGL) [\[42\]](#page-8-36). For computing distribution based on submodular ranking, we use Apricot library [\[37\]](#page-8-18). We modified the Apricot code to make the implementation more efficient. Source codes for all our implementations are provided anonymously on  $\operatorname{GitHub}^1$  $\operatorname{GitHub}^1$ .

5.1.3 Implemented Methods: We consider graphs with  $H_a \le 0.5$ to be heterophilic. The small instances contain graphs with less than  $100K$  nodes, and they fit in the GPU memory. The larger instances are compared against only scalable homophilic and heterophilic GNNs. We compare AGS-GNN (the Node Sampling AGS-NS variant) with other Node Sampling methods (GSAGE [\[15\]](#page-8-10)), Graph-Sampling (GSAINT [\[51\]](#page-9-6)), and Heterophilic GNNs (LINKX [\[25\]](#page-8-3), ACM-GCN [\[27\]](#page-8-1)). LINKX is used for only the small graphs, where the entire graph fits into GPU memory. For large graphs, we used the row-wise minibatching of the adjacency matrix (AdjRowLoader) for LINKX, which is denoted by LINKX+. Since, most of the heterophilic GNNs require entire graph and do not support mini-batching, we compare AGS-GNN with 18 standard heterophilic and homophilic GNNs on small heterophilic graphs only. Appendix [11.2](#page-21-0) provides details on these method and results.

### 5.2 Key Results

In Fig. [5,](#page-7-0) we show the performance profile plot of the algorithms w.r.t. their relative  $F_1$ -score. For each graph, we compute the relative  $F_1$ -score for all algorithms by subtracting their  $F_1$ -score from the best one. Thus the best performing algorithm for a problem receives a score of 0, and for all other algorithms the difference is positive. The X-axis of Fig. [5](#page-7-0) represents these relative values from the bestperforming algorithms across the graph problems, and the Y-axis shows the fraction of problems that achieve  $F_1$ -score within the bound on the difference specified by the X-axis value. Thus, the performance plot reveals a ranking of the algorithms in terms of their quality. The closer a curve (algorithm) is to the Y-axis, and the smaller the difference in the X-axis, the better its performance w.r.t. other algorithms across all the problems considered. Fig. [5a](#page-7-2) summarizes results from five algorithms across 17 test problems for small heterophilic graphs, where we observe that AGS-NS performs the best or close-to-best for about half of the problems and has up to 10% lower  $F_1$  scores compared to the best algorithm for the other half. ACM-GCN performs similarly to AGS-NS for these small graphs. While LINKX achieves comparable accuracies to AGS-NS for most of the problems (about 80%), for a few problems it achieves lower  $F_1$  scores.

For large heterophilic graphs (Fig. [5c\)](#page-7-3), performance improvement for AGS-NS is considerably better than all algorithms. LINKX+ performs second-best for 75% of the problems. In small homophilic graphs (Fig. [5b\)](#page-7-4), AGS-NS and GSAGE are the top two performers for most of the problems, followed by GSAINT, ACM-GCN, and LINKX. This is expected since ACM-GCN and LINKX are tailored for heterophilic graphs. In large homophilic graphs (Fig. [5d\)](#page-7-5), AGS-NS is the best-performing algorithm in terms of accuracy, followed by GSAGE. We also observe from this figure that for homophilic graphs, LINKX+ is not competitive.

<span id="page-6-1"></span>

Dataset			CoraSvn0.05			CoraSyn0.25					CoraSvn0.50	
<b>GNN</b>	ChebNet GSAGE		<b>GSAGE</b>		ChebNet		<b>GSAGE</b>		ChebNet			
Sparse	$\mu$	$\sigma$	$\mu$	$\sigma$	$\mu$	$\sigma$	$\mu$	$\sigma$	$\mu$	$\sigma$	$\mu$	$\sigma$
Random	57.08	0.46	56.44	0.14	61.85	0.94	62.14	1.29	92.09	0.79	92.48	0.72
Similar	48.50	0.29	50.91	0.22.	71.66	0.42	71.02	0.17	92.48	0.51	91.71	0.25
<b>Diverse</b>	61.79	0.17	64.67	0.22.	53.91	0.22	57.03	0.30	79.48	0.36	76.07	0.36
Whole	63.67	0.43	62.79	0.25	69.49	0.38	67.61	0.22	96.94	0.08	96.47	0.14

Table 1:  $F_1$  score of a single sparse subgraph keeping  $(0.25 \cdot d<sub>u</sub>)$ neighbors of node  $u$ . Three synthetic versions of Cora are produced ( $d = 200$  and  $H_n$  0.05, 0.25, and 0.50, respectively).

<span id="page-6-2"></span>

Dataset			CoraSyn0.05			CoraSyn0.25					CoraSyn0.50		
<b>GNN</b>		ChebNet <b>GSAGE</b>			<b>GSAGE</b>		ChebNet		<b>GSAGE</b>		ChebNet		
Sampler		$\sigma$	$\sigma$ $\mu$		$\mathfrak u$	$\sigma$	и	$\sigma$	$\iota$	σ	$\mu$	$\sigma$	
Random	59.20	0.22	57.50	0.80	62.85	0.55	61.67	0.46	91.06	0.36	88.89	1.32	
Similar	54.44	0.68	54.03	0.51	69.19	0.08	67.43	0.30	92.00	0.08	91.71	0.29	
Diverse	60.96	0.55	0.43 61.73		56.67	0.46	58.38	0.25	86.65	0.44	83.54	0.79	
T11 A F	$\sim$ $\sim$ 1.00 $\sim$ 1.1 1.1 1.1												

Table 2:  $F_1$  score using different subgraph samples ( $k =$ [25, 25]). Three synthetic versions of Cora are produced  $(d =$ 200 and  $H_n$  0.05, 0.25, and 0.50, respectively).

In Table. [15](#page-23-0) (Appendix [11.2\)](#page-21-0) we present performance of AGS-NS compared to 18 recent competing algorithms on small heterophilic graphs. ACM-GCN, AGS-NS, and LINKX remain the bestperforming, with AGS-NS as the leading method for these inputs. The full set of results with numerical values are provided in Appen-dix (Tables [11,](#page-22-0) [12,](#page-22-1) [13,](#page-22-2) [14,](#page-23-1) [15\)](#page-23-0). These tables present the mean  $(\mu)$  and standard deviation  $(\sigma)$  of the runs. We use a one-tailed statistical hypothesis t-test to verify whether one set of values is better than the other. The better-performing results are highlighted in boldface.

### <span id="page-6-0"></span>5.3 Ablation study

We now investigate the contribution of individual components of AGS-GNN, employing different sampling strategies and GNNs. For GNNs, we consider GSAGE (spatial) and ChebNet [\[16\]](#page-8-23) (spectral). We sample  $\lfloor d_u \cdot k' \rfloor$   $(k' \in [0, 1])$  neighbors for each node u using similarity and diversity-based sparsification using precomputed weights (detailed in section [3.2\)](#page-4-2), and random sparsification that selects a subgraph uniformly at random. Only a single sampled subgraph is used throughout the training. For experiments, we generate three synthetic versions of Cora with average degree  $d = 200$ , keeping the original nodes and features the same but changing the connectivity to have strong (0.05), moderate (0.25), and weak (0.50) heterophily. The distribution of heterophily for each node is close to uniform. Table [1](#page-6-1) shows that diversity-based selection performs best with strong heterophily, and with spectral GNN, it even achieves accuracy better than using the entire graph. In contrast, on moderate heterophily, the similarity-based selection performs the best (even better than the whole graph). For weak heterophily (homophily), similar and random sparse perform alike. When we convert these into a sampling paradigm (node sampling or graph sampling), similar behavior can be seen (Table [2\)](#page-6-2) as we get the best performance from diversity-based selection for strong heterophily and similarity-based for moderate heterophily with a wide margin than random. For weak heterophily or homophily, the similarity-based performs slightly better than the random sampler.

Since real-world graphs have nonuniform node homophily, we generated a synthetic version of Cora where individual nodes have

 $^{1}$ GitHub link for AGS-GNN [and all other methods.](https://github.com/anonymousauthors001/AGS-GNN)

<span id="page-7-2"></span><span id="page-7-0"></span>

<span id="page-7-4"></span>Figure 5: Performance Profile: The X-axis shows the differences in  $F_1$ -scores (scaled to 100) between the best algorithm for a specific problem, and the Y-axis shows the fraction of the problems. We compare AGS to two scalable homophilic GNNs (GSAGE, GSAINT) and two heterophilic GNNs (ACM-GCN, LINKX). For small  $(< 100K$  vertices) and large ( $\geq 100K$  vertices) graphs, we consider LINKX (full-batch) and LINKX+ (mini-batch), respectively. Full results are in Appendix [11.1.](#page-21-1)

<span id="page-7-6"></span>

ACM-GCN	<b>LINKX</b>			$\vert$ AGS (Sim. + Sim.) $\vert$ AGS (Div. + Div.) $\vert$ AGS (Sim. + Div.)	
				35.3394 0.6922 34.2081 0.7889 60.8145 0.7759 62.8394 0.8522 63.0317 0.5079	

Table 3:  $F_1$  Score of two-channel GNNs with a differently weighted sampler in synthetic Cora graph with locally heterophilic and homophilic nodes mixed  $(H_n(u) = [0.05, 0.50])$ .

different local node homophily in the range [0.05, 0.50]. Table [3](#page-7-6) shows that our proposed two channel (one for homophily and one for heterophily) AGS-GNN performs the best, significantly outperforming ACM-GCN and LINKX. Detailed studies on the parameters and different submodular functions used in diversity-based sampling are presented in Appendix [12.2.](#page-21-2)

<span id="page-7-7"></span>

Figure 6: Performance Profile: X-axis is the difference in  $F_1$ scores (scaled to 100) for different GNNs coupled with AGS sampler on five benchmark heterophilic graphs.

<span id="page-7-1"></span>We coupled our sampling strategy (both node sampling and graph sampling ([§9\)](#page-13-3)) to existing GNNs (GSAGE, ChebNet, GSAINT, GIN, GAT, and GCN) and evaluated them on five heterophilic graphs (Reed98, Roman-empire, Actor, Minesweeper, Tolokers). While detailed numerical values are provided in Table [16](#page-24-0) in Appendix [12,](#page-21-3) we summarize the key results as a performance profile in Fig. [6.](#page-7-7) We observe that AGS with GSAGE, ChebNet, and GSAINT performed the best.

<span id="page-7-8"></span><span id="page-7-5"></span><span id="page-7-3"></span>

Method	Settings	Reddit	Genius	Yelp
<b>GSAGE</b>	$k = [25, 10], b = 1024, \ell = 2, H = 256$	5.47	2.16	7.71
<b>GSAINT</b>	$b = 4096$ , rw, step = 2, $\ell$ = 2, H = 256	8.01	2.10	4.34
$LINKX+$	random 100 parts, $b = 2$ , $H = 32$	10.63	2.35	3.54
AGS-NS	$k = [25, 10], b = 1024, \ell = 2, H = 256$	18.44	2.43	13.30
AGS-GS	$b = 4096$ , wrw, step = 2, $\ell$ = 2, H = 256	5.90	1.72	4.06

Table 4: Average training time (seconds/epoch). **rw** and **wrw** refer to random walk and weighted random walk, respectively.





## 5.4 Experimental Runtime and Convergence

Table [4](#page-7-8) shows per epoch training time of different methods under the same settings. For large datasets such as Reddit, with single worker thread, our current implementation of weighted sampling requires around 3 times more than the random sampling used in GSAGE due to the dual channels and a few implementation differences with PyTorchGeometric. We plan to improve our implementation next. Since our precomputation is embarrassingly parallel, we can accelerate our algorithm by increasing the number of worker threads. Our weighted random walk, is faster than the library implementation even for sequential execution. Fig. [7](#page-8-37) shows the number of epochs required to converge for random sampling (GSAGE) and our weighted sampling (AGS-GNN). Using the same settings, we see that AGS-GNN is more stable and requires fewer epochs on average to converge than GSAGE.

#### 6 Conclusions

In this work, we proposed attribute-guided sampling that uses node features in an unsupervised and supervised fashion. We have shown that through a biased sampling of similar and diverse neighbors,

<span id="page-8-37"></span>

Figure 7: Num. of epochs for **AGS-GNN** and GSAGE to converge.

we get improved performance in homophilic graphs and can handle challenging heterophilic graphs. We verify our claims through exhaustive experimentation on various benchmark datasets and methods. A limitation of our work is the time required for submodular optimization when the facility location function is used; the computation complexity is higher for dense graphs. We will optimize implementations in our future work. We will also build an end-to-end process for supervised sampling.

#### References

- <span id="page-8-38"></span>[1] Sami Abu-El-Haija, Bryan Perozzi, Amol Kapoor, Nazanin Alipourfard, Kristina Lerman, Hrayr Harutyunyan, Greg Ver Steeg, and Aram Galstyan. 2019. Mixhop: Higher-order graph convolutional architectures via sparsified neighborhood mixing. In International Conference on Machine Learning. PMLR, 21–29.
- <span id="page-8-27"></span>[2] Hao Chen, Yue Xu, Feiran Huang, Zengde Deng, Wenbing Huang, Senzhang Wang, Peng He, and Zhoujun Li. 2020. Label-aware graph convolutional networks. In Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management. 1977–1980.
- <span id="page-8-7"></span>[3] Jie Chen, Tengfei Ma, and Cao Xiao. 2018. FastGCN: Fast Learning with Graph Convolutional Networks via Importance Sampling. In International Conference on Learning Representations.
- <span id="page-8-8"></span>[4] Jianfei Chen, Jun Zhu, and Le Song. 2018. Stochastic Training of Graph Convolutional Networks with Variance Reduction. In International Conference on Machine Learning. PMLR, 942–950.
- <span id="page-8-39"></span>[5] Ming Chen, Zhewei Wei, Zengfeng Huang, Bolin Ding, and Yaliang Li. 2020. Simple and deep graph convolutional networks. In International Conference on Machine Learning. PMLR, 1725–1735.
- <span id="page-8-9"></span>[6] Wei-Lin Chiang, Xuanqing Liu, Si Si, Yang Li, Samy Bengio, and Cho-Jui Hsieh. 2019. Cluster-gcn: An efficient algorithm for training deep and large graph convolutional networks. In Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining. 257–266.
- <span id="page-8-22"></span>[7] Davide Chicco. 2021. Siamese neural networks: An overview. Artificial neural networks (2021), 73–94.
- <span id="page-8-2"></span>[8] Eli Chien, Jianhao Peng, Pan Li, and Olgica Milenkovic. 2020. Adaptive universal generalized pagerank graph neural network. arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.07988 (2020).
- <span id="page-8-16"></span>Venkatesan Nallampatti Ekambaram. 2014. Graph-structured data viewed through a Fourier lens. University of California, Berkeley.
- <span id="page-8-35"></span>[10] Matthias Fey and Jan Eric Lenssen. 2019. Fast graph representation learning with PyTorch Geometric. arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.02428 (2019).
- <span id="page-8-32"></span>[11] Xinyu Fu, Jiani Zhang, Ziqiao Meng, and Irwin King. 2020. Magnn: Metapath aggregated graph neural network for heterogeneous graph embedding. In Proceedings of The Web Conference 2020. 2331–2341.
- <span id="page-8-40"></span>[12] Johannes Gasteiger, Aleksandar Bojchevski, and Stephan Günnemann. 2018. Predict then propagate: Graph neural networks meet personalized pagerank. arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.05997 (2018).
- <span id="page-8-29"></span>[13] C Lee Giles, Kurt D Bollacker, and Steve Lawrence. 1998. CiteSeer: An automatic citation indexing system. In Proceedings of the third ACM Conference on Digital Libraries. 89–98.
- <span id="page-8-41"></span>[14] Ian Goodfellow, Yoshua Bengio, and Aaron Courville. 2016. Deep learning. MIT press.
- <span id="page-8-10"></span>[15] Will Hamilton, Zhitao Ying, and Jure Leskovec. 2017. Inductive representation learning on large graphs. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems. 1024–1034.
- <span id="page-8-23"></span>[16] Mingguo He, Zhewei Wei, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2022. Convolutional neural networks on graphs with chebyshev approximation, revisited. Advances in Neural

Information Processing Systems 35 (2022), 7264–7276.

- <span id="page-8-42"></span>[17] Qian Huang, Horace He, Abhay Singh, Ser-Nam Lim, and Austin R Benson. 2020. Combining label propagation and simple models out-performs graph neural networks. arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.13993 (2020).
- <span id="page-8-11"></span>[18] Wenbing Huang, Tong Zhang, Yu Rong, and Junzhou Huang. 2018. Adaptive sampling towards fast graph representation learning. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31 (2018).
- <span id="page-8-26"></span>[19] Wei Jin, Tyler Derr, Yiqi Wang, Yao Ma, Zitao Liu, and Jiliang Tang. 2021. Node similarity preserving graph convolutional networks. In Proceedings of the 14th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining. 148–156.
- <span id="page-8-33"></span>[20] Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2014. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980 (2014).
- <span id="page-8-24"></span>[21] Thomas N Kipf and Max Welling. 2016. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.02907 (2016).
- <span id="page-8-17"></span>[22] Andreas Krause and Daniel Golovin. 2014. Submodular function maximization. Tractability 3, 71-104 (2014), 3.
- <span id="page-8-6"></span>[23] Xiang Li, Renyu Zhu, Yao Cheng, Caihua Shan, Siqiang Luo, Dongsheng Li, and Weining Qian. 2022. Finding global homophily in graph neural networks when meeting heterophily. In International Conference on Machine Learning. PMLR, 13242–13256.
- <span id="page-8-12"></span>[24] Ningyi Liao, Siqiang Luo, Xiang Li, and Jieming Shi. 2023. LD2: Scalable Heterophilous Graph Neural Network with Decoupled Embeddings. In Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems. [https://openreview.net/](https://openreview.net/forum?id=7zkFc9TGKz) [forum?id=7zkFc9TGKz](https://openreview.net/forum?id=7zkFc9TGKz)
- <span id="page-8-3"></span>[25] Derek Lim, Felix Hohne, Xiuyu Li, Sijia Linda Huang, Vaishnavi Gupta, Omkar Bhalerao, and Ser Nam Lim. 2021. Large scale learning on non-homophilous graphs: New benchmarks and strong simple methods. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34 (2021), 20887–20902.
- <span id="page-8-4"></span>[26] Meng Liu, Zhengyang Wang, and Shuiwang Ji. 2021. Non-local graph neural networks. IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence 44, 12 (2021), 10270–10276.
- <span id="page-8-1"></span>[27] Sitao Luan, Chenqing Hua, Qincheng Lu, Jiaqi Zhu, Mingde Zhao, Shuyuan Zhang, Xiao-Wen Chang, and Doina Precup. 2022. Revisiting heterophily for graph neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.07606* (2022).<br>[28] Sitao Luan, Mingde Zhao, Chenqing Hua, Xiao-Wen Chang, and Doina Precup.
- <span id="page-8-5"></span>2020. Complete the missing half: Augmenting aggregation filtering with diver-sification for graph convolutional networks. arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.08844 (2020).
- <span id="page-8-21"></span>[29] Michel Minoux. 1978. Accelerated greedy algorithms for maximizing submodular set functions. Optimization Techniques (1978), 234–243.
- <span id="page-8-30"></span>[30] Galileo Namata, Ben London, Lise Getoor, Bert Huang, and U Edu. 2012. Querydriven active surveying for collective classification. In 10th International Workshop on Mining and Learning with Graphs, Vol. 8. 1.
- <span id="page-8-19"></span>[31] George L Nemhauser, Laurence A Wolsey, and Marshall L Fisher. 1978. An analysis of approximations for maximizing submodular set functions—I. Mathematical programming 14 (1978), 265–294.
- <span id="page-8-34"></span>[32] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, et al. 2019. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32 (2019).
- <span id="page-8-14"></span>[33] Hongbin Pei, Bingzhe Wei, Kevin Chen-Chuan Chang, Yu Lei, and Bo Yang. 2020. Geom-gcn: Geometric graph convolutional networks. arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.05287 (2020).
- <span id="page-8-0"></span>[34] Oleg Platonov, Denis Kuznedelev, Artem Babenko, and Liudmila Prokhorenkova. 2022. Characterizing graph datasets for node classification: Beyond homophilyheterophily dichotomy. arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.06177 (2022).
- <span id="page-8-28"></span>[35] Oleg Platonov, Denis Kuznedelev, Michael Diskin, Artem Babenko, and Liudmila Prokhorenkova. 2023. A critical look at the evaluation of GNNs under heterophily: are we really making progress? arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.11640 (2023).
- <span id="page-8-15"></span>[36] Benedek Rozemberczki, Carl Allen, and Rik Sarkar. 2021. Multi-scale attributed node embedding. Journal of Complex Networks 9, 2 (2021), cnab014.
- <span id="page-8-18"></span>[37] Jacob Schreiber, Jeffrey Bilmes, and William Stafford Noble. 2020. apricot: Submodular selection for data summarization in Python. The Journal of Machine Learning Research 21, 1 (2020), 6474–6479.
- <span id="page-8-20"></span>[38] Prithviraj Sen, Galileo Namata, Mustafa Bilgic, Lise Getoor, Brian Galligher, and Tina Eliassi-Rad. 2008. Collective classification in network data. AI magazine 29, 3 (2008), 93–93.
- <span id="page-8-31"></span>[39] Oleksandr Shchur, Maximilian Mumme, Aleksandar Bojchevski, and Stephan Günnemann. 2018. Pitfalls of graph neural network evaluation. arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.05868 (2018).
- <span id="page-8-13"></span>[40] Jesper E Van Engelen and Holger H Hoos. 2020. A survey on semi-supervised learning. Machine learning 109, 2 (2020), 373–440.
- <span id="page-8-25"></span>[41] Petar Veličković, Guillem Cucurull, Arantxa Casanova, Adriana Romero, Pietro Lio, and Yoshua Bengio. 2017. Graph attention networks. arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.10903 (2017).
- <span id="page-8-36"></span>[42] Minjie Wang, Da Zheng, Zihao Ye, Quan Gan, Mufei Li, Xiang Song, Jinjing Zhou, Chao Ma, Lingfan Yu, Yu Gai, et al. 2019. Deep graph library: A graphcentric, highly-performant package for graph neural networks. arXiv preprint

arXiv:1909.01315 (2019).

- <span id="page-9-16"></span>[43] Felix Wu, Amauri Souza, Tianyi Zhang, Christopher Fifty, Tao Yu, and Kilian Weinberger. 2019. Simplifying graph convolutional networks. In International Conference on Machine Learning. PMLR, 6861–6871.
- <span id="page-9-8"></span>[44] Keyulu Xu, Weihua Hu, Jure Leskovec, and Stefanie Jegelka. 2018. How powerful are graph neural networks? arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.00826 (2018).
- <span id="page-9-13"></span>[45] Keyulu Xu, Chengtao Li, Yonglong Tian, Tomohiro Sonobe, Ken-ichi Kawarabayashi, and Stefanie Jegelka. 2018. Representation learning on graphs with jumping knowledge networks. In International Conference on Machine Learning. PMLR, 5453–5462.
- <span id="page-9-3"></span>[46] Zhe Xu, Yuzhong Chen, Qinghai Zhou, Yuhang Wu, Menghai Pan, Hao Yang, and Hanghang Tong. 2023. Node Classification Beyond Homophily: Towards a General Solution. In Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining. 2862–2873.
- <span id="page-9-4"></span>[47] Yujun Yan, Milad Hashemi, Kevin Swersky, Yaoqing Yang, and Danai Koutra. 2022. Two sides of the same coin: Heterophily and oversmoothing in graph convolutional neural networks. In 2022 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM). IEEE, 1287–1292.
- <span id="page-9-9"></span>[48] Liang Yang, Mengzhe Li, Liyang Liu, Chuan Wang, Xiaochun Cao, Yuanfang Guo, et al. 2021. Diverse message passing for attribute with heterophily. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34 (2021), 4751–4763.
- <span id="page-9-10"></span>[49] Tianmeng Yang, Yujing Wang, Zhihan Yue, Yaming Yang, Yunhai Tong, and Jing Bai. 2022. Graph pointer neural networks. In Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Vol. 36. 8832–8839.
- <span id="page-9-1"></span>[50] Yang Ye and Shihao Ji. 2021. Sparse graph attention networks. IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering (2021).
- <span id="page-9-6"></span>[51] Hanqing Zeng, Hongkuan Zhou, Ajitesh Srivastava, Rajgopal Kannan, and Viktor Prasanna. 2019. GraphSAINT: Graph Sampling Based Inductive Learning Method. In International Conference on Learning Representations.
- <span id="page-9-14"></span>[52] Elena Zheleva and Lise Getoor. 2009. To join or not to join: the illusion of privacy in social networks with mixed public and private user profiles. In Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on World Wide Web. 531–540.
- <span id="page-9-11"></span>[53] Cheng Zheng, Bo Zong, Wei Cheng, Dongjin Song, Jingchao Ni, Wenchao Yu, Haifeng Chen, and Wei Wang. 2020. Robust graph representation learning via neural sparsification. In International Conference on Machine Learning. PMLR, 11458–11468.
- <span id="page-9-0"></span>[54] Xin Zheng, Yixin Liu, Shirui Pan, Miao Zhang, Di Jin, and Philip S Yu. 2022. Graph neural networks for graphs with heterophily: A survey. arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.07082 (2022).
- <span id="page-9-15"></span>[55] Dengyong Zhou, Olivier Bousquet, Thomas Lal, Jason Weston, and Bernhard Schölkopf. 2003. Learning with local and global consistency. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 16 (2003).
- <span id="page-9-5"></span>[56] Jiong Zhu, Ryan A Rossi, Anup Rao, Tung Mai, Nedim Lipka, Nesreen K Ahmed, and Danai Koutra. 2021. Graph neural networks with heterophily. In Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Vol. 35. 11168–11176.
- <span id="page-9-2"></span>[57] Jiong Zhu, Yujun Yan, Lingxiao Zhao, Mark Heimann, Leman Akoglu, and Danai Koutra. 2020. Beyond homophily in graph neural networks: Current limitations and effective designs. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33 (2020), 7793–7804.

#### 7 Appendix: Preliminaries

#### <span id="page-9-7"></span>7.1 Homophily of similarity-based selection

Let t be an ego node of a graph with degree  $d_t$ , local node homophily  $H_n(t)$ , and label  $y_t$ . From the definition of homophily, the probability of selecting a neighbor  $i \in \mathcal{N}(t)$  with the same label as the ego node uniformly at random is  $P_{\mathcal{U}}(y_i = y_t) = \mathcal{H}_n(t)$ , where  $U$  denotes to the distribution obtained by selecting a neighbor uniformly at random. If features and labels correlate positively, and similarity is computed from the features, we can expect the following assumption to be valid:

<span id="page-9-12"></span>ASSUMPTION 7.1. For a node t, the average similarity of neighbors with the same label as t is greater than or equal to the average similarity of all neighbors.

Lemma 7.1. If the probability of selecting a neighbor is proportional to its similarity to the ego node t, then the local node homophily of a sampled neighborhood  $\mathcal{H}'_n(t) \geq \mathcal{H}_n(t)$ . If the sampling probability distribution is S then  $P_S(y_i = y_t) \geq P_{qI}(y_i = y_t)$ .

Proof. Consider an ego node  $t = \{x_t, y_t\}$  where  $x_t$ , and  $y_t$  are its feature and label, respectively. Let the feature and labels of the neighboring nodes of t be  $N(t) = \{ (x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), \cdots, (x_{d_t}, y_{d_t}) \}.$ 

Let  $s(x_i, x_t)$  be a similarity function that measures how similar the feature of a neighbor  $x_i$  is to the feature of the ego node  $x_t$ . This function returns a positive value, and higher values indicate higher similarity.

A probability distribution with probability mass function  $p_{\mathcal{S}}(i)$ assigns a probability to each neighbor *i* based on its similarity to the ego node. The distribution should satisfy the following properties:

• 
$$
p_S(i) \ge 0
$$
 for all *i*;

- $\sum_{i=1}^{d_t} p_{\mathcal{S}}(i) = 1;$
- $p_S(i)$  is proportional to  $s(x_i, x_t)$ . (An example is  $p_S(i) = s(x_i, x_t)$ )  $\frac{s(\pmb{x}_i,\pmb{x}_t)}{\sum_{j=1}^{d_t} s(\pmb{x}_j,\pmb{x}_t)}$ .)

Let  $I(y_i = y_t)$  be an indicator function that returns 1 if  $y_i = y_t$ and 0 otherwise. If a neighbor  $i$  of a node  $t$  is selected randomly then  $p_{\mathcal{U}}(i) = \frac{1}{d_t}$ . Therefore the probability of selecting a neighbor randomly having the same label as the ego node is

$$
P_{\mathcal{U}}(y_i = y_t) = \sum_{i=1}^{d_t} p_{\mathcal{U}}(i) \cdot I(y_i = y_t),
$$
  
= 
$$
\frac{1}{d_t} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{d_t} I(y_i = y_t).
$$

If the selection probability is based on similarity, then

$$
P_S(y_i = y_t) = \sum_{i=1}^{d_t} p_S(i) \cdot I(y_i = y_t)
$$
  
= 
$$
\sum_{i=1}^{d_t} \frac{s(x_i, x_t)}{\sum_{j=1}^{d_t} s(x_j, x_t)} \cdot I(y_i = y_t).
$$

- $\bullet$  Let *n* be the number of neighbors having the same label as ego node *t*, i.e.,  $n = \sum_{i=1}^{d_t} I(y_i = y_t)$ .
- Let  $s_t$  be the sum of similarities of all neighbors having the same label as t, i.e.,  $s_t = \sum_{i=1}^{d_t} (s(x_i, x_t) \cdot I(y_i = y_t)$ . Also let  $s_d$  denote the sum of similarities of all neighbors of t, then  $s_d = \sum_{j=1}^{d_t} s(x_j, x_t).$
- If the features and labels are positively correlated, the average similarity of neighbors having the same label as the ego node should be higher than the average similarity of all neighbors of the ego node. That is,  $\frac{s_t}{n} \geq \frac{s_d}{d_t}$ .

We can now use these expressions and the substitutions shown below to derive the result. From Assumption [7.1,](#page-9-12)

$$
\frac{s_t}{n} \ge \frac{s_d}{d_t}
$$
\n
$$
\frac{s_t}{s_d} \ge \frac{s_d}{d_t}
$$
\n
$$
\frac{s_t}{s_d} \ge \frac{n}{d_t}
$$
\n
$$
\frac{1}{\sum_{j=1}^{d_t} s(x_j, x_t)} \sum_{i=1}^{d_t} s(x_i, x_t) \cdot I(y_i = y_t) \ge \frac{1}{d_t} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{d_t} I(y_i = y_t)
$$
\n
$$
\sum_{i=1}^{d_t} \frac{s(x_i, x_t)}{\sum_{j=1}^{d_t} s(x_j, x_t)} \cdot I(y_i = y_t) \ge \sum_{i=1}^{d_t} \frac{1}{d_t} \cdot I(y_i = y_t)
$$
\n
$$
\sum_{i=1}^{d_t} p_S(i) \cdot I(y_i = y_t) \ge P_{\mathcal{U}}(i) \cdot I(y_i = y_t)
$$
\n
$$
P_S(y_i = y_t) \ge P_{\mathcal{U}}(y_i = y_t)
$$
\n
$$
\mathcal{H}'_n(t) \ge \mathcal{H}_n(t).
$$

 $\Box$ 

#### <span id="page-10-1"></span>7.2 Homophily of diversity-based selection

A submodular function is a set valued function that assigns a value to every subset of a ground set that satisfies the diminishing returns property, i.e., for two subsets *S*, *T* with  $S \subseteq T$  of a ground set *A*, and any element  $e \in A \setminus T$ ,

$$
f(S \cup e) - f(S) \ge f(T \cup e) - f(T).
$$

The quantity on either side of the inequality is the marginal gain. An example of a submodular function is the facility location function

<span id="page-10-4"></span>
$$
f(S, A) = \sum_{y \in A} \max_{x \in S} \phi(x, y),
$$
 (7)

where S and A are as above and  $\phi$  is a similarity measure on the elements of A. The facility location function can be maximized by a Greedy algorithm, which starts with the empty subset and iteratively adds an element that gives the largest marginal gain to the function value until a cardinality (or other) constraint on  $S$  is reached.

In this context,  $S$  is the current set of selected nodes initialized with ego node t, and ground set  $A = N(t) \cup \{t\}$ . The marginal gain is  $f_i = f(S \cup \{i\}, A) - f(S, A)$  for each neighbor  $i \in \mathcal{N}(t) \setminus S$ . The neighbors are iteratively added based on marginal gain. If node features and labels are positively correlated, then we can expect the following assumption to be valid:

<span id="page-10-3"></span>Assumption 7.2. The average marginal gain of the neighbors of a node t with the same label as t is less than or equal to the average marginal gain of all neighbors.

Lemma 7.2. If the probability of selecting a neighbor of the ego node t is proportional to the marginal gain of the neighbor, then the local node homophily of a sampled neighborhood  $\mathcal{H}'_n(t) \leq \mathcal{H}_n(t)$ . If the sampling probability distribution is  $D$  then  $P_{\mathcal{D}}(y_i = y_t) \leq$  $P_{\mathcal{U}}(y_i = y_t).$ 

PROOF. Let the probability mass function of the distribution  $D$ be proportional to the marginal gain value,  $p_{\mathcal{D}}(i) = \frac{f_i}{\nabla d_i}$  $\frac{f_i}{\sum_{j=1}^{d_t}f_j}.$  The higher the marginal gain, the higher is the selection probability.

If a neighbor is selected randomly, then  $p_{\mathcal{U}}(i) = \frac{1}{d_t}$ . Therefore, the probability of selecting a neighbor randomly having the same label as the ego node is

$$
P_{\mathcal{U}}(y_i = y_t) = \sum_{i=1}^{d_t} p_{\mathcal{U}}(i) \cdot I(y_i = y_t)
$$

$$
= \frac{1}{d_t} \cdot I(y_i = y_t).
$$

If the selection probability is based on diversity, then

$$
P_{\mathcal{D}}(y_i = y_t) = \sum_{i=1}^{d_t} p_{\mathcal{D}}(i) \cdot I(y_i = y_t)
$$
  
= 
$$
\sum_{i=1}^{d_t} \frac{f_i}{\sum_{j=1}^{d_t} f_j} \cdot I(y_i = y_t).
$$

- As in the earlier subsection, let  $n$  be the number of neighbors having the same label as the ego node *t*, i.e.,  $n = \sum_{i=1}^{d} I(y_i =$  $y_t$ ).
- Let  $m_t$  be the sum of marginal gains of all neighbors having the same label as t, i.e.,  $m_t = \sum_{i=1}^{d_t} (f_i) \cdot I(y_i = y_t)$ , and let  $m_d$  denote the sum of all marginal gains of the neighbors  $m_d = \sum_{j=1}^{d_t} f_j$ .
- If the features and labels are positively correlated, the average marginal gains of neighbors having the same label as the ego node should be less than or equal to the average marginal gains of all neighbors of the ego node. Hence  $\frac{m_t}{n} \leq \frac{m_d}{d_t}$ .

We use the above expressions and the substitutions shown below get the desired result. From Assumption [7.2,](#page-10-3)

$$
\frac{m_t}{n} \le \frac{m_d}{d_t}
$$
\n
$$
\frac{m_t}{m_d} \le \frac{n}{d_t}
$$
\n
$$
\frac{1}{\sum_{j=1}^d f_j} \sum_{i=1}^{d_t} f_i \cdot I(y_i = y_t) \le \frac{1}{d_t} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^d I(y_i = y_t)
$$
\n
$$
\sum_{i=1}^d \frac{f_i}{\sum_{j=1}^d f_j} \cdot I(y_i = y_t) \le \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{d_t} \cdot I(y_i = y_t)
$$
\n
$$
\sum_{i=1}^d p_{\mathcal{D}}(i) \cdot I(y_i = y_t) \le \sum_{i=1}^d p_{\mathcal{U}}(i) \cdot I(y_i = y_t)
$$
\n
$$
P_{\mathcal{D}}(y_i = y_t) \le P_{\mathcal{U}}(y_i = y_t)
$$
\n
$$
\mathcal{H}'_n(t) \le \mathcal{H}_n(t).
$$

□

### <span id="page-10-2"></span>7.3 Empirical verification of the Lemmas

<span id="page-10-0"></span>Fig. [8](#page-11-0) empirically verifies our assumptions that a subgraph selected from a similar neighborhood increases the homophily, and selecting a diverse neighborhood using a submodular function decreases homophily, relative to the values in the original graph. For each vertex u, we take  $\lfloor d_u \cdot k' \rfloor$  ( $k' \in [0,1]$ ) neighbors based on the ranking from similarity and diversity and compare against random selection.

<span id="page-11-0"></span>

Figure 8: Empirical homophily comparison of different sampled subgraphs keeping  $\lfloor 0.25 \cdot d_u \rfloor$  neighbors of node u. The synthetic graphs are from squirrel with  $d = 42$ . The figure shows that similar neighbors increase  $\mathcal{H}_n$ , diverse samples obtained from a submodular function decrease  $\mathcal{H}_n$ , and random selection keeps  $\mathcal{H}_n$  the same as in the original graph.

### 7.4 High-Pass and Low-Pass Filters for GNN

We consider the following heterophilic graph in Fig. [9](#page-11-1) to demonstrate how high-pass filters can help in node classification in heterophilic graphs. Assume a heterophilic graph  $G$  has 18 nodes of five different classes where nodes in the range [0, 14] are locally heterophilic and [15, 17] are locally homophilic. We assume the graph's node feature  $X$  be the one-hot encoding of labels, thus the features and labels are (perfectly) correlated. This is to show how low-pass and high-pass filters perform in an ideal scenario with heterophily.

<span id="page-11-1"></span>

Figure 9: A heterophilic graph to demonstrate the performance of high-pass and low-pass filter. Here, nodes 0 − 14 are locally heterophilic, and nodes 15−17 are locally homophilic. In the figure, vertices with the same color correspond to the same class label.

In the graph convolution step, the feature information of the neighbors gets aggregated with the ego node. So, we get different



transformed representations of features depending on the representation of the underlying graph. For this example, we use a symmetric normalized adjacency matrix,  $A_{sym}$  as a low-pass filter and a symmetric normalized graph Laplacian,  $L_{sum}$  as a high-pass filter [\[9\]](#page-8-16). These filters are defined as,

$$
A_{sym} = D^{-\frac{1}{2}} A D^{-\frac{1}{2}}
$$

$$
L_{sym} = I - D^{-\frac{1}{2}} A D^{-\frac{1}{2}}
$$

If self-loops are added, then,

$$
\bar{A} = A + I
$$
  

$$
\bar{A}_{sym} = \bar{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \bar{A} \bar{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}}
$$
  

$$
\bar{L}_{sym} = I - \bar{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \bar{A} \bar{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}}
$$

Graphs under heterophily may perform well if the node features of the neighbors make two heterophilic nodes similar after aggregation. To evaluate this, we first compute aggregated feature information based on the filters and then inspect pairwise similarities.

$$
S(A, X) = AX(AX)^{T}
$$

$$
S(\bar{A}_{sym}, X) = \bar{A}_{sym}X(\bar{A}_{sym}X)^{T}
$$

$$
S(\bar{L}_{sym}, X) = \bar{L}_{sym}X(\bar{L}_{sym}X)^{T}
$$

In these matrices, for a particular node  $u$ , if the average similarity of nodes with the same label as  $y_u$  is greater than the average similarity of the nodes not having the same label as  $y_u$ , then we can expect that node to be appropriately classified (Definition 2 and Theorem 1 in [\[27\]](#page-8-1)).

In AGS-GNN based sampler, along with similarity based sampling, we also sample the neighborhood of vertices based on feature diversity. The feature diversity-based sampler will attempt to create

V/V	$\Omega$	$\mathbf{1}$	$\mathbf{2}$	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
$\bf{0}$	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.12	0.12	0.12	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.16$	$-0.16$	$-0.16$
1	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.12	0.12	0.12	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.16$	$-0.16$	$-0.16$
$\boldsymbol{2}$	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.12	0.12	0.12	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.16$	$-0.16$	$-0.16$
3	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.04	0.04	0.04	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.04$	$-0.04$	$-0.04$
4	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.04	0.04	0.04	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.04$	$-0.04$	$-0.04$
5	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.04	0.04	0.04	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.04$	$-0.04$	$-0.04$
6	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.06
7	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.06
8	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.06
9	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.06
10	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.06
$\overline{11}$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.06
12	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.06	0.06	0.06
13	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.06	0.06	0.06
14	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.3$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	$-0.06$	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.06	0.06	0.06
15	$-0.16$	$-0.16$	$-0.16$	$-0.04$	$-0.04$	$-0.04$	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.1	0.1	0.1
16	$-0.16$	$-0.16$	$-0.16$	$-0.04$	$-0.04$	$-0.04$	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0 <sub>1</sub>	0.1	0.1
17	$-0.16$	$-0.16$	$-0.16$	$-0.04$	$-0.04$	$-0.04$	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.1	0.1	0.1

Table 6:  $\bar{A} = A + I$ , Graph Laplacian  $\bar{L}_{sum} = I - \bar{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \bar{A} \bar{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ , and the pairwise similarity weight after aggregation is,  $S(\bar{L}_{sum}, X) = \bar{L}_{sum} X(\bar{L}_{sum} X)^T$ . The highlighted values show that this high-pass filter can properly classify heterophilic nodes. Here, nodes 0 − 2 are mapped in the same space and have high similarity weight since they have the same dissimilar neighborhood.

V/V	0	1	$\mathbf{2}$	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
$\Omega$	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.25	0.25	0.25
1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.25	0.25	0.25
$\boldsymbol{2}$	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.25	0.25	0.25
3	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.62	0.62	0.62	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.16	0.16	0.16
$\overline{4}$	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.62	0.62	0.62	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.16	0.16	0.16
5	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.62	0.62	0.62	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.16	0.16	0.16
6	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.06
7	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.06
8	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.06
9	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.06
10	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.06
11	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.06
12	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.06	0.06	0.06
13	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.06	0.06	0.06
14	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.06	0.06	0.06
15	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.6	0.6	0.6
16	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.6	0.6	0.6
17	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.6	0.6	0.6

Table 7:  $\bar{A} = A + I$ , Symmetric normalized adjacency matrix of  $G$ ,  $\bar{A}_{sym} = \bar{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \bar{A} \bar{D}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ , and the pairwise similarity weight after aggregation is,  $S(\overline{A}_{sym}, X) = \overline{A}_{sym} X(\overline{A}_{sym} X)^{T}$ . The highlighted values show that this low-pass filter cannot properly classify heterophilic nodes. Here, nodes 0 − 2 have positive similarity weights to all other nodes.

the same diverse neighborhood of two heterophilic nodes, thus potentially mapping in the same vector space. In a low-pass filter, however, the neighboring nodes of the same label as the ego node with similar features help to map them in the same space; therefore, the feature-similarity-based sampler will work in conjunction with the low-pass filter. AGS-GNN uses a dual channel of featuresimilar and feature-diverse samples for each node in the graph and adaptively learns a better representation.

#### <span id="page-12-1"></span>8 Appendix: Additional Details on **AGS-GNN**

#### 8.1 Probability Mass Functions

Fig. [10](#page-12-0) shows some possible Probability Mass Functions that take the rank of neighbors as input and return weights for sampling probabilities.

# 8.2 Computation of sampling probability for similar samples

Algorithm [2](#page-12-4) shows how the similarity based sampling algorithm with the step function is used to rank and pre-compute the probability distribution. Here we can use any known similarity functions or a learned function. The pseudocode shows how step functions with

<span id="page-12-0"></span>

#### Figure 10: Probability Mass Functions (PMFs) for weights used later for selection probabilities

three different selection probabilities are used to compute sampling probabilities.

<span id="page-12-4"></span>

# <span id="page-12-2"></span>8.3 Computation of sampling probability for diverse samples

We can use submodular functions to rank the neighbors of a vertex. Multiple submodular functions are available for finding a useful subset from a larger set; e.g., 'MaxCoverage', 'FeatureBased', 'GraphBased', 'FacilityLocation', etc. Algorithm [3](#page-13-0) shows the pseudocode for computing sampling probabilities using ranking by diversity. Algorithm [4](#page-13-1) shows the pseudocode of a simplified Lazy Greedy algorithm using the facility location function. For distance measures such as 'Euclidean', distance.max()-distance is used to convert into similarity measure. Note that the ego node  $u$  is already taken as an initial set for submodular selections, and the remaining nodes are to be selected from the neighbors.

<span id="page-12-3"></span>Ablation studies on different submodular functions are provided in Appendix [12.2,](#page-21-2) and more details on functions and implementations are provided in Apricot [\[37\]](#page-8-18) [\(url\)](https://apricot-select.readthedocs.io/en/latest/index.html). Similar to the pseudocode of RankBySimilarity in Algorithm [2,](#page-12-4) we can also use a step function to reduce computation complexity by ranking only the top few items.

<span id="page-13-0"></span>

**Input** : Graph  $G(V, \mathcal{E})$ , Feature matrix  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times f}$ , Similarity function  $S$ , Probability Mass Function,  $P$ 

- 1: for  $u \in V$  do
- 2:  $N(u)$  is the neighbors of u
- 3: Ranks,  $R_u =$  LazyGreedy( $N(u)$ , u,  $X_u|X_{N(u)}$ )
- 4: Assign weights  $W_{u,v}$  for  $v \in \mathcal{N}(u)$  from the ranks  $R_u$  using  $\mathcal{P}$ .
- 5: Sampling probability of neighbors,  $P_{u,v}$  $W_{u,v}/\sum_{v\in \mathcal{N}(u)} W_{u,v}$
- 6: end for
- 7:  $return P$

# <span id="page-13-1"></span>Algorithm 4 LazyGreedy  $(N(u), u, X', S)$

**Input** :  $\mathcal{N}(u)$  is the neighbors of ego node  $u, X' \in \mathbb{R}^{|N(u) \cup \{u\}|}$  is the feature of  $N(u) \cup \{u\}$ , Similarity function S

- 1: kernel = compute\_pairwise\_similarity( $X', S$ )
- 2: Initial set,  $S = \{u\}$
- 3: Ground set,  $Y = \{u\} \cup \mathcal{N}(u)$
- 4: Gain of set S is  $S_{gain} = Gain(S, Y, kernel)$  {Eq[.7](#page-10-4) is used}
- 5: Initialize max-heap  $H$ , where key is the marginal gain w.r.t S and the element is neighboring vertex  $v$
- 6: while  $H \neq \emptyset$  do
- 7:  $(gain, v) = H.pop()$
- 8: gain<sub>v</sub> = Gain(S ∪ {v}, Y, kernel) S<sub>gain</sub>
- 9:  $(gain_2, \cdot) = H.top()$
- 10: if  $\text{gain}_v \geq \text{gain}_2$  then
- 11:  $S = S \cup \{v\}$
- 12:  $S_{\varphi \text{ain}} = \text{Gain}(S, Y, \text{kernel})$
- 13: else
- 14:  $H.push(gain_v, v)$
- 15: end if
- 16: end while

17: Rank the vertices by marginal gain,  $R_u = Rank(S)$ 

18: **return**  $R_u$ 

# 8.4 Training and inference of a similarity learning model

We use the Siamese [\[7\]](#page-8-22) model to predict the edge weights given two node features. Here are simplified equations showing the architecture used for the regression task of edge weight predictions.

The network can be described by

$$
mlp1 = MLP(f, H1),\nmlp2 = MLP(H1, H2),\nmlp3 = MLP(2 * H2, 1).
$$

The forward propagation is described by

$$
x_1 = \sigma_1(\text{mlp}_2(\sigma_1(\text{mlp}_1(x_u))))
$$
  
\n
$$
x_2 = \sigma_1(\text{mlp}_2(\sigma_1(\text{mlp}_1(x_v))))
$$
  
\n
$$
x = \sigma_2(\text{mlp}_3(x_1 - x_2|x_1 \times x_2)).
$$

Here MLP corresponds to Multi-Layer Perceptron or linear neural network layers,  $\sigma_1$  refers to ReLU activation function, and  $\sigma_2$  is

Sigmoid for predicting edge weight between 0 to 1. The MSELoss function is used as an optimization function.

#### <span id="page-13-2"></span>Algorithm 5 LearnSimilarity  $(G, X, y)$

- $\textbf{Input}: \text{Graph } G(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}), \text{Feature matrix } X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times f}, \text{Label } \bm{y} \in \mathbb{Y}^n$
- 1: Extract the training subgraph,  $G'$ , containing training vertices only.
- 2: Initialize a model, SIM<sup>W</sup>
- 3: while condition do
- $4:$  Batch  $B$  contains an equal number of edges and non-edges in the  $\mathcal{G}'$
- 5: Target label,  $T = [(y_u = y_v) : (u, v) \in B]$
- 6: Train, SIM<sub>W</sub> using  $B, T$
- 7: end while
- 8: Get edge weight,  $\mathcal{E}' = SIM_W(\mathcal{E})$
- 9: return  $\text{SIM}_W, \mathcal{E}'$

Algorithm [5](#page-13-2) shows the training process for the regression task of predicting edge weights between 0 and 1. We form a mini-batch by sampling an equal number of edges and non-edges from the training subgraph. The target labels are computed using the labels of each endpoint of the edges. For a few training nodes, training subgraphs mostly contain isolated vertices. In such a scenario, we can construct a new graph where all training nodes with the same class are connected and use that for training purposes.

# <span id="page-13-3"></span>9 Appendix: AGS-GS: **AGS-GNN** with Graph Sampling

This section covers how feature-similarity and feature-diversitybased samplers can be used in graph sampling. The graph sampling paradigm is significantly faster than node sampling since it avoids neighborhood expansions.

# <span id="page-13-4"></span>9.1 **AGS-GS-RW**: Graph Sampling with Random Walk

A simple way to perform graph sampling is to use weighted random walks on the precomputed graphs, as shown in Fig. [11.](#page-13-5)

<span id="page-13-5"></span>

Figure 11: Graph Sampling using Weighted Random walk. The weights for sampling are computed based on the ranks by similarity and diversity.

<span id="page-14-1"></span>Algorithm 6 AGS-GS-RW  $(G, X, y)$  [Weighted Random Walk]

 $\textbf{Input}: \text{Graph } G(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}), \text{Feature matrix } X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times f}, \text{Label, } \bm{y} \in \mathbb{Y}^n$ 

1:  $S =$  LearnSimilarity( $G, X, y$ ) /\* model for feature similarity, if an appropriate function not known, Alg. [5](#page-13-2) \*/



```
Algorithm 6 shows the pseudocode when the weighted random
walk is performed. Here for a minibatch we first generate random
seed nodes from V and then start the random walk of k steps from
these nodes to generate subgraphs. If we use a single channel, the
training process can be similar to GSAINT. However, if two channels
are used, the nodes of sampled subgraphs from two random walks
will differ, and there are a few choices to compute loss:
```
- (i) Only compute the loss of training nodes from the seed nodes.
- (ii) Compute loss from common training nodes of the two sampled subgraphs.
- (iii) Combine the loss of training nodes from seed nodes, training nodes of the first and second subgraphs

During inference, we can sample two subgraphs starting from the test nodes and check predictions from the combination network.

# <span id="page-14-0"></span>9.2 **AGS-GS-Disjoint**: **AGS-GNN** with edge-disjoint subgraph sampling

9.2.1 Edge Disjoint Sparse Graph for Graph Sampling We can use the pre-computed weighted graph from Section [3.1](#page-2-3) and go one step further in graph sampling and incorporate some heuristics into the sampling process. To do this, we take some high-quality sparse subgraphs with unique properties and compute edge-disjoint subgraphs. Subgraph selection examples include Spanning Trees,  $k$ -Nearest Neighbor,  $b$ -matching subgraph, and Spectral Sparsifier. Algorithm [7](#page-14-2) shows the process of computing edge-disjoint subgraphs and their corresponding weights. Note that the weight of the residual subgraph is set to zero.

Consider the heuristic of ensuring connectivity among sampled nodes. We compute  $k$ -edge-disjoint Maximum Spanning Trees (MSTs) for a graph, sample a few of them, and combine these subgraphs to get a sparse representation of the original graph. Note that

the best-quality sparse graphs will be in in the order of selection when similarity and diversity-based edge weights are considered for edge-disjoint subgraph computation. Therefore, the importance of the sparse graph quality should also be considered in the sparse graph sampling. Fig. [12](#page-14-3) shows how an edge-disjoint subgraph can be used to sample a sparse representation. In the example scenario, the original graph  $G$  is split into  $k = 4$  edge-disjoint subgraphs  $\{(q_1, w_1), (q_1, w_1), (q_1, w_1), (q_4, w_4)\}\.$  The  $w_i$  is the weight of the subgraph used for sampling. Here  $q_4 = G - q_1 - q_2 - q_3$  is the residual subgraph. In the DisjointSubgraphSample process, we randomly sample  $k = 2$  of these subgraphs from  $q_1, q_2, q_3$ , excluding the residual graph. We combine these sampled subgraphs and add random edges from the residual graph.

<span id="page-14-3"></span>

Figure 12: We split the original graph  $G$  into a collection of disjoint edges (here, a spanning tree is used), and then we sample such subgraphs to get a sparse graph,  $G' = g_1 + g_2$  for an epoch/batch.

<span id="page-14-2"></span>

- **Input**:Graph  $G(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ , Feature matrix  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times f}$ , R is the rank from similarity or diversity of the neighborhood,  $K$  is the number of edge-disjoint graph, Subgraph selection  ${\mathcal F}$ could be MST,  $k$ -NN,  $b$ -matching, or combinations of these
- 1: Get edge weights,  $W$ , from rank  $R$  using Probability Mass Function P
- 2: Graph collections,  $G_{\text{col}} = \{\}$ , Graph Weights,  $G_{\text{w}} = \{\}$
- 3: while True do
- 4: Compute,  $\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{G}} = \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{W})$
- 5:  $G_{\text{col}} = G_{\text{col}} \cup \text{Sub}_G$
- $6:$  /\* make sure the sparse graph weight doesn't become too small  $\star/$
- 7:  $G_{\text{w}} = G_{\text{w}} \cup \max(\text{Weight}(\text{Sub}_G), \text{K} \times 1\text{e}^{-3})$
- 8:  $G = G Sub_G$
- 9:  $K = K 1$
- 10: if  $K = 0$  then
- 11:  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{col}} = \mathcal{G}_{\text{col}} \cup \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{G}}$
- 12:  $\mathcal{G}_{w} = \mathcal{G}_{w} \cup \{0\}$
- 13: break
- 14: end if
- 15: end while
- 16: **return**  $G_{\text{col}}$ ,  $G_{\text{w}}$

9.2.2 AGS-GS-Disjoint: AGS-GNN with edge-disjoint graph sampling Algorithm [8](#page-15-2) shows overall AGS-GNN as a graph sampling process for training when disjoint graphs sampling with heuristics are used. For simplicity, we include the pseudocode on a single channel; the dualchannel implementation is similar to the Random Walk version. Here, we sample a sparse graph at the start of the epoch and perform random walk-based graph sampling as a mini-batch process to ensure that the subgraph remains small for GNN iterations. The second step is unnecessary if the initial sampled sparse graph fits in the GPU memory. We can also directly perform random-walk on the collection of edge-disjoint subgraphs instead of the two-stage process.

<span id="page-15-2"></span>Algorithm 8 AGS-GS-Disjoint  $(G, X, y)$  [Disjoint subgraph sample\* (single channel)]

 $\textbf{Input}: \text{Graph } G(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}), \text{Feature matrix } X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times f}, \text{Label, } \bm{y} \in \mathbb{Y}^n$ 



#### <span id="page-15-1"></span>10 Appendix: Dataset Details

# 10.1 Dataset Description

10.1.1 Dataset with Heterophily: Cornell, Texas, and Wisconsin are three sub-datasets from the WebKB set [\[33\]](#page-8-14). Chameleon and Squirrel are web page datasets collected from Wikipedia [\[36\]](#page-8-15). The actor is an actor co-occurrence network [\[33\]](#page-8-14), where nodes are actors and edges represent two actors whose names occur together on the same Wikipedia page. Recently [\[25\]](#page-8-3) collected and released a series of large-scale benchmark datasets from diverse areas which include a Wikipedia web page dataset (Wiki), two citation network datasets (ArXiv-year and Snap-Patents), online social network datasets (Penn94, Pokec, Genius, and Twitch-Gamers). We also use the dataset from [\[25\]](#page-8-3), which includes reed98, amherst41, cornell5, Yelp and johnshopkins55. In [\[35\]](#page-8-28), the authors proposed new benchmark datasets, Roman-empire, Amazon-ratings,

Minesweeper, Tolokers, and Questions to show the effect of homophilic and heterophilic GNNs. We also converted a few multilabel multiclass classification problems (Flickr, AmazonProducts) to single-label multiclass node classification problems. Through this process, their homophily values are reduced, rendering them heterophilic.

10.1.2 Dataset with Homophily: Cora [\[38\]](#page-8-20), Citeseer [\[13\]](#page-8-29) and pubmed [\[30\]](#page-8-30) are three classic paper citation network benchmarks. For Cora and Citeseer, class labels correspond to paper topics, while for pubmed, labels correspond to the type of diabetes. Coauthorcs and Coauthor-physics [\[39\]](#page-8-31) are coauthorship networks, where nodes represent authors and an edge connects two authors if they co-authored a paper. Node labels correspond to fields of study. The Amazon-computers and Amazon-photo [\[39\]](#page-8-31) are co-purchasing networks with nodes representing products and edges representing two products that are frequently bought together. Here labels correspond to product categories. Reddit [\[15\]](#page-8-10) is one of the most popular large homophilic benchmark datasets. The graph contains Reddit posts belonging to different communities; the node label is the community, or subreddit, that a post belongs to. Reddit2 [\[51\]](#page-9-6) is the sparse version of the original Reddit graph with average degree 100 instead of the original 492. The dblp [\[11\]](#page-8-32) is from a subset of the DBLP computer science bibliography website.

#### <span id="page-15-0"></span>10.2 Homophily measures of Dataset

Here we provide more homophily measures than included in the paper, and provide additional details.

(1) Edge homophily [\[57\]](#page-9-2): is defined as the fraction of edges in a graph that join nodes that have the same class label

$$
\mathcal{H}_e = \frac{|(u, v) : (u, v) \in \mathcal{E} \wedge y_u = y_v|}{|\mathcal{E}|}.
$$
 (8)

Recall that  $y_u, y_v$  represent labels of node  $u$  and  $v$ , respectively.

(2) Node homophily [\[33\]](#page-8-14):

$$
\mathcal{H}_n = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{V}|} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{|(u, v) : v \in N(u) \land y_u = y_v|}{|N(u)|}.
$$
 (9)

Here  $N(u)$  represents neighbors of node u.

(3) Class insensitive edge homophily [\[25\]](#page-8-3): Edge homophily is modified to be insensitive to the number of classes and size of each class as follows.

$$
\mathcal{H}_i = \frac{1}{c-1} \sum_{k=1}^{c} max(0, \mathcal{H}_k - \frac{|c_k|}{|V|}),
$$
 (10)

where c denotes the number of classes,  $|c_k|$  denotes the number of nodes of class  $k$ , and  $H_k$  denotes the edge homophily ratio of nodes of class  $k$ .

These homophily score range between [0, 1]. The definitions of homophily scores given above may not represent heterophilic graphs well; hence we consider a few more. In addition, we define two more intuitive definitions to understand the distribution of labels in the neighborhood of a vertex.

<span id="page-16-0"></span>

Dataset	$\boldsymbol{N}$	E	$\overline{d}$	$\mathcal{C}_{0}^{(n)}$	$\mathcal{H}_n$	$\mathcal{H}_e$	$\mathcal{H}_i$	$\mathcal{H}_a \downarrow$	$\mathcal{H}_{agg}^{LP}$	$\mathcal{H}_{agg}^{HP}$	$\mathcal{H}_t$	$\mathcal{H}_u$	${\mathcal{A}}$
Cornell	183	298	1.63	5	0.11	0.13	0.15	$-0.42$	0.62	0.61	0.05	0.01	$-0.38$
<b>Texas</b>	183	325	1.78	5	0.07	0.11	0.00	$-0.26$	0.55	0.56	0.09	0.00	$-0.35$
Wisconsin	251	515	2.05	5	0.17	0.20	0.08	$-0.20$	0.50	0.51	0.06	0.00	$-0.27$
reed98	962	37,624	39.11	$\overline{2}$	0.45	0.45	$\qquad \qquad -$	$-0.10$	0.55	0.54	$\qquad \qquad -$	$\overline{\phantom{0}}$	0.02
amherst41	2,235	181,908	81.39	$\overline{2}$	0.47	0.46	$\overline{\phantom{0}}$	$-0.07$	0.50	0.58	$\qquad \qquad -$	$\qquad \qquad -$	0.06
penn94	41,554	2,724,458	65.56	$\overline{2}$	0.48	0.47	$\qquad \qquad -$	$-0.06$	$\qquad \qquad -$	$\qquad \qquad -$	$\overline{\phantom{0}}$	$\qquad \qquad -$	0.00
Roman-empire	22,662	65,854	2.91	18	0.05	0.05	0.02	$-0.05$	$\equiv$	$\overline{\phantom{0}}$	0.31	0.00	$-0.03$
cornell5	18,660	1,581,554	84.76	$\overline{2}$	0.48	0.48	$\equiv$	$-0.04$	$\overline{\phantom{0}}$	$\equiv$	$\equiv$	$\overline{\phantom{0}}$	0.02
Squirrel	5,201	217,073	41.74	5	0.09	0.22	0.04	$-0.01$	0.43	0.55	0.68	0.28	0.37
johnshopkins55	5,180	373,172	72.04	$\overline{2}$	0.50	0.50	$\equiv$	0.00	0.49	0.56	$\overline{\phantom{0}}$	$\overline{\phantom{0}}$	0.08
AmazonProducts	1,569,960	264,339,468	168.37	107	0.48	0.09	0.01	0.01	$\qquad \qquad -$	$\equiv$	$\equiv$	$\equiv$	$-0.03$
Actor	7,600	30,019	3.95	5	0.16	0.22	0.01	0.01	0.36	0.36	0.34	0.11	$-0.11$
Minesweeper	10,000	78,804	7.88	$\overline{2}$	0.68	0.68	0.01	0.01	0.58	0.59	$\overline{\phantom{m}}$	0.86	0.39
Questions	48,921	307,080	6.28	$\overline{2}$	0.90	0.84	0.08	0.02	$\qquad \qquad -$	$\qquad \qquad -$	$\overline{\phantom{0}}$	0.23	$-0.15$
Chameleon	2,277	36,101	15.85	5	0.10	0.24	0.06	0.03	0.51	0.53	0.55	0.17	$-0.11$
Tolokers	11,758	1,038,000	88.28	$\overline{2}$	0.63	0.59	0.18	0.09	$\overline{\phantom{0}}$	$\overline{\phantom{0}}$	$\qquad \qquad -$	0.92	$-0.08$
Flickr	89,250	899,756	10.08	$\overline{7}$	0.32	0.32	0.07	0.09	$\equiv$	$\equiv$	0.47	0.01	$-0.04$
Yelp	716,847	13,954,819	19.47	100	0.52	0.44	0.02	0.12	$\equiv$	$\overline{\phantom{0}}$	$\qquad \qquad -$	$\qquad \qquad -$	0.10
Amazon-ratings	24,492	186,100	7.60	5	0.38	0.38	0.13	0.14	$\equiv$	$\overline{\phantom{0}}$	0.37	0.03	$-0.09$
genius	421,961	984,979	2.33	$\overline{2}$	0.48	0.62	0.22	0.17	$\equiv$	$\qquad \qquad -$	$\overline{\phantom{0}}$	0.03	$-0.11$
cora	19,793	126,842	6.41	70	0.59	0.57	0.50	0.56	$\overline{\phantom{0}}$	$\equiv$	0.09	0.00	$-0.05$
CiteSeer	3,327	9,104	2.74	6	0.71	0.74	0.63	0.67	0.72	0.73	0.03	0.00	0.05
dblp	17,716	105,734	5.97	$\overline{4}$	0.81	0.83	0.65	0.68	$\equiv$	$\equiv$	0.05	0.01	$-0.01$
Computers	13,752	491,722	35.76	10	0.79	0.78	0.70	0.68	$\overline{\phantom{0}}$	$\overline{\phantom{0}}$	0.15	0.00	$-0.06$
pubmed	19,717	88,648	4.50	3	0.79	0.80	0.66	0.69	$\qquad \qquad -$	$\overline{\phantom{0}}$	0.04	0.05	$-0.04$
Reddit	232,965	114,615,892	491.99	41	0.81	0.76	0.65	0.74	$\overline{\phantom{0}}$	$\qquad \qquad -$	0.28	0.00	0.11
cora ml	2,995	16,316	5.45	$\overline{7}$	0.81	0.79	0.74	0.75	0.84	0.78	0.06	0.00	$-0.07$
Cora	2,708	10,556	3.90	$\overline{7}$	0.83	0.81	0.77	0.77	0.85	0.81	0.04	0.00	$-0.07$
Reddit2	232,965	23,213,838	99.65	41	0.81	0.78	0.69	0.77	$\equiv$	$\equiv$	0.21	0.00	0.10
<b>CS</b>	18,333	163,788	8.93	15	0.83	0.81	0.75	0.78	$\qquad \qquad -$	$\qquad \qquad -$	0.07	0.00	0.11
Photo	7,650	238,162	31.13	8	0.84	0.83	0.77	0.79	0.77	0.81	0.13	0.00	$-0.04$
Physics	34,493	495,924	14.38	5	0.92	0.93	0.85	0.87	$\overline{\phantom{0}}$	$\equiv$	0.04	0.00	0.20
citeseer	4,230	10,674	2.52	6	0.96	0.95	0.94	0.94	0.96	0.95	0.00	0.00	$-0.08$

Table 8: Properties of all datasets used in the experiments and their different homophily measure. The datasets are sorted (in ascending order) based on their adjusted homophily,  $h_{adj}$ . The '-' represents the value that is not computed due to memory complexity or an error in computation. The datasets are termed heterophily and homophily based on the  $h_{ad}$  cutoff 0.5

(1) Aggregated Homophily [\[27\]](#page-8-1): is the only measure that considers associated node features. It is defined as

$$
\mathcal{H}_{agg} = [2S_{agg}(S(A, X)) - 1]_{+}
$$
\n(11)

$$
S = S(A, X) = (AX) \times (AX)^{T}
$$
\n(12)

$$
S_{agg}(S(A, X)) = \frac{1}{|V|} \{v | \mu_u(S_{v,u} | y_u = y_v) \ge \mu_u(S_{v,u} | y_u \ne y_v) . \}
$$
\n(13)

Here  $S(A, X)$  is an  $N \times N$  matrix, and the method computes the average similarity weights for edges that share the same label for each row. Moreover, it counts the expected number of correctly classified nodes with a single-layer GNN.

#### (2) Adjusted Homophily [\[34\]](#page-8-0) is defined as

$$
\mathcal{H}_a = \frac{\mathcal{H}_e - \sum_{k=1}^C D_k^2 / (2|\mathcal{E}|^2)}{1 - \sum_{k=1}^C D_k^2 / 2|\mathcal{E}|^2};
$$
\n(14)

here  $d_v$  denotes the degree of node  $v$  and  $D_k = \sum_{v:y_v=k} d_v$ . (3) Entropy Score: A vertex may have edges connecting it to clusters with labels that differ from its own, and we evaluate if these edges are connected to specific clusters or distributed across all cluster labels. Entropy is an excellent measure for this, and it is defined as

$$
\mathcal{H}_t = \sum_{u \in V} \text{Entropy}(u) / |\mathcal{V}|. \tag{15}
$$

(4) Uniformity Score: Another metric with the same inspiration comes from checking the distribution of neighboring node labels of the vertex.

$$
\mathcal{H}_u = \sum_{u \in V} \text{Uniformity(u)}/|\mathcal{V}|,\tag{16}
$$

where Uniformity(u) does the Chi-square test with expected uniform distribution with 95% confidence.

Table [8](#page-16-0) shows different homophily measures of all the datasets used for experimentation. Here,  $\mathcal A$  refers to the degree assortativity coefficient of the graph. Assortivity measures how similar the nodes are in terms of some degree. It is calculated as the correlation coefficient between the degree values for pairs of connected nodes. A positive assortivity means that nodes tend to connect with other nodes that have similar degrees. In contrast, a negative assortivity means that nodes tend to connect with other nodes with different degrees.

$$
\mathcal{A} = \frac{\sum_{ij} (e_{ij} - p_i q_j)}{\sqrt{(\sum_i p_i^2 - (\sum_i p_i)^2)(\sum_j q_j^2 - (\sum_j q_j)^2)}}.
$$
(17)

Here  $e_{ij}$  is the fraction of edges in the network that join nodes of degrees *i* and *j*,  $p_i$  is the fraction of edges connecting nodes of degree *i* to each other, and  $q_i$  is the fraction of edges that connect nodes of degree  $j$  to each other.

## 10.3 Additional Dataset Properties

<span id="page-17-1"></span>

Dataset	Feat.	Isolated	Self-loop	Directed	Tr./Va./Te.	Context
Cornell	1.703	Nο	Yes	No	0.48/0.32/0.20	Web Pages
Texas	1.703	No	Yes	No.	0.48/0.32/0.20	Web Pages
Wisconsin	1,703	No	Yes	No	0.48/0.32/0.20	Web Pages
reed98	745	No	No	<b>Yes</b>	0.60/0.20/0.20	Social Network
amherst41	1,193	No	No	<b>Yes</b>	0.60/0.20/0.20	Social Network
penn94	4,814	No	No	Yes	0.47/0.23/0.23	Social Network
Roman-empire	300	No	No	Yes	0.50/0.25/0.25	Wikipedia
cornell5	4,735	No	No	Yes	0.60/0.20/0.20	Web pages
Squirrel	2,089	No	<b>Yes</b>	No	0.48/0.32/0.20	Wikipedia
johnshopkins55	2,406	No	No	Yes	0.60/0.20/0.20	Web Pages
<b>AmazonProducts</b>	200	Yes	Yes	Yes	0.80/0.05/0.15	Reviews
Actor	932	No	Yes	No	0.48/0.32/0.20	<b>Actors in Movies</b>
Minesweeper	7	No	No	Yes	0.50/0.25/0.25	Synthetic
Ouestions	301	No	No	Yes	0.50/0.25/0.25	Yandex O
Chameleon	2.325	No	Yes	No.	0.48/0.32/0.20	Wiki Pages
Tolokers	10	No	No	<b>Yes</b>	0.50/0.25/0.25	Toloka Platform
Flickr	500	No	No	Yes	0.50/0.25/0.25	Social network
Yelp	300	No	Yes	Yes	0.75/0.15/0.10	Review
Amazon-ratings	300	No	No	Yes	0.50/0.25/0.25	Co-purchase network
genius	12	Yes	No	No	0.60/0.20/0.20	Social Network
cora	8,710	No	No	<b>Yes</b>	0.60/0.20/0.20	<b>Citation Network</b>
CiteSeer	3,703	Yes	No	Yes	0.04/0.15/0.30	Citation Network
dblp	1,639	No	No	Yes	0.60/0.20/0.20	<b>Citation Network</b>
Computers	767	Yes	No	Yes	0.60/0.20/0.20	Co-purchase Network
pubmed	500	No	No	Yes	0.60/0.20/0.20	Social Network
Reddit	602	No	No	Yes	0.66/0.10/0.24	Social Network
cora ml	2,879	No	No	Yes	0.60/0.20/0.20	<b>Citation Network</b>
Cora	1,433	No	No	Yes	0.05/0.18/0.37	<b>Citation Network</b>
Reddit <sub>2</sub>	602	Yes	No	Yes	0.66/0.10/0.24	Social Network
CS.	6,805	No	No	Yes	0.60/0.20/0.20	Co-author Network
Photo	745	Yes	No	Yes.	0.60/0.20/0.20	Co-purchase Network
Physics	8,415	No	No	<b>Yes</b>	0.60/0.20/0.20	Co-author Network
citeseer	602	No	No	<b>Yes</b>	0.60/0.20/0.20	Citation Network

Table 9: Additional details of the dataset used for experiments

Additional dataset properties are included in Table [9.](#page-17-1) The table includes feature size, whether isolated nodes exist, whether self-loops are present, and whether the graphs are directed or undirected. We also include train, test, validation split provided from the benchmark or our random split size and the context from which the graphs arise.

#### <span id="page-17-0"></span>10.4 Feature Similarity versus Label Matching

ASSUMPTION 10.1. The nodes with similar features tend to have a similar labels [\[40\]](#page-8-13).

Here, we provide evidence to support this assumption. Table [10](#page-18-1) shows the Pearson correlation between feature similarity and labels for our benchmark dataset. The Pearson correlation between two vectors  $x$  and  $y$  with  $n$  elements is,

$$
r = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - \bar{y})^2}}.
$$
(18)

Here  $\bar{x}$  and  $\bar{y}$  are the means of the vectors  $x$  and  $y$ , respectively. In Table [10,](#page-18-1) we show a comparison between Cosine Similarity, Euclidean distance, and Learned model for similarity measure.

To compute the similarity between two node features, we use cosine similarity and Euclidean distances. We also train a similarity function learning regression model that learns from training nodes and evaluates on test nodes. Here is a brief explanation of each column in the table.

The three categories are based on how we evaluated or computed the Pearson correlations of the nodes.

- (1) In the first category, we take random sets of test nodes and consider all pair of edges to compute the Pearson correlation between them.
	- (a) Rand Learned: We train a regression model to learn similarity functions based on training subgraphs. Then, we evaluate  $r$  on random test nodes.
	- (b) Rand Cosine Sim. We consider the same random test nodes and use cosine similarity measures.
	- (c) Rand Euclidean  $\times$  1: We consider the negative Euclidean distance of two node features since the distance is minimum when similarity is maximum.
- (2) The problem with the previous type of evaluation is that the number of edges with non-matching labels at the endpoints will be high due to the consideration of all pairs, which introduces a bias in the Pearson correlation computation. To handle that, we evaluated on random sets of test nodes but with an equal number of edges and non-edges.
	- (a) Balance. Learned: The regression model is trained on a training subgraph with an equal number of positive and negative edges.
	- (b) Balance. Cosine Sim: The Pearson correlation with cosine similarity is evaluated on the same number of equal edges and non-edges.
	- (c) Balance. Euclidean× − 1: The same evaluation is done with the negative of the Euclidean distance.
- (3) The previous two categories were evaluated on random sets of training nodes. In this category, we computed Pearson correlation only on the given edges for cosine similarity and Euclidean distance. For learned models, we evaluated on test subgraph edges only.

<span id="page-18-1"></span>

Table 10: Pearson correlation coefficient between feature similarity and label matching. The table shows results in three categories: 1) evaluation done on nodes taken randomly, the model is also trained with random training node samples; 2) training and evaluation done where nodes are taken from each class of equal size; 3) evaluation done only to the given edges, the learned model is trained both random sampling and balanced sampling (from the training nodes).

- (a) Edge Learned: We trained a regression model with training edges and set a target with equal endpoint labels as one and zero otherwise.
- (b) Edge Learned Balanced: We trained the regression model with equal training edges and non-edges from the training subgraph.
- (c) Edge Cosine Sim.: We evaluated only on given edges using cosine similarity.
- (d) Edge Euclidean× − 1: We evaluated only on given edges using the negative of the Euclidean distance.

The table shows that the feature similarity and labels are positively correlated for all datasets. We specifically have a higher correlation value on the trained model. It highlights the importance of training a model for computing similar and diverse neighborhoods of a subgraph in the pre-computation step. This experiment also validates the importance of our supervised sampling strategy.

# <span id="page-18-0"></span>10.5 Local Node Homophily Distribution of Dataset

Figs. [13](#page-19-0) and [14](#page-20-0) show a histogram of *local node homophily*,  $H_n(u)$ values of all vertices of a graph. For example, Fig. [13a](#page-19-1) shows that most of the nodes of Cornell graphs have local node homophily 0

and only a few have 1, meaning the graph is strongly heterophilic with the majority of nodes having no neighbors of the same label as ego node. In contrast, Reddit (in Fig. [14f\)](#page-20-1) has the most nodes with high homophily. We can use a single channel AGS-GNN based on a feature-similarity sampler for graphs like Reddit, where we have only a few heterophilic nodes. In contrast, when a graph consists of both local homophilic and heterophilic (as in Amherst41 in Fig. [13e\)](#page-19-2), we need both feature-similarity and feature-diversity samplers. Therefore, the histogram plots of graphs give us a good insight into the distribution of local homophily. It explains when and why dual channel samplers work for homophilic and heterophilic graphs.

<span id="page-19-2"></span><span id="page-19-1"></span><span id="page-19-0"></span>

Figure 13: Local Node Homophily distributions of our benchmark datasets (Part 1)

AGS-GNN: Attribute-guided Sampling for Graph Neural Networks **KDD** '24, August, Barcelona KDD '24, August, Barcelona

<span id="page-20-1"></span><span id="page-20-0"></span>

Figure 14: Local Node Homophily distributions of our benchmark datasets (Part 2)

### 11 Appendix: Detailed Experimental Results

#### <span id="page-21-1"></span>11.1 AGS-GNN performance comparison

Table [11](#page-22-0) shows numerical results of the algorithms for small heterophilic graphs ( $N < 100K$ ). The performance plot in Fig. [5a](#page-7-2) ([§5\)](#page-5-0) is drawn based on the data from this table.

Table [12](#page-22-1) shows the comparison for small homophilic graphs  $(N < 100K)$ . The performance plot in Fig. [5b](#page-7-4) ([§5\)](#page-5-0) is drawn based on the data from this table.

Table [13](#page-22-2) shows the comparison of algorithms for large heterophilic graphs ( $N \ge 100K$ ). The performance plot in Fig. [5c](#page-7-3) ([§5\)](#page-5-0) is drawn based on the data from this table.

Table [14](#page-23-1) compares the algorithms for large heterophilic graphs  $(N \geq 100K)$ . The performance plot in Fig. [5d](#page-7-5) ([§5\)](#page-5-0) is drawn based on the data from this table.

# <span id="page-21-0"></span>11.2 AGS-GNN vs other homophilic and heterophilic GNNs

Homophilic GNNs: Some notable homophilic GNNs from the literature are Graph Isomorphic Network (GIN) [\[44\]](#page-9-8), Graph Attention Network (GAT) [\[41\]](#page-8-25), Graph Convolutional Network (GCN) [\[21\]](#page-8-24). For scaling widely used method for node sampling is GSAGE [\[15\]](#page-8-10) and for sampling based methods ClusterGCN [\[6\]](#page-8-9) and GSAINT [\[51\]](#page-9-6).

Heterophlic GNNs: Currently, the SOTA performance in heterophilic graph is from ACM-GCN [\[27\]](#page-8-1). Some other notable heterophilic GNNs in the literature are H2GCN [\[57\]](#page-9-2), MixHop [\[1\]](#page-8-38), GPRGNN [\[8\]](#page-8-2), GCNII [\[5\]](#page-8-39), However, most of these are not scalable for large graphs as they need to process entire graphs for improved performance. LINKX [\[25\]](#page-8-3) is the only scalable GNN for heterophilic graphs. However, the input dimension of MLP depends on the number of nodes and may cause scaling issues for very large graphs. Some other related GNN for heterophilic graphs are jumping knowledge networks (GCNJK, GATJK)[\[45\]](#page-9-13), and APPNP [\[12\]](#page-8-40). The method uses only node features, MLP [\[14\]](#page-8-41). Uses only graph structure, label propagation, LINK [\[52\]](#page-9-14), MultiLP [\[55\]](#page-9-15). And simple network methods, Simple Graph Convolutional Network (SGC) [\[43\]](#page-9-16), C&S [\[17\]](#page-8-42).

Table. [15](#page-23-0) shows the performance of AGS relative to the 18 recent algorithms for small heterophilic graphs. We can see that ACM-GCN, AGS-NS, and LINKX are the best-performing, with AGS-NS the best among them.

#### <span id="page-21-3"></span>12 Appendix: Ablation Study Results

# 12.1 AGS with existing GNNs

Table [16](#page-24-0) compares the performance cof AGS with existing GNNs (GSAGE, ChebNet, GSAINT, GIN, GAT, and GCN) evaluated on the heterophilic graphs (Reed98, Roman-empire, Actor, Minesweeper, Tolokers). These results show that AGS with GSAGE, ChebNet, and GSAINT performed the best. Fig. [6](#page-7-7) in the ablation study ([§5.3\)](#page-6-0) is based on the result from this table.

# <span id="page-21-2"></span>12.2 Different similarity functions for Nearest Neighbor and Submodular optimization

Table [17](#page-24-1) shows a performance comparison of different submodular and nearest neighbor samplers in heterophilic graphs. Here, we generate three synthetic graphs of average degree 200 with strong (0.05), moderate (0.25), and weak (0.50) heterophily. The underlying GNN is ChebNet, and only the samplers are changed. Neighborhood samplers of two hops, with sizes set as  $k = [25, 25]$ .

We consider the following sampler variants.

- Wholegraph: All neighbors of vertices are taken.
- Random: 25 Random neighbors are taken from each node's first and second hop.
- knncosine: Similarity sampler with  $k$ -Nearest Neighbor using Cosine similarity function.
- $\bullet$  knneuclidean:  $k$ -Nearest Neighbor sampler with Euclidean distance function. Note that  $distance.max() - distance$  operation is performed to convert it into similarity.
- submodularcosine: submodular optimization with facility location using cosine similarity as  $\phi$  is used. The general form of the facility location function is:

$$
f(X, Y) = \sum_{y \in Y} \max_{x \in X} \phi(x, y)
$$

- submodulareuclidean: submodular optimization with facility location using Euclidean distance measures is used. The distance is also converted into similarity.
- fastlink: The learned weight from the Siamese model using regression task directly used for sampling.
- link-nn: The learned weight is used with the nearest neighbor ranking and weight assignment.
- link-sub: The learned function generates a pairwise similarity kernel for the submodular optimization facility location function.
- apricotfacilityeuclidean: This is the same as submodulareuclidean, but the implementation and optimization operations are performed using the Apricot library.
- apricotfacilitycosine: This is the same as submodularcosine, but the implementation and optimization operations are performed using the Apricot library.
- apricotcoverage: Maximum Coverage submodular function is used. The general form of coverage function is:

$$
f(X) = \sum_{d=1}^{D} \min\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N} X_{i,d}, 1\right)
$$

•  $\frac{d}{dt}$   $\begin{pmatrix} \frac{d}{dt} & \frac{d}{dt} \\ \frac{d}{dt} & \frac{d}{dt} \end{pmatrix}$  • apricot feature: Feature-based submodular function is used. The general form of feature-based function is,

$$
f(X) = \sum_{d=1}^{D} \phi \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} X_{i,d} \right)
$$

This experiment uses the  $\phi$  = sqrt concave function.

• apricotgraph: Graph-based submodular function is used. The general form of Graph cut selection is:

 $f(X, V) = \lambda \sum_{v \in V} \sum_{x \in X} \phi(x, v) - \sum_{x, y \in X} \phi(x, y)$ 

<span id="page-22-0"></span>



<span id="page-22-1"></span>

Small Homophilic	<b>GSAGE</b>		<b>GSAINT</b>		LINKX <sup>+</sup>		<b>ACMGCN</b>		AGS-NS		AGS-GS	
Graphs	$\mu$	$\sigma$	$\mu$	σ	μ	$\sigma$	μ	$\sigma$	μ	$\sigma$	$\mu$	$\sigma$
cora	52.59	0.25	65.85	0.27	57.18	0.16	66.79	0.24	69.32	0.11	69.18	0.25
CiteSeer	71.14	0.10	65.84	3.86	44.20	2.49	55.42	3.43	69.33	0.31	68.14	0.56
dblp	85.80	0.16	85.65	0.21	80.47	0.04	85.68	0.24	85.97	0.11	85.40	0.05
Computers	91.31	0.11	91.77	0.14	91.38	0.17	92.03	0.48	92.18	0.08	91.28	0.14
pubmed	89.00	0.09	88.57	0.14	85.05	0.25	83.79	0.15	89.34	0.07	87.41	0.17
cora ml	88.71	0.23	87.21	0.37	80.67	0.32	85.28	0.12	87.70	0.08	87.95	0.41
Cora	80.56	0.52	79.12	1.22	59.28	3.80	71.16	0.98	81.13	0.90	79.54	0.14
CS	95.13	0.19	95.81	0.07	94.48	0.12	94.80	0.34	95.18	0.06	95.81	0.06
Photo	96.58	0.09	96.51	0.10	95.48	0.15	96.21	0.11	96.56	0.16	95.86	0.12
Physics	96.64	0.05	96.81	0.09	96.23	0.05	96.11	0.24	96.62	0.04	96.90	0.04
citeseer	95.15	0.20	95.32	0.16	88.53	0.27	94.26	0.19	95.40	0.10	94.61	0.45

Table 12: The table shows micro  $F_1$ -measure in small homophilic graphs.

<span id="page-22-2"></span>

Large Heterophilic	<b>GSAGE</b>		<b>GSAINT</b>		<b>LINKX</b>		AGS-NS		AGS-GS	
Graphs	μ	$\sigma$	$\mu$	$\sigma$	μ	$\sigma$	$\mu$	$\sigma$	$\mu$	$\sigma$
genius	81.76	0.33	82.09	0.19	82.59	0.02	82.84	0.01	81.36	0.52
pokec	68.91	0.03	68.18	0.12	70.57	0.3	70.08	0.00	65.77	0.00
arxiv-year	47.5	0.15	40.04	0.32	49.89	0.18	50.27	0.10	38.14	0.00
snap-patents	48.36	0.01	32.86	0.11	43.19	1.86	48.22	0.02	28.68	0.00
twitch-gamer	61.41	0.00	61.39	0.32	59.62	0.18	61.38	0.05	60.9	0.00
AmazonProducts	62.96	0.00	75.25	0.05	50.66	0.28	73.78	0.01	75.07	0.06
Yelp	65.15	0.00	77.06	0.07	52.84	2.4	75.82	0.01	77.09	0.08

Table 13: The table shows micro  $F_1$ -measure in large heterophilic graphs.

<span id="page-23-1"></span>

Large Homophilic	<b>GSAGE</b>		<b>GSAINT</b>		<b>LINKX</b>		AGS-NS		$AGS-GS$	
Graphs	$\mu$	$\sigma$	$\mu$	$\sigma$	$\mu$	$\sigma$	$\mu$	$\sigma$	$\mu$	$\sigma$
Reddit	95.17	0.01	93.91	0.03	92.53	0.26	95.64	0.06	94.64	0.03
Reddit2	88.94	0.32	73.3	2.2	86.54	0.44	92.23	0.11	70.14	0.82
Reddit0.525	91 31	0.06	90.46	0.05	87.13	0.18	91.91	0.06	91.40	0.05
Reddit0.425	8933	0.07	89.13	0.06	84.38	0.61	90.27	0.1	90.17	0.20
Reddit0.325	87.19	0.12	87.69	0.15	81.97	0.31	88.48	0.05	87.50	0.05

Table 14: The table shows micro  $F_1$ -measure in large homophilic graphs.

<span id="page-23-0"></span>

Table 15: F1-Score of other homophilic and heterophilic GNN performance on small heterophilic graphs (node  $<$  100 $k$ ).

<span id="page-24-0"></span>AGS-GNN: Attribute-guided Sampling for Graph Neural Networks **KDD** '24, August, Barcelona KDD '24, August, Barcelona

Methods	AGS-GSAGE			AGS-GSAINT (rw)   AGS-Chebnet			AGS-GCN		AGS-GAT		AGS-GIN	
Dataset		$\sigma$		$\sigma$	$\mu$	$\sigma$	$\mu$	$\sigma$	$\iota$	$\sigma$	$\mu$	$\sigma$
reed98	63.32	0.76	55.44	3.04	64.56	0.84	56.58	1.20	55.85	1.33	59.48	2.00
Roman-empire	77.35	0.43	74.39	0.41	77.44	0.24	44.36	1.76	46.57	0.75	45.91	0.26
Actor	35.36	0.49	29.97	0.52	33.76	0.73	28.64	0.75	26.58	1.01	26.74	0.30
Minesweeper	84.45	0.41	82.31	0.68	84.45	0.62	80.21	0.08	80.08	0.16	80.88	0.13
Tolokers	78.33	0.14	78.69	0.39	78.31	0.35	78.16	0.00	78.16	0.00	78.38	0.11

<span id="page-24-1"></span>Table 16:  $F_1$  score of heterophilic graphs using AGS sampler with different underlying GNNs. The best-performing models are AGS-GSAGE and AGS-CHEB.



Table 17: Performance of different sub-modular functions and nearest neighbors on Synthetic Cora graphs.