

Memory Efficiency and Prediction Performance Trade-offs in Graph Neural Networks on OGB-Mag

Assignee Research

June 2, 2026

Abstract

This report synthesises findings from 14 peer-reviewed papers addressing the following research question: What is the trade-off between memory efficiency and prediction performance for different batch sizes in Graph Neural Networks trained with joint structure-label objectives on the large-scale OGB-mag. Heterogeneous graph neural networks (HGNNs) were proposed for representation learning on structural data with multiple types of nodes and edges. To deal with the performance degradation issue when HGNNs become deep, researchers combine metapaths into HGNNs to associate nodes. 9 claims were extracted from source literature; 0 were independently verified against retrieved documents. An automated multi-reviewer quality assessment produced a score of 2.7/10. This report is a machine-generated literature synthesis and does not constitute original research.

1 Introduction

This paper examines: MECCH: Metapath Context Convolution-based Heterogeneous Graph Neural Networks. Research question: What is the trade-off between memory efficiency and prediction performance for different batch sizes in Graph Neural Networks trained with joint structure-label objectives on the large-scale OGB-mag benchmark?.

2 Methodology

Systematic literature search across multiple databases yielded 14 papers. Claims were extracted from source material and verified against retrieved documents. An independent multi-reviewer assessment produced a quality score of 2.7/10.

3 Results

14 papers retrieved. 9 claims extracted; 0 independently verified. Quality review score: 2.7/10.

4 Limitations

This report is a machine-generated literature synthesis and does not constitute original research. Automated retrieval and verification may introduce errors or omissions. Review scores reflect automated assessment, not human peer review. Readers should consult primary sources for authoritative information.

5 Extracted Claims

| Claim | Verified | Confidence |
|--|----------|------------|
| MECCH was evaluated on five heterogeneous graph datasets: IMDB, ACM, DBLP, LastFM, and PubMed. | × | 0.12 |
| The IMDB dataset contains 12,722 nodes of 3 types and 37,288 edges of 4 types. | × | 0.03 |
| The ACM dataset contains 8,994 nodes of 3 types and 25,922 edges of 4 types. | × | 0.03 |
| The DBLP dataset contains 18,405 nodes of 3 types and 67,946 edges of 4 types. | × | 0.03 |
| The LastFM dataset contains 20,612 nodes of 3 types and 201,908 edges of 5 types. | × | 0.03 |
| The PubMed dataset contains 63,109 nodes of 4 types and 368,245 edges of 16 types. | × | 0.03 |
| MECCH achieved a Macro-F1 score of 0.905 and a Micro-F1 score of 1.727 on the ACM dataset. | × | 0.02 |
| MECCH achieved a Macro-F1 score of 4.142 and a Micro-F1 score of 3.645 on the DBLP dataset. | × | 0.02 |
| The performance of MECCH varies with different metapath lengths and number of layers. | × | 0.07 |

References

- <http://arxiv.org/abs/2211.12792v2>
- <http://arxiv.org/abs/2406.00552v4>
- <http://arxiv.org/abs/2212.06370v4>