

SEA: Spectral Edge Attacks on Graph Neural Networks

Yongyu Wang

Abstract. Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) achieve strong performance on graph-structured data, but are notoriously vulnerable to small, carefully crafted perturbations of the graph structure. Most existing structure-based attacks rely on gradient-based heuristics or local connectivity patterns, and treat edges as equally important candidates for manipulation. In this paper, we propose Spectral Edge Attacks (SEA), a new family of adversarial attacks that explicitly leverage spectral robustness evaluation to guide structural perturbations. Our key idea is to compute a spectral embedding that captures the most fragile directions of the input manifold and to use it to assign a robustness score to each edge or non-edge. Based on these scores, we introduce two complementary attack variants: (i) a Spade-guided deletion attack that removes the most spectrally robust edges, and (ii) a Spade-guided addition attack that inserts edges between nodes that are maximally incompatible in the fragile spectral space. Both attacks operate at the graph level, are model-aware but conceptually simple, and can be plugged into existing GNN architectures without requiring gradients. We describe the spectral formulation, the attack algorithms, and experiments on benchmarks.

1 Introduction

Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) have become the de facto standard for learning on graph-structured data, with successful applications in citation networks, recommendation, and many other domains [1–4].

By iteratively aggregating information from neighbors, GNNs jointly exploit node features and the relational structure encoded in the graph topology. However, this reliance on message passing also induces a critical weakness: small perturbations to the graph structure, such as adding or removing a few edges, can be propagated and amplified across multiple layers, making GNNs highly vulnerable to structural adversarial attacks. Adversarial robustness of deep neural networks has been extensively studied in the Euclidean setting [5, 6], and a growing line of work has extended these ideas to graph-structured data via structure-based attacks on GNNs [7–9]. A complementary line of work develops detection- or defense-oriented strategies against adversarial examples [10–14], but most of these methods focus on Euclidean data rather than graph-structured inputs.

A growing body of work has therefore focused on designing attacks that manipulate the graph structure to mislead GNNs. Most existing structural

Correspondence to: yongyuw@mtu.edu

attacks fall into one of two categories: gradient-based methods that approximate the effect of edge flips on the loss, and heuristic methods that rely on local connectivity patterns, degree statistics, or influence scores. While effective, these approaches treat edges as largely interchangeable candidates for perturbation and rarely exploit a global view of how edges interact with the intrinsic geometry of the data manifold.

In parallel, recent work on *spectral robustness* has proposed to analyze models by relating the manifolds of the input space and the learned representation space through spectral operators. In particular, SPADE [24] constructs a generalized eigenvalue problem between input and output Laplacians and uses the resulting spectral embedding to quantify the adversarial robustness of individual samples. This spectral perspective provides a principled way to identify directions along which the manifold is fragile.

This work. Building on this line of thought, we ask: *Can spectral robustness evaluation be used not only for analysis and pruning, but also to design targeted, structure-aware attacks on GNNs?* To answer this question, we propose **Spectral Edge Attacks** (SEA), a new family of adversarial edge perturbations guided by spectral edge robustness.

Our approach proceeds in three steps. First, we adopt a spectral robustness framework that aligns the Laplacians of the input graph and a k -NN graph in the latent space and extracts a low-dimensional spectral embedding that captures the most fragile eigen-directions. Second, we use this embedding to define a *Spade score* for each edge, which measures how far its endpoints are separated along the fragile directions. Third, we exploit these scores in two complementary ways:

- A *deletion attack* that removes edges with the *lowest* Spade scores, i.e., edges that are most spectrally consistent and beneficial for the classifier.
- An *addition attack* that inserts edges between non-neighbor node pairs that are maximally distant in the fragile spectral space, thereby forcing information flow along misaligned directions.

Both variants are model-aware but gradient-free, and can be applied to any trained GNN as long as we can compute the relevant Laplacians and spectral embeddings. Conceptually, they provide the “attack side” counterpart to spectral pruning: where pruning removes spectrally unstable edges to improve robustness, SEA removes spectrally stable edges or adds spectrally incompatible edges to maximally degrade performance.

In the rest of this paper, we formalize the spectral robustness framework underlying SEA (Section 2), introduce the two attack variants (Section 3), discuss computational aspects and threat model (Section 4), and outline an experimental protocol on citation networks (Section 5). We conclude with a discussion of limitations and potential extensions (Section 6).

2 Preliminaries

Graph and GNN setup. We consider an undirected, unweighted graph $G_X = (V, E_X)$ with node set V and edge set $E_X \subseteq V \times V$. Let $n = |V|$ be the number of nodes. Each node $p \in V$ is associated with a feature vector $x_p \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and we collect all features into a matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$. We denote by $A_X \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$ the adjacency matrix of G_X , and by D_X the diagonal degree matrix with entries $(D_X)_{pp} = \sum_q (A_X)_{pq}$.

We consider a standard message-passing GNN such as GCN, which computes node representations

$$H^{(1)} = \sigma(\hat{A}_X X W^{(0)}), \quad Z = \hat{A}_X H^{(1)} W^{(1)},$$

where \hat{A}_X is the symmetrically normalized adjacency with self-loops, $W^{(0)}, W^{(1)}$ are trainable weights, and $\sigma(\cdot)$ is an element-wise nonlinearity. The final representation $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times c}$ is fed into a softmax classifier for node classification over c classes.

Laplacians and spectral robustness. Our construction is grounded in classical spectral graph theory [15, 16] and matrix analysis [17], and follows the spectral robustness formulation of SPADE [24].

Let L_X denote the (combinatorial or normalized) Laplacian of the input graph G_X . Given a trained GNN, we obtain a latent representation $H \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d'}$ from an intermediate layer (typically the penultimate hidden layer). To capture the manifold structure in this latent space, we construct a k -nearest neighbor (k -NN) graph $G_Y = (V, E_Y)$ based on pairwise distances between rows of H , and let L_Y denote its Laplacian.

Following the spectral robustness framework of [24], we consider the generalized eigenvalue problem associated with the operator $L_Y^+ L_X$, where L_Y^+ is the Moore–Penrose pseudoinverse of L_Y . Let $\zeta_1 \geq \zeta_2 \geq \dots \geq \zeta_s$ be the largest s generalized eigenvalues and v_1, \dots, v_s the corresponding eigenvectors. We then form the weighted eigenspace matrix

$$V_s = [v_1 \sqrt{\zeta_1}, v_2 \sqrt{\zeta_2}, \dots, v_s \sqrt{\zeta_s}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times s}. \quad (1)$$

The p -th row of V_s defines an s -dimensional spectral embedding for node p , which emphasizes the directions along which the input manifold encoded by L_X is most fragile with respect to the latent manifold encoded by L_Y .

Spectral edge robustness (Spade score). Given V_s , we can lift this spectral view from nodes to edges. For any existing directed edge $(p, q) \in E_X$, let $e_{p,q} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denote its incidence vector, with a single non-zero entry at positions p and q (the exact sign convention is immaterial for our purposes). The spectral robustness of edge (p, q) is defined as

$$\text{Spade}(p, q) = \|V_s^\top e_{p,q}\|_2^2 = \|V_s[p, :] - V_s[q, :]\|_2^2. \quad (2)$$

Intuitively, edges with *large* Spade scores connect nodes that differ significantly along the fragile spectral directions, and are therefore more likely to amplify perturbations; these edges are deemed *non-robust*. Conversely, edges with *small* Spade scores connect nodes that are spectrally consistent, and are expected to support the underlying manifold and the classifier.

Previous work has used these scores to prune non-robust edges for defense. In this paper, we instead *invert* this perspective to design spectral attacks.

3 Spectral Edge Attacks

We now introduce *Spectral Edge Attacks* (SEA), a family of adversarial structural perturbations guided by the Spade scores and the spectral embedding V_s . We assume a white-box adversary who has access to the trained GNN, the input graph, and the spectral quantities L_X, L_Y, V_s . Given a budget B on the number of undirected edge modifications, the goal is to select a set of edges to delete or add so as to maximally degrade the classification performance of the fixed GNN.

We consider two complementary variants: a *Spade-guided deletion attack*, which removes the most robust edges, and a *Spade-guided addition attack*, which inserts the most spectrally destabilizing edges.

3.1 Spade-Guided Edge Deletion Attack

Let $E_X^\uparrow = \{\{p, q\} : (p, q) \in E_X, p < q\}$ be the set of undirected edges in the original graph. We extend the Spade score in (2) to undirected edges by setting $\text{Spade}(\{p, q\}) = \text{Spade}(p, q)$ for any orientation.

Our first attack variant focuses on deleting edges that are most beneficial for the classifier. Spectrally, such edges are characterized by low Spade scores: their endpoints are close in the fragile spectral space, suggesting that they lie on the same local region of the manifold and that information propagation along these edges is stable. Removing them degrades the connectivity of the manifold and weakens the evidence supporting correct predictions.

Formally, we define the deletion score for each existing undirected edge as

$$S_{\text{del}}(\{p, q\}) = \text{Spade}(\{p, q\}). \quad (3)$$

Given a budget B , the Spade-guided deletion attack sorts all edges in ascending order of S_{del} and removes the top- B edges with the smallest scores. Let π_{del} be a permutation such that

$$S_{\text{del}}(\{p_{\pi_{\text{del}}(1)}, q_{\pi_{\text{del}}(1)}\}) \leq S_{\text{del}}(\{p_{\pi_{\text{del}}(2)}, q_{\pi_{\text{del}}(2)}\}) \leq \dots$$

Then the attack edge set is

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{attack}}^{\text{del}} = \{\{p_{\pi_{\text{del}}(1)}, q_{\pi_{\text{del}}(1)}\}, \dots, \{p_{\pi_{\text{del}}(B)}, q_{\pi_{\text{del}}(B)}\}\}, \quad (4)$$

and the attacked graph is

$$\tilde{G}^{\text{del}} = (V, E_X \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\text{attack}}^{\text{del}}). \quad (5)$$

This deletion attack can be seen as the spectral dual of non-robust edge pruning: while pruning removes edges with large Spade scores to improve robustness, the deletion attack removes edges with small Spade scores to maximally disrupt the stable backbone of the manifold.

3.2 Spade-Guided Edge Addition Attack

Our second attack variant aims to *insert* edges between nodes whose spectral embeddings are most incompatible. Instead of modifying existing edges, the attacker considers candidate non-edges and uses the distance in the fragile spectral space to drive edge insertion.

Let $\bar{E}_X = \{\{p, q\} : p \neq q, \{p, q\} \notin E_X\}$ denote the set of undirected non-edges. For each $\{p, q\} \in \bar{E}_X$, we define a spectral incompatibility score

$$S_{\text{add}}(\{p, q\}) = \|V_s[p, :] - V_s[q, :]\|_2^2. \quad (6)$$

Intuitively, large values of S_{add} indicate that the two nodes are far apart along the most fragile spectral directions. Adding an edge between such nodes forces the GNN to propagate messages along a path that conflicts with the underlying manifold, potentially distorting the representations and the decision boundary.

To further tailor the attack to the classifier, we also impose semantic constraints on candidate pairs. Let y_p be the true label and \hat{y}_p the predicted label of node p . Let \mathcal{T} be a set of target nodes, typically the subset of test nodes that are correctly classified, i.e., $\mathcal{T} = \{p \in V_{\text{test}} : \hat{y}_p = y_p\}$. We restrict candidate non-edges to those that satisfy

$$p \in \mathcal{T}, \quad y_p \neq y_q, \quad \{p, q\} \in \bar{E}_X, \quad (7)$$

so that adversarial edges connect nodes from different classes and only attack nodes that the model currently handles correctly.

The Spade-guided addition attack then proceeds in two stages:

1. For each target node $p \in \mathcal{T}$, we enumerate or sample a subset of candidate neighbors q that satisfy the above constraints, compute $S_{\text{add}}(\{p, q\})$, and retain the top-scoring candidate for each p .
2. We pool all these candidate edges into a global list, sort them in descending order of S_{add} , and select the top- B pairs as adversarial edges:

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{attack}}^{\text{add}} = \arg \max_{\mathcal{E} \subseteq \bar{E}_X, |\mathcal{E}|=B} \sum_{\{p, q\} \in \mathcal{E}} S_{\text{add}}(\{p, q\}). \quad (8)$$

The attacked graph is obtained by inserting these edges:

$$\tilde{G}^{\text{add}} = (V, E_X \cup \mathcal{E}_{\text{attack}}^{\text{add}}). \quad (9)$$

In practice, to avoid quadratic enumeration over all non-edges, we can approximate the candidate set by using a k' -nearest neighbor search in the spectral space V_s , but selecting the *farthest* neighbors among those with different labels. This yields an efficient and scalable approximation of the ideal Spade-guided addition attack.

4 Complexity and Threat Model

Computational considerations. The main computational cost of Spectral Edge Attacks lies in the spectral robustness evaluation. Constructing the latent k -NN graph and computing the generalized eigenpairs of $L_Y^+ L_X$ are shared with our pruning framework and are performed once per graph. To approximate the latent manifold efficiently, we build a k -NN graph in the embedding space, which can be implemented either exactly or via scalable approximate nearest neighbor search [25].

Given V_s , computing Spade scores for all existing edges is $O(|E_X|s)$, and sorting them for deletion is $O(|E_X| \log |E_X|)$.

For the addition attack, directly evaluating S_{add} on all non-edges is prohibitive on large graphs. However, we only need to consider non-edges incident to target nodes \mathcal{T} and can further restrict ourselves to a small candidate set per node by using approximate nearest neighbor search in the spectral space. Under this design, the marginal cost of SEA on top of spectral robustness evaluation is modest.

Threat model. SEA assumes a white-box adversary with access to the trained GNN and the spectral quantities L_X, L_Y, V_s . The attacker can modify up to B undirected edges in the graph but cannot change node features or labels. The model parameters are fixed during the attack evaluation; retraining or adaptive defenses are left for future work.

We emphasize that SEA does not rely on gradients of the loss with respect to edges and is therefore applicable even when gradients are unavailable or unreliable (e.g., due to discrete operations, non-differentiable components, or gradient obfuscation).

5 Experiments

In this section, we empirically evaluate Spectral Edge Attacks (SEA) on a standard citation benchmark. We focus on the transductive node classification setting and study how SEA degrades the performance of a fixed GNN under different structural perturbation budgets.

5.1 Experimental Setup

Dataset. We conduct experiments on the CITESEER citation network. The graph contains 3,327 nodes, 9,104 directed edges (4,552 undirected edges), 3,703-dimensional bag-of-words node features, and 6 classes. We follow the standard Planetoid split for training/validation/test.

Backbone model. As the victim model, we use a 2-layer GCN with 64 hidden units, ReLU activations, dropout, and ℓ_2 regularization. The model is trained with Adam for 200 epochs using the default Planetoid split. On the clean graph, the best test accuracy reached by early stopping is

$$\text{Acc}_{\text{clean}} = 70.0\%.$$

Spectral embedding. To construct the spectral quantities used by SEA, we first obtain the hidden node representations from the first GCN layer and build a 20-nearest-neighbor graph in the latent space using cosine distance. We then compute the normalized Laplacians L_X of the original input graph and L_Y of the latent k -NN graph, form the generalized operator $L_Y^+ L_X$ using the pseudoinverse of L_Y , and extract the top $s = 16$ eigenpairs. The weighted eigenspace matrix $V_s \in \mathbb{R}^{3327 \times 16}$ is used to define Spade scores for edges and non-edges as described in Section 3.

Threat model and budgets. We adopt a white-box, test-time attack setting: the GCN parameters are frozen, and only the graph structure is perturbed. We consider two types of structural modifications: (i) edge deletions and (ii) edge additions. The modification budget is expressed as a fraction ρ of the number of undirected edges in the original graph (4,552 edges), with

$$\rho \in \{5\%, 10\%, 15\%, 20\%, 25\%, 30\%\}.$$

For deletions, we compare SEA-Del against random deletion under the same budget. For additions, we evaluate SEA-Add as defined in Section 3; budgets larger than 15% saturate due to the limited number of high-scoring candidate pairs.

5.2 Spade-Guided Edge Deletion (SEA-Del)

We first examine the Spade-guided deletion attack (SEA-Del), which removes edges with the *lowest* Spade scores. Intuitively, these are the most spectrally robust edges, and thus the ones that best support the underlying manifold and the classifier. We compare SEA-Del with a random deletion baseline that removes the same number of undirected edges chosen uniformly at random.

Table 1 shows the test accuracy under different deletion budgets. On the clean graph, the GCN achieves 70.0% test accuracy. Under a 5% deletion budget, SEA-Del reduces accuracy to 66.9% (−3.1 points), whereas random deletion only reduces it to 67.9% (−2.1 points). As the budget increases, the gap persists or widens: at 30% deleted edges, SEA-Del drives accuracy down to 65.5% (−4.5 points), while random deletion still retains 67.1% (−2.9 points).

Overall, SEA-Del consistently causes a larger accuracy drop than random deletion at every budget. This indicates that Spade scores successfully identify edges that are structurally important for maintaining the classifier’s performance: removing the most spectrally robust edges is substantially more damaging than perturbing edges uniformly at random.

5.3 Spade-Guided Edge Addition (SEA-Add)

We next evaluate the Spade-guided addition attack (SEA-Add), which inserts edges between nodes that are maximally incompatible in the fragile spectral space.

Table 1. Citeseer: test accuracy under Spade-guided edge deletion (SEA-Del) and random deletion. Budgets ρ are expressed as a percentage of undirected edges. Clean accuracy is 70.0%.

Budget ρ	SEA-Del		Random deletion	
	Acc (%)	Δ (%)	Acc (%)	Δ (%)
5%	66.9	-3.1	67.9	-2.1
10%	66.6	-3.4	67.4	-2.6
15%	66.3	-3.7	67.2	-2.8
20%	66.0	-4.0	67.9	-2.1
25%	65.7	-4.3	66.5	-3.5
30%	65.5	-4.5	67.1	-2.9

Table 2. Citeseer: test accuracy under Spade-guided edge addition (SEA-Add). Budgets ρ are defined w.r.t. the number of undirected edges in the original graph (4,552), but the number of candidate adversarial pairs is bounded by the number of correctly classified test nodes (682), so the attack saturates at $\rho \geq 15\%$.

Budget ρ	#Added edges	Acc (%)	Δ (%)
5%	227	67.7	-2.3
10%	455	67.5	-2.5
15%	682	66.7	-3.3
20%	682	66.7	-3.3
25%	682	66.7	-3.3
30%	682	66.7	-3.3

For SEA-Add, we adopt a targeted setting: the attack only considers test nodes that are correctly classified on the clean graph. Let \mathcal{T} denote this set of target nodes; on CITESEER, we obtain $|\mathcal{T}| = 682$. For each $p \in \mathcal{T}$, we search over cross-class non-neighbors q (i.e., $y_q \neq y_p$ and $\{p, q\}$ is not an edge in the original graph), and select the pair with the largest spectral incompatibility score

$$S_{\text{add}}(\{p, q\}) = \|V_s[p, :] - V_s[q, :]\|_2^2.$$

This yields at most one high-scoring candidate edge per target node. After deduplication, we obtain 682 unique candidate adversarial edges, sorted by S_{add} in descending order. SEA-Add then selects the top- B candidate edges according to the budget and inserts them into the graph.

The results are summarized in Table 2. Adding as few as 227 edges (corresponding to a nominal budget $\rho = 5\%$) already reduces the test accuracy from 70.0% to 67.7% (-2.3 points). At a nominal budget of $\rho = 15\%$, the attack saturates the candidate pool and inserts all 682 high-scoring edges, pushing the accuracy down to 66.7% (-3.3 points). Increasing the nominal budget beyond 15% does not add more edges (the candidate pool is exhausted), so the accuracy remains at the same level.

These results show that SEA-Add can consistently degrade GCN performance by injecting a relatively small number of spectrally incompatible edges, without retraining the model and without relying on gradients.

5.4 Discussion

On CITESEER, both Spectral Edge Attacks exhibit clear effectiveness against a fixed GCN:

- For edge deletions, SEA-Del consistently causes a larger drop in test accuracy than random deletion under the same budget, confirming that edges with low Spade scores—those that are most spectrally robust—are also the most critical for preserving classification performance.
- For edge additions, SEA-Add exploits spectral incompatibility in the fragile eigenspace to connect semantically different nodes, achieving up to a 3.3 percentage point drop in accuracy by inserting at most 682 edges.

These findings support the central premise of SEA: spectral edge robustness is a powerful signal not only for pruning and defense, but also for constructing strong, structure-aware adversarial attacks on graph neural networks.

6 Conclusion

We have introduced Spectral Edge Attacks, a new family of adversarial structural perturbations for graph neural networks that are guided by spectral edge robustness. By constructing a spectral embedding that captures the most fragile directions of the input manifold and defining Spade scores for edges and non-edges, SEA identifies edges that are either most beneficial or most harmful to the model. The Spade-guided deletion attack removes spectrally robust edges that support correct predictions, while the Spade-guided addition attack injects edges between nodes that are maximally incompatible in the fragile spectral space.

Conceptually, SEA provides a unified view that links spectral robustness evaluation, graph pruning, and adversarial attacks. We believe that this perspective can help design both stronger attackers and more principled defenses. Future work includes a comprehensive empirical evaluation on diverse graph benchmarks, extending SEA to inductive and dynamic settings, and exploring certified robustness guarantees under spectral attacks.

References

1. T. N. Kipf and M. Welling, “Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks,” arXiv:1609.02907, 2016.
2. P. Veličković, G. Cucurull, A. Casanova, A. Romero, P. Liò, and Y. Bengio, “Graph attention networks,” arXiv:1710.10903, 2017.
3. W. Hamilton, Z. Ying, and J. Leskovec, “Inductive representation learning on large graphs,” Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS), 2017.

4. J. Zhou, G. Cui, S. Hu, Z. Zhang, C. Yang, Z. Liu, L. Wang, C. Li, and M. Sun, "Graph neural networks: A review of methods and applications," *AI Open*, vol. 1, pp. 57–81, 2020.
5. I. Goodfellow, P. McDaniel, and N. Papernot, "Making machine learning robust against adversarial inputs," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 61, no. 7, pp. 56–66, 2018.
6. A. Fawzi, O. Fawzi, and P. Frossard, "Analysis of classifiers' robustness to adversarial perturbations," *Machine Learning*, vol. 107, no. 3, pp. 481–508, 2018.
7. D. Zügner, A. Akbarnejad, and S. Günnemann, "Adversarial attacks on neural networks for graph data," in *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining (KDD)*, 2018, pp. 2847–2856.
8. 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," arXiv:1906.04214, 2019.
9. K. Sharma, S. Verma, S. Medya, A. Bhattacharya, and S. Ranu, "Task and model agnostic adversarial attack on graph neural networks," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 37, no. 12, 2023, pp. 15091–15109.
10. R. Feinman, R. R. Curtin, S. Shintre, and A. B. Gardner, "Detecting adversarial samples from artifacts," arXiv:1703.00410, 2017.
11. J. H. Metzen, T. Genewein, V. Fischer, and B. Bischoff, "On detecting adversarial perturbations," arXiv:1702.04267, 2017.
12. P. Yang, J. Chen, C.-J. Hsieh, J.-L. Wang, and M. Jordan, "ML-LOO: Detecting adversarial examples with feature attribution," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 34, no. 4, 2020, pp. 6639–6647.
13. C. Agarwal, A. Nguyen, and D. Schonfeld, "Improving robustness to adversarial examples by encouraging discriminative features," in *2019 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, IEEE, 2019, pp. 3801–3805.
14. X. Liu, Y. Li, C. Wu, and C.-J. Hsieh, "Adv-BNN: Improved adversarial defense through robust Bayesian neural network," arXiv:1810.01279, 2018.
15. F. R. K. Chung, *Spectral Graph Theory*, vol. 92 of CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics. American Mathematical Society, 1997.
16. U. von Luxburg, "A tutorial on spectral clustering," *Statistics and Computing*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 395–416, 2007.
17. G. H. Golub and C. F. Van Loan, *Matrix Computations*, 4th ed. Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013.
18. Z. Hu, Y. Dong, K. Wang, K.-W. Chang, and Y. Sun, "GPT-GNN: Generative pre-training of graph neural networks," in *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, 2020, pp. 1857–1867.
19. W. Fan, Y. Ma, Q. Li, Y. He, E. Zhao, J. Tang, and D. Yin, "Graph neural networks for social recommendation," in *The World Wide Web Conference (WWW)*, 2019, pp. 417–426.
20. B. Yu, H. Yin, and Z. Zhu, "Spatio-temporal graph convolutional networks: A deep learning framework for traffic forecasting," arXiv:1709.04875, 2017.
21. A. Mirhoseini et al., "A graph placement methodology for fast chip design," *Nature*, vol. 594, no. 7862, pp. 207–212, 2021.
22. R. Ying, R. He, K. Chen, P. Eksombatchai, W. L. Hamilton, and J. Leskovec, "Graph convolutional neural networks for web-scale recommender systems," in *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, 2018, pp. 974–983.

23. M. Song, Z. Zhan, and H. E, “Hierarchical schema representation for text-to-SQL parsing with decomposing decoding,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 103706–103715, 2019.
24. W. Cheng, C. Deng, Z. Zhao, Y. Cai, Z. Zhang, and Z. Feng, “SPADE: A spectral method for black-box adversarial robustness evaluation,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, PMLR, 2021, pp. 1814–1824.
25. Y. A. Malkov and D. A. Yashunin, “Efficient and robust approximate nearest neighbor search using hierarchical navigable small world graphs,” *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 824–836, 2020.