Representation Learning for Frequent Subgraph Mining

 $\text{Rex}\; \text{Ying}^1 \; \text{ Tianyu}\; \text{Fu}^2 \; \text{Andrew}\; \text{Wang}^3 \; \text{Jiaxuan}\; \text{You}^4 \; \text{Yu}\; \text{Wang}^2 \; \text{June} \; \text{Leskovec}^3$

Abstract

Identifying frequent subgraphs, also called *network motifs*, is crucial in analyzing and predicting properties of real-world networks. However, finding large commonly-occurring motifs remains a challenging problem not only due to its NPhard subroutine of subgraph counting, but also the exponential growth of the number of possible subgraphs patterns. Here we present *Subgraph Pattern Miner (SPMiner)*, a novel neural approach for approximately finding frequent subgraphs in a large target graph. SPMiner combines graph neural networks, order embedding space, and an efficient search strategy to identify network subgraph patterns that appear most frequently in the target graph. SPMiner first decomposes the target graph into many overlapping subgraphs and then encodes each subgraph into an order embedding space. SPMiner then uses a monotonic walk in the order embedding space to identify frequent motifs. Compared to existing approaches and possible neural alternatives, SPMiner is more accurate, faster, and more scalable. For 5- and 6-node motifs, we show that SPMiner can almost perfectly identify the most frequent motifs while being 100x faster than exact enumeration methods. In addition, SPMiner can also reliably identify frequent 10-node motifs, which is well beyond the size limit of exact enumeration approaches. And last, we show that SPMiner can find large up to 20 node motifs with 10-100x higher frequency than those found by current approximate methods.

1. Introduction

Finding frequently recurring subgraph patterns or *network motifs* in a graph dataset is important for understanding structural properties of complex networks [\(Benson et al.,](#page-10-0) [2016\)](#page-10-0). Frequent subgraph mining is a challenging but important task in network science: given a target graph or a collection of graphs, it aims to discover subgraphs or motifs that occur frequently in this data [\(Kuramochi & Karypis,](#page-11-0) [2004\)](#page-11-0). In biology, subgraph counting is highly predictive for disease pathways, gene interaction and connectomes [\(Agrawal et al.,](#page-10-0) [2018\)](#page-10-0). In social science, subgraph patterns have been observed to be indicators of social balance and status [\(Leskovec et al.,](#page-11-0) [2010\)](#page-11-0). In chemistry, common substructures are essential for predicting molecular properties (Cereto-Massagué et al., [2015\)](#page-10-0).

However, frequent subgraph mining has extremely high computational complexity. A traditional approach to motif mining is to enumerate all possible motifs Q of size up to k , usually $k \leq 5$, and then count appearances of each Q in a given graph (Hočevar & Demšar, [2014\)](#page-10-0). This is problematic as the number of motifs Q increases super exponentially with their size k , and counting the number of occurrences of a single motif Q in the target graph G is NP-hard by itself [\(Ribeiro et al.,](#page-11-0) [2021\)](#page-11-0).

More recently, neural approaches to learning combinatorially-hard graph problems, such as prediction of edit distance [\(Bai et al.,](#page-10-0) [2019\)](#page-10-0), graph isomorphism [\(Fey et al.,](#page-10-0) [2020;](#page-10-0) [Guo et al.,](#page-10-0) [2018;](#page-10-0) [Li et al.,](#page-11-0) [2019b;](#page-11-0) [Xu](#page-11-0) [et al.,](#page-11-0) [2019a\)](#page-11-0), pairwise maximum common subgraphs [\(Bai et al.,](#page-10-0) [2020\)](#page-10-0) and substructure counting [\(Chen et al.,](#page-10-0) [2020;](#page-10-0) [Liu et al.,](#page-11-0) [2020\)](#page-11-0), have been explored. Most recently, NeuroMatch [\(Ying et al.,](#page-11-0) [2020\)](#page-11-0) focuses on subgraph isomorphism testing, which attempts to predict whether a single query motif Q is a subgraph of a large target graph G . While subgraph isomorphism is an important subroutine, frequent subgraph counting is much more challenging because it requires solving two intractable search problems: (i) counting the frequency of a given motif Q in G ; (ii) searching over all possible motifs to identify the ones with the highest frequency. Problem (i) is NP-hard; Problem (ii) is also hard because the number of possible graphs Q increases super-exponentially with their size.

Here we propose *Subgraph Pattern Miner (SPMiner)*, a

¹Department of Computer Science, Yale University, New Haven, USA ²Department of Electronic Engineering, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China ³Department of Computer Science, Stanford University, Stanford, USA ⁴Department of Computer Science, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, USA. Correspondence to: Rex Ying \langle rex.ying @yale.edu \rangle .

The Graph Representation Learning and Beyond (GRL+) Workshop in *The* 37 th *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2020.

Representation Learning for Frequent Subgraph Mining

Figure 1: SPMiner encoder (a) and SPMiner motif search procedure (b). (a) The SPMiner decomposes a dataset into many node-anchored neighborhoods, and maps each neighborhood into a point in the embedding space such that order embedding property is preserved: if neighborhood A is a subgraph of neighborhood B then A is embedded to the lower left of B . Here yellow node-anchored neighborhood is a subgraph of both blue and red neighborhoods, so it is embedding to the lower left of both of them. (b) SPMiner then starts with an empty graph and iteratively adds nodes and edges to it to find frequent motifs. SPMiner performs a monotonic walk in the order embedding space to identify a motif that is a subgraph of many neighborhoods. The walk in red represents growing of a frequent motif. Key insight here is that SPMiner can quickly count the number of occurrences of a given motif by simply checking the number of neighborhoods (points) that are embedded to the top-right of it (denoted with a shaded region).

general framework using graph representation learning for identifying large frequent motifs in a large target graph. To the best of our knowledge, SPMiner is the first neural approach to mining frequent subgraphs.

SPMiner consists of two steps (Figure 1): (1) Embedding Candidate Subgraphs: SPMiner decompose the input graph into overlapping node-anchored neighborhoods around each node. It then uses an expressive graph neural network (GNN) to embed these neighborhoods to points in an *order embedding* space. The order embedding space is trained to enforce the property that if one graph is a subgraph of another, then they are embedded to the "lower left" of each other (Figure 1 (a)). Hence the order embedding space captures the partial ordering of graphs under the subgraph relation. Importantly the GNN only needs to be trained once (using synthetic data) and then can be apply to *any* input graph. (2)Motif Search Procedure: SPMiner then directly reasons in the embedding space to identify frequent motifs of desired size k . SPMiner searches for a k -step walk in the embedding space that stays to the lower left of as many neighborhoods (blue dots) as possible (Figure 1 (b)). The walk is performed by iteratively adding nodes and edges to the current motif candidate, and tracking its embedding. The key insight here is that SPMiner can quickly count the number of occurrences of a given motif by simply checking the number of neighborhoods (points) that are embedded to the top-right of it in the embedding space.

Evaluation. We carefully design an evaluation framework to evaluate performance of SPMiner. Current exact combinatorial frequent subgraph mining techniques only scale to [motifs of up to 6 nodes. So, we first show that for 5- and](#page-10-0)

6-node motifs (where their exact count can be obtained), SP-Miner correctly identifies most of the top 10 most frequent motifs while being 100x faster than the exact enumeration. As present exact enumeration methods do not scale beyond motifs of size 6, we then generate synthetic graphs with planted frequent motifs of size 10, and again show that SPMiner is able to robustly identify them. Last, we also compare SPMiner to approximate methods for finding large motifs, and show that SPMiner is able to identify large motifs that are 10-100x more frequent than those identified by current methods.

Overall, there are several benefits of our approach: robustness, accuracy and speed. In particular, (a) SPMiner avoids expensive combinatorial graph matching and counting by mapping the problem into an embedding space; (b) SPMiner allows for a neural model to estimate frequency of any motif Q directly in the order embedding space; (c) Training only needs to be performed once on a proposed large synthetic dataset, and then SPMiner can be applied to any graph dataset; (d) The embedding space can be efficiently navigated in order to identify large motifs with high frequency.

2. Related Work

Existing approaches on subgraph mining include two lines of work: subgraph counting and frequent subgraph mining.

Subgraph counting. There have been works in counting a query motif in a target graph. Hand-crafted schemes have been successful for small motifs (up to 5 nodes) (Hočevar $&$ Demšar, [2014;](#page-10-0) [Jha et al.,](#page-10-0) [2015\)](#page-10-0), and approaches like statistical sampling [\(Kashtan et al.,](#page-10-0) [2004\)](#page-10-0), random walk [\(Chen](#page-10-0) [et al.,](#page-10-0) [2016\)](#page-10-0), and redundancy elimination [\(Shi et al.,](#page-11-0) [2020;](#page-11-0) [Mawhirter et al.,](#page-11-0) [2021\)](#page-11-0) have been applied. However, these methods are unscalable for the subgraph mining task, since they would require intractable enumeration of all possible motifs of a given size.

Non-ML approaches to frequent subgraph mining. SP-Miner aims to solve the problem of frequent subgraph mining, which is much more challenging than subgraph counting as it involves searching for the most frequent subgraphs. There exist exact and approximate methods for frequent subgraph mining that involve searching the possible subgraphs by pruning or compression. Exact methods often use order restrictions to reduce the search space[\(Yan & Han,](#page-11-0) [2002;](#page-11-0) [Kuramochi & Karypis,](#page-11-0) [2004;](#page-11-0) [Nijssen & Kok,](#page-11-0) [2005\)](#page-11-0) or use decomposition for small subgraphs[\(Pinar et al.,](#page-11-0) [2017\)](#page-11-0). Heuristic and sampling methods offer faster execution time while no longer guaranteeing that all frequent subgraphs will be found: greedy beam search [\(Ketkar et al.,](#page-11-0) [2005\)](#page-11-0), pattern contraction [\(Matsuda et al.,](#page-11-0) [2000\)](#page-11-0), subgraph sampling [\(Wer](#page-11-0)[nicke,](#page-11-0) [2006\)](#page-11-0) and color coding [\(Bressan et al.,](#page-10-0) [2019;](#page-10-0) [2021\)](#page-10-0) have been used, which reduces the size of the subgraph search space to scale with target graph size. However, these approaches scale poorly with increasing query graph size due to combinatorial growth of the sample space; and the precision degrades significantly for larger subgraphs.

Neural approaches. Recently there are approaches that use graph neural networks (GNNs) to predict relations between graphs: models that learn to predict graph edit distance [\(Bai](#page-10-0) [et al.,](#page-10-0) [2019;](#page-10-0) [Li et al.,](#page-11-0) [2019b\)](#page-11-0), graph isomorphism [\(Fey et al.,](#page-10-0) [2020;](#page-10-0) [Guo et al.,](#page-10-0) [2018;](#page-10-0) [Xu et al.,](#page-11-0) [2019a;b\)](#page-11-0), and substructure counting [\(Chen et al.,](#page-10-0) [2020;](#page-10-0) [Liu et al.,](#page-11-0) [2020\)](#page-11-0) have been developed. Neural models have also been proposed to find maximum common subgraphs [\(Bai et al.,](#page-10-0) [2020\)](#page-10-0) and generate prediction explanations [\(Ying et al.,](#page-11-0) [2019\)](#page-11-0), but only in the context of a single prediction or graph pair rather than across an entire dataset. Our work is inspired by the recent approach to neural subgraph matching [\(Ying et al.,](#page-11-0) [2020\)](#page-11-0). However, here we are solving a different and a much harder problem: our goal is not only to identify the frequency of a given motif Q in graph G but also identify motifs Q that have high frequency.

3. Proposed Method

We first introduce subgraph mining problem and its subroutine of subgraph isomorphism, then define our objective of finding frequent motifs. We then introduce SPMiner, which has two components: an encoder that maps graphs into embeddings to capture subgraph relation, and a motif search procedure that identifies motifs that appear most frequently in the graph dataset.

Figure 2: Distinction between Node-anchored and Graphlevel subgraph frequency. Consider a hub node with degree 100 (left). We aim to determine frequency of the star motif (right). Definition 1 with center anchor results in a count of 1. In contrast, Definition 2 counts in $\binom{100}{6}$ motif occurrences.

3.1. Problem Setup

Let $G_T = (V_T, E_T)$ be a large *target graph* where we aim to identify common motifs, with vertices V_T and edges E_T . For notational simplicity, we consider the case of a single target graph. A dataset of multiple graphs could be considered as a large target graph with multiple disconnected components.

Analogously, let $G_Q = (V_Q, E_Q)$ be a *query motif*. The *subgraph isomorphism problem* is to determine whether an isomorphic copy of the query graph G_Q appears as a subgraph of the target graph G_T . Formally, G_Q is subgraph isomorphic to G_T if there exists an injection $f : V_Q \mapsto V_T$ such that $(f(v), f(u)) \in E_T \iff (v, u) \in E_Q$ (all corresponding edges match). The function f is a *subgraph isomorphism mapping*. Following most previous motif mining literature, we focus on mining *node-induced* subgraphs following many previous works [\(Inokuchi et al.,](#page-10-0) [2000;](#page-10-0) [Ku](#page-11-0)[ramochi & Karypis,](#page-11-0) [2004;](#page-11-0) [Yan & Han,](#page-11-0) [2002\)](#page-11-0), where subgraph edges are induced by the subset of nodes. However our method can also be applied to the variation of mining edge-induced subgraphs¹.

The problem of *frequent subgraph mining* is to identify subgraph patterns (i.e., motifs) that appear most frequently in a given dataset G_T . We focus on the case of finding *nodeanchored* motifs (G_Q, v) [\(Benson et al.,](#page-10-0) [2016;](#page-10-0) [Hocevar &](#page-10-0) Demšar, [2014\)](#page-10-0). Throughout, we say that G_Q anchored at $v \in V_Q$ is a subgraph of G_T anchored at $u \in V_T$ if there exists a subgraph isomorphism $f : V_Q \mapsto V_T$ satisfying $f(v) = u$. Our goal is to find most frequent motifs G_Q with associated *anchor nodes* $v \in V_Q$. We define the frequency of a node-anchored subgraph pattern as:

Definition 1. *Node-anchored Subgraph Frequency. Let* (GQ, v) *be a node-anchored subgraph pattern. The fre-*

¹The only change is to adjust the training set to sample edgeinduced subgraph pairs instead of node-induced subgraph pairs in Section [3.2.](#page-3-0)

quency of motif G_Q *in the graph dataset* G_T *, relative to* anchor node *v*, is the number of nodes *u* in G_T for which *there exists a subgraph isomorphism* $f : V_Q \mapsto V_T$ *such that* $f(v) = u^{-1}$ *.*

We remark that Definition 1 is the Minimum Image Support frequency [\(Bringmann & Nijssen,](#page-10-0) [2008\)](#page-10-0) or graph transaction based frequency[\(Jiang et al.,](#page-10-0) [2012\)](#page-10-0) from existing literature, extended to the node-anchored setting. Although we focus on the node-anchored frequency definition in designing methods, in experiments we additionally evaluate performance with the alternative graph-level frequency definition, and show that SPMiner works under both definitions.

Definition 2. *Graph-level Subgraph Frequency. Let* G_Q *be a subgraph pattern. The graph-level frequency of* G_Q *in* G_T *is the number of unique subsets of nodes* $S \subset V_T$ *for which there exists a subgraph isomorphism* $f : V_Q \mapsto V_T$ *whose image is* S*.*

Compared with graph-level frequency, the node-anchored definition is 1) robust to outliers, 2) provides more holistic understanding of subgraphs, and 3) satisfies the Downward Closure Property (DCP). Fig. [2](#page-2-0) shows that a highly selfsymmetric pattern. It occurs combinatorially many times in the neighborhood under Definition 2, which gives an outlier count that overshadows the counts of other important neighborhoods in the target graph. Choosing the center and peripheral nodes as the anchor node under Definition 1 will result in different counts (1 and 100). Different counts based on different anchor nodes of the same subgraph holistically describe the frequency of appearances of nodes of different roles in the pattern. Furthermore, Definition 1 has an important Downward Closure Property (DCP), which is valued by previous works[\(Yan & Han,](#page-11-0) [2002;](#page-11-0) [Nijssen & Kok,](#page-11-0) [2005\)](#page-11-0). DCP bounds the count of large query by that of its subgraphs. So the number of center-anchored 6-star is no larger than center-anchored 5-star, 4-star, etc.

The goal of SPMiner is to identify subgraphs of maximum frequency:

Problem 1. *Goal of SPMiner. Given a target* G_T *, a motif size parameter* k *and desired number of results* r*, the goal of SPMiner is to identify, among all possible graphs on* k *nodes, the* r *graphs (i.e, motifs) with the highest frequency in* G_T *.*

Note that the anchors do *not* need to be specified by the user. Instead, the frequent motif output by the mining algorithm contain an anchor node (see Figure [2](#page-2-0) for example). Depending on downstream applications, the anchor information can be ignored. If multiple frequent motifs are needed, graph

Figure 3: SPMiner Learnable skip layer. (a) Initially all skip connections are assigned equal weights. (b) After training the learnable skip GNN, the model learns the best skip connection configurations that encode subgraph relations. The architecture only requires $O(L^2)$ additional paramters.

isomorphism test (a much easier task) can be used to deduplicate predicted top-K frequent motif patterns that have different anchors but are isomorphic.

3.2. SPMiner Encoder ϕ : Embedding Candidate Subgraphs

We first provide a high-level overview of subgraph encoding, consisting of two steps: (1) Given G_T , we decompose it by extracting k -hop neighborhoods G_v (Definition 3) anchored at each node v. In SPMiner the neighborhoods are extracted via breadth-first search procedure. (2) The encoder ϕ is a graph neural network (GNN) to map the neighborhoods G_v into an order embedding space (Figure [1\)](#page-1-0).

Definition 3. *Neighborhood. The* k*-hop neighborhood anchored at node* v *contains all nodes that have shortest path length at most* k *to node* v*.*

Mapping node-anchored neighborhood to embedding space. Subgraph Frequency Definition [1](#page-2-0) uses the concept of node-anchored subgraph isomorphism. We use a categorical node feature to represent whether a node is an anchor v of a neighborhood graph G_v , embed it by computing node embeddings of G_v through a GNN and aggregate into the neighborhood embedding by sum pooling.

Order embedding space. Order embedding [\(Vendrov et al.,](#page-11-0) [2016\)](#page-11-0) is a representation learning technique that uses the geometric relations of embeddings to model a partial ordering structure. Order embeddings are a natural way to model subgraph relations because subgraph isomorphism induces a partial ordering on the set of all graphs via its properties of *transitivity* and *antisymmetry*.

Formally, we define a partial order \preceq on the set of all graphs G. Let $A, B \in \mathcal{G}$, and denote $A \prec B$ if graph A is isomorphic to a subgraph of B . We then assume we are given an

¹Note that standard subgraph isomorphism can be reduced to anchored subgraph isomorphism by adding an auxiliary anchor node to both the query and target graph that is connected to all existing nodes.

embedding function $\phi : \mathcal{G} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$ that maps graphs to vectors, enforcing the *order embedding constraint* that $A \preceq B$ if and only if $\phi(A) \leq \phi(B)$ elementwise. In other words, embedding $\phi(A)$ is to the "lower left" of embedding $\phi(B)$.

The key property of the space is that SPMiner can quickly count the number of occurrences of a given motif by simply counting the number of points in the embedding space (i.e., node-anchored neighborhoods) that are to the top-right of the motif's embedding.

SPMiner Graph Neural Network. SPMiner uses a Graph Neural Network (GNN) to learn an embedding function ϕ , which maps node-anchored neighborhoods into points in the embedding space such that the subgraph property is preserved. Importantly, SPMiner GNN is only trained once and then can be applied to any target graph from any domain. This is due to the fact, that GNN needs to learn to map different subgraphs to different points in the embedding space and once it is trained it can be applied. This means that an application of SPMiner to a new graph does not require any training.

To train the SPMiner GNN we need to define a loss function and then optimize parameters of the GNN to minimize the loss. The *order embedding penalty* between two graphs A and B (where A is a subgraph of B) is defined as:

$$
E(A, B) = ||\max(0, \phi(A) - \phi(B))||^{2}.
$$
 (1)

We call $E(A, B)$ the *penalty*. To enforce the order embedding constraint when training the SPMiner GNN, we use this penalty in the following max-margin loss:

$$
\sum_{(A,B)\in P} E(A,B) + \sum_{(A',B')\in N} \max(0, \alpha - E(A',B')) \tag{2}
$$

Here, P is the set of positive examples (pairs A, B where A is a subgraph of B) and N is the set of negative examples (pairs that do not satisfy the subgraph relation); α is the margin hyperparameter which controls the separation between penalties of positive and negative examples.

Observe that at the query time, given precomputed embeddings of A, B, we can use $E(A, B)$ to quickly determine if A is subgraph isomorphic to B , simply by checking if $E(A, B)$ is below a learned threshold. This is important as it allows us to test whether A is a subgraph of B in time linear in embedding dimension, independent of graph sizes.

SPMiner GNN Architecture. It is essential for our GNN to be expressive in capturing neighborhood structures [\(Xu](#page-11-0) [et al.,](#page-11-0) [2019a\)](#page-11-0). We achieve this with a GNN of large depth. However, increasing depth can potentially degrade GNN model performance due to oversmoothing. We propose a new approach of *learnable skip layer*, based on the dense skip layers. Different from previous GNN skip layers [\(Hamilton et al.,](#page-10-0) [2017;](#page-10-0) [Li et al.,](#page-11-0) [2019a\)](#page-11-0), we use a fully connected skip layer analogous to DenseNet [\(Huang et al.,](#page-10-0) [2017\)](#page-10-0), and additionally assign a learnable scalar weight $w_{i,l}$ to each skip connection from layer i to l. Let $1 \le l \le L$ be the layer number, and H'_l be the embedding matrix at l -th layer after message passing. At each layer l , the node embedding matrix H_l is computed by:

$$
H_l = \text{Concat}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{l-1} w_{i,l} H_i, H'_l\right), \ \forall l = 1, 2, ..., L \quad (3)
$$

When learning embeddings for subgraph isomorphism tasks, we can view representations at layer i as describing the graph structural information for the i -th hop neighborhood [\(Hamilton et al.,](#page-10-0) [2017\)](#page-10-0). Learnable skip allows every layer of the model to easily access structural features of different sized neighborhoods. This ensures that only useful skip connections across layers are retained, and different sized subgraph components (at different layers) can be simultaneously considered.

Training the SPMiner GNN. To train the SPMiner GNN, we generate a set of positive and negative training instances and then minimize the order embedding loss in Equation 2. In particular, we first sample a random subgraph anchored at a random node v as a target neighborhood G . To generate a positive example, we sample a smaller random subgraph from the target neighborhood G_v . Negative examples are generated by random sampling of a different subgraph. This sampling setup allows us to circumvent exact computation of subgraph isomorphism or subgraph frequency, which would make training intractable.

3.3. SPMiner Decoder: Motif Search Procedure

Motif search procedure by walking in order embedding space. Given the encoder GNN ϕ that maps node-anchored subgraphs to order embeddings, the goal of the search procedure is to identify node-anchored motifs that appear most frequently in the given graph dataset. SPMiner uses the approach of generating frequent motifs by iterative addition of nodes. Proposition 1 shows that the order embedding provides a well-behaved space that makes the search process efficient and effective:

Proposition 1. *Given an order embedding encoder GNN* ϕ*, let a graph generation procedure be* $\{G_0, G_1, \ldots, G_{k-1}\}$, *where at any step* i*,* Gⁱ *is generated by adding 1 node to* G_{i-1} *. Then the sequence* $\{\phi(G_0), \phi(G_1), \ldots, \phi(G_{k-1})\}$ *is a monotonic walk in the order embedding space, i.e.* $\phi(G_0)$ ≤ ... ≤ $\phi(G_{k-1})$ *elementwise.*

See Figure [1\(](#page-1-0)b) for an example of monotonic walk in the order embedding space in 2D.

In particular, we observe that node-anchored frequency

monotonically decreases with each step of the monotonic walk:

Proposition 2. *Given a motif* G_A *with embedding* x_A *and motif* G_B *with embedding* x_B , $x_A \leq x_B$ *elementwise implies* $Freq(G_A) \leq Freq(G_B)$ *where Freq denotes frequency under Definition 1.*

This proposition is an immediate consequence of the fact that for all node-anchored graphs G that G_B is a subgraph of, particularly the target graph G_T anchored at each of its nodes, G_A is also a subgraph of G. This property, known as the anti-monotonic property [\(Elseidy et al.,](#page-10-0) [2014\)](#page-10-0), demonstrates that the monotonic walk enforces important structure on the search space. In particular, the frequency of a motif at any point in a monotonic walk is an upper bound on the frequency of all motifs at subsequent points on the walk, serving as an approximation for their frequencies. Thus, this quantity can be useful for guiding search in the order embedding space, a property that we leverage in the next section.

Hard frequency objective. Assuming a perfect order embedding, the *frequent motif objective* is then translated to finding a walk with destination embedding such that the number of neighborhoods G_v in dataset G_T satisfying $\phi(G_{k-1}) \preceq \phi(G_v)$ is maximized.

Soft frequency objective. Recall that the SPMiner GNN is trained with a max margin loss on the penalty E :

$$
E(A, B) = ||\max(0, \phi(A) - \phi(B))||^{2}.
$$
 (4)

The penalty can be interpreted as a measure of model confidence: the smaller the penalty is, the more confident is the model about A being a subgraph of B . To take model confidence into account, we define a continuous objective: find graph G_{k-1} of given size k that minimizes the total penalty $m(G_{k-1})$. Under Definition [1,](#page-2-0) the predicted frequent subgraph G_{freq} is then:

$$
\phi(G_{\text{freq}}) = \underset{G \in \mathcal{G}}{\arg \min m(G)},
$$

where $m(G) = \sum_{N \in \mathcal{N}} ||\max(0, \phi(G) - \phi(N)||^2)$. (5)

G is the set of all graphs of size k ; $\mathcal N$ is the set of all neighborhood graphs in G_T for all nodes $v \in G$ (See Defi-nition [3\)](#page-3-0). The total penalty $m(G)$ is a *soft estimation* of the number of neighborhoods containing the anchored subgraph G.

Motif search. Directly finding the frequent motif is hard since the number of possible motifs is exponential to the size, so we design a special search procedure that iteratively grows the motif. In order to find a frequent motif of size k , SPMiner randomly samples a *seed node* from the dataset G_T , referred to as the trivial seed graph G_0 with size 1. Starting from the seed graph G_0 , we iteratively generate the next graph by adding an adjacent node in G_T (and its corresponding edges). Figure [1\(](#page-1-0)b) shows an example search process and the corresponding walk in the embedding space. Proposition [1](#page-4-0) guarantees that the corresponding embedding increases monotonically as more nodes are added. Throughout the walk/generation, we make use of both G_i and its embedding $\phi_i, \phi_i = \phi(G_i)$. In practice, to attain a robust estimate, we sample several seed nodes, run several walks, and select the resulting motifs of size k that we encountered the most times.

Search strategies: Greedy strategy, beam search and Monte Carlo Tree Search (MTCS). Our motif search procedure is general and different strategies can be implemented to navigate the space of motifs. We propose a greedy strategy to improve scalability. At every step, SPMiner adds the node such that the total penalty m in Eq. 5 is minimized. Let G' be chosen by adding 1 adjacent node to G_i in G_T . The greedy approximation simplifies Equation 5 into a step-wise minimization: $\forall i = 0, 1, \dots, k - 1$,

$$
G_{\text{freq}} = G_{k-1}, \quad G_{i+1} = \underset{G'}{\text{arg min}} \, m(\phi(G')).
$$
 (6)

A beam search strategy strikes a balance between the greedy and exhaustive strategies, where instead of greedily adding the next node resulting in the smallest penalty, we explore a fixed number of options with small total penalty scores to add nodes at each generation step.

The SPMiner framework also naturally lends itself to Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) strategies [\(Coulom,](#page-10-0) [2006\)](#page-10-0) with neural value function. SPMiner MCTS runs multiple walks starting from multiple seed nodes and maintains a visit count $n(G_i)$ and a total value $f(G_i)$ for each step G_i in each walk explored so far. The visit counts $n(G_i)$ refer to the number of times where G_i is visited. Graphs that share an embedding also share a visit count, except for seed nodes; this setup allows SPMiner to revisit promising seeds and explore new ones. We design $f(G_i) = \sum_{G'} (1 - \log(\frac{m(G')}{|N|} + 1)),$ where G' ranges over all size- k graphs reached from any walk that visited G_i . We design the following objective based on the upper confidence bound criterion for trees (UCT) (Kocsis $&$ Szepesvári, [2006\)](#page-11-0) to replace the greedy approach (Eq. 6), with an exploration constant c : $\forall i = 0, 1, \ldots, k - 1,$

$$
G_{i+1} = \underset{G'}{\arg \max} \left(\frac{f(G')}{n(G')} + c \sqrt{\frac{\log n(G_i)}{n(G')}} \right). \tag{7}
$$

The use of f rather than the total penalty $m(G')$ ensures that the first term has the same numerical scale as the second term. In the end, the motifs with highest visit count are selected.

Figure 4: Graph statistics of the synthetic and real-world graph datasets. Each point represents the statistics of one graph; the color of a point represents the dataset that the graph belongs to.

3.4. Runtime and Memory Analysis

The memory cost of SPMiner is $O((N+K)d+Kn^2)$, and its runtime is $O(Nb^2 + Kn(n^2 + Nnd))$, where N is the number of neighborhoods, d is embedding dimension, K is number of decoder iterations, n is the desired motif size and b is neighborhood size. The polynomial runtime and memory usage enable efficient mining of large motifs.

3.5. SPMiner Expressive Power

Expressiveness of SPMiner encoder GNN. To show the expressiveness of SPMiner GNN encoder with order embedding, we first show the existence of a perfect order embedding, and then demonstrate that the SPMiner encoder architecture can capture information in the perfect order embedding.

In addition to satisfying the properties of subgraph relations, the following proposition demonstrates the full expressive power of the order embedding space in predicting subgraph relations.

Proposition 3. *Given a graph dataset of size* n*, we can find a perfect order embedding of dimension* D*, where* D *is the number of non-isomorphic node-anchored graphs of size no greater than* n*. The perfect order embeddings satisfy* $z(G_Q) \preceq z(G)$ *if and only if* G_Q *is a subgraph of* G *, where* $z(G)$ *is the order embedding of G.*

This can be proven by constructing an order embedding and enumerating all possible non-isomorphic node-anchored graphs of size no greater than n , and placing the count of the i -th graph into the i -th dimension of the order embedding. The proposition indicates that order embeddings can achieve perfect expressiveness. Although D can be large in theory, in practice, the neural model can learn a more compressed embedding space, and we find $D = 64$ is sufficient to achieve good performance.

3.6. Synthetic Graph Pretraining

The SPMiner GNN needs to be trained only once and can be applied to any input graph. In fact, we train the SPMiner GNN on a set of synthetic graphs. We generate millions of synthetic training datasets to learn a general order embedding space agnostic to the dataset domain. This pretrained GNN model can then be immediately applied to real-world datasets not seen in training without further fine-tuning.

In contrast to the previous works, we use a combination of graph generators, such as Erdos-Renyi, Power Law Cluster and others, to ensure that the model can be trained on a diverse set of graphs in terms of graph properties (parameter specification in Appendix [B\)](#page-12-0).

Using this graph generator, we create a balanced dataset of graph pairs (A, B) in which a pair is positive if B is a subgraph of A. To create positive pairs, we sample a graph A from the generator and sample a subgraph B of A using the sampling procedure of MFINDER [\(Kashtan](#page-10-0) [et al.,](#page-10-0) [2004\)](#page-10-0). To create negative pairs, we sample a graph A from the generator. With 50% probability, we sample a subgraph B of A , then randomly add up to 5 edges to B so that it is unlikely to be a subgraph of A. Otherwise, we randomly sample another graph from the generator, and the sample is unlikely to be a subgraph of A . We sample A of size uniform from 6 to 29 and B of size uniform from 5 to $|A| - 1$. Empirically we observe that the model is able to continue improving in performance even after seeing millions of training pairs, hence a large synthetic dataset provides an important performance advantage.

Synthetic dataset statistics. We demonstrate that our synthetic data generation scheme is capable of generating graphs with high variety. Figure 4 shows the statistics of the synthetic graphs, compared to real-world datasets. In terms of graph statistics, including density, diameter, average shortest path length, and average clustering coefficient, the synthetic dataset (large blue dots) covers most of the real-world datasets, including those in the domains of chemistry (COX2), biology (ENZYMES) and social networks (REDDIT-BINARY) [\(Fey & Lenssen,](#page-10-0) [2019\)](#page-10-0).

The high coverage of statistics suggests that the synthetic dataset is an application-agnostic dataset that allows SP-Miner to learn a highly generalizable order embedding model, and immediately apply it to analyzing new realworld datasets without further training.

4. Experiments

To our knowledge, SPMiner is *the first method for learning neural models to perform frequent motif mining*. Here, we propose the first benchmark suites of experimental settings, baselines and datasets to evaluate the efficacy of neural frequent motif mining models.

Figure 5: SPMiner vs. approximate frequent subgraph mining techniques: Among size-6 motifs, SPMiner is able to correctly identify the top K most frequent motifs more accurately than baselines (left). Furthermore, the top 10 motifs identified by SPMiner have higher frequency than those found by baselines, for size 5 (middle) and size 6 (right) motifs. The blue dotted line represents the frequency of the groundtruth most frequent motifs.

4.1. Experimental setup

We perform the following experiments: (1) **Small motifs.** We experiment with small motifs of 5 and 6 nodes, where exact enumeration methods (Hočevar & Demšar, [2014;](#page-10-0) [Cordella et al.,](#page-10-0) [2004\)](#page-10-0) are able to find ground-truth most frequent motifs. We show that SPMiner nearly perfectly finds these most frequent motifs. (2) Large planted motifs. To evaluate performance for mining larger motifs (computationally prohibitive for exact enumeration methods), we plant a large 10-node motif many times in a dataset (details in Appendix). Again, we show that SPMiner is able to identify the planted motif as one of the most frequent in the dataset. (3) Large motifs in real-world datasets We also compare SPMiner against approximate methods [\(Wernicke,](#page-11-0) [2006;](#page-11-0) [Kashtan et al.,](#page-10-0) [2004\)](#page-10-0) that scale to motifs with over 10 nodes. Here we find that SPMiner identifies large motifs that are 100x more frequent than the ones identified by approximate methods in real-world datasets. (4) Runtime Comparison We compare SPMiner against non-neural exact methods, gSpan and Gaston [\(Yan & Han,](#page-11-0) [2002;](#page-11-0) [Nijssen](#page-11-0) [& Kok,](#page-11-0) [2005\)](#page-11-0), as well as the highly accurate approximate method Motivo [\(Bressan et al.,](#page-10-0) [2021\)](#page-10-0) to show that although more accurate, these methods are exponentially more expensive with respect to the size of subgraph patterns. (5) Encoder validation validates the representations learned by the encoder architecture, and demonstrates the superior generalizability of the order embedding space through an ablation analysis.

Approximate baselines. We compare against two widelyused approximate sampling-based motif mining algorithms, RAND-ESU [\(Wernicke,](#page-11-0) [2006\)](#page-11-0) and MFINDER [\(Kashtan](#page-10-0) [et al.,](#page-10-0) [2004\)](#page-10-0). For MFINDER, we omit the slow $O(n^{n+1})$ exact probability correction. MFINDER takes a degreeweighted sampling approach to seek motifs containing highdegree hub nodes. RAND-ESU iteratively expands candidate motifs one node at a time by maintaining a candidate set to ensure unbiased sampling. We tune hyperparameters of these baselines and SPMiner so that they sample a comparable number of subgraphs and achieve comparable wall clock runtime (details in Appendix [D\)](#page-14-0).

Datasets. We mine frequent motifs in a variety of domains, including biological (ENZYMES), chemical (COX2) and image (MSRC) datasets [\(Borgwardt et al.,](#page-10-0) [2005;](#page-10-0) [Sutherland](#page-11-0) [et al.,](#page-11-0) [2003;](#page-11-0) [Neumann et al.,](#page-11-0) [2016\)](#page-11-0). Table [2](#page-12-0) in Appendix [B](#page-12-0) shows the graph statistics of the datasets used in our experiments. All datasets have been made public. We focus on the topological structure of these datasets, omitting node labels when identifying frequent motifs; incorporation of labels is an interesting avenue for further work.

4.2. Results

(1) Small motifs. First, we experiment with small motifs of 5 and 6 nodes, where exact enumeration methods (Hočevar & Demšar, [2014;](#page-10-0) [Cordella et al.,](#page-10-0) [2004\)](#page-10-0) are able to find true most frequent motifs. We pick an existing dataset, ENZYMES, and count the exact motif counts for all possible motifs of size 5 and 6. We use the metric *hit rate* at k, which measures the proportion of top- k frequent motifs identified by SPMiner and baselines, that are within the ground truth top- k most frequent motifs by exact enumeration. Figure 5 left shows that SPMiner consistently achieves higher hit rate compared to baselines for mining size 6 motifs.¹

We further compare the frequencies of the top 10 motifs found by exact enumeration, SPMiner and the baselines, MFINDER and RAND-ESU for size 5 and 6 motifs. We observe that SPMiner can consistently identify the size 5 and size 6 motifs whose frequencies are within 90% of that of the groundtruth. Furthermore, SPMiner runs in 5 minutes, versus 10 hours for exact enumeration with (exact) ESU [\(Wernicke,](#page-11-0) [2006\)](#page-11-0) using the same hardware (see Appendix).

(2) Large planted motifs. Currently exact methods for finding most frequent motifs are prohibitively expensive

¹Note that as the rank increases, each method is required to identify a larger set of queries, thus the hit rate may increase or decrease.

Figure 6: The frequent subgraphs identified by SPMiner (under Definition 1) closely match the planted motifs. Orange nodes denote the anchor node of the motif identified in SPMiner.

for larger motifs, and hence groundtruth frequency is hard to obtain. To evaluate identification of larger motifs, we randomly generate a large motif pattern Q of size $n_1 = 10$, and randomly attach an instance of the motif to base graphs of size $n_2 = 10$ generated using a synthetic generator. Each motif is attached to base graph by randomly connecting a nodes from the motif with a node from the base graph. This process ensures that this pattern is one of the most frequent in the dataset. We repeat this process to generate a dataset of 1000 graphs.

Then, we use SPMiner to identify frequent motifs. We expect SPMiner to output patterns that resemble the planted motif. Figure 6 shows three examples of the top 10 identified frequent patterns outputted by SPMiner. We observe that for all examples, the planted motif is identified as one of the most frequent by SPMiner¹.

(3) Identifying large motifs in real-world datasets. Lastly, we compare against several baselines for finding large frequent motifs in graph data. Our baselines are MFINDER, RAND-ESU and a neural baseline MLP that replaces order embeddings with an MLP and cross entropy loss. For varying motif sizes k , we take the top ten candidates for the most frequent motif for each method, and compute their true mean frequency via exact subgraph matching. Compared to approximate methods, SPMiner is able to identify motifs that appear 10-100x more frequently, as seen in Fig-ure [7,](#page-9-0) particularly for graphs with size > 12 . The MCTS search variant of SPMiner discovers frequent patterns of over 15 nodes in ENZYMES, while no baseline can find motifs of median frequency more than 3. Note that even though

SPMiner's primary objective is to maximize anchored frequency (Definition [1\)](#page-2-0), it outperforms all baselines on large motifs by 10-100x with the graph-level Definition [2](#page-3-0) as well (Figure [7](#page-9-0) right). We further present the results for other datasets in Appendix [B.](#page-12-0)

(4) Runtime Comparison. We consider state-of-the-art exact motif mining methods, gSpan [\(Yan & Han,](#page-11-0) [2002\)](#page-11-0) and Gaston [\(Nijssen & Kok,](#page-11-0) [2005\)](#page-11-0), as well as the highly accurate approximate method Motivo [\(Bressan et al.,](#page-10-0) [2021\)](#page-10-0). These methods can produce exact, or highly accurate frequent subgraphs; at the cost of exponentially increasing cost with respect to subgraph pattern sizes. Note that although an approximate method, Motivo use an expensive build-up phase to color the target before sampling [\(Bressan et al.,](#page-10-0) [2021\)](#page-10-0). For each dataset, we adapt their code in C++, and tune the support threshold parameter [\(Yan & Han,](#page-11-0) [2002\)](#page-11-0) in order to obtain at least 10 frequent motifs of the specified size, without exceeding a runtime budget of 1 hour and memory budget of 50GB. Implementation details of these baselines are further explained in Appendix.

In Figure [8,](#page-9-0) we plot the frequency of the motif identified by SPMiner and the exact baseline methods, against the size of the motifs to be identified. SPMiner identifies small frequent motifs (of size less than 10) whose frequency is at least 90% that of the groundtruth most frequent motifs (by exact methods). For both datasets, gSpan and Gaston exceed the resource budget when identifying motifs of size larger than 10, while SPMiner can still identify them efficiently.

We further compare the runtimes. Note that SPMiner uses synthetic graph pretraining which takes fixed amount of time (8 hours) and shared for all experiments. 2 . Hence we report the runtime of SPMiner at inference time. We show that the runtime of the exact methods grows exponentially, whereas SPMiner has a linear trend as the size of motif grows. In Figure [9,](#page-9-0) we plot the runtime required against the size of frequent motifs identified by SPMiner and the exact methods. We observe that even with more computational budget, baseline methods quickly become intractable due to exponential increase in runtime.

(5) Encoder validation. Figure [10](#page-9-0) demonstrates the structure of our order embedding space (here in just 2 dimensions). Notice how subgraphs are embedded to the lower left of their supergraphs. Experiments shows that SPMiner achieves 95% accuracy in determining whether one graph is a subgraph of the other. The learnable skip layer also contributes to the encoder performance gains by increasing the accuracy and area under PR curve. Please refer to appendix for subgraph relation performance of our GNN model component and the ablation studies.

²See Appendix [D](#page-14-0) for runtime details

¹See Appendix for more details on all identified motifs.

Figure 7: Comparison of median frequencies of motifs identified by different search strategies (SPMiner-greedy and SPMiner-MCTS) and baselines (MFinder, Rand-ESU); higher is better. Across all motif sizes, SPMiner finds patterns with higher node-anchored frequency than do the neural MLP baseline or the Rand-ESU and MFinder sampling-based baselines, across COX2 (A), ENZYMES (B), and ENZYMES (C) datasets.

Figure 8: Frequency of motifs identified by Gaston, gSpan, Motivo, and SPMiner. SPMiner is able to identify highfrequency motifs of large size.

Figure 9: Runtime comparison between non-neural methods and SPMiner. The curves for Gaston, gSpan, and Motivo end early due to exceeding memory or time limit for larger motifs.

5. Limitations

SPMiner is the first approach to mine large frequent motifs in graph datasets. However, there are still limitations to this pioneering approach. The algorithm does not directly optimize for the graph-level frequency definition (Definition 2), although we observe that in practice the subgraphs identified by SPMiner are still frequent (see Figure 7(c)). Additionally, SPMiner only provides a list of frequent subgraph patterns via search, but not an accurate count prediction for a given subgraph pattern. Future work in approximating the # P problem of subgraph counting is needed. Finally, although

Figure 10: Two dimensions of the embedding space. Each point corresponds to a graph; color range from blue to yellow corresponds to small-to-large graphs.

in experiments, we find that distinguishing between the anchor node and other nodes in the neighborhood via node features results in more expressive GNNs beyond the WL test, further work on more expressive GNNs can further improve SPMiner. We hope that SPMiner opens a new direction in graph representation learning and embedding space search to solve graph mining problems.

6. Conclusion

We propose SPMiner, the first neural framework for identifying frequent motifs in a target graph using graph representation learning. SPMiner learns to encode subgraphs into an order embedding space, and uses a novel search procedure on the learned order embedding space to identify frequent motifs. SPMiner advances the state-of-the-art, and is able to identify frequent motifs that are 10-100x more frequent than those identified by existing methods.

References

- Agrawal, M., Zitnik, M., Leskovec, J., et al. Large-scale analysis of disease pathways in the human interactome. In *PSB*. World Scientific, 2018.
- Albert, R. and Barabási, A.-L. Topology of evolving networks: local events and universality. *Physical Review Letters*, 2000.
- Bai, Y., Ding, H., Bian, S., Chen, T., Sun, Y., and Wang, W. Simgnn: A neural network approach to fast graph similarity computation. In *WSDM*, 2019.
- Bai, Y., Xu, D., Gu, K., Wu, X., Marinovic, A., Ro, C., Sun, Y., and Wang, W. Neural maximum common subgraph detection with guided subgraph extraction, 2020.
- Benson, A. R., Gleich, D. F., and Leskovec, J. Higher-order organization of complex networks. *Science*, 2016.
- Borgwardt, K. M., Ong, C. S., Schönauer, S., Vishwanathan, S., Smola, A. J., and Kriegel, H.-P. Protein function prediction via graph kernels. *Bioinformatics*, 2005.
- Bressan, M., Leucci, S., and Panconesi, A. Motivo: fast motif counting via succinct color coding and adaptive sampling. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 12(11): 1651–1663, 2019.
- Bressan, M., Leucci, S., and Panconesi, A. Faster motif counting via succinct color coding and adaptive sampling. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)*, 15(6):1–27, 2021.
- Bringmann, B. and Nijssen, S. What is frequent in a single graph? In *PAKDD*, pp. 858–863. Springer, 2008.
- Cereto-Massague, A., Ojeda, M. J., Valls, C., Mulero, M., ´ Garcia-Vallvé, S., and Pujadas, G. Molecular fingerprint similarity search in virtual screening. *Methods*, 2015.
- Chen, X., Li, Y., Wang, P., and Lui, J. A general framework for estimating graphlet statistics via random walk. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.07504*, 2016.
- Chen, Z., Chen, L., Villar, S., and Bruna, J. Can graph neural networks count substructures? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.04025*, 2020.
- Cordella, L. P., Foggia, P., Sansone, C., and Vento, M. A (sub) graph isomorphism algorithm for matching large graphs. *PAMI*, 2004.
- Coulom, R. Efficient selectivity and backup operators in monte-carlo tree search. In *International conference on computers and games*. Springer, 2006.
- Elseidy, M., Abdelhamid, E., Skiadopoulos, S., and Kalnis, P. Grami: Frequent subgraph and pattern mining in a single large graph. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 7(7):517–528, 2014.
- Erdos, P. and Renyi, A. On random graphs. i. *Publ. Math. Debrecen*, 1959.
- Fey, M. and Lenssen, J. E. Fast graph representation learning with PyTorch Geometric. In *ICLR Workshop on Representation Learning on Graphs and Manifolds*, 2019.
- Fey, M., Lenssen, J. E., Morris, C., Masci, J., and Kriege, N. M. Deep graph matching consensus. In *ICLR*, 2020.
- Guo, M., Chou, E., Huang, D.-A., Song, S., Yeung, S., and Fei-Fei, L. Neural graph matching networks for fewshot 3d action recognition. In *ECCV*, 2018.
- Hamilton, W., Ying, Z., and Leskovec, J. Inductive representation learning on large graphs. In *NeurIPS*, 2017.
- Hočevar, T. and Demšar, J. A combinatorial approach to graphlet counting. *Bioinformatics*, 2014.
- Holme, P. and Kim, B. J. Growing scale-free networks with tunable clustering. *Physical review E*, 2002.
- Hu, W., Fey, M., Zitnik, M., Dong, Y., Ren, H., Liu, B., Catasta, M., and Leskovec, J. Open graph benchmark: Datasets for machine learning on graphs. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:22118–22133, 2020.
- Huang, G., Liu, Z., Van Der Maaten, L., and Weinberger, K. Q. Densely connected convolutional networks. In *CVPR*, 2017.
- Inokuchi, A., Washio, T., and Motoda, H. An apriori-based algorithm for mining frequent substructures from graph data. In Zighed, D. A., Komorowski, J., and Żytkow, J. (eds.), *Principles of Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2000.
- Jha, M., Seshadhri, C., and Pinar, A. Path sampling: A fast and provable method for estimating 4-vertex subgraph counts. In *Proceedings of the 24th international conference on world wide web*, pp. 495–505, 2015.
- Jiang, C., Coenen, F., and Zito, M. A. A. A survey of frequent subgraph mining algorithms. *The Knowledge Engineering Review*, 28:75 – 105, 2012.
- Kashtan, N., Itzkovitz, S., Milo, R., and Alon, U. Efficient sampling algorithm for estimating subgraph concentrations and detecting network motifs. *Bioinformatics*, 2004.
- Kersting, K., Kriege, N. M., Morris, C., Mutzel, P., and Neumann, M. Benchmark data sets for graph kernels, 2016. URL [http://graphkernels.cs.](http://graphkernels.cs.tu-dortmund.de) [tu-dortmund.de](http://graphkernels.cs.tu-dortmund.de).
- Ketkar, N. S., Holder, L. B., and Cook, D. J. Subdue: Compression-based frequent pattern discovery in graph data. In *Proceedings of the 1st international workshop on open source data mining: frequent pattern mining implementations*, 2005.
- Kipf, T. N. and Welling, M. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. In *ICLR*, 2017.
- Kocsis, L. and Szepesvári, C. Bandit based monte-carlo planning. In *European conference on machine learning*. Springer, 2006.
- Kuramochi, M. and Karypis, G. An efficient algorithm for discovering frequent subgraphs. *IEEE TKDE*, 2004.
- Leskovec, J., Huttenlocher, D., and Kleinberg, J. Signed networks in social media. In *SIGCHI*, 2010.
- Li, G., Muller, M., Thabet, A., and Ghanem, B. Deepgcns: Can gcns go as deep as cnns? In *ICCV*, 2019a.
- Li, Y., Gu, C., Dullien, T., Vinyals, O., and Kohli, P. Graph matching networks for learning the similarity of graph structured objects. In *ICML*, 2019b.
- Liu, X., Pan, H., He, M., Song, Y., and Jiang, X. Neural subgraph isomorphism counting. *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, 2020.
- Matsuda, T., Horiuchi, T., Motoda, H., and Washio, T. Extension of graph-based induction for general graph structured data. In *PAKDD*, 2000.
- Mawhirter, D., Reinehr, S., Holmes, C., Liu, T., and Wu, B. Graphzero: A high-performance subgraph matching system. *ACM SIGOPS Operating Systems Review*, 55(1): 21–37, 2021.
- Neumann, M., Garnett, R., Bauckhage, C., and Kersting, K. Propagation kernels: efficient graph kernels from propagated information. *Machine Learning*, 2016.
- Nijssen, S. and Kok, J. N. The gaston tool for frequent subgraph mining. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, 2005.
- Pinar, A., Seshadhri, C., and Vishal, V. Escape: Efficiently counting all 5-vertex subgraphs. In *Proceedings of the 26th international conference on world wide web*, pp. 1431–1440, 2017.
- Ribeiro, P., Paredes, P., Silva, M. E., Aparicio, D., and Silva, F. A survey on subgraph counting: concepts, algorithms, and applications to network motifs and graphlets. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 54(2):1–36, 2021.
- Riesen, K. and Bunke, H. Iam graph database repository for graph based pattern recognition and machine learning. In *Joint IAPR International Workshops on Statistical Techniques in Pattern Recognition (SPR) and Structural and Syntactic Pattern Recognition (SSPR)*, pp. 287–297. Springer, 2008.
- Rossi, R. A. and Ahmed, N. K. The network data repository with interactive graph analytics and visualization. In *AAAI*, 2015.
- Shi, T., Zhai, M., Xu, Y., and Zhai, J. Graphpi: High performance graph pattern matching through effective redundancy elimination. In *SC20: International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, pp. 1–14. IEEE, 2020.
- Sutherland, J. J., O'brien, L. A., and Weaver, D. F. Splinefitting with a genetic algorithm: A method for developing classification structure- activity relationships. *Journal of chemical information and computer sciences*, 2003.
- Vendrov, I., Kiros, R., Fidler, S., and Urtasun, R. Orderembeddings of images and language. In Bengio, Y. and LeCun, Y. (eds.), *ICLR*, 2016. URL [http://arxiv.](http://arxiv.org/abs/1511.06361) [org/abs/1511.06361](http://arxiv.org/abs/1511.06361).
- Watts, D. J. and Strogatz, S. H. Collective dynamics of 'small-world'networks. *Nature*, 1998.
- Wernicke, S. Efficient detection of network motifs. *IEEE/ACM transactions on computational biology and bioinformatics*, 2006.
- Xu, K., Li, C., Tian, Y., Sonobe, T., Kawarabayashi, K.-i., and Jegelka, S. Representation learning on graphs with jumping knowledge networks. In *ICML*, 2018.
- Xu, K., Hu, W., Leskovec, J., and Jegelka, S. How powerful are graph neural networks? In *ICLR*, 2019a.
- Xu, K., Wang, L., Yu, M., Feng, Y., Song, Y., Wang, Z., and Yu, D. Cross-lingual knowledge graph alignment via graph matching neural network. 2019b.
- Yan, X. and Han, J. gspan: Graph-based substructure pattern mining. In *ICDM*. IEEE, 2002.
- Ying, R., Wang, A., You, J., Wen, C., Canedo, A., and Leskovec, J. Neural subgraph matching. *arXiv preprint*, 2020.
- Ying, Z., Bourgeois, D., You, J., Zitnik, M., and Leskovec, J. Gnnexplainer: Generating explanations for graph neural networks. In *NeurIPS*, 2019.

A. Model Analysis

A.1. Proof of order embedding expressiveness

Proposition 4. *Given a graph dataset of size* n*, we can find a perfect order embedding of dimension* D*, where* D *is the number of non-isomorphic node-anchored graphs of size no greater than* n*. The perfect order embeddings satisfy* $z(G_Q) \preceq z(G)$ *if and only if* G_Q *is a subgraph of* G *.*

Proof. This perfect order embedding can be simply constructed by enumerating all possible non-isomorphic nodeanchored graphs of size no greater than n , and place the count of the i -th graph into the i -th dimension of the order embedding.

If graph G_Q is a subgraph of graph G, then by definition there exists an isomorphism f between G_Q and a subgraph of G. Therefore each motif in G_Q can be mapped to the corresponding motif in G by f . Hence the motif count of G_Q for any motif is no less than the corresponding motif count of G.

Conversely, if graph G_Q is not a subgraph of graph G , then the motif isomorphic to G_Q has count at least 1 for G_Q , and 0 for graph G, violating the order constraint. \Box

A.2. Motif Counts Prediction

To demonstrate the capability of GNNs in predicting motif counts, we randomly generate graphs using synthetic and real datasets [\(Kersting et al.,](#page-11-0) [2016\)](#page-11-0) and train the SPMiner GNN to predict (log) counts of small motifs. We find that GNNs can accurately estimate these counts, with relative mean squared error of 12% across all datasets. Together with Proposition 1, it confirms the capacity of SPMiner to learn order embeddings that capture the subgraph relation.

Table 1: The MSE and relative MSE of log motif counts. B. Further Implementation Details

Real-world datasets.

Table 2 shows the graph statistics of the real-world datasets used in our experiments.

Synthetic dataset. We design a synthetic graph generator to provide training graphs for synthetic pretraining, so that the model learns an order embedding space over diverse types of graphs and can generalize to new datasets at inference time.

The generator randomly chooses one of the following ways to generate a graph: Erdős-Rényi (E-R) (Erdos $&$ Renyi, [1959\)](#page-10-0), Extended Barabási–Albert graphs (Albert & Barabási,

Table 2: Graph statistics of datasets used in experiments. The PLANT datasets are those used in Experiment (2).

[2000\)](#page-10-0), Power Law Cluster graphs [\(Holme & Kim,](#page-10-0) [2002\)](#page-10-0) and Watts-Strogatz graph [\(Watts & Strogatz,](#page-11-0) [1998\)](#page-11-0). For the Erdős-Rényi generator, the probability of an edge is $p \sim \text{Beta}(1.3, 1.3n/\log_2(n) - 1.3)$. For the Extended Barabási–Albert generator, the number of attachment edges per node is $m \sim \text{Unif}(1, 2\log_2 n)$, the probability of adding edges is $p \sim \text{Exp}(20)$ (capped at 0.2) and the probability of rewiring edges is $q \sim \text{Exp}(20)$ (capped at 0.2). For the Power Law Cluster generator, the number of attachment edges per node is $m \sim \text{Unif}(1, 2\log_2 n)$ and the probability of adding a triangle after each edge is $p \sim \text{Unif}(0, 0.5)$. For the Watts-Strogatz generator, each node is connected to $k \sim n \text{Beta}(1.3, 1.3n/\log_2(n) - 1.3)$ neighbors (minimum 2) and the rewiring probability is $p \sim \text{Beta}(2, 2)$. Here *n* is the desired graph size.

Training details. Our encoder model architecture consists of a single hidden-layer feedforward module, followed by 8 graph convolutions with ReLU activation and learned dense skip connections, followed by a 4-layer perceptron with 64-dimensional output. We use SAGE graph convolutions [\(Hamilton et al.,](#page-10-0) [2017\)](#page-10-0) with sum aggregation and no neighbor sampling. We train the network with the Adam optimizer using learning rate 10[−]⁴ for 1 million batches of synthetic data, with batch size 64 and balanced class distribution.

Decoder configuration. To sample node-anchored neighborhoods, we follow the iterative procedure of MFINDER [\(Kashtan et al.,](#page-10-0) [2004\)](#page-10-0): after picking a random node as the anchor, we maintain a search tree, in each step randomly picking a node from the frontier with probability weighted by its number of edges with nodes in the search tree. The procedure terminates when the search tree reaches N nodes, and we take the subgraph induced by these nodes as the neighborhood. We select N uniformly randomly from 20 to 29 for each neighborhood (except for Experiment (2), where the maximum size is 25), sampling 10000 neighborhoods in total.

For a given maximum motif size k , SPMiner generates all motifs up to size k through a single run of the search procedure. For the greedy procedure, we sample 1000 seed nodes and expand each corresponding candidate motif up to size k , recording all candidates for intermediate sizes. For

Representation Learning for Frequent Subgraph Mining

Dataset	ENZYMES	COX ₂	COIL-DEL	MNROADS	Dataset	ENZYMES	COX ₂	COIL-DEL	MNROADS
RAND-ESU	3:59	13:56	19:22	4:47	RAND-ESU	39235	29368	85149	7605
MFINDER	7:29	17:13	20:57	16:24	MFINDER	10000	10000	10000	10000
SPMiner	9:26	8:13	1:15	9:41	SPMiner	1500	'500	1500	!500

(a) Runtime comparison with approximate methods

(b) Average number of subgraphs sampled

Table 3: Comparison of runtimes and number of subgraphs sampled (averaged over all motif sizes) for methods in Experiment (3). SPMINER has the lowest runtimes and requires fewer samples to identify frequent motifs. We compare against the greedy variant of SPMiner; the MCTS variant samples the same number of subgraphs and incurs small computational overhead.

the MCTS procedure, we run a total of 1000 simulations, divided equally among each motif size up to k , reusing the existing search tree with each new iteration; this procedure creates a useful prior for each successive motif size. We use exploration constant $c = 0.7$ throughout.

Baseline configuration. For MFINDER [\(Kashtan et al.,](#page-10-0) [2004\)](#page-10-0), we sample 10000 neighborhoods per motif size. We omit the slow $O(n^{n+1})$ exact probability correction, simply weighting each sampled neighborhood equally. We take the first sampled node as the anchor node in node-anchored experiments.

For RAND-ESU [\(Wernicke,](#page-11-0) [2006\)](#page-11-0), we set the expansion probabilities for each search tree level i according to $p_i =$ $(1 - i/(k + 1))^{\tau}$ where k is the maximum motif size and τ can be tuned for runtime depending on the dataset; we use $\tau = 5$ for ENZYMES (except $\tau = 2.3$ in Experiment (1)), $\tau = 2$ for COX2, $\tau = 2$ for MNROADS and $\tau = 9$ for COIL-DEL. We use the suggested variance reduction technique of sampling a fixed proportion of children to expand at each level.

For MOTIVO [\(Bressan et al.,](#page-10-0) [2021\)](#page-10-0), we use the official cpp implementation with 10^7 samples.

C. Further Experimental Results

Encoder Validation Details.

Table 4 evaluates the faithfulness of the order embedding space: given a pair of graphs, the task is to predict whether one is a subgraph of the other. We use accuracy and area under PR curve to evaluate the performance. SPMiner achieves 95% accuracy in determining whether one graph is a subgraph of the other.

Table 4: Accuracy and area under PR curve performance With different GNN architectures. A random model that We further conduct ablation studies. A random model that outputs labels according to the class distribution would re-

Figure 11: Median frequencies of motifs identified by SP-Miner and baselines for each graph size; higher is better. Top: MNROADS; bottom: COIL-DEL.

ceive 3.5 AUPR in our task. The following architectures are considered: (1) GCN+MLP: uses MLP with cross entropy loss to replace order embedding; uses the GCN [\(Kipf &](#page-11-0) [Welling,](#page-11-0) [2017\)](#page-11-0) architecture; (2) GIN+MLP: same as (1) but with GIN [\(Xu et al.,](#page-11-0) [2018\)](#page-11-0) architecture; (3) SAGE+MLP: same as (1) but with SAGE [\(Hamilton et al.,](#page-10-0) [2017\)](#page-10-0) architecture¹; (4) No skip: same as SPMiner (order embedding loss and the SAGE [\(Hamilton et al.,](#page-10-0) [2017\)](#page-10-0) architecture), but does not use the proposed learnable skip layer.

Results in Table 4 demonstrate that both order embedding and the learnable skip layer are crucial to performance gains, together reaching over 60 AUPR on real-world datasets.

Frequency comparison of identified motifs. We additionally run Experiment (3) on three more datasets, COIL-DEL [\(Riesen & Bunke,](#page-11-0) [2008\)](#page-11-0), a dataset of 3D objects derived from COIL-100, a graph of the Minnesota road network [\(Rossi & Ahmed,](#page-11-0) [2015\)](#page-11-0), abbreviated MNROADS and the Arxiv dataset [\(Hu et al.,](#page-10-0) [2020\)](#page-10-0) with 100K nodes and 1M edges to demonstrate that SPMiner can efficiently process larger graphs. We find again that SPMiner consistently identifies more frequent motifs than the baselines, especially for large motifs (Figure 11).

Table [5](#page-14-0) shows the node-anchored frequency of motifs identified by SPMiner and MFinder on the larger Arxiv dataset. Due to the computational expense of getting ground-truth frequencies for the identified motifs, we estimate these frequencies by anchoring the target graph at randomly sampled anchor points, and only checking subgraph isomorphism between the query and target anchored at the sampled points. SPMiner identifies more frequent motifs in the regime of larger motif sizes.

¹We use the SAGE architecture with sum aggregation, but without neighbor sampling.

Table 5: Median frequencies of motifs identified by SPMiner and baselines for each graph size.

D. Runtime Comparison

SPMiner uses a pre-training stage to train the encoder, and a search stage to identify frequent subgraphs (inference stage). The pre-training stage takes 8 hours, which is only performed once for all datasets in the experiment section (see dataset statistics). We further perform runtime comparison at inference stage, compared to other baselines. Runtime comparison with approximate methods. We tune the hyperparameters so that all methods are comparable in runtime and sample a comparable number of subgraphs. All methods are single-process and implemented with Python; the neural methods are implemented with PyTorch Geometric [\(Fey & Lenssen,](#page-10-0) [2019\)](#page-10-0). We run all methods on a single Xeon Gold 6148 core; the neural methods additionally use a single Nvidia 2080 Ti RTX GPU. Table [3](#page-13-0) shows that SP-Miner runs in less time and requires fewer subgraph samples than the baselines.

Runtime comparison with exact methods. In experiments, we compare with exact methods gSpan [\(Yan & Han,](#page-11-0) [2002\)](#page-11-0), Gaston [\(Nijssen & Kok,](#page-11-0) [2005\)](#page-11-0) and Motivo [\(Bressan et al.,](#page-10-0) [2021\)](#page-10-0). For gSpan, we use a highly optimized C++ implementation¹, which we modify to prune the search once the identified motif reaches the specified maximum motif size, in order to increase its efficiency in our setting. We use the single-threaded version. For Gaston, we use the official C++ implementation², using the variant with occurrence lists and specifying the desired maximum motif size through a command-line argument. For Motivo, we use the official C++ implementation³, using 4 threads and 10^7 samples through command-line arguments. We impose a resource limit of two hours of runtime and 50GB of memory for both methods. We run both methods on a single Xeon Gold 6148 core.

²[http://liacs.leidenuniv.nl/˜nijssensgr/](http://liacs.leidenuniv.nl/~nijssensgr/gaston/download.html) [gaston/download.html](http://liacs.leidenuniv.nl/~nijssensgr/gaston/download.html)

¹<https://github.com/Jokeren/gBolt>

³<https://gitlab.com/steven3k/motivo/>