[Re] GNNInterpreter: A probabilistic generative model-level explanation for Graph Neural Networks

Ana-Maria Vasilcoiu, Batu Helvacioğlu, Thies Kersten, Thijs Stessen

Outline

- Introduction and Background
- GNNInterpreter model
- Scope of reproducibility
- Methodology
- Results from reproducing the original paper
- Results beyond the original paper
- Discussion and Main Takeaways

Introduction & Background

- Why interpret GNNs?
	- GNNs demonstrate strong performance on graph-based tasks, but their complexity challenges interpretability, which is critical in high-stakes domains (e.g. chemistry or biomedicine).
- Existing state-of-the-art solution \overline{XGNN}
	- Uses reinforcement learning to generate representative graphs for each class.
	- Limitations: requires domain-specific rules and can't handle continuous features.

GNNInterpreter (1)

- Explanation method that works with any GNN model.
- Generates graphs that highlight the key patterns the GNN uses for its predictions.
- Learning objective with 2 goals:

$$
\max_{G} L(G) = \max_{A, Z, X} L(A, Z, X) = \max_{A, Z, X} \phi_c(A, Z, X) + \mu \cdot \text{sim}_{\cos}(\psi(A, Z, X), \bar{\psi}_c)
$$
\nMaximize the likelihood of explanation
graphs being predicted as the target class
by the GNN

\nCombine explanation graph distribution
within domain-specific boundaries

GNNInterpreter (2)

- Continuous relaxation: converts discrete graph structures to continuous form for gradient-based optimization.
- Reparameterization trick: enables differentiable sampling over the relaxed graph.
- Regularization
	- L1 & L2: prevent overfitting and reduce gradient saturation.
	- Budget penalty: limits graph size for concise explanations.
	- Connectivity incentive: promote correlation.

Scope of Reproducibility

- Claim 1: The explanations generated by GNNInterpreter are *faithful and realistic*. Additionally, GNNInterpreter *doesn't require domain-specific knowledge* to achieve that.
- Claim 2: GNNInterpreter is a general approach that performs well with *different types of node and edge features*.
- Claim 3: The explanations generated by GNNInterpreter are *more representative regarding the target class* compared to XGNN.
- Claim 4: The *time complexity* for training GNNInterpreter is *much lower* than for XGNN.

Methodology

● Datasets

Synthetic datasets Real-world datasets

● GNN architectures - GCN and NNConv

Results - Qualitative (1)

Results - Qualitative (1)

Motif

Shape

Results - Qualitative (3)

Qualitative comparison on the Mutag dataset between XGNN and GNNInterpreter.

Analysis of Training Instability (1)

4 scenarios (Top-Left to Bottom-Right):

- Expected behaviour (decreasing graph size and increasing correct class probability)
- Never converging
- Convergence
- Non-convergence

Analysis of Training Instability (2)

Main Reason - Discrete Behavior in Loss Despite Continuous Graph Relaxation

Discussion and Main Takeaways

- **Performance**: GNNInterpreter works with different types of node and edge features and can produce realistic explanations. However, its performance is inconsistent across datasets and highly sensitive to seed initializations and hyperparameters.
- **Faithfulness and Reliability**: Good quantitative results don't always translate to faithful or realistic explanation graphs.
- **Comparison to XGNN**: Explanation graphs are generally on-par, but GNNInterpreter has a lower time complexity. However, the time required for hyperparameter tuning and initialization can offset this advantage in practice.
- **Graph size and complexity**: GNNInterpreter performs best on large graphs, but experiences training instability on small graphs and highly specific structures.

Thank you!

Questions?

Email us at: ana-maria.vasilcoiu@student.uva.nl