

Graph Condensation for Continual Graph Learning

Ruihong Qiu

The University of Queensland

r.qiu@uq.edu.au





Contents

- Continual Graph Learning
- Related Work
- CaT
- PUMA



Contents

- Continual Graph Learning
- Related Work
- CaT
- PUMA



Continual Graph Learning (CGL)

- Traditional Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) are not good at **streaming** inputs.
- New nodes can appear dynamically





Class/Task Incremental Learning (IL)



• Class-IL is much harder than Task-IL



Catastrophic Forgetting (CF)

- CF is a general challenge in CGL
- Old knowledge covered by new ones.





Contents

- Continual Graph Learning
- Related Work
- CaT
- PUMA



Related Work

• Regularisation-based: TWP



• Architecture-based: HPNs





Related Work

• Replay-based





Related Work

- Replay-based: ER-GNN
 - Mean feature
 - Coverage Maximization
 - Influence Maximization

• SSM





Contents

- Continual Graph Learning
- Related Work
- CaT
- PUMA



CaT **Solution**: Balanced Continual Graph Learning with Graph Condensation

Yilun Liu, Ruihong Qiu, Zi Huang

The University of Queensland

yilun.liu@uq.edu.au



https://github.com/superallen13/CaT-CGL



Batch Training in Replay-based CGL

• Sample and combine





Challenges in Replay

• Large storage requirement



• Imbalanced training graph size







Condense and Train (CaT) Framework





Graph Condensation

- Smaller yet effective
- Model performance trained on condensed graph matches on original graph
- Bi-level optimisation problem

$$\min_{\tilde{G}} \mathcal{L}(G; \tilde{\theta}), s. t. \tilde{\theta} = \underset{\theta}{\operatorname{argmin}} \mathcal{L}(\tilde{G}; \theta)$$





Condensed Graph Memory (CGM)

- Distribution matching method.
- Random GNN encoder to obtain latent features.
- Minimise **MMD** losses

$$\ell_{\text{MMD}} = \sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}_k} r_c \cdot ||\text{Mean}(\boldsymbol{E}_{k,c}) - \text{Mean}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{E}}_{k,c})||^2$$



Train in Memory (TiM)

- Condense incoming graph
- Balanced replayed graphs.

Algorithm 2: Overall procedure of CaTInput: A streaming of tasks $\{\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, ..., \mathcal{T}_K\}$ Output: GNN_K1 Initialise a CGL model GNN₀;2 Initialise an empty memory bank \mathcal{M}_0 ;3 for $k \leftarrow 1$ to K do4Extract incoming graph \mathcal{G}_k from \mathcal{T}_k ;5Obtain $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_k$ by CGM;6 $\mathcal{M}_k = \mathcal{M}_{k-1} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_k$;7Update GNN_{k-1} to GNN_k;8 end

Implementation

- Baselines
 - Joint: full-size.
 - ER-GNN: informative nodes.
 - SSM: subgraphs.
- Metrics
 - Average performance (AP): $\frac{1}{k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} m_{k,i}$
 - Backward transfer (BWT): $\frac{1}{k-1}\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} m_{k,i} - m_{i,i}$

- Experiment settings
 - Dataset splitting [CGLB, NeurIPS 2022]
 - Each task contains two classes.
 - Task incremental learning (task-IL)
 - Classification heads are growing.

Dataset	Nodes	Edges	Features	Classes	Tasks
CoraFull	19,793	130,622	8,710	70	35
Arxiv	169,343	1,166,243	128	40	20
Reddit	227,853	114,615,892	602	40	20
Products	2,449,028	61,859,036	100	46	23





Overall Results

Category	Methods	CoraFull		Arxiv		Reddit		Products	
		AP (%) ↑	BWT (%) \uparrow	AP (%) ↑	BWT (%) ↑	AP (%) ↑	BWT (%) \uparrow	AP (%) ↑	BWT (%) ↑
Lower bound	Finetuning	2.2±0.0	-96.6±0.1	5.0±0.0	-96.7±0.1	5.0±0.0	-99.6±0.0	4.3±0.0	-97.2±0.1
Regularisation	EWC	2.9±0.2	-96.1±0.3	5.0±0.0	-96.8±0.1	5.3±0.6	-99.2±0.7	7.6±1.1	-91.7±1.4
	MAS	2.2±0.0	-94.1±0.6	4.9±0.0	-95.0±0.7	10.7±1.4	-92.7±1.5	10.1±0.6	-89.0±0.5
	GEM	2.5±0.1	-96.6±0.1	5.0 ± 0.0	-96.8±0.1	5.3±0.5	-99.3±0.5	4.3±0.1	-96.8±0.1
	TWP	<u>21.2±3.2</u>	<u>-67.4±1.6</u>	4.3±1.1	-93.0±8.3	9.5±2.0	-35.5±5.5	6.8±3.5	-64.3±12.8
Distillation	LWF	2.2±0.0	-96.6±0.1	5.0±0.0	-96.8±0.1	5.0±0.0	-99.5±0.0	4.3±0.0	-96.8±0.2
Replay	ER-GNN	4.0±0.7	-94.3±0.9	30.8±0.6	-68.3±0.7	31.8±4.0	-71.2±4.2	39.5±1.3	-48.2±1.4
	SSM	16.2±2.8	-82.1±2.9	<u>35.1±1.8</u>	<u>-63.7±1.9</u>	<u>51.6±6.4</u>	<u>-50.3±6.7</u>	<u>62.7±0.5</u>	<u>-22.1±0.5</u>
Full dataset	Joint	85.3±0.1	-2.7±0.0	63.5±0.3	-15.7±0.4	98.2±0.0	-0.5±0.0	72.2±0.4	-5.3±0.5
Ours	СаТ	64.5±1.4	-3.3±2.6	66.0±1.1	-13.1±1.0	97.6±0.1	-0.2±0.2	71.0±0.2	-4.8±0.4

- Replayed-based methods are overall better.
- CaT is the best, sometimes can match the ideal Joint scenario.



Effectiveness of CGM





- Use TiM for ER-GNN and SSM
- CGM is more effective than other memory banks



Visualisation of CGM





(c) Random Choice





(d) CGM

Good coverage of the original distribution



TiM for Catastrophic Forgetting



• TiM has a **balanced** learning to **solve CF**.



Conclusion

- 1. CGM: Graph condensation gives a small yet effective memory bank
- 2. TiM: A training scheme for balanced continual learning



https://github.com/superallen13/CaT-CGL



Contents

- Continual Graph Learning
- Related Work
- CaT
- PUMA



PUMA MR: Efficient Continual Graph Learning via Retraining with Pseudo-label Guided Graph Condensation

Yilun Liu, Ruihong Qiu, Yanran Tang, Zi Huang

The University of Queensland

yilun.liu@uq.edu.au



https://github.com/super allen13/PUMA



Problems of CaT

- 1. Unlabelled nodes in streaming graph data
- 2. Still imbalance historical knowledge







Problems of CaT

3. Slow condensation and training





PUMA Framework





Pseudo Labelling-Guided CGM

- An extra classifier for pseudo labels
- Select unlabelled nodes with a high confidence score
- Condense both labelled and confidently pseudo labelled nodes



Train from Scratch

- No more continual training, but retraining from scratch
- **Balanced** historical knowledge and incoming knowledge.



Fast Condensation and Training

- One-time propagation
- Wide graph encoders
- They are fast in calculation and not sacrificing performance. Details in paper



Overall Performance

Category	Methods	CoraFull		Arxiv		Reddit		Products	
		AP (%) ↑	BWT (%) ↑	AP (%) ↑	BWT (%) ↑	AP (%) ↑	BWT (%) ↑	AP (%) ↑	BWT (%) ↑
Lower bound	Finetuning	2.2±0.0	-96.6±0.1	5.0±0.0	-96.7±0.1	5.0±0.0	-99.6±0.0	4.3±0.0	-97.2±0.1
Regularisation	EWC	2.9±0.2	-96.1±0.3	5.0±0.0	-96.8±0.1	5.3±0.6	-99.2±0.7	7.6±1.1	-91.7±1.4
	MAS	2.2±0.0	-94.1±0.6	4.9±0.0	-95.0±0.7	10.7±1.4	-92.7±1.5	10.1±0.6	-89.0±0.5
	GEM	2.5±0.1	-96.6±0.1	5.0±0.0	-96.8±0.1	5.3±0.5	-99.3±0.5	4.3±0.1	-96.8±0.1
	TWP	21.2±3.2	-67.4±1.6	4.3±1.1	-93.0±8.3	9.5±2.0	-35.5±5.5	6.8±3.5	-64.3±12.8
Distillation	LWF	2.2±0.0	-96.6±0.1	5.0±0.0	-96.8±0.1	5.0±0.0	-99.5±0.0	4.3±0.0	-96.8±0.2
Replay	ER-GNN	3.1±0.2	-94.6±0.2	23.2±0.5	-77.1±0.5	20.0±3.0	-83.7±3.1	34.0±1.0	-55.7±0.8
	SSM	3.5±0.5	-94.7±0.5	26.4±0.8	-73.7±0.9	41.8±3.2	-60.8±3.4	58.1±0.4	-29.3±0.5
Full dataset	Joint	85.3±0.1	-2.7±0.0	63.5±0.3	-15.7±0.4	98.2±0.0	-0.5±0.0	72.2±0.4	-5.3±0.5
Condensation	CaT (ours) PUMA (ours)	<u>68.5±0.9</u> 77.9±0.2	<u>-5.7±1.3</u> - 4.2±0.9	<u>64.9±0.3</u> 67.0±0.1	<u>-12.5±0.8</u> - 12.2±0.3	<u>97.7±0.1</u> 98.0±0.1	<u>-0.4±0.1</u> -0.3±0.1	<u>71.1±0.3</u> 74.2±0.4	<u>-5.4±0.3</u> -4.1±0.5



Effectiveness of Retraining



Converge higher



Time Efficiency



• PUMA is fast and performs well



Conclusion

- 1. Unlabelled nodes help with condensation
- 2. Retraining improve the performance
- 3. Careful designs to accelerate



Q&A

Ruihong Qiu

The University of Queensland r.qiu@uq.edu.au

CRICOS 00025B • TEQSA PRV12080