

IDEA: Invariant Defense for Graph Adversarial Robustness

Shuchang Tao^{a,b}, Qi Cao^{a,*}, Huawei Shen^{a,b,*}, Yunfan Wu^{a,b}, Bingbing Xu^a and Xueqi Cheng^{a,b}

^aCAS Key Laboratory of AI Safety, Institute of Computing Technology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

^bUniversity of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Invariant Defense
Adversarial Robustness
Causal Feature
Graph Neural Networks

ABSTRACT

Despite the success of graph neural networks (GNNs), their vulnerability to adversarial attacks poses tremendous challenges for practical applications. Existing defense methods suffer from severe performance decline under unseen attacks, due to either limited observed adversarial examples or pre-defined heuristics. To address these limitations, we analyze the causalities in graph adversarial attacks and conclude that causal features are key to achieve graph adversarial robustness, owing to their determinedness for labels and invariance across attacks. To learn these causal features, we innovatively propose an *Invariant causal DEfense method against adversarial Attacks* (IDEA). We derive node-based and structure-based invariance objectives from an information-theoretic perspective. IDEA ensures strong predictability for labels and invariant predictability across attacks, which is provably a causally invariant defense across various attacks. Extensive experiments demonstrate that IDEA attains state-of-the-art defense performance under all five attacks on all five datasets. The implementation of IDEA is available at <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/IDEA>.

1. Introduction

Graph neural networks (GNNs) have achieved immense success in numerous tasks and applications, including node classification [28], recommendation [22], and fraud detection [9]. However, GNNs have been found to be vulnerable to adversarial attacks [70], i.e., imperceptible perturbations on graph data can easily mislead GNNs into misprediction. For example, in credit scoring, attackers add fake connections with high-credit customers to deceive GNNs [25], leading to loan fraud and severe economic losses. This vulnerability poses significant security risks, hindering the deployment of GNNs in real-world scenarios. Therefore, defending against adversarial attacks is crucial and has attracted substantial research interests.

Existing defense methods, mainly including graph purification, robust aggregation, and adversarial training [25], show effectiveness under specific attacks but lack broad protection across various attacks. Specifically, graph purification [14] purifies adversarial perturbations by modifying graph structure, while robust aggregation [24] redesigns GNN structure to defend against attacks. Both methods rely on pre-defined heuristics such as local smoothness (e.g., SimPGCN [24]) or low rank (e.g., GARNET [13]). However, they are susceptible to unseen attacks, as shown in Figure 1 (a), ProGNN [26] and SimPGCN fail against TDGIA [69] since TDGIA deviates from the assumed heuristics. The similar phenomenon is also observed in adversarial training, which tunes model on generated adversarial examples, resulting in vulnerability to unseen attacks. Moreover, modifying graph structure (ProGNN) or adding noise (RGCN [68]) even degrade performance on clean graphs, shown in Figure 1 (b).

To address the above limitations, we innovatively propose an invariant causal defense perspective. Note that while invariant causal methods have fueled a surge of research interests, they mainly focus on the independent samples [2, 33]. However, these methods cannot be directly applied to solve adversarial robustness on graph due to its complex nature. On graph data, the interconnectedness (edges) among the samples (nodes) results in dependence among the nodes, which presents unique challenges. In this paper, we design an interaction causal model [64] to capture causalities in graph adversarial attacks, tackling non-independent nature of graph data. Our findings suggest that causal features are crucial for graph adversarial robustness due to their: (1) **Strong predictability for labels**, since causal features determine labels; (2) **Invariant predictability across attacks**, as the causalities between causal features and labels

*Corresponding author

✉ shuchangtao5@gmail.com, tshuchang@163.com (S. Tao); caoqi@ict.ac.cn (Q. Cao); shenhuawei@ict.ac.cn (H. Shen); wuyunfan19b@ict.ac.cn (Y. Wu); xubingbing@ict.ac.cn (B. Xu); cxq@ict.ac.cn (X. Cheng)
ORCID(s): 0000-0001-6113-6145 (S. Tao)




Figure 1: Limitation of existing methods: Defenses suffer performance degradation under various attacks and on clean graph.

remains consistent regardless of attacks. These properties highlight causal features' importance for robustness under unseen attacks.

Guided by our designed interaction causal model, we propose an *Invariant causal DEfense method against adversarial Attacks (IDEA)*. By analyzing distinct characteristics of causal features, we derive node-based and structure-based invariance objectives considering both nodes and edges in graph. Node-based invariance goal minimizes the conditional mutual information between label and attack given causal feature, based on the consistent causality between causal feature and label regardless of attacks. While structure-based invariance goal is specially designed for graph structure, learning neighbors' causal feature to address the dependence among nodes. IDEA is proved to be a causally invariant defense, under the linear causal assumptions. It possesses strong and invariant predictability across attacks, offering broad protection. Extensive experiments confirm its superiority, outperforming all baselines across five datasets and attack scenarios.

The main contributions of this paper are:

1. *New perspective:* We propose an invariant causal defense perspective and design an interaction causal model to capture the causalities in graph adversarial attack, offering a new insights to the field.
2. *Novel methodology:* We propose IDEA to learn causal features for graph adversarial robustness. We design two invariance objectives to learn causal features by modeling and analyzing the causalities in graph adversarial attacks.
3. *Experimental evaluation:* Comprehensive experiments demonstrate that IDEA achieves state-of-the-art defense performance on all five datasets, highlighting its strong and invariant predictability.

2. Preliminary

Given an attributed graph $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, X)$, we denote $\mathcal{V} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ as node set, $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ as edge set, and $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ as the attribute matrix with d -dimensional attributes. The class set \mathcal{K} contains $K = |\mathcal{K}|$ classes. The goal of node classification is to assign labels for nodes based on the node attributes and network structure by learning a GNN f_θ [25]. The objective is: $\min_\theta \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{train}}} [L(f_\theta(G)_i, Y_i)]$, where Y_i denotes the ground-truth label of node i .

The graph adversarial attack aims to find a perturbed graph \hat{G} that maximizes the loss of GNN model [25]:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\hat{G} \in \mathcal{B}(G)} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} [L(f_{\theta^*}(\hat{G})_i, Y_i)] \\ \text{s.t.}, \quad & \theta^* = \arg \min_{\theta} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} [L(f_\theta(G_{\text{train}})_i, Y_i)]. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Here, perturbed graph \hat{G} is chosen from the admissible set $\mathcal{B}(G)$, where the perturbed nodes, edges, and node attributes should not exceed the budget [25]. $G_{\text{train}} = G$ in evasion attacks, and $G_{\text{train}} = \hat{G}$ in poisoning attacks.

Defense methods aim to improve graph adversarial robustness. The goal can be formulated as:

$$\min_{\theta} \max_{\hat{G} \in \mathcal{B}(G)} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} [L(f_\theta(\hat{G})_i, Y_i)]. \quad (2)$$




Figure 2: Left: Interaction causal model for graph adversarial attacks. **Right:** Causality and conditional independences.

Existing defense methods suffer performance degradation under various attacks or on clean graphs. Adversarial training [29] generalizes poorly to unseen adversarial attacks. While graph purification and robust aggregation are designed based on specific heuristic priors, such as local smoothness [35, 24] and low rank [26, 14]. They are only effective when attacks satisfy these priors. Hence, there is an urgent need to design a defense method that performs well both on clean graphs and across various attacks.

3. Methodology

We first model the causalities between causal features and other variables in graph adversarial attacks. Based on this causal analysis, we propose an Invariant causal DEfense method against Attacks (IDEA) to learn causal features.

3.1. Interaction Causal Model

To model the dependence characteristics in graph data, namely the interactions (e.g. edges) between samples (e.g. nodes), we design an interaction causal model with explicit variables¹ to capture the causality between different samples [64] under graph adversarial attacks.

Figure 2 (left) illustrate an example involving two connected nodes i and k . We inspect the causal relationships among variables: input data G_i (node i 's ego-network), label Y_i , causal feature C_i , perturbation T_i , attack domain D_i , and those variables of neighbor node k .

We introduce the latent causal feature C_i as an abstraction that causes both input ego-network G_i and label Y_i . For example, in credit scoring, C_i represents the financial situation, which determines both G_i (including personal attributes and friendships) and credit score Y_i . Besides, the causal feature C_i influences neighbor G_k due to network structure, aligning with GNN studies [28, 57]. We model graph adversarial attack with perturbation T_i and attack domain D_i which is a latent factor that determines T_i , as shown in Figure 2 (left). Attack domain D_i denotes attack categories based on characteristics, like attack type or attack strength. Here, D_i and T_i are considered as non-causal features N_i associated to attack, and we strive to exclude their influence. Perturbation T_i may impact the neighbor ego-network G_k due to edges between nodes.

We analyze these causalities and find that: (i) Causal feature C determines label Y , indicating causal feature's **strong predictability** for label; (ii) The $C - Y$ causality remains unchanged across attack domains, indicating the causal feature maintains **invariant predictability** across attack domains. These properties make causal features beneficial in enhancing graph adversarial robustness. Specifically, strong predictability enables good performance on clean graphs, while invariant predictability maintains performance under attacks. Meanwhile, the impact of attacks including D_i and T_i should be eliminated. Based on the above intuition, we aim to design a method to learn causal feature C and reduce the influence of non-causal feature to defend against attacks.

3.2. IDEA: Invariant causal DEfense method against adversarial Attack

We propose IDEA to learn causal features. Our approach involves designing invariance objectives based on the distinctive properties of causal features and approximating losses accordingly.

3.2.1. Invariance Objective

To learn causal features, we design invariance objectives by analyzing causality and conditional independences with d -separation [45] in Figure 2. The observations are:

¹Note that the explicit variable X_i refers to the event of one specific sample i , and the generic variable X is the event of all samples.

1. $C_i \rightarrow Y_i$: Causal feature C determines label Y (first path in Figure 2 (right)).
2. $Y_i \not\perp\!\!\!\perp D_i \mid G_i$: Y and attack domain D are associated given G (second path in Figure 2 (right)), since G is a collider² between Y and D .
3. $Y_i \perp\!\!\!\perp D_i \mid C_i$: The $C - Y$ causality remains unchanged across attack domain D , i.e., C has invariant predictability for Y across various attack domains.
4. $Y_i \not\perp\!\!\!\perp D_i \mid G_k$: Y_i and D_i are associated given the neighbor's ego-network G_k (third path in Figure 2(right)), since G_k is a collider of Y_i and D_i . It is crucial to recognize that this association is unique and arises from the dependencies between nodes which are inherent to the graph structure.
5. $Y_i \perp\!\!\!\perp D_i \mid C_k$: Y_i and D_i are independent conditional on neighbor's causal feature C_k .

Based on these observations, we analyze the characteristics of C and propose three goals from the perspective of mutual information I to learn causal feature C . Let Φ represent the feature encoder.

- **Predictive goal:** $\max_{\Phi} I(\Phi(G), Y)$ to guide $\Phi(G)$ to have strong predictability for Y in (1).
- **Node-based Invariance goal:** $\min_{\Phi} I(Y, D \mid \Phi(G))$. By comparing the conditional independences regarding G_i in (2) and C_i in (3), we propose this goal to guide $\Phi(G)$ learning C and excluding the influence of attack, to obtain invariant predictability across different attack domains.
- **Structure-based Invariance goal:** $\min_{\Phi} I(Y, D \mid \Phi(G)_{\mathcal{N}})$ Through comparing G_k in (4) and C_k in (5), we propose this goal to guide $\Phi(G)_{\mathcal{N}}$ learning the causal feature for neighbor \mathcal{N} . This goal is specifically designed for the graph data, taking into account intrinsic the dependence among nodes. It leverages the graph structure to better learn causal features.

To sum up, the objective can be formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\Phi} \quad & I(\Phi(\hat{G}^*), Y) - [I(Y, D \mid \Phi(\hat{G}^*)) + I(Y, D \mid \Phi(\hat{G}^*)_{\mathcal{N}})] \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \hat{G}^* = \arg \min_{\hat{G} \in \mathcal{B}(G)} I(\Phi(\hat{G}), Y), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Here, attack domain D is used to expose the difference of attack influence on feature, mitigate thereby learning the causal features that are invariant across attacks. The objective guides IDEA to learn causal feature with strong predictability and invariant predictability across attack domains, as well as exclude the impact of attacks. The capability of this objective relies on the diversity of attack domain D (Section 3.2.3). However, two challenges persist in solving Eq. 3: i) The objective is not directly optimizable since estimating mutual information of high-dimensional variables is difficult. ii) It is unknown that how to design attack domain D . Intuitively, diverse D can expose the difference of attack influence on features and promote learning invariant causal feature.

To address the challenge i), Section 3.2.2 presents the loss approximations for our proposed objectives. To tackle the challenge ii), Section 3.2.3 provides domain construction to learn the attack domain.

3.2.2. Loss Approximation

Let $Z = \Phi(\hat{G}^*)$ denote the representation to learn C .

Predictive loss. The predictive goal is $I(Z, Y) = \mathbb{E}_{p(y,z)} \log \frac{p(y|z)}{p(y)}$. Unfortunately, it is challenging to directly compute the distribution $p(y|z)$. To overcome this, we introduce $q(y|z)$ as a variational approximation of $p(y|z)$. Similar to [1, 32], we derive a lower bound of predictive goal: $\mathbb{E}_{p(x,y)} \mathbb{E}_{p(z|x)} \log q(y|z)$, where x is the input ego-network. Consequently, we can maximize $I(Z, Y)$ by maximizing the lower bound.

The lower bound involves two distributions, $p(z|x)$ and $q(y|z)$ that need to be solved. For $p(z|x)$, we employ neural network h as a realization of Φ to learn representation. We assume a Gaussian distribution $p(z|x) =$

²A collider is causally influenced by two variables and blocks the association between the variables that influence it. Conditioning on a collider opens the path between its causal parents [45, 44]. In our case, C_i and T_i are associated conditioned on G_i , making Y_i and D_i associated, conditioned on G_i .




Figure 3: Overall architecture of our IDEA method. IDEA contains feature encoder, classifier, domain-based classifier, and domain learner. The black arrows denote the workflow of IDEA during training, while the red arrows denote how IDEA predicts in the test phase.

$\mathcal{N}(z | h^\mu(x), h^\Sigma(x))$, where h^μ and h^Σ output the mean and covariance matrix, respectively [32, 1]. Subsequently, we leverage a re-parameterization technique [27] to tackle non-differentiability: $z = h^\mu(x) + \epsilon h^\Sigma(x)$, where ϵ is a standard Gaussian random variable. In general, encoder h contains GNN and re-parameterization, outputting $z = h(x, \epsilon)$. For $q(y|z)$, we use a neural network g as classifier to learn the variation distribution $q(y|z)$. With $p(z|x)$ and $q(y|z)$, we obtain the predictive loss \mathcal{L}_P :

$$\min_{g,h} \mathcal{L}_P(g, h, \hat{G}^*) = \min_{g,h} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_I} L(g(h(\hat{G}^*)_i), Y_i). \quad (4)$$

Node-based invariance loss. The node-based invariance goal strategically minimizes the conditional mutual information between the label and attacks, conditional on the causal features. This is rooted in the principle of consistent causality, which posits that the relationship between causal features and labels remains stable irrespective of adversarial attacks.

The conditional mutual information is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} I(Y, D|Z) &= \mathbb{E}_{p(z)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{p(y,d|z)} \left[\log \frac{p(y, d | z)}{p(d | z)p(y | z)} \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{p(z)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{p(y,d|z)} [\log p(y | z, d) - \log p(y | z)] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

To approximate $p(y | z, d)$, $p(y | z)$, we also employ two variational distributions $q_d(y | z, d)$ and $q(y | z)$. This allows us to obtain an estimation of $I(Y, D|Z)$:

$$\hat{I}(Y, D|Z) = \mathbb{E}_{p(z)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{p(y,d|z)} [\log q_d(y | z, d) - \log q(y | z)] \right].$$

Similar to CLUB [10, 33], we minimize $\mathbb{E}_{p(z,d)} KL[p(y | z, d) || q_d(y | z, d)]$ to make $\hat{I}(Y, D|Z)$ as an upper bound on $I(Y, D|Z)$. We prove that minimizing both $\mathbb{E}_{p(z,d)} KL[p(y | z, d) || q_d(y | z, d)]$ and $\hat{I}(Y, D|Z)$ minimizes our goal $I(Y, D|Z)$.

Proposition 1. *The node-based invariance goal $I(Y, D|Z)$ reaches its minimum value if $\mathbb{E}_{p(z,d)} KL[p(y | z, d) || q_d(y | z, d)]$ and $\hat{I}(Y, D|Z)$ are minimized*

The proof is in Appendix B.1. We utilize a neural network g_d to learn $q_d(y | z, d)$, optimizing the KL divergence $\mathbb{E}_{p(z,d)} KL[p(y | z, d) || q_d(y | z, d)]$ through minimizing the loss $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} L(g_d(h(\hat{G}^*)_i), D_i), Y_i)$. Additionally, we refine $\hat{I}(Y, D|Z)$ by reducing $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} [L(g(h(\hat{G}^*)_i), Y_i) - L(g_d(h(\hat{G}^*)_i), D_i), Y_i)]$. The node-based invariance loss \mathcal{L}_I :

$$\begin{aligned} &\min_{g, g_d, h} \mathcal{L}_I(g, g_d, h, \hat{G}^*, D) \\ &= \min_{g, g_d, h} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} L(g_d(h(\hat{G}^*)_i), D_i), Y_i) + \alpha \left[L(g(h(\hat{G}^*)_i), Y_i) - L(g_d(h(\hat{G}^*)_i), D_i), Y_i) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where coefficient α balances the two terms.

Structure-based invariance loss. To address the inherent dependencies between nodes in graph data, we design the structure-based invariance goal. This objective is crafted with the unique topology of graph data in mind, specifically considering its dependence nature among nodes. The intuition behind this goal is to harness the relational information among nodes to learn causal features of neighborhood \mathcal{N} . By doing so, we can capture the essence of the graph structure, which is pivotal for robust and generalizable model performance.

To operationalize this goal, we optimize the structure-based invariance loss, $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{E}}$, which serves as a guiding metric for the learning process:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{g, g_d, h} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{E}}(g, g_d, h, \hat{G}^*; D) \\ = & \min_{g, g_d, h} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}, k \sim \mathcal{N}_i} L(g_d(h(\hat{G}^*)_k, D_i), Y_i) + \alpha \left[L(g(h(\hat{G}^*)_k), Y_i) - L(g_d(h(\hat{G}^*)_k, D_i), Y_i) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where k is the sampled node from the neighbors \mathcal{N}_i of node i . This loss function is designed to minimize any extraneous variability that does not contribute to the true signal of the data, thereby reinforcing the model's predictive power and stability in the face of changing graph dynamics.

Overall loss. In summary, the overall loss function consists of predictive loss and two newly proposed invariance losses:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{g, g_d, h} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{P}}(g, h, \hat{G}^*) + \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}}(g, g_d, h, \hat{G}^*, D) + \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{E}}(g, g_d, h, \hat{G}^*, D) \\ & \text{s.t. } \hat{G}^* = \arg \max_{\hat{G} \in \mathcal{B}(G)} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{P}}(g, h, \hat{G}). \end{aligned}$$

3.2.3. Domain Construction

How to design attack domain D remains critical. Straightforward ways such as categorizing by attack type or strength can yield very few, non-diverse domains. Intuitively, attack domains should be both sufficiently numerous [47, 2] and distinct from each other [11, 2] to reveal the various effects of attacks. To this end, we leverage a neural network s as domain learner to learn attack domain. Here, s allows for the adjustable number of domains. We ensure the domain diversity by minimizing the co-linearity between the samples from different domains. We adopt Pearson correlation coefficient (**PCCs**) to measure of linear correlation between two sets of data. The loss function $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_s \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}(s, h) &= \min_s \sum_{D, D' \in \mathcal{D}, D \neq D'} \text{PCCs}(r^D, \rho(\hat{G})^{D'}) \\ r^D &= \mathbb{E}_{i \in \mathcal{V}^D} [h(\hat{G}^*)_i (g(h(\hat{G}^*)_i) - Y_i)], \\ \mathcal{V}^D &= \{i | (s(h(\hat{G}^*)_i) = D)\}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where attack domain D is in the form of one-hot vector to categorize adversarial samples, \mathcal{D} is the attack domain set, \mathcal{V}^D denotes nodes assigned to domain D by learner s , r^D denotes the representation of \mathcal{V}^D . The form of r^D aids in proving IDEA achieving adversarial robustness (Proposition 2).

3.2.4. Overall Framework

According to the above analysis, the overall loss function of IDEA is formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{g, g_d, h} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{P}}(g, h, \hat{G}^*) + \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}}(g, g_d, h, \hat{G}^*, s^*) + \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{E}}(g, g_d, h, \hat{G}^*, s^*) \\ & \text{s.t. } \hat{G}^* = \arg \max_{\hat{G} \in \mathcal{B}(G)} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{P}}(g, h, \hat{G}), s^* = \arg \min_s \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}(s, h). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The overall architecture of IDEA is illustrated in Figure 3. The IDEA model consists of four parts: an encoder h to learn the node representation, i.e., causal feature; a classifier g for final classification; a domain-based classifier g_d for invariance goals; and a domain learner s to provide the partition of attack domain. We also provide the algorithm in Appendix C.

Through theoretical analysis in Proposition 2, IDEA produces causally invariant defenders under the linear assumption of causal relationship [2], enabling graph adversarial robustness.

Table 1
Statistics of benchmark datasets

Dataset	Type	#Nodes	#Edges	#Attr.	Classes
Cora	Citation network	2,485	5,069	1,433	7
Citeseer	Citation network	2,110	3,668	3,703	6
Reddit	Social network	10,004	73,512	602	41
ogbn-products	Co-purchasing network	10,494	38,872	100	35
ogbn-arxiv	Citation network	169,343	2,484,941	128	39

Proposition 2. Let $Y = C\gamma + \epsilon$ where γ is the causal mechanism, $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ is Gaussian noise. Let $\rho(\hat{G}) = \psi(C, N)$ where ψ is the mapping from causal feature C and non-causal feature N to graph representation $\rho(\hat{G})$, and ρ is a powerful graph representation extractor can extract all information from \hat{G} . Encoder Φ comprises ρ and a learner ϕ with parameter Θ_ϕ to learn C . Suppose a function $\tilde{\psi}$ satisfying $\tilde{\psi}(\rho(\hat{G})) = C$, with parameters $\Theta_{\tilde{\psi}}$. Assume the rank of Θ_ϕ is r . Let $\Theta_{\tilde{\psi}}^\top \Theta_\gamma$ and $\Theta_\phi^\top \Theta_\omega$ be the parameter of the ground truth defender and learned defender. If $\Theta_\phi^\top \Theta_\omega$ satisfies the following conditions in training attack domain set \mathcal{D}_{tr} :

- (1) $I(\Phi(\hat{G}), Y) - [I(Y, D | \Phi(\hat{G})) + I(Y, D | \Phi(\hat{G})_{\mathcal{N}})]$ (Eq. 3) is maximized,
- (2) Consider the set $\{\mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D)}[\rho(\hat{G}^D)\rho(\hat{G}^D)^\top](\Theta_\phi^\top \Theta_\omega - \Theta_{\tilde{\psi}}^\top \Theta_\gamma)\}_{D \in \mathcal{D}_{tr}}$, which we will refer to as S . If S is linearly independent and the dimension of the span of S , denoted as $\dim(\text{span}(S))$, exceeds $\dim(\phi) - r$, then the equality $\Theta_\phi^\top \Theta_\omega = \Theta_{\tilde{\psi}}^\top \Theta_\gamma$ defines a causal invariant defender for all attack domain sets \mathcal{D}_{all} .

The proof of Proposition 2 is available in Appendix B.2. Condition (1) aligns with minimizing the losses \mathcal{L}_P , \mathcal{L}_I , and \mathcal{L}_E in Eq.8. In condition (2), the first term corresponds to minimizing \mathcal{L}_D in Eq.8, while the second term ensures diversity of adversarial examples, common in graph. Proposition 2 serves as a theoretical validation for the effectiveness of IDEA.

4. Experiments

4.1. Experimental Settings

4.1.1. Datasets

We conduct node classification experiments on 5 diverse network benchmarks: three citation networks (Cora [26], Citeseer [26], and ogbn-arxiv [23]), a social network (Reddit [21, 63]), and a product co-purchasing network (ogbn-products [23]). Due to the high complexity of some GNN and defense methods, it is difficult to apply them to very large graphs with more than million nodes. Thus, we utilize subgraphs from Reddit and ogbn-products for experiments. Following the settings of most methods [70, 71, 54, 26, 24, 39, 35], experiments are conducted on the largest connected component (LCC). All datasets can be assessed at <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/IDEA>. The statistics of datasets are summarized in Table 1.

- *Cora* [26]: A node represents a paper with key words as attributes and paper class as label, and the edge represents the citation relationship.
- *Citeseer* [26]: Same as *Cora*.
- *Reddit* [21, 63]: Each node represents a post, with word vectors as attributes and community as the label, while each edge represents the post-to-post relationship.
- *ogbn-products* [23]: A node represents a product sold in Amazon with the word vectors of product descriptions as attributes and the product category as the label, and edges between two products indicate that the products are purchased together.
- *ogbn-arxiv* [23]: Each node denotes a Computer Science (CS) arXiv paper indexed by [59] with attributes obtained by averaging the embeddings of words in paper’s title and abstract. Each edge indicates the citation relationship, and the node label is the primary categories of each arXiv paper.

4.1.2. Defense baselines

We evaluate the performance of our proposed method, IDEA, by comparing it against ten baseline approaches. These baselines include traditional Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) and defense techniques from three main categories:

graph purification, robust aggregation, and adversarial training. For each category, we select the most representative and state-of-the-art methods for comparison. In summary, our comparison includes the following ten baselines:

- Traditional GNNs
 1. *GCN* [28]: GCN is a popular graph convolutional network based on spectral theory.
 2. *GAT* [57]: GAT computes the hidden representations of each node by attending over its neighbors via graph attentional layers.
- Graph purification
 3. *ProGNN* [26]: ProGNN simultaneously learns the graph structure and GNN parameters by optimizing three regularizations, i.e., feature smoothness, low-rank and sparsity.
 4. *STABLE* [35]: STABLE first learns reliable representations of graph structure via unsupervised learning, and then designs an advanced GCN as a downstream classifier to enhance the robustness of GCN.
 5. *GARNET* [13]: GARNET uses weighted spectral embedding to create a base graph, then refines this graph through the pruning of non-essential edges to enhance adversarial robustness.
- Robust aggregation
 6. *RGCN* [68]: RGCN uses gaussian distributions in graph convolutional layers to absorb the effects of adversarial attacks.
 7. *SimPGCN* [24]: SimPGCN presents a feature similarity preserving aggregation which balances the structure and feature information, and self-learning regularization to capture the feature similarity and dissimilarity between nodes.
 8. *Elastic* [39]: Elastic enhances the local smoothness adaptivity of GNNs via ℓ_1 -based graph smoothing and derives the elastic message passing (EMP).
 9. *Soft-Median* [19]: Soft-Median is robust aggregation function where the weight for each instance is determined based on the distance to the dimension-wise median.
- Adversarial training
 10. *FLAG* [29]: FLAG, a state-of-the-art adversarial training method, defends against attacks by incorporating adversarial examples into the training set, enabling the model to correctly classify them.

4.1.3. Attack Methods

We assess the robustness of IDEA by examining its performance against five adversarial attacks, including one representative poisoning attack (MetaAttack [71]) and four evasion attacks (netattack [70], PGD [41], TDGIA [69], G-NIA [54]). Among these attacks, netattack and MetaAttack modify the original graph structure, while PGD, TDGIA, and G-NIA are node injection attacks. The following is a brief description of each attack:

- *netattack* [70]: Netattack is the first adversarial attack on graph data, which can attack node attributes and graph structure with gradient. In this paper, we adopt netattack to attack graph structure, i.e., adding and removing edges.
- *PGD* [41]: PGD, a popular adversarial attack, is used as node injection attack. We employi projected gradient descent (PGD) to inject malicious nodes on graphs.
- *TDGIA* [69]: TDGIA consists of two modules: the heuristic topological defective edge selection for injecting nodes and smooth adversarial optimization for generating features of injected nodes.
- *G-NIA* [54]: G-NIA is one of the state-of-the-art node injection attack methods, showing excellent attack performance. G-NIA models the optimization process via a parametric model to preserve the learned attack strategy and reuse it when inferring.
- *MetaAttack* [71]: MetaAttack is the most representative poisoning attack method, which has been widely-used to evaluate the robustness of GNN models.

Table 2

Accuracy(%) of targets under evasion attacks. The **best** and **second-best** are highlighted. Parentheses denote IDEA's relative increase compared to second-best. "-" for out-of-memory (OOM).

Dataset	Attack	GCN	GAT	ProGNN	STABLE	GARNET	RGCN	SimpGCN	Elastic	Soft-Median	FLAG	IDEA
Cora	Clean	85.0 ± 0.5	84.6 ± 0.8	81.9 ± 1.2	83.9 ± 0.6	84.2 ± 0.8	83.6 ± 0.7	83.0 ± 1.2	83.4 ± 1.9	84.3 ± 0.9	85.8 ± 0.6	88.4 ± 0.6 (↑ 3.0%)
	netttack	83.0 ± 0.5	81.7 ± 0.7	79.9 ± 1.1	21.5 ± 4.8	83.0 ± 1.0	81.7 ± 0.6	82.0 ± 1.2	79.4 ± 1.7	83.5 ± 0.8	84.8 ± 0.6	85.4 ± 0.7 (↑ 0.8%)
	PGD	44.2 ± 3.4	26.7 ± 7.6	19.6 ± 2.2	32.2 ± 0.2	81.4 ± 1.6	80.5 ± 0.4	9.0 ± 2.2	29.0 ± 5.5	19.5 ± 2.3	60.2 ± 2.4	83.6 ± 2.1 (↑ 2.6%)
	TDGIA	20.2 ± 2.3	33.7 ± 14.9	15.4 ± 1.7	30.9 ± 2.4	76.1 ± 2.9	79.9 ± 0.9	13.5 ± 1.2	18.0 ± 1.2	16.8 ± 0.4	57.2 ± 3.0	81.2 ± 2.5 (↑ 1.6%)
	G-NIA	2.3 ± 0.5	5.2 ± 3.1	4.2 ± 0.8	25.8 ± 10.1	6.1 ± 0.9	81.3 ± 0.9	11.5 ± 8.1	11.2 ± 3.7	4.8 ± 0.8	64.8 ± 2.0	85.3 ± 1.2 (↑ 4.9%)
	AVG	47.0 ± 37.0	46.4 ± 35.2	40.2 ± 37.6	38.9 ± 25.5	66.2 ± 33.7	81.4 ± 1.4	39.8 ± 39.0	44.2 ± 34.6	41.8 ± 38.8	70.6 ± 13.7	84.8 ± 2.7 (↑ 4.1%)
Citeseer	Clean	73.6 ± 0.6	74.7 ± 1.0	74.1 ± 0.9	75.2 ± 0.5	71.3 ± 1.0	74.6 ± 0.5	74.9 ± 1.3	74.0 ± 1.3	73.6 ± 0.9	74.7 ± 0.9	82.0 ± 1.9 (↑ 9.1%)
	netttack	72.6 ± 0.7	72.6 ± 1.8	71.5 ± 0.9	20.8 ± 8.5	70.3 ± 1.1	73.2 ± 0.6	74.5 ± 1.1	71.8 ± 1.5	72.8 ± 0.9	73.6 ± 1.2	78.8 ± 1.6 (↑ 5.7%)
	PGD	52.7 ± 4.5	54.5 ± 5.3	41.4 ± 4.1	17.7 ± 6.2	65.4 ± 1.1	70.1 ± 1.1	48.2 ± 13.9	39.1 ± 6.0	36.2 ± 1.9	60.1 ± 2.5	76.9 ± 3.4 (↑ 9.8%)
	TDGIA	23.0 ± 3.8	44.7 ± 11.2	16.9 ± 2.1	15.5 ± 5.3	57.1 ± 2.4	63.8 ± 7.4	28.1 ± 11.1	18.2 ± 3.6	21.6 ± 1.1	57.5 ± 1.7	75.9 ± 3.9 (↑ 19.0%)
	G-NIA	15.0 ± 3.6	13.6 ± 3.6	22.5 ± 4.8	18.5 ± 6.6	18.2 ± 0.8	32.1 ± 6.4	54.4 ± 16.8	30.2 ± 4.2	14.1 ± 1.0	68.0 ± 0.9	79.4 ± 3.0 (↑ 16.8%)
	AVG	47.4 ± 27.3	52.0 ± 24.9	45.3 ± 26.7	29.5 ± 25.6	56.4 ± 22.1	62.8 ± 17.7	56.0 ± 19.6	46.6 ± 25.1	43.6 ± 28.1	66.8 ± 7.8	78.6 ± 2.4 (↑ 17.7%)
Reddit	Clean	84.9 ± 0.6	88.5 ± 0.3	66.2 ± 3.1	83.6 ± 0.4	85.7 ± 0.3	68.0 ± 1.7	50.2 ± 8.3	72.7 ± 0.6	85.6 ± 0.8	86.9 ± 0.4	90.8 ± 0.3 (↑ 2.7%)
	netttack	84.8 ± 0.5	87.9 ± 0.4	68.8 ± 3.1	3.6 ± 3.2	86.5 ± 0.4	67.0 ± 1.7	49.5 ± 8.4	71.4 ± 0.7	84.5 ± 0.8	85.5 ± 0.4	89.1 ± 0.5 (↑ 1.4%)
	PGD	46.0 ± 1.6	30.8 ± 2.5	20.0 ± 5.4	3.6 ± 1.5	81.2 ± 0.8	53.1 ± 2.1	9.8 ± 3.3	19.0 ± 1.0	16.5 ± 0.9	72.1 ± 0.9	81.6 ± 0.9 (↑ 0.4%)
	TDGIA	24.1 ± 1.6	32.8 ± 3.8	9.0 ± 3.0	3.6 ± 1.4	48.5 ± 1.5	44.3 ± 1.9	5.5 ± 1.6	8.3 ± 0.6	6.3 ± 0.7	73.1 ± 0.7	81.3 ± 0.6 (↑ 11.1%)
	G-NIA	1.0 ± 0.8	2.5 ± 1.1	4.0 ± 3.6	4.7 ± 2.2	8.8 ± 2.6	5.0 ± 2.0	5.3 ± 3.7	3.3 ± 0.7	1.9 ± 0.9	76.9 ± 1.2	84.2 ± 1.1 (↑ 9.5%)
	AVG	48.2 ± 37.1	48.5 ± 38.2	33.6 ± 31.5	19.8 ± 35.6	62.1 ± 33.7	47.5 ± 25.7	24.1 ± 23.6	34.9 ± 34.4	39.0 ± 42.4	78.9 ± 6.9	85.4 ± 4.4 (↑ 8.2%)
ogbn-products	Clean	63.9 ± 0.7	69.6 ± 0.4	49.7 ± 2.4	67.6 ± 0.8	71.9 ± 0.6	64.3 ± 0.4	57.7 ± 2.2	57.9 ± 0.9	72.8 ± 0.4	67.6 ± 0.7	76.1 ± 0.4 (↑ 4.5%)
	netttack	63.3 ± 0.6	62.1 ± 2.1	50.1 ± 3.1	14.9 ± 1.4	72.8 ± 0.7	62.1 ± 0.8	56.1 ± 2.4	52.6 ± 0.9	71.3 ± 0.5	65.8 ± 0.5	74.4 ± 0.6 (↑ 2.3%)
	PGD	32.2 ± 0.9	25.0 ± 0.8	17.5 ± 1.0	14.3 ± 1.8	57.7 ± 2.7	34.8 ± 0.9	17.8 ± 1.5	21.2 ± 0.5	19.8 ± 0.7	54.0 ± 0.6	67.9 ± 0.6 (↑ 17.5%)
	TDGIA	23.1 ± 1.0	16.9 ± 1.1	11.0 ± 0.5	16.5 ± 1.9	54.6 ± 2.4	28.0 ± 0.9	16.5 ± 2.2	16.9 ± 0.8	11.7 ± 0.5	49.5 ± 1.0	64.9 ± 0.9 (↑ 18.8%)
	G-NIA	2.7 ± 1.0	3.6 ± 2.0	2.2 ± 0.8	9.9 ± 5.2	4.4 ± 1.0	7.1 ± 2.6	8.6 ± 4.5	3.3 ± 0.6	0.8 ± 0.3	54.2 ± 0.8	65.6 ± 1.1 (↑ 21.0%)
	AVG	37.1 ± 26.5	35.5 ± 28.9	26.1 ± 22.4	24.7 ± 24.1	52.3 ± 28.0	39.3 ± 24.1	31.3 ± 23.6	30.4 ± 23.7	35.3 ± 34.2	58.2 ± 8.0	69.8 ± 5.2 (↑ 19.8%)
ogbn-arxiv	Clean	65.3 ± 0.3	65.2 ± 0.1	-	-	53.0 ± 0.1	60.2 ± 1.0	-	58.0 ± 0.1	61.1 ± 0.2	61.0 ± 0.7	66.7 ± 0.4 (↑ 2.1%)
	PGD	41.1 ± 1.0	22.6 ± 1.9	-	-	52.3 ± 0.1	37.8 ± 2.0	-	29.9 ± 0.6	19.1 ± 0.4	24.2 ± 2.8	52.9 ± 1.0 (↑ 1.2%)
	TDGIA	33.1 ± 1.6	9.7 ± 1.8	-	-	51.6 ± 0.1	27.5 ± 2.1	-	20.5 ± 0.9	18.6 ± 0.8	29.3 ± 2.3	53.2 ± 0.8 (↑ 3.0%)
	G-NIA	4.6 ± 0.4	2.5 ± 0.3	-	-	35.3 ± 0.1	5.6 ± 0.8	-	14.6 ± 0.1	2.5 ± 0.1	11.5 ± 1.1	40.5 ± 1.6 (↑ 14.5%)
	AVG	36.0 ± 25.0	25.0 ± 28.1	-	-	48.1 ± 8.5	32.8 ± 22.7	-	30.7 ± 19.2	27.3 ± 22.2	31.5 ± 21.0	53.3 ± 10.7 (↑ 10.9%)

4.1.4. Implementation Details

For each dataset, we randomly split nodes as 1:1:8 for training, validation and test, following [26, 24, 39, 35]. For each experiment, we report the average performance and the standard deviation of 10 runs. For attack and defense methods, we employ the most widely recognized DeepRobust [37] benchmark in the field of graph adversarial and defense, to ensure that the experimental results can be compared directly to other papers that use DeepRobust (such as Elastic [39], ProGNN [26], STABLE [35], and SimPGCN [24]). Note that MetaAttack is untargeted attack, performance is reported on the test set with perturbation rates from 0% to 20%, following [39, 35]. The evasion attacks are targeted attacks, and we randomly sample 20% of all nodes from the test set as targets. Nettack perturbs 20% edges, while node injection attacks (PGD, TDGIA, and G-NIA) inject 20% nodes and edges. We focused on gray-box attack scenarios following [70, 71, 35, 24, 26] and the attacker is only aware of the input and output, which is practical.

For our IDEA, we tune the hyper-parameters from the following range: the coefficient α over {10, 25, 100, 150}, the number of domains over {2, 5, 10, 20}. The hyper-parameters of all datasets can be assessed at <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/IDEA>. Note that we implement both attribute and structural attacks to generate adversarial examples that minimize the predictive loss \mathcal{L}_p . Specifically, attribute attack generation is the same as that in FLAG [29], while structural attack generation is the same as that in EERM [61]. For all methods that require a backbone model (e.g., FLAG and our IDEA), we use GCN as the backbone model. All experiments are conducted on a single NVIDIA V100 32 GB GPU.

4.2. Robustness against Evasion Attacks

We conduct experiments under four evasion attacks (nettack, PGD, TDGIA, and G-NIA), and show the accuracy of target nodes in Table 2. We also report the average accuracy of clean and attacked graphs, along with standard deviation of accuracy across these graphs, denoted as AVG. Note that we exclude nettack from ogbn-arxiv evaluation due to its lack of scalability. GCN and GAT exhibit high accuracy on clean graphs, however, their accuracy significantly declines under PGD, TDGIA, and G-NIA. Defense methods suffer from severe performance degradation under various attacks, and some (such as ProGNN (81.9%) and RGCN (83.6%)) even experience a decline on Clean. For graph purification methods, ProGNN and STABLE perform poorly under most attacks, maybe because they require retraining to achieve defensive effects, rendering them unsuitable for evasion attacks. GARNET shows effectiveness against PGD and TDGIA, but still struggles to defend against G-NIA. RGCN, SimPGCN, Elastic, and Soft-Median perform well against nettack; however, they suffer from performance degradation on clean graphs, which is undesirable. Adversarial training FLAG outperforms other baselines but exhibits unsatisfactory defense on Cora, Citeseer, and ogbn-arxiv.

Table 3
Accuracy(%) of test set under poisoning attack (MetaAttack).

Dataset	Pb. rate	GCN	GAT	ProGNN	STABLE	GARNET	RGCN	SimpGCN	Elastic	Soft-Median	FLAG	IDEA
Cora	0%	83.6±0.5	83.5±0.5	83.0±0.2	85.6±0.6	80.1±0.5	82.6±0.3	81.9±1.0	85.8±0.4	84.0±0.5	83.4±0.3	87.1±0.7 (↑ 1.5%)
	5%	77.8±0.6	80.3±0.5	82.3±0.5	81.4±0.5	77.1±0.8	77.5±0.5	77.6±0.7	82.2±0.9	79.9±0.8	80.9±0.3	85.5±0.6 (↑ 3.9%)
	10%	74.9±0.7	78.5±0.6	79.0±0.6	80.5±0.6	75.3±0.8	73.7±1.2	75.7±1.1	78.8±1.7	73.4±2.3	78.8±0.9	84.8±0.6 (↑ 5.3%)
	15%	67.8±1.2	73.6±0.8	76.4±1.3	78.6±0.4	72.3±0.7	70.2±0.6	72.7±2.8	77.2±1.6	70.5±1.1	75.0±0.7	84.2±0.6 (↑ 7.1%)
	20%	61.6±1.1	66.6±0.8	73.3±1.6	77.8±1.1	69.8±0.7	62.7±0.7	70.3±4.6	70.5±1.3	60.5±0.4	70.2±1.1	83.2±0.6 (↑ 6.9%)
Citeseer	0%	73.3±0.3	74.4±0.8	73.3±0.7	75.8±0.4	70.4±0.7	74.4±0.3	74.4±0.7	73.8±0.6	71.3±0.8	72.8±0.8	80.3±1.0 (↑ 5.9%)
	5%	70.2±0.8	72.3±0.5	72.9±0.6	74.1±0.6	69.2±0.9	71.7±0.3	73.3±1.0	72.9±0.5	69.6±2.2	71.1±0.6	79.1±0.9 (↑ 6.7%)
	10%	68.0±1.4	70.3±0.7	72.5±0.8	73.5±0.4	68.5±1.0	69.3±0.4	72.0±1.0	72.6±0.4	67.9±1.9	69.2±0.6	78.6±1.1 (↑ 6.9%)
	15%	65.2±0.9	67.7±1.0	72.0±1.1	73.2±0.5	65.0±1.2	66.0±0.2	70.8±1.3	71.9±0.7	66.0±2.9	66.5±0.8	77.6±0.6 (↑ 6.0%)
	20%	60.1±1.4	64.3±1.0	70.0±2.3	72.8±0.5	62.9±1.9	61.2±0.5	70.0±1.7	64.7±0.8	56.1±1.3	64.1±0.8	77.8±0.9 (↑ 6.9%)
Reddit	0%	84.5±0.5	88.0±0.3	73.4±2.8	86.6±0.2	85.2±0.2	78.2±0.6	51.4±7.6	83.8±0.3	88.8±0.5	84.6±0.2	91.2±0.3 (↑ 2.7%)
	5%	81.0±0.8	86.1±0.6	73.9±1.2	81.5±0.4	78.3±0.3	73.9±1.7	34.8±9.9	80.6±0.5	69.6±2.2	71.1±0.6	79.1±0.9 (↑ 6.7%)
	10%	72.1±0.6	78.8±0.8	63.2±1.2	75.9±0.5	63.4±1.3	57.8±1.3	27.3±7.8	70.4±1.0	66.4±1.4	72.2±0.8	89.0±0.4 (↑ 12.9%)
	15%	70.1±1.7	76.0±1.6	59.9±1.4	73.8±0.4	62.2±0.6	53.3±1.4	25.0±6.4	68.7±0.6	60.5±2.4	66.3±1.2	88.4±0.4 (↑ 16.3%)
	20%	67.9±1.4	72.7±1.9	56.7±0.9	71.7±0.5	60.7±0.8	51.5±2.8	19.0±4.5	67.4±0.6	56.6±1.5	63.7±0.5	88.1±0.3 (↑ 21.2%)
ogbn-products	0%	63.0±0.7	68.6±0.4	64.3±2	70.5±0.5	71.3±0.5	63.0±0.5	57.1±2.1	72.7±0.2	74.3±0.3	66.3±0.4	75.2±0.3 (↑ 1.2%)
	5%	49.6±0.9	64.4±0.5	50.0±2.4	58.7±0.7	61.5±0.6	40.0±1.1	31.9±10.3	61.0±0.7	66.5±0.4	57.3±0.4	73.7±0.5 (↑ 10.8%)
	10%	39.4±1.1	54.4±0.7	43.4±1.9	50.5±0.5	53.6±0.9	33.4±0.9	26.7±8.1	52.3±0.7	56.3±0.7	46.7±0.7	72.9±0.3 (↑ 29.5%)
	15%	34.4±1.1	46.7±0.7	38.4±1.8	44.6±0.8	47.7±0.4	29.9±1.0	20.3±6.6	48.6±0.4	47.7±1.0	42.7±0.5	71.9±0.7 (↑ 47.9%)
	20%	31.2±1.0	41.9±1.2	34.0±2.5	40.3±0.7	42.3±0.4	27.8±0.8	16.0±2.1	46.3±0.4	42.8±1.3	39.3±0.6	71.0±0.8 (↑ 53.3%)




Figure 4: Ablation Study.

Our proposed method, IDEA, achieves the best performance on Clean and across all attacks, significantly outperforming all baselines on all datasets. On Clean, IDEA exhibits the best performance primarily due to its ability to learn causal features that have strong label predictability. Furthermore, IDEA’s performance remains good consistency under both clean graphs and various attacks, evidenced by the low standard deviation in AVG. This emphasizes its invariant predictability across all attacks. For instance, on Citeseer, IDEA’s standard deviation across graphs is a only 2.4, while the runner-up, FLAG, reaches 7.8. These results demonstrate that IDEA possesses both strong predictability (high accuracy on Clean) and invariant predictability (sustained accuracy across attacks).

4.3. Robustness against Poisoning Attacks

We evaluate IDEA’s robustness under poisoning attacks, employing the widely-adopted MetaAttack [71] and varying the perturbation rate (the rate of changing edges) from 0 to 20% following [39, 35]. We exclude ogbn-arxiv since MetaAttack cannot handle large graphs. Table 3 shows that all methods’ accuracy decreases as perturbation rate increases. Among baselines, graph purification methods demonstrate better defense performance, with STABLE outperforming others on Cora and Citeseer. RGCN, SimpGCN, and Soft-Median resist attacks only at low perturbation rates. The adversarial training FLAG brings less improvement than it does under evasion attacks. Maybe due to its training on evasion attacks, leading to poor generalization for poisoning attacks.

IDEA achieves the state-of-the-art performance under all perturbation rates on all datasets, significantly outperforming all baselines. When the attack strength becomes larger, our IDEA still maintains good performance, demonstrating that IDEA has the invariant prediction ability across perturbations.

4.4. Ablation Study

We analyze the influence of each part of IDEA through experiments on invariance goals and domain construction. We implement four variants of IDEA, including IDEA without node-based invariance goal (IDEA w/o \mathcal{L}_I), IDEA without structure-based invariance goal \mathcal{L}_E (IDEA w/o \mathcal{L}_E), IDEA without both invariance goals (IDEA w/o \mathcal{L}_I and \mathcal{L}_E), and IDEA without domain partition (IDEA w/o \mathcal{L}_D). The variant IDEA w/o \mathcal{L}_I and \mathcal{L}_E , which only optimizes the




Figure 5: Hyperparameter analysis: The average accuracy of clean and attacked graphs, including Clean, netack, PGD, TDGIA, and G-NIA.

Table 4

Accuracy(%) of targets under adaptive attack.

Dataset	GCN	ProGNN	STABLE	RGCN	SimPGCN	FLAG	IDEA
Cora	18.7±3.5	15.0±2.8	27.5±5.0	14.3±1.6	28.9±3.4	36.7±2.4	53.1±5.0
Citeseer	11.8±2.0	21.8±2.3	12.7±2.3	10.1±1.2	24.5±4.7	31.1±6.4	44.4±1.6
Reddit	34.7±4.9	43.1±8.1	27.3±4.4	57.5±3.0	12.5±6.7	5.2±5.9	61.7±5.3

predictive loss, serves as a test for the benefit brought by learning causal features. We take the results on clean graph and evasion attacks on Cora as an illustration.

As shown in Figure 4, all variants exhibit a decline compared to IDEA (red), highlighting the significance of both invariance goals and domain construction. Specifically, IDEA w/o \mathcal{L}_I and \mathcal{L}_E (blue) suffers the largest drop, highlighting our objectives' benefits since IDEA is much more robust than simple adversarial training using same adversarial examples. The performance decline of IDEA w/o \mathcal{L}_E (orange) illustrates the significant advantages of the structure-based invariance goal, especially on clean graph, highlighting the benefits of modeling the interactions between samples. IDEA w/o \mathcal{L}_D (green) displays a large standard deviation, with the error bar much larger than that of IDEA, emphasizing the stability achieved through the diverse attack domains.

4.5. Hyper-Parameter Analysis

We investigate the effects of coefficient α and the number of domains and compare the defense performance. Note that we take results against evasion attacks on Cora as an illustration. Figure 5 shows that the average accuracy of the clean and attacked graphs, along with the standard deviation of accuracy across these graphs, i.e., AVG in Section 4.1. For coefficient α , we observe that when α is increasing, IDEA achieves better performance (higher accuracy), and performs more stable (lower standard deviation), validating the effectiveness of invariance component. While, too large α (e.g. $\alpha = 150$) causes domination of invariance goal, leading to little attention to the predictive goal and degradation of performance. Regarding the number of attack domains, performance improves with increasing domain numbers, reaching its peak at 10 domains. This may be due to the relatively small number of nodes in the Cora dataset, suggesting that a larger number of domains (e.g., 20) is not necessary. In our main experiment shown in Table 1, we utilized $\alpha = 100$ and the attack domain number to 10 to achieve the best results.

4.6. Performance under Adaptive Attacks

To better evaluate our IDEA, we also conduct experiments under adaptive attack, i.e., PGD in [42]. We implement adaptive attacks for baselines and IDEA. Some baselines are excluded because their open source codes use edge_index to represent edges. This makes calculating gradients on edges challenging, so the implementation of these baselines are difficult to conduct white-box adaptive attacks. As shown in Table 4, adaptive attack causes serious performance degradation to defense methods because adaptive attacks are powerful white-box attacks. IDEA outperforms all the baselines. Experiments offer a more broader evaluation of IDEA's performance under a hard scenario, consistently showing IDEA's superiority.




Figure 6: Visualizing learned features: clean and attacked graphs. Color denote ground-truth labels.

4.7. Visualization

We further visualize the learned features with t-SNE technique [40] to show whether IDEA learns the features that have strong and invariant predictability. Figure 6 illustrates the feature learned by GCN, RGCN, FLAG, and IDEA on clean graph and under the strongest G-NIA attack on Cora. As shown in Figure 6, existing methods either learn the features destroyed under attack (GCN and FLAG), or learn features are mixed (RGCN).

For IDEA, in Figure 6(d,h), the features learned by IDEA can be distinguished by labels. Specifically, IDEA’s learned features are similar for nodes with the same label and distinct for different labels, emphasizing features’ **strong predictability** for labels. Furthermore, the features in Figure 6(d) on clean graph and those in Figure 6(h) on attacked graph exhibit nearly the same distributions. This observation demonstrates that the relationship between features and labels remained invariant across attacks, thus exhibiting **invariant predictability**. These results show that IDEA learned causal invariant features with both strong and invariant predictability for labels.

5. Related works

In this section, we present the related works on defense methods against graph adversarial attacks and invariant learning methods.

5.1. Defense against Graph Adversarial Attack

Despite the success of graph neural networks (GNNs), they are shown to be vulnerable to adversarial attacks, [70, 51, 5, 16, 18, 17], i.e., imperceptible perturbations on graph data can dramatically degrade the performance of GNNs [54, 69, 52, 58, 55], blocking the deployment of GNNs to real world applications [25]. Various defense mechanisms [36, 20, 56, 53] have been proposed to counter these graph adversarial attacks, which can broadly be classified into adversarial training, graph purification, and robust aggregation strategies [51, 35, 25].

Adversarial training methods, such as FLAG [29] and others [12, 15, 34], typically employ a min-max optimization approach. This involves iteratively generating adversarial examples that maximize the loss and updating GNN parameters to minimize the loss on these examples. However, adversarial training may be not robust under unseen attacks [3]. Robust training methods [72, 3, 73, 4, 48] incorporate worst-case adversarial examples to enhance certifiable robustness [3, 72]. These methods can be considered an improved version of traditional adversarial training. However, due to limited searching space, robust training still faces similar challenges as adversarial training.

Graph purification methods [60, 26, 14] aim to purify adversarial perturbations by modifying graph structure. Jaccard [60] prunes edges that connect two dissimilar nodes, while ProGNN [26] concurrently learns the graph structure and GNN parameters through optimization of feature smoothness, low-rank and sparsity. The recent method STABLE [35] acquires reliable representations of graph structure via unsupervised learning. GARNET [13] first leverages weighted spectral embedding to construct a base graph, then refines the base graph by pruning additional uncritical edges based on probabilistic graphical model, to boost the adversarial robustness of GNN models.

Robust aggregation methods [68, 39, 24, 31, 65] redesign model structures to establish robust GNNs. RGCN [68] uses Gaussian noise to mitigate adversarial perturbations. SimPGCN [24] resents a feature similarity preserving aggregation that balances the structure and feature information. Elastic [39] improves the local smoothness adaptivity and derives the elastic message passing. Geisler et al. [19] design a robust aggregation function, Soft Median to achieve an effective defense at all scales. However, both kinds of methods rely on specific heuristic priors such as local smoothness [60, 57, 26, 65, 35, 24] or low rank [26, 14], that may be ineffective against some attacks [7], leading to method failure. What's worse, modifying graph structure [26, 65] or adding noise [68] with this heuristic may even cause performance degradation on clean graphs.

Different from the above studies, in this paper, we creatively propose an invariant causal defense perspective, providing a new perspective to address this issue. Our method aims to learn causal features that possess strong predictability for labels and invariant predictability across attacks, to achieve graph adversarial robustness.

5.2. Invariant Learning Methods

Invariant learning methods [2, 30, 32] have fueled a surge of research interests [49, 11, 62, 6, 8, 61]. These work typically assume that data are collected through different domains or environments [2], and the causal relationships within the data remain unchanged across different domains, denoting invariant causality [49]. Generally, invariant learning methods aim to learn the causal mechanism or causal feature that is invariant across different domains or environments, allowing the causal feature to generalize across all domains, which can be used to solve the out-of-distribution generalization problem [49, 2, 47].

However, such methods cannot be directly applied to solve graph adversarial robustness due to the complex nature of graph data and the scarcity of diverse domains. Two main challenges arise: i) On graph data, there are interconnections (edges) between nodes, so nodes are no longer independent of each other, making samples not independent and identically distributed (non-IID) [61, 8]. We model the generation of graph adversarial attack via an interaction causal model and propose corresponding invariance goals considering both node itself and the interconnection between nodes. ii) In adversarial learning, constructing sufficiently diverse domains or environments is challenging due to a lack of varied domains. We propose to learn sufficient and diverse domains by limiting the co-linearity between domains.

5.3. Causal methods for Adversarial Robustness

A few recent works attempt to achieve adversarial robustness with causal methods on computer vision [46, 66]. These methods, such as DICE [46], ADA [66], mainly use causal intervention to achieve the robustness. The difference between them and our work lies in two aspects: (1) Existing causal methods for robustness are developed for the image area. However, the non-IID nature of graph data brings challenges to these methods in achieving graph adversarial robustness. Our work proposes the structural-level invariance goal for the non-IID graph data. (2) These methods adopt causal intervention. For example, DICE uses hard intervention [46], and ADA [66] uses "soft" intervention. However, the intervention is difficult to achieve [44]. Our work constructs diverse domains and learns causal features by optimizing both node-based and structural-based invariance goals.

5.4. Purification methods in Computer Vision

There are also some purification works in computer vision for defending against attacks. Shi et al. propose Self-supervised Online Adversarial Purification (SOAP), leveraging self-supervised loss to purify adversarial examples at test-time [50]. Zhou et al. propose to remove adversarial noise by implementing a self-supervised adversarial training mechanism in a class activation feature space [67]. Naseer et al. propose a self-supervised adversarial training mechanism in the input space [43]. Liao et al. propose high-level representation guided denoiser (HGD), using a loss function defined as the difference between the target model's outputs activated by the clean image and denoised image [38].

Most purification methods in computer vision leverage image data priors. For example, SOAP [50] incorporates self-supervised tasks such as image rotation that are unique to the domain of computer vision, while NRP [43] depends on a pixel loss function, i.e., \mathcal{L}_{img} , to encourage image smoothness. These domain-specific dependencies pose significant challenges when considering the direct transposition of these methods to graph data, which inherently lacks such image-based priors.

In contrast, graph purification methods [26, 35] are specifically designed to exploit the unique properties of graph data, making them appropriate for addressing graph-specific issues. However, graph purification defenses rely on predefined heuristics, while these may be ineffective for some attacks causing the methods to fail. Therefore, there is a pressing need to develop a defense strategy that is robust and effective against various attacks.

6. Conclusion and Future work

In this paper, we creatively introduce a causal defense perspective by learning causal features that have strong and invariant predictability across attacks. Then, we propose IDEA and design two invariance objectives to learn causal features. Extensive experiments demonstrate that IDEA significantly outperforms all the baselines under both evasion attacks and poisoning attacks on five benchmark datasets, emphasizing that IDEA possesses both strong and invariant predictability across attacks. We believe causal defense approach is a promising new direction, and there are many interesting and valuable research problems in the future. For example, studying domain partitioning is more suitable for adversarial attack and defense scenarios; or exploring more ways to generate adversarial examples.

Acknowledgments

This work is funded by the National Key R&D Program of China (2022YFB3103700, 2022YFB3103701), the Strategic Priority Research Program of the Chinese Academy of Sciences under Grant No. XDB0680101, and the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant Nos. 62102402, U21B2046, 62272125. Huawei Shen is also supported by Beijing Academy of Artificial Intelligence (BAAI).

References

- [1] Alemi, A.A., Fischer, I., Dillon, J.V., Murphy, K., 2017. Deep variational information bottleneck, in: International Conference on Learning Representations.
- [2] Arjovsky, M., Bottou, L., Gulrajani, I., Lopez-Paz, D., 2019. Invariant risk minimization. arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.02893 .
- [3] Bojchevski, A., Günnemann, S., 2019. Certifiable robustness to graph perturbations, in: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32. NeurIPS '19, pp. 8319–8330.
- [4] Bojchevski, A., Klicpera, J., Günnemann, S., 2020. Efficient robustness certificates for discrete data: Sparsity-aware randomized smoothing for graphs, images and more, in: Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning, pp. 11647–11657.
- [5] Chen, L., Li, J., Peng, J., Xie, T., Cao, Z., Xu, K., He, X., Zheng, Z., 2020. A survey of adversarial learning on graphs. ArXiv abs/2003.05730.
- [6] Chen, Y., Xiong, R., Ma, Z., Lan, Y., 2022a. When does group invariant learning survive spurious correlations?, in: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36.
- [7] Chen, Y., Yang, H., Zhang, Y., KAILI, M., Liu, T., Han, B., Cheng, J., 2022b. Understanding and improving graph injection attack by promoting unnoticeability, in: International Conference on Learning Representations.
- [8] Chen, Y., Zhang, Y., Bian, Y., Yang, H., KAILI, M., Xie, B., Liu, T., Han, B., Cheng, J., 2022c. Learning causally invariant representations for out-of-distribution generalization on graphs, in: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36.
- [9] Cheng, D., Wang, X., Zhang, Y., Zhang, L., 2022. Graph neural network for fraud detection via spatial-temporal attention. IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering 34, 3800–3813. doi:10.1109/TKDE.2020.3025588.
- [10] Cheng, P., Hao, W., Dai, S., Liu, J., Gan, Z., Carin, L., 2020. Club: A contrastive log-ratio upper bound of mutual information, in: Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning.
- [11] Creager, E., Jacobsen, J.H., Zemel, R., 2021. Environment inference for invariant learning, in: Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning, pp. 2189–2200.
- [12] Dai, Q., Shen, X., Zhang, L., Li, Q., Wang, D., 2019. Adversarial training methods for network embedding, in: Proceedings of The Web Conference 2019, pp. 329–339.
- [13] Deng, C., Li, X., Feng, Z., Zhang, Z., 2022. GARNET: reduced-rank topology learning for robust and scalable graph neural networks, in: Rieck, B., Pascanu, R. (Eds.), Learning on Graphs Conference, LoG 2022, 9-12 December 2022, Virtual Event, PMLR. p. 3.
- [14] Entezari, N., Al-Sayouri, S.A., Darvishzadeh, A., Papalexakis, E.E., 2020. All you need is low (rank): Defending against adversarial attacks on graphs, in: Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining, pp. 169–177.
- [15] Feng, F., He, X., Tang, J., Chua, T.S., 2019. Graph adversarial training: Dynamically regularizing based on graph structure. IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering .
- [16] Gao, Y., Wang, X., He, X., Feng, H., Zhang, Y., 2023a. Rumor detection with self-supervised learning on texts and social graph. Frontiers Comput. Sci. 17, 174611.
- [17] Gao, Y., Wang, X., He, X., Liu, Z., Feng, H., Zhang, Y., 2023b. Addressing heterophily in graph anomaly detection: A perspective of graph spectrum, in: WWW, ACM. pp. 1528–1538.
- [18] Gao, Y., Wang, X., He, X., Liu, Z., Feng, H., Zhang, Y., 2023c. Alleviating structural distribution shift in graph anomaly detection, in: WSDM, ACM. pp. 357–365.
- [19] Geisler, S., Schmidt, T., Sirin, H., Zügner, D., Bojchevski, A., Günnemann, S., 2021. Robustness of graph neural networks at scale, in: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34.
- [20] Gosch, L., Sturm, D., Geisler, S., Günnemann, S., 2023. Revisiting robustness in graph machine learning, in: International Conference on Learning Representations.
- [21] Hamilton, W., Ying, Z., Leskovec, J., 2017. Inductive representation learning on large graphs, pp. 1024–1034.
- [22] He, X., Deng, K., Wang, X., Li, Y., Zhang, Y., Wang, M., 2020. Lightgcn: Simplifying and powering graph convolution network for recommendation, in: Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, pp. 639–648.

- [23] Hu, W., Fey, M., Zitnik, M., Dong, Y., Ren, H., Liu, B., Catasta, M., Leskovec, J., 2020. Open graph benchmark: Datasets for machine learning on graphs, pp. 22118–22133.
- [24] Jin, W., Derr, T., Wang, Y., Ma, Y., Liu, Z., Tang, J., 2021. Node similarity preserving graph convolutional networks, in: Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining, pp. 148–156.
- [25] Jin, W., Li, Y., Xu, H., Wang, Y., Tang, J., 2020a. Adversarial attacks and defenses on graphs: A review and empirical study. ArXiv abs/2003.00653.
- [26] Jin, W., Ma, Y., Liu, X., Tang, X.F., Wang, S., Tang, J., 2020b. Graph structure learning for robust graph neural networks, in: Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining.
- [27] Kingma, D.P., Welling, M., 2014. Auto-encoding variational bayes, in: International Conference on Learning Representations.
- [28] Kipf, T.N., Welling, M., 2017. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks, in: International Conference on Learning Representations.
- [29] Kong, K., Li, G., Ding, M., Wu, Z., Zhu, C., Ghanem, B., Taylor, G., Goldstein, T., 2022. Robust optimization as data augmentation for large-scale graphs, in: Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition.
- [30] Krueger, D., Caballero, E., Jacobsen, J.H., Zhang, A., Binas, J., Zhang, D., Le Priol, R., Courville, A., 2021. Out-of-distribution generalization via risk extrapolation (rex), in: Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning, pp. 5815–5826.
- [31] Lei, R., Wang, Z., Li, Y., Ding, B., Wei, Z., 2022. Evennet: Ignoring odd-hop neighbors improves robustness of graph neural networks, in: Proceedings of Neural Information Processing Systems.
- [32] Li, B., Shen, Y., Wang, Y., Zhu, W., Li, D., Keutzer, K., Zhao, H., 2022a. Invariant information bottleneck for domain generalization, in: Proceedings of the 36th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, pp. 7399–7407.
- [33] Li, B., Wang, Y., Zhang, S., Li, D., Keutzer, K., Darrell, T., Zhao, H., 2021a. Learning invariant representations and risks for semi-supervised domain adaptation, in: Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, pp. 1104–1113.
- [34] Li, J., Peng, J., Chen, L., Zheng, Z., Liang, T., Ling, Q., 2022b. Spectral adversarial training for robust graph neural network. IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering .
- [35] Li, K., Liu, Y., Ao, X., Chi, J., Feng, J., Yang, H., He, Q., 2022c. Reliable representations make a stronger defender: Unsupervised structure refinement for robust gnn, in: Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining, pp. 925–935.
- [36] Li, K., Liu, Y., Ao, X., He, Q., 2023. Revisiting graph adversarial attack and defense from a data distribution perspective, in: International Conference on Learning Representations.
- [37] Li, Y., Jin, W., Xu, H., Tang, J., 2021b. Deeprobust: A pytorch library for adversarial attacks and defenses, in: Proceedings of the 35rd AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence. URL: <https://github.com/DSE-MSU/DeepRobust>.
- [38] Liao, F., Liang, M., Dong, Y., Pang, T., Hu, X., Zhu, J., 2018. Defense against adversarial attacks using high-level representation guided denoiser, in: Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, pp. 1778–1787.
- [39] Liu, X., Jin, W., Ma, Y., Li, Y., Liu, H., Wang, Y., Yan, M., Tang, J., 2021. Elastic graph neural networks, in: Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning, pp. 6837–6849.
- [40] Van der Maaten, L., Hinton, G., 2008. Visualizing data using t-sne. Journal of machine learning research 9.
- [41] Madry, A., Makelov, A., Schmidt, L., Tsipras, D., Vladu, A., 2018. Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks, in: International Conference on Learning Representations.
- [42] Mujkanovic, F., Geisler, S., Günnemann, S., Bojchevski, A., 2022. Are defenses for graph neural networks robust?, in: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36.
- [43] Naseer, M., Khan, S.H., Hayat, M., Khan, F.S., Porikli, F., 2020. A self-supervised approach for adversarial robustness, in: Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, pp. 259–268.
- [44] Pearl, J., 2009. Causal inference in statistics: An overview .
- [45] Pearl, J., 2010. Causal inference, in: Causality: Objectives and Assessment (NIPS 2008 Workshop), pp. 39–58.
- [46] Ren, Q., Chen, Y., Mo, Y., Wu, Q., Yan, J., 2022. Dice: Domain-attack invariant causal learning for improved data privacy protection and adversarial robustness, in: Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining, pp. 1483–1492.
- [47] Rosenfeld, E., Ravikumar, P.K., Risteski, A., 2021. The risks of invariant risk minimization, in: International Conference on Learning Representations.
- [48] Schuchardt, J., Bojchevski, A., Klicpera, J., Günnemann, S., 2021. Collective robustness certificates: Exploiting interdependence in graph neural networks, in: International Conference on Learning Representations.
- [49] Shen, Z., Liu, J., He, Y., Zhang, X., Xu, R., Yu, H., Cui, P., 2021. Towards out-of-distribution generalization: A survey. arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.13624 .
- [50] Shi, C., Holtz, C., Mishne, G., 2021. Online adversarial purification based on self-supervision .
- [51] Sun, L., Wang, J., Yu, P.S., Li, B., 2018. Adversarial attack and defense on graph data: A survey. ArXiv abs/1812.10528.
- [52] Sun, Y., Wang, S., Tang, X.F., Hsieh, T.Y., Honavar, V.G., 2020. Adversarial attacks on graph neural networks via node injections: A hierarchical reinforcement learning approach, in: Proceedings of The Web Conference 2020, pp. 673–683.
- [53] Tao, S., Cao, Q., Shen, H., Hou, L., Cheng, X., 2021a. Adversarial immunization for certifiable robustness on graphs, in: Proceedings of the 14th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining.
- [54] Tao, S., Cao, Q., Shen, H., Huang, J., Wu, Y., Cheng, X., 2021b. Single node injection attack against graph neural networks, in: Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, p. 1794–1803.
- [55] Tao, S., Cao, Q., Shen, H., Wu, Y., Hou, L., Cheng, X., 2023a. Adversarial camouflage for node injection attack on graphs. Information Sciences , 1–doi:10.1016/j.ins.2023.119611.

- [56] Tao, S., Shen, H., Cao, Q., Wu, Y., Hou, L., Cheng, X., 2023b. Graph adversarial immunization for certifiable robustness. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 1–1. doi:10.1109/TKDE.2023.3311105.
- [57] Veličković, P., Cucurull, G., Casanova, A., Romero, A., Liò, P., Bengio, Y., 2018. Graph Attention Networks, in: *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [58] Wang, J., Luo, M., Suya, F., Li, J., Yang, Z., Zheng, Q., 2020a. Scalable attack on graph data by injecting vicious nodes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.13825*.
- [59] Wang, K., Shen, Z., Huang, C., Wu, C.H., Dong, Y., Kanakia, A., 2020b. Microsoft academic graph: When experts are not enough. *Quantitative Science Studies* 1, 396–413.
- [60] Wu, H., Wang, C., Tyshetskiy, Y., Docherty, A., Lu, K., Zhu, L., 2019. Adversarial examples on graph data: Deep insights into attack and defense, in: *Proceedings of the 28th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 4816–4823.
- [61] Wu, Q., Zhang, H., Yan, J., Wipf, D., 2022. Handling distribution shifts on graphs: An invariance perspective, in: *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [62] Yong, L., Zhu, S., Tan, L., Cui, P., 2022. Zin: When and how to learn invariance without environment partition?, in: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36.
- [63] Zeng, H., Zhou, H., Srivastava, A., Kannan, R., Prasanna, V.K., 2020. Graphsaint: Graph sampling based inductive learning method, in: *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [64] Zhang, C., Mohan, K., Pearl, J., 2022a. Causal inference with non-iid data using linear graphical models, in: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36.
- [65] Zhang, X., Zitnik, M., 2020. Gnn-guard: Defending graph neural networks against adversarial attacks, in: *Proceedings of Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 9263–9275.
- [66] Zhang, Y., Gong, M., Liu, T., Niu, G., Tian, X., Han, B., Schölkopf, B., Zhang, K., 2022b. Adversarial robustness through the lens of causality, in: *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [67] Zhou, D., Wang, N., Peng, C., Gao, X., Wang, X., Yu, J., Liu, T., 2021. Removing adversarial noise in class activation feature space, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 7858–7867.
- [68] Zhu, D., Zhang, Z., Cui, P., Zhu, W., 2019. Robust graph convolutional networks against adversarial attacks, in: *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pp. 1399–1407.
- [69] Zou, X., Zheng, Q., Dong, Y., Guan, X., Kharlamov, E., Lu, J., Tang, J., 2021. Tdgia: Effective injection attacks on graph neural networks, in: *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, p. 2461–2471.
- [70] Zügner, D., Akbarnejad, A., Günnemann, S., 2018. Adversarial attacks on neural networks for graph data, in: *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pp. 2847–2856.
- [71] Zügner, D., Günnemann, S., 2019a. Adversarial attacks on graph neural networks via meta learning, in: *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [72] Zügner, D., Günnemann, S., 2019b. Certifiable robustness and robust training for graph convolutional networks, in: *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pp. 246–256.
- [73] Zügner, D., Günnemann, S., 2020. Certifiable robustness of graph convolutional networks under structure perturbations, in: *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*.

Table 5
Symbol table

Symbol	Definition
G	Graph in a node classification task
\mathcal{V}	Node set of a graph
\mathcal{E}	Edge set of a graph
X	Attribute matrix
\mathcal{K}	Class set
K	Class number
f_θ	GNN classifier
\hat{G}	Perturbed graph
\mathcal{G}	Admissible perturbed graph set
i, j	Nodes in graph
G_i	Input ego-network of node i
Y_i	Label of node i
C_i	Causal feature of node i
D_i	Attack domain of node i
N_i	Non-causal feature of node i
$I(\cdot)$	Mutual information
Φ	Feature encoder
$C_{\mathcal{N}}$	Causal feature of neighbor \mathcal{N}
Z	Representation of feature encoder
$p(\cdot)$	Natural distribution
$q(\cdot)$	Variation approximation
h	Neural network feature encoder
g	Neural network classifier
g_d	Neural network auxiliary classifier
s	Domain learner
\mathcal{V}^D	Nodes assigned to domain D
r^D	Overall representation of \mathcal{V}^D
\mathcal{L}_p	Predictive loss
\mathcal{L}_I	Node-based invariance loss
$\mathcal{L}_\mathcal{E}$	Structure-based invariance loss
\mathcal{L}_D	Domain loss
γ	Intrinsic causal mechanism
e	Gaussian noise
ψ	Mapping from causal and non-causal features to graph representation
ρ	Powerful graph representation extractor
Θ	Parameter associated with a particular model component

A. Symbol and Definition

This section summarizes all symbols and their definitions for a clear understanding of our paper. Understanding the notations and terminologies used throughout this paper is crucial for comprehending the theoretical constructs and the methodologies proposed. To facilitate this, Table 5 shows a comprehensive summary of all the symbols and their associated definitions, categorized into three main parts for ease of reference.

Specifically, the first part of the table presents the foundation symbols related to graph, including nodes and edges. The second part lists the symbol regarding interaction causal model in Section 3.1. In the third part, we delve into the specific notation employed in the proposed IDEA, including components, representation and loss functions in our IDEA method.

B. Proofs

B.1. Proof for Proposition 1

Proof. The difference between $\hat{I}(Y, D|Z)$ and $I(Y, D|Z)$ could be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \hat{I}(Y, D|Z) - I(Y, D|Z) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{p(z)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{p(y,d|z)} \left[\left[\log q_d(y | z, d) - \log q(y|z) \right] - \left[\log p(y | z, d) - \log p(y | z) \right] \right] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{p(z)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{p(y,d|z)} \left[\log \frac{p(y | z)}{q(y | z)} - \log \frac{p(y | z, d)}{q_d(y | z, d)} \right] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{p(z)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{p(y|z)} \left[\log \frac{p(y | z)}{q(y | z)} \right] - \mathbb{E}_{p(d|z)} \mathbb{E}_{p(y|z,d)} \left[\log \frac{p(y | z, d)}{q_d(y | z, d)} \right] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{p(z)} \text{KL} [p(y | z) \| q(y | z)] - \mathbb{E}_{p(z,d)} \text{KL} [p(y | z, d) \| q_d(y | z, d)]
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Next, similar to the theoretical analysis in CLUB [10], we can prove that \hat{I} is either an upper bound of I or a estimator of I whose absolute error is bounded by the approximation performance $\mathbb{E}_{p(z,d)} \text{KL} [p(y | z, d) \| q_d(y | z, d)]$. That is to say, if $\mathbb{E}_{p(z,d)} \text{KL} [p(y | z, d) \| q_d(y | z, d)]$ is small enough, $I(Y, D|Z)$ is bounded by $\hat{I}(Y, D|Z)$. Therefore, $\hat{I}(Y, D|Z)$ is minimized if $\mathbb{E}_{p(z,d)} \text{KL} [p(y | z, d) \| q_d(y | z, d)]$ and $\hat{I}(Y, D|Z)$ are both minimized. \square

B.2. Proof for Proposition 2

Proof. The proof includes three steps:

Step 1: We prove that if Φ and ω satisfies the condition (1), i.e., $I(\Phi(\hat{G}), Y) - [I(Y, D | \Phi(\hat{G})) + I(Y, D | \Phi(\hat{G})_{\mathcal{N}})]$ (denoted as κ) is maximized, then $\Theta_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D)} [\rho(\hat{G}^D) \rho(\hat{G}^D)^\top] \Theta_{\phi}^\top \Theta_{\omega} = \Theta_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D), Y^D} [\rho(\hat{G}^D) Y^D]$ where $\hat{G}^D = \{\rho(\hat{G})_i | i \in \mathcal{V}^D\}$, for all $D \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{tr}}$. Next, we begin our proof. Suppose that Φ has infinite capacity for representation, with $\Phi = \arg \max \kappa$ and Φ containing ϕ and ρ , we have $Y^D = \rho(\hat{G}^D)^\top \Theta_{\phi}^\top \Theta_{\omega} + \epsilon_{\Phi}$, where $\rho(\hat{G}^D)^\top \Theta_{\phi}^\top \Theta_{\omega}$ represents the output of $\rho(\hat{G}^D)$ after passing through learner ϕ and classifier ω (i.e., the output of \hat{G}^D after passing through Φ and ω). The error term ϵ_{Φ} satisfies $\mathbb{E}_{Y^D} [\epsilon_{\Phi}] = 0$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
Y^D &= \rho(\hat{G}^D)^\top \Theta_{\phi}^\top \Theta_{\omega} + \epsilon_{\Phi} \\
\mathbb{E}_{Y^D} [Y^D] &= \mathbb{E}_{Y^D} [\rho(\hat{G}^D)^\top \Theta_{\phi}^\top \Theta_{\omega} + \epsilon_{\Phi}] = \mathbb{E}_{Y^D} [\rho(\hat{G}^D)^\top \Theta_{\phi}^\top \Theta_{\omega}] = \rho(\hat{G}^D)^\top \Theta_{\phi}^\top \Theta_{\omega} \\
\mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D), Y^D} [\rho(\hat{G}^D) Y^D] &= \mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D)} [\rho(\hat{G}^D) \rho(\hat{G}^D)^\top] \Theta_{\phi}^\top \Theta_{\omega} \\
\Theta_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D), Y^D} [\rho(\hat{G}^D) Y^D] &= \Theta_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D)} [\rho(\hat{G}^D) \rho(\hat{G}^D)^\top] \Theta_{\phi}^\top \Theta_{\omega}.
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

The validity of line 2 in Eq. 10 stems from $\mathbb{E}_{Y^D} [\epsilon_{\Phi}] = 0$, and the fact that Y^D is independent with $\rho(\hat{G}^D)^\top \Theta_{\phi}^\top \Theta_{\omega}$. Consequently, we have $\Theta_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D)} [\rho(\hat{G}^D) \rho(\hat{G}^D)^\top] \Theta_{\phi}^\top \Theta_{\omega} = \Theta_{\phi} \mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D), Y^D} [\rho(\hat{G}^D) Y^D]$.

Step 2: We prove that if $\Theta_{\phi}^\top \Theta_{\omega}$ satisfies the condition (2), i.e., $\left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D)} [\rho(\hat{G}^D) \rho(\hat{G}^D)^\top] \left(\Theta_{\phi}^\top \Theta_{\omega} - \Theta_{\psi}^\top \Theta_{\gamma} \right) \right\}_{D \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{tr}}}$ is linearly independent, and $\dim \left(\text{span} \left(\left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\hat{G}_i} [\rho(\hat{G})_i \rho(\hat{G})_i^\top] \left(\Theta_{\phi}^\top \Theta_{\omega} - \Theta_{\psi}^\top \Theta_{\gamma} \right) \right\}_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \right) \right) > \dim(\phi) - r$, then,

$$\dim \left(\text{span} \left(\left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D)} [\rho(\hat{G}^D) \rho(\hat{G}^D)^\top] \left(\Theta_{\phi}^\top \Theta_{\omega} - \Theta_{\psi}^\top \Theta_{\gamma} \right) - \mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D), \epsilon^D} [\rho(\hat{G}^D) \epsilon^D] \right\}_{D \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{tr}}} \right) \right) > \dim(\phi) - r$$

We examine the two component individually. Suppose that

$$\dim(\text{span} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D)} [\rho(\hat{G}^D) \rho(\hat{G}^D)^\top] \left(\Theta_{\phi}^\top \Theta_{\omega} - \Theta_{\psi}^\top \Theta_{\gamma} \right) \right\}_{D \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{tr}}} = k. \tag{11}$$

Since the set $\left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D)} [\rho(\hat{G}^D) \rho(\hat{G}^D)^\top] \left(\Theta_{\phi}^\top \Theta_{\omega} - \Theta_{\psi}^\top \Theta_{\gamma} \right) \right\}_{D \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{tr}}}$ is linearly independent, and

$\dim \left(\text{span} \left(\left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\hat{G}_i} [\rho(\hat{G})_i \rho(\hat{G})_i^\top] \left(\Theta_{\phi}^\top \Theta_{\omega} - \Theta_{\psi}^\top \Theta_{\gamma} \right) \right\}_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \right) \right) > \dim(\phi) - r$, we have $k > \dim(\phi) - r$.

Next, we consider $\mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D), \epsilon^D} [\rho(\hat{G}^D) \epsilon^D]$. Since $\text{rank}(A) \geq \text{rank}(AB)$, and both ϵ^D and $(\Theta_\phi^\top \Theta_\omega - \Theta_{\tilde{\psi}}^\top \Theta_\gamma)$ are scalar values that do not affect the dimension, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \dim(\text{span} \left(\left[\mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D), \epsilon^D} [\rho(\hat{G}^D) \epsilon^D] \right] \right)) \\ & \geq \dim(\text{span} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D)} [\rho(\hat{G}^D) \rho(\hat{G}^D)^\top] \left(\Theta_\phi^\top \Theta_\omega - \Theta_{\tilde{\psi}}^\top \Theta_\gamma \right) \right\}_{D \in \mathcal{D}_{tr}}} = k. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Taking the dimensions of both components into account, we arrive at

$$\dim \left(\text{span} \left(\left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D)} [\rho(\hat{G}^D) \rho(\hat{G}^D)^\top] \left(\Theta_\phi^\top \Theta_\omega - \Theta_{\tilde{\psi}}^\top \Theta_\gamma \right) - \mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D), \epsilon^D} [\rho(\hat{G}^D) \epsilon^D] \right\}_{D \in \mathcal{D}_{tr}}} \right) \right) \geq k > \dim(\phi) - r. \quad (13)$$

Step 3: We prove that if $\Theta_\phi^\top \Theta_\omega$ satisfies: $\Theta_\phi \mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D)} [\rho(\hat{G}^D) \rho(\hat{G}^D)^\top] \Theta_\phi^\top \Theta_\omega = \Theta_\phi \mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D), Y^D} [\rho(\hat{G}^D) Y^D]$, for all $D \in \mathcal{D}_{tr}$ and $\dim(\text{span}(\{\mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D)} [\rho(\hat{G}^D) \rho(\hat{G}^D)^\top] \left(\Theta_\phi^\top \Theta_\omega - \Theta_{\tilde{\psi}}^\top \Theta_\gamma \right) - \mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D), \epsilon^D} [\rho(\hat{G}^D) \epsilon^D] \}_{D \in \mathcal{D}_{tr}})) > \dim(\phi) - r$, then $\Theta_\phi^\top \Theta_\omega = \Theta_{\tilde{\psi}}^\top \Theta_\gamma$ is causal invariant defender for all attack domain set \mathcal{D}_{all} .

According to $Y = C\gamma + \epsilon$, $\tilde{\psi}(\rho(\hat{G})) = C$, and Step 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Theta_\phi \mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D)} [\rho(\hat{G}^D) \rho(\hat{G}^D)^\top] \Theta_\phi^\top \Theta_\omega \\ & = \Theta_\phi \mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D), Y^D} [\rho(\hat{G}^D) Y^D] \\ & = \Theta_\phi \mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D), \epsilon^D} \left[\rho(\hat{G}^D) \left((\Theta_{\tilde{\psi}} \rho(\hat{G}^D))^\top \Theta_\gamma + \epsilon^D \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

We can re-write the Eq. 14 as:

$$\Theta_\phi \left(\underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D)} [\rho(\hat{G}^D) \rho(\hat{G}^D)^\top] \Theta_\phi^\top \Theta_\omega - \mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D), \epsilon^D} \left[\rho(\hat{G}^D) \left((\Theta_{\tilde{\psi}} \rho(\hat{G}^D))^\top \Theta_\gamma + \epsilon^D \right) \right]}_{:= t_D} \right) = 0 \quad (15)$$

To show that Φ leads to the desired invariant defender $\Theta_\phi^\top \Theta_\omega = \Theta_{\tilde{\psi}}^\top \Theta_\gamma$, we assume $\Theta_\phi^\top \Theta_\omega \neq \Theta_{\tilde{\psi}}^\top \Theta_\gamma$ and reach a contradiction. First, according to Step 2, we have $\dim(\text{span}(\{\mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D)} [\rho(\hat{G}^D) \rho(\hat{G}^D)^\top] \left(\Theta_\phi^\top \Theta_\omega - \Theta_{\tilde{\psi}}^\top \Theta_\gamma \right) - \mathbb{E}_{\rho(\hat{G}^D), \epsilon^D} [\rho(\hat{G}^D) \epsilon^D] \}_{D \in \mathcal{D}_{tr}})) > \dim(\phi) - r$. Second, according to Step 1, each $t_D \in \text{Ker}(\phi)$. Therefore, it would follow that $\dim(\text{Ker}(\Theta_\phi)) > \dim(\Theta_\phi) - r$, which contradicts the assumption that $\text{rank}(\Theta_\phi) = r$, which is similar to [2]. Therefore, Φ leads to the desired invariant defender $\Theta_\phi^\top \Theta_\omega = \Theta_{\tilde{\psi}}^\top \Theta_\gamma$. \square

C. Algorithm

In this section, we present the training process for the IDEA algorithm, as illustrated in Algorithm 1. The model f is first optimized using Algorithm 2. During this optimization, the encoder h calculates the representation z for a minibatch of nodes V_t , and the domain learner s identifies the attack domain D . Next, classifiers g and g_d produce predictions \hat{y} and \hat{y}_d , respectively, which are then used to compute the total loss. After updating f , both the attack method and domain learner are optimized. This procedure is repeated iteratively for the number of training iterations.

Algorithm 1 The training process for IDEA method

Require: clean graph $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, X)$, attack method Λ , set of node labels Y

Ensure: model f concluding encoder h , classifiers g and g_d , domain learner s

- 1: **for** number of training iterations **do**
- 2: Sample minibatch of nodes V_t from node set \mathcal{V} , $V_t = \text{Sample}(V)$
 % Optimize the model f
- 3: Update the model f by Algorithm 2
- 4: Sample minibatch of nodes V_t from node set \mathcal{V} , $V_t = \text{Sample}(V)$
 % Optimize the attack method
- 5: Generate the perturbed graph by attack method Λ , $\hat{G} = \Lambda(G)$
- 6: Compute the prediction \hat{y} by the classifier g , $\hat{y} = g(z_{\text{atk}})$, where $z_{\text{atk}} = h(\hat{G})[V_t]$
- 7: Compute the attack loss $\mathcal{L}_{\text{atk}} = -\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{P}}$, where $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{P}}$ is computed by Eq.5
- 8: Compute the gradient of attack method Λ and update Λ .
- 9: Sample minibatch of nodes V_t from node set \mathcal{V} , $V_t = \text{Sample}(V)$
 % Optimize the domain learner
- 10: Generate the perturbed graph by attack method Λ , $\hat{G} = \Lambda(G)$
- 11: Obtain total representation z by concatenating z_{cln} and z_{ptb} , $z = \text{Concat}(z_{\text{cln}}, z_{\text{ptb}})$, where $z_{\text{cln}} = h(G)[V_t]$,
 $z_{\text{ptb}} = h(\hat{G})[V_t]$
- 12: Obtain the attack domain D by domain learner s , $D = s(z)$
- 13: Compute the prediction \hat{y} by the classifier g , $\hat{y} = g(z)$
- 14: Compute the loss for the domain learner s by Eq.11
- 15: Compute the gradient of domain learner s and update s
- 16: **end for**

Algorithm 2 The algorithm of IDEA

Require: clean graph $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, X)$, attack method Λ , set of node labels Y , minibatch nodes V_t

Ensure: updated model f

- 1: Sample a neighbor for each v in V_t and obtain neighbor nodes \mathcal{N}_t , $\mathcal{N}_t = \text{NeighbSample}(V_t)$
- 2: Generate the perturbed graph by attack method Λ , $\hat{G} = \Lambda(G)$
- 3: Compute the representation by the encoder h on clean graph G (i.e., z_{cln}) and on perturbed graph \hat{G} (i.e., z_{ptb}),
 $z_{\text{cln}} = h(G)[V_t]$, $z_{\text{ptb}} = h(\hat{G})[V_t]$
- 4: Obtain the total representation z by concatenating z_{cln} and z_{ptb} , $z = \text{Concat}(z_{\text{cln}}, z_{\text{ptb}})$
- 5: Obtain the attack domain D by domain learner s , $D = s(z)$
- 6: Compute the prediction \hat{y} and prediction based on attack domain \hat{y}_d for nodes V_t by the classifier g and g_d , $\hat{y} = g(z)$,
 $\hat{y}_d = g_d(z, D)$
- 7: Compute the predictive loss $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{P}}$, node-based invariance loss $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}}$, and structural-based invariance loss $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{E}}$ by Eq.5,
 Eq.8, and Eq.9, respectively.
- 8: Compute the total loss $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{P}} + \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{I}} + \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{E}}$
- 9: Compute the gradient of the model f and update f
- 10: **Return** model f
