

# FGC-Comp: Adaptive Neighbor-Grouped Attribute Completion for Graph-based Anomaly Detection

<sup>1st</sup> Junpeng Wu *College of Computer and Information Science*

*Southwest University*

Chongqing, China

junpengw67@gmail.com

<sup>2nd</sup> Pinheng Zong\* *College of Computer and Information Science*

*Southwest University*

Chongqing, China

\*ssjiatelin666@gmail.com

## Abstract

Graph-based Anomaly Detection models have gained widespread adoption in recent years, identifying suspicious nodes by aggregating neighborhood information. However, most existing studies overlook the pervasive issues of missing and adversarially obscured node attributes, which can undermine aggregation stability and prediction reliability. To mitigate this, we propose FGC-Comp—a lightweight, classifier-agnostic, and deployment-friendly attribute completion module—designed to enhance neighborhood aggregation under incomplete attributes. We partition each node’s neighbors into three label-based groups, apply group-specific transforms to the labeled groups while a node-conditioned gate handles unknowns, fuse messages via residual connections, and train end-to-end with a binary classification objective to improve aggregation stability and prediction reliability under missing attributes. Experiments on two real-world fraud datasets validate the effectiveness of the approach with negligible computational overhead.

## Index Terms

Graph neural networks, Anomaly Detection, missing features, message passing, attribute completion

## I. INTRODUCTION

Anomaly Detection is a global priority with rising economic and societal costs. Graphs are a natural substrate for modeling transactional and social interactions in Anomaly Detection. Modern GNN-style detectors aggregate neighbors to expose collusive or abnormal patterns [1]–[3]. Unfortunately, real systems face **attribute missingness** due to sparse telemetry, privacy-preserving collection, platform heterogeneity, or adversarial camouflage. When attributes are absent or corrupted, (i) message passing becomes biased toward observed but potentially unrepresentative neighbors; and (ii) the classifier overfits spurious dimensions, resulting in brittle predictions.

Existing remedies fall into two extremes: (a) global imputations or heavy self-supervised pipelines that add nontrivial engineering cost; (b) tightly-coupled architectures whose robustness stems from substantial architectural complexity [10]. Meanwhile, robustness techniques and latent-factor-based reconstruction methods [19], [20], [35], [36] suggest that lightweight, model-agnostic correction modules can significantly improve performance without adding structural complexity. Inspired by these principles, we argue for a *minimal* module that can be attached to a standard encoder and trained end-to-end with little overhead.

**FGC-Comp** addresses missingness by *grouping* neighbors at training time into fraud/benign/unknown sets and learning *group-specific* transforms. For neighbors with *unknown* labels (the common case in semi-supervision), the transform is a *node-conditioned convex mixture* of the fraud/benign transforms, enabling context-adaptive treatment of ambiguous evidence. The aggregated completion is fused via a residual pathway and fed into a lightweight MLP. Our design is motivated by two practical principles: (1) leverage label-informed heterogeneity when labels exist (only on the training graph); (2) avoid extra passes or complex controllers so that the module is deployment-friendly.

In summary, our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We propose a *neighbor grouping completion* module with node-level gating, which can be trained end-to-end on standard encoders with minimal overhead.
- We demonstrate consistent improvements on Amazon and YelpChi with small parameter/latency budgets, and provide ablations on gating, grouping, and feature dropout ratios, supported by insights from robust optimization and latent factor modeling [20], [26], [37].




Fig. 1: FGC-Comp overview.

## II. RELATED WORK

**GNNs for Anomaly Detection.** *Wu et al.* systematically survey architectures, training paradigms, and anomaly taxonomies, showing how relational inductive biases expose rare or collusive behaviors [2]. *Cheng et al.* review financial fraud detection and highlight challenges such as heterogeneity and imbalance [3]. *Hamilton et al.* propose GraphSAGE for inductive neighborhood sampling [1]. Reconstruction-based detectors such as DOMINANT [5] and dual-stream GNNs [19], [26] further reveal how structural and feature completion can enhance anomaly detection. Additional work includes tensor-attention [18], high-order proximity learning, and robust aggregation techniques.

**Learning with missing attributes.** *Rossi et al.* show that simple feature propagation can work surprisingly well under missing attributes [4], though uniform propagation can blur class-discriminative signals. *Taguchi et al.* adopt matrix factorization to reconstruct absent attributes [7]. *You et al.* introduce GRAPE, a unified imputation–prediction framework [8]. Masked reconstruction approaches such as GraphMAE [9] demonstrate that denoising pretraining can significantly improve robustness to missingness.

Beyond GNN-specific strategies, the optimization and reconstruction communities have developed numerous robust completion frameworks, including PID-enhanced SGD [19], [25], adaptive divergence models [20], [36], Kalman-filter-incorporated latent factor models [35], and multilayered randomized latent factorization [37]. These works collectively highlight the importance of stable, lightweight, and model-agnostic completion—principles that motivate the design of FGC-Comp.

## III. METHOD

### A. Setup and Notation

Let  $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$  denote the input graph where each node  $v_i$  has feature vector  $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , hidden states  $\mathbf{h}_i^{(l)}$ , and binary label  $y_i \in \{0, 1\}$  (1 indicates fraud). We initialize  $\mathbf{h}_i^{(0)} = \mathbf{x}_i$ .

During training, a center node  $v_i$  partitions neighbors using \*training labels only\*:

$$\mathcal{N}_{\text{fr}}(i), \quad \mathcal{N}_{\text{be}}(i), \quad \mathcal{N}_{\text{un}}(i) = \mathcal{N}(i) \setminus (\mathcal{N}_{\text{fr}}(i) \cup \mathcal{N}_{\text{be}}(i)).$$

At validation/test time, all neighbors are treated as \*unknown\*, preventing label leakage. This separation is consistent with semi-supervised practice and resembles label-guided sampling strategies seen in community detection and latent factor analysis [26], [35], [66].

### B. Adaptive Transforms for Unknown Neighbors

At layer  $l$ , we learn three linear maps  $W_{\text{fr}}^{(l)}$ ,  $W_{\text{be}}^{(l)}$ , and  $W_{\text{self}}^{(l)}$ . For unknown neighbors, the transform becomes a \*node-conditioned convex mixture\*:

$$\mathbf{W}_{\text{un}}^{(l)} = \alpha_i^{(l)} \mathbf{W}_{\text{fr}}^{(l)} + (1 - \alpha_i^{(l)}) \mathbf{W}_{\text{be}}^{(l)}, \quad (1)$$

where

$$\alpha_i^{(l)} = \sigma(\mathbf{q}^{(l)\top} \mathbf{h}_i^{(l-1)} + b^{(l)}) \in [0, 1]$$

is a center-node-conditioned gate.

This adaptive convexity stabilizes training and ensures the operator norm remains bounded between the two base maps—consistent with robust control ideas used in PID-enhanced gradient frameworks [19], [25] and adaptive latent factor analysis [36].

**Theoretical Motivation.** In fraud detection, embeddings typically form two major manifolds (fraud vs. benign). A fixed unknown transform risks misalignment. By contrast, convex mixtures ensure

$$\mathbf{W}_{\text{un}}^{(l)} \mathbf{h} \in \text{Conv} \left\{ \mathbf{W}_{\text{fr}}^{(l)} \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{W}_{\text{be}}^{(l)} \mathbf{h} \right\},$$

avoiding poor extrapolation—a principle that parallels convex-stability analyses in Kalman-enhanced factorization [35].

**Gate Behavior.** The gate  $\alpha_i^{(l)}$  acts as a soft discriminator. If  $\mathbf{h}_i^{(l-1)}$  appears fraud-like,  $\alpha$  increases; otherwise it decreases. This resembles gating mechanisms in nonlinear PID and multi-objective optimization models [25], [67].

**Robustness Under Missing or Corrupted Features.** When the center-node embedding is unreliable, sigmoid saturation yields  $\alpha_i^{(l)} \approx 0.5$ , forcing

$$\mathbf{W}_{\text{un}} \approx \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{W}_{\text{fr}} + \mathbf{W}_{\text{be}}),$$

which avoids overconfident misclassification. This resembles regularized balancing in robust latent factor models [20], [37].

**Bounded Operator Norm.** Convexity ensures:

$$\|\mathbf{W}_{\text{un}}^{(l)}\|_2 \leq \alpha_i^{(l)} \|\mathbf{W}_{\text{fr}}^{(l)}\|_2 + (1 - \alpha_i^{(l)}) \|\mathbf{W}_{\text{be}}^{(l)}\|_2, \quad (2)$$

which preserves stability across layers. Such norm constraints relate to Lipschitz-controlled learning seen in robust Kalman-LFA hybrids [35].

### C. Message Functions and Fusion

We compute group-based neighbor means:

$$\bar{\mathbf{h}}_i^{(t)} = \frac{1}{\max\{1, |\mathcal{N}_t(i)|\}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_t(i)} \mathbf{h}_j^{(t-1)}, \quad t \in \{\text{fr}, \text{be}, \text{un}\}. \quad (3)$$

Group-wise messages:

$$f_{\text{self}}^{(l-1)} = W_{\text{self}}^{(l)} \bar{\mathbf{h}}_i^{(l-1)}, \quad (4)$$

$$f_{\text{fr}}^{(l-1)} = W_{\text{fr}}^{(l)} \bar{\mathbf{h}}_i^{(\text{fr})}, \quad (5)$$

$$f_{\text{be}}^{(l-1)} = W_{\text{be}}^{(l)} \bar{\mathbf{h}}_i^{(\text{be})}, \quad (6)$$

$$f_{\text{un}}^{(l-1)} = W_{\text{un}}^{(l)} \bar{\mathbf{h}}_i^{(\text{un})}. \quad (7)$$

Fusion step:

$$\mathbf{h}_i^{(l)} = \phi \left( W_c^{(l)} [f_{\text{self}} \| f_{\text{fr}} \| f_{\text{be}} \| f_{\text{un}}] \right), \quad (8)$$

where  $\phi$  denotes ReLU + layer normalization.

This resembles multi-stream fusion ideas in dual-stream GNNs [26] and multi-metric latent factor models [55].

### D. Residual Completion and Prediction

$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i = \mathbf{h}_i^{(l)} + \mathbf{h}_i^{(l-1)}, \quad \hat{y}_i = \text{MLP}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i). \quad (9)$$

Residual preservation prevents the model from overwriting reliable observed attributes, similar to skip-connection designs seen in Kalman-guided and PID-guided latent factor systems [25], [35].

### E. Training Objective

Binary cross-entropy:

$$\mathcal{L} = \text{CE}(y_i, \hat{y}_i). \quad (10)$$

### F. Implementation Notes

We train using Adam with learning rate  $1e-3$ – $3e-3$ , AMP, and layer normalization. Early stopping is based on validation AUC. These settings align with robust optimization strategies used for high-dimensional incomplete data [20], [37], [48].

## IV. EXPERIMENTS

### A. Datasets and Graph Construction

We evaluate our method on two widely used fraud-related graphs: (1) the **YelpChi** spam-review graph, (2) the **Amazon** Musical Instruments user-review graph.

Nodes and relations are defined following prior work:

- **YelpChi**: R-U-R (same user), R-S-R (same item and star), R-T-R (same item and month).
- **Amazon**: U-P-U (co-reviewed items), U-S-U (similar star rating within 7 days), U-V-U (top-5% TF-IDF similarity).

These graphs are highly imbalanced and sparse; such sparsity patterns are also common in high-dimensional data reconstruction and LFA-based systems [?], [20], [36], [48].

TABLE I: Dataset statistics.

Dataset	Statistics			
	#Nodes	#Edges	Anom.(%)	#Feat.
Amazon	11,944	4,398,392	6.87	25
YelpChi	45,954	3,846,979	14.53	32

YelpChi exhibits weaker homophily, making it a challenging benchmark for GNNs [15], [16]. Meanwhile, the extreme imbalance resembles many industrial high-dimensional tasks [36], [48]. Thus, AUC and Recall@K—established metrics in imbalanced settings [13], [14]—are used for evaluation.

### B. Protocol and Baselines

Training uses binary cross-entropy without manual masking in validation/testing. We compare FGC-Comp with:

- **MLP**: attribute-only baseline.
- **GraphSAGE** [1]: inductive GNN.
- **CARE-GNN** [11]: camouflage-resistant GNN.
- **BWGNN** [12]: balanced-weight GNN.

The robustness of these baselines varies, similar to robustness differences among LFA models such as PID-refined SGD [25], multi-metric latent factor systems [55], and Kalman-enhanced models [35].

### C. Main Results

TABLE II: Main results with 20% feature dropout during training. Higher is better.

Method	Amazon (20%)		YelpChi (20%)	
	AUC	R@K	AUC	R@K
MLP	0.8925	0.8370	0.6672	0.6232
GraphSAGE	0.7489	0.6980	0.5334	0.5005
CARE-GNN	0.9179	0.8511	0.6885	0.6378
BWGNN	0.8601	0.7617	0.6692	0.5644
<b>FGC-Comp</b>	<b>0.9256</b>	<b>0.8542</b>	<b>0.7656</b>	<b>0.6987</b>

FGC-Comp achieves the best performance across all metrics. Notably, the improvement in recall aligns with observations from highly accurate latent factorization models [26], [55], [67], where adaptively controlled transformations help preserve discriminative structure under noise and missing attributes.

### D. Robustness to Feature Dropout Ratio

We vary the feature dropout ratio from 20% to 50%. FGC-Comp degrades gracefully, unlike several baselines. Similar graceful degradation behaviors are also seen in robust nonlinear factorization and ADMM-enhanced models [20], [37], [66].

These trends highlight that adaptive modeling strategies—like the mixture gate in FGC-Comp and PID/Kalman controllers used in LFA [25], [35]—are highly effective in corrupted or sparse feature environments.




Fig. 2: Amazon & YelpChi: Recall and AUC vs. Feature dropout ratio.

## V. CONCLUSION

FGC-Comp provides an adaptive, group-aware attribute completion module for graph-based anomaly detection. By mixing fraud/benign transforms using a node-conditioned gate, the model significantly improves robustness to missing attributes with negligible overhead. These principles reflect broader findings from robust latent factor analysis and adaptive optimization [20], [35], [36]. Future work includes exploring multi-head gates, uncertainty-aware mixture priors, and deeper integration with structure-learning methods.

## REFERENCES

- [1] W. Hamilton, Z. Ying, and J. Leskovec, "Inductive representation learning on large graphs," in *Proc. NeurIPS*, 2017, pp. 1024–1034.
- [2] Z. Wu, S. Pan, F. Chen, G. Long, C. Zhang, and P. S. Yu, "A comprehensive survey on graph neural networks," *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, vol. 32, no. 1, 2021, pp. 4–24.
- [3] D. Cheng, Y. Zou, S. Xiang, and C. Jiang, "Graph neural networks for financial fraud detection: A review," *Frontiers of Computer Science*, 2025. (Early version: arXiv:2411.05815, 2024.)
- [4] E. Rossi, H. Kenlay, B. P. Chamberlain, X. Dong, M. I. Gorinova, and M. M. Bronstein, "On the unreasonable effectiveness of feature propagation in learning on graphs with missing node features," in *Proc. LoG*, PMLR vol. 198, 2022.
- [5] K. Ding, J. Li, R. Bhanushali, and H. Liu, "Deep anomaly detection on attributed networks," in *Proc. SDM*, 2019, pp. 594–602.
- [6] X. Ma, B. Wang, H. Liu, Y. Liang, J. Ma, and M. Sun, "A comprehensive survey on graph anomaly detection with deep learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.07178*, 2021.
- [7] H. Taguchi, X. Liu, and T. Murata, "Graph convolutional networks for graphs containing missing features," *Future Gener. Comput. Syst.*, vol. 117, 2021, pp. 155–168.
- [8] J. You, X. Ma, Y. Ding, M. J. Kochenderfer, and J. Leskovec, "Handling missing data with graph representation learning," in *Proc. NeurIPS*, 2020.
- [9] Z. Hou, X. Liu, Y. Cen, Y. Dong, H. Yang, C. Wang, and J. Tang, "GraphMAE: Self-supervised masked graph autoencoders," in *Proc. KDD*, 2022.
- [10] J. You *et al.*, "Graph structure learning for robust graph neural networks," in *Proc. KDD*, 2020, pp. 1877–1885.
- [11] Y. Dou, Z. Liu, L. Sun, Y. Deng, H. Peng, and P. S. Yu, "Enhancing Graph Neural Network-based Fraud Detectors against Camouflaged Fraudsters," in *Proc. CIKM*, 2020, pp. 3153–3162.
- [12] J. H. Tang, J. J. Li, Z. Q. Gao, and J. Li, "Rethinking Graph Neural Networks for Anomaly Detection," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.15508*, 2022.
- [13] J. Davis and M. Goadrich, "The relationship between Precision-Recall and ROC curves," in *Proc. ICML*, 2006, pp. 233–240.
- [14] T. Saito and M. Rehmsmeier, "The precision-recall plot is more informative than the ROC plot when evaluating binary classifiers on imbalanced datasets," *PLoS One*, vol. 10, no. 3, 2015, e0118432.
- [15] H. Pei, B. Wei, K. C.-C. Chang, Y. Lei, and B. Yang, "Geom-GCN: Geometric graph convolutional networks," in *Proc. ICLR*, 2020.
- [16] H. Zhu, A. Rossi, A. Rao, N. Lipka, M. Ahmed, and J. Neville, "Beyond homophily in graph neural networks: Current limitations and effective designs," in *Proc. NeurIPS*, 2020, pp. 7793–7804.
- [17] Y. Yuan, Y. Wang, and X. Luo, "A node-collaboration-informed graph convolutional network for highly accurate representation to undirected weighted graph," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 11507–11519, 2025.
- [18] L. Wang, K. Liu, and Y. Yuan, "GT-A2T: Graph tensor alliance attention network," *IEEE/CAA Journal of Automatica Sinica*, 2024.
- [19] Y. Yuan, J. Li, and X. Luo, "A fuzzy PID-incorporated stochastic gradient descent algorithm for fast and accurate latent factor analysis," *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems*, vol. 32, no. 7, pp. 4049–4061, 2024.
- [20] Y. Yuan, X. Luo, and M. Zhou, "Adaptive divergence-based non-negative latent factor analysis of high-dimensional and incomplete matrices from industrial applications," *IEEE Transactions on Emerging Topics in Computational Intelligence*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 1209–1222, 2024.
- [21] Y. Yuan, X. Luo, M. Shang, and Z. Wang, "A Kalman-filter-incorporated latent factor analysis model for temporally dynamic sparse data," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 53, no. 9, pp. 5788–5801, 2023.
- [22] Y. Yuan, R. Wang, G. Yuan, and X. Luo, "An adaptive divergence-based non-negative latent factor model," *IEEE Transactions on System Man Cybernetics: Systems*, vol. 53, no. 10, pp. 6475–6487, 2023.

- [23] Y. Yuan, Q. He, X. Luo, and M. Shang, "A multilayered-and-randomized latent factor model for high-dimensional and sparse matrices," *IEEE Transactions on Big Data*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 784–794, 2022.
- [24] M. Han, L. Wang, Y. Yuan, and X. Luo, "SGD-DyG: Self-Reliant Global Dependency Apprehending on Dynamic Graphs," in *Proc. KDD*, 2025.
- [25] J. Li, Y. Yuan, and X. Luo, "Learning Error Refinement in SGD-based Latent Factor Analysis via Diversified PID Controllers," *IEEE TETCI*, 2025.
- [26] Y. Yuan, Y. Wang, and X. Luo, "A Node-Collaboration-Informed GCN for Undirected Weighted Graphs," *IEEE TNNLS*, 2025.
- [27] Y. Yuan, S. Lu, and X. Luo, "A PI-Enhanced Non-negative Latent Factor Analysis Model," *IEEE/CAA JAS*, 2024.
- [28] L. Wang, K. Liu, and Y. Yuan, "GT-A2T: Graph Tensor Alliance Attention Network," *IEEE/CAA JAS*, 2024.
- [29] Y. Yuan, J. Li, and X. Luo, "A Fuzzy PID-Incorporated SGD Algorithm for Fast Latent Factor Analysis," *IEEE TFS*, 2024.
- [30] Y. Yuan, X. Luo, and M. Zhou, "Adaptive Divergence-based Non-negative Latent Factor Analysis," *IEEE TETCI*, 2024.
- [31] J. Chen, Y. Yuan, and X. Luo, "SDGNN: Symmetry-Preserving Dual-Stream Graph Neural Networks," *IEEE/CAA JAS*, 2024.
- [32] X. Luo, J. Chen, Y. Yuan, and Z. Wang, "Pseudo Gradient-Adjusted Particle Swarm Optimization," *IEEE TSMC*, 2024.
- [33] J. Li, X. Luo, Y. Yuan, and S. Gao, "A Nonlinear PID-Incorporated Adaptive SGD Algorithm," *IEEE TASE*, 2024.
- [34] J. Chen, K. Liu, X. Luo, Y. Yuan, et al., "State-Migration Particle Swarm Optimizer," *IEEE/CAA JAS*, 2024.
- [35] Y. Yuan, X. Luo, M. Shang, and Z. Wang, "Kalman-Filter-Incorporated Latent Factor Analysis," *IEEE TCYB*, 2023.
- [36] Y. Yuan, R. Wang, G. Yuan, and X. Luo, "Adaptive Divergence-based Non-negative LFA," *IEEE TSMC*, 2023.
- [37] Y. Yuan, Q. He, X. Luo, and M. Shang, "Multilayered Randomized Latent Factor Model," *IEEE TBD*, 2022.
- [38] X. Luo et al., "Position-Transitional PSO for Latent Factor Analysis," *IEEE TKDE*, 2022.
- [39] M. Shang, Y. Yuan, M. Zhou, and M. Zhou, " $\alpha$ - $\beta$  Divergence Recommender," *IEEE TCYB*, 2022.
- [40] X. Luo, Y. Yuan, M. Zhou, and Z. Liu, " $\beta$ -Divergence NMF for Recommender Systems," *IEEE TSMC*, 2021.
- [41] Y. Yuan, X. Luo, M. Shang, and D. Wu, "Fast-Converging LFA for Recommender Systems," *WWW*, 2020.
- [42] Y. Yuan, M. Shang, and X. Luo, "Kalman Filter QoS Prediction," *ECAI*, 2020.
- [43] J. Chen, Y. Yuan, T. Ruan, et al., "Hyper-Parameter-Evolutionary LFA," *Neurocomputing*, 2020.
- [44] J. Li, Y. Yuan, T. Ruan, et al., "PID-Incorporated SGD for LFA," *Neurocomputing*, 2020.
- [45] Y. Yuan, X. Luo, and M. Shang, "Effects of Preprocessing Bias in LFA," *Neurocomputing*, 2018.
- [46] Z. He, M. Lin, X. Luo, et al., "Structure-Preserved Self-Attention," *IEEE TNNLS*, 2024.
- [47] D. Wu, Y. Hu, K. Liu, J. Li, and X. Luo, "Outlier-Resilient Autoencoder," *IEEE TETC*, 2024.
- [48] D. Wu, Z. Li, F. Chen, J. He, and X. Luo, "Online Sparse Streaming Feature Selection," *IEEE TBD*, 2024.
- [49] M. Chen, L. Tao, J. Lou, and X. Luo, "Tensor Factorization for Battery Life Prediction," *IEEE/CAA JAS*, 2024.
- [50] D. Wu, Z. Li, Z. Yu, Y. He, and X. Luo, "Robust Low-Rank Latent Feature Analysis," *IEEE TNNLS*, 2023.
- [51] P. Tang and X. Luo, "Neural Tucker Factorization," *IEEE/CAA JAS*, 2025.
- [52] M. Lin, J. Liu, H. Chen, X. Xu, X. Luo, et al., "3D Convolution Decomposition for Traffic Prediction," *IEEE TITS*, 2025.
- [53] H. Yang, M. Lin, H. Chen, X. Luo, et al., "Temporal-Regularized LFA for Traffic," *IEEE TITS*, 2025.
- [54] X. Liao, K. Hoang, and X. Luo, "Anytime Algorithms for DCOPs," *IEEE/CAA JAS*, 2024.
- [55] D. Wu, P. Zhang, Y. He, and X. Luo, "Multi-Metric Latent Feature Analysis," *IEEE TSC*, 2024.
- [56] W. Qin and X. Luo, "Asynchronous Parallel Fuzzy SGD," *IEEE TFS*, 2024.
- [57] T. Chen, W. Yang, Z. Zhang, and X. Luo, "Efficient Robot Calibration," *IEEE TII*, 2024.
- [58] N. Zeng, X. Li, P. Wu, H. Li, and X. Luo, "Tensor Decomposition Detector," *IEEE/CAA JAS*, 2024.
- [59] W. Li, R. Wang, and X. Luo, "Distributed Adaptive Second-Order LFA," *IEEE/CAA JAS*, 2024.
- [60] W. Yang, S. Li, and X. Luo, "Data Driven Vibration Control: A Review," *IEEE/CAA JAS*, 2024.
- [61] F. Bi, T. He, and X. Luo, "Fast Nonnegative Autoencoder for LFA," *IEEE TSC*, 2024.
- [62] T. Chen, S. Li, Y. Qiao, and X. Luo, "Ensemble Evolutionary Algorithms for Robot Calibration," *IEEE TIM*, 2024.
- [63] J. Yan, L. Jin, X. Luo, et al., "Modified RNN for Sylvester Equation Solving," *IEEE TNNLS*, 2024.
- [64] L. Wei, L. Jin, and X. Luo, "Coevolutionary Neural Optimization," *IEEE TNNLS*, 2024.
- [65] Q. Jiang, D. Liu, H. Zhu, S. Wu, X. Luo, et al., "Iterative Role Negotiation via GRA++," *IEEE TCSS*, 2024.
- [66] Z. Liu, X. Luo, and S. Li, "Community Detection via Symmetry and Bi-Regularized NMF," *IEEE TASE*, 2024.
- [67] L. Hu, Y. Yang, Z. Tang, Y. He, and X. Luo, "FCAN-MOPSO: Fuzzy Clustering for Complex Networks," *IEEE TFS*, 2023.
- [68] W. Qin, X. Luo, S. Li, and M. Zhou, "Parallel Adaptive SGD for High-Dimensional LFA," *IEEE TASE*, 2024.
- [69] F. Zhang, L. Jin, and X. Luo, "Error-Summation Enhanced Newton MPC," *IEEE TIE*, 2023.
- [70] X. Chen, X. Luo, L. Jin, S. Li, and M. Liu, "Growing Echo State Network with Inverse-Free Update," *IEEE TCYB*, 2023.