

Joint Data Inpainting and Graph Learning via Unrolled Neural Networks

Subbareddy Batreddy[§], Pushkal Mishra[§], Yaswanth Kakarla, Aditya Siripuram

Indian Institute of Technology Hyderabad, India.

Abstract—Given partial measurements of a time-varying graph signal, we propose an algorithm to simultaneously estimate both the underlying graph topology and the missing measurements. The proposed algorithm operates by training an interpretable neural network, designed from the unrolling framework. The proposed technique can be used both as a graph learning and a graph signal reconstruction algorithm. This work enhances prior work in graph signal reconstruction by allowing the underlying graph to be unknown; and also builds on prior work in graph learning by tailoring the learned graph to the signal reconstruction task.

Index Terms—Graph signal processing, graph topology inference, graph temporal data, unrolling

I. INTRODUCTION

Graphs are a natural way to represent a large class of irregularly structured signals obtained from numerous sources such as health monitoring devices [1], economic networks [2], meteorological stations[†] [3], transportation networks [4], and biological networks [5], [6]. The graph’s vertices represent the signal components, and the edges encode the relation between various signal components. Graph signal processing (GSP) extends techniques and concepts from classical signal processing (e.g., the Fourier transform and frequencies) to such graph signals [7] and by exploiting the information from the underlying graph, GSP aims to improve upon the traditional techniques [3]. Extending the tools of classical signal processing to graph-based data is of interest to the signal processing community due to its proven success in applications such as graph filters [8], sampling [9], [10], graph neural networks [11], [12], and graph learning from data [13].

In this work, we investigate the problems of *graph-based data inpainting* and *graph learning*. In real-world datasets, certain values may be absent due to various factors, which causes loss in data or including errors in data collection. Graph-based data inpainting is the process of reconstructing missing data points from datasets that are derived from an underlying graph structure. Examples of such datasets include neurological data like fMRI (where the underlying graph is the functional connectivity map of the brain) [14], temperature data (the underlying graph corresponds to geographical similarity) [15] and neuroskeletal data (underlying graph is based on neural connectivity) [3]. Recent works [16]–[18] have proposed an inpainting algorithm for time-varying graph signals. The inpainting task is accomplished by assuming some prior on the signal, typically via graph-variation minimization:

which requires knowledge of the underlying graph. However, in many real-world applications, the underlying graph is unknown; as evident in neurological and biological datasets (such as fMRI and MEG), sensor measurements, and others.

This naturally points us to the problem of graph learning: constructing an approximate graph given a dataset assumed to be derived from an underlying graph. Techniques from GSP have offered a new perspective on the problem of graph learning by assuming certain priors on the data model. For example, well-known methods, such as [15], [19], [20], assume that the data is smooth on the graph (or that the signal has low graph frequencies): similar to assumptions made for data inpainting. Other techniques exploit statistical properties [21], [22] or spectral characteristics [23]–[25]. Review articles such as [26], [27] provide comprehensive overviews of graph learning methods based on these different perspectives and assumptions. While most of these methods are not specific to time-varying data, techniques in [28], [29] give algorithms for learning graphs from time-varying data.

We identify two key challenges in deploying these graph learning algorithms for data inpainting. First, note that graph learning techniques are typically evaluated on a GSP task (such as classification or data inpainting) using the learned graph [18], [30], [31]. However, graph learning techniques may not be tailored to the GSP task (data-inpainting) at hand; as this is an *open-loop system*. Secondly, there is a multitude of signal priors to deploy for graph learning: take for instance the global smoothness-based techniques from [15] which assume the signals are smooth on the graph, or the data inpainting techniques in [16], [18] where the temporal difference of the signal is assumed to be smooth on the graph. It may not be clear which model fits the given dataset. Our work aims to investigate a systematic solution to address these challenges.

Consider starting with a parameterized graph-learning model (which encompasses existing models as special cases) and a dataset with missing entries. Our objective is to jointly learn the graph structure and estimate the missing entries. We first perform data-inpainting using a guessed graph structure and then use a suitable graph learning technique to update the graph. If the estimation results are not satisfactory, we update the parameters based on the received feedback. This iterative process forms a *closed loop system* as opposed to the open loop system discussed earlier; forming the core of our approach. The parameter updates are accomplished via the unrolling framework [32]: where each iteration in an iterative technique is interpreted as a layer of a deep neural network. End-to-end training of this neural network accomplishes the

[§]Equal contribution

role of feedback. The block diagram as shown in Figure 1 provides an illustration of the proposed model.




Fig. 1: Proposed model with a closed-loop feedback system

Thus the proposed approach *jointly* accomplishes both data-inpainting and graph learning tasks. Note that this technique can also be used as a standalone graph-learning technique (by artificially removing a small number of entries from the given dataset).

Our work is heavily motivated from [16]; where an unrolling framework is applied for data-inpainting with the underlying graph structure assumed to be known. We extend their work by allowing an unknown underlying graph. Consequently, the unrolled neural network in our setting is significantly different from the network in [33] (details in Section III-C). Evaluation of our results show that:

- 1) The proposed algorithm estimates the missing entries better than techniques that first learn the graph and then use the learned graph for data inpainting (on real datasets)
- 2) The proposed algorithm recovers a graph closer to the ground truth compared with other graph learning techniques (on synthetic datasets)

Thus suggesting a potential use for the algorithm in both data-inpainting and graph-learning tasks. We hope that the proposed framework can also extend to GSP tasks other than inpainting as well, e.g. classification tasks; and allow for tailoring to other GSP tasks.

II. PROBLEM SETUP

A data matrix $\mathbf{X} = [\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \dots, \bar{x}_M]$ is an $N \times M$ matrix of real numbers, with each of the M columns corresponding to signals at M successive timestamps. We work with undirected graphs $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ with vertices $V = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ and edges $E \subseteq V \times V$. Each column $\bar{x}_i : V \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is interpreted as a graph signal defined on the vertices V of \mathcal{G} . The Laplacian matrix \mathbf{L} of the graph has a diagonal entry at (i, i) as the degree of vertex i , an off-diagonal entry at (i, j) as -1 if vertices i and j are connected by an edge, and 0 otherwise. The graph-variation of the data matrix \mathbf{X} is defined as

$$\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{X}) = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{L} \mathbf{X}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=1}^M \sum_{i \sim j} (x_{ti} - x_{tj})^2$$

Graph-based data-inpainting algorithms [16], [18] and graph learning algorithms [15], [19], [20] assume that $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}(f(\mathbf{X}))$ is small, for a suitably defined f , thus linking the data matrix with the graph structure. This assumption is then used to recover missing entries and the graph.

We denote Ψ as the mask matrix where $\Psi_{ij} = 1$ if the entry at that location (i, j) in \mathbf{X} is known and $\Psi_{ij} = 0$ otherwise.

With this setup, the problem under investigation is: ‘Given $\Psi \circ \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{E}$ (where \mathbf{E} is the noise) and Ψ , design an algorithm that outputs the graph \mathcal{G} and the entire data matrix \mathbf{X} ; such that $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}(f(\mathbf{X}))$ is small’. Some general notations: We denote by $\mathbf{A} \circ \mathbf{B}$ the Hadamard (elementwise) product of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} , by $\mathbf{1}$ a vector of all 1’s and $\text{tr}(\cdot)$ as the trace of the matrix.

III. PROPOSED ALGORITHM

A. Framing the optimization problem

Motivated by [16] and [18], we define the function f referenced in the previous section as a higher-order temporal difference. Let the temporal difference operator be defined as:

$$\mathbf{X}\Delta = [\bar{x}_2 - \bar{x}_1 \quad \bar{x}_3 - \bar{x}_2 \quad \dots \quad \bar{x}_M - \bar{x}_{M-1}]$$

Thus, we can take $f(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{X}\Delta$, and get $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{X}) = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{L} \mathbf{X} \Delta \Delta^T)$. This variation measures the smoothness of the temporal difference on the graph. We generalize the $\Delta \Delta^T$ operator above by introducing powers of $\Delta \Delta^T$ and their polynomial combinations- this has the effect of accounting for smoothness of higher order temporal differences:

$$Z(\bar{\alpha}) = \alpha_0 \mathbf{I} + \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i (\Delta \Delta^T)^i. \quad (1)$$

Hence, we use $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{X}, \bar{\alpha}) = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{L} \mathbf{X} Z(\bar{\alpha}))$. Note that this is a semi-norm for $\bar{\alpha} \geq 0$, and generalizes the regularizer (based on difference operators) from [18]. Now given the partial data $\Psi \circ \mathbf{X}$ and Ψ , we frame the following optimization problem to obtain the complete data $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$ (output of the neural network), the graph Laplacian \mathbf{L} (learned graph) and the model parameters $\bar{\alpha}$ (graph learning parameters):

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{L}, \bar{\alpha}} & \left\| \Psi \circ (\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}) \right\|_F^2 + \lambda \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \bar{\alpha}) + \beta \|\mathbf{L}\|_F^2 + \gamma \|Z(\bar{\alpha})\|_F^2 \\ \text{s.t.} & \quad \mathbf{L}_{ii} \geq 1, \mathbf{L}_{ij} = \mathbf{L}_{ji} \leq 0 \quad \forall i \neq j, \mathbf{L} \cdot \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{0} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

In the objective function, the first term ensures data fidelity, the second term is the graph variation, the third term ensures that the learned graph is sparse and the last term imposes a norm-bound constraint on the solution space and ensures stability of the solution. The constraints ensure that the learned \mathbf{L} is a valid Laplacian matrix.

B. Solving the optimization problem

The objective function in (2) is non-convex due to the product term involving the variables $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$, \mathbf{L} , and $\bar{\alpha}$. To solve this issue, we adopt a standard alternating minimization technique. We fix the graph learning parameter $\bar{\alpha}$ and alternately updating the Laplacian \mathbf{L} and data matrix $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$ using projected gradient and conjugate gradient descent methods, respectively. Further, these steps are unrolled into a neural network to update the graph learning parameters $\bar{\alpha}$.

1) *Estimating $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$* : In the first step, we estimate unknown entries of the data matrix $\Psi \circ \mathbf{X}$, assuming \mathbf{L} (initialized using covariance matrix from available data) and $\bar{\alpha}$ are known. The corresponding optimization problem is as follows:

$$\min_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}} \left\| \Psi \circ (\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}) \right\|_F^2 + \lambda \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \bar{\alpha}) \quad (3)$$

This is solved using the conjugate gradient descent method [34], similar to the prior work in [16]. Refer to appendix section VI for more details (EMD: Estimate Missing Data).

2) *Updating L*: In the second step, we update \mathbf{L} by fixing the other two variables $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$ and $\bar{\alpha}$. The corresponding optimization problem is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \arg \min_{\mathbf{L}} \quad & \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \bar{\alpha}) + \beta \|\mathbf{L}\|_F^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{L}_{ii} \geq 1, \mathbf{L}_{ij} = \mathbf{L}_{ji} \leq 0 \forall i \neq j, \mathbf{L} \cdot \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{0} \end{aligned}$$

To solve this optimization problem, we employ the Projected Gradient Descent method [34]: this is a standard gradient descent followed by the projection of the updated variable onto a feasible space. The update steps are as follows:

Algorithm Graph Learning

```

1: function GL ( $\Psi \circ \mathbf{X}, \hat{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{L}, \bar{\alpha}, k, \beta, \eta$ )
2:   Set:  $\mathbf{L}_1 = \mathbf{L}$  and  $\mathcal{M} = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top$ 
3:   for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $k$  do
4:     Compute gradient  $\nabla f(\mathbf{L}_i) \leftarrow \hat{\mathbf{X}} Z(\bar{\alpha}) \hat{\mathbf{X}}^\top + \beta \mathbf{L}_i$ 
5:     Update Laplacian  $\bar{\mathbf{L}}_{i+1} \leftarrow \mathbf{L}_i - \eta \nabla f(\mathbf{L}_i)$ 
6:     Project to feasible space  $\mathbf{L}_{i+1} \leftarrow \text{Proj}_{\mathcal{M}}(\bar{\mathbf{L}}_{i+1})$ 
7:   end for
8:   return  $\mathbf{L}_k$ 
9: end function

```

Here we construct the $\text{Proj}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{L})$ operator as: first extract the off-diagonal entries of \mathbf{L} and multiply them by -1 (hadamard product with \mathcal{M}), second passing them through a ReLU unit to retain edges with positive weights and finally converting resulting matrix into a Laplacian matrix by replacing the diagonal entries suitably. The update procedure for \mathbf{L} is better illustrated in Figure 2.




Fig. 2: Illustration of the proposed Graph learning update step using linear operations and a ReLU unit

C. Setting up the unrolled neural network

Now, we have an iterative technique to find the graph and missing entries assuming $\bar{\alpha}$ is fixed. Next, we unroll this algorithm by mapping each iteration to a single network layer. Our iterations consist of those that update $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$ (Section III-B1) and update \mathbf{L} (Section III-B2). The design of our iterative technique for graph learning involves linear operations mixed with ReLU (Figure 2), which enables us to do the mapping easily.

The feed-forward process of this neural network is thus equivalent to iteratively reconstructing a graph and time-varying graph signal inpainting with the given parameters $\bar{\alpha}$. Note that $\Psi \circ \mathbf{X}$ is the input and $\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{L}$ are the outputs, and $\bar{\alpha}$ the parameters of the neural network. We use the following loss function to train the neural network:

$$\text{Loss}(\bar{\alpha}) = \left\| \Psi \circ (\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}) \right\|_F^2 + \lambda \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \bar{\alpha}) + \beta \|\mathbf{L}\|_F^2 + \gamma \|Z(\bar{\alpha})\|_F^2 \quad (4)$$

The previous discussion is summarized in the pseudocode below.

Algorithm Unrolled Neural Network (Forward pass)

```

1: Given: Missing data matrix  $\Psi \circ \mathbf{X}$  and  $\Psi$ 
2: Input:  $\mathbf{Y} = \Psi \circ \mathbf{X}$  and  $\Psi$ 
3: Hyperparameters:  $k, k_1, k_2, \eta, \beta, \gamma$  and  $\lambda$ 
4: Parameters of the neural network:  $\bar{\alpha}$ 
5: Initialization:  $\mathbf{L}_1 \leftarrow$  Covariance graph from  $\Psi \circ \mathbf{X}$ 
6: for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $k$  do ▷ Unrolled iterations
7:    $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_i \leftarrow$  EMD ( $\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{L}_i, \bar{\alpha}, \lambda, k_1$ ) ▷ See Appendix VI
8:    $\mathbf{L}_{i+1} \leftarrow$  GL ( $\mathbf{Y}, \hat{\mathbf{X}}_i, \mathbf{L}_i, \bar{\alpha}, k_2, \beta, \eta$ ) ▷ Graph update
9: end for
10: Output  $\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{L}$ 

```

D. Differences from prior work

Our work is motivated from and builds on [16]. The main differences stem from the formulation of the objective function (2): the graph is unknown for our framework, i.e. \mathbf{L} is a variable. In addition, we omit the polynomial terms in \mathbf{L} (to promote convexity of the alternate minimization steps) in favour of a regularization term involving both \mathbf{L} and the graph parameters via $Z(\bar{\alpha})$. Further, the cost function used to train the neural network is the same as the objective in (2), unlike [16] where only one term in the objective is used to train the neural network. The proposed unrolled neural network consists of additional layers corresponding to the graph learning which are interlaced with the ones seen in [16] for data inpainting.

Unrolling has also been used for graph learning in different contexts: e.g. [35] proposes a distributed learning model for multi-agent collaborative setup. The goal here is to enable the agents to detect appropriate collaborators for performance gains autonomously. The graphs here denote pairwise collaborative relations which are obtained using a graph learning network; and unrolling is employed by introducing trainable attention for each model parameter at the agent. This is in contrast to our setup where the signals involved at each graph node have a time-based interpretation.

The work [36] introduces an unrolling-based technique to learn graphs with certain topological properties. The unrolling model is trained with node data and graph samples. From the graph learning perspective, this technique operates in a supervised framework. In contrast, we do not have access to graph samples, and thus operate in an unsupervised framework. Our end-to-end training is done based on how well the graph model fits the data within the inpainting process.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, we evaluate the performance of the proposed graph learning algorithm on both synthetic and real data sets.

A. Evaluation Metrics:

- *Normalized error*: We evaluate the data inpainting performance by comparing the MSE error of unknown entries.

$$\text{Error} = \left\| (\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top - \Psi) \circ (\hat{\mathbf{X}} - \mathbf{X}) \right\|_F / \left\| \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top - \Psi \right\|_1$$

- *F-Score*: We use this to measure the similarity of the learnt graph with the ground truth graph (synthetic dataset only) [37]: higher F-Score relates to better graph learning.

Note that the sensing ratio is referred to as $\|\mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top - \Psi\|_1 / NM$, i.e. fraction of missing entries.




Fig. 3: Reconstruction errors as a function of the sensing ratio on (a) Temperature dataset (b) fMRI (Open Neuro) dataset (c) Synthetic dataset (d) F-score for different sensing ratios on Synthetic dataset.

B. Competing methods

We compare our joint graph learning and data inpainting algorithm with techniques that separately perform the two tasks. We compare with various graph learning techniques from literature including global smoothness-based learning [15], [20] and diffusion-based learning [23], [25]. We also compare with a nearest neighbour-based graph learning (each vertex is connected to its k nearest neighbours in 2-norm): as used in [16]. Once the graph is learned, we artificially remove some entries and recover these missing entries using the learned graph as in [16]. This process is repeated 20 times for various mask matrices and the computed MSE is averaged.

C. Results on real datasets

We evaluated the proposed graph learning model on two publicly available datasets. The first is the Brittany temperature dataset [20] (the temperature measurements collected across 32 weather stations, with 744 observations per weather station). The second dataset is the Open Neuro dataset [38] (this is fMRI data from 32 brain regions and 152 observations per region of interest).

Figure 3a and Figure 3b compare the performance of the proposed and competing methods on these datasets as a function of the sensing ratio. The performance gains are evident; we hypothesize that this is because the proposed algorithm can better learn the underlying graph topology, as motivated in the introduction.

D. Results on synthetic datasets

Synthetic datasets are generated by first constructing a graph and then generating data that is a temporally smooth on the constructed graph. The (unweighted) graph is generated according Erdős-Rényi (ER) model [39] with $N = 20$ vertices and probability of edge 0.3. On this graph, we generate time-varying data \mathbf{X} as per the model in (2). We generate $M = 500$ time varying observations. The polynomial parameters are set as $\alpha_1 = 4$ and $\alpha_2 = 1.66$. We have verified that the proposed algorithm recovers these ground truth α 's.

In addition to the competing methods from before, we also compare the performance of our algorithm with prior graph signal reconstruction work [16] by giving the *ground truth* graph as input. This is marked as a lower bound for the MSE of our algorithm.

Figure 3c compares the data inpainting performance of the proposed and competing methods. The proposed technique shows better performance in data inpainting tasks and is quite close to the lower bound as defined above. Figure 3d depicts the performance of graph learning. The green plot depicting the closeness of learned graph with ground truth and blue plot showing the similarity of graphs generated with 100 different mask matrices Ψ . Thus we notice that at low sensing ratios, the impact of Ψ is minimal, establishing that the learnt graph is stable w.r.t where the entries in the dataset are removed.




Fig. 4: F-Score vs SNR on Synthetic dataset

To demonstrate the robustness of graph learning task, we add Gaussian noise to the (synthetic) data matrix and then apply our algorithm to learn the graph. We then plot the F-score as a function of the SNR as seen in the Figure 4.

V. CONCLUSION

In this letter, we have proposed a new method that integrates both data-inpainting and graph-learning tasks via a closed-loop feedback system using a parameterized graph-learning model. We then unroll this algorithm into an interpretable neural network by mapping each iteration to a single layer, to learn the above-mentioned parameters. Enabling the graph learning task to be guided by the data-inpainting performance, we have demonstrated that our method outperforms other models in reconstruction error and graph learning performance. It also eliminates the dependency of knowing the underlying graph structure for the inpainting task, and hence providing a two-in-one solution.

The dataset and code used in this work can be downloaded from here.

REFERENCES

- [1] David Ahméd-Aristizabal, Mohammad Ali Armin, Simon Denman, Clinton Fookes, and Lars Petersson, "Graph-based deep learning for medical diagnosis and analysis: Past, present and future," *Sensors*, vol. 21, no. 14, 2021.
- [2] D. König Michael and Stefano Battiston, *From Graph Theory to Models of Economic Networks. A Tutorial*, pp. 23–63, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009.
- [3] Antonio Ortega, Pascal Frossard, Jelena Kovačević, José MF Moura, and Pierre Vandergheynst, "Graph signal processing: Overview, challenges, and applications," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 106, no. 5, pp. 808–828, 2018.
- [4] Tao Liu, Aimin Jiang, Xiaoyu Miao, Yibin Tang, Yanping Zhu, and Hon Keung Kwan, "Graph-based dynamic modeling and traffic prediction of urban road network," *IEEE Sensors Journal*, vol. 21, no. 24, pp. 28118–28130, 2021.
- [5] Mathilde Ménoret, Nicolas Farrugia, Bastien Padeloup, and Vincent Gripon, "Evaluating graph signal processing for neuroimaging through classification and dimensionality reduction," 2017.
- [6] Chenhui Hu, Lin Cheng, Jorge Sepulcre, Keith A Johnson, Georges E Fakhri, Yue M Lu, and Quanzheng Li, "A spectral graph regression model for learning brain connectivity of alzheimer's disease," *PLoS One*, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. e0128136, May 2015.
- [7] Aliaksei Sandryhaila and Jose MF Moura, "Big data analysis with signal processing on graphs: Representation and processing of massive data sets with irregular structure," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 31, no. 5, pp. 80–90, 2014.
- [8] Jiani Liu, Elvin Isufi, and Geert Leus, "Filter design for autoregressive moving average graph filters," *IEEE Transactions on Signal and Information Processing over Networks*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 47–60, 2018.
- [9] Antonio G Marques, Santiago Segarra, Geert Leus, and Alejandro Ribeiro, "Sampling of graph signals with successive local aggregations," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 64, no. 7, pp. 1832–1843, 2015.
- [10] Aamir Anis, Akshay Gadde, and Antonio Ortega, "Towards a sampling theorem for signals on arbitrary graphs," in *2014 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 3864–3868.
- [11] Fernando Gama, Antonio G Marques, Geert Leus, and Alejandro Ribeiro, "Convolutional neural network architectures for signals supported on graphs," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 67, no. 4, pp. 1034–1049, 2018.
- [12] Fernando Gama, Joan Bruna, and Alejandro Ribeiro, "Stability properties of graph neural networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.04497*, 2019.
- [13] Xiaowen Dong, Dorina Thanou, Michael Rabbat, and Pascal Frossard, "Learning graphs from data: A signal representation perspective," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.00848*, 2018.
- [14] Jonas Richiardi, Sophie Achard, Horst Bunke, and Dimitri Van De Ville, "Machine learning with brain graphs: predictive modeling approaches for functional imaging in systems neuroscience," *IEEE Signal processing magazine*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 58–70, 2013.
- [15] Xiaowen Dong, Dorina Thanou, Pascal Frossard, and Pierre Vandergheynst, "Learning laplacian matrix in smooth graph signal representations," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 64, no. 23, pp. 6160–6173, 2016.
- [16] Siheng Chen and Yonina C Eldar, "Time-varying graph signal inpainting via unrolling networks," in *ICASSP 2021-2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 8092–8097.
- [17] Siheng Chen, Aliaksei Sandryhaila, José MF Moura, and Jelena Kovačević, "Signal recovery on graphs: Variation minimization," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 63, no. 17, pp. 4609–4624, 2015.
- [18] Kai Qiu, Xianghui Mao, Xinyue Shen, Xiaohan Wang, Tiejian Li, and Yuantao Gu, "Time-varying graph signal reconstruction," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 11, no. 6, pp. 870–883, 2017.
- [19] Vassilis Kalofolias, "How to learn a graph from smooth signals," in *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2016, pp. 920–929.
- [20] Sundeep Prabhakar Chepuri, Sijia Liu, Geert Leus, and Alfred O Hero, "Learning sparse graphs under smoothness prior," in *2017 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 6508–6512.
- [21] Brenden Lake and Joshua Tenenbaum, "Discovering structure by learning sparse graphs," *Proceedings of 32nd Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society*, 2010.
- [22] Hilmi E Egilmez, Eduardo Pavez, and Antonio Ortega, "Graph learning from data under laplacian and structural constraints," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 11, no. 6, pp. 825–841, 2017.
- [23] Dorina Thanou, Xiaowen Dong, Daniel Kressner, and Pascal Frossard, "Learning heat diffusion graphs," *IEEE Transactions on Signal and Information Processing over Networks*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 484–499, 2017.
- [24] Hilmi E Egilmez, Eduardo Pavez, and Antonio Ortega, "Graph learning from filtered signals: Graph system and diffusion kernel identification," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.02553*, 2018.
- [25] Hermína Petric Maretić, Dorina Thanou, and Pascal Frossard, "Graph learning under sparsity priors," in *2017 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. Ieee, 2017, pp. 6523–6527.
- [26] Xiaowen Dong, Dorina Thanou, Michael Rabbat, and Pascal Frossard, "Learning graphs from data: A signal representation perspective," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 44–63, 2019.
- [27] Gonzalo Mateos, Santiago Segarra, Antonio G Marques, and Alejandro Ribeiro, "Connecting the dots: Identifying network structure via graph signal processing," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 16–43, 2019.
- [28] Vassilis Kalofolias, Andreas Loukas, Dorina Thanou, and Pascal Frossard, "Learning time varying graphs," in *2017 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. Ieee, 2017, pp. 2826–2830.
- [29] Koki Yamada, Yuichi Tanaka, and Antonio Ortega, "Time-varying graph learning with constraints on graph temporal variation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.03346*, 2020.
- [30] Pierre Humbert, Batiste Le Bars, Laurent Oudre, Argyris Kalogeratos, and Nicolas Vayatis, "Learning laplacian matrix from graph signals with sparse spectral representation," *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 8766–8812, 2021.
- [31] Ariel Kroizer, Yonina C Eldar, and Tirza Routtenberg, "Modeling and recovery of graph signals and difference-based signals," in *2019 IEEE Global Conference on Signal and Information Processing (GlobalSIP)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–5.
- [32] Vishal Monga, Yuelong Li, and Yonina C Eldar, "Algorithm unrolling: Interpretable, efficient deep learning for signal and image processing," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 18–44, 2021.
- [33] Siheng Chen, Yonina C Eldar, and Lingxiao Zhao, "Graph unrolling networks: Interpretable neural networks for graph signal denoising," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 69, pp. 3699–3713, 2021.
- [34] Stephen Boyd, Stephen P Boyd, and Lieven Vandenberghe, *Convex optimization*, Cambridge university press, 2004.
- [35] Enpei Zhang, Shuo Tang, Xiaowen Dong, Siheng Chen, and Yanfeng Wang, "Unrolled graph learning for multi-agent collaboration," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.17101*, 2022.
- [36] Xingyue Pu, Tianyue Cao, Xiaoyun Zhang, Xiaowen Dong, and Siheng Chen, "Learning to learn graph topologies," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 34, pp. 4249–4262, 2021.
- [37] Yutaka Sasaki et al., "The truth of the f-measure," *Teach tutor mater*, vol. 1, no. 5, pp. 1–5, 2007.
- [38] Pierre Bellec, Carlton Chu, Francois Chouinard-Decorte, Yassine Benhajali, Daniel S Margulies, and R Cameron Craddock, "The neuro bureau adhd-200 preprocessed repository," *Neuroimage*, vol. 144, pp. 275–286, 2017.
- [39] Paul Erdős and Alfréd Rényi, "On the evolution of random graphs," *Publ. Math. Inst. Hung. Acad. Sci.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 17–60, 1960.

VI. APPENDIX

A. Estimate Missing Data (EMD: Section III-B1)

Since our optimization equation has different regularizers compared to the one in [16], we recompute the gradient of f . For the data inpainting block, we have the optimization function as follows:

$$f(\mathbf{X}) = \left\| \Psi \circ (\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}) \right\|_F^2 + \lambda \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \bar{\alpha}).$$

Computing the gradient of f with respect to \mathbf{X} yields:

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{X}} f(\mathbf{X}) = 2\Psi \circ (\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}) + 2\lambda \mathbf{L}\mathbf{X}Z(\bar{\alpha})$$

Further, we use equations 4a to 4d from [16], replace the gradient with the above expression and follow the exact iteration steps as mentioned in [16].

B. Estimating $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$ from [16]

We use equations 4a to 4d from [16] and recompute the gradient of f based on our optimization problem. For the data inpainting block, we have the optimization function as follows:

$$f(\mathbf{X}) = \left\| \Psi \circ (\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}) \right\|_F^2 + \lambda \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}(\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \bar{\alpha})$$

Computing the gradient of f with respect to \mathbf{X} yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\mathbf{X}} f(\mathbf{X}) &= 2\Psi \circ (\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}) + \lambda \nabla_{\mathbf{X}} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{L}\mathbf{X}Z(\bar{\alpha})) \\ &= 2\Psi \circ (\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}) + \lambda \sum_{i=0}^K \alpha_i \nabla_{\mathbf{X}} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{L}\mathbf{X}(\Delta\Delta^T)^i) \\ &= 2\Psi \circ (\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}) + \lambda \sum_{i=0}^K \alpha_i \nabla_{\mathbf{X}} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}(\Delta\Delta^T)^i \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{L}) \\ &= 2\Psi \circ (\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}) + \lambda \sum_{i=0}^K \alpha_i \mathbf{L}\mathbf{X}(\Delta\Delta^T)^i \\ &= 2\Psi \circ (\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{X}}) + 2\lambda \mathbf{L}\mathbf{X}Z(\bar{\alpha}) \end{aligned}$$

The data inpainting algorithm modified with our optimization problem is as follows:

Algorithm Estimating missing data from the graph

```

1: function EMD ( $\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{L}, \bar{\alpha}, \lambda, k$ )
2:   Set:  $Z(\bar{\alpha}) = \alpha_0 \mathbf{I} + \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i (\Delta\Delta^T)^i$ 
3:   Given:  $f'(\mathbf{X}) = \Psi \circ \mathbf{X} - \mathbf{Y} + \lambda \mathbf{L}\mathbf{X}Z(\bar{\alpha})$ 
4:   Initialization:  $\mathbf{X}_0 = 0, \mathbf{Z}_0 = -\nabla f(\mathbf{X}_0)$ 
5:   for  $i \leftarrow 0$  to  $k$  do
6:      $\tau \leftarrow \frac{\text{tr}(\nabla f(\mathbf{X}_i)^T \mathbf{Z}_i)}{\text{tr}(\mathbf{Y} + \nabla f(\mathbf{X}_i)) \mathbf{Z}_i}$ 
7:      $\mathbf{X}_{i+1} \leftarrow \mathbf{X}_i - \tau \mathbf{Z}$ 
8:      $\gamma \leftarrow \frac{\|\nabla f(\mathbf{X}_{i+1})\|_F^2}{\|\nabla f(\mathbf{X}_i)\|_F^2}$ 
9:      $\mathbf{Z}_{i+1} \leftarrow -\nabla f(\mathbf{X}_{i+1}) + \gamma \mathbf{Z}_i$ 
10:  end for
11:  return  $\mathbf{X}$ 
12: end function

```

C. Semi-Norm property of graph variation term

Here, we provide a short proof that the graph variation term $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}()$ is a semi-norm.

Proof: Let $\Delta\Delta^T = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{U}^T$ where \mathbf{U} is orthogonal and \mathbf{D} is diagonal. Note that the diagonal entries in \mathbf{D} are non-negative. We have

$$(\Delta\Delta^T)^i = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{D}^i\mathbf{U}^T$$

Now consider our trace term

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{X}, \bar{\alpha}) &= \text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{L}\mathbf{X}Z(\bar{\alpha})) \\ &= \text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{L}\mathbf{X} \sum_{i=0}^k \alpha_i \mathbf{U}\mathbf{D}^i\mathbf{U}^T) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^k \alpha_i \text{Tr}((\mathbf{X}\mathbf{U})^T \mathbf{L}(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{U})\mathbf{D}^i) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^k \alpha_i \text{Tr}((\mathbf{X}\mathbf{U}\mathbf{D}^{i/2})^T \mathbf{L}(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{U}\mathbf{D}^{i/2})) \end{aligned}$$

Note that is a non-negative combination of non-negative terms (since the entries in \mathbf{D}^i and α_i are non-negative), and hence is a semi-norm. This can also be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{X}, \bar{\alpha}) = \sum \alpha_i \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{U}\mathbf{D}^{i/2})$$

Thus the term $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{G}}()$ is a conic combination of semi-norms, and hence a semi-norm. In general, the trace of the product of two positive semidefinite matrices is non-negative (even though the product itself is not symmetric).

D. Synthetic data generation

The synthetic data generated for the experiments is as follows:

Algorithm Generate synthetic data for experiments

```

1: function GSD ( $N, \bar{\alpha}$ )
2:   Generate Erdős-Rényi graph  $\mathcal{G}$  with  $N$  nodes,  $p = 0.3$ 
3:   Find the eigen decomposition  $(U, \Sigma)$ :  $U\Sigma U^T = \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{G}}$ 
4:   Generate  $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma^\dagger)$ ,  $X \leftarrow UY$  as in [15]
5:    $Z(\bar{\alpha}) = \alpha_0 \mathbf{I} + \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i (\Delta\Delta^T)^i$  as in (1)
6:   return  $XZ^{\dagger 1/2}$ 
7: end function

```
