

Explainable AI Security: Exploring Robustness of Graph Neural Networks to Adversarial Attacks

Tao Wu, Canaryxing Cui, Xingping Xian, Shaojie Qiao, Chao Wang, Lin Yuan, Shui Yu

Abstract—Graph neural networks (GNNs) have achieved tremendous success, but recent studies have shown that GNNs are vulnerable to adversarial attacks, which significantly hinders their use in safety-critical scenarios. Therefore, the design of robust GNNs has attracted increasing attention. However, existing research has mainly been conducted via experimental trial and error, and thus far, there remains a lack of a comprehensive understanding of the vulnerability of GNNs. To address this limitation, we systematically investigate the adversarial robustness of GNNs by considering graph data patterns, model-specific factors, and the transferability of adversarial examples. Through extensive experiments, a set of principled guidelines is obtained for improving the adversarial robustness of GNNs, for example: (i) rather than highly regular graphs, the training graph data with diverse structural patterns is crucial for model robustness, which is consistent with the concept of adversarial training; (ii) the large model capacity of GNNs with sufficient training data has a positive effect on model robustness, and only a small percentage of neurons in GNNs are affected by adversarial attacks; (iii) adversarial transfer is not symmetric and the adversarial examples produced by the small-capacity model have stronger adversarial transferability. This work illuminates the vulnerabilities of GNNs and opens many promising avenues for designing robust GNNs.

Index Terms—Graph neural networks, adversarial attacks, adversarial robustness, decision boundary, adversarial transferability.

INTRODUCTION

RECENT studies have shown that artificial intelligence (AI) models are vulnerable to various adversarial attacks and are easily fooled to produce incorrect results. With the increasing adoption of AI systems in industry, medicine and health care, finance, and other fields, safety-critical systems using AI need to address the crucial problem of AI security. Therefore, exploring the robustness of intelligent models and creating trusted AI systems are now top priorities.

Graph neural networks (GNNs) have emerged as powerful tools for the representation learning of graph-structured data and have achieved remarkable results in various tasks such as social networks, knowledge graphs, and recommendation systems. Recently, various techniques have been proposed to improve the performance of GNNs, including graph convolutional networks (GCNs), graph attention networks (GATs), and graph autoencoders (GAEs). Despite their excellent performance, GNNs inherit the shortcomings of deep-learning models and are vulnerable to adversarial attacks; that is, the attackers can degrade the performance of GNNs by carefully crafting adversarial perturbations, as illustrated in Fig. 1. Specifically, adversarial attacks on GNNs have caused a wide range of security threats to the organization and society,

for example, in public opinion system, spammers add fake relationships to social networks, thereby increasing the spread opportunities for false information, and in financial credit system, attackers give themselves high credit by establishing connections with high credit users. Therefore, understanding model robustness and constructing GNNs that are robust against adversarial attacks are becoming increasingly important.




Fig. 1: Illustration of adversarial attack on GNNs. Given an original graph, a malicious attacker manipulates node features and edges to generate a perturbed graph to mislead the target GNNs, thereby producing an incorrect label for the target node.

Motivation. Currently, studies on the design of robust GNNs are quite comprehensive and from various perspectives [1], [2], [3]. However, existing studies are mainly based on empirical intuition, heuristics, and experimental trial and error, and they cannot provide the principle guidance for the study of adversarial robustness. In contrast to the remarkable and relatively mature framework against adversarial attacks on deep neural networks (DNNs), systematic research and

- Manuscript received XXXX; revised XXXX; accepted XXXX. Date of publication XXXX. This work was partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant Nos. 62106030, 62272074; Chongqing Municipal Natural Science Foundation under Grant No. cstc2020jcyj-msxmX0804; Chongqing Research Program of Basic Research and Frontier Technology under Grant No. cstc2021jcyj-msxmX0530.
- T. Wu, X. Xian, C. Cui and L. Yuan are with School of Cyber Security and Information Law, Chongqing University of Posts and Telecommunications, Chongqing, China. (E-mail: wutaoadeny@gmail.com, xxp0213@gmail.com, cuicananyixing@163.com, LinYuan@cqupt.edu.cn).
- S. Qiao is with School of Software Engineering, Chengdu University of Information Technology, Chengdu, China. E-mail: qiaoshaojie@gmail.com.
- C. Wang is with School of Computer and Information Science, Chongqing Normal University, Chongqing, China. E-mail: chaosimpler@gmail.com.
- S. Yu is with School of Computer Science, University of Technology Sydney, Australia. E-mail: Shui.Yu@uts.edu.au.

Corresponding author: Xingping Xian, Chao Wang.

a comprehensive understanding of the robustness of GNNs against adversarial attacks are lacking, regardless of their importance. Migrating insights from adversarial attacks on DNNs, especially DNN-based image processing scenarios [4], to GNNs is a nontrivial problem. These facts motivated us to comprehensively study the underlying mechanisms influencing the adversarial robustness of mainstream GNNs.

Challenges. Despite its importance, current research on the adversarial robustness of GNNs still faces crucial challenges: (1) *Researches on robust GNNs lacks a serious understanding and utilization of training graph data.* Although the performance of GNNs depends on the structural characteristics of graphs, it is difficult to understand the organization patterns of real-world graphs and their interactions with the underlying mechanisms of GNNs. Existing methods mainly focus on model architecture and overlook the inherent pattern characteristics of graphs for model training. (2) *Mechanisms through which GNNs capture graph structures and their influence on the discriminative power remain unclear.* The GNN model architectures directly determines their expressive power and affects their representation results. However, the manner by which GNN variants learn to represent and distinguish between graph structures remains unclear, and the relative independence or commonality of the models remains unknown. Robust GNNs must be able to identify adversarial perturbations and suppress their effects. (3) *An in-depth understanding of the transferability of adversarial examples is lacking.* The transferability of adversarial examples generated from a specific model can fool other unseen models with a high probability, which directly determines the security risks of models and raises serious security issues. However, the mechanisms behind this are still unknown.

Contribution. Considering these challenges, we present the first comprehensive investigation of factors that may influence the robustness of GNNs. In particular, to explore the effects of graph data patterns, we generate artificial graphs with different structural regularities to train GNNs and analyze their adversarial robustness. The experiment is compared with adversarial training strategy to illustrate the rationality of diversifying data patterns by augmenting the training data with adversarial examples. To explore the structural roles of adversarial perturbations, their pattern characteristics are studied using traditional graph structure measures. Moreover, from the perspective of model-specific factors, we discuss the adversarial robustness of GNNs with different model architectures and capacities. Considering that the complexity of the decision boundary increases with the model capacity, we study the robustness of GNNs by simultaneously increasing the amount of training data. We also analyze the sensitivity of the neurons in GNNs to understand the underlying mechanisms of adversarial attacks. Furthermore, to understand the adversarial transferability, we measure the adversarial transferability and explore its causes from a model perspective.

Our main contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We emphasize the concept of the robustness explanation of GNNs and give a formal definition, stressing the importance of explaining the underlying mechanisms behind intelligent security threats. We propose two evaluation metrics, i.e., loss landscape-based decision surface and accuracy-based adversarial transferability rate (ATR), to explore the robustness of GNNs.
- We propose a robustness explanation framework to explain why GNNs are vulnerable and how

adversarial attacks work against them, considering graph data patterns, model-specific factors, and adversarial transferability are put forward for consideration. In particular, the structural regularity, sensitive neurons, adversarial transferability rate, and other concepts play important roles.

- We systematically study the classic GNNs defending multiple adversarial attacks and explore the possible factors that affect the robustness of GNNs. Based on extensive experiments, we reveal and substantiate several insights that reflect the inherent vulnerability of GNNs. Additionally, we discuss the potential pathways that improve the robustness of GNNs.

The remainder of our paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we summarize related works; in Section 3, we provide the problem definition and preliminaries; and in Section 4, we introduce the robustness analysis framework for GNNs. Section 5 presents the results of model robustness analysis. Section 6 discusses the potential directions for designing robust GNNs. Finally, the conclusions are presented in Section 7.

2 RELATED WORK

2.1 Adversarial Attacks on GNNs

With the increasing popularity of GNNs, adversarial attacks on them have attracted increasing attention in recent years. Based on the concepts involved in back-propagation, gradient-based adversarial attack methods have been proposed by calculating the gradient information of the loss function with respect to the input data, thereby identifying and perturbing the links or node features that have the greatest impact on GNN performance. For example, Chen et al. [5] proposed the fast gradient attack (FGA), which generates adversarial examples based on the gradient information of a GCN. Zügner et al. [6] proposed the poisoning attack method, Mettack, which treats the graph structure matrix as a hyperparameter and computes the related gradient of the attacker's loss with respect to it. Wu et al. [7] introduced a gradient-guided adversarial attack method, IG-JSMA, which computes the gradients of the prediction score with respect to the entries of adjacency and feature matrices, and then uses them to perturb links or features.

Many adversarial attack methods based on reinforcement learning have also been proposed. Dai et al. [8] proposed a reinforcement-learning-based attack method, RL-S2V, which only requires the prediction labels of the target classifier to learn the graph attack policy. Sun et al. [9] proposed a deep hierarchical reinforcement learning-based method, NIPA, which models the key steps of node injection attacks through a Markov decision process. Ju et al. [10] presented the attack method, G2A2C, to inject highly malicious nodes with extremely limited attack budgets using reinforcement learning.

In addition to the two aforementioned methods, adversarial attack methods based on optimization have been proposed. Wang et al. [11] presented a threat model for characterizing the attack surface of collective classification methods by manipulating the graph structure based on optimization modeling. Geisler et al. [12] proposed two sparsity-aware first-order optimization attacks. Zou et al. [13] proposed the topological defective graph injection attack method, TDGIA, which designs a smooth feature-optimization objective to generate the features of the injected nodes. Sharma et al. [14] proposed an optimization-based node injection method, NICKI,

which uses an optimization-based method to generate the features and edges of the injected nodes.

2.2 Robustness of GNNs

Extensive efforts have been made to improve the robustness of GNNs, which can generally be categorized into three classes: preprocessing, adversarial training, and robust model design-based methods. Specifically, preprocessing-based methods remove or weaken adversarial perturbations before model training so that the resulting graphs are similar to the original graphs. Wu *et al.* [7] used Jaccard similarity to determine the likelihood of links and improved the robustness by removing links connecting very different nodes. Entezari *et al.* [15] found that Nettek only affects the high-rank singular values of graphs and introduced a low-rank approximation method to eliminate adversarial perturbations.

Adversarial training-based methods aim to defend against adversarial attacks by augmenting the training set using adversarial examples. Feng *et al.* [16] proposed an adversarial training method with dynamic regularization, GraphAT, to improve model robustness and generalization. Deng *et al.* [17] proposed a batch virtual adversarial training method based on GCNs, BVAT, to smooth the output distribution of the classifier. By solving the min-max problem, Xu *et al.* [18] proposed an optimization-based adversarial training method that is robust to both optimization-based and greedy search-based topological attacks. Sun *et al.* [19] transferred the efficacy of virtual adversarial training on the supervised losses of GCNs to enhance their generalization performance.

Robust model design-based methods establish learning mechanisms based on the characteristics of adversarial perturbations to eliminate their negative effects. Feng *et al.* [20] proposed a semi-supervised learning framework called GRAND, which includes graph data expansion and consistent regularization strategies. Jin *et al.* [21] proposed a general framework, ProGNN, which jointly learns a structural graph and robust GNN model from the perturbed graph. Ioannidis *et al.* [22] introduced a semi-supervised learning-based tensorGCN, TGCN. Liu *et al.* [23] presented a message-passing scheme and developed a series of GNN architectures called Elastic GNNs by integrating the scheme into deep neural networks.

2.3 Explainability Methods for Robust GNNs

The explainability of GNNs is critical to understand their underlying mechanisms and improve their robustness. Recently, increasing effort has been devoted to the explainability of GNNs. For example, Ying *et al.* [24] proposed a generic approach, GNNExplainer, to explain the predictions of any GNN-based model that can identify a compact subgraph structure and a small subset of node features that have a crucial role in GNN prediction. Yuan *et al.* [25] proposed the XGNN approach to explain GNNs by training a graph generator to generate graph patterns that maximize a certain model prediction. Yuan *et al.* [26] proposed a method called SubgraphX for interpreting GNNs by identifying significant subgraphs using a Monte Carlo tree search. Huang *et al.* [27] proposed the generic GNN explanation framework, GraphLIME, which learns the nonlinear interpretable model locally.

To explore the factors affecting the adversarial vulnerability of GNNs, Chen *et al.* [28] claimed that the success of adversarial

attacks against GCNs can be attributed to a non-robust aggregation scheme (i.e., the weighted mean). Zhu *et al.* [29] found that adversarial attacks on GNNs were mainly caused by the increased heterogeneity of the graphs. By analyzing popular defense methods, Mujkanovic *et al.* [30] found that most defense methods show little or no improvement compared with the undefended baseline. However, there are few studies on the underlying mechanisms of GNN vulnerability, and these studies are scattered and fragmentary. In contrast to the aforementioned methods, our goal is to comprehensively understand the underlying mechanisms of adversarial attacks, and discover the factors that influence model vulnerability, thereby supporting the design of robust GNNs.

3 PROBLEM DEFINITION AND PRELIMINARIES

3.1 Notations

Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ represents a graph, where $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, \dots, v_N\}$ is the set of nodes with size N , $\mathcal{E} = \{e_1, \dots, e_K\}$ is the set of edges with size K , and $e_{i,j} = (v_i, v_j)$ indicates the edge between nodes v_i and v_j . Formally, we denote the adjacency matrix of \mathcal{G} as $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$, in which $\mathbf{A}_{ij} = 1$ if v_i and v_j are connected in \mathcal{G} , otherwise $\mathbf{A}_{ij} = 0$, and the feature matrix as $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times D}$, where D is the dimension of feature vector. Thus, the graph can also be denoted as $\mathcal{G} = (\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{X})$.

3.2 Problem Definition

Definition 1 (Adversarial Attack on Graphs). For an original graph \mathcal{G} , the attacker manipulates the graph structure or node feature to generate the adversarial graph $\hat{\mathcal{G}} = (\hat{\mathbf{A}}, \hat{\mathbf{X}})$ by adding imperceptible adversarial perturbations δ . This will make the graph neural network model $f(\cdot)$ generate wrong judgement, while minimizing the perturbation between \mathcal{G} and $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$.

$$\arg \min_{\delta} \|\delta\| \quad \text{subject to } f(\hat{\mathcal{G}}) \neq f(\mathcal{G}) \quad (1)$$

In this paper, we focus only on the adversarial attacks that perturb the graph structure, i.e., $\hat{\mathcal{G}} = (\mathcal{V}, \hat{\mathcal{E}})$, $\hat{\mathcal{E}} = \mathcal{E} + \delta$.

Definition 2 (Adversarial Defense). For the perturbed graph $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$, the goal of adversarial defence is to minimize the loss function \mathcal{L}_{atk} of the attacked model so that it is as consistent as possible with the loss of the unattacked model. If the model $f(\cdot)$ has the ability to maintain its performance under adversarial attacks, the model is said to be robust.

$$f(\hat{\mathcal{G}}) \rightarrow y, \quad \text{while } f(\mathcal{G}) \rightarrow y. \quad (2)$$

Definition 3 (Robustness Explanation of GNNs). Let $f(\cdot)$ denote the model that needs to be explained. Given a perturbation graph $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ generated by the adversarial attack methods, the goal of robust explanation for GNNs is to find the effective factors \mathcal{P}^* that affect the performance of GNNs from the set of all possible options \mathcal{P} .

$$\mathcal{P}^* = \{p \mid f(\hat{\mathcal{G}}|p), p \in \mathcal{P}\}, \quad (3)$$

where p represents the value in the set of possible options \mathcal{P} . By traversing each possible option p , we use $f(\hat{\mathcal{G}}|p)$ (i.e., model output) to identify the options in set \mathcal{P} that have a significant influence on robustness and add them into set \mathcal{P}^* .

Note that we use graphs/networks and links/edges interchangeably.

3.3 Adversarial Attacks on GNNs

According to the goal of the attackers, adversarial attacks on GNNs can be split into targeted, untargeted, and random attacks, in which the representative methods are Nettack, Mettack, and Random Attack, respectively.

3.3.1 Nettack

Nettack [31] conducts attacks based on the losses of GNNs by selecting a two-layer GCN as the surrogate model and replacing the activation function σ with the identity function, making \mathbf{W} equals to $\mathbf{W}^{(1)} \cdot \mathbf{W}^{(2)}$, and leading to:

$$\mathbf{Z} = \text{soft max}(\mathbf{A}^2 \mathbf{X} \mathbf{W}). \quad (4)$$

Because the normalization factor of the softmax function does not affect the prediction category, the surrogate model can be simplified as $\mathbf{A}^2 \mathbf{X} \mathbf{W}$. Accordingly, the surrogate loss can be defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_S(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}, v_0) = \max_{c \neq c_{old}} [\hat{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{W}]_{v_0 c} - [\hat{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{W}]_{v_0 c_{old}}, \quad (5)$$

where \mathcal{S} denotes the surrogate model. Then, scoring functions \mathcal{S}_{struct} and \mathcal{S}_{feat} are introduced to evaluate the loss of the perturbation model.

$$\mathcal{S}_{struct}(e; \mathcal{G}, v_0) := \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{A}', \mathbf{X}; \mathbf{W}, v_0), \quad (6)$$

$$\mathcal{S}_{feat}(f; \mathcal{G}, v_0) := \mathcal{L}_s(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{X}'; \mathbf{W}, v_0). \quad (7)$$

Subsequently, the perturbation that maximizes the scoring functions is selected and applied to the graph until the threshold perturbation number is reached.

3.3.2 Mettack

To reduce the overall classification accuracy, Mettack [6] sets the graph structure as a hyperparameter and calculates the loss gradient after training. The method is expressed as a bilevel optimization problem:

$$\nabla_{\mathcal{G}}^{meta} := \nabla_{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{L}_{atk}(f_{\theta^*}(\mathcal{G})), \theta^* = \text{opt}_{\theta}(\mathcal{L}_{train}(f_{\theta}(\mathcal{G}))), \quad (8)$$

where \mathcal{L}_{atk} is the loss function for optimization, θ is the parameter of the surrogate model, \mathcal{L}_{train} is the training loss function, and $\text{opt}(\cdot)$ is a differentiable optimization process. Using the obtained meta-gradient, the attacker updates the graph and obtains the final poisoning graph.

3.3.3 Random Attack

Random attack [32] casually deletes/inserts a small number of nodes/edges from the clean graph with different perturbation rates. Compared with other attacks, random attack does not require any knowledge, and the cost is the lowest.

4 EXPERIMENTAL SETTINGS

4.1 Datasets

We conducted experiments on three public citation networks: Cora, Citeseer, and PubMed, where the nodes denote papers and the edges correspond to citation relationships. Specifically, (1) Cora [33] is a dataset that records information about the keywords of each paper and its classification, as well as cross-references between papers. This dataset consists of 2485 scientific papers (nodes) classified into seven categories. Each node has 1433 features; that is, each paper is represented by a 1433-dimensional word vector. Each element of the word vector corresponds to a word and has only two values: zero or one.

(2) The Citeseer [34] dataset contains 2110 scientific publications in six categories, consisting of 3668 links. Each publication in the dataset is described by a zero-or-one-valued word vector that indicates the presence or absence of the corresponding word in the dictionary. (3) The PubMed [35] citation network contains 19,717 scientific publications on diabetes, including three categories and 44,338 links. Each publication is described by a TF/IDF weighted word vector in a dictionary consisting of 500 unique words.

4.2 Parameter Setting

In our experiments, we added 5% perturbations for Mettack and Random Attack, whereas for Nettack, we set the number of perturbations to 2.0. All GNN models were run ten times to obtain their average values. All the models were implemented in PyTorch 1.8.2, running on an NVIDIA RTX 3080Ti GPU and CUDA 11.1. ReLU was used as the activation function, and the dropout rate was set to 0.5, with the epoch equals to 200.

4.3 Evaluation Strategies

To explore the robustness of GNNs, we chose three classical adversarial attack methods with various perturbation ratios to generate adversarial perturbations. To test the robustness of GNNs against adversarial attacks, we adopted the classification accuracy of the models as an evaluation metric: a higher value in the aligned training setting indicates a greater robustness of the target model. Moreover, we defined two metrics, the decision surface and ATR, to evaluate the robustness of GNNs and the transferability of adversarial examples.

4.3.1 Decision Surface

A decision boundary is a surface that separates the data points belonging to different classes. For classifier \mathcal{F} , the decision boundary of adjacent classes i and j can be denoted as:

$$\mathbb{B} = \{z : \mathcal{F}_i(z) - \mathcal{F}_j(z) = 0\}, \quad (9)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_i(z)$ and $\mathcal{F}_j(z)$ are the i^{th} and j^{th} components of $\mathcal{F}(z)$ respectively, which correspond to the i^{th} and j^{th} classes. Accordingly, for graph \mathcal{G} with decision space \mathbb{S} , the GNN model \mathcal{F} used for the node classification task partitions space \mathbb{S} into r decision regions, that is, $s_1, s_2 \dots s_r$. The decision boundaries of the adjacent categories in \mathcal{G} can be expressed as:

$$\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{B}_{i,j}} = \{\mathcal{F}_i(v) = \mathcal{F}_j(v) \mid i \in [1, r], j \in [1, r], i \neq j, v \in \mathbb{S}\}, \quad (10)$$

where v indicates the node embedding in space \mathbb{S} .

Intuitively, the difference between the predictions for different classes of samples should be as large as possible, and a robust model should have a high prediction confidence. However, the model \mathcal{F} cannot support the formation of an explicit decision boundary. Therefore, according to [36], for the logit output $\mathcal{Z}(g)$ before the softmax layer materializing model \mathcal{F} , the decision surface can be defined as:

$$\mathcal{S}(g) = \mathcal{Z}(g)_t - \max\{\mathcal{Z}(g)_i, i \neq t\}. \quad (11)$$

The loss function measures the loss variations of the model with respect to the input perturbations and is used to evaluate the target model. By treating $\mathcal{S}(g)$ as a loss function, given an input graph g for GNNs, the perturbed graphs around it can be interpolated and the corresponding loss values can be calculated as:

$$\mathcal{V}(g, \alpha, \beta) = \mathcal{S}(g + \alpha \cdot P(\mathcal{V}), \beta \cdot P(\mathcal{E})), \quad (12)$$




Fig. 2: Robustness exploration framework of GNNs. (1) Robustness analysis of models trained based on regular and irregular graphs. Compared with the model trained using an irregular graph, the model trained on a regular graph is more vulnerable to adversarial attack, as shown by the circles with red edges. (2) Robustness analysis of models with different model architectures (M1 vs. M2). Compared with small-capacity models, large-capacity models are more robust and less susceptible to adversarial attack, as shown by the squares with red edges. (3) Robustness analysis of models under transfer-based adversarial attacks from the perspective of model architecture (M2 vs. M3) and model capacity (M1 vs. M2).

where g denotes the original graph, and α and β can be treated as the degree of node perturbation $P(\mathcal{V})$ and edge perturbation $P(\mathcal{E})$, respectively, added into the original graph.

4.3.2 Adversarial Transferability Rate (ATR)

By utilizing the transferability of adversarial examples, adversarial examples generated from the source model can fool the target model without accessing it. To assess the security risks caused by adversarial transferability, an evaluation index using adversarial examples generated specifically for the target model as a baseline, ATR, is defined based on the impact of the transferred adversarial examples:

$$ATR = \frac{Acc_{transfer} - Acc_{specific}}{Acc_{specific}}, \quad (13)$$

where $Acc_{transfer}$ denotes the accuracy of the target model attacked by the adversarial examples transferred from the source model, and $Acc_{specific}$ denotes the accuracy of the target model attacked by the adversarial examples generated specifically for the model itself. Specifically, $ATR = 0$ indicates that transfer-based attacks have the same effect as local-based attacks, whereas $ATR < 0$ denotes that transfer-based attacks have a more significant effect on the accuracy of the target model than local-based attacks.

5 ROBUSTNESS EXPLORATION FRAMEWORK

The model decision space learned by fitting the training data to the model reflects the inherent nature of the model robustness. Thus, training data and model architecture are closely related to model robustness. Adversarial transferability directly affects the availability of adversarial examples, which in turn affects the security risk of the target model. Hence, we systematically investigated the adversarial robustness of GNNs by considering graph data patterns, model-specific factors, and the transferability of adversarial examples. An overview of this framework is presented in Fig. 2.

5.1 Graph Data Pattern

5.1.1 Regularity of Training Graph Data

The organization of real-world graphs typically embodies both regular and irregular components, and only the former can be explained and modeled. Hence, the significance of the graph data patterns directly affects the training of the learning models. In practice, the structural regularity of a graph can be reflected in the consistency of structural features before and after a random removal of a small set of links. Consequently, the structural regularity coincides with our ability to predict missing links [37]:

$$\sigma_c = \left| \mathcal{E}^L \cap \Delta \mathcal{E} \right| / \Delta \mathcal{E}, \quad (14)$$

where \mathcal{E}^L is the set of top-L predicted links and $\Delta\mathcal{E}$ is the set of randomly removed links.

In the adversarial attack scenarios, we assumed that adversarial attacks destroy the structural patterns of the input graphs, thus making the graphs more irregular. Hence, the irregular components in the graphs can be viewed intuitively as adversarial perturbations. Because models trained with completely regular graphs have difficulty recognizing adversarial perturbations, the intrinsic complexity of GNNs presents the question of how graph data with different degrees of structural regularity influence the robustness of models against adversarial attacks.

To illustrate this concept, as shown in Fig. 2, we exemplify the regular and irregular graphs and generate adversarial perturbations to poison them. By using the regular and the irregular graphs to train model M1, the resulting model has a different robustness. That is, the model trained on the regular graph misclassifies the target node: it changes from blue to yellow. By contrast, according to the results in the second row of Fig. 2, the model trained based on irregular graph can withstand the effects of adversarial perturbations and classify the target node correctly.

5.1.2 Structural Characteristics

An adversary can mislead GNNs to generate inaccurate results by modifying the structure of the training graph data. Unlike image and text data, graph data do not possess natural semantics. Thus, to understand the specific mechanism of adversarial attacks, classic structural measures of graphs were adopted to reveal the structural role of adversarial perturbations, including degree (D_i), clustering coefficient (C_i), degree centrality (DC_i), betweenness centrality (BC_i), closeness centrality (CC_i), eigenvector centrality (EC_i), Katz centrality (KC_i), neighbor degree (ND_i), edge betweenness centrality (EBC_i), and edge load centrality (ELC_i). Further details are provided in the Supplementary Materials.

5.2 Model Architecture

5.2.1 Model Architecture

Since the GCN model was proposed for semi-supervised node classification, GAT [38], GraphSAGE [39], and other typical models have been proposed. On this basis, many new models have been developed in the GNNs literature for different task scenarios, learning paradigms, data characteristics, etc. Generally, GNN models are defined to solve specialized tasks and are typically proposed in a trial-and-error manner. Owing to the relative independence of the intra-layer mechanism, the inter-layer mechanism and the learning configuration of GNNs, there is a lack of evolutionary development relationships among various GNNs, and it is difficult to determine a clear working direction for robust GNN designs based on their performance under adversarial attacks. In other words, the development of robust GNNs has no clear guiding principles and suffers from the problem of a local optimal solution.

Different model architectures have different internal mechanisms, and an appropriate model architecture can extract robust feature representations, thereby improving the model performance. Inspired by the design space for GNNs [40], existing works have only focused on a specific GNN design rather than the model design space, limiting the discovery of robust GNNs. Therefore, it is necessary to systematically study the architectures of GNNs against adversarial attacks.

Overall, we expect this investigation to offer a principled approach and basic model architecture for robust model design in the future. This issue is especially critical considering the large model space of GNNs and adversarial attack methods, because re-exploring all possible combinations is prohibitively expensive. Classical model architectures and adversarial attack methods are described in Supplementary Materials and Section 3.3, respectively.

5.2.2 Model Capacity

The model capacity refers to the ability of a model that fits various functions to appropriately map inputs to outputs. In machine learning, a model with less capacity may be unable to learn the training data sufficiently, whereas a model with excess capacity may memorize the training data. In other words, models with different capacities are likely to underfit or overfit the training dataset. In the context of adversarial attacks, model capacity plays an important role in adversarial robustness, and models that can withstand adversarial attacks require a significantly larger model capacity than those that correctly classify benign examples only. Hence, we conjecture that the larger the GNN model capacity, the more robust the model.

To explore the effect of model capacity on the robustness of GNN models, the capacity of a GNN model is defined by configuring the number of layers, and a model with more layers has a larger capacity, as shown by the model architecture in Fig. 2. Specifically, the decision boundary of the model with a small capacity is simple and easily crossed by the perturbed input, as shown on the right in the second row of the figure. In contrast, a model with a larger capacity can generate a more complicated decision boundary and is less likely to be fooled by adversarial examples, as shown on the right in the third row of Fig. 2. Similarly, in adversarial training, the model requires a complicated decision boundary to memorize adversarial examples from the training data. Taking a typical GNN GCN as an example, after increasing the model capacity, the GCN models contain more convolution layers, with nodes in each layer aggregating and updating information based on their own features and those of the neighboring nodes. It can be observed that the multi-layer GCN can capture more levels of graph structure information, thereby improving the expression ability and performance of the model. Therefore, it is necessary to study the robustness of GNNs against adversarial attacks from the perspective of model capacity.

5.2.3 Sensitive Neurons

Neurons are the basic units of deep neural networks that perform nonlinear transformations through activation functions to produce a final output. Because the output of a model is the result of the joint action of the neurons in each hidden layer, the change in the model result caused by adversarial attacks arises from the influence of adversarial perturbations on each neuron in the model, where the activation values of the affected neurons change significantly, owing to imperceptible adversarial perturbations. In other words, adversarial attacks occur when neurons are activated, which induces erroneous hidden representations and ultimately leads to an inaccurate output. Therefore, the adversarial robustness of deep-learning models can be explored from a new perspective on neurons.

To understand adversarial attack behaviors, we analyze the difference in the results of neurons before and after adversarial attacks to find the sensitive neurons that make the most

important contributions to inaccurate model results. If the neurons in the hidden layers are stable and do not suffer significant performance degradation under adversarial attacks, the model forms robust representations and makes correct predictions. Therefore, for adversarial robustness optimization, if sensitive neurons account for only a small proportion of the neurons in the model, then the robustness of the model can be enhanced by locating and repairing the sensitive neurons. To identify sensitive neurons, given a robust neuron function $\mathcal{M}(\cdot)$, if two samples x_1 and x_2 in the dataset \mathcal{D} are similar, they should have similar outputs [41].

$$if \ ||x_1 - x_2|| \leq \varepsilon \Rightarrow \ ||\mathcal{M}(x_1) - \mathcal{M}(x_2)|| \leq \delta, \quad (15)$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes a distance metric to quantify the distance between samples, and ε and δ are small values. Because of the imperceptibility of adversarial perturbations, the benign sample x_i and corresponding adversarial example \hat{x}_i should be similar and follow the fact above. However, in practice, because of the non-robustness of neurons, the benign sample x_i and its adversarial example \hat{x}_i are likely to result in very different representations. Thus, the sensitivity of neurons can be quantified based on the deviation of the feature representations between benign samples and the corresponding adversarial examples.

$$\sigma(\mathcal{M}, \bar{\mathcal{D}}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{\dim(\mathcal{M}(x_i))} \|\mathcal{M}_F(x_i) - \mathcal{M}(\bar{x}_i)\|, \quad (16)$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{D}}$ denotes the set of sample pairs, $\bar{\mathcal{D}} = \{(x_i, \bar{x}_i)\}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, and $\dim(\cdot)$ denotes the dimension of a vector. Consequently, larger values of σ represent more sensitive neurons and can be used for adversarial analysis.

5.3 Adversarial Transferability

In addition to building proper training graph data and model architecture, reducing the effectiveness of adversarial examples is critical for increasing the robustness of GNNs. Recent studies have found that adversarial examples have cross-model transferability and can be used to attack a target model with a significant success rate. Based on these reports, adversarial examples generated for a specific model can be used to fool another model with a different architecture and training set. The properties of adversarial examples have inspired the development of black-box adversarial attacks in which a substitute model (source model) is trained to simulate the target model and then harnessed to produce adversarial examples without interacting with the target model. Hence, understanding the essence of adversarial transferability is a fundamental problem in robust GNN design.

Several recent studies investigated the transferability of adversarial attacks. Fan *et al.* [42] found that crafted adversarial examples are always prone to overfitting the adversary model employed and aimed to increase transferability by designing a proper model architecture and ameliorating the overfitting problem. Wiedeman *et al.* [43] suggested that lower-capacity and less complex models are more vulnerable to adversarial attacks and that robustness against strong attacks requires training on high-capacity networks to fit complex decision boundaries. Meanwhile, numerous studies have rationalized adversarial transferability by demonstrating the correlated decision boundaries between different models [44], [45], which are directly affected by the model architecture and capacity. Therefore, in this study, we aim to explain adversarial

transferability by exploring the influence of model architecture and model capacity, as shown in the adversarial transferability in Fig. 2.

6 EXPERIMENTS: ROBUSTNESS EXPLORATION

In this section, we investigate how graph data patterns, model-specific factors, and adversarial transferability affect the robustness of GNNs, and specify the findings on the adversarial robustness of GNNs. The mainstream GCN [46], GAT [38], and GAE [47] were used as the target models. Further details can be found in the Supplementary Materials.

6.1 Robustness Analysis through Data Pattern

6.1.1 Structural Regularity of Training Graph Data

To illustrate the influence of graph data with different structural patterns on the robustness of GNNs, we generated artificial graphs with various structural regularities based on the community structure of real systems. Specifically, we hypothesized that graphs with a significant community structure have high structural regularity. The Lancichinetti-CFortunato-CRadicchi (LFR) benchmark network generation algorithm [48] was adopted to create artificial graphs with different structural regularities, as shown in Fig. 3. The LFR benchmark has a large set of parameters, which allows for the creation of diverse but realistic graphs, in which the mixing parameter μ determines the regularity of the graphs; its formula is as follows:

$$\mu = \frac{K_c}{N}. \quad (17)$$

where N represents the total number of current node links and K_c is the number of links to other communities. In other words, each node shares $1 - \mu$ of its links with the other nodes in its community and with the other nodes in the network. The larger μ is, the more connections there are between different communities, and the less regular the graph. When μ is zero, there are no edges between communities and the graph is perfectly pure and regular. In Fig. 3, we set μ as 0.00, 0.02, 0.04, 0.06, 0.08 and 0.10, indicating that the structural regularity of the graph changes from strong to weak.




Fig. 3: Artificial graphs with different structural regularities.

A GCN model was trained on the generated artificial graphs for the node classification task, and three typical adversarial attack methods, Mettack, Nettack, and Random Attack, were used to fool the model, as shown in Fig. 4. In the experiments, we considered poisoning attacks, that is,

TABLE 1: Robustness of different regularity graphs for GCN under three typical adversarial attacks. **Bold** numbers are the best results of different regularities.

Method \ Mu	0.00	0.02	0.04	0.06	0.08	0.10
Mettack(0%)	0.7186	0.7550	0.7693	0.7639	0.7504	0.7492
Mettack(5%)	0.7184	0.7427	0.7550	0.7748	0.7498	0.7489
Mettack(10%)	0.7049	0.7064	0.6411	0.7712	0.6318	0.6296
Nettack(0.0)	0.7108	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Nettack(2.0)	0.5012	0.6398	0.6169	0.6120	0.5699	0.5675
Nettack(4.0)	0.1470	0.1211	0.1048	0.9319	0.7982	0.7108
Random Attack(0%)	0.7181	0.7541	0.7582	0.7635	0.7509	0.7507
Random Attack(5%)	0.7160	0.7538	0.7573	0.7627	0.7508	0.7505
Random Attack(10%)	0.7153	0.7509	0.7564	0.7618	0.7498	0.7481

the target models were retrained on the perturbed graphs, which is more challenging for attackers, but better reflects real-world scenarios. We used classification accuracy to assess the robustness of the GCN model against adversarial attacks, the higher the classification accuracy, the higher the adversarial robustness of the model. Table 1 lists the classification accuracies of the GCN model under different adversarial attacks. The header row shows the mixed parameter mu from left to right, indicating that the structural regularity of the adversarial graphs gradually weakens. The header column lists the adversarial attack methods and their perturbation rate or number. We found that the classification accuracy is low when mu equals 0.00, and reaches the highest point when the mixed parameter rises to 0.06 (except for a peak of 0.02 in Nettack with 2.0 perturbations), then it declines as mu increases. That is, the classification accuracy first increases and then decreases with a decline in the structural regularity of the training graphs. This implies that in addition to the model architecture, the structural pattern of the training graph data is crucial for the adversarial robustness of GNNs, and strong, regular training graph data are harmful to the robustness of the models. The construction of robust GNN models requires training graph data with an appropriate structural regularity.

all adversarial attack methods seek to attack links between similar nodes, and adversarial perturbations are always links that connect very dissimilar nodes, which are similar to the irregular links in graphs. Hence, there is internal consistency between adversarial training and structural regularity. Table 2 presents the classification accuracy of GCN under adversarial training, where the proportion of adversarial examples added to the training set increases gradually. The accuracy first increases until the proportion of added adversarial examples reaches 0.06, and then gradually decreases as the proportion of adversarial examples increases. Therefore, the essence of adversarial training is to change the structural pattern of the training graph data, and adversarial training is only effective when the structural regularity of the model training data is at a specific level. This confirms our finding that "the structural regularity of the training graph data has an important influence on the robustness of GNNs."

TABLE 2: Accuracy of GCN under adversarial training.

AE Prop	0.00	0.02	0.04	0.06	0.08	0.10
Cora	0.7445	0.7456	0.7471	0.7499	0.7495	0.7480
Citeseer	0.6479	0.6485	0.6486	0.6516	0.6514	0.6511
Pubmed	0.8104	0.8117	0.8130	0.8159	0.8156	0.8141




Fig. 4: Adversarial graphs under typical attack methods. Red nodes and links are the perturbed structure, and blue nodes and edges are the original topology.

To counter the threat of adversarial attacks, a common method to improve model robustness is adversarial training, which adds adversarial examples to the training data and then trains the model on the augmented data. To some degree,

6.1.2 Robustness Analysis through Structural Characteristics

To understand the mechanisms underlying adversarial attacks, we explored the characteristics of adversarial perturbations. Ten classic graph structure measures were adopted, and their average values were calculated for every perturbed and unperturbed node or edge. The results are reported in Tables 3 and 4. We found that the adversarial perturbations generally had higher values than the original components for all structural measures. In particular, betweenness, closeness, eigenvector, and edge betweenness centrality exhibited significantly larger values for adversarial perturbations than original components, thus showing a clear correlation with adversarial perturbations. This reveals the preference for adversarial perturbations and implies that they can be identified and preprocessed based on structural measures, thereby enhancing the adversarial robustness of GNNs.

TABLE 3: Graph structural characteristics of adversarial attacks on GNNs (Mettack 5% perturbation rate, Nettack 2.0 perturbations, and Random Attack 5% perturbation rate). Note: D, degree; C, clustering coefficient; DC, degree centrality; BC, betweenness centrality; CC, closeness centrality; EC, eigenvector centrality; KC, Katz centrality; ND, neighbor degree; EBC, edge betweenness centrality; ELC, edge load centrality.

Method	Mettack(5%)		Nettack(2.0)		Random Attack(5%)	
	Unperturbed Nodes/Edges	Perturbed Nodes/Edges	Unperturbed Nodes/Edges	Perturbed Nodes/Edges	Unperturbed Nodes/Edges	Perturbed Nodes/Edges
<i>D</i>	3.3512	5.1348	3.6853	4.3614	3.3511	4.4145
<i>C</i>	0.0055	0.0049	0.0061	0.0020	0.0056	0.0034
<i>DC</i>	0.0013	0.0021	0.0015	0.0018	0.0013	0.0018
<i>BC</i>	0.0020	0.0089	0.0023	0.0038	0.0022	0.0054
<i>CC</i>	0.0089	0.1493	0.1474	0.1554	0.1296	0.1376
<i>EC</i>	0.0113	0.0408	0.0119	0.0202	0.0158	0.0284
<i>KC</i>	0.0196	0.0242	0.0198	0.0219	0.0196	0.0221
<i>ND</i>	3.5744	4.2358	3.9209	4.4815	3.5873	3.7886
EBC	0.0016	0.0050(add edges)	0.0013	0.0029(add edges)	0.0014	0.0026(add edges)
				0.0021(delete edges)		
ELC	14220	43948(add edges)	15540	70521(add edges)	15096	31478(add edges)
				19066(delete edges)		

TABLE 4: Graph structural characteristics of adversarial attacks on GNNs (Mettack 10% perturbation rate, Nettack 4.0 perturbations, and Random Attack 10% perturbation rate). Note: D, degree; C, clustering coefficient; DC, degree centrality; BC, betweenness centrality; CC, closeness centrality; EC, eigenvector centrality; KC, Katz centrality; ND, neighbor degree; EBC, edge betweenness centrality; ELC, edge load centrality.

Method	Mettack(10%)		Nettack(4.0)		Random Attack(10%)	
	Unperturbed Nodes/Edges	Perturbed Nodes/Edges	Unperturbed Nodes/Edges	Perturbed Nodes/Edges	Unperturbed Nodes/Edges	Perturbed Nodes/Edges
<i>D</i>	3.3580	5.5106	3.3984	4.9036	3.3488	4.5063
<i>C</i>	0.0056	0.0020	0.0039	0.0020	0.0058	0.0034
<i>DC</i>	0.0014	0.0022	0.0014	0.0020	0.0013	0.0018
<i>BC</i>	0.0015	0.0074	0.0025	0.0153	0.0017	0.0042
<i>CC</i>	0.1437	0.1679	0.1195	0.1397	0.1397	0.1485
<i>EC</i>	0.0085	0.0384	0.0063	0.0381	0.0144	0.0259
<i>KC</i>	0.0189	0.0252	0.0199	0.0240	0.0192	0.0219
<i>ND</i>	3.7119	4.8480	3.5351	4.2462	3.7521	3.9793
EBC	0.0013	0.0037(add edges)	0.0017	0.0083(add edges)	0.0017	0.0036(add edges)
				0.0022(delete edges)		
ELC	12049	33532(add edges)	12225	26854(add edges)	13520	23793(add edges)
				18813(delete edges)		

6.2 Robustness Analysis through Model-specific Factors

6.2.1 Impact of Model Architecture

To systematically study the adversarial robustness of GNNs against adversarial attacks and provide a basic model architecture for robust model design, the classical GNNs (GCN, GAT, and GAE) were tested against typical adversarial attack methods, and the t-SNE visualization of the output space of the classification models are shown in Figs. 5, 6, and 7. Each column in the figures shows the output of each model with respect to the test data, including embedded representations and category labels. Colors represent different class labels. The optimal classification accuracies are denoted in bold. We found that the GAT model generally achieved the highest accuracy of the models under the same adversarial attack conditions. This suggests that the attention mechanism is a better choice than other model mechanisms for designing robust GNNs.

To analyze the robustness of GNNs more intuitively, we used the "decision surface" $\mathcal{S}(g)$ as an evaluation metric to measure the difference between predictions for different classes of nodes. A robust model should have an explicit decision boundary, and $\mathcal{S}(g)$ should be large. Meanwhile, adversarial

attacks fool target models using adversarial perturbations such that the input samples cross the decision boundary. Thus, robust models should maintain a high and stable $\mathcal{S}(g)$ value under increasing adversarial attack strengths. The decision surfaces of GNNs under classic adversarial attack methods are shown in Fig. 8. GAT is the most robust of the models, which is consistent with previous conclusions. This consistency also explains the effectiveness of proposed metric $\mathcal{S}(g)$.

6.2.2 Impact of Model Capacity

To investigate the relationship between the model capacity and robustness of the GNNs, the classification accuracies of two-, three-, and four-layer GCNs under three typical attack methods were compared, and the results are displayed in Figs. 5, 6, and 7. The higher the accuracy under adversarial attacks, the better the robustness of the models. Specifically, Fig. 5 shows the classification accuracy under 5% perturbation rate of Mettack. According to the results, the three-layer GCN generates the clearest decision boundaries and produced the highest accuracy. Fig. 6 presents the results under targeted attack Nettack with 2.0 perturbations. For the Cora and Citeseer




Fig. 5: Robustness of GNNs under Mettack with 5% perturbation rate. The output spaces of the classification models are visualized using t-SNE. Colors represent different class labels; color separation shows the effectiveness of the models.




Fig. 6: Robustness of GNNs under Nettack with a perturbation number of 2.0. The output spaces of the classification models are visualized using t-SNE. Colors represent different class labels; color separation shows the effectiveness of the models.




Fig. 7: Robustness of GNNs under Random Attack with 5% perturbation rate. The output spaces of the classification models are visualized using t-SNE. Colors represent different class labels; color separation shows the effectiveness of the models.




Fig. 8: Decision surface of GNNs under classic adversarial attack methods.

datasets, the classification accuracy increased with an increase in model capacity. However, for PubMed, the two-layer GCN had the highest classification accuracy. Moreover, Fig. 7 shows the classification results under Random Attack. Qualitatively one can see that with an increase in the model capacity, the decision boundary becomes less clear, and the classification accuracy decreases. Based on the results presented in Figs. 5, 6, and 7, there is no strong correlation between model capacity and model robustness. However, the model complexity always increases with an increase in the model capacity, and learning the decision boundary requires the support of more training samples. Therefore, training and comparing models with different capacities using the same training dataset is unfair. Therefore, it is necessary to extend the training data while increasing the model capacity.

Fig. 9 shows the classification accuracy of two-, three-, and four-layer GCNs under Mettack while increasing the training data synchronously. When the training data of the four-layer GCN increases by 20% in Cora and 10% in Citeseer, the decision boundaries become clear; thus, the classification accuracy of the model increases with the extension of the model layers.

For Nettack (Fig. 10), the above conclusions can be also obtained when the training data of the three- and four-layer

GCNs increase by 10% and 20%, respectively. Regarding Random Attack (Fig. 11), the same conclusion can be obtained when the GCNs with three and four layers increase by 10% and 20%, respectively, in Cora and Citeseer, and by 10% and 30%, respectively, in PubMed. Generally, the robustness of GNNs increases synchronously with an increase in the model capacity and training data. Therefore, when the training data are sufficient, the model capacity should be increased to improve the adversarial robustness of GNNs.

6.2.3 Sensitive Neurons under Adversarial Attacks

To explore the specific effects of adversarial attacks on GNNs, this study explained the adversarial robustness of GNNs from the perspective of neuron sensitivity and measured the neuron behavior variation intensity against benign and adversarial examples. Specifically, for the two-layer GCN model, Fig. 12 shows the weights before and after the adversarial attack and the weight difference. The first and second lines in Fig. 12 represent the weight parameters of the first and second layers of the two-layer GCN model, respectively. We assumed that the more robust the target model, the more consistent the model weights before and after the adversarial attack. That is, for a robust target model, the weights presented in the first and




Fig. 9: Robustness of two-, three-, and four-layer GCN under Mettack (5% perturbation rate) while increasing training data synchronously.




Fig. 11: Robustness of two-, three-, and four-layer GCN in Random Attack (5% perturbation rate) while increasing training data synchronously.

second columns of Fig. 12 should be the same. The third column in Fig. 12 shows the change of model weights before and after the adversarial attack, where a darker block color indicates a greater weight change. We found that only a small proportion of the weight values changed significantly and that most of the weights were stable. Hence, by investigating the behaviors of the model's intermediate layers, we concluded that most model neurons behave stably without excessive performance degeneration and only a small number of neurons are affected by adversarial attacks.




Fig. 12: Weights of two-layer GCN before and after adversarial attack (Mettack 5% perturbation rate), and the weight difference.

6.3 Transferability of Adversarial Examples

We now investigate how the model architecture and model capacity affect the transferability of adversarial examples. To construct empirical experiments with various model architectures and capacities, we chose the classic GNNs, GCN, GAE, and GAT, with two, three, and four intermediate layers in the GCN, and conducted transfer-based adversarial attacks between them. We generated adversarial examples by attacking

Fig. 10: Robustness of two-, three-, and four-layer GCN under Nettack (2.0 perturbation number) while increasing training data synchronously.

the source model and transferring the generated adversarial examples to fool the other models.

The ATRs shown in Fig. 13 are calculated based on the average accuracies of the models under different adversarial attack methods. According to Equation (13) in Section 4.3.2, the smaller the values of ATR, the greater the transferability of the adversarial examples. Fig. 13 implies that: (1) The transferability of adversarial examples is nonsymmetrical. For example, in Fig. 13(a), the items in the middle upper triangle are negative and the items in the lower triangle are positive. (2) The smaller the capacity of the source model and the larger the capacity of the target model, the better the effect of transfer-based adversarial attacks. For example, a transfer-based adversarial attack using GCN2 as the source model, as shown in the first row of Fig. 13(a), obtains smaller values than that of GCN3 and GCN4. Meanwhile, the attack with GCN4 as the target model yields smaller values than those with GCN2 and GCN3, as shown in the third column of Fig. 13(a). (3) From the perspective of the model architecture, GCN is the most suitable original model and GAT is the most vulnerable target model in transfer-based adversarial attacks. In contrast, when GAT was the original model and GCN was the target model, it was the most robust.

6.4 Summary of Findings

The findings regarding the robustness of GNNs are summarized below.

- The data pattern directly affects the robustness of GNNs, and the models trained using highly regular graphs have poor tolerance to adversarial attacks. Therefore, maintaining the regularity of the training data in a reasonable interval is crucial for model robustness, which is consistent with the concept of adversarial training.
- When ensuring sufficient training data, increasing the model capacity improves the robustness of GNNs. The robust exploration of models with different capacities should ensure sufficient training data.
- Adversarial attacks only affect a small percentage of neurons in GNNs, and most model neurons behave stably; therefore, the model robustness can be improved by locating and repairing the few damaged neurons.
- Transfer-based adversarial attacks between GNNs are not symmetric. The adversarial examples generated by the small-capacity model show stronger transferability than those of the large-capacity model, which has significant vulnerability in transfer-based attacks.

7 CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

In this study, we comprehensively explored the robustness of GNNs against various adversarial attacks using node classification as an application task. We conducted numerous experiments on mainstream GNNs using the node classification datasets Cora, Citeseer, and PubMed. We analyzed the influence of graph data patterns, model-specific factors, and the transferability of adversarial examples on the robustness of GNNs to explore the underlying mechanisms. Through analysis of the experimental results, we made a number of enlightening findings that open promising avenues for the design of robust GNNs, such as building training graph data with diverse structural patterns, increasing model capacity while maintaining training data, and discovering and suppressing sensitive neurons.

Our work explored the robustness of GNNs, although the findings of this study require further verification and theoretical analysis. Moreover, it is worth exploring the robustness of GNNs in more adversarial environments, such as exploring the robustness of GNNs under evasion and backdoor attacks. The robustness evaluation metrics deserve further attention. Additionally, a framework that integrates various adversarial attacks, adversarial defenses, and robustness measurements is important for the development of robust GNNs.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Zhu, Z. Zhang, P. Cui, and W. Zhu, "Robust graph convolutional networks against adversarial attacks," in *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, ser. KDD '19. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2019, pp. 1399–1407.
- [2] X. Tang, Y. Li, Y. Sun, H. Yao, P. Mitra, and S. Wang, "Transferring robustness for graph neural network against poisoning attacks," in *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, ser. WSDM '20. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2020, pp. 600–608.
- [3] X. Zhang and M. Zitnik, "Gnn-guard: Defending graph neural networks against adversarial attacks," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M. Balcan, and H. Lin, Eds., vol. 33. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020, pp. 9263–9275.
- [4] S. Zhang, S. Chen, X. Liu, C. Hua, W. Wang, K. Chen, J. Zhang, and J. Wang, "Detecting adversarial samples for deep learning models: a comparative study," *IEEE Transactions on Network Science and Engineering*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 231–244, 2021.
- [5] J. Chen, Y. Wu, X. Xu, Y. Chen, H. Zheng, and Q. Xuan, "Fast gradient attack on network embedding," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.02797*, 2018.
- [6] D. Zügner and S. Günnemann, "Adversarial attacks on graph neural networks via meta learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.08412*, 2019.
- [7] H. Wu, C. Wang, Y. Tyshetskiy, A. Docherty, K. Lu, and L. Zhu, "Adversarial examples for graph data: Deep insights into attack and defense," in *Proceedings of the 28th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, ser. IJCAI'19. AAAI Press, 2019, pp. 4816–4823.
- [8] H. Dai, H. Li, T. Tian, X. Huang, L. Wang, J. Zhu, and L. Song, "Adversarial attack on graph structured data," in *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, J. Dy and A. Krause, Eds., vol. 80. PMLR, 2018, pp. 1115–1124.
- [9] Y. Sun, S. Wang, X. Tang, T.-Y. Hsieh, and V. Honavar, "Adversarial attacks on graph neural networks via node injections: A hierarchical reinforcement learning approach," in *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2020*, 2020, pp. 673–683.
- [10] M. Ju, Y. Fan, C. Zhang, and Y. Ye, "Let graph be the go board: gradient-free node injection attack for graph neural networks via reinforcement learning," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 37, no. 4, 2023, pp. 4383–4390.
- [11] B. Wang and N. Z. Gong, "Attacking graph-based classification via manipulating the graph structure," in *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, ser. CCS '19. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2019, pp. 2023–2040.
- [12] S. Geisler, T. Schmidt, H. Şirin, D. Zügner, A. Bojchevski, and S. Günnemann, "Robustness of graph neural networks at scale," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, M. Ranzato, A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P. Liang, and J. W. Vaughan, Eds., vol. 34. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021, pp. 7637–7649.
- [13] X. Zou, Q. Zheng, Y. Dong, X. Guan, E. Kharlamov, J. Lu, and J. Tang, "Tdgia: Effective injection attacks on graph neural networks," in *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, ser. KDD '21. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2021, pp. 2461–2471.
- [14] A. K. Sharma, R. Kukreja, M. Kharbanda, and T. Chakraborty, "Node injection for class-specific network poisoning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.12277*, 2023.
- [15] N. Entezari, S. A. Al-Sayouri, A. Darvishzadeh, and E. E. Papalexakis, "All you need is low (rank): Defending against adversarial attacks on graphs," in *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, ser. WSDM '20. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2020, pp. 169–177.
- [16] F. Feng, X. He, J. Tang, and T.-S. Chua, "Graph adversarial training: Dynamically regularizing based on graph structure," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 33, no. 6, pp. 2493–2504, 2021.




Fig. 13: Transferability of adversarial examples. (a) ATR: the smaller the value of ATR, the more transferable of the adversarial examples. (b) Statistical results of ATR: the horizontal coordinate represents the source model and the vertical coordinate is the ATR.

- [17] Z. Deng, Y. Dong, and J. Zhu, "Batch virtual adversarial training for graph convolutional networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.09192*, 2019.
- [18] K. Xu, H. Chen, S. Liu, P.-Y. Chen, T.-W. Weng, M. Hong, and X. Lin, "Topology attack and defense for graph neural networks: An optimization perspective," in *Proceedings of the 28th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, ser. IJCAI'19. AAAI Press, 2019, pp. 3961–3967.
- [19] K. Sun, Z. Lin, H. Guo, and Z. Zhu, "Virtual adversarial training on graph convolutional networks in node classification," in *Pattern Recognition and Computer Vision: Second Chinese Conference, PRCV 2019, Xian, China, November 8-11, 2019, Proceedings, Part I*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2019, pp. 431–443.
- [20] W. Feng, J. Zhang, Y. Dong, Y. Han, H. Luan, Q. Xu, Q. Yang, E. Kharlamov, and J. Tang, "Graph random neural networks for semi-supervised learning on graphs," in *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, ser. NIPS'20. Red Hook, NY, USA: Curran Associates Inc., 2020.
- [21] W. Jin, Y. Ma, X. Liu, X. Tang, S. Wang, and J. Tang, "Graph structure learning for robust graph neural networks," in *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, ser. KDD '20. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2020, pp. 66–74.
- [22] V. N. Ioannidis, A. G. Marques, and G. B. Giannakis, "Tensor graph convolutional networks for multi-relational and robust learning," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 68, pp. 6535–6546, 2020.
- [23] X. Liu, W. Jin, Y. Ma, Y. Li, H. Liu, Y. Wang, M. Yan, and J. Tang, "Elastic graph neural networks," in *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, M. Meila and T. Zhang, Eds., vol. 139. PMLR, 2021, pp. 6837–6849.
- [24] R. Ying, D. Bourgeois, J. You, M. Zitnik, and J. Leskovec, *GNNExplainer: Generating explanations for graph neural networks*. Red Hook, NY, USA: Curran Associates Inc., 2019.
- [25] H. Yuan, J. Tang, X. Hu, and S. Ji, "Xggn: Towards model-level explanations of graph neural networks," in *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, ser. KDD '20. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2020, pp. 430–438.
- [26] H. Yuan, H. Yu, J. Wang, K. Li, and S. Ji, "On explainability of graph neural networks via subgraph explorations," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 12 241–12 252.
- [27] Q. Huang, M. Yamada, Y. Tian, D. Singh, and Y. Chang, "Graphlime: Local interpretable model explanations for graph neural networks," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, pp. 1–6, 2022.
- [28] L. Chen, J. Li, Q. Peng, Y. Liu, Z. Zheng, and C. Yang, "Understanding structural vulnerability in graph convolutional networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.06280*, 2021.
- [29] J. Zhu, J. Jin, D. Loveland, M. T. Schaub, and D. Koutra, "How does heterophily impact the robustness of graph neural networks? theoretical connections and practical implications," in *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, ser. KDD '22. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2022, pp. 2637–2647.
- [30] F. Mujkanovic, S. Geisler, S. Günemann, and A. Bojchevski, "Are defenses for graph neural networks robust?" *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 8954–8968, 2022.
- [31] D. Zügner, A. Akbarnejad, and S. Günemann, "Adversarial attacks on neural networks for graph data," in *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, ser. KDD '18. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2018, pp. 2847–2856.
- [32] H. A. M. Malik, F. Abid, M. R. Wahiddin, and Z. Bhatti, "Robustness of dengue complex network under targeted versus random attack," *Complex.*, vol. 2017, p. 2, 2017.
- [33] A. K. McCallum, K. Nigam, J. Rennie, and K. Seymore, "Automating the construction of internet portals with machine learning," *Information Retrieval*, vol. 3, pp. 127–163, 2000.
- [34] C. L. Giles, K. D. Bollacker, and S. Lawrence, "Citeseer: An automatic citation indexing system," in *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM conference on Digital libraries*, 1998, pp. 89–98.
- [35] P. Sen, G. Namata, M. Bilgic, L. Getoor, B. Galligher, and T. Eliassi-Rad, "Collective classification in network data," *AI magazine*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 93–93, 2008.
- [36] A. Fawzi, S.-M. Moosavi-Dezfooli, P. Frossard, and S. Soatto, "Empirical study of the topology and geometry of deep networks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2018, pp. 3762–3770.
- [37] L. Lü, L. Pan, T. Zhou, Y.-C. Zhang, and H. E. Stanley, "Toward link predictability of complex networks," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 112, no. 8, pp. 2325–2330, 2015.
- [38] P. Veličković, G. Cucurull, A. Casanova, A. Romero, P. Lio, and Y. Bengio, "Graph attention networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.10903*, 2017.
- [39] W. Hamilton, Z. Ying, and J. Leskovec, "Inductive representation learning on large graphs," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [40] J. You, Z. Ying, and J. Leskovec, "Design space for graph neural networks," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 17 009–17 021, 2020.
- [41] C. Zhang, A. Liu, X. Liu, Y. Xu, H. Yu, Y. Ma, and T. Li, "Interpreting and improving adversarial robustness of deep neural networks with neuron sensitivity," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 30, pp. 1291–1304, 2020.
- [42] M. Fan, W. Guo, Z. Ying, and X. Liu, "Enhance transferability of adversarial examples with model architecture," in *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–5.

- [43] C. Wiedeman and G. Wang, "Disrupting adversarial transferability in deep neural networks," *Patterns*, vol. 3, no. 5, pp. 1–13, 2022.
- [44] F. Tramèr, N. Papernot, I. Goodfellow, D. Boneh, and P. McDaniel, "The space of transferable adversarial examples," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.03453*, 2017.
- [45] S.-M. Moosavi-Dezfooli, A. Fawzi, O. Fawzi, and P. Frossard, "Universal adversarial perturbations," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2017, pp. 1765–1773.
- [46] K. Xu, W. Hu, J. Leskovec, and S. Jegelka, "How powerful are graph neural networks?" *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.00826*, 2018.
- [47] T. N. Kipf and M. Welling, "Variational graph auto-encoders," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.07308*, 2016.
- [48] A. Lancichinetti, S. Fortunato, and F. Radicchi, "Benchmark graphs for testing community detection algorithms," *Physical review E*, vol. 78, no. 4, p. 046110, 2008.



Tao Wu is currently the Head and a Professor at Department of Cybersecurity, School of Cyber Security and Information Law, Chongqing University of Posts and Telecommunications, China. He is the Executive Deputy Director of Chongqing Network and Information Security Technology Engineering Laboratory. He received the Ph.D. degree from University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, in June 2017. His research interests include graph neural networks, artificial intelligence (AI) security, graph mining.



Canyixing Cui received her B.E. degree from Shandong University of Science and Technology, Shandong, China, in 2021. She is currently working toward the master's degree with the School of Cyber Security and Information Law, Chongqing University of Posts and Telecommunications, Chongqing, China. Her main research interests include graph neural networks, adversarial attack, and robust model design.



Xingping Xian received her M.S. degree from Chongqing University of Posts and Telecommunications, Chongqing, China and is currently a Ph.D. candidate of the school of computer science, Chongqing University of Posts and Telecommunications. Her current research interests include machine learning, social network analysis, privacy-preserving, etc. She has published more than ten scientific papers in international journals and conferences.



Shaojie Qiao received the B.S. and Ph.D. degrees from Sichuan University, Chengdu, China, in 2004 and 2009, respectively. He is a Distinguished Young Scholars of Sichuan Province. He is currently a professor with the School of Software Engineering, Chengdu University of Information Technology, Chengdu, China. He has authored more than 160 high quality papers, including IEEE Transactions on ITS, TKDE, TNNLS, etc. His research interests include graph neural networks and spatio-temporal databases.



Chao Wang received the Ph.D. degree in computer science from the University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu, China, in 2019. In 2019, he joined the School of Electrical Engineering, Chongqing University, as an Assistant Professor. He is currently with the School of Computer and Information Science, Chongqing Normal University, Chongqing, China. His research interests include data mining and machine learning and its applications.



Lin Yuan received the PhD degree in Electrical Engineering at EPFL, Switzerland in 2017. He is currently working at the School of Cyber Security and Information Law in the Chongqing University of Posts and Telecommunications. His research interests include multimedia analysis, security and privacy protection.



Shui Yu received the Ph.D. degree in computer science from the University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu, China, in 2019. In 2019, he joined the School of Electrical Engineering, Chongqing University, as an Assistant Professor. He is currently with the School of Computer and Information Science, Chongqing Normal University, Chongqing, China. His research interests include data mining and machine learning and its applications.

STRUCTURE MEASURES OF GRAPHS

The following is a detailed description of the structural measures of the graphs.

(1) Degree (D_i): number of edges connected to the node i .

(2) Clustering Coefficient (C_i): the degree to which the neighbors of a node tend to connect with each other. This measures the density of triangles in a graph.

(3) Degree Centrality (DC_i): the most direct indicator of centrality. The greater the node degree, the higher the degree centrality and the more important the node is in the graph.

(4) Betweenness Centrality (BC_i): the ability to transmit information along the shortest path between pairs of nodes in a graph. The greater the betweenness, the greater the influence of the nodes on the information flow.

$$BC_i = \sum_{s \neq i \neq t} \frac{n_{st}^i}{g_{st}}, \quad (18)$$

where g_{st} is the number of all shortest paths from point s to t , n_{st}^i indicates the number of shortest paths from node s to t through node i .

(5) Closeness Centrality (CC_i): the reciprocal of the sum of the distances between a node and all other nodes in the graph. The greater the compactness, the closer the distance between the node and other nodes, and the node has a more significant influence on the information transmission process in the graph.

$$CC_i = \frac{N}{\sum_{j=1}^N d_{ij}}. \quad (19)$$

(6) Eigenvector Centrality (EC_i): the measure of a node's influence based on the number and importance of its neighboring nodes. The more important the neighboring nodes connected to the node, the more important the original node.

$$EC_i = c \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} x_j, \quad (20)$$

where x_j is the node center vector and $x = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N]^T$.

(7) Katz Centrality (KC_i): this calculates the relative impact of nodes in a graph by measuring the number of direct neighbors and the number of connections to other nodes through the direct neighbors.

(8) Neighbor Degree (ND_i): the degree of node's neighborhood. This is the total number of edges connected to the neighborhood of a specific node, which measures the overall connectivity of the nodes in a graph.

(9) Edge Betweenness Centrality (EBC_i): the ratio of the number of shortest paths that pass through the edge to the total number of shortest paths. The larger the value, the greater the influence of the edge on the information flow.

$$EBC_i = \sum_{s \neq i \neq t} \frac{ne_{st}^i}{g_{st}}, \quad (21)$$

where e_{st}^i is the number of shortest paths from node s to t through edge i .

(10) Edge Load Centrality (ELC_i): the load on the edge quantifies the load flowing through each edge in the graph and evaluates the importance of the edge according to the traffic carried or promoted by the edge.

GNNs

GNNs are a family of neural networks that combine graph data with deep neural networks. Typical GNNs include the following categories: GCNs, GATs, and GAEs. The details of these GNNs are introduced below.

(1) GCN

GCN is a popular GNN proposed for the semi-supervised node classification of graph-structured data. GCN utilizes a convolution operation to aggregate features of the graph and transmit multi-order neighborhood information by superimposing several convolution layers, in which the propagation rule of each convolution layer can be formulated as follows:

$$\mathbf{H}^{(l+1)} = \sigma \left(\tilde{\mathbf{D}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\mathbf{A}} \tilde{\mathbf{D}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{H}^{(l)} \mathbf{W}^{(l)} \right), \quad (22)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{I}_N$ and \mathbf{I}_N is the identity matrix of \mathcal{G} . $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}$ is the degree matrix of $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_{ii} = \sum_j \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{ij}$. $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\mathbf{A}} \tilde{\mathbf{D}}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ represents the normalization of adjacency matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$, preventing a large difference in features between high- and low-level nodes. $\mathbf{W}^{(l)}$ and $\sigma(\cdot)$ denote the weight matrix and activation function, respectively.

(2) GAT

GAT assigns different weights to different neighbors to address the problem of fixed edge weights during GCN aggregation. GAT adds an attention coefficient to each edge while aggregating features, such that the model parameters can be adjusted according to the task in the process of feature aggregation. The GAT operation is calculated as follows:

$$\mathbf{H}_i^{(l+1)} = \sigma \left(\sum_{j \in N_i} \alpha(h_i^{(l)}, h_j^{(l)}) \mathbf{W}^{(l)} h_j^{(l)} \right), \quad (23)$$

where $\alpha_{ij} = \frac{\exp(\text{LeakyReLU}(e_{ij}))}{\sum_{k \in N_i} \exp(\text{LeakyReLU}(e_{ik}))}$ represents the attention coefficient, $\text{LeakyReLU}(\cdot)$ is the activation function, and $e_{ij} = a([\mathbf{W}h_i || \mathbf{W}h_j])$, $j \in N_i$ denotes the similarity coefficient.

(3) GAE

GAE represents the vertices of a graph as low-dimensional vectors consisting of an encoder and decoder. GAE uses GCN as the encoder to obtain the embedding of the nodes:

$$\mathbf{Z} = \text{GCN}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{X}) = \hat{\mathbf{A}} \text{ReLU}(\hat{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{W}_0) \mathbf{W}_1, \quad (24)$$

The original graph is then reconstructed using the inner product of the decoder as follows:

$$\hat{\mathbf{A}} = \sigma(\mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}^T), \quad (25)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ denotes the adjacency matrix of the reconstructed graph.